

MEMORANDUM FOR CABINET
BY THE HON. PRIME MINISTER

Police Corps Salary Structure

In July of 1966, following the publication of the First Anomalies Report, the Constables Section of the Malta Police Association requested the setting up of a Commission for the revision of their salary scales.

2. The Police Association was invited, through the Commissioner of Police, to submit definite claims for consideration by a sub-Committee which had already been set up to investigate anomaly claims by various other Associations. Two separate claims, one covering the Officer ranks of Inspector and Sub-Inspector, and another the other ranks from Sergeant-Major I down to Probationary Constable, were submitted to Government in October 1966. However, on the 17th January, 1967, Government was informed that the Police Association had formed a Joint Representative Committee to whom was delegated the task of negotiating salary adjustments with Government.

3. At a meeting held on the 11th March, 1967, between representatives of Establishments and Finance with the Joint Representative Committee of the Malta Police Association, the latter asked the Official Side to consider the two abovementioned claims for salary revision as withdrawn, as they would soon be forwarding a combined memorandum. Eventually, the Malta Police Association presented a "Memorandum of Evidence in Support of Claim for Increased Pay and Emoluments".

4. On the 22nd May, 1967, the Malta Police Association, accompanied by the Commissioner of Police, met the Prime Minister. The Association went through the principal points in their Memorandum and strongly stressed the point that the Police Force, in matters of conditions of service and pay, should not be directly compared with any other branch of the Civil Service. This principle of divorce was accepted in the United Kingdom, and was recommended to the Malta Government in the Muller report of 1955, and confirmed by the Johnson report of 1961. This principle has been agreed to by Government. However, because of this principle, of which the Police Force is very jealous, a claim on salary anomalies becomes rather difficult to sustain. In fact, what the Police Association have done in their Memorandum is the formulation of a claim for a general revision of salaries and not for the adjustment of anomalies. This may be seen from Column B of the attached Appendix A. As a general revision has been denied to all other Associations, it could not obviously be conceded to the Police Association. The Association representatives appeared to appreciate this fact

and put forward the following three requests for Government consideration:-

- (i) that salaries in the Police Force be adjusted vertically in the same ratio as any adjustment made to the salary of the Commissioner of Police.
 - (ii) that the recommendation made by the Johnson salary Commission for the payment of overtime which was not adopted by Government, be given due consideration in any adjustment of the present salaries.
 - (iii) that the rank of Sub-Inspector be combined with that of Inspector by a system of long-grading.
5. Vertical Adjustment of pay scale of all ranks and long-grading for Sub-Inspectors - Para. 4 (i) and (iii) above refer.

At paragraph 4 above, the Association asked for the adjustment of vertical anomalies, on the assumption that an upward adjustment of the salary of the Commissioner of Police was inevitable once all other Heads of Department had received an uplift, in some cases a considerable one. They therefore requested that the salary scale of the Force should be adjusted in the same proportion. This vertical adjustment would not be in conflict with the principle of divorce.

6. Consideration has already been given to the salary of the Commissioner of Police. The responsibilities devolving on this Officer have increased considerably as a result of Independence: some detail of this aspect is given at paragraph 16 below. Taking this into consideration, and particularly the fact that the Police Salaries Commission of 1961 had placed the Commissioner of Police only a step lower than the top Civil Service post, a good case can be made out paying him a salary of £1800, as in the case of the Secretaries, the Chief Government Medical Officer, and the Director of Public Works is considered justified.

7. If the association's request at paragraph 3 (i) for an adjustment based on a simple mathematical ratio were to be approved, the result would be the scales shown in Column C of Appendix A, with increases ranging between £40 per annum for the lower grades and £87 per annum for the Inspector. These increases would be far in excess of what other grades in the Civil Service have received. This is due to the fact that the proposed increase to the Commissioner's salary contains, besides the normal projection of the increases already granted to other Heads of Departments, an increment due to the added responsibilities of the post.

8. It would be more equitable to adjust the pay scales of the Force by the same increases that have already been approved for other grades in the service, as shown in Column D of Appendix A, subject of course, to further adjustment, if this should be found necessary, following the publication of the Independent Commission's report. This would result in increases ranging between £25 and £35 per year up to the rank of Sergeant Major I.

9. No claim has been made by the Police Association for a revision of the Sub-Inspector scale. Instead, they requested the

incorporation of this grade into the Inspector grade by a system of long-grading. From an Establishments point of view, there are objections to the acceptance of this request. This would convert the Inspector grade from a promotion to an entry grade with a maximum just short of £1000 per year, and it is anticipated that Associations representing other branches of the Service would seize this opportunity to make similar claims.

