

2. As a result of the use moratorium, persons (some of whom might not be Anne Arundel County residents) wishing to work on the construction of, or seeking employment in, a facility of the nature prohibited, could be limited or restricted in their ability to do so.

3. The inability to commence any of the prohibited uses in Anne Arundel County within the next year might cause companies to seek alternative sites outside of Anne Arundel County.

While the kinds of facilities which are made the subject of the moratorium are not of an inconsequential nature, and while it may be presumed that such facilities could have a significant impact (both environmental and otherwise) on the surrounding area, we do not believe that the kinds of extra-territorial effects described above are sufficient to bring House Bill 1785 within the Dasch doctrine. Although there is no Court of Appeals decision directly on point, those relevant cases of which we are aware support our conclusion that this bill is not a public general law.* In Cole v. Secretary of State, 249 Md. 425, 434-435 (1968), the Court observed that "some statutes, local in form, have been held to be general laws, since they affect the interest of the whole state" (citing cases) and that the "rationale of these cases lies in the concept that while the immediate objective sought to be achieved was local in character, the statutes individually affected matters of significant interest to the entire state". (Emphasis added). The examples cited were the regulation of elections, the control of natural resources (oysters) and the protection of State revenues derived from licenses. 249 Md. at 435. The last of these three examples was indicated as the rationale of both Dasch v. Jackson, supra, and Gaither v. Jackson, 147 Md. 655 (1925), and this might be regarded as a sub silentio recognition of the limitations of the alternative basis for the result in Dasch (the fact that some persons residing outside of Baltimore City might be affected by the licensing of paper-hangars working in the City).

The other examples of matters of substantial State interest cited by the Court in Cole (elections and natural resources) are distinguishable from the kinds of factors involved in the one year moratorium embodied in House Bill 1785.

House Bill 1785, is of course, a land use bill directed solely at land located within a single county. While it is true that persons or entities from outside of the county may own land affected by the moratorium or that non-county residents may be indirectly affected by the moratorium, the plain fact is that the bill is