

EDUCATION (MALTA).

RETURN to an Address of the Honourable The House of Commons,  
dated 7 August 1874;—for,

“ COPY of REPORT of Crown Advocate at *Malta* referred to in the Governor's  
Despatch of the 12th day of December 1872, regarding EDUCATION.”

(In continuation of House of Commons Paper, No. 260, 3 July 1874.)

Colonial Office. }  
6 February 1875. }

J. LOWTHER.

COPY of REPORT of Crown Advocate at *Malta* referred to in the Governor's  
Despatch of the 12th day of December 1872, regarding EDUCATION.

Malta, Crown Advocate's Office,  
4 December 1872.

Sir,

IN his letter of the 21st ultimo\* to Earl Kimberley, referred to me by your  
Excellency's commands, Mr. Cachia Zammit impugns, in disrespectful terms,  
the veracity of a considerable portion of Sir Patrick Grant's Despatches of the  
2nd and 5th April last, copies of which were, in the latter part of June, pub-  
lished in this island; he, directly or indirectly, charges the late Governor  
with suppression of important circumstances, with statements inconsistent with  
truth, and with having suffered himself to be actuated by party feelings in-  
compatible with the duties of a Governor.

2. It would, unquestionably, be derogatory to the personal dignity of that  
upright and noble-minded gentleman, than whom no Governor of Malta within  
my long experience has ever more deservedly or in a higher degree possessed,  
during the whole period of his administration, the cordial esteem of all classes  
of this community, to notice that letter, with a view to vindicate his so well  
known and so long established character, as if such attacks could possibly affect  
his reputation; but, independently of any personal interest of my late respected  
chief, there are in Mr. Cachia Zammit's letter statements which, on readers  
unacquainted with local circumstances, may make an unfavourable impression  
as to the character of the correspondence of the local with the Imperial  
Government.

3. I have always thought it a good policy in Malta to refrain from answer-  
ing invectives from the press; but it appears to me that a representation to  
the Secretary of State, evidently made with a view to future publication, coming  
from a Member of the Council of Government, and connected with a subject  
of great public importance, should hardly ever be passed over, however intem-  
perate may be the style of the communication, or weak and imaginary the  
foundation of the complaint.

4. On the intelligent classes in Malta, Mr. Cachia Zammit's charges would,  
undoubtedly, make an impression very different from that which it is intended  
to produce; but other persons may, on perusal of that letter, feel disposed  
to think that he must, after all, have some ground for his remonstrances.  
I make

\* *Vide* Enclosure 1, in No. 1, of House of Commons Paper, No. 260, 3 July 1874.

I make, therefore, no apology for entering fully into the subject, with a view of laying before your Excellency detailed information of circumstances which occurred long before your Excellency assumed the Government of this island.

5. Mr. Cachia Zammit says (Section 2 of his letter), "The subject of my (his) representations is so serious, the scandal raised in this community (by the Despatches above referred to) so great, that it would be a dereliction of duty on my (his) part to remain silent"; but he does not explain how, under such pressure, and with his sense of political duty, he could have so patiently suffered "to remain silent" for a period of five months.

6. On a careful consideration of that gentleman's accusations, it appears to me that a stronger confirmation of the main points of Sir Patrick Grant's Despatches than Mr. Cachia Zammit himself has furnished by his letter, cannot reasonably be desired. His great efforts to refute those Despatches lead naturally, necessarily, to the conclusion that what he does not object to or deny, must, indeed, be unobjectionable and undeniable.

7. Thus, of all that passed between Mr. Cachia Zammit and Sir Patrick Grant, Sir Victor Houlton, or myself, in connection with his motion for leave to introduce an ordinance "for the organisation of public instruction," and in reference to the course which he pursued on the subject of public instruction from July 1870 to January 1872, the Despatches in question contain but a faithful and accurate representation. It stands thus indirectly but indisputably confirmed by Mr. Cachia Zammit himself: That when in December 1870, after giving notice of several resolutions, he moved one of them, proposing that the primary schools and the Lyceums should be reformed on the basis of a Report dated 23rd June 1865, a Report containing numerous suggestions, it was publicly recommended to him by myself, in Council, and, as he says in Section 31 of his letter, on the part of the Government, to substitute for that complex proposition, a series of resolutions, each dealing with a particular point, and he accepted that advice, on condition only that he should be allowed sufficient time to prepare fresh propositions. That, when a year after he changed his mind, and expressed an intention, never previously intimated, of introducing an ordinance embodying the whole subject of primary, secondary, and superior instruction, he was successively, at different private interviews, informed, not only by Sir Victor Houlton and myself, but also by Sir Patrick Grant personally, that that course could not be supported by the Government, in whose opinion the organisation and the rules for the internal management of the educational institutions were matters which should continue to be governed, as in England, by regulations made by the Executive, subject, of course, to the control of the Legislature. That he was assured, over and over again, that if, reverting to the arrangement publicly come to in Council in December 1870, he would propose resolutions distinctly stating the reforms he wished to introduce, so that each point might be separately considered on its own merits, and in a manner that the public could easily comprehend the importance of the question, he would have every possible assistance from the Government. That, whether in his conversations with Sir Patrick Grant, and those who acted under that gentleman, or in Council, he never pointed out any one single paragraph of the existing Statute and regulations as the part, or one of the parts, of that body of rules which he thought to be defective or objectionable; and that he moved for leave to introduce his ordinance in disregard of repeated solicitations to adhere to the course of proceeding settled in December 1870, and with full knowledge that his motion would be opposed.

8. Mr. Cachia Zammit's adverse remarks refer to collateral, and comparatively immaterial, circumstances; but he, in Section 3 of his letter, by a strange abuse of rhetoric calls them "the most important facts;" I propose, therefore, to examine his remarks *seriatim*.

