

## Senate Bill No. 187—Baltimore County Taxicabs

AN ACT to repeal and re-enact, with amendments, Section 21 of Article 78 of the Annotated Code of Maryland (1951 Edition), title "Public Service Commission", relating to the ~~operation of taxicabs to and from Points in Baltimore City and Baltimore County.~~ REGULATION AND CONTROL BY THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF TAXICABS IN BALTIMORE COUNTY AND IN BALTIMORE CITY AND TO THE OPERATION OF TAXICABS THEREIN.

May 9, 1955.

Honorable Louis L. Goldstein  
President of the Senate  
State House  
Annapolis, Maryland

Dear Mr. President:

Senate Bill 187 provides for Public Service Commission control of Baltimore County taxicabs and would permit a Baltimore County cab which transports a fare into Baltimore City, to take on passengers there for return to Baltimore County. On May 7, 1951, I vetoed House Bill 138 of the 1951 Session, which would have had similar effect, except that it did not place Baltimore County taxicabs under jurisdiction of the Public Service Commission. However, I am convinced that the basic objections to the 1951 measure remain valid. It would be impossible to supervise operation of Baltimore County taxicabs in Baltimore City to make sure that they were merely transporting passengers from Baltimore City after having carried fares into the City from the County. The practical effect would be to multiply by indirection the number of taxicab licenses to be used in the City.

I am advised that the general duties of the transportation division of the Public Service Commission, which include inspection, supervision and administration of the Baltimore City taxicab industry, require the full time of the present personnel. Any addition to this burden would necessitate additional personnel and expense. Present local control of the Baltimore County cab industry has proved satisfactory and workable. No valid reason exists for change of this control to an agency further removed from the industry. Especially is this true since the extension of control to the adjoining territory of Baltimore County would be ineffective without policing authority, which the Public Service Commission does not have.

Finally, it should be noted that the bill omits the usual "grandfather clause" which would recognize the rights of those in business at the time the law would become effective and thus, presents a serious question as to constitutionality. At the very least, it would invite a deluge of applications for County permits—many of which might be sought to avoid the existing limitations in Baltimore City—and would necessitate lengthy, complicated hearings in order to ascertain those to whom permits should be issued. For all of which reasons, I have vetoed Senate Bill 187.

Respectfully,

(s) THEODORE R. MCKELDIN,  
Governor