

Song...Who wants to be a millionaire?
Now calm down and remember that this is not new money – it is what the government owes us for allowing us to slip so far behind civilian pay norms. OK, small gold bars then



It is 1979, and about time too!. Look at page 23 of the PDF File, to paragraph 50. A 32.5% pay rise. Now we are talking.



1979

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?}

355.135 / 1

PORTSMOUTH CENTRAL LIBRARY
RESERVE
STACK

REVIEW BODY
ON
ARMED FORCES PAY
EIGHTH REPORT
1979

Chairman:
SIR HAROLD ATCHERLEY

LONDON
HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE
70p net

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:

Sir Harold Atcherley (*Chairman*)¹

Admiral Sir Desmond Dreyer GCB CBE DSC JP

Dr Ewen M'Ewen CBE

Dame Rosemary Murray DBE JP

Sir John Read

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 Review Body on Top Salaries.

CONTENTS

	<i>Paragraph</i>	<i>Page</i>
Chapter 1. Background and considerations affecting the review	1	1
Chapter 2. The evidence	19	7
Chapter 3. Our recommendations	37	14
Chapter 4. Costs and conclusion	49	19
Appendix 1: Scales of military salary appropriate at 1 April 1978		21
Appendix 2: Scales of military salary introduced at 1 April 1978		23

CHAPTER 1

BACKGROUND AND CONSIDERATIONS AFFECTING THE REVIEW

Introduction

1. In our Seventh Report¹ we indicated the detailed structure and levels of pay for the armed forces appropriate at 1 April 1978 and recommended that they should be brought into effect at the earliest possible date. We were aware of the Government's expectation that increases which exceeded the guidelines under the restraint measures then in operation would need to be staged and we recommended that in those circumstances, the Government should give a firm commitment that fully up-to-date rates of pay would be implemented not later than 1 April 1980. We drew attention to the fact that implementation of pay levels that were justified at 1 April 1978 at a date so far ahead implied that the salaries would need to be brought up to date again on the implementation of each stage.

2. The Government's decisions on our recommendations were made known by the Prime Minister in the House of Commons² on 25 April 1978. The levels of military salary that we judged to be fully up to date at 1 April 1978 were accepted but it was indeed found necessary to stage their implementation: they are, however, in operation for pensions purposes. The first stage took the form of an increase in military salaries and additional pay and certain other improvements which accounted for an addition to the pay bill of 14 per cent. The decision to stage implementation was accompanied by a firm commitment that the increases which we had recommended would be implemented in full in two further approximately equal stages from 1 April 1979 and 1 April 1980³, and would be brought up to date to "take account of increases that are gained during the next two years".

3. This commitment provides a guarantee to members of the armed forces that their pay will be brought fully up to date by 1 April 1980 on what we judge to be the appropriate basis. It implies also that, during the coming year, there will be a residual shortfall from fully up-to-date levels of pay which will be eliminated in the next review.

4. In order to enable the Government to fulfil the commitment, we make known in this report the fully up-to-date 1 April 1979 levels of military salary, of the major forms of additional pay, and of Northern Ireland pay. The levels appropriate to 1 April 1980 will be made known in our next report. At the same time, the shortfall in military salary that remained after the first stage of the 1 April 1978 increases⁴ had been implemented needs to be defined: for each individual member of the armed forces, it is the difference between the scales of military salary inclusive of the X factor appropriate at 1 April 1978 (Appendix 1)⁵ which were made known in our Seventh Report⁶ and the first stage scales and rates of military salary that were introduced with effect from 1 April 1978 (Appendix 2)⁵.

¹Review Body on Armed Forces Pay, Seventh Report 1978, Cmnd. 7177, April 1978.

²Hansard Volume 948 No 103, 25th April 1978, Columns 1178-1192.

³The commitment was defined in greater detail by the Secretary of State on 22 May 1978 (Hansard Volume 950 No 121, Column 1148) when he explained that the increases on 1 April 1979 and 1 April 1980 would each consist of half of the amount required to make up the military salary appropriate at 1 April 1978 together with whatever amounts were required to bring them up to date from April 1978 to April 1979 and from April 1979 to April 1980 respectively which would, of course, arise from further recommendations by the Review Body.

⁴There is no shortfall in the major forms of additional pay or in Northern Ireland pay which the Government decided to increase to the fully up-to-date levels appropriate at 1 April 1978 with effect from that date.

⁵Including the specific salaries for the rest of the Services that were derived from them.

⁶Cmnd. 7177, April 1978, Chapter 3.

5. Our recommendations last year were made in the context of serious manning problems, particularly among middle ranking officers and in the most highly skilled technical trades and branches. It was hoped that they would at least have helped to hold in check the unacceptably high outflows from the Services, until the military salary could be restored to levels that were fully comparable with earnings in jobs of equivalent weight outside. Only then could the military salary resume its proper role as one of the primary incentives to recruitment to the Services and to prolongation of service. However, outflows from all three Services continue to create acute problems (paragraph 7-8). Senior officers have told us that, in their view, many of those who have given notice or who have indicated an intention to leave the Services are in practice waiting for the results of the current pay review and that they may withdraw their applications if they find it satisfactory. This underlines the importance of the decisions to be taken in the current review.

6. We have visited units in all three Services in the United Kingdom and in the Army and the Royal Air Force in Germany during the last year. We have heard from members of the Services at all ranks, and from their wives, of the financial difficulties that they face because pay is below its proper level; more particularly, we have been told repeatedly of the real hardship suffered by families of the more junior ranks. In these circumstances, discontent about relatively minor conditions of service assumes disproportionate importance as an irritant; examples are the cost of travel, particularly in the face of increased separation which is a feature of current 'overstretch' within the Services, and the scales of baggage allowance. We comment on these items in greater detail later (paragraph 12): at this point, we need only draw attention to the fact that dissatisfaction with conditions of service of this kind does not grow up overnight. It is a gradual process, that results at least in part from failure to ensure that conditions of service keep abreast of economic and social developments generally.

