

one of the rights and remedies which have accrued previous thereto. In the second place, even if it be said that the construction which I have outlined above would give the statute a retroactive operation, I would nevertheless be of the opinion that it is the correct one. As aforesaid, remedial statutes should be given a liberal construction and in my opinion, the following rule stated in Sutherland, *supra*, page 1075, should be followed:

“The letter of remedial statutes may be extended to include cases clearly within the mischief they were intended to remedy, unless such construction does violence to the language used; * * *”

In conclusion and to summarize, it is my opinion that Section 13452-7 of the General Code, being a remedial statute, should be given a liberal interpretation to carry out its purposes so that it may include all cases not expressly excluded and that since there is nothing in the statute clearly indicating a legislative intent to exclude from the operation of this statute all persons who had been convicted prior to the effective date thereof, the judge of the Court of Common Pleas has the power to restore the rights of citizenship to a person who was convicted and placed on probation prior to the effective date of the statute to the same extent and in the same manner as he has the said power in connection with persons who have been convicted and placed on probation after the effective date of the statute.

Respectfully,

HERBERT S. DUFFY,
Attorney General.

2823.

APPROVAL—BONDS OF CUYAHOGA COUNTY, OHIO,
\$15,000.00.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, August 16, 1938.

State Employes Retirement Board, Columbus, Ohio.

GENTLEMEN:

RE: Bonds of Cuyahoga County, Ohio, \$15,000.00.

The above purchase of bonds appears to be part of an issue of bonds of the above county dated December 16, 1932. The transcript

relative to this issue was approved by this office in an opinion rendered to the Teachers Retirement System under date of October 10, 1933, being Opinion No. 1786.

It is accordingly my opinion that these bonds constitute valid and legal obligations of said county.

Respectfully,

HERBERT S. DUFFY,
Attorney General.

2824.

APPROVAL—BONDS OF CITY OF CLEVELAND, CUYAHOGA
COUNTY, OHIO, \$15,000.00.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, August 16, 1938.

State Employes Retirement Board, Columbus, Ohio.

GENTLEMEN :

RE: Bonds of City of Cleveland, Cuyahoga County,
Ohio, \$15,000.00.

The above purchase of bonds appears to be part of an issue of bonds of the above city dated December 1, 1926. The transcript relative to this issue was approved by this office in an opinion rendered to the Industrial Commission under date of April 1, 1937, being Opinion No. 374.

It is accordingly my opinion that these bonds constitute valid and legal obligations of said city.

Respectfully,

HERBERT S. DUFFY,
Attorney General.