

The statement in the last *Herald of the Times* relative to the publication in the *Republican* of the 6th inst. of the ayes and noes on the motion of Mr. Calhoun to recommit the bill to the Committee on Finance with instructions to reduce the appropriations one half, is incorrect and it may not be deemed improper for us to specify wherein. The *Herald* tells us to the effect that Mr. Calhoun's motion to recommit and reduce the appropriations one half, excepted Fort Adams - that the original 200,000, reported for that work would not have been curtailed had Mr. C.'s motion passed! Now what but a reckless determination to screen a faithless public servant from just and merited obloquy could have induced the writer of that article to make an assertion so absurd and improbable and impotent and false. Fort Adams excepted indeed! Why Mr. Calhoun himself openly declared that the object of his motion was to reduce the appropriations for constructing fortifications one half - not to reduce certain items of the bill only, as stated in the *Herald*; - but to reduce all the appropriations for the construction of Fortifications, one half - the two hundred thousand dollars appropriated for Fort Adams down to one hundred thousand dollars. This is the motion for which Mr. Robbins voted and the *Herald* now upholds him for so doing. That Mr. Robbins voted on this occasion, as he has on so many others, in direct contravention to the well-known wishes of his constituents, it seems to us unparalleled fatuity to deny. But what cares he for the will of his constituents? It is not the first time he has thwarted them, and bid them defiance! He holds his seat in the senate against their wishes - by tenure of fraud, and through the instrumentality of a mmi who stands superlatively blasted, blighted, a loathsome living monument of drunkenness and debauchery - we mean Poindexter, the worthless, heartless Poindexter - to that man's villany is Mr. Robbins indebted for his seat.

Now let us compare the following sentence from the article under review, with the ayes and noes, which we copy from that paper on the final passage of the Fortification Bill: -

"Finding it impossible, however, from the shortness of the time to correct the unless at the imminent hazard of losing it, Mr. Robbins and many other Whigs waved their objections, and carried the bill by their votes."

"Carried the bill by their votes !" There's a whapper for you! Read the following statement of the ayes and noes on the final passage of the bill, and then tell us if the Federalists "carried the bill by their votes."

"The following is the final vote on the FORTIFICATION BILL of the present year as it passed the SENATE, after its third reading on Thursday, June 30th ."

"YEAS - Messrs, Bayard, Benton, Black, Brown, Buchanan, Cuthbert, Ewing, of Illinois ; Grundy, Hendricks, Hubbard, Kent, King, of Alabama, Linn, Morris, Nicholas, Niles, Page, Porter, Rives, Robbins, Robinson, Ruggles, Tallmadge, Tipton, Tomlinson, Walker, Webster, White, Wright, - 28.

"NAYS - Messrs. Calhoun, Clay, Crittenden, Ewing, of Ohio, Leigh, Mangum, Moore, Preston, Southard - 9."

It will be seen by the above statement, which the reader will bear in mind is taken from the *Herald*, that twenty-one democrats and eight federalists voted for the passage of the bill, and nine Federalists, and not a single democrat voted against it. Our readers will observe that there were but seventeen Federalists that voted at all on this question, and that had they all voted against, the bill, it would still have been carried by a majority of four. We ask then did the Federalists by their votes carry the bill as stated in the above short extract from the *Herald* ?