File No. 3528 Continued. CORRESPONDENCE.

MARYLAND TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH COMPANY.

Baltimore, Sept. 7, 1905.

Mr. Charles E. Phelps, Jr.,
Chief Engineer,
Electrical Commission of Baltimore City,
City Hall, City.

Dear Sir:-

I beg to acknowledge receipt of your favor of the 5th inst., relative to the electrolytic action on our transmission cables at Charles and West Streets, and Riverside and Fort Avenues.

2874 I fully agree with you that the only feasible way to permanently protect these cables against electrolytic action is to run a copper return, of sufficient size, to the power houses in question. This should be done as quickly as possible as any delay in this matter will in all probability cause us an infinite amount of trouble and expense.

We, as tenants of the City, however, cannot erect this copper return at our expense, but respectfully request and demand as our right that we receive adequate protection of some kind at the earliest possible moment.

It seems to us that this case should be settled in the same manner as was the controversy in regard to the electrolytic action on our telephone cables. A precedent was established at that time, which, in our opinion, should apply in this case.

Yours very truly,
MARYLAND TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH CO.,
(Signed) J. J. Comer,
General Manager.

File No. 3528.

ELECTRICAL COMMISSION OF BALTIMORE CITY,
OFFICE OF CHIEF ENGINEER.

Baltimore, Sept. 21, 1905.

Mr. J. J. Comer,
General Manager,
Maryland Telephone & Telegraph Co.,
City.

Dear Sir:-

2875 I have your letter of September 16th, enclosing tests for electrolysis on your transmission cables from the Gould Street Power House