10. This point has been discussed with the Commissioner of Police. He still feels that he cannot escape the fact that Sub-Inspectors will continue to be given exactly the same duties and responsibilities as Inspectors, after an initial period of training. The result of this is that, on promotion through the filling of a vacancy, an Inspector remains on the same duties as before, and this gives strength to the request for long-grading. The insistence for this request has become stronger since Government granted long-grading to the Junior Officers in the Customs Department. It is therefore proposed that automatic promotion of Sub-Inspectors to Inspectors should take place after a probationary period of three years. However, in combining the present scales of the two grades (viz. £540 x 27 to £756 of the Sub-Inspector and £783 x 27 to £918 of the Inspector) the minimum of the Inspector scale would have to be appreciably reduced, as otherwise there would be an increment of £189 in the fourth year of Service, as shown below:

1st year	£540	
2nd year	£567	- increase £27
3rd year	£594	- increase £27
4th year	£783	- increase £189 i.e. the present minimum of Inspector scale
5th year	£810	- increase £27
		etc.

11. In order to avoid this substantial, and not in any way justified, increase in the fourth year, a long-grading scale of £540 x 25 to £590 x 30 to £918 is suggested. This scale, when improved by the same increases to maintain relativity with other recently adjusted scales would become £570 x 30 - £810 x 40 - £950. By this scale Sub-Inspectors would be reaching the maximum of their grade (Inspector) after 12 years of service. This proposal would, however, be of no immediate benefit at all to Inspectors already in the service, for whom it would be advisable to retain the present scale of £783 x 27 - £918 duly projected to £815 x 40 - £950. This suggested maximum (£950) is £10 less than the recently increased maximum of an H.E.O. This might sound objectionable to the Association, but, reference to Appendix B will show that the Inspector scale, from a pre-war level lower than that of a Second Class Clerk (present E.O.) has steadily advanced to a level with a maximum higher than that of an H.E.O. (£918 compared with £875). The recent uplift of the H.E.O. maximum should not therefore reasonably cause grudges to the Police Association.

12. The Superintendent scale which, before the war, was on a level lower than Clerk 1st Class (present H.E.O.), has steadily gone up the ladder until, by the 1961 Commission,

the maximum was fixed just £10 below the maximum of an Administrative Officer, viz. £1050 against £1060 (or inclusive of the 8% increase, £1134 against £1145). This is more than made up by the house allowance (£60). Superintendents are normally in charge of a district or a branch of the Force, and, in addition to their multifarious police duties, have to assume a measure of administrative responsibility for the running of the branch or district. It is therefore advisable that the relativity with Administrative Officers be maintained. A scale of £995 to £1260 is therefore recommended.

13. The Deputy Commissioner's salary is at present £1350 which was the maximum of the Assistant Heads scale before it was raised to £1400 by the Second Anomalies Report. However in view of the structure proposed for the professional grades which contains fixed salaries of £1500 and £1600 without attaining headship level, a salary of £1500 is recommended.

14. Overtime in the Police Force - Paragraph 4 (ii) above refers

On the question of overtime, the Malta Police Association has a very valid argument. They claim that the Johnson Salary Commission of 1961 had recommended the payment of overtime in addition to the new scales of salary. The recommendation was not, however, implemented. They argued that the Commission would have recommended higher basic salaries had they known that their suggestion regarding overtime would not be implemented. They were therefore asking that either the overtime performed by members of the Force be remunerated under the same conditions obtaining in the Civil Service for non-industrial grades, or that non-payment of overtime be taken into account when the revised salary scales come to be fixed.

15. It is considered that this claim is justified. The Commissioner of Police also agrees. He is, however, of the opinion that payment of overtime would involve considerable expenditure not easily controlled. Though this expenditure would be justifiable from the Constable's point of view, it would bring no benefit to the Force. He was therefore inclined to tackle the problem from another angle, that is by eliminating or at least drastically reducing the incidence of overtime. This could be done by an increase in the number of the Force.

16. What the Commissioner has in mind goes far beyond the relatively simple problem of eliminating the performance of overtime. The benefits of such an increase will become evident by having a look at the position and functions of the Force before Independence, and the position as it is now. Before Independence, the internal security of the Island was not such a big problem as it is now. In fact, the Force could obtain the help of the Services if control of a situation during an emergency became difficult. For the purpose of maintaining the machinery of Government in an emergency, the Services used to train a number of men in such "civilian" duties as running a power station, manning a gas producing plant, and port operation and control. Now that the Police Force has no longer such a valuable reserve on which to fall in case of an emergency, it is up to its leaders to start thinking on the lines of having its own emergency reserve. If, therefore, the Force were to be increased by a number of men, who would be used for substitution of duties vice overtime, and at the same time be trained for the above-mentioned emergency duties,

the extra expenditure incurred by Government would result in a material benefit to the Community, besides providing additional employment.

