

*A Crumb of Comfort.*---Amid the tremendous torrent of unprovoked abuse and illiberal censure which has been heaped with no unsparing hand, not only upon the authorities of Georgia, but her citizens generally, by many of the Northern prints, it is no small gratification to know that there are some--a chosen few--who, not blinded by prejudice, or tinctured with sectarianism, can appreciate the integrity of our motives, and commend the justness of our course. Among others we have read with pleasure the annexed remarks from the Bath (Me.) Enquirer. They contain sound views on the subject to which they refer, and denote a generous mind and enlightened intellect. The arrest and imprisonment of the Missionaries is a matter of regret to every philanthropist--willingly would it have been dispensed with, were it possible otherwise to induce re-

spect for our civil institutions—yet it must be remembered that they, in common with some others, were the violators of our laws, from the observance of which, even their sacerdotal character should not exempt them. Therefore, while we feel pity for their obstinacy, and sorrow for their unnecessary opposition to equitable enactments, we are compelled to believe their punishment just. A reasoning and reflecting public will ultimately sustain us in this opinion. The following are the remarks of the Enquirer:

“*Georgia and the Indians.*—We would not again advert to this subject, if it were not to correct a misrepresentation that is going the rounds, in relation to the arrest of the missionaries. The opposition editors, and many others who profess to love the truth, would have the people believe that the missionaries have been arrested, merely because they have gone among the Indians, and that this too, has been done by order of the national executive. The facts are these. Georgia like every other State in the Union, claims to have civil jurisdiction over the territory within its own limits. By a law of the State Legislature, white persons going to reside in the territory at present occupied by the Indians, are required to take an oath of allegiance, or rather an oath to support the laws and constitution of the state. Is there any thing unreasonable in this, or inconsistent with the duties or profession of these heralds of the cross? Do bands and the surplice place men above the laws of the land, or give them a right to question the propriety or expediency of legislative enactments, or to resist their operation? Such is not the doctrine of the true preacher of peace and good will towards men. In our own State every minister of the gospel who is authorized to solemnize marriages, is required to take an oath to support the constitution and laws. This has not, to our knowledge, been complained of; and we believe the clergy are as fond as any men, of enjoying the protection and security afforded them by the laws of the land. It seems in Georgia, the missionaries, as they are styled, *refused to take the oath required by law*, and not only so, but took it upon themselves to judge of the right of jurisdiction which the State claims over her own territory. Hence they were arrested, as ought to be every man whether clergyman or layman, who will not submit to the laws.”