

ORDER OF THE DAY

for the 3rd Ordinary Meeting of the Colonial Council for St. Croix, MONDAY, December 13, 1920, at one o'clock p. m.

1. Colonial Council Bill No. 50.
2nd Discussion on Colonial Council Bill No. 50 Draft of Additional Money Bill to the Budget for the Municipality of St. Croix, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921. Introduced by Government, authorizing the payment of Frs. 60,000.00 from funds in the Municipal Treasury, not otherwise obligated, to the Telephone Fund for the purpose of effecting repairs and new installations.
2. Colonial Council Bill No. 52.
Introduction of, and 1st Discussion on Colonial Council Bill No. 52, Draft of Additional Money Bill to the Budget for the Municipality of St. Croix, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, Aid to poor of Christiansted and Frederiksted introduced by Government.
3. Colonial Council Bill No. 51.
1st Discussion on Resolution introduced by 4th Appointed Member (Blackwood) authorizing the payment of the unexpended balance of the pension granted former Sicknurse Ritzberg to his widow.

Colonial Council Office, St. Croix, December 6, 1920.

ROBT. L. MERWIN,
Chairman.

Post Office Notice.

FACILITIES for exchanging local currency for United States paper having become still more materially restricted since the notice of this office of September 16th.. only United States money or Government paper will be acceptable for the purchase of money orders and payment of money-order fees (including C. O. D. business).

Until further, Danish money (which for the most part can be disposed of in local disbursements) will be accepted for the purchase of postage stamped paper, box-rent, etc.

Post Office, Christiansted, V. I. December 6, 1920

B. R. LARSEN, *Postmaster.*

EDITORIAL.

Under correspondence space is accorded two communications on the subject of the automobile mishap of Friday last reported in yesterday's issue. We are glad to accept these letters which

indicate that the writers understand the function of the paper: that it is prepared to give all sides a chance in all disputes; in other words, that it is a liberal paper open to all within the bounds of newspaper ethics. Of course there are some contributions that would be eagerly given prominence in some papers which could never for any consideration obtain an inch of accommodation in these columns, but it goes without saying that such are the mud-slinging kind of writing which does not teach anything edifying, and which tends to debase instead of educate, and is a disgrace to newspaperdom. All that has been said about this paper being against the people is sheer idiocy and drivelling imbeciles could never utter anything more ridiculous than that we are opposed to the inhabitants of St. Croix—because a few self-styled progressivists in a spirit of intolerance develop ideas overnight and then present them as being the feelings of the whole island when for the most part nineteen persons in twenty had never heard of those ideas and ninety-nine out of every hundred do not understand them. What we stand for and always will defend is the right of every man to his own opinion. We concede and likewise demand and are going to have that right every time. Because a few men get on a box and declare something is in fact no business of ours; we investigate for ourselves, but we have no grudge against those who take everything for granted. We hope never to become so narrow-minded that we shall condemn a man for his opinion, when he stands with the majority or in an aggressive minority—but, we look for the same courtesy and consideration. There is some talk that unity is strength and admittedly unity can exist for good purposes, but that is no more true than that unity is often responsible for tyranny. Without unity there would be no Bolshevism in Russia today or bloodshed in Ireland. There is much cry about the majority, but we know that majorities are not necessarily right; we know that large bodies of men have been frequently wrong; that truth and wisdom have often been trampled beneath the feet of the multitude. We do not say whether or not these analogies apply locally but we do say that no allowance is made for them and that as a rule we are represented, or rather misrepresented and maligned without even a case being stated or we having said pro or con,—the old stunt of building on the ruins of other people's character.

In the present instance before us we refer readers to our reporter's comment appended elsewhere in this issue, and would emphasize observation of the fact that this incident is so far closed where we are concerned.

Under the caption of "Jensen længtes

after Jomfruerne" (Jensen longs for the Virgin Islands, "Nordlyset" tells of a former Danish gendarm Jens Skydt Jensen who was serving in these islands at the time of the transfer, eventually going to New York where he volunteered in the American army during the war and did service "over there" returning ultimately to Brooklyn, where he developed an irresistible desire to see the waving palms of St. Croix, with the result that he has enlisted in the Marine Corps on condition that he may be stationed in the Virgin Islands, which wish will be granted him. The paper says he is on the way to St. Croix.

"Nordlyset" also reports that Ex-Governor Helweg-Larsen, formerly of the Virgin Islands, filled his sixtieth year the other day and received many guests and heaps of flowers.

The Automobile Mishap On Centre Line With Comment On Versions Of The Union Chauffeur And Mr. J. D. Christian.

(Specially reported for the Avis.)

To deal first with the account of Mr. J. D. Christian, we admit he has presented the matter well. We believe he is honest in what he relates. He has written in a genteel manner and that is so strikingly singular these days, and so different to what we expect that we feel like giving Christian a pat on the shoulder and tell him go edit the Herald in which job he would certainly put some men of degrees and measures in the shade where evidence of culture is concerned. But there are other considerations which must be regarded and we therefore proceed to sustain our report of yesterday by calling attention to the disagreement between Mr. Christian's report and the chauffeur's. These two versions are so contradictory that both cannot be true. According to Mr. Christian he heard a horn sounded behind; this Mr. Benjamin says nothing about. If it was heard by the one it was most likely heard by the other, and as we understand Mr. Christian is hard of hearing it is quite possible that he did not hear the preceding toots which it is believed were heard and ignored. The horn was sounded repeatedly which required both time and distance. The speed they were going at made it appear the crash was away behind but if they had stopped the same moment they would have been convinced of the close proximity of the cars. Christian says Revd. Pigott admitted there was no fault on their side; Benjamin says he started an altercation,—how can these statements be reconciled? Benjamin says Revd. Pigott was driving recklessly but Christian makes no mention of this, nor does he refer to the cheering of the union