

"Here, * * the purpose of the journey was to acquire such information in regard to the duties of his office as the building inspector might reasonably acquire while in attendance upon a convention of officials 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. He was presumably appointed to his present position because of his fitness by experience and education to discharge the duties of the place, and the salary paid him is presumably adapted to secure the degree of efficiency in these respects which the city desires that its building inspector shall possess. If a person relatively uneducated, inexperienced and inefficient in the discharge of the duties of the position of building inspector were appointed at a salary proportioned to his fitness, it might as well be argued that his deficiencies may thereafter be supplemented at the charge of the municipality which he serves by directing him to attend an architectural school and to render his bills for board and tuition to the city. The salary attached to the office of building inspector is presumed to be sufficient to enable him to maintain his professional or official efficiency at proper standard."

It is axiomatic that public office or public employment should not be regarded as a sinecure. The service rendered is presumed at least to be commensurate with the compensation, and it would clearly be an illegal expenditure of public funds to pay an employe for doing nothing. Theoretically, of course, the rule which you state has been adopted by the library board in question does not contemplate the expenditure of public money without proper return therefor. However, the arrangement which the rule authorizes does not result in providing a fixed compensation, in my opinion, such as is contemplated by the statute and is therefore an unauthorized exercise of power on the part of the board of library trustees.

Respectfully,

GILBERT BETTMAN,

Attorney General.

3302.

APPROVAL, CONTRACT FOR ROAD IMPROVEMENT IN ASHLAND COUNTY.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, June 5, 1931.

HON. O. W. MERRELL, *Director of Highways, Columbus, Ohio.*

3303.

INSURANCE—LIABILITY AND PROPERTY DAMAGE UPON VEHICLES USED FOR TRANSPORTING CHILDREN'S HOME INMATES TO SCHOOL—MAY NOT BE PROCURED BY COUNTY COMMISSIONERS AND HOME'S TRUSTEES.

SYLLABUS:

Neither a board of county commissioners, nor the trustees of a children's