1964 OPINIONS

papers of general circulation in the subdivision once a week for four consecutive weeks prior thereto. * * " In the case of *State* vs. *Kulmer and King*, 107 O. S. 406, the court interpreted the word "for" to mean during the continuance of rather than the number of times of insertion.

Throughout this entire transcript, there is no mention made of federal participation nor reference to House Bill 544 effective June 7, 1935, and for this reason the procedure taken in the issuance of those bonds must have been taken pursuant to the Uniform Bond Act. The election notice was not published pursuant to Section 2293-21, General Code, and I am therefore disapproving this transcript and advise your system against the purchase of these bonds.

Respectfully,
HERBERT S. DUFFY,
Attorney General.

3145.

DISAPPROVAL—BONDS, BENNINGTON RURAL SCHOOL DISTRICT, LICKING COUNTY, OHIO, \$4,500.00.

Columbus, Ohio, October 27, 1938.

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

RE: Bonds of Bennington Rural School District, Licking County, Ohio, \$4,500.00.

I have examined the transcript relative to the above bond issue and wish to advise you that there are certain omissions from the transcript that I shall not enumerate at this time but wish to point out to you one pertinent defect upon which I base my disapproving opinion:

The election notice was published in the Newark Advocate four times beginning October 7, 1937, and for that reason the first insertion was not a full twenty-eight days prior to the date of election, namely November 2, 1937. Section 2293-21, General Code, provides in part as follows: "Notice of the election shall be published in one or more newspapers of general circulation in the subdivision once a week for four consecutive weeks prior thereto. * * " In the case of State vs. Kuhner and King, 107 O. S. 406, the court interpreted the word "for" to mean during the continuance of rather than the number of times of insertion.

Throughout this entire transcript, there is no mention made of federal participation nor reference to House Bill 544, effective June 7, 1935, and for this reason the procedure taken in the issuance of these bonds must have been taken pursuant to the Uniform Bond Act. The election notice was not published pursuant to Section 2293-21, General Code, and I am therefore disapproving this transcript and advise your system against the purchase of these bonds. Respectfully.

Herbert S. Duffy
Attorney General.

3146.

APPROVAL—CANAL LAND LEASE, STATE OF OHIO, THROUGH SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC WORKS, WITH CURTIS GREEN, GROVEPORT, OHIO, TERM FIFTEEN YEARS, ANNUAL RENTAL, \$15.00, RIGHT TO OCCUPY AND USE FOR RESIDENTIAL AND AGRICULTURAL PURPOSES, DESCRIBED PORTION, ABANDONED OHIO CANAL PROPERTY, MADISON TOWNSHIP, FRANKLIN COUNTY, OHIO.

Columbus, Ohio, October 27, 1938.

Hon. Carl G. Wahl, Director, Department of Public Works, Columbus, Ohio.

DEAR SIR: You recently submitted for my examination and approval a certain canal land lease in triplicate executed by you as Superintendent of Public Works and as Director of said department to one Curtis Green of Groveport, Ohio.

By this lease, which is one for a stated term of fifteen years and which provides for an annual rental of \$15.00, there is leased and demised to the lessee above named the right to occupy and use for residential and agricultural purposes that portion of the abandoned Ohio Canal property, located in Madison Township, Franklin County, Ohio, and described as follows:

Being the portion of said canal property, lying between the southerly line of said canal property and the southerly line of that portion of said canal property leased to the Scioto Valley Traction Company, under date of December 28, 1916, and extending from the east end of Lock No. 19, south of the Licking Summit, said end of lock being at or near