

It should be noticed that in the per curiam opinion in the case of *Trustees of Crane Township vs. Trustees of Antrim Township*, 12 O. S. 430, the following statement appears:

“If a person resident in, and having a settlement entitling him to relief under the act for relief of the poor of the state, removes to a sister state, with the intention of remaining, and while there, exercises the right of suffrage, and acquires a residence and settlement entitling him to relief under the poor laws of that state, his residence and settlement in this state is lost, and his return will not revive it. He must obtain a new settlement after his return, by a continuous residence of one year, in some township in this state.”

However, I do not think that the above case would require the blind person in question to secure a legal settlement in another state for blind relief purposes, even though the blind person intends to make such foreign state his home, before he would lose his right to blind relief in this state. Clearly, our statutes contemplate relief to citizens of this state. It is well established that the statutes of our state have no extra territorial effect. As stated in 1 Lewis' Sutherland Statutory Construction 21:

“Statutes derive their force from the authority of the legislature which enacts them; and hence, as a necessary consequence, their authority as statutes will be limited to the territory or county to which the enacting power is limited. It is only within these boundaries that the legislature is law maker, that its laws govern people, that they operate of their own vigor upon any subject.”

Whether or not the blind person in question could again secure blind relief if he returned to this state, is not asked by you, and I express no opinion upon the same.

Without further prolonging this discussion, it is my opinion that where a person who has been receiving blind relief in this state under the provisions of Sections 2965, et seq., General Code, changes his residence and domicile to another state, he is ineligible to further blind relief in this state while residing in such other state.

Respectfully,
JOHN W. BRICKER,
Attorney General.

3202.

DISAPPROVAL, CERTIFICATE OF INCORPORATION OF THE BELL
MUTUAL FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, September 13, 1934.

HON. GEORGE S. MYERS, *Secretary of State, Columbus, Ohio.*

DEAR SIR:—I have examined the certificate of incorporation of The Bell Mutual Fire Insurance Company.

Section 9594, General Code, in stating what the certificate of incorporation shall contain, provides that the kinds of property proposed to be insured, specified in Section 9593, also must be specified in such certificate. I do not believe there has been a sufficient specification of the kinds of property which it is proposed to insure. Opinions of the Attorney General for 1919, Volume I, page 18; 1910-11, page 245.

While the certificate in setting forth the purposes of the association provides, as required by law, for the enforcement of a contract entered into in which the parties thereto agree to be assessed specifically for incidental purposes and for the payment of losses which occur to members, it does not contain the power to assess upon and collect from each other sums of money from time to time as are necessary to pay losses which occur by fire and lightning, cyclones, tornadoes, windstorms and explosions from gas to any member of such association.

I notice also that the association in question is called a mutual fire insurance company. Of course, this is not to be a mutual fire insurance company but a mutual protective fire insurance association, and the name as set forth in this certificate would be misleading to the public. It is my opinion that this association should not, for that reason, be called a mutual fire insurance company.

For the reasons above stated, I am herewith returning said certificate of incorporation to you without my approval thereon.

Respectfully,
JOHN W. BRICKER,
Attorney General.

3203.

APPROVAL, BONDS OF CITY OF CLEVELAND, CUYAHOGA COUNTY,
OHIO—\$56,000.00.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, September 13, 1934.

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

3204.

APPROVAL, BONDS OF CITY OF HAMILTON, BUTLER COUNTY,
OHIO—\$126,000.00.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, September 13, 1934.

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