#### REMARK I.

##### Sections 4, 5, and 6 of Mr. Cachia Zammit's Letter.

9. In the Despatch of the 2nd of April, it is not stated that "in accordance with the principles on which the Statute (of the University) is based, the Governor should have exercised *no other authority but that of sanctioning the*"  
 "acts

“ acts of the then Legislature, which, with regard to the University, consisted of the General Council, and of the Special Councils of Faculties, and with regard to the Lyceum, it consisted of the General Council, under whose direction the teachers, in accordance with Article 171 of the said Statute should have framed the regulation of studies for the later institution. \* \* \* Our Governors have completely disfigured it (the Statute). The General and Special Councils were abolished, power being only given to the rector to convoke them when he might deem it expedient; as also were abolished the clauses relative to the faculty of Philosophy and Arts. The regulation of studies in the Lyceum was nullified, and another substituted, without the opinion of the teachers themselves being heard.”

## REPLY.

10. No man acquainted with the Statute and its legal force could have made the statement, the omission of which from the quoted Despatch is the subject of Mr. Cachia Zammit's first remonstrance; because the General and the Special Councils were, and are, but consultative bodies, and their suggestions have no effect unless they are approved by the Government. To call those Councils the Legislature, and to limit the functions of the Government under the Statute to the duty of giving effect (which seems to be the sense in which Mr. Cachia Zammit employs the word “sanctioning”) to the acts of those Councils, is a very strange misconception of the nature of that Statute.

11. The alterations respecting the meetings of the General and the Special Councils were made by Sir Henry F. Bouverie in 1841, during the rectorship of the Rev. T. O'Malley, an Irish priest appointed to that office at the recommendation of the late Sir George C. Lewis, to improve the Malta Educational Establishments. The alterations concerning the Faculty of Philosophy and Arts, in reference to the chair of Political Economy, were made by Sir Patrick Stuart in 1845, after a report from the General Council of the University, during the rectorship of Mr. W. H. Butt, whose opinion was followed; and in reference to the transfer of Chemistry and Natural History to the Faculty of Philosophy and Arts from the Faculty of Medicine, was made in 1857, on the recommendation of the present rector, by Sir William Reid, with no indication of disapprobation from any quarter. And the new regulations respecting the Lyceum were made by Mr. More O'Ferrall in 1850, on a report of a special Commission consisting of Mr. Butt, then rector, Mr. Howard, then teacher of the English language, and Dr. Trapani (now collector of land revenue), then secretary to the University. All those amendments are printed in an appendix to the Statute.

12. If, in Mr. Cachia Zammit's opinion, they have disfigured that book, he ought to have proposed their suppression. Mr. Decesare, an elected member, suggested in December 1870, a return to the Statute as it came out in 1838, but he was not supported by any one of his colleagues, Mr. Cachia Zammit himself included.

13. At all events, the fact that the Statute had, since its original publication, been amended by Government, is expressly Stated in section 4 of Sir P. Grant's Despatch. A reconsideration of those amendments, or a discussion on their merits, was evidently foreign to the scope of that Despatch.

## REMARK II.

## Sections 7 and 8 of Mr. Cachia Zammit's Letter.

14. “ Primary instruction was not regulated by determined rules. These, if there were any, were ignored by the public as well as by the Government, until the director was prevailed upon to publish them in January 1871.

15. “ The regulations which have been published have no sanction whatever from the Government, and the director might at any time substitute new ones; but, if they were sanctioned, most decidedly they are not the regulations which this community has a right to demand.”

## REPLY.

16. The primary schools were reorganised in 1850 by Mr. More O'Ferrall, who, by letter dated 12th December, approved a set of general regulations prepared by the chief director. Those regulations were subsequently added to, or otherwise modified, by the latter gentleman, who, in his reports, invariably submitted such improvements to Government. The regulations were printed and affixed to the walls of the schools, and the reports of the chief director were likewise printed and communicated to the Council by orders from Government. To say, therefore, that the regulations of the primary schools were unknown to the Government as well as to the public, is inconsistent with the fact; a fact which Mr. Cachia Zammit could very easily have ascertained. His visit to some of those schools, before he moved his original resolutions in December 1870, must have been very superficial indeed, if, as it appears, he did not notice those papers, and made no inquiries for the rules of those schools.

17. What was done early in 1871 was a collection of those rules in two small books, one containing the regulations of the schools, and the other some instructions for the guidance of the teachers. Copies of the former book were distributed to Members of Council in February, and of the latter, in April, of that year.

18. They were not accompanied by any Government Act giving them a fresh sanction, and it would have been most indelicate to do so at a time when Mr. Cachia Zammit was, or appeared to be, engaged in preparing the resolutions for the reform of the public instruction, which, on the 15th December 1870, after an animated debate, he had undertaken to submit to the Council.

## REMARK III.

## Section 9 of Mr. Cachia Zammit's Letter.

19. "So well pleased is Sir Patrick Grant with the working of the Statute and regulations, that in paragraph 20 of the first Despatch, he says, that the educational establishment was, upon the whole, the best that, under the circumstances, could be had in Malta. Now, the intelligent classes of this community and the local press have strongly and repeatedly raised their voice against the provisions of the existing Statute, the want of many others which the requirements of the times have made necessary, and the strange innovations it has undergone as well as against the set of rules compiled by the director of primary schools, and insist upon a sound organisation of the public establishments."

## REPLY.

20. Sir Patrick Grant was perfectly justified in expressing that opinion after what occurred in his own time and during the administration of his predecessor, Sir Henry Storks. The latter gentleman was the Governor who appointed the Commission of 1865, and received the report of that Commission, as well as the reply made by the chief director of the primary schools, and he, whose ability is not questioned, even by Mr. Cachia Zammit, set aside the report, confirmed, with slight modification, the existing arrangement by his notice of 15th April 1867, and subsequently being in England, he kindly authorised me to state publicly in Council (which I did), what he had privately communicated to me at Malta, namely, that he had been very favourably impressed *with the system of instruction*, and with the amount of information possessed by the children in the school he had visited.

