

Of the 3d objection, we can speak more certainly. If the Journal will condescend to look on page 418 of the journals, it will see the reason of Schley's vote partially stated in a substitute offered by Mr Turner, a political friend of the Journal, as follows: "*Resolved*, That the action of the General Assembly is deemed *unnecessary* at the present time in the case of George Tassels aforesaid"—which Judge Schley voted for. In voting against the original resolutions, he assigned his reasons for so voting, and those reasons contained as we learn, a declaration, that the attempt to arrest the execution of Tassels was so flagrant a violation of all law, that he had no doubt the Supreme court would at once reject the application. He voted against the Resolutions therefore, because with Mr Turner and others, he thought them unnecessary. Was the Journal ignorant of this?