

2459.

APPROVAL, DEFICIENCY BONDS OF WEST JEFFERSON VILLAGE  
SCHOOL DISTRICT IN AMOUNT OF \$10,500.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, October 10, 1921.

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

Re: Deficiency bonds of West Jefferson village school district in the amount of \$10,500, being 17 bonds of \$500 each and 2 bonds of \$1,000 each—6 per cent.

GENTLEMEN:—I have examined the transcript of the proceedings of the board of education and other officers of the West Jefferson village school district, relative to the above bond issue, and find the same regular and in conformity with the provisions of the General Code.

In approving the bonds under consideration, I wish to call your attention to the fact that the resolution authorizing the issuance of the bonds has been amended since the same were purchased by the commission so that under the amendment the bonds fall due as follows:

One bond of \$500 falling due on the first day of April and October of each year, commencing October 1, 1922, and ending April 1, 1930, and one bond of \$1,000 falling due October 1, 1930; one bond of \$1,000 falling due April 1, 1931.

This change in the bond resolution was necessary in order to comply with the General Code requiring such bonds to fall due within ten years from the date of issuance.

I am of the opinion that said bonds, drawn in accordance with the legislation authorizing their issuance, will, upon delivery, constitute valid and binding obligations of said school district.

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

2460.

ROADS AND HIGHWAYS—WHERE COUNTY COMMISSIONERS ELECT  
TO DO ROAD WORK—NOT AUTHORIZED TO EMPLOY ROAD FORE-  
MAN.

*Where county commissioners have elected to do road work by force account they are not authorized by section 6948-1 G. C. or otherwise to employ a road foreman to take charge of the work, but they must proceed as defined in sections 7198 G. C. et seq.*

COLUMBUS, OHIO, October 11, 1921.

HON. LLOYD S. LEECH, *Prosecuting Attorney, Coshocton, Ohio.*

DEAR SIR:—Your letter of September 22nd, is received relative to the matter of force account work. The substance of your inquiry is whether the county commissioners may, on the one hand, under section 6948-1 employ a road foreman to do work; or whether on the other hand, the work is merely to be designated by the board of county commissioners, leaving the actual