

Our construction or interpretation of the two bills is supported by the rule of statutory construction announced by the Supreme Court in the cases of *In re Allen*, 91 Ohio St., 315, and *State v. Spiegel*, 91 Ohio St., 13, that where there is reenacted in an amendatory act provisions of the original statute in the same or substantially the same language, such provisions will not be considered as repealed and again reenacted, but will be regarded as having been continuous and undisturbed by the amendatory act, and be given the same meaning in the amendatory act as in the original act.

Respectfully,

THOMAS J. HERBERT,  
*Attorney General.*

---

647.

BONDS—CITY OF TOLEDO, LUCAS COUNTY, \$12,000.00.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, May 25, 1939.

*Retirement Board, Public Employes Retirement System, Columbus, Ohio.*

GENTLEMEN :

RE: Bonds of the City of Toledo, Lucas County, Ohio,  
\$12,000.

I have examined the transcript of proceedings relative to the above bonds purchased by you. These bonds comprise part of an issue of bridge bonds in the aggregate amount of \$65,000, dated March 1, 1927, and bearing interest at the rate of  $4\frac{1}{2}\%$  per annum.

From this examination, in the light of the law under authority of which the above bonds have been authorized, I am of the opinion that bonds issued under these proceedings constitute valid and legal obligations of said city.

Respectfully,

THOMAS J. HERBERT,  
*Attorney General.*