

The country is still in big trouble and PAY restrictions are imposed by the government. These restrictions expire at midnight on the 31st July 1977. The Government has promised "flexibility" after this time.

JUST ABOUT EVERY CIVILIAN I KNOW HAS A 'GOING ON STRIKE' MENTALITY.



1977

The AFPRB has recommended a supplement of 5% of total earnings subject to a cash minimum of £2.50 a week for those earning less than £50 per week and a cash maximum of £4 per week for those who earn more than £80 per week.

but lots of debts ..story of
your



life?

.....!

In the **BLACK** is nice, but fleeting
And all too quickly changes when meeting
The cost of our life style, married or single
With few coins left in our pockets to jingle.

Then the colour changes to **GREY** well known to mean 'uncertain' bets
That even the few coins we have are assets or debts
So we tighten our belts and look to our savings
Bemoaning our lot and our pay whilst retaining our cravings.

When the piggy-bank is empty but the needs are still there
We still go ashore with or without a care
And although now at **RED** when we should stop
We borrow a rubber, half a bar, to buy our pop.

Then it is pay day, what a relief
All debts are settled and there is a belief
That this month things will be different and debt free
How right you are matey because the ship is due for a month at sea.

{G. Dykes May 2005 – a budding Poet Laureate?}

PORTSMOUTH CENTRAL LIBRARY
RESERVE
STACK

355.135/
2



REVIEW BODY
ON
ARMED FORCES PAY
SIXTH REPORT
1977

Chairman:
H. W. ATCHERLEY

*Presented to Parliament by the Prime Minister
by Command of Her Majesty
April 1977*

LONDON
HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE
45p net

Cmd. 6801

REVIEW BODY ON ARMED FORCES PAY

The Review Body on Armed Forces Pay was appointed in September 1971 to advise the Prime Minister on the pay and allowances of members of Naval, Military and Air Forces of the Crown and of any women's service administered by the Defence Council.

The members of the Review Body are:

H. W. Atcherley (*Chairman*)¹

Admiral Sir Desmond Dreyer GCB CBE DSC JP

Dr Ewen M'Ewen CBE

Miss A. R. Murray JP

Sir John Read²

C. A. Roberts CBE

J. R. Sargent

Sir Leslie Williams CBE

The Secretariat is provided by the Office of Manpower Economics.

¹Also a member of the Top Salaries Review Body.

²Sir John Read was appointed to the Review Body by the Prime Minister in October 1976.

Introduction

1. The Government's general measures for pay restraint for the twelve months from 1 August 1976 were described in detail in the White Paper "The Attack on Inflation, The Second Year".¹ They are similar in principle to the measures that applied in the preceding twelve months,² which we took into account in considering the recommendations in our Fifth Report,³ and they again embody pay limits on an individual earnings basis. But they are different in certain important respects. They provide for increases of £2.50 for those whose earnings⁴ do not exceed £50 a week, and limit increases to 5 per cent of total earnings for those who earn between £50 and £80 a week, and to a maximum of £4 for those who earn more than £80 a week, with pro-rata payments for those in part-time employment and for juveniles. They also differ in that they allow increases within the limits at all earnings levels, whereas the previous measures included an earnings ceiling of £8,500 above which no increase was permitted. The requirement that a 12 month period must elapse between pay increases is continued. The introduction of the measures on 1 August 1976 was accompanied by the introduction of tax reliefs which were retrospective to 1 April 1976. For the armed forces, as for many others, the tax reliefs, which are a very important element of the package, will have been in operation for a year before the associated pay increase falls due. The benefits from them will already have been felt at all levels, and will have been greatest for those who were not eligible for a pay increase in 1976. In Service terms, and assuming no income other than the military salary, for Warrant Officers and below and for officers up to Captain, they range from about 40p a week for single men to about £1.68 for married men with two children aged under 11. On the same assumption, for more senior officers up to and including Brigadier, the equivalent range would be £1.52 to £5.29 a week. A table which illustrates the effects, based on the information in Annex A to the White Paper,⁵ is in Appendix 1. The proposals announced by the Chancellor on 29 March 1977, if implemented, will have a similar effect.

2. The pay limits are again maxima within which the amount of an increase has to be settled: the interpretation of the policy in other respects is unchanged. In particular, the White Paper says that "the Government will ensure strict observance of the new policy throughout the public sector" and that "the arrangements and sanctions in Cmnd. 6151 to secure compliance in both public and private sectors will continue to apply".⁶ Once again, therefore, effectively we are free only to recommend whether the pay of members of the armed forces should be increased by the maximum amount allowed by the pay limits, or by some lesser amount.

