

File No. 11310 Continued.

OPINION.

8976

Department had taken the position that the ownership of these cable conduits was in the City, and that the cost of removing them should be borne by the City. On the contrary, however, this Department has always ruled that these structures still belong to the Railways Company, and that the Company is bound to remove them at its own expense when they impede or in any way interfere with the operations of the various City departments in the streets.

8977

In so far as the Sewerage Commission's work is concerned, it was agreed that the contractors should remove these cableways, in the first instance, because of the fact that they were in a situation to remove them more economically, and that a separate statement should be kept of the cost incident to the removal, - the ultimate payment to await the termination by the Court of the legal questions involved. No such termination by the Court has as yet been made. I return Mr. Hood's letter.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) Edgar Allan Poe,
City Solicitor.

.....

File No. 11317.

CORRESPONDENCE.

SEWERAGE COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF BALTIMORE
CHIEF ENGINEER'S OFFICE,
AMERICAN BUILDING.

Baltimore, May 12th, 1910.

Mr. Edgar Allan Poe,
City Solicitor.

Dear Sir:-

I enclose herewith a letter received from Irwin Brothers, contractors for Sanitary Lateral Sewer Contracts Nos. 48 and 49, with reference to repairs to water pipes.

8978