

At the time of the enactment of the budget law in 1925, in which Section 2987, General Code, was enacted in its present form there was enacted Section 5649-3g which read in part as follows:

“At the beginning of each fiscal year, the county commissioners of every county, the board of education of every school district, including county school districts, the council of or other legislative authority of every municipal corporation, including charter municipalities, the trustees of every township, and the governing board or body of every other type of political subdivision or taxing district authorized by law to levy taxes or expend public funds shall make appropriations classified for the several purposes for which expenditures are to be made for and during the said fiscal year. \* \* \* ”

The provisions of Section 5649-3g, General Code, above quoted, were incorporated by the 87th General Assembly in Section 5625-29, General Code, (112 O. L. 404) which together with Section 2987, General Code, supra, are the only provisions of the statutes relating to the payment of salaries of deputies, assistants and other employes of the county offices. By virtue of Section 5625-29, General Code, the county commissioners on or about the first day of each year are directed to make appropriations for the several purposes for which expenditures may be made during the year from the funds of the county. This appropriation measure may be supplemented from time to time during the year as necessity requires. County commissioners in making this appropriation and in exercising the discretion vested in them by virtue of Section 2987, supra, to determine what is the appropriate fund from which the compensation of the deputies and employes of the county officers should be paid, could certainly not be said to have abused their discretion if they should determine that the appropriate fund from which an inspector, employed by a county surveyor to make inspections of a public improvement which was being constructed under authority of the county commissioners, should be paid from the same fund from which the cost of the improvement itself was being paid.

I am therefore of the opinion that a county surveyor may appoint inspectors for the purpose of making inspections of road or bridge improvements constructed under authority of the county commissioners and that said inspectors should be paid from appropriations made by the county commissioners for the purpose; and that county commissioners may make appropriations for the purpose of paying such inspectors from the road or bridge fund, as the case may be.

Respectfully,  
EDWARD C. TURNER,  
*Attorney General.*

---

1080.

APPROVAL, BONDS OF THE CITY OF CANTON, STARK COUNTY, OHIO  
—\$5,650.89.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, September 29, 1927.