21. Besides, other very important circumstances occurred in Sir Patrick Grant's time, leading to the same conclusion. Dr. Sciortino, then one of the elected Members of Council in 1868, moved some resolutions in connection with the educational establishments, which the opponents of the existing system had strongly recommended. The rector of the University and the chief director of the primary schools were, by the unanimous consent of the Council, appealed to

to for their opinions; and after the reports of those gentlemen, Dr. Sciortino let his motion drop.

22. Again, Mr. Cachia Zammit himself, who, in July 1870, gave notice of his intention of reforming those establishments *radicitus*; who, in December of the same year, made a very strong speech reflecting on the director of primary schools, and concluded by a motion for a reform on the basis of the Report of 1865; when he was invited to point out specifically the existing defects, and the remedies he thought desirable, he did, indeed, promise to do so, but, with the Report of 1865, which he had taken for his guidance, with the publications in the portion of the local press to which he now refers, before him, and with all the facility given to him in the meantime by the printed copies of the existing Statute and regulations which Sir Patrick Grant caused to be put in his hands, failed to perform that promise. He had no defect to specify, no remedy to suggest.

23. Surely, after all this, Sir Patrick Grant was well justified in saying, as he said in Section 20 of his Despatch: "Meanwhile, the debates of 1868 and 1870, and the difficulties which Mr. Cachia Zammit found himself in when he undertook to submit specific propositions, confirmed the opinion I had formed, in common with my predecessors, that the educational establishment was, upon the whole, the best that, under the circumstances, could be had in Malta. It was, of course, open to improvement, &c., &c."

#### REMARK IV.

##### Sections 10 and 11 of Mr. Cachia Zammit's Letter.

24. "I must declare inexact the assertion made by Sir Patrick Grant in the fifth paragraph of his first Despatch, viz., that, during the five years he had the honour of administering this Government, he had not heard any specific, intelligible, complaint respecting the organisation of the educational institutions, or the particular rules by which they are governed. Sir Patrick Grant assumed the government of these islands in May 1867, when the Session of the Council for that year was over, and in February 1868 was present in Council at the discussion which was raised on the resolutions proposed by Dr. Sciortino on public education. This important question was afterwards thoroughly discussed in the local press, and I took it up in July 1870."

#### REPLY.

25. This is one of the most extraordinary passages in Mr. Cachia Zammit's letter. It implies that St. Patrick omitted from his Despatches Dr. Sciortino's resolutions, or the debate that ensued upon them; whereas in the very Despatch now quoted by Mr. Cachia Zammit, there are four long paragraphs (13, 14, 15, and 16) devoted to Dr. Sciortino's motion, stating not only the substance of the resolutions he proposed to the Council, but also the substance of the debate that took place, and the abandonment of that motion by the mover himself after, and it is natural to presume in consequence of, the adverse reports of the rector of the University, and the director of the primary schools, to whom all parties in Council had appealed.

#### REMARK V.

##### Section 13 of Mr. Cachia Zammit's Letter.

26. "It may not be amiss to state that the want of a reform of the educational establishments was so much felt at the time indicated by Sir Patrick Grant (that of the reform proposed by Mr. O'Malley in 1842), that the well-to-do classes of this community betook themselves to the expedient of sending their sons first to a college in Sicily, and afterwards, in order to have their children near them, eagerly promoted the establishment of a boarding-school at Notabile, and of daily schools at Valletta; and precisely during the administration of

“ Sir P. Grant, a seminary was instituted by the Jesuit Fathers at Gozo, and “ there is now a plan of founding a college in Malta.”

REPLY.

27. Mr. Cachia Zammit is quite correct in that statement. The better classes in Malta, as elsewhere, are most anxious to have their children brought up in Colleges, or as they call them “ Convitti ”; and they would gladly see a good “ Convitto ” established in Malta. The absence of such a school is what they generally and frequently complain of; and that complaint is the only foundation, if foundation it be, that the opponents of the existing public educational establishments have, when they speak of a cry, sometimes of the respectable classes, sometimes of the whole community, for a reform of those establishments. But, assuredly, Mr. Cachia Zammit does not mean to convert the University, the Lyceums, or the primary schools into one or more boarding-schools; and, at all events, in Sir Patrick Grant's Despatch of the 2nd of April, Section 12, that *desideratum* of the respectable classes, or of the community at large, is distinctly mentioned in the following terms: “ On investigation I found that very few persons, indeed, took any part or any interest in the discussion; what a considerable number of respectable persons were really anxious to obtain, was some very cheap college or boarding-school (‘ Convitto,’ as they call it) for primary and secondary instruction, which it was impossible for the Government to provide.”

REMARK VI.

Sections 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18 of Mr. Cachia Zammit's Letter.

28. “ Sir Patrick . . . says in paragraph 7 of his first Despatch that only in 1860 there appeared in the press general vague articles on the necessity of a reform of the educational institutions, without specification of any particular defect in the existing arrangements, so that it was impossible for the Government to say whether the organisation of the establishment, the method of teaching, or the ability of the teachers was really in question. “ I do not know, indeed, whether so reckless an assertion is to be ascribed to a complete ignorance of facts or want of understanding them. It would, in fact, have sufficed for Sir Patrick Grant to reflect that, if Sir John Gaspard Le Marchant and Sir Henry Storks were each, at different periods, compelled to appoint more or less solemnly a Commission to inquire into the state of public instruction, they could never have been brought to this step by vague attacks against the educational establishments, but by a strong conviction that an evil existed, and that it ought to be remedied. \* \* \* The local press spoke on the necessity of an educational reform long before.”

REPLY.

29. The complaint here is that Sir Patrick Grant's Despatch states, that in 1860 the attacks on the educational institutions were general and vague; and, to contradict that statement, Mr. Cachia Zammit quotes Sir J. Gaspard Le Marchant's and Sir H. K. Storks' Commissions, and the publications in the press.

30. The first observation I would make is, that, whether certain attacks are general and vague, or specific, is almost always, more or less, a matter of opinion. What may be specific enough for a person in certain circumstances, may be only a general vague attack for another in different circumstances. Mere lookers on, or general critics, may well take for a specific complaint that which, for persons who are bound to action when there is occasion for it, is but sheer declamation.