Manning

7. The Statement on the Defence Estimates 1979¹ indicates that, although recruitment improved in 1978 compared with 1977, it is unlikely to meet the increased targets needed to relieve 'overstretch' and improve operational capability, and to make good losses by premature voluntary release. Moreover, the total outflow remains at a disquieting level: the number of experienced men in the most highly skilled categories among those seeking premature voluntary release continues to be unusually high. Unless this trend is reversed, the consequences in the loss of trained officers and men will be serious. The Statement attributes the outflows in part to dissatisfaction with pay, and in part to other conditions of service including turbulence and increased family separation. It envisages that a more normal pattern of outflow will be resumed as pay is restored to levels that compare properly with those for comparable jobs elsewhere, and as turbulence is reduced by the completion of the process of reorganisation and redeployment and of the measures to relieve the current overstretch.

8. Against the background of a general shortfall from recruitment targets for officers, detailed evidence on manning indicates that the main shortages are expected to be among engineers, instructors and aircrew categories. But recruitment of pilots in the Royal Air Force has been stimulated by the reintroduction of Short Service Commissions. Recruitment of servicemen is also expected to fall short of requirements overall, but particularly in some of the key technical trades. This situation, combined with the high outflows (paragraph 5) which tend

¹Cmnd. 7474, February 1979, Chapter 4.

to be more serious in the areas in which recruitment itself is not satisfactory, makes clear that there has been little or no relief from the 'overstretch' which we described last year. Moreover, recurrent calls on the armed forces to provide emergency services in certain essential areas have continued to make an additional demand. Increased recruitment on its own is **not** in any case a solution: the replacement of experienced officers and of highly trained technicians is a long and costly business. It is difficult to isolate the training costs specifically associated with excessive outflow, but the average cost of training individuals to the stage where they enter productive service can be assessed. At the top end of the scale, the average training cost for all types of pilot is just under £800,000 per man, and for navigators it is more than £300,000. The range of training costs of officers in the Royal Navy and in the Army is between about £11,000 and £100,000 according to specialisation; and for soldiers, from about £3,000 to about £9,000. Moreover, the cost of replacement is not confined to training costs alone. It takes time after completion of training before operational experience produces the high professional standards that the Services require.

Pay

9. It is extremely wasteful of resources to incur costs of this order in further training to replace losses that are clearly avoidable. These costs can only be avoided by stopping excessive outflow. This will not happen as long as pay and other day to day conditions of service are allowed to remain below an acceptable and competitive level. Recruitment is likely to be relatively less satisfactory in 1978-79 than in 1977-78 because of the higher targets, but the continued loss of highly trained technicians and relatively young middle rank officers in a number of specialisations gives rise to particular concern. The commitment to restore fully up-to-date pay levels in the armed forces by 1 April 1980 is a step in the right direction, but we cannot ignore the fact that on 1 April 1979, after the introduction of the second stage of the increases covered by the commitment, military salaries will still be below outside levels for comparable jobs. The shortfall will of course be reduced to one-half of the amount that existed after implementation of the 1 April 1978 increases, but it is as yet a matter for conjecture whether this will restore confidence to an extent that will reduce the outflow as a step towards reversing the present trend. Whatever the immediate effect, the earliest possible restoration of competitive pay levels is the least that is needed: it will then be essential to maintain them in line with earnings outside according to the accepted standards. To the extent that pay has an influence on manning, it is not the occasional bringing into line of military salaries that will have the continuing effect: it is a commitment that the pay of the Services will be maintained at competitive levels.

The X factor

10. We are bound to point out that the element included in the military salary to compensate for the balance of disadvantage and advantage of Service life by comparison with civil life—the X factor—is, in effect, not being paid at present because the military salary is depressed below the levels justified on the normal basis of assessment. In our view, it is the inadequacy of the military salary as a whole that is the underlying cause of the growing discontent over relatively minor conditions of service which we have noted (paragraph 6). The first priority must be to bring the military salary up to date as early as possible, ensuring that the X factor once again becomes a reality.

11. In the meantime, the Ministry of Defence have proposed a substantial increase in the X factor across the board, on the grounds that the elements that make up the justification for it have shifted to the disadvantage of the Services. At this stage we do not feel that the arguments are sufficiently documented for us to be able to reach a firm conclusion, although we recognise that the balance may well have changed adversely for some individuals. We drew attention to this in our Seventh Report¹. We have begun an examination of the problem on the basis of preliminary evidence from the Ministry of Defence, but it is not yet detailed enough to indicate how the pressures of work on servicemen have changed over time. We await fuller evidence in the coming year. A judgment on the effectiveness of the X factor can be made more readily when military salaries are once again fully up to date.

Other conditions of service

12. Many of the minor conditions of service about which we have heard widespread complaint do not come within our terms of reference, but some of them have been raised so often during our visits in recent years that we cannot let them pass without comment. We understand that one of them—baggage allowance, which governs the quantity of goods, including household goods, that Service families can take with them at public expense on their fairly frequent postings at home and overseas—has very recently been brought into line with the scales elsewhere in the public services and we welcome this improvement as a step in the right direction. Some of them are examples of conditions of service that have not kept pace with changes in the social and economic environment and that affect individual members of the Services and their families: baggage allowance before the recent change is one such example, and the entitlement to travel warrants which is designed, *inter alia*, to alleviate the effects of family separation, is another. In the ordinary way, improvements in them would not be relevant to consideration of levels of pay. But in the context of successive rounds of restraint measures, it has been put to us that the Government would regard improvements in some of these conditions as non-wage benefits, the cost of which would have to be offset against the cost of an increase in pay.

