

ted with the papers the certificate of the department of finance showing funds appropriated and available in the amounts of the several contracts.

Finding, as I do, that the proceedings in respect to these several proposed contracts have been in conformity to law, and that the proposed contracts themselves are in proper form, I am endorsing my approval thereon, and am returning them herewith, together with all accompanying papers as above noted.

Respectfully,  
JOHN G. PRICE,  
*Attorney-General.*

---

2616.

APPROVAL, BONDS OF CITY OF SPRINGFIELD, OHIO, IN AMOUNT OF \$40,000 FOR STREET IMPROVEMENTS.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, November 22, 1921.

*Department of Industrial Relations, Industrial Commission of Ohio, Columbus, Ohio.*

---

2617.

TOWNSHIP MEMORIAL BUILDING—WHERE FOUR TOWNSHIPS VOTE UPON BOND ISSUE—THREE RETURN NEGATIVE VOTE—EFFECT OF SUCH VOTE.

*Where four townships have voted under authority of sections 3410-1 to 3410-11 G. C. upon the question of authorizing the bonds of the township for the proportionate share of the township in the cost of erecting a memorial building at the expense of such four townships, three of the townships returning a negative vote, and one an affirmative vote, the aggregate vote for the four townships being affirmative, HELD,*

1. *The three townships returning a negative vote are neither required nor authorized to issue bonds for the proposed building.*
2. *The township returning an affirmative vote is not authorized to issue bonds and use the proceeds for the erection of a single township building.*

COLUMBUS, OHIO, November 23, 1921.

HON. ALLAN G. AIGLER, *Prosecuting Attorney, Norwalk, Ohio.*

DEAR SIR:—Your letter of recent date is received, reading:

“Under sections 3410-1 and 3410-2 of the General Code, the question of issuing bonds in the sum of eighty thousand dollars (\$80,000.00) for a joint memorial building was submitted to the electors of four townships in Huron county, at the regular election held November 8th, 1921. In three of said townships a majority of the electors voted against the proposed bond issue, while in the fourth township the bond issue carried by so large a majority that, taking the four townships together, there was a majority in favor of the bond issue.