31. My next observation is, that the very public acts quoted by Mr. Cachia Zammit, in support of his accusation, condemn it. If, instead of confining himself to presume on what ground Sir Gaspard Le Marchant appointed Dr. Torreggiani to make an inquiry, he had taken the trouble to read the letter dated 25th June 1862, containing that appointment, he would have found that

Sir

Sir Gaspard alluded to no specific complaints, and far from admitting the existence of any foundation for them, he was confident that the result of that inquiry might as well remove any doubts respecting the efficiency of the educational system, as enable the Government to remedy defects that might be discovered. Dr. Torreggiani was not appointed to inquire what remedies were necessary to remove admitted evils, but to see whether there was any evil at all.

32. Sir Henry Storks' Commission was appointed by a notice in the Government Gazette, dated the 11th February 1865, in consequence of the clamour raised when it became known that Dr. Torreggiani had finally declared that he would present no report of the inquiry which he had, nearly three years before, been appointed to make; and, as above stated, a confirmation by Sir Henry Storks, through his public notice, dated 15th April 1867, of the existing arrangements, with some slight modification expressed in the same notice, was the result of the step taken by that gentleman.

33. Thus much for what Mr. Cachia Zammit, in his well-pondered accusations, calls a reckless assertion, which he "does not know whether it is to be ascribed to a complete ignorance of facts or want of understanding them."

#### REMARK VII.

Sections 19 and 20 of Mr. Cachia Zammit's Letter.

34. The substance of his remark in those long paragraphs is, that Sir Patrick Grant had no foundation for saying, in Section 7 of his first Despatch, that Dr. Torreggiani's appointment and inquiry had practically no other effect than that of weakening the authority of the rector and the director on the teachers placed respectively under their control, and of raising in the minds of the latter an unfounded expectation of an increase of salaries.

#### REPLY.

35. That the appointment by Government of a gentleman in the position of a Member of Council, as Dr. Torreggiani then was, to inquire into the manner in which a public institution is conducted, does, pending at least that inquiry, weaken the moral influence of the head of that institution on his subordinate officers, is a matter which no man of any degree of experience in public affairs would question for a moment. That from that ordinary effect of commissions of inquiry, the appointment of Dr. Torreggiani was not exempt, ample evidence may be found in Dr. Pullicino's Report to Government, dated 5th February 1863. But that that inquiry led also to an unfounded expectation of an increase of salaries can only be proved by testimonial evidence, which it is not worth while to produce, to show the groundlessness of Mr. Cachia Zammit's attack. He may say, with good reason, that he never saw Dr. Pullicino's Report, and that being absent from Malta from about 1860 to 1870, he had no personal information of what occurred during that long period. But, under such circumstances, he, in the position which he holds, should have refrained from even questioning the correctness of a statement in a public Despatch emanating from a Governor, and addressed to the Secretary of State; and under no circumstances should he, without conclusive evidence to the contrary, have permitted himself to deny such statement, with the assurance which characterises his letter.

#### REMARK VIII.

Sections 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25 of Mr. Cachia Zammit's Letter.

36. Mr. Cachia Zammit, after mentioning the names of the members who composed Sir Henry Storks' Commission, their Report, the reply from the director of primary schools, and the opinion of Sir Patrick Grant that that reply was "very able and persuasive," proceeds to remark that that same reply was but a sequel of contradictions to facts established by the Report, and

was founded on the assertions made by the director and the masters "who, in the present case, being the censured party, carry little or no weight whatever." He adds, that "the members of that Commission wished to give a rejoinder to the director's reply," and that "the Governor (Sir H. Storks) being thoroughly convinced of the honesty of the Commissioners, deprecated such a step, considering it quite unnecessary." And he ends by blaming Sir Patrick Grant for "representing a fact in such a way as to discredit and throw blame on three most respectable persons, without at least mentioning the letters written by Colonel Romer and Mr. Emilio Sceberas in vindication of their Report."

#### REPLY.

37. Of all the strange remarks in Mr. Cachia Zammit's letter, this is perhaps the most extraordinary. He says that the directors' reply was worthless, because based upon assertions from the teachers, who were with the director, the *censured* parties; and yet in section 20 he states that an increase of salaries to those teachers was recommended by public opinion, warmly advocated by the press, and strongly supported by the elected Members of Council.

38. He blames Sir Patrick Grant for not having in his Despatch described the steps taken or the letters written by the Members of the Commission of 1865 in vindication of their character; whereas in that Despatch there was nothing whatever that called for a defence of the reputation of those gentlemen for integrity and honourable feelings. The expression contained in Sir Patrick Grant's Despatch, that the reply of the director of the primary schools to the Report of the Commissioners was "very able and persuasive," contained nothing of a nature offensive to the character of the Commissioners, and the offence on which Mr. Cachia Zammit displays such indignation is but a creature of his own imagination.

#### REMARK IX.

##### Sections 26 and 27 of Mr. Cachia Zammit's Letter.

39. "I will not, my Lord, stop here to discuss Dr. Sciortino's resolutions, but having been discussed in the presence of Sir Patrick Grant, I cannot conceal the painful impression made by paragraph 14 of the first Despatch, wherein it is stated that the course taken by Dr. Sciortino on that occasion was a very proper one. Nothing could be further from the fact. The Government, through its organ, the Crown Advocate, said, in February 1868:—'All the resolutions of Dr. Sciortino, in so far as they referred to primary and secondary instruction, tended to establish nothing of a practical character, and they entirely ignored the materials that had been collected and published.' Moreover the Crown Advocate wished to know why the information contained in the Report of the Commission appointed by Government in 1865, and in the reply to that Report made by the director of primary instruction, should be set aside. In December 1870, the Crown Advocate solemnly declared, in his own name and that of the Government, that this very Report had been disavowed by the Government since the administration of Sir Henry Storks."

