

Appeals and has been interpreted as vesting a charter county with plenary legislative power to pass all ordinances it deems expedient under the police power.

A limitation on this power is that an ordinance cannot be inconsistent with Article 25A or the laws of the State; additionally the police power can be exercised only to the extent not provided for by public general law.^{2/} Montgomery County Citizens League v. Greenhalgh, 253 Md. 151 (1969). See also County Council v. Investors Funding Corp., 270 Md. 403 (1973). As the Court of Appeals declared in Greenhalgh, supra, Section 5(S) is to be construed as a "broad grant of power to legislate on matters not specifically enumerated in Article 25-A." 253 Md. at 161.

Although we have found no decision where the Court of Appeals has held that a charter county's police power under the general welfare clause of Art. 25A, Sec. 5(S) includes the power to regulate pawnbrokers, in our opinion the general welfare clause is sufficiently broad to permit the enactment of ordinances regulating pawnbrokers. ⁷ McQuillan Mun. Corp. (3rd Ed.) §24.355. Additionally, we note that several other charter counties have enacted such ordinances. See, e.g., 1 Anne Arundel County Code §§12-1801 and 12-1802 (1976 Ed.); Baltimore County Code §§19-1 through 19-10 (1978 Edition); Montgomery County Code §§30-7 and 30-8 (1977 Edition); 1 Prince George's County Code §§5-189 (1975 Edition). ^{3/}

We are advised that the intention of the bill was to solve a problem stemming from the belief that the existing county ordinance was unenforceable in the municipalities in the county since those municipalities, pursuant to Article 23A and their charters, have the independent power to regulate pawnbrokers.^{4/} See Const. Art. XI-A, §3. The bill was thus intended to give the county the authority to enforce the regulations on pawnbrokers in the municipalities located within Harford County. The bill, however, is broader in reach because it has applicability county-wide. To the extent the bill is aimed solely at the possible inapplicability of the county ordinance within the municipalities in Harford County, it could be argued that the matter is not within the charter home rule power of the county. Under this view, the General Assembly would be capable of legislating as to this matter. We are unpersuaded by this argument, for the reason that nothing in the bill limits its coverage to municipalities. We advise that the particular problem as to municipalities within a charter county can certainly be remedied by the General Assembly by the enactment of a public general law applicable to at least two counties. Additionally, the matter could arguably be resolved by a bill to authorize Harford County to pass a county ordinance that would be applicable county-wide, including within municipalities. However, the problem cannot be remedied by a bill such as Senate Bill
