

be reckoned with most seriously and not disregarded and set aside unless judicial construction makes it imperative so to do. *State, ex rel. vs. Brown*, 121 O. S., 73; *Industrial Commission vs. Brown*, 92 O. S. 309; L. R. A. 1916B, 1277; 25 R. C. L. 1043; *Opinions of Attorney General*, 1932, Vol. I, page 337. In that instant case, I do not find that judicial construction requires a variation from this administrative interpretation of Section 2973, General Code, which interpretation appears to have been recognized in the opinion of this office rendered in 1920, *supra*.

It is accordingly my opinion, in specific answer to your question, that the limitation of one hundred dollars for expenses of a board of county visitors in any year contained in Section 2973, General Code, is a limitation upon the total expenses of such board and its members for such period of time.

Respectfully,

JOHN W. BRICKER,
Attorney General.

4934.

APPROVAL, BONDS OF CITY OF TORONTO, JEFFERSON
COUNTY, OHIO, \$7,000.00.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, November 23, 1935.

State Employes Retirement Board, Columbus, Ohio.

4935.

APPROVAL, BONDS OF VILLAGE OF DRESDEN, MUSKINGUM
COUNTY, OHIO, \$24,000.00 (UNLIMITED).

COLUMBUS, OHIO, November 23, 1935.

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