

# Letters to the Editor

## The Piper Lance stories

"Malden Times" 18.1.2000

I refer to the article about the disappearance of the Piper Lance four years ago, in which my son

Matthew was a passenger.

In general I appreciate the genuine interest of your staff reporter. In fact I am grateful to you and to him for bringing the matter to the public's attention.

Indeed, as reported, I too feel rather uncomfortable about the delay in finalising the inquiry.

However, my public statements so far have been limited to a letter of thanks published in *The Sunday Times*, addressed to all those who in any way

assisted in the air and sea rescue operation and to a very flat categorical statement of personal belief "that the accident was a genuine general aviation accident"

in answer to a request for a position, asked of me by Mr Lou Bondi in his first live programme on the

subject in the TV series *Razzia 3*.

I have never made any public statement regarding some of the details attributed to me in the article in question. Some I have not even said in private.

I am very disturbed, indeed very angry, at the public position assumed by lawyer Malcolm Pace, in the inquiry report is made public, I will answer Dr

Pace in no uncertain terms on all of his "17 reasons" for his hypothesis of interception, hijacking and

forced landings, and his 12 reasons for considering the possibility that the aircraft was sabotaged and

exploded in mid-air.

In the meantime I will only remark that all these "reasonable" considerations but remarkably are

potentially very much in the business interest of the deceased pilot's estate. Incidentally, the inquiry could

not start and many previous months were lost due to the fact that Dr Pace's clients had instituted action in

court to challenge the validity of the nominations of the members of the commission. Now I read of a last-

minute report.

Obviously this may yet further delay the publication of the inquiry findings.

For the moment I await in silence, but with anxiety, the publication of the inquiry commission's

report.

I take the opportunity to express amazement at Dr Pace's blatant indiscretion in this case.

I expect Dr Pace to be well aware of the very valid principle that while a matter is still sub-judice, one

ought to refrain from making such public statements. I have been taught that this principle seeks to

establish a measure of decency with which an investigative procedure is to proceed and acting

contrary to this same principle could be tantamount to sheer disrespect towards the very process.

J R AQUINA  
Belgian

## Caravaggio's St Jerome

With regard to your centre-page feature about the Caravaggio's *St Jerome* (January 11) I want to voice an open opinion.

It is just plain common sense and one need not be a connoisseur to realise that *St Jerome* should be where it

was meant to be: in the chapel of Italy at St John's. Not the oratory, where as the

anonymous source says, it directs attention from the same artist's *Redeasing of St John*. Moreover, the smaller

masterpiece is hiding from view a work by Preb.

Just as it would be senseless to have the *Beholding* anywhere else, the same applies to the smaller painting. For years, the wall

space in the Italian chapel laid bare by the *St Jerome's* removal has been a ghastly eyesore with that series of

turquoise wooden slats

Albert G. Storace,  
St Julian's.

Cannot the same be done here?

abode.

Remained in their rightful

France have always securely

another three in San Luigi del

in Santa Maria del Popolo and

the two Caravaggio paintings

quote two examples in Rome,

no additional danger. Just to

rightful home should present

proved futile and staying in its

In one case (e.g. 1984) it

weight in justifying the move.

considerations have had any

wonders whether security

or in the Oratory one

Whether in the museum

unwise step.

Florence, constituted an

painting's restoration in

duration of the larger

the Oratory if just for the

Even removing the painting to

blasting with the fine shuco.

## Simply scandalous

I read your front page coverage (January 11) on Vodafone's application for significant tariff reductions to the telecommunications regulator. I find the content simply scandalous. After the attacks on the mobile tariffs by the prime minister and several of his ministers in chorus over the past months, I would have expected the regulator to simply say "yes" or even "Yes, thank you" - to Vodafone's application. It would have been a nice Christmas present for us all. And certainly a more welcome present than the speeches that we were all regaled with over the millennium celebrations. Perhaps they did not realise that this was the present we Maltese consumers deserved.

D. DAVUTANIN,  
Belgian