3. The measures provide that increases within the limits are again to take the form of a supplement to earnings. The provisions relating to the continued payment of increments within established incremental and wage-for-age scales remain unchanged. But those increments that were withheld because of the £8,500

¹Cmnd. 6507, June 1976.

²The Attack on Inflation, Cmnd. 6151, July 1975.

³Review Body on Armed Forces Pay, Fifth Report 1976, Cmnd. 6470, May 1976.

⁴In the context of the armed forces, total earnings include both the military salary and all forms of additional pay.

⁵Cmnd. 6507.

⁶Cmnd. 6507, paragraph 21.

ceiling prior to 1 August 1976 are now being paid on the anniversary of the date on which they were withheld. Where a second increment has fallen due, it can be paid instead.

4. We drew attention in our Fifth Report to the practical effects of the introduction of limits and to the distortions of earnings patterns that they would create in a pay system as complex as the armed forces' system.¹ Under it, total earnings reflect a number of elements—the military salary, which itself combines differential rewards for rank with committal pay for forward commitment to fixed periods of service and with length of service increments; a variety of forms of additional pay for special duties—for example, flying, service in submarines or service in parachute units; and certain allowances in the nature of pay that are broadly related to the circumstances of the individual—for example, separation allowance. We referred then to the structural problems that would inevitably arise from the application of a flat rate increase paid as a supplement to a complex and closely-knit series of pay scales, and from the introduction of the £8,500 ceiling on any increase. Most important, we established that the maximum supplement of £6 a week permitted under the restraint measures at that time fell short of the increases that were justified by the evidence on earnings levels outside—evidence that normally provides one important indicator for our recommendations. We observed then that remedial action would be needed if, in the longer term, pay levels that were competitive with pay for comparable work outside were to be maintained in the armed forces.² At higher earnings levels, the existence of the £8,500 ceiling meant that no progress at all could be made towards the pay levels indicated by outside evidence. This resulted in further compression as earnings below £8,500 were increased, and it exacerbated the disturbance of differentials between individual members of the Services of different ranks, trades and professions and between the various components of earnings—differentials which we had brought into balance in our 1975 review. In short, the first round of restraint measures has led to pay levels that fall markedly short of the levels justified by outside evidence; to the compression of differentials; and to a loss in the relative value of individual items of additional pay and allowances which also disturbs differentials.

5. Where comparison with earnings in other fields of employment over an annual cycle has a part to play in settling pay at a particular date each year (as it has for the armed forces), it is inevitable that a process of “falling behind” begins as later outside settlements are reached. In normal circumstances, the annual review cycle ensures that, over a reasonable period, a balance is maintained. In circumstances in which restraint measures are introduced four months after the effective date of a review, the balance is disturbed. But this situation arises in any system which involves comparison with pay movements in other fields that apply from different dates in the year as a whole. The armed forces are not alone in having to face these effects, but the impact on them is particularly severe because of the nature of the Service rank structure. Furthermore, unlike some other people in the community, individual servicemen are unable to increase their earnings by working longer hours or by moving to new and higher paid jobs.

¹Cmnd. 6470, paragraphs 4–5.

²Cmnd. 6470, paragraph 8.

6. Senior officers of the armed forces in their management capacity have emphasised in evidence to us the awareness in the Services as a whole of the fact that their pay has fallen behind the levels that could be justified by the outside evidence: and also the general understanding of the comprehensive nature and application of the restraint measures and of the fact that the shortfall cannot be made good by exempting the armed forces from measures that apply to the community generally. We have observed this ourselves in the course of the visits that we have made in recent months to servicemen in a number of stations in Great Britain, in Northern Ireland and in Germany.

