

inspector might reasonably acquire while in holding like positions, in various cities. We are unable to see how such an object relates itself either directly or with reasonable necessity to the duties of the relator's office. * * *

While the opinion of the Attorney General above referred to concerns a board of library trustees, and the opinion of the Circuit Court above quoted from relates to the officials of a municipality, the conclusions of said opinions and the principles of law upon which the same were based, apply with equal force to the question here under consideration.

I am of the opinion, therefore, that if a board of park commissioners in its sound discretion believes that such travel is necessary and proper in the carrying on of the business of the park district, such board may allow and pay the traveling expenses of its secretary, when the trip or journey in which such expenses were incurred is necessarily implied in or reasonably and directly incident to the duties of the secretary, but that traveling expenses incurred by such secretary in attending conventions, or on like trips, cannot be allowed and paid out of the public funds.

Respectfully,

EDWARD C. TURNER,

Attorney General.

280.

DISAPPROVAL, BONDS OF JEFFERSON RURAL SCHOOL DISTRICT, HAMILTON COUNTY, OHIO—\$28,000.00.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, April 4, 1927.

Re: Bonds of Jefferson Rural School District, Hamilton County, \$28,000.00.

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

GENTLEMEN:—Upon examination of the transcript for the above bond issue I note that these bonds purport to have been authorized by elections held in 1925 and 1926.

The affidavit of the publisher shows that notice of the 1925 election was first published on October 10th. The last of the four publications was accordingly made on October 31st; the election was held on November 3rd so that a full week had not elapsed between the date of the last publication and the date of election.

The affidavit as to the 1926 election shows that the first publication was on October 8th, the last publication was accordingly on October 29th. As the election was on November 2nd a full week had not elapsed after the last publication.

Section 5649-9b of the General Code makes it mandatory that notice shall be given for four consecutive weeks prior to the election.

In construing similar statutes requiring notice the Supreme Court of Ohio has ruled that a full week must elapse from the date of the last publication. See the case of State of Ohio vs. Kuhner and King, 107 O. S., page 406.

Because of the insufficiency of the notice of both elections I am compelled to advise you that the bonds should be rejected.

Respectfully,

EDWARD C. TURNER,

Attorney General.