

7. Transcript contains no certificate as to the fact that notice of the adoption of said resolution was served on property owners to be assessed, or as to the time and manner of said service.

8. Transcript does not set out the minutes of the meeting of council at which the ordinance to proceed was passed.

9. It does not appear that said ordinance was published in the manner provided by law.

10. The ordinance to proceed does not refer to the date of the passage of the resolution of necessity as required by statute.

11. It is reasonably apparent that council had no authority to pass the ordinance to proceed at the time indicated by the transcript. The resolution of necessity apparently was passed August 1, 1922 and the ordinance to proceed was passed August 18, 1922. Apparently the resolution of necessity was adopted by council without a petition for said improvement having been filed. Said resolution did not by reason of the provisions of the referendum law go into effect for thirty days after its passage, and the ordinance to proceed should not have been passed until the resolution of necessity went into effect.

Again, it is altogether probable that if any notice of the adoption of the resolution of necessity was served upon abutting property owners as required by law, the same was not completed two weeks before the time said ordinance to proceed was passed, as required by the statutes.

12. The transcript does not show the minutes of the meetings of the council at which time the bond ordinance was passed. The bond ordinance should refer to the part of the street to be improved rather than to the whole of said street.

13. The bond ordinance is defective in that it does not affirmatively appear therein that the bonds to be issued are in anticipation of the collection of assessments for the improvement of the part of the street above indicated.

14. The bond ordinance is defective because it does not provide for tax levies upon the taxable property of the village to meet deficiencies in the collection of assessments for said improvement.

15. The transcript should show that this proposed issue of bonds was offered to the board of sinking fund trustees of said village and by said board rejected.

16. The transcript contains no financial statement.

Some of the objections above noted may doubtless be corrected by further information. It is apparent, however, that some of them are fatal to this issue of bonds, and I feel that I have no discretion to do otherwise than disapprove same and advise you not to purchase this issue.

Respectfully,
JOHN G. PRICE,
Attorney-General.

3720.

APPROVAL, BONDS OF FRANKLIN TOWNSHIP RURAL SCHOOL DISTRICT, FRANKLIN COUNTY, \$1,500, FOR ERECTION OF PORTABLE SCHOOL BUILDING.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, November 15, 1922.

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