7. The Government has said that it intends to provide flexibility in whatever arrangements will follow the current restraint measures after 31 July 1977. We welcome this recognition of the need for flexibility. For the armed forces, it has two aspects. First, it has to allow for justice to be done in relation to earnings outside, so that comparable and competitive rates of pay can be re-established. Second, the form in which it is provided must be directly applicable to the pay and rank structure of the armed forces. The current restraint measures have the effect of locking into the pay system most of the anomalies to which we drew attention last year, and the upper cash limit of £4 a week will not relieve the problems in the higher earnings range although the removal of an earnings ceiling will ensure that they are not worsened. It remains impossible under them to resolve problems that affect particular groups of servicemen without creating injustice for the majority. Like last year, when an increase in excess of £6 a week was justified for all adult members of the armed forces, the only means of improving the lot of one group relative to another would have been by recommending a lower increase than £6 for some, and this would have been impossible to justify. We see the restoration of freedom to remove distortions and anomalies as essential, and we focus attention on the fact that not all arrangements that may be suited to an industrial situation can be applied to a military structure: examples of such arrangements are productivity payments and other enhancements of the kind that can only be reflected in armed forces pay after they have been adopted elsewhere, and then only if we are in a position to recommend pay levels that directly reflect what other people in jobs of comparable skill, responsibility and effort earn outside. This underlines the importance of ensuring that the flexibility provided can be applied to the circumstances of the armed forces.

Pay: the justification for an increase

8. The current pay limits are maxima and we take the view—as we did last year—that an increase in the pay of the armed forces has to be justified, and its level decided, on the basis of evidence. We have, therefore, again adopted our normal approach of considering evidence of earnings outside, both to maintain continuity and to identify how the Services have fared over the two years since 1975 by comparison with other people. We have collected up-to-date evidence of pay levels outside for jobs comparable in skill and responsibility to the jobs of servicemen and women, and we have brought up-to-date the associated evaluation of jobs both outside and inside the Services as this provides the basis for establishing comparability of work. We see this as an essential and continuing part of our task and we are most grateful for the co-operation of the organisations which provide the necessary data and facilities.

9. We have tested the validity of the evidence provided by the surveys carried out on our behalf against published evidence of earnings and hours of work indicated by the New Earnings Survey. The evidence of our own surveys is in line with the information from these sources, after making adjustments to allow for their different dates, and we are satisfied that, on the basis of all the evidence, the maximum increase allowed under the restraint measures is justified for all adult servicemen.

Pay: the operation of incremental and wage-for-age scales

10. The current restraint measures again provide that the operation of established incremental and wage-for-age scales may continue so long as the overall pay bill is not increased by more than the total increase allowed within the pay limits alone. The Ministry of Defence have calculated the current cost of continuing to operate the system, and we are satisfied from our examination of their evidence that no additional cost will be incurred on this account. Thus, the continued operation of incremental scales for officers and for other ranks who serve for nine years or more, and wage-for-age scales for junior servicemen and women under the age of 17½, does not require any offset against the pay limits.

Pay: our recommendations

11. We therefore recommend that, with effect from 1 April 1977, a supplement of 5 per cent of total earnings, subject to a cash minimum of £2.50 a week for those who earn less than £50 a week and a cash maximum of £4 a week for those who earn more than £80 a week, should be paid to all members of the armed forces within our terms of reference except junior servicemen and women and apprentices (paragraph 13 below).

12. On this occasion, we are able to put forward recommendations for Service medical and dental officers as part of our main report, instead of in a Supplement to it: we expect to return to our normal practice in future reviews. The military salary of medical and dental officers from Captain to Colonel has, since 1970, been derived from the average net remuneration of general medical practitioners (GMPs) in the National Health Service (NHS) in the light of the recommendations of the Review Body on Doctors' and Dentists' Remuneration. Under those recommendations, a supplement of £6 a week both for GMPs in the NHS and for Service medical and dental officers has been paid with effect from 1 April 1976. If a further supplement under the current restraint measures is introduced for GMPs in the NHS, we recommend that, on this occasion, the same amount should be paid to medical and dental officers from Captain to Colonel in the three Services, without further reference to us. We extend our general recommendations to cover medical and dental cadets, pre-registration medical practitioners, and Brigadiers and their equivalents in the medical and dental branches of the armed forces.

13. We recommend supplements pro-rata to the minimum adult supplement for junior servicemen and women (those under age 17½) and apprentices serving apprenticeships of three years or more who are paid on special scales which reflect their age and, in the case of apprentices, the stage of training they have reached. Details are in Appendix 2.