#### REPLY.

40. The painful impression which Sir Patrick Grant's approval of the course taken in 1868 by Dr. Sciortino, made on Mr. Cachia Zammit, arises, as he explains it, from its supposed inconsistency with the speech I made in that year. Now, in the first place, if any one will think it worth while to read my speech, as reported in the paper which accompanies Mr. Cachia Zammit's letter (Enclosure 7), he will find that from beginning to end I said nothing as proceeding from the Government. On the contrary, my last words in that speech were precisely a declaration that, in what I had said I only expressed my own humble views. I said nothing on the part of the Government, and, indeed, I could say nothing, because I had on that occasion received no instructions whatever from Sir Patrick



Patrick Grant. Sir Patrick, therefore, was not in any way bound by what I thought it my duty to say on Dr. Sciortino's resolutions.

41. Secondly, on perusal of Section 14 of the Despatch, it will be seen that what Sir Patrick Grant approved in reference to Dr. Sciortino's motion of 1868, was merely the course or mode of proceeding, namely, that of submitting propositions "in a manner to give to all those, in and out of the Council, who took any interest in the matter, an opportunity of considering, and forming an opinion upon, each of them on its own merits;" and in respect to the substance, as far as Sir Patrick expressed any opinion in that Despatch, he concurred with those who opposed the resolutions themselves, as may be seen by reference to Section 15 of the same Despatch. Now, it so happened that, in this, the Despatch was perfectly in accordance with my speech, because in that speech I never said a single word that might, by any one in his senses, be construed into an objection to the mode of proceeding; and, indeed, the passages quoted by Mr. Cachia Zammit show that my difference with Dr. Sciortino was on the substance of his resolutions, not on the form in which he brought the subject to the consideration of the Council.

42. Mr. Cachia Zammit's remark that, in 1868, I deprecated the appointment proposed by Dr. Sciortino of another Commission, and that I recommended that the suggestions of the Report of 1865, and the observations contained in the reply to it by the director of primary schools, should not be set aside, is perfectly correct; but this is exactly what I repeated in December 1870, when I, with others, recommended to Mr. Cachia Zammit to withdraw his vague resolution for a reform on the basis of the Report of 1865, and to propose a series of specific resolutions, each referring to a particular point. Of this the evidence is again in the paper (Encl. 11) annexed to his letter, where, towards the end of my speech, as reported in that paper, the following words will be found:— "As that resolution was framed, the questions involved in it could not be satisfactorily dealt with. It proposed that the system of the instruction given in the primary schools and the Lyceum should be reformed, taking as a basis the Report of the Commission of 1865. In that Report, however, upwards of 20 different suggestions were made. How was it possible to discuss those numerous points on one question, whether that resolution should be adopted? . . . Some members might agree to some of the suggestions in the Report, and owing to their objections to other suggestions in the same Report, they would be under the necessity of opposing the resolution. He, therefore, advised the honourable Member to prepare, and give notice of, for the next meeting, the particular matters which he wished to see adopted by the Council, in a series, so that each might be separately discussed, and adopted or rejected, without involving other points in the same decision. This was not the first time he had made that suggestion, &c. &c." Surely this was perfectly consistent with my remarks in 1868 on Dr. Sciortino's motion, when I said that there was no necessity for another Commission, and that we might proceed to the consideration of the Report of 1865, together with the reply to it made by the director of the primary schools.

43. Mr. Cachia Zammit's statement, that, "In December 1870 the Crown Advocate solemnly declared, in his own name and that of the Government, that this very Report had been disavowed by the Government since the administration of Sir Henry Storks," is incorrect. What I said was (*vide* the papers above referred to, viz., Enclosure 11 in Mr. Cachia Zammit's own letter), "The honourable gentleman who seconded the motion was exceedingly surprised that the Government, after having, in 1865, appointed a Commission to inquire the educational establishments, the primary schools and the Lyceum, took no notice of the Report of that Commission. He (the Crown Advocate) knew not what impression that Report made or left on Sir H. Storks' mind, after the complete answer given to it by the director of primary schools. If that most competent gentleman was satisfied that the Report should not be acted upon, and gave no public decision, the conclusion should have been, not that that Report was not taken into consideration, but that it failed to give satisfaction even to the Governor who had appointed that Commission. There was no need of any public declaration of the conclusion the Government had arrived at. But, in point of fact, that conclusion

“ was made publicly know by the Government notice published by Sir Henry Storks, and just quoted by the honourable gentleman who spoke before the last speaker (Dr. Rapinett).”

## REMARK X.

## Section 28 of Mr. Cachia Zammit's Letter.

44. In this paragraph Mr. Cachia Zammit says that his Resolutions of December 1870 were not correctly reported in Sir P. Grant's Despatch; that he proposed a reform on the basis of the Report of 1865, because it pointed out the defects and the remedies, and contains “ a most elaborate programme, which defined the kind of instruction to be imparted in the Lyceum,” as the Crown Advocate expressed himself on the 7th February 1868, that he did not say that the Faculty of Philosophy and Arts should be transferred to the Lyceum, but that it should be the completion of the course of studies in the Lyceum; that it was competent for him to move an increase of salaries consistently with the eighth clause of Her Majesty's instructions.

## REPLY.

45. On comparing Mr. Cachia Zammit's Resolutions, as reported in the paper (Encl. 9) accompanying his letter with Section 17 of Sir P. Grant's Despatch, reporting the substance of those Resolutions, it will be found that the Report in the Despatch was perfectly correct.

46. It is true that in 1868 I said that the programme proposed by the Commissioners was an excellent one, but at the same time I added, “ The rector of the university might have some objections, which, perhaps, he had refrained from stating, because he thought that that programme would not be adopted. Well, then, let the Council suggest to the Government the expediency of consulting the rector on that programme, with the view of submitting, for the consideration of the Council, that programme with such modifications as the rector would recommend.” So my admiration of the programme in question was qualified, and subject to reconsideration in case of an adverse opinion from the rector. That gentleman, as stated in Section 16 of Sir Patrick Grant's Despatch, has since given his opinion; and the objections stated by him on that point were among the reasons for which, in December 1870, I so urgently requested Mr. Cachia Zammit to propose specific propositions, one of which of course would directly bring for a decision by the Council the question of adopting that programme, with or without modification. Why he should not have done so, is to me still an impenetrable mystery.

