

an inference should not be indulged in that will defeat the object of the law. *C. C. Cook & Cook vs. Hamilton County*, 3 O. F. D. 207.

In construing a statute, a word is not to be given a limited or specialized meaning until such meaning is attached by authority of legislative enactment. *Venable vs. Schafer*, 7 C. C. (N. S.) 337, 339.

The legislature has, in reference to corporations formed under the General Corporation Act, given an enlarged meaning to the word "articles" which, if applicable to insurance companies, will, where the specific statutes require approval of the Attorney General of articles of incorporation, effectuate the purpose of the legislature to prevent illegal provisions in articles of a corporation and subsequent amendments. In so far as the legislature has failed expressly to provide for the approval of the Attorney General of amendments to articles, certificates, etc., which have to do with the fundamental powers of the corporation, it would seem that the definition contained in Section 8623-2, General Code, can well be held to be applicable. This definition is not in conflict with the special provisions of the insurance laws but rather is an aid in making the special provisions effective.

You point out in your communication that the Superintendent of Insurance construes the statutes expressly requiring approval by the Attorney General of articles of incorporation of insurance companies to require a like approval by implication of amendments to said articles. Administrative interpretation of a statute is not conclusive but, where long continued, is to be given the greatest consideration. *Industrial Commission vs. Brown*, 92 O. S. 309, 311; *State, ex rel. vs. Brown*, 121 O. S. 73, 75; *State vs. Evans*, 21 O. A. 168.

Recognizing the strength and validity of the arguments against the liberal interpretation of the statutes which contain no express provision as to the approval by the Attorney General of amendments to articles of incorporation, certificates, etc., I am not convinced that they are of such conclusive character as to prevent an interpretation which more closely conforms to the purpose of the particular statutes in question and the clear legislative policy of regulating insurance companies in the interest of the public good.

Based on the foregoing, I am of the opinion that where the provisions of the General Code require the approval of the Attorney General of articles of incorporation of insurance companies, a like approval must be endorsed on all amendments thereto.

Respectfully,

GILBERT BETTMAN,
Attorney General.

3916.

APPROVAL, BONDS OF RIPLEY VILAGE SCHOOL DISTRICT, BROWN COUNTY, OHIO—\$30,000.00.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, January 6, 1932.

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