

ernor Francis Thomas, in his message to the Assembly, declared that the judicial establishment cost the state \$36,000 in salaries yearly, and that there was not a state in the whole union even those four times the population, where the number of judges and the salaries were not smaller.<sup>30</sup> "Besides these objections," he continued, "another is that there are no effectual means provided for in the constitution to get rid of judges once commissioned as promptly as public interest may demand." In 1844, the House of Delegates appointed a committee to consider the reduction of expenses of the system and changing the tenure of office of judges, but the committee recommended only a reduction in the number of judges. The judicial salaries were regarded as low already. In 1849, county conventions held about the state to press for the calling of a constitutional convention generally included the life tenure of the judiciary as one of the subjects of reform.

Finally, the demand for the convention grew so strong that there seemed to be a real danger that, as Governor Philip Francis Thomas expressed it in his message to the Assembly of 1850, unless the wishes of the majority of the people were gratified, the sanction of the Legislature would not much longer be invoked; and the convention was held in the next year, 1851.

In the convention there was an unmistakable sentiment at the outset for an elective judiciary, but it was by no means unanimous. The lawyers of the state seemed generally opposed to it, and

30. This was a mistake. Inquiry made for the House of Delegates of 1844 disclosed that the total salaries of judges in some other states were much larger.