13. We find this approach surprising. It seems to us that, where an employment environment is such that (for example) the employer requires his employees to undertake frequent movements to locations dispersed over a wide area and this involves the employee in separation from his family or in the need to move his belongings, it should be axiomatic that the accompanying conditions of service are adequate to cover the reasonable costs engendered by the particular form of service. Moreover, an obligation rests on the employer to maintain the level of the provisions in line with a reasonable view of what society generally expects from time to time. If all improvements have to be made at the expense of pay, the employee is in effect required to finance them from his own pocket. We consider that the removal of disincentives of this kind should be explored further as a matter of some urgency: it seems to us that this is an area in which improvements that may be relatively small could yield useful returns.

Charges

Food charges

14. The evidence put to us proposes no changes in the basis on which the food charge is calculated and we see no reason to depart from our standard approach. Our recommendation is in paragraph 47.

¹Review Body on Armed Forces Pay, Seventh Report 1978, Cmnd. 7177, April 1978, paragraph 41.

Accommodation charges

15. We have expressed certain doubts in earlier reports¹ about the continuing appropriateness of the method by which the principle of comparison has been applied in the past to accommodation charges. These doubts increased last year, when we observed that the differences between the conditions of tenancy enjoyed by local authority tenants and by occupiers of Service married quarters had grown wider. We drew attention in our Seventh Report² to the growing differences between Service and local authority tenants in what was 'bought' by the rental element in charges on the one hand and by the rent on the other. This is attributable, in the main, to changes in the conditions imposed on local authority tenants and the improvement in the stake in their houses that results.

16. Local authority tenants now enjoy long-term security of tenure, subject of course to payment of rent and observance of the other conditions of tenancy, whereas Service tenants do not. An analysis of local authority rental income and housing expenditure suggests that long-term security of tenure is reflected in rent as a contribution to the capital cost of the house as, indeed, is reasonable. Tenants of Service married quarters do not have continuous occupation or long-term security of tenure, and it is therefore open to question whether they should be required (through the rent element of the accommodation charge) to make a contribution to capital costs.

17. Because this is a new approach, we have consulted the Director of the Department of the Environment's Housing Services Advisory Unit about the principles involved and on our interpretation of the data. As a result, we consider that it may well offer a satisfactory alternative to the present basis of assessment of the rent element in charges and one which is to be preferred. We also need to consider further whether, in the context of quarters which vary widely in quality, in age and in location and general desirability, the present rates element of the charge (an average payment for each type of quarter) continues to be the most suitable approach. This raises a number of questions of principle, not least whether uniform charges for standard quarters irrespective of age or other considerations continue to meet the Services' needs. It is a separate question from the rent element of the charge, and we shall need to consider it further. The Government decided last year to impose a "standstill on charges for accommodation pending a further examination by the Review Body"³; that examination is in progress, and we assume that the Government will want to continue the standstill for the time being.

Medical and dental officers

18. The pay of Service medical and dental officers continues to be based on the average net remuneration of general medical practitioners in the National Health

¹Review Body on Armed Forces Pay: First Report 1972, Cmnd. 4954, April 1972, paragraph 79; Second Report 1973, Cmnd. 5336, June 1973, paragraph 15; Fourth Report 1975, Cmnd. 6063, May 1975, paragraph 86; Seventh Report 1978, Cmnd. 7177, April 1978, paragraphs 16 and 47-50.

²Review Body on Armed Forces Pay, Seventh Report 1978, Cmnd. 7177, April 1978, paragraph 16 and Chapters 3 and 4.

³Hansard Volume 948 No 103, Tuesday 25th April 1978, Column 1179.

Service(NHS), as recommended by the National Board for Prices and Incomes,¹ and our 1978 recommendations were made on that basis². However, we recognised that, because the manning problems relating to doctors were closely similar to those in the technical branches of the Services, the Government might well extend the spirit of its decision on our main recommendations to medical and dental officers also. In the event, this was done and the first stage of the 1 April 1978 increase for medical and dental officers was more favourable overall (at a total of 14 per cent) than the equivalent increase (10.5 per cent) for general medical practitioners in the NHS. Our recommendations for the second stage payment under the commitment that will be implemented with effect from 1 April 1979 must await the outcome of the current review of the remuneration of doctors and dentists in the NHS. In line with our usual practice, we will put forward recommendations in a Supplement to this Report.

¹National Board for Prices and Incomes Report No 116, Cmnd. 4079, June 1969, Chapter 9.

²Review Body on Armed Forces Pay, Service Medical and Dental Officers, Supplement to Seventh Report 1978, Cmnd. 7288, December 1978.

CHAPTER 2

THE EVIDENCE

19. We now consider the evidence in detail.

Pay

20. As foreshadowed in our Seventh Report¹, we have added to the evidence of outside earnings that we obtain on a regular basis by making a start on the detailed comparison of jobs and earnings at job levels equivalent to those of Warrant Officers and senior non-commissioned ranks which we had concluded was essential for our future work. We know that the extensive evaluation of jobs in industry and commerce, and the accompanying surveys of earnings that are carried out on our behalf, impose a substantial burden on the organisations that co-operate in these studies and once again we want to express our gratitude for their valuable contribution. With their help, we now have earnings data related to comprehensive job evaluation studies from Corporal to Warrant Officer Class 1, and from Captain to Brigadier². Earnings data from other sources are used as indicators of salaries appropriate to Privates and to junior officers. We now discuss the evidence and our conclusions in each of these areas. Since the submission of our Seventh Report, we have made recommendations for an increase in London weighting within the guidelines that were operative last year; these have been implemented with effect from 1 April 1978.

Officers

21. We have described in previous reports the nature of the evidence that we take into account in reaching conclusions on the pay of officers and we need refer to it only briefly here. The primary evidence comes from two main sources. From Captain to Brigadier it comprises earnings data related to outside jobs of similar weight as measured by the same system of job evaluation in nearly 300 organisations which together provide a wide representation of types, sizes and locations of business. These earnings levels are adjusted to take account of differences in pensions arrangements, including benefits, and of the incidence and value of benefits in cash or in kind. For junior officers—Lieutenants and Second Lieutenants—our object is to maintain an appropriate relationship both to the pay of non-commissioned ranks and to the pay of Captains. We take account of evidence of starting salaries and early salary progressions of graduate and non-graduate management recruits in civil employment, and also of the system of antedating seniority for graduates, which is a feature of the entry arrangements in the Services.