Charges for food and accommodation

14. In the course of discussions with us on our visits, servicemen often put forward the view that, if their pay and charges are intended to be based on comparability with what people in equivalent walks of life outside earn and have to pay out, then it is inequitable that restraint measures should prevent the maintenance of comparable levels of pay (giving rise to the shortfall that we have referred to) but at the same time should preclude any departure from comparability of charges. We understand the argument but, in practice, the situation does no more and no less than reflect the position outside the Services where the normal arrangements for settling pay also fall victim to general restraint measures in times of economic stringency while costs continue to rise. Servicemen can at least gain some consolation from the advantage inherent in the fact that the statistics of rents and costs from which their accommodation charges are derived are, of necessity, up to twelve months out of date.

15. We have therefore been guided by the same considerations in relation to charges that we saw as right in our Fourth Report¹: that, in principle, charges levied on servicemen for food and accommodation should be related both to the corresponding expenses associated with equivalent standards of food and housing which others have to meet in similar circumstances, and to servicemen's pay. However, like last year, we are prevented by the restraint measures from giving full weight to the relationship with pay: but a departure from comparability of charges calculated in accordance with previous practice would create a "non-wage benefit" for servicemen which would have to be offset against the pay limits. In implementing the principle, therefore, we have continued to use the basis for calculating new levels of charges for food and accommodation that we have described in our earlier reports.

Food charges

16. The gross charge calculated by the accepted method is now £1·035 a day (£7·24 a week): after abatement to take account of weekend absences of less than 48 hours, during which the charge continues to be payable, this is reduced to 93·15p a day (£6·52 a week). We therefore recommend that with effect from 1 April 1977, the food charge should be 93p a day (£6·51 a week). This is an increase of 16p a day (£1·12 a week) over the current charge of 77p a day (£5·39 a week) introduced on 1 April 1976.

Accommodation charges

17. Our calculations of the appropriate accommodation charges have been based on the recognised principles that we have described in our earlier reports. We recommend that the following charges should be introduced for married and single accommodation with effect from 1 April 1977:

¹Cmnd. 6063, paragraph 15.

Table 1
Married Quarters

Type of quarter	Annual charge			
	Standard quarters		Sub-standard quarters	
	Existing	Recommended	Existing	Recommended
	£	£	£	£
Other ranks				
A	273.75	328.50	182.50	219.00
B	379.60	430.70	251.85	288.35
C	438.00	500.05	292.00	332.15
D/WO	474.50	573.05	317.55	383.25
Officers				
V	609.55	686.20	405.15	456.25
IV	722.70	817.60	481.80	543.85
III	821.25	923.45	547.50	616.85
II	923.45	1,043.90	—	—
I	1,032.95	1,164.35	—	—

Table 2
Single Quarters

Rank	Annual charge					
	Standard quarters		Officers occupying single rooms		Sub-standard quarters	
	Existing	Recommended	Existing	Recommended	Existing	Recommended
	£	£	£	£	£	£
Young servicemen receiving less than the minimum adult (ie Private IV) rate						
Corporal and below	98.55	109.50	Not applicable		65.70	73.00
Warrant Officer and senior NCO ...	127.75	146.00	Not applicable		83.95	98.55
Captain and below	244.55	277.40	Not applicable		164.25	186.15
Major ...	346.75	390.55	Not applicable		229.95	259.15
Lieutenant Colonel and above ...	423.40	478.15	357.70	401.50	281.05	317.55
	474.50	532.90	383.25	427.05	317.55	354.05

18. We have recommended a composite charge for married quarters as is our normal practice: it is made up of the four elements of basic (unfurnished) rent; rates; furniture; and additional maintenance. We are aware that a choice of unfurnished or partly furnished quarters would be preferred by some servicemen to the present fully equipped basis. It is not for us to advise whether the accommodation provided by the Services should be furnished or unfurnished but, to enable further consideration to be given to this view in the proper quarter, we have decided to show separately for the main types of married quarter the four elements of the recommended charge. They are:

Table 3
Married Quarters
Breakdown of total annual charge (standard quarters)

Type of quarter	Basic (un-furnished) rent	Rates	Furniture hire	Additional maintenance	Recommended charge ^(a)
	£	£	£	£	£
Other ranks					
A	190.96	68.79	42.08	26.67	328.50
B	245.65	94.08	59.25	30.26	430.70
C	279.34	120.08	67.80	31.80	500.05
D/WO	324.61	139.08	75.58	33.34	573.05
Officers					
V	348.41	193.08	92.15	54.13	686.20
IV	414.41	238.08	105.51	58.75	817.60
III	471.50	273.08	116.01	63.37	923.45

^(a)The recommended charge is not necessarily the exact sum of the elements because it has been adjusted in order to provide a daily rate in whole pence.

