

said before, be conditioned upon its reasonableness, and I make no attempt to pass upon this question without having a specific case before me.

Although I have made answer to your question, I deem it not improper to point out that the question presented appears to be one which should be answered in the first instance by the solicitor of the municipal corporation in question and then by the courts. As I have stated at the first of this opinion, it is difficult to generalize upon a subject of this character because of the fact that the apparently minor provisions of particular ordinances or peculiar sets of facts may ultimately be decisive of the reasonableness of the ordinances in particular cases. Charter provisions may also have a direct bearing on the question under consideration. Because of this I feel that it would be unsafe to use this opinion as a test of the validity of any particular municipal legislation, since it is a mere generalization indicating the modern tendency with respect to the exercise of police power.

Respectfully,
EDWARD C. TURNER,
Attorney General.

1907.

APPROVAL, BONDS OF COLERAIN TOWNSHIP RURAL SCHOOL DISTRICT, BELMONT COUNTY, OHIO—\$9,000.00.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, March 28, 1928.

Retirement Board, State Teachers Retirement System, Columbus, Ohio.

1908.

APPROVAL, BONDS OF COLERAIN TOWNSHIP RURAL SCHOOL DISTRICT, BELMONT COUNTY—\$14,768.33.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, March 28, 1928.

Retirement Board, State Teachers Retirement System, Columbus, Ohio.