22. The evidence based on job evaluation at January 1979³ indicates that, in jobs equivalent to the range from Captain to Brigadier, median levels of basic salary were higher than the corresponding levels in January 1978 by between 11.8 per cent and 14.6 per cent. After bringing the January figures up to date at 1 April in each year, we have adjusted them to take account of differences in pensions arrangements, of the incidence and levels of bonus payments and profit sharing arrangements, of London weighting, and of the estimated benefit derived from the private use of a company car. Finally, we have added the X factor. On this basis, the range of increases in percentage terms is between 13.0 per cent and 14.8 per cent, with the exception of one rank at which the increase is marginally over 16 per cent. As a secondary check, we have compared the increases indicated at each rank between April 1975 and April 1978, and

¹Cmnd. 7177, April 1978, paragraph 35.

²Throughout this report, references to army ranks relate also to equivalent ranks in the other Services where the context allows.

³The salary survey employed has a reference date of 1 January 1979.

between April 1972 and April 1978 with the movements in salaries over the same periods in the New Earnings Survey. Over both periods, the increases in the fully up-to-date military salary justified on the basis of the primary evidence are broadly consistent with the increases in earnings at comparable levels indicated by the New Earnings Survey¹.

23. Nevertheless, this evidence cannot be considered in isolation. It relates to a part of the military salary structure only (Captain to Brigadier). Taking account of the salary of Major General as the next rank above Brigadier, and of the evidence on the starting salaries in outside jobs for which candidates are needed from the same field as the Services, we are satisfied that the structure in Table 1, which includes the X factor, reflects all the evidence and is the fully up-to-date structure appropriate at 1 April 1979. The military salaries in it are higher than the equivalent fully up-to-date rates appropriate at 1 April 1978 (Appendix 1) by between 13.0 per cent and 16.1 per cent, and thus correspond closely to the evidence (paragraph 22).

Table 1
Scales of military salary inclusive of the X factor appropriate at
1 April 1979 for officers up to Brigadier based on the
evidence (annual rates ^(a))

Rank	Military salary £
Brigadier	15,251
Colonel	14,175
	6 13,838
	4 13,502
	2 13,165
	on appointment 12,828
Lieutenant Colonel	12,078
	6 11,789
	4 11,500
	2 11,211
	on appointment 10,921
Major	10,054
	7 9,853
	6 9,651
	5 9,450
	4 9,249
	3 9,048
	2 8,846
	1 8,645
	on appointment 8,444
Captain	7,799
	5 7,616
	4 7,433
	3 7,250
	2 7,067
	1 6,884
	on appointment 6,701
Lieutenant	5,962
	3 5,819
	2 5,677
	1 5,534
	on appointment 5,391
Second Lieutenant	4,352

^(a) Annual salaries are derived from daily rates in whole pence and rounded to the nearest £.

¹At the most appropriate percentile, which we define as the percentile which in April 1975 (and 1972) had a level nearer to the mid-point of the salary scale for a given rank than the level of any other percentile available.

Servicemen

Warrant Officers and senior non-commissioned ranks

24. Our initial approach in this field of comparison (paragraph 20) has been on a parallel basis to the regular comparison at Corporal level, and we have commissioned an evaluation of outside jobs by means of the factor plan that was first developed in 1970-71 for assessing job weights within the Services only. As a preliminary measure, it was necessary to confirm that this factor plan was still valid for that purpose and to examine its feasibility for the purpose of evaluating jobs in civil life also. This examination by our consultants has confirmed the validity of the plan as a means of evaluating Service jobs consistently, but for the field outside, from an initial sample of some 100 jobs selected for evaluation, it was found to be more satisfactory in the broad middle ground than at the extremes of the range of job values, where the results were not always consistent. It has nevertheless been possible to use it to indicate broad earnings levels in jobs that span the whole range of job sizes found in the Services but, because of the qualifications that we have indicated, we have treated with caution the earnings levels found at both the top and the bottom of the range. As this is the first year in which it has been possible to obtain information in this way, a direct comparison cannot be made with the position in the past. But we have observed that the earnings levels that we regard as more reliable are consistent with the more limited information on earnings which we obtained in a different way for our last review and which has been brought up to date this year. During the coming year, we shall explore alternative methods of obtaining reliable evidence in addition to possible ways of eliminating the distortion that has been disclosed.

25. We are satisfied that the structure and levels of military salary for Warrant Officers and senior non-commissioned ranks in Table 2 reflect realistically the evidence of outside earnings within the higher and lower levels of the overall Services' pay structure into which they have to be fitted. These military salaries are appropriate at 1 April 1979 and are between 14.9 per cent and 16.6 per cent higher than the equivalent fully up-to-date salaries that we indicated in our Seventh Report as appropriate at 1 April 1978.

Corporals and below

26. We have again obtained evidence on the tried and tested basis that has been found to be reliable in previous years. The evidence for Corporals relates to the total earnings in a reference week in November 1978, and to other conditions of service, for a sample of some 600 jobs in civil life which have been evaluated by exactly the same methods and criteria used in the armed forces to evaluate Corporals' jobs. It indicates that, over the sample as a whole, outside earnings in November 1978 were about 14 per cent higher than they had been in November 1977. There was wide variation in the increases in different points score ranges—from about 9¼ per cent to about 23¾ per cent¹. The use of regression analysis indicated earnings levels in the precise points ranges occupied by Corporals which were between 14.6 per cent and 15.1 per cent higher than the equivalent levels in November 1977. After bringing the figures up to date to 1 April 1978 and 1 April 1979 respectively, and after making the appropriate adjustments for X factor and for structural considerations, the range of increases in percentage terms in the salaries (Scale B) for Corporals appropriate at 1 April 1979 is between 14.3 per cent and 15.3 per cent over the fully up-to-date salaries at 1 April 1978.