Garage charge

19. We recommend that, with effect from 1 April 1977, the garage charge should be increased from the present level of £43.80 a year to £51.10 a year.

The relationship between increases in pay and increases in charges

20. Strictly, increases in pay and increases in charges are unrelated, in the sense that the evidence from which our recommendations flow is taken from unrelated sources. From time to time since we were appointed in 1971, the effect of the prevailing pay and prices policies has been to restrict the use that we have been able to make of evidence on pay: but, on occasion too, the application of Government policy on rents to Service accommodation charges has enabled us to moderate the increases justified by the outside evidence. For example, in 1973, the provisions of the Housing Finance Act 1972 meant that the introduction of fair rents could be phased and that a rent rebate system could be introduced; and, in 1974, a standstill on rents was imposed¹ and a rate rebate scheme was added to the earlier rent rebate system. Members of the armed forces will, however, inevitably compare the effect of both increases because they are confronted by the combined impact of them in their pay packets: this is natural, particularly when the rate of inflation is high. For the armed forces, as for the community in general, the effect of a progressive tax system at different earnings levels and of pay increases that vary according to earnings levels is to give rise to many variations according to individual circumstances: but, in general, the after-tax² amounts that arise from the supplements exceed the sum of the increases in food and accommodation charges for all unmarried adult servicemen and servicewomen and, apart from Second Lieutenants, for unmarried officers up to Lieutenant Colonel. The increases in charges for unmarried Second Lieutenants and for more senior officers exceed the after-tax increases in pay, but in the main by small

¹Statutory Instruments Nos 380 and 381.

²Assumes taxation rates and allowances at the levels announced for the year 1977-78 and no income other than the military salary and pay supplements under the current restraint measures.

amounts. The position of servicemen and officers who occupy married quarters is more complex. Married servicemen are allotted quarters according to family size but, generally, for them and for officers up to and including Lieutenant Colonel, the after-tax pay increase will exceed the increase in the accommodation charge. The single exception appears to be the rare case of the lower paid Corporal or Lance Corporal or Private who has four or more children and who happens to occupy one of the relatively few Type D/WO quarters.¹ Some Colonels and Brigadiers will receive a smaller increase in pay than the increase in charges: but this directly reflects the impact of the restraint measures on those in the community generally at comparable pay levels. Where the increase in charges exceeds the amount available after tax from the pay supplement alone, it is important not to lose sight of the fact that the after-tax incomes of all members of the Services have already risen since the 1976 pay review as a result of the tax reliefs which are an integral part of the current restraint measures (paragraph 1 and Appendix 1).

The cost of our recommendations

21. The estimated cost of our recommendations in the year beginning 1 April 1977 is:

<i>Cost of weekly supplements to earnings</i>		£ million
Officers		8.5
Servicemen and women including juniors and apprentices		47.1
		55.6
Total cost ² of recommendations on pay		55.6
<i>Charges</i>	£ million	
Increased yields: Food	6.0	
Accommodation	10.4	16.4
		39.2
<i>Net cost of current recommendations</i>		39.2

The supplements represent an average increase in officers' total pay of 3.5 per cent and in servicemen's total pay of 5.1 per cent. For the Services as a whole, the total cost represents an average increase of 4.8 per cent.

Work in progress

22. The programme of evaluation of jobs in the Services and outside will continue and the evidence provided for us on the associated earnings will be kept up to date. The review of additional pay on which we resumed work in 1975 continues. In addition to our examination of the three major items—flying pay, submarine pay and parachute pay—we are considering a number of minor items. We are not yet in a position to reach firm conclusions. On two other outstanding issues—the related subjects of house purchase and accommodation charges and the Education Allowance—we are looking to the Ministry of Defence for further information. Following the Government's announcement, in December 1976, of

¹His position would, however, be affected by the operation of the rent and rates rebate system.

²The total cost is not directly related to the total additional expenditure from the Defence Budget in 1977-78 as the latter will also take into account items such as the increased yields from food charges and accommodation charges which reduce total expenditure.

the intended expansion of the permanent staff of the Ulster Defence Regiment, we were asked to consider the pay structure and levels appropriate to its change in role. We have already made our recommendations. The task of comparing the work of Service doctors and dentists with the work of doctors and dentists in the various branches of the National Health Service is essential to our re-examination of the basis of Service medical and dental pay. We are exploring what we believe to be a reliable and consistent means by which the work in each field can be compared and are now collecting the data needed. The extent to which progress can be made in the whole of the field of continuing work will, however, also depend on the form of the Government's new measures in the post-1 August 1977 period.

