

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mr. Dunn May 20, 1970  
FROM: Monsignor Finnegan  
RE: Salary questions raised in your memo of May 18, 1970

---

Rev. Paul R. Shanley

Apparently, Father Shanley went to see His Eminence personally and arranged for his appointment "among the alienated youth." Neither the Personnel Office nor the Chancery was involved in any discussion of arrangements, so I am unaware of any salary commitment which might have been made by the Cardinal. I had already discussed this with Father Bullock and he feels that Father Shanley's apostolate is a "direct spin-off of the Campus Ministry" and that his salary should continue to be included in the Campus Ministry budget. Father Shanley feels that this is a satisfactory arrangement and, if the Cardinal gives his explicit approval, this might be the best arrangement for resolving the salary problem. Otherwise, we might be faced with the question of setting up a budget, etc. for a new apostolate.

Rev. Msgr. James E. Tierney and Rev. Dennis J. Burns, Tribunal

I am not clear as to the "previous policy" referred to by Monsignor Harrington in his memorandum to you. However, any "previous policy" would have been established at a time when the salary for curates in parishes was \$1200 and they were not guaranteed a \$3000 minimum as is now the case. Neither Monsignor Tierney nor Father Burns has ever applied to the Interim Salary Committee for a salary adjustment to bring their income up to the \$3000 minimum. So, they must be realizing more than \$250 a month total income at the present time. Since any "previous policy" would seem to have/eliminated by the establishment of

been  
the Interim Salary Plan, I would feel that their salary at the Tribunal should remain at \$200 a month.

3JF:jd

Attachment