

addition to and different from any provision in Chapter 107. The question to be determined is whether or not one, or both, of these acts is in force, whether either repeals the other, whether they are to be construed separately or as one act.

Both laws were passed at the same legislative assembly, the first bill to be passed by the legislative assembly was the last bill signed by the Governor, so no decided inference can be drawn that either bill expressed the last legislative intent upon the subject. Both bills are affirmative acts and are not inconsistent with each other. Under such circumstances each act must be held to be legal and valid. *Sutherland on Statutory Construction*, Section 218; 59 C. J. 918; *State v. Quinn*, 40 Mont. 472.

The provisions of the two acts are so dissimilar that they cannot be reconciled and made into one. Therefore, each statute is complete in itself and must be so construed. Neither statute negatives or makes ineffectual the other statute.

Opinion No. 173

Statutes—Construction—Schools—Warrants—Bonds.

HELD: Where two affirmative statutes are not inconsistent with each other, but are so dissimilar that they cannot be reconciled and made into one, each statute is complete in itself and must be held to be legal and valid.

April 20, 1933.

You request an opinion as to the issuance of school district bonds for warrants.

The Twenty-third Legislative Assembly passed two acts covering the question of bonds to replace warrants outstanding on June 30, 1933. These laws are Chapters 160 and 107 of the Twenty-third Legislative Assembly. They cover very much the same field and permit the issuance of bonds for the same purposes. Other portions of said acts are entirely dissimilar as the provision contained in subdivision 1 of Section 3 of Chapter 160, which provides for the payment of outstanding warrants by special levies between July 1, 1933 and July 1, 1936, which is an