Conclusion

23. Our recommendations comply with the restraint measures set out in the White Paper "The Attack on Inflation, The Second Year". We have again focused attention on the shortfall in relation to the pay levels justified on the basis of outside evidence that has arisen, in part at least, because of the accident of the timing of the introduction of the pay restraint measures on 1 August 1975. We have drawn attention to the fact that the current measures prevent any steps from being taken to reduce that shortfall. We see this as the most important single issue which will face us in the coming year and which will have to be resolved before competitive pay levels for the armed forces can be restored on the basis of pay in jobs of comparable skills and responsibility outside. The disturbance of differentials and the anomalies created by the application of the particular form of restraint measures are also matters for concern, and they too will inevitably continue for the time being. We attach particular importance to the need for a measure of flexibility in the period after 1 August 1977 in a form that is directly relevant to the armed forces pay system, having regard to the plain fact that measures which provide flexibility in an industrial environment may very well be impossible to reflect directly in an armed forces environment. Only if this is provided will it be possible to begin to deal with the problems that we have described.

HAROLD ATCHERLEY (*Chairman*)

DESMOND DREYER

EWEN M'EWEN

A R MURRAY

JOHN READ

C A ROBERTS

J R SARGENT

LESLIE WILLIAMS

OFFICE OF MANPOWER ECONOMICS

1 April 1977

APPENDIX 1

WHITE PAPER: THE ATTACK ON INFLATION, THE SECOND YEAR

The effect of tax reliefs associated with the restraint measures

Gross earnings ^(a) (per week)	Tax relief (per week)		
	Single	Married	Married with 2 children under 11
£	£	£	£
30	} 0.40	} 0.88	1.68
40			
50			
60			
70			
80	} 0.63	} 2.09	} 2.80
90			
100			
125			
150			
200	3.09	3.91	5.29

Source: Cmnd. 6507 Annex A

^(a)The army ranks for which military salary plus the £6 a week supplement (disregarding all forms of additional pay) approximates to the gross earnings figures used are given below:

£ per
week

- 30 —
- 40 Private
- 50 Private; Lance Corporal; Corporal
- 60 Private; Lance Corporal; Corporal; Sergeant; Second Lieutenant
- 70 Corporal; Sergeant; Staff Sergeant; Warrant Officer; Lieutenant
- 80 Sergeant; Staff Sergeant; Warrant Officer; Lieutenant
- 90 Staff Sergeant; Warrant Officer; Captain
- 100 Captain; Major
- 125 Major; Lieutenant Colonel
- 150 Lieutenant Colonel; Colonel
- 200 Brigadier

APPENDIX 2

**RECOMMENDED INCREASES IN PAY FOR JUNIOR SERVICEMEN AND
SERVICEWOMEN AND APPRENTICES**

**Recommended increases for all categories of young entrants other than
those serving apprenticeships of three years or more**

Age		Weekly supplement
		£
On entry before 16½	...	1·68
16½	...	1·89
17	...	2·03

**Recommended increases for young entrants serving apprenticeships of
three years or more**

Age	Weekly supplement during year of training			
	First	Second	Third	Fourth
	£	£	£	£
16	1·68	2·24	—	—
17	1·89	2·31	2·38	—
18	2·03	2·31	2·50	2·50
19	2·50	2·50	2·50	2·50
20	2·50	2·50	2·50	2·50
21 (and over) ...	2·50	2·50	2·50	2·50

SUPPLEMENT

PREPARED BY THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

The Pay Supplement

and

Accommodation Charges

Pay

1. The increases in pay recommended by the Review Body in this report will again take the form of supplements to earnings (see paragraph 2 below) and will be additional to the supplements payable following the Review Body's 1976 recommendations.

2. The rates of service pay and additional pay published in the Ministry of Defence Supplement to the Fourth Report of the Review Body on Armed Forces Pay, 1975 (Cmnd. 6063) remain in force and are not repeated in this document.

3. The supplements for adult members of the Armed Forces up to and including one-star rank (except medical and dental officers^(a)) will be:

<i>Gross taxable earnings^(b)</i>	<i>Amount of Supplement</i>
—£50 a week or less:	£2.50 a week
—more than £50, and not more than £80 a week:	5% of gross taxable earnings
—more than £80 a week:	£4 a week

(a) For medical and dental officers—see paragraph 12 of the report.

