It was only in art. 30 of the Bill of Rights and art. 4, secs. 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 art. 8—see notes thereto. Board of Supervisors

v. Todd, 97 Md. 263; Close v. So. Md. Agri. Assn., 134 Md. 641.

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 art. 4 of the Md. 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 art. 2, Md. 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.

The position of councilman of Snow Hill held to be an "office of profit" within the meaning of this article. The acceptance of this office vacates the office of supervisor of elections held by the same person, and a subsequent resignation from the former does not restore such person to the office of supervisor. Truitt v. Collins, 122 Md. 527. And see State Tax Commission v. Harrington, 126 Md. 162.

The act of 1910, ch. 180 (establishing the public service commission), creates one indivisible office, and does not violate this article. See notes to art. 23, sec. 347, of the Code. Thrift v. Laird, 125 Md. 60.

This article referred to in discussing meaning of term "citizen"—see notes to Code.

This article referred to in discussing meaning of term "citizen"—see notes to Code. art. 25, sec. 144. Fitzwater v. Hydro-Elec. Corp., 149 Md. 466.

Same individual cannot be justice of the peace in Montgomery County and a justice of the peace in Prince George's County, as each office is separate and distinct. Day v. Sheriff, 162 Md. 227.

This Article does not apply to member of General Assembly who also holds office of Justice of Peace, as Art. 3, Sec. 11 of the Constitution exempts members of the General Assembly from ineligibility if they happen to be Justices of the Peace. Kimble v.

Bender, 173 Md. 615

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

and be rewarded or punished therefor in this world or the world to come. A plea in abatement alleging that one of the grand jurors who indicted the traverser did not believe in the truths of the Holy Scriptures, is bad; this article does not so require. The provision that no one should be deemed incompetent by reason of his religious belief provided he believes in the existence of God and His dispensation of rewards and punishments, means that no one is competent as a juror who does not so believe. If a grand juror is incompetent, the indictment is void. State v. Mercer, 101 Md. 537.

His dispensation such person will be held morally accountable for his acts,

This article and art. 37 referred to in holding that the act of congress of February 26, 1885, prohibiting the immigration of aliens under contract, etc., had no application to a minister of the gospel. Church, etc., v. United States, 143 U. S. 457.