47. As to whether it is competent for any member, not acting in behalf of the Governor, to bring forward a motion for increase of salaries, which involves a grant of public money, I think Sir Patrick Grant was perfectly correct; and the attempt of Mr. Cachia Zammit to explain the 8th clause of Her Majesty's instructions, in a manner that a motion for a resolution or for an ordinance to increase salaries, is, until it is passed, but a suggestion which it is competent for any member to make, is contrary to the direct meaning of that clause of the said instructions, and to the interpretation put upon it, ever since the Council has been in existence. Besides, if such motion cannot be resisted, as inconsistent with the provisions of that clause, until it is passed by the Council, it can never be resisted at all on that ground.

## REMARK XI.

## Sections 29, 30, and 31 of Mr. Cachia Zammit's Letter.

48. “. . . . The narration of facts (in the Despatch) relative to the debate held in Council on the regulations proposed by myself is so amazingly inaccurate, that I am at a loss to qualify it. It is, in fact, untrue that the Chief Secretary and the Crown Advocate opposed the first resolution proposed by myself, because the Report of 1865 contained numerous suggestions upon which opinions widely differed. It was opposed because they considered the Report  
“ of

“of the Commissioners fallacious and unfair, which bold and reckless assertions called forth letters in the press from Mr. E. Sceberras and Colonel Romer. Nor is it true that the suggestion of moving a series of resolutions was made by one or more of my colleagues. It was the organ of the Government, the Crown Advocate, who, on 15th December 1870, suggested to me that course, and I accepted it conditionally, asking time for the purpose of preparing the series of the proposed resolutions, as the task was to frame a new regulation of studies.”

## REPLY.

49. It is extremely painful to have to answer such statements ; but I believe I must do so, in order, at least, to show the excitement under which Mr. Cachia Zammit was labouring when he penned that letter, and to facilitate the appreciation of its contents.

50. The Report of 1865 consisted of two parts ; the former of which stated the result of the inquiry into the then existing state of things, and the latter contained suggestions for the improvement of the schools. The former part reflected very strongly on the conduct of the Chief Director ; and Mr. Cachia Zammit having, in December 1870, when he introduced his original resolutions, renewed that censure in a violent speech, Sir Victor Houlton and myself, in our replies, expressed our strong opinion that that censure was unmerited, and that the manner in which the Commissioners had proceeded in their inquiry was not such as to command confidence in the soundness of their conclusions. But in regard to the second part of the Report, Sir Victor, indeed, urged Mr. Cachia Zammit to set aside that Report, which, he stated, the Government considered as a thing of the past, and to propose anything he had to suggest, as a matter proceeding from himself ; but as much was said also by Dr. Rapinett and Mr. Zimelli, both elected members, who spoke before Sir Victor and myself. On reference to the paper enclosed (Enclosure II) in Mr. Cachia Zammit's letter, it will be found that Dr. Rapinett said : “ In regard to the Report (of 1865) it was imprudent to effect any reforms on so unstable a basis as that of the Report, which was contradicted by the director. He (Dr. Rapinett) believed that a Report which was so formally contradicted, should not be adopted as a basis of any reform. He did not oppose the principle of a reform, but he disapproved of the resolutions as brought forward.” It will also be found in the same paper that Mr. Zimelli said : “ He was opposed to the adoption of the Commissioners' Report, as the basis of any reform in the educational institutes. He could not say how far the reply was just and correct, &c. &c.”

51. On the other hand, both Sir Victor and I requested Mr. Cachia Zammit not to press his first resolution, because it was too wide, and to bring forward, instead of it, a series of resolutions each dealing with a particular point, such, for instance, as that of the compulsory programme of studies and the increase of the monthly payment in reference to scholars who do not follow it in its integrity, the suppression, immediate or prospective, of the lowest school, &c. &c. For the evidence of this, I beg to refer your Excellency to the same paper which accompanies Mr. Cachia Zammit's letter, namely, to Enclosure II, an extract from which I have reported above, in my reply to remark IX. (Section 42). Mr. Cachia Zammit is, indeed, inconsistent with himself ; for, in the very next paragraph of his letter, he gives to myself the credit of having been the first to suggest to him to move specific resolutions ; and the real point of the question, for any one whose attention was not diverted from it by feelings foreign to it, was whether the Government should assent to a resolution involving many doubtful points, or insist upon the Council being first given an opportunity of expressing their opinion upon each point separately. It betrays an extraordinary misapprehension of all that took place in December 1870, to say that a suggestion of dividing a motion into as many parts as can be separately discussed, was an opposition to all that that motion involved ; and what Sir Patrick Grant stated in his Despatch (Section 18) was : “ The first resolution, the only one moved in Council, was supported by only one elected member, Mr. Barbaro, and it was opposed by Dr. Rapinett and Mr. Zimelli, and to a certain extent also by Mr. Decesare, all elected members. On the part of the Government, it was also opposed by

“ the Chief Secretary and the Crown Advocate, who objected to the complicated nature of the question involved in that resolution, inasmuch as the Report of 1865, to which it referred, contained numerous suggestions upon which opinions differed.”

52. The credit of having been the first to suggest that practical course, did indeed belong to me, in the sense only that, when, about the middle of November 1870. Mr. Cachia Zammit was pleased to show me the notice he intended to give of the resolutions he proposed to submit to the Council, I told him at once that the first resolution was too wide, and that he ought to propose specifically any of the suggestions in the Report of 1865 which he thought it advisable to adopt. But Sir Patrick knew nothing of our conversation at that interview. In his Despatch he evidently referred to what took place in Council; and in Council the members who first recommended specific propositions were Mr. Cachia Zammit's own colleagues, Dr. Rapinett and Mr. Zimelli, both of whom spoke before me.