(b) Payments of boarding school allowance and of language awards will be excluded from the assessment.

4. The rates of supplement for junior servicemen and servicewomen, and for apprentices are shown in Tables 1–3.

Accommodation Charges

5. Revised charges for single and married quarters and garages are set out in Tables 4–7.

Table 1
ROYAL NAVY AND ROYAL MARINES
 JUNIORS
ARMY
 JUNIOR ENTRANTS (ALL CATEGORIES, INCLUDING YOUNG SOLDIERS)
ROYAL AIR FORCE
 AIRMEN AND APPRENTICES WHO ENTER THE RAF BELOW AGE 17½

Age	Daily rate of Pay Supplement
16 but under 16½	£ 0.24
16½ but under 17	0.27
17 but under 17½	0.29

Table 2
ROYAL NAVY
ARTIFICER APPRENTICES, MECHANICIAN APPRENTICES
JUNIOR AND PROBATIONARY MEDICAL TECHNICIANS

Daily rate of Pay Supplement at age	Stage of training in years			
	First	Second	Third	Fourth
16 and under	£ 0.24	£ 0.32	£ —	£ —
17	0.27	0.33	0.34	—
18	0.29	0.33	*	*
19	*	*	*	*
20	*	*	*	*
21 and over	*	*	*	*

*£2.50 a week.

Table 3
JUNIOR SERVICEWOMEN
(INCLUDING LOCAL SERVICE ENGAGEMENTS)
WRNS: WRAC/QARANC:
PMRAFNS (NON-COMMISSIONED ELEMENT) AND WRAF GROUND AIRWOMEN

Rating/Rank	Daily rate of Pay Supplement
Wren (Ordinary Rating) Private Class IV† Aircraftwoman	£ 0.29
} under age 17½	

†£0.27 if aged under 17.

ACCOMMODATION CHARGES

Table 4
CHARGES FOR STANDARD MARRIED QUARTERS
Payable from 1 April 1977

Type of Quarter	Daily	Weekly	Annual
	£	£	£
<i>Other Ranks</i>			
A	0.90	6.30	328.50
B	1.18	8.26	430.70
C	1.37	9.59	500.05
D/WO	1.57	10.99	573.05
<i>Officers</i>			
V	1.88	13.16	686.20
IV	2.24	15.68	817.60
III	2.53	17.71	923.45
II	2.86	20.02	1,043.90
I	3.19	22.33	1,164.35

Table 5
CHARGES FOR SUB-STANDARD MARRIED QUARTERS
 Payable from 1 April 1977

Type of Quarter	Daily	Weekly	Annual
	£	£	£
<i>Other Ranks</i>			
A	0·60	4·20	219·00
B	0·79	5·53	288·35
C	0·91	6·37	332·15
D/WO	1·05	7·35	383·25
<i>Officers</i>			
V	1·25	8·75	456·25
IV	1·49	10·43	543·85
III	1·69	11·83	616·85

Table 6
CHARGES FOR SINGLE QUARTERS
 Payable from 1 April 1977

Rank	Daily	Weekly	Annual
	£	£	£
<i>Standard Accommodation</i>			
Young servicemen receiving less than the minimum adult rate (ie Private IV rate)	0·30		109·50
Corporal and below	0·40	2·10	146·00
Warrant Officer and Senior NCO	0·76	2·80	277·40
Captain and below	1·07	5·32	390·55
Major	1·31	7·49	478·15
Lieutenant Colonel and above	1·46	9·17	532·90
<i>Senior Officers occupying single rooms</i>			
Major	1·10	10·22	401·50
Lieutenant Colonel and above	1·17	8·19	427·05
<i>Sub-Standard Accommodation</i>			
Young servicemen receiving less than the minimum adult rate (ie Private IV rate)	0·20		73·00
Corporal and below	0·27	1·40	98·55
Warrant Officer and Senior NCO	0·51	1·89	186·15
Captain and below	0·71	3·57	259·15
Major	0·87	4·97	317·55
Lieutenant Colonel and above	0·97	6·09	354·05

Table 7
CHARGES FOR STANDARD GARAGES
 Payable from 1 April 1977

	Daily	Weekly	Annual
All ranks 	£ 0·14	£ 0·98	£ 51·10