17. In the opinion of the Commissioner, an additional 90 men, including sergeants, would be required. If this addition would be approved, he would not be able to take on 90 new entrants all in one go. He would however, take them on in three batches of 30 at, say, six months interval, the whole operation lasting about 18 months.

18. Hon. Ministers are requested to state whether they agree to:

- (a) adjustment of salaries as shown in Column D of Appendix A.
- (b) the incorporation of the Sub-Inspector grade into the Inspector grade on a long-grading system.
- (c) the gradual increase in the strength of the Police Force by 90 men.

30th June, 1967.

L-ARKIVJI NAZZIONALI TA' MALTA

APPENDIX 'A'

SALARY CLAIMS BY POLICE FEDERATION
(all rates inclusive of 8% increase)

Grade	Year	A		B		C		D	
		Present	Federation's Claim	Vertical relativity based on salary of £1800	Increase	Projection of increases allowed to other grades of the Service	Equiv. p.w.		
Probationer	1st	£8. 7.6	£14. 1.2	£731. 0.8	£475	£39.10.0	£460	£8.17.0	
	2nd	8.13.0	14.10.5	755. 1.8	490	40. 4.0	472	9. 1.6	
	3rd	8.18.0	14.18.10	776.19.4	505	42. 4.0	485	9. 6.6	
	4th	9. 3.6	15. 8.1	801. 0.4	520	42.18.0	499	9.12.0	
	5th	9. 9.0	15.17.4	825. 1.4	540	48.12.0	513	9.17.6	
Constable III	6th	9.14.6	16. 6.7	849. 2.4	555	49. 6.0	528	10. 3.0	
	7th	10. 0.0	16.15.10	873. 3.4	570	50. 0.0	542	10. 8.6	
	8-17th	10. 0.0	16.15.10	873. 3.4	570	50. 0.0	542	10. 8.6	
	18-22nd	10. 5.0	17. 4.3	895. 1.0	585	52. 0.0	560	10.15.6	
	23rd +	10.10.6	17.13.5	918.17.8	600	52.14.0	580	11. 3.0	
Constable II	1st	10.18.6	18. 6.10	953.15.4	625	56.18.0	601	11.11.0	
	2nd	11. 4.0	18.16.1	977.16.4	640	57.12.0	615	11.16.6	
	3rd	11. 9.6	19. 5.4	1001.17.4	655	58. 6.0	629	12. 2.0	
	4th	11.15.0	19.14.7	1025.18.4	670	59. 0.0	643	12. 7.6	
	5th	12. 0.6	20. 3.10	1049.19.4	685	59.14.0	657	12.13.0	
Bergeant III	1st	12.19.0	21.14.11	1130.15.8	735	61.12.0	705	13.11.0	
	2nd	12. 0.6	20. 3.10	1049.19.4	685	59.14.0	657	12.13.0	
	3rd	12. 0.6	20. 3.10	1049.19.4	685	59.14.0	657	12.13.0	
	4th	12. 0.6	20. 3.10	1049.19.4	685	59.14.0	657	12.13.0	
	5th	12. 0.6	20. 3.10	1049.19.4	685	59.14.0	657	12.13.0	
Bergeant II	1st	12.19.0	21.14.11	1130.15.8	735	61.12.0	705	13.11.0	
	2nd	12. 0.6	20. 3.10	1049.19.4	685	59.14.0	657	12.13.0	
	3rd	12. 0.6	20. 3.10	1049.19.4	685	59.14.0	657	12.13.0	
	4th	12. 0.6	20. 3.10	1049.19.4	685	59.14.0	657	12.13.0	
	5th	12. 0.6	20. 3.10	1049.19.4	685	59.14.0	657	12.13.0	
Bergeant I	1st	12.19.0	21.14.11	1130.15.8	735	61.12.0	705	13.11.0	
	2nd	12. 0.6	20. 3.10	1049.19.4	685	59.14.0	657	12.13.0	
	3rd	12. 0.6	20. 3.10	1049.19.4	685	59.14.0	657	12.13.0	
	4th	12. 0.6	20. 3.10	1049.19.4	685	59.14.0	657	12.13.0	
	5th	12. 0.6	20. 3.10	1049.19.4	685	59.14.0	657	12.13.0	
Bergeant Major II	1st	12.19.0	21.14.11	1130.15.8	735	61.12.0	705	13.11.0	
	2nd	12. 0.6	20. 3.10	1049.19.4	685	59.14.0	657	12.13.0	
	3rd	12. 0.6	20. 3.10	1049.19.4	685	59.14.0	657	12.13.0	
	4th	12. 0.6	20. 3.10	1049.19.4	685	59.14.0	657	12.13.0	
	5th	12. 0.6	20. 3.10	1049.19.4	685	59.14.0	657	12.13.0	
Bergeant Major I	1st	12.19.0	21.14.11	1130.15.8	735	61.12.0	705	13.11.0	
	2nd	12. 0.6	20. 3.10	1049.19.4	685	59.14.0	657	12.13.0	
	3rd	12. 0.6	20. 3.10	1049.19.4	685	59.14.0	657	12.13.0	
	4th	12. 0.6	20. 3.10	1049.19.4	685	59.14.0	657	12.13.0	
	5th	12. 0.6	20. 3.10	1049.19.4	685	59.14.0	657	12.13.0	
Quartermaster	1st	12.19.0	21.14.11	1130.15.8	735	61.12.0	705	13.11.0	
	2nd	12. 0.6	20. 3.10	1049.19.4	685	59.14.0	657	12.13.0	
	3rd	12. 0.6	20. 3.10	1049.19.4	685	59.14.0	657	12.13.0	
	4th	12. 0.6	20. 3.10	1049.19.4	685	59.14.0	657	12.13.0	
	5th	12. 0.6	20. 3.10	1049.19.4	685	59.14.0	657	12.13.0	
Sergeant	1st	12.19.0	21.14.11	1130.15.8	735	61.12.0	705	13.11.0	
	2nd	12. 0.6	20. 3.10	1049.19.4	685	59.14.0	657	12.13.0	
	3rd	12. 0.6	20. 3.10	1049.19.4	685	59.14.0	657	12.13.0	
	4th	12. 0.6	20. 3.10	1049.19.4	685	59.14.0	657	12.13.0	
	5th	12. 0.6	20. 3.10	1049.19.4	685	59.14.0	657	12.13.0	
Inspector	1st	13. 5.6	22. 5.10	1159. 3.4	755	64.14.0	723	13.18.0	
	2nd	13.12.0	22.16.9	1187.11.0	775	67.16.0	741	14. 5.0	
	3rd	13.12.0	22.16.9	1187.11.0	775	67.16.0	741	14. 5.0	
	4th	13.12.0	22.16.9	1187.11.0	775	67.16.0	741	14. 5.0	
	5th	13.12.0	22.16.9	1187.11.0	775	67.16.0	741	14. 5.0	