53. In the report of our speeches given by the “ Malta Observer,” and forwarded by Mr. Cachia Zammit with his letter (Enclosures 10 and 11), that suggestion does not appear; but we all, in Council, spoke in Italian, and the Italian report fortunately contains it. That report was made by a shorthand writer, and, as usual, revised by the respective speakers. It was published in several journals, including the “ Corriere Maltese,” a paper edited by Mr. Barbaro, the seconder of Mr. Cachia Zammit's motion, and in the speeches of Dr. Rapinett, Mr. Zimelli, and Mr. Scicluna, the following words occur :

54. Dr. Rapinett. . . . “ Se l'onorevole proponente avesse sottomesse le sue risoluzioni al banco elettivo prima di proporle al Consiglio, si sarebbe potuto modificarle, e riformarle in modo comprendere le idee di tutti noi, o almeno della maggior parte di noi; si sarebbe potuto presentare al Governo proposte appoggiate da tutti noi; si sarebbero evitate le tante divergenze che oggi presenta il banco elettivo, ove vi è chi vuole lo Statuto senza il Rettore, chi il Rettore senza lo Statuto, chi l'istruzione forzata; chi non vuole la Teologia a dispetto del paese, e della fondazione che l'ha stabilita, chi il Rapporto dei Commissionarj, chi le sue critiche, e il Governo, quando anche lo volesse, non saprebbe come contenerci. Disse l'onorevole proponente che tutti dovremmo porre mano in una opera tanto importante. Or bene, che si formulino quattro, otto, dieci risoluzioni, che siano approvate ed appoggiate dalla maggioranza elettiva; si dica al Governo: questo è ciò che il banco elettivo crede necessario per riformare l'istruzione pubblica. Ed allora si avrà qualche speranza di successo, e non già ora che sembra vi siano tante opinioni quanti individui da questo lato del Consiglio.”

55. Mr. Zimelli. . . . “ A mio credere, dovrebbe l'onorevole Sig. Cachia Zammit lasciare affatto di prendere per base delle riforme che intende proporre, il rapporto dei tre Commissionarj, come anche quello del Direttore delle Scuole Primarie, fatto in sua difesa; ma, quando sarebbe a discutere in Comitato le sue risoluzioni, scegliere dal rapporto dei Commissionarj quelle parti che credesse ammissibili, proponendole come miglioramenti da adottarsi nei rami della pubblica istruzione.”

56. Mr. Scicluna. . . . “ Sarei di avviso che su questo soggetto si faccia dall'onorevole proponente quanto viene di suggerire l'onor: Avvocato della Corona, acciocchè possiamo essere positivi su ciò che è desiderabile di proporre per migliorare la pubblica educazione.”

57. Thus much for Mr. Cachia Zammit's memory of what occurred in December 1870. The Report of 1865 was set aside by two of his own colleagues, by whom also was made to him the suggestion of proposing particular resolutions, as stated in Sir Patrick Grant's Despatch; and in that suggestion Mr. Scicluna, another elected member, also concurred. The only mistake committed by Sir Patrick on this point was in having, in his Despatch of the 5th of April, inadvertently included Mr. Scicluna with those who had made that suggestion before any one had spoken on the part of the Government, whereas Mr. Scicluna spoke after me.

## REMARK XII.

## Sections 32 and 33 of Mr. Cachia Zammit's Letter.

58. "I was prepared to discuss my promised Statute on the 26th of April 1871, but I was requested by my colleagues to postpone its discussion to the beginning of next Session, as your Lordship will find stated in the accompanying newspaper report of the proceedings of the Council. It is therefore untrue, as is stated in Section 19 of the first Despatch, that though the Council continued to meet till the end of May, I took no further step in the matter in the course of that Session. Nor could Sir Patrick Grant expect that I, in a week or a fortnight, would submit to the Council a series of resolutions, as I had bound myself to bring them forward in the shape of a Regulation."

## REPLY.

59. That Mr. Cachia Zammit, up to the end of May 1871, brought nothing for the consideration of the Council, of what he had promised in December 1870, is a fact admitted by himself in the above quoted passage of his letter, because he himself admits that up to the 26th of April he did never mention the subject, and that on that day he mentioned it only to postpone it to the then next Session. Whether he did so because he was not prepared with anything, or because of the unwillingness of his colleagues to resume the discussion at that period, is a question which he alone, perhaps, can solve. But is it not extraordinary that a member of Council who, on the 15th of December 1870, insisted on the Government adopting a resolution for a reform of the schools on the basis of the Report of 1865, who had, on that occasion, been urged by his own colleagues, Dr. Rapinett and Mr. Zimelli, as well as by those who spoke on the part of the Government, not to press that resolution, but to submit, instead of it, particular motions, each dealing with a separate subject, should up to April refrain from showing, by some motion for the adoption of some one or other of the suggestions contained in the Report of 1865, that he had, indeed, made himself familiar with them.

60. To prove that he had, in the meantime, prepared a whole Statute, he now produces an extract from the "Malta Observer," which published, not a report, in the usual form, of the meeting of Council of the 26th April, but a summary of what took place at that meeting, the author of which is unknown. All I can say is, that I did not hear Mr. Cachia Zammit, on that occasion, say that he had prepared a Statute; and such statement, indeed, would have surprised all members, because what in December 1870 he had been requested, and what everybody understood him then to have undertaken to do, was to select such of the suggestions contained in the Report of 1865 as he deemed proper to recommend for adoption by the Council. He was never asked or expected to prepare a Statute.

## REMARK XIII.

## Section 33 of Mr. Cachia Zammit's Letter.

61. "It is equally unfair to state that Messrs Scicluna, Barbaro, and Zimelli supported the motion (for leave to introduce an ordinance for the organisation of public instruction), in courtesy to their colleague. I understood them to say that, though the Government was opposed to the ordinance, it should not, out of courtesy, object to the first reading."

## REPLY.

62. What Mr. Barbaro and Mr. Zimelli said on that occasion, can best be seen in the Italian report of their speeches, in the former gentleman's own paper, the "Corriere Mercantile."

