able end to notice ge of his e of Virnt is not the world titled to preponderating influence. ource, and the very into, with umstances , preclude s to Maryed wanting

nia and her it over in he law of te, and the commonas intendthe amicaus. That ion of her s probably of that ensatisfactory because the

any thing uggest the pplicable to bers of this reign to the attitude in ost glorious guinity and y, not envy; interest of

nacing.

s Virginia; the contrasagreement, re intimate. foundations. ryland have th Virginia

We hold by a Charter, a charter which has been fully and solemnly recognized by the State of Virginia, but in the interpretation of that instrument, the two States have not been agreed. It is right-even indispensable, that the interpretation should be settled, and the limits of the States ascertained. and our sister State cannot but some time perceive that in that settlement her voice (admitted to be equal) is not en-

The State of Maryland seeks or desires nothing which is not hers of right, and it is necessary for her honor, that in her controversy, though amicable, and with her sister, the

terms of adjustment shall not be dictated to her.

A brief review of the proceedings of Maryland, would demonstrate that she has from time to time mildly reminded her sister State of her claims, and sought to refer them to the examination of commissioners, to be appointed by the parties, from among their own citizens respectively, desiring only to provide for the appointment of an umpire by one of our disinterested sister States, in the event of disagreement among the commissioners. In such propositions Maryland has evinced her confidence in the justice of her cause, but has suggested nothing incompatible with the dignity of Virginia. She has desired, and still desires the peaceful ascertainment of her rights, never doubting but Virginia would deem it necessary to her true glory to do right at whatever sacrifice, just that the relative rights of herself and neighbors should be equitably ascertained, and govern herself accordingly, without reckoning her means of resistance.

The law of Virginia, before referred to, of March 5th, 1833, has been understood by us as not only not in accordance with, but directly repulsive of, the equitable and moderate wishes of Maryland, as an undertaking in truth, by one of the parties, absolutely to settle and pronounce

against the claim of the other.

So regarding it, the State of Maryland determined to lay her controversy before that high and independent tribunal, empowered by all the States to hear and decide "all controversies between two or more States;" and she has unshaken confidence that when the founders of the union agreed that all controversies between these States, should be settled by appeals to justice, and not to arms, they did not fail to achieve that peculiar and brightest glory of our country.

It is, however, gratifying to learn from a source entitled to so much respect, that we may have misconceived the proceedings and intentions of Virginia, and to be allowed to