

File No. 11237.

CORRESPONDENCE.

ELECTRICAL COMMISSION OF BALTIMORE CITY.

OFFICE OF CHIEF ENGINEER.

Baltimore, April 22, 1910.

Hon. Edgar Allan Poe,
City Solicitor.

Dear Sir:-

0891

I beg to hand you a copy of a letter from the Maryland Telephone Company and a draft of letter which I have written in reply thereto which will partially explain the condition on which I would respectfully request you to advise me. The facts are as follows:

A good many years ago when the Maryland Tel. & Tel. Company was building up its business in the city they made application to the Electrical Commission from time to time for the construction of conduits for their accommodation. The Commission established a rule that in such cases, in order that the Company making application should not have the right to ask for the construction of unlimited conduits which might not be used, to require the company making application to guarantee the use of at least 70% of the amount of duct space which they requested to be constructed. The companies in making application, made it specifically with this provision. In some cases it was stated that 70% of the capacity asked for, and in some cases it was stated as an actual number of ducts.

In 1900 or 1901, upon application of the Maryland Tel. & Tel. Company, we constructed a conduit in Hanover Street from Barre to Cross Street upon the guarantee of the Maryland Tel. & Tel. Co., that they would pay rental for 9 ducts, and this they did up to sometime ago.

In the winter of 1904 and 1905, the Maryland Tel. & Tel. Co., entered into the electric light business through the medium of a company called the Baltimore Electric Company, but this latter company had no franchises for the use of the city conduits, but operated through the Maryland Tel. & Tel. Company.

At the request of the Maryland Tel. & Tel. Company, and for our own convenience in keeping account of the classification of cables the account carried in the name of that company was divided into "tel-