¹The average earnings of full-time manual men aged 21 or over, whose pay was not affected by absence, as recorded by the New Earnings Surveys in April 1977 and April 1978 and brought up to date by the movement in the index of average earnings (new series) to November in each year, show a movement of 13.5 per cent.

27. For Privates and equivalent, we have again developed a pay structure which, on the basis of weighted averages, broadly reflects earnings recorded in the New Earnings Survey in the age groups equivalent to those of Privates. This evidence and the evidence at Corporal level has enabled us to devise a progressive salary structure which both provides adequate incentives to promotion and is compatible with the structure immediately above for senior non-commissioned officers and Warrant Officers. The new levels are between 11.0 per cent and 14.5 per cent higher than the corresponding 1978 levels. This structure, which is appropriate at 1 April 1979, is in Table 3.

Table 2
Scales of military salary inclusive of the X factor appropriate at 1 April 1979
for Warrant Officers and senior NCOs based on the evidence
(annual^(a) and weekly rates)

Scale B (men committed to 6 years or more but less than 9 years' service) ^(b)	Band							
	4		5		6		7	
	Annual	Weekly	Annual	Weekly	Annual	Weekly	Annual	Weekly
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Warrant Officer 1 ...	6,357	121.59	6,771	129.50	7,247	138.60	7,788	148.96
Warrant Officer 2 ...	6,050	115.71	6,464	123.62	6,939	132.72	7,481	143.08
Staff Sergeant ...	5,757	110.11	6,171	118.02	6,647	127.12	7,188	137.48
Sergeant ...	5,475	104.72	5,889	112.63	6,365	121.73	—	—

Table 3
Scales of military salary inclusive of the X factor appropriate at 1 April 1979
for adult servicemen of the rank of Corporal and below based on the evidence
(annual^(a) and weekly rates)

Scale B (men committed to 6 years or more but less than 9 years' service) ^(b)	Band					
	1		2		3	
	Annual	Weekly	Annual	Weekly	Annual	Weekly
	£	£	£	£	£	£
Corporal I ...	5,109	97.72	5,497	105.14	5,937	113.54
Corporal II ...	4,798	91.77	5,186	99.19	—	—
Lance Corporal I ...	4,505	86.17	4,893	93.59	5,333	101.99
Lance Corporal II ...	4,231	80.92	4,619	88.34	—	—
Lance Corporal III ...	3,971	75.95	4,359	83.37	—	—
Private I ...	3,971	75.95	4,359	83.37	4,798	91.77
Private II ...	3,730	71.33	4,118	78.75	—	—
Private III ...	3,503	66.99	3,891	74.41	—	—
Private IV ...	3,287	62.86	—	—	—	—

^(a) Rounded to the nearest £.

^(b) Scale A (men committed to less than 6 years' service) – deduct £2.10 a week from the above rates.

Scale C (men committed to, or who have completed, more than 9 years' service)—add £3.15 a week to the above rates.

The X factor

28. The structure and levels of military salaries in Army terms that are appropriate at 1 April 1979 are in Tables 1, 2 and 3. These provide the basic data from which salaries in the other Services will be calculated, and the additional information required (paragraph 4) to enable the Government to fulfil its commitment to bring Service pay up to date. They incorporate an unchanged X factor, at the rate of 10 per cent for men and 5 per cent for women, subject to a maximum amount that comes into effect at the rank of Lieutenant Colonel and then tapers until it is extinguished at the level of Major General and above, in accordance with the recommendations of the Review Body on Top Salaries¹.

Special pay scales: legal officers and veterinary officers

29. We have considered evidence about the work of legal officers in the Army and in the Royal Air Force and of veterinary officers in the Royal Army Veterinary Corps relative to the work of other members of those professions in the civil service. We have also considered pay proposals based on that evidence that were designed, in each case, to solve present and prospective manning problems in these two small specialist groups. The evidence suggests that the problems have probably been intensified just because the groups concerned are very small: but adoption of the proposals would change the present relationships with the pay of other officers and, as long as pay generally is below its proper level, we are unable to endorse them. It would not be appropriate, in our view, to introduce changes in the pay structure, or in the relative levels of constituent parts of it in isolation, in the hope that they might somehow redress the imbalance created by the inadequacy of the military salary generally. Moreover, we do not consider that the proposals get to the root of the problem and we intend to explore certain features of the evidence further with the Ministry of Defence during the coming year. For the time being, we have concluded that the existing cash lead over the military salaries of combatant officers should be maintained for legal officers and that the relationship between the military salaries of veterinary officers and combatant officers established following the recommendations in our Fourth Report 1975² should also be maintained.

Additional pay

30. For the same reasons, we do not discuss in detail certain proposals to modify existing differentials—whether internal or external—within the structure of additional pay. Change would not be appropriate in present circumstances: peripheral improvements—even where they can be justified—should not be allowed to interfere with the overriding priority of restoring military salaries to levels that are fully comparable with outside earnings in jobs of equivalent weight. Nevertheless, we have no doubt about the importance of additional pay in certain circumstances and we shall consider the proposals that have been put to us in the context of our ongoing review. We find certain aspects of the proposals unsatisfactory in principle and we need to consider them further. However, we have already noted (paragraph 4) the Government's decision last year to increase by 50 per cent the major items of additional pay that constitute a significant proportion of the total earnings of those who receive them (flying pay, submarine pay, parachute and parachute jumping instructors' pay, diving pay and hydrographic pay). This decision in effect restored the relationship with the fully up-to-date salaries at that date that we considered appropriate and that

¹Review Body on Top Salaries, Report No. 6, Cmnd. 5846, December 1974, paragraph 61.

