

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
STATE HOUSE, BOSTON, August 21, 1969.

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives:

Pursuant to the provisions of Article LVI of the Amendments of the Constitution, I return, herewith, Senate Bill No. 838, entitled "AN ACT PROVIDING THAT THE SALARIES OF COURT OFFICERS IN THE MUNICIPAL COURT OF THE CITY OF BOSTON SHALL BE ESTABLISHED UNDER THE SUFFOLK COUNTY COMPENSATION AND PAY PLAN", with my recommendation for amendments described below.

This bill would increase the salaries of fifteen court officers of the Municipal Court of Boston by assigning them to certain designated compensation grades in the Classification and Pay Plan for Officers and Employees of Suffolk County. The weekly salary ranges resulting over the next three-year period would be as follows:

<i>Chief Court Officer, Criminal</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>
Sept. 1969 - Aug. 1970	\$200.50	\$271.75
Sept. 1970 - Aug. 1971	216.00	291.50
Sept. 1971 - Aug. 1972	233.25	312.50
<i>Chief Court Officer, Civil;</i>		
<i>Asst. Chief Ct. Offr., Criminal</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>
Sept. 1969 - Aug. 1970	\$181.50	\$245.75
Sept. 1970 - Aug. 1971	195.50	265.00
Sept. 1971 - Aug. 1972	210.75	285.00
<i>Other Court Officers</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>
Sept. 1969 - Aug. 1970	\$164.50	\$221.50
Sept. 1970 - Aug. 1971	177.00	239.50
Sept. 1971 - Aug. 1972	190.75	258.50

In my opinion these salary levels are too high, at least in the case of the "other court officers". They now receive a salary

equal to 53% of the salary of the Clerk of the Boston Municipal Court, which works out to \$8,745 annually. Under Senate Bill No. 858, the annual salaries of those at the top of the range would immediately increase to \$11,562.30 and would rise to \$13,493.70 two years hence. Increases of this magnitude cannot be justified. Chapter 885 of the Acts of 1965 places the court officers of Boston's other district courts at a lower compensation grade. Since the amount and character of their work is comparable to that of the court officers of the Boston Municipal Court, I fail to see any reason why there should be a statutory distinction in their compensation grades.

I believe it undesirable, moreover, to assign compensation grades to county employees legislatively. The Classification and Compensation Plan referred to in the bill, and the compensation grades specified, were all established administratively by the City of Boston under G.L. c. 35, ss. 49-56. Under those statutes most county employees are assigned to compensation grades by a long established and well tested administrative process. The classification of the positions dealt with in Senate Bill No. 858 and their allocation to appropriate compensation groups, in light of the classification and allocation of other county positions, can best be accomplished, in my opinion, by officials of the City. It should be noted, moreover, that it is the City of Boston which must pay these salaries.

Accordingly, I recommend that Senate Bill No. 858 be amended so as to eliminate the specific references to particular compensation groups, and to place these court officers within the purview of the established administrative process of classification and wage determination for county employees.

I further recommend that this bill be made subject to acceptance by the City of Boston. Since it is the already hard-pressed taxpayers of that City who must ultimately pay the salary increases contemplated by Senate Bill No. 858, it is only fair that those taxpayers, through their City Council, have some say in the matter.

The foregoing recommendations can be carried out by amending Senate Bill No. 858 as follows:

By striking out SECTION 1.

By redesignating SECTIONS 2 and 3 as SECTIONS 1 and 2, respectively.

By adding the following section: — SECTION 3. This act shall take effect upon its acceptance by the City of Boston.

Respectfully submitted,

FRANCIS W. SARGENT,

Acting Governor,

Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The following information was received from the
 Bureau of the Census, Washington, D. C., on
 the 15th day of August, 1901, in answer to a
 letter of the 10th day of July, 1901, from
 the Bureau of the Census, Washington, D. C.,
 dated the 10th day of July, 1901, in which
 it was requested that the Bureau of the
 Census, Washington, D. C., be advised of the
 date when the information in the
 report was received.

Receipts estimated

Receipts in 1901

The following information was received from the
 Bureau of the Census, Washington, D. C., on
 the 15th day of August, 1901, in answer to a
 letter of the 10th day of July, 1901, from
 the Bureau of the Census, Washington, D. C.,
 dated the 10th day of July, 1901, in which
 it was requested that the Bureau of the
 Census, Washington, D. C., be advised of the
 date when the information in the
 report was received.