

1974 WL 28022 (S.C.A.G.)

Office of the Attorney General

State of South Carolina

December 9, 1974

***1 Re: County General Obligation Bonds Pledged for a Specific Water District**

Honorable J. D. Long, III
Senator
District No. 5
P. O. Box 266
Union, South Carolina 29379

Dear Senator Long:

You have requested an opinion from this Office as to whether or not the County of Union can issue obligation bonds for the purpose of funding improvements in the water system of a small rural district within the County.

It seems to be the general consensus of South Carolina law that the County cannot finance such improvements under the general county purpose doctrine. See Op. Atty. Gen. 23 (1962-63); Op. Atty. Gen. 76 (1964-65); and Op. Atty. Gen. 35 (1971-72).

It is also the general law that a county may not issue bonds payable from general taxes for improvements benefiting a single district. See 20 C.J.S. Counties, § 261; [Dora v. Robertson](#), 203 S.C. 434, 27 S.E.2d 714 (1943).

If we can be of any further service, please do not hesitate to call upon us.

Sincerely,

A. Camden Lewis
Assistant Attorney General

1974 WL 28022 (S.C.A.G.)

End of Document

© 2019 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.