²Cmnd. 6063, May 1975.

is in line with the recommendations in our Fourth Report¹. In our view the relationship with the fully up-to-date salaries appropriate at 1 April 1979 should again be maintained.

Northern Ireland pay

31. Northern Ireland pay at the rate of 50p a day was introduced with effect from 1 April 1974 for all ranks up to and including Brigadier who served continuously in Northern Ireland for more than 14 days, as a result of Government acceptance of a recommendation in our Third Report². It was directly related to the abnormal extent of work during “unsocial hours” associated with service in Northern Ireland. The rate remained unchanged until 1 April 1978 when the Government decided to increase it to £1 a day forthwith, as we had in principle considered justified in our Seventh Report³.

32. The evidence submitted to us by the Ministry of Defence for the present review has sought to draw a parallel between Northern Ireland pay and the Special Duty Allowance that has been paid to members of the Royal Ulster Constabulary (RUC) and the RUC Reserve since 1 April 1974, on the grounds that there is little to distinguish the conditions of life and the risks run by members of the Ulster Defence Regiment (UDR) and their families from those of the RUC. Their argument is, therefore, that it would be inequitable if, on 1 April 1979, the rate of Northern Ireland pay for the UDR were not brought into line with the rate of Special Duty Allowance for the RUC, which is to be increased to £500 a year on that date; and further, that it would be inequitable if Northern Ireland pay were to be increased for the UDR but not for the rest of the armed forces in Northern Ireland.

33. We find this approach unconvincing: nor have we found any support for it in the approach adopted by the Committee of Inquiry on the Police in reaching their conclusions on the Special Duty Allowance for the RUC⁴. The Committee considered the position of the RUC in detail and with particular reference to the comparison with the armed forces serving in Northern Ireland. They recognised that there had been a link in the past between Northern Ireland pay and the Special Duty Allowance which might be maintained by increasing the rate of the allowance to £1 a day, but they concluded that the differences between the RUC and the armed forces outweighed the similarities and that different treatment was justified. In reaching their conclusion, the Committee commented on the uniquely difficult conditions that faced the RUC in carrying out their duties. Their conclusions were intended to recognise the differences between the 24 hours a day exposure to attack of members of the RUC and their families and the more limited exposure of the great majority of soldiers who return to the comparative safety of military quarters after duty and who spend relatively short tours of duty only in Northern Ireland. The contribution of the armed forces and the pressures to which they were subjected were not in any sense underrated: but the differences between them and the RUC were seen as justifying separate consideration. The Committee of Inquiry’s reference to Northern Ireland pay as having been “. . . also intended to compensate servicemen for the loss of their

¹*Ibid*, Chapter 4.

²Review Body on Armed Forces Pay, Third Report 1974, Cmnd. 5631, May 1974, Chapter 2.

³Review Body on Armed Forces Pay, Seventh Report 1978, Cmnd. 7177, April 1978.

⁴Committee of Inquiry on the Police, Reports on Negotiating Machinery and Pay, Cmnd. 7283, July 1978, Report II, paragraphs 230-237.

overseas and duty-free allowances on transfer from BAOR to Northern Ireland"¹ is mistaken, but this does not, in our view, affect the validity of their conclusions. Nevertheless, we take this opportunity to record that such compensation did not feature in the justification for the introduction of Northern Ireland pay².

34. We are unable to endorse the proposal that the rate of Northern Ireland pay should be increased to £500 a year (or £1.37 a day), but we are in no doubt that its April 1978 value ought to be maintained, and our recommendations reflect this conclusion.

Charges

Food charges

35. No change has been proposed in the method by which the food charge has been calculated since the introduction of the military salary. The gross charge appropriate with effect from 1 April 1979 on the accepted basis is 133.7p a day; after abatement by 10 per cent to take account of the incidence of absences of less than 48 hours when meals are not taken, it is reduced to £1.20 a day (£8.40 a week). This represents an increase of 8p a day (56p a week) over the current charge or, in percentage terms, an increase of 7.1 per cent.

Accommodation charges

36. We have discussed the considerations that have affected our approach to accommodation charges (paragraphs 15-17) but we are not yet able to reach firm conclusions from the necessarily limited evidence that we have obtained. This apart, we consider in Chapter 3 the conclusions drawn from all the evidence in the light of the Government's commitment and make appropriate recommendations.

¹*ibid*, paragraph 231.

²Review Body on Armed Forces Pay, Third Report 1974, Cmnd. 5631, May 1974, Chapter 2.

CHAPTER 3

OUR RECOMMENDATIONS

37. The structure and levels of military salaries in Chapter 2 are those that we recommend as appropriate at 1 April 1979. We now have to consider them in the context of the decision to stage the introduction of the 1 April 1978 salaries and of the commitment to implement them on a fully up-to-date basis by 1 April 1980. We see it as incumbent upon us to put forward the scales and rates of military salary that will enable that commitment to be fulfilled in the terms in which it has been made known to Parliament and to the Services, and has been repeated in evidence to us (paragraph 2). If the Government were to decide in the light of the outside pay evidence generally that some improvement on the commitment could now be made, we would see this as entirely consistent with the spirit of our recommendations¹ last year, when we saw 1 April 1980 as the latest acceptable date for the restoration of fully up to date military salaries.

38. The military salaries needed to meet the Government's commitment are expressed in Army terms, as is our usual practice. Their calculation is based on the data in this report²: the three elements of it are:

- a. the fully up-to-date military salaries appropriate at 1 April 1979 (Tables 1-3);
- b. the fully up-to-date military salaries at 1 April 1978 (Appendix 1);
- c. the military salaries introduced with effect from 1 April 1978 (Appendix 2).

39. The detailed scales and rates of military salary on this basis at 1 April 1979 are in Tables 4-6 .

¹Review Body on Armed Forces Pay, Seventh Report 1978, Cmnd. 7177, April 1978, Chapter 4.
²From this information, the 'second stage' salary to fulfil the commitment is $(a-b) + \frac{1}{2}(b-c) + c$, subject to adjustment for structural consistency and for daily rates.