63. That gentleman is there reported to have concluded his speech as follows: "Ma la questione qui si riduce a mera cortesia. In tutti i parlamenti del mondo, ed

“ il nostro per quanto si chiami consiglio, è un piccolo parlamento, si costuma di  
 “ passare quasi sempre una legge in prima lettura. In seconda lettura, poi, o la  
 “ si modifica, ovvero del tutto la si rovescia. Si direbbe forse, se noi passiamo  
 “ l’ordinanza in prima lettura, che ammettiamo il principio che si possa legistare  
 “ in fatto di pubblico insegnamento. Non credo che vi sia tale pericolo. La  
 “ cortesia verso un collega, è la conservazione del rispetto dovuto agli usi  
 “ parlamentari, obbligano, in vece, di passare in prima lettura l’ordinanza, e poi  
 “ farvi in seconda lettura tutte quelle correzioni che gli onorevoli membri con-  
 “ templeranno utili, coll’intesa che si conservi sempre il principio della necessità  
 “ di una riforma. Così, per molte ragioni, e soprattutto per quella di cortesia,  
 “ voto in favore della prima lettura della ordinanza dell’onorevole Cachia  
 “ Zammit.”

64. Mr. Zimelli concluded :—“ D'altronde, per cortesia, a meno che non mi  
 “ si dimostri che è regola permanente che un’ordinanza si debba opporre dalla  
 “ prima volta che si propone, se non si vuole per certe ragioni, credo che il Sig.  
 “ Cachia possa insistere per avere la sua ordinanza pubblicata. Il Signor  
 “ Barbaro dice che, per tale cortesia, voterà in suo favore, ed io, qualora non  
 “ senta qualche ragione che mi convinca in contrario, voterò pure in favore della  
 “ mozione.”

65. Of Mr. Scicluna’s short observations, I find no report in Italian. To the  
 best of my recollection, he said he would vote for the motion for the same  
 reasons stated by Mr. Barbaro and Mr. Zimelli. But, at all events, the above  
 quoted statements by the latter two gentlemen bear no such construction as  
 that which Mr. Cachia Zammit wishes to put upon them. That he had the  
 consent of his colleagues, Mr. Scicluna, Mr. Barbaro, and Mr. Zimelli, as he  
 states in Section 35 of his letter, is perfectly true; but that consent is men-  
 tioned also in Sir Patrick Grant’s Despatch.

#### REMARK XIV.

##### Sections 37 and 38 of Mr. Cachia Zammit’s Letter.

66. “ Sir Patrick Grant, in vindication of the opposition shown to the  
 “ ordinance, states, in the 4th paragraph of the second Despatch, that I, in  
 “ moving for leave to introduce my ordinance, made no mention of the existing  
 “ statute and regulations, and did not show that the existing organic rules were  
 “ defective in any respect. \* \* \* \* \* I made no mention of the  
 “ statute or of the necessity of substituting a new one, because my speech was  
 “ a continuation, and, I may say, the conclusion of the debates that ensued in  
 “ Council in December 1870, when the necessity of a reform was amply shown,  
 “ and when the Crown Advocate himself admitted the necessity of altering the  
 “ existing regulations, so much so as to advise me to propose a series of resolu-  
 “ tions.”

#### REPLY.

67. The fact stated in Sir Patrick’s Despatch that Mr. Cachia Zammit, on  
 moving the first reading of his ordinance, made no attempt to show any defects  
 in the existing organic rules, is here confirmed. He, however, says that the  
 reason of his silence on that point on the 13th January 1872, was that he had  
 spoken upon it on the 15th December 1870, viz., 13 months before. Now, it  
 happens that in December 1870 Mr. Cachia Zammit, as may be seen in the  
 paper annexed to his letter, Enclosure 10, did not say one single word against  
 the statute of the university and the organic rules of its four faculties of  
 theology, jurisprudence, medicine, and philosophy and arts, except that he  
 wished to make of the latter faculty a complement of the studies in the Lyceum,  
 instead of the beginning of those in the university, and to see the chair of  
 political economy re-established. He spoke almost exclusively of the schools  
 of primary and secondary instruction, and his principal object was a reform of  
 those schools on the basis of the Report of 1865, which did not contain a single  
 word about the university. And he now came with a proposition to introduce  
 an ordinance superseding that statute as well as the regulations of the inferior  
 schools.

68. The second reason which he gives for his omission to show any existing  
 defects,

defects, namely, the suggestion I made to him of proposing a series of resolutions, is still much weaker. In my suggestion that he should propose particular resolutions, instead of the one which he had proposed, I referred to the suggestions contained in the Report of 1865, which was the only matter alluded to in his motion; and, at all events, a suggestion to bring forward specific points for consideration by the Council was no admission of the necessity of altering the existing regulations.

69. There are in Mr. Cachia Zammit's letter some other remarks which I think it altogether unnecessary to notice. He says, among other things, that Sir Patrick Grant, Sir Victor Houlton, and myself, were not competent to deal with scholastic matters, and must inevitably follow the opinions of the rector and the director, which are opposed to public opinion, the reflection of the opinion of practical men; and that Mr. Inglott, who was for some years in a school in England, and Dr. Trapani, who was for years secretary to the rector of the University and the Lyceum, have since for many years devoted their attention to other departments unconnected with the educational institutions, and have thereby become also incompetent to advise the Government on scholastic subjects. All that may be perfectly true, but I have looked in vain, in Mr. Cachia Zammit's letter, for information as to how, when, and where he acquired the experience which makes him so confident in his own opinion on scholastic affairs.

His Excellency the Governor,  
&c.      &c.      &c.

I have, &c.  
(signed) *A. Dingli*,  
Crown Advocate.

EDUCATION (MALTA).

---

COPY of REPORT of Crown Advocate at *Malta*,  
referred to in the Governor's Despatch of 12th  
December 1872, regarding EDUCATION.—(In  
continuation of House of Commons Paper, No.  
260, 3rd July 1874.)

(*Sir George Bowyer.*)

---

---

Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,  
12 February 1875.

---

---