

Continued

purposes in these words:

"To create for the City of Baltimore a commission to determine upon and to erect jointly with the State of Maryland, a memorial in Baltimore City to the men and women of Maryland who gave their lives for their country in the military or naval service in the World War, and to commemorate the services of all other men and women of Maryland who were engaged in the military or naval service".

These ordinances referred to above have no specific sections setting forth the power of the War Memorial Commission, as the ordinances were passed for the particular purpose of appointing a building commission which was to have full control of the erection of the building, the selection of its design, etc., and, upon its completion, the ordinances provided that the Park Board was to have jurisdiction over this lot of ground.

It seems to me, therefore, that we must have reference entirely to the Code of 1924 and Section 63 of Article 65, with particular reference to the heading of the act wherein its purpose is set forth. I, therefore, feel that suitable regulations can be passed by the War Memorial Commission for the regulation, use and conduct of the War Memorial Building itself.

I concur in what the Attorney General says, that this cannot be an arbitrary abuse of this power. I disagree with him, however, when he says that this is not an arbitrary abuse of its power, for as set forth in the original act "all persons" were to be given the privilege of using the War Memorial Building subject to reasonable regulations.

Very truly yours,

(signed) EDWIN J. WOLF

Assistant City Solicitor

EJW/DS