Table 4
Scales of military salary inclusive of the X factor for officers up to
Brigadier based on the Government commitment
(annual rates^(a))

Rank	Military salary
	£
Brigadier	14,274
Colonel	13,209
	12,894
	12,583
	12,305
	12,052
Lieutenant Colonel	11,328
	11,061
	10,790
	10,522
	10,255
Major	9,432
	9,245
	9,058
	8,872
	8,685
	8,499
	8,312
	8,125
	7,942
Captain	7,397
	7,232
	7,064
	6,899
	6,734
	6,570
	6,401
Lieutenant	5,721
	5,589
	5,457
	5,322
	5,190
Second Lieutenant	4,216

^(a) Annual salaries are derived from daily rates in whole pence and rounded to the nearest £.

Table 5
Scales of military salary inclusive of the X factor
for Warrant Officers and senior NCOs based on the Government commitment
(annual ^(a) and weekly rates)

Scale B (men committed to 6 years or more but less than 9 years' service) ^(b)	Band							
	4		5		6		7	
	Annual	Weekly	Annual	Weekly	Annual	Weekly	Annual	Weekly
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Warrant Officer 1 ...	5,937	113·54	6,314	120·75	6,749	129·08	7,247	138·60
Warrant Officer 2 ...	5,647	108·01	6,024	115·22	6,460	123·55	6,958	133·07
Staff Sergeant ...	5,373	102·76	5,750	109·97	6,185	118·30	6,683	127·82
Sergeant ...	5,109	97·72	5,486	104·93	5,922	113·26	—	—

Table 6
Scales of military salary inclusive of the X factor
for adult servicemen of the rank of Corporal and below based on the Government commitment
(annual ^(a) and weekly rates)

Scale B (men committed to 6 years or more but less than 9 years' service) ^(b)	Band					
	1		2		3	
	Annual	Weekly	Annual	Weekly	Annual	Weekly
	£	£	£	£	£	£
Corporal I ...	4,765	91·14	5,117	97·86	5,519	105·56
Corporal II ...	4,473	85·54	4,824	92·26	—	—
Lance Corporal I ...	4,198	80·29	4,549	87·01	4,952	94·71
Lance Corporal II ...	3,942	75·39	4,293	82·11	—	—
Lance Corporal III ...	3,704	70·84	4,055	77·56	—	—
Private I ...	3,704	70·84	4,055	77·56	4,458	85·26
Private II ...	3,484	66·64	3,836	73·36	—	—
Private III ...	3,283	62·79	3,634	69·51	—	—
Private IV ...	3,074	58·80	—	—	—	—

^(a) Rounded to the nearest £.

^(b) Scale A (men committed to less than 6 years' service)—deduct £2·10 a week from the above rates.

Scale C (men committed to, or who have completed more than 9 years' service)—add £3·15 a week to the above rates.

40. With one exception, the scales and rates of military salary for the rest of the Services covered by this report (including the Women's Services) are derived from these tables. The exception is university cadets.

41. The present level of pay for university cadets is £2,161 a year; it was introduced with effect from 1 April 1978. In considering the appropriate level at 1 April 1979, we have taken into account two important developments. The first, once again, is the manning situation. We have been told in evidence that the cadetship scheme has failed to attract sufficient candidates for commissions in the combatant branches and this clearly will have implications for the longer term.

The second development is a recent concession by the Board of Inland Revenue¹ which will exempt university cadets from liability to income tax, so long as their income does not exceed £3,000 in a year. We do not yet know the full effects of the new arrangements and, until we do, we have decided not to make major changes which might have unforeseen effects. It would be wrong in principle to base our recommendations on the treatment of the payments for income tax purposes, but we cannot ignore the fact that, under the new arrangements the existing payment will now be equivalent to a taxable income of £2,650 for a single man. We also need to consider the pay of medical and dental cadets, which is at present £3,000 a year. If we were to recommend increases in both levels of pay, the whole of the university cadet's income would be free of tax unless the increase carried the total income above £3,000, whereas the pay of the medical and dental cadet would immediately become liable to tax. The relationship between the two would undergo a dramatic change, for which we see no justification.

42. We will not therefore be in a position to reach a conclusion on this issue until the implications of the new tax arrangements have been clarified and until we have had further evidence on the relationships that the Ministry of Defence see as appropriate in the new situation, between university cadets on the one hand and medical and dental cadets on the other. In the meantime, university cadets will benefit to the extent of the tax that has been paid hitherto—£328 a year for single men. We will put forward our recommendations as soon as we are in a position to do so.

Additional pay

43. The five major forms of additional pay (paragraph 30) were increased with effect from 1 April 1978 to levels which restored the relationships with the fully up-to-date military salaries that we had considered appropriate in 1975 and had recommended in our Seventh Report should again be restored. We recommend that, with effect from 1 April 1979, the five items should be increased to levels which maintain the present relationship with the fully up-to-date salaries in 1 April 1979 terms. In broad terms, this means that the rates will need to be increased on average by about 14 per cent.

Northern Ireland pay

44. We recommend that the rate of Northern Ireland pay should be increased by 10 per cent with effect from 1 April 1979 in order to maintain its value.

Special pay scales

45. The scales of military salary for legal officers and for veterinary officers will follow from the basis that we have recommended should continue for the time being (paragraph 29). We recommend that the present relationships between other special scales of pay and military salaries generally (chaplains and young entrants to the Services, including apprentices) should continue unchanged.

46. Flying pay for specialist aircrew differs from the standard form of flying pay in that it is designed to bring their total earnings into a specific relationship with the total earnings of other officers in the Royal Air Force. It is therefore closely akin to a special scale of pay and we recommend that both the fully up-to-date and 'second stage' rates of flying pay for specialist aircrew should be

¹The concession relates to the application of Section 375, Income and Corporation Taxes Act 1970, to scholarship income.

at levels which maintain the present relationships with the earnings of the command stream Squadron Leader on appointment and, after 13 years, with the earnings of the Ground Branch Wing Commander.

