fewer than four cases which went to the court by bond
attorneys seeking to have the word, debt, defined.

Without going into the layman's language, those who are not working in this field can wonder with some degree of justifiable amazement, I think, why this should be the case, but nevertheless it is the case, and it stems from an old precedent called Baltimore versis Gill, in which the Court of Appeals held that the City, in seeking to hypothecate stock, that is to say, pledging stock that it owned to secure the indebtedness of another entity, by pledging its own property, was thereby creating a debt, and therefore that the act of pledging was invalid within Section 34, so ever since that time, whenever we have had a situation in which bonds are to be issued, the question always comes up in bond attorneys! minds as to whether or not you are creating a debt, because if you are creating a debt, then you are creating what is known as a Section 34 debt, and all of the other provisions of Section 34 have to be followed, the principal one being, or the principal ones being first, that you must have a tax which will support that debt, and secondly,

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21