tive office at the same time goes to the character of the office rather than to whether the officer draws two salaries.

Indiana Constitution, Article II, Section 9.

The answer to your sixth question is in the negative. It is the duty of the Director of Public Welfare, if possessed of the requisite qualifications, upon the request of the court, to perform such designated duties of a probation officer as the court may direct. These duties are performed by him by virtue of his office as County Director and not by virtue of some new appointment.

Acts of 1936, page ...

The County Board can and doubtless will take into consideration the question of whether the County Director will be called upon to perform the extra duties as provided in Section 21 of the Act, in fixing his salary within the maximum limits provided in the Act; but the salary, when fixed, is the salary as County Director and not as County Director and Probation Officer.

Your seventh question is answered in the negative. The salary of the County Director as provided by the statute covers his salary both for his regular duties as well as for his ex officio duties.

PROBATION DIVISION, STATE: Effect of Welfare Act on State Probation Commission and county probation work (See opinion to Hon. Wayne Coy, Acting Administrator of the Department of Public Welfare, dated April 20, 1936.)

April 20, 1936.

Hon. Francis D. McCabe,
Director of Probation,
Indianapolis, Indiana.

Dear Sir:

I have before me your letter requesting an official opinion in answer to the following question:

"In what respect, if any, has the Indiana State Probation Commission and County Probation work,
as it now exists in the several counties of the State, been affected by the State Security Act?"

The same question stated more in detail has been under consideration in an opinion of even date herewith addressed to Hon. Wayne Coy, copy of which I am enclosing herewith for your information. I think the letter to Mr. Coy fully answers your question, but if there are other specific questions which you have in mind which are not covered by the above opinion, and you will so indicate, I shall be glad to consider them.

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE: Rural Electric Corporations—Use of roads for distribution lines; whether such use is an additional servitude.

April 21, 1936.

Hon. Earl Crawford,
Secretary to the
Governor of Indiana,
Indianapolis, Indiana.

Dear Sir:

I have before me your request for an official opinion in answer to the following question:

"Does a rural electric distribution line, when erected on a highway constitute an additional servitude with respect to abutting owners?"

To limit the question to the specific matter under consideration, I am advised that it relates particularly to electric distribution lines constructed or to be constructed by corporations organized pursuant to Chapter 175 of the Acts of 1935, and in the discussion of the matter herein the question will be so limited.

Chapter 175 supra expressly provides that corporations organized pursuant to its provisions shall have power, among other things,—

"To construct works across or along any street or public highway, or over any lands which are now or may be the property of this state or any political subdivision thereof without obtaining any franchise