

the chartered counties of Maryland". We do not consider this to be a fatal defect since House Bill 1785, a more recent enactment than Section 7.03, clearly purports to apply to Anne Arundel County and to Anne Arundel County alone.

For the reasons indicated above, it is our view that House Bill 1785 is contrary to Section 4 of Article XI-A of the Maryland Constitution.

Very truly yours,
/s/Francis B. Burch
Attorney General

* In Dineen v. Rider, 152 Md. 343 (1927) the Court of Appeals held that the possibility that persons outside of a Metropolitan District might have to pay taxes for improvement if the assessments levied within the district prove insufficient was too remote an effect to make a law referable as a county-wide law. See discussion in Board of Education v. Mayor, etc. of Frederick, 194 Md. 170, 184-185 (1949).

** Were House Bill 1785 held valid on the grounds that, despite its appearance, it represented a public general law, this conclusion could in turn raise doubts about whether the County Council's January 24, 1974 action represented proper local legislation under what Anne Arundel County had concluded to be within its express powers as a charter county. Any such doubts would necessarily draw into question the extent of the many heretofore exercised powers of charter counties (i.e., planning and zoning ordinances enacted pursuant to Article 25A, Section 5(x) of the Maryland Code).
