

the word to include a process involving the principles of photography in the recording of the instruments specified by the section.

In this connection, it is believed that the main purpose of the section considered was to require an exact record of the language used in the specified instruments, in order that the meaning, purport, and significance, of such language should be permanently preserved for the purpose of determining the legal rights of parties bound by such instruments, and it is thought the legislature was more concerned in the reproduction of the language used rather than in requiring the exact image or reproduction of the characters and symbols of which such language was composed.

It is not known definitely as to the date of the invention or perfection of the process or art called "photostating," however from information available it is not believed that the process could be said to have existed or been known at the time of the enactment of H. B. No. 578, May 12, 1902, and under such circumstances it is hardly possible that the legislature intended by the use of the word "printing" to include such a process. It would seem therefore more reasonable to presume, that by the use of the word printing the legislature contemplated the process of typographical printing, or that ordinarily obtained from the use of inks or pigments and the mechanical impression of types upon paper or other impressible surfaces.

Viewed however in the light of economy it would seem that such a process might possess many advantages over those methods now employed in the recording of public records, since from information obtainable it is thought the same might save time and labor, as well as being less expensive than the present methods in use. While appreciative therefore of the advantages possibly attainable by the adoption of this modern method of recording public records, yet until such a time as the legislature may see fit to more specifically authorize such a process, I feel unwarranted in concluding that the word "printing" as used in section 2759 G. C. may be construed to include the process of photostating. Specific answer therefore to your question must be made in the negative.

Respectfully,

JOHN G. PRICE,
Attorney-General.

2998.

APPROVAL, ABSTRACT OF TITLE, PREMISES SITUATE IN MUSKINGUM COUNTY, VILLAGE OF DRESDEN, PART OF OUT-LOT NUMBERED THIRTY-FIVE.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, April 17, 1922.

HON. GEORGE FLORENCE, *Adjutant General of Ohio, Columbus, Ohio.*

DEAR SIR:—You have submitted an abstract, certified by John P. Baker, abstracter, March 16, 1922, and inquired as to the status of the title to the following described premises as disclosed by said abstract:

"Situated in the county of Muskingum, in the State of Ohio, and in the village of Dresden, and bounded and described as follows: And being a part of out-lot numbered thirty-five (No. 35) as the said lot is numbered and designated upon the plat of said village of Dresden, recorded in the recorder's office of Muskingum county, Ohio, in deed record, volume I, page 24, commencing on the southeast corner of said lot 35, thence westwardly

with the south line of said lot two hundred and thirty-six (236) feet to a point on the south line of said lot, thence north parallel with the east line of said lot 35 to a point on the north line of said lot two hundred and thirty-six (236) feet west of the northeast corner of said lot, thence east with the north line of said lot two hundred and thirty-six (236) feet to the northeast corner of said lot, thence south with the east line of said lot to the place of beginning; and being a part of the same premises conveyed to the said John F. Egbert and Fannie A. Egbert by Mary Ada Scaife by deed dated March 4, 1919, and of record in volume 179, page 379 of the deed records of Muskingum county, Ohio."

On examination of said abstract I find a number of imperfections in the chain of title in reference to tax titles and unreleased mortgages. However, in view of the time that has elapsed since the execution of such instruments, it is believed that no serious consideration need be given these matters.

It is the opinion of this department that the abstract shows a sufficient title to be in the name of John F. Egbert and Fannie A. Egbert at the date of the abstract, free from encumbrances excepting the taxes for the last half of the year 1921 and the taxes for the year 1922, all of which are liens upon the premises.

You have further submitted a deed executed by said John F. Egbert and Fannie A. Egbert conveying said premises to the State of Ohio, which it is believed is sufficient when properly delivered.

Respectfully,
JOHN G. PRICE,
Attorney-General.