

political trust, or employment of any kind whatsoever, under the Constitution or Laws of this State, or of the United States, or any of them; or receive fees, or perquisites of any kind, for the discharge of his official duties.

The act of 1894, chapter 6, providing that if an objection were filed to an application for a license to sell liquor in Carroll county, the judge of the circuit court should determine whether the license should issue, held not to violate this article. *McCrea v. Roberts*, 89 Md. 251.

The act of 1841, chapter 271, imposing a tax upon monies deposited in Baltimore county court or coming into the hands of trustees, etc., to be paid the judges as a part of their salary, held not to violate this article (as it stood in the constitution of 1851). Design of this article. *Bradford v. Jones*, 1 Md. 368.

It was only in article 30 of the bill of rights and article 4, sections 4 and 9 of the constitution of 1851. that judicial officers were subject to removal by the governor. *Cantwell v. Owens*, 14 Md. 227.

This article referred to in construing article 8—see notes thereto. *Board of Supervisors v. Todd*, 97 Md. 263.

For cases dealing with this article as it stood in the constitution of 1776, see *State v. Chase*, 5 H. & J. 297; *The Chancellor's case*, 1 Bland, 595.

As to the judiciary, see article 4 of the Maryland constitution.

Art. 34. That a long continuance in the Executive Departments of power or trust is dangerous to liberty; a rotation, therefore, in those Departments is one of the best securities of permanent freedom.

As to the executive department, see article 2 of the Maryland constitution.

Art. 35. That no person shall hold, at the same time, more than one office of profit, created by the Constitution or Laws of this State; nor shall any person in public trust receive any present from any foreign Prince or State, or from the United States, or any of them, without the approbation of this State.

This article does not justify an injunction to stop the proceedings of a class of officers with the registration of voters, because a few of the officers in certain districts were not proper subjects of appointment. *Hardesty v. Taft*, 23 Md. 529.

Art. 36. That as it is the duty of every man to worship God in such manner as he thinks most acceptable to Him, all persons are equally entitled to protection in their religious liberty; wherefore, no person ought, by any law to be molested in his person or estate, on account of his religious persuasion or profession, or for his religious practice, unless, under the color of religion, he shall disturb the good order, peace or safety of the State, or shall infringe the laws of morality, or injure others in their natural, civil or religious rights; nor ought any person to be compelled to frequent, or maintain, or contribute, unless on contract, to maintain any place of worship or any ministry; nor shall any person, otherwise competent, be deemed incompetent as a witness, or juror, on account of his religious belief; provided, he believes in the existence of God, and that under His dispensation such person will be