570x30-810 for sub-Inspectors
x40-950 for existing Inspectors
815 - 950 for existing Inspectors

L-ARKIVI NAZZJONALI TA' MALTA

Grade	Year	Present		Federation's Claim		Vertical relativity based on salary of £1800		Projection of increases allowed to other grades of the Service	
		Per week	Per Year	Per week	Per year	Annual Salary	Increase	Annual Salary	Equiv. p.w.
Superintendent			961x45-1134			1005-1240	Min. 44 Max. 106	995-1260	
Deputy Commissioner			1350			1480	130	1500	
Commissioner			1647			1800	153	1800	

A B C D

L-ARKKIVJI NAZZJONALI TA' MALTA

SALARY MOVEMENTS

Appendix B

Comparison between some Police Officers' scales and the Administrative/Executive Grade

<u>Financial Year</u>	<u>Superintendent</u>	<u>Inspector</u>	<u>Administrative Officer/ Principal Officer</u>	<u>Higher Executive Officer</u>	<u>Executive Officer</u>
	£	£	£	£	£
Pre-War: 1939/40	270 - 330	190 - 260		320 - 360 (1st Class)	180-290 (2nd Class) 100-170 (3rd Class)
1943/44	300 - 360	150 - 290	500 - 550	420 - 480	200 - 400
1948/49	-	-	-	-	-
1953/54	420 - 480	200 - 400	600 - 660	504 - 576	240 - 480
1954/55	504 - 576	240 - 480	-	-	-
1955/56	572 - 620	336 - 548	-	-	-
1956/57	-	-	860 - 1060	705 - 810	254 - 490
1961/62	890 - 1050	725 - 850	929 - 1145	761 - 875	380 - 655
Scales on 1. 3.66	961 - 1134	783 - 918			410 - 707
(including 8% First Anomalies: 1. 4.66 (including 8%) Second Anomalies: 1. 4.66	-	-	983 - 1199	761 - 929	508 - 707
	(suggested) 995 - 1260	(suggested) 815 - 950	1050 - 1275	707 - 960	530 - 740