Charges

Food charges

47. We recommend that the charge for food should be increased to £1.20 a day (£8.40 a week) with effect from 1 April 1979.

Accommodation charges

48. In the light of the Government's decision to impose a standstill on accommodation charges pending completion of our review of the basis of the charges, we make no formal recommendation at this time other than to confirm that we would expect the standstill to continue for the time being.

CHAPTER 4

COSTS AND CONCLUSION

Costs

49. The estimated additional cost of the fully up-to-date (at 1 April 1979) pay structure for the three Services based on the outline for men in the Army (Chapter 2), and of the 'second stage' structure required to fulfil the Government's commitment (Chapter 3) are as follows:

	Cost of fully up-to- date structure at 1 April 1979 £ million	'second stage' structure at 1 April 1979 £ million
<i>Military salary (all Services)</i>		
Officers	69.8	53.7
Officers promoted from the ranks	11.0	8.3
Servicemen and servicewomen	343.6	253.3
Young entrants and apprentices	8.7	6.2
	433.1	321.5
<i>Additional pay (all Services), including Northern Ireland pay</i>	3.5	3.5
Total cost of increases in pay	436.5	325.0
<i>Charges (all Services)</i>		
Increased yields: Food	2.8	2.8
	433.7	322.2
<i>Net cost of structure of pay and charges</i>	433.7	322.2

50. The total additional cost over the current pay bill of increases in pay needed to implement the fully up-to-date structure represents an increase of 32.5 per cent, of which about one-half is attributable to the shortfall that remained after the implementation of the pay increases on 1 April 1978. The additional cost of the 'second stage' structure over the current paybill is 24.2 per cent. These are, of course, average figures which mask a wide range of increases in individual salaries, according to the extent to which the effect of restraint measures in the last three years has distorted the pattern of pay increases at the different levels of pay.

Conclusion

51. The implementation of the 'second stage' increases will undoubtedly do much to restore servicemen's confidence in the Government's commitment to bring their pay fully up to date by 1 April 1980 in relation to earnings levels in jobs of equivalent skills and responsibilities in civil life. But this alone will not be enough: there must be an assurance too that pay will be kept up to date in later years. Deferment for a further year of the introduction of fully up-to-date military salaries means that members of the armed forces will continue to be paid less than is justified now by the difference, in broad terms, between the two cost figures (£111.5 million).

52. Senior officers have expressed to us in forthright terms their concern about the present state of manning in the armed forces, and their conviction that improvement in the rate of retention of skilled and experienced officers and servicemen is of paramount importance if the Services are to maintain their operational capability. The losses remain serious: the replacement of skill and experience is a long and costly process even on the assumption that instructors of the right quality will continue to be available. Inevitably, it will involve a loss of quality in the intervening years which cannot but affect morale and standards of effectiveness.

53. Against this background, the Government may decide to consider whether the restoration of fully up-to-date military salaries should still be deferred for a further year. The shortfall that will remain after implementation of the second stage pay structure is substantial but it represents no more than the cost, on average, of training replacements for 140 or so pilots in the Royal Air Force. Should any improvement be found to be possible beyond the commitment, we consider that it should take the form of advancing the date on which fully up-to-date pay is restored.

54. Looking to the future, we are in no doubt that servicemen are entitled to expect that, during the period of service for which they enlist, their earnings and conditions of service will continue to reflect what they could earn outside. This means that the restrictions inherent in employment in the Services—like the minimum period of service required and the standard minimum period of notice of eighteen months—must be taken into account. Only if servicemen are assured that it is the intention to keep pay up to date can recruitment and retention return to and be maintained at satisfactory levels.

HAROLD ATCHERLEY (*Chairman*)

D P DREYER

EWEN M'EWEN

ROSEMARY MURRAY

JOHN READ

C A ROBERTS

J R SARGENT

LESLIE WILLIAMS

OFFICE OF MANPOWER ECONOMICS
5 April 1979

APPENDIX 1

Table 1·1

**Scales of military salary inclusive of the X factor appropriate at 1 April 1978
for officers up to Brigadier based on the evidence
(annual rates ^(a))**

Rank										Military salary
										£
Brigadier	13,501
Colonel	after 8 years			12,498
							6			12,198
							4			11,899
							2			11,600
							on appointment			11,300
Lieutenant Colonel	after 8 years			10,497
							6			10,249
							4			10,001
							2			9,753
							on appointment			9,505
Major	after 8 years			8,702
							7			8,526
							6			8,351
							5			8,176
							4			8,001
							3			7,826
							2			7,650
							1			7,475
							on appointment			7,300
Captain	after 6 years			6,720
							5			6,563
							4			6,406
							3			6,249
							2			6,092
							1			5,935
							on appointment			5,778
Lieutenant	after 4 years			5,146
							3			5,022
							2			4,898
							1			4,774
							on appointment			4,650
Second Lieutenant	3,749

Table 1·2
Scales of military salary inclusive of the X factor appropriate at 1 April 1978
for Warrant Officers and senior NCOs based on the evidence
(annual^(a) and weekly rates)

Scale B (men committed to 6 years or more but less than 9 years' service) ^(b)	Band							
	4		5		6		7	
	Annual	Weekly	Annual	Weekly	Annual	Weekly	Annual	Weekly
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Warrant Officer 1 ...	5,497	105·42	5,858	112·35	6,245	119·77	6,661	127·75
Warrant Officer 2 ...	5,238	100·45	5,599	107·38	5,986	114·80	6,402	122·78
Staff Sergeant ...	4,986	95·62	5,347	102·55	5,734	109·97	6,150	117·95
Sergeant ...	4,749	91·07	5,110	98·00	5,497	105·42	—	—

Table 1·3
Scales of military salary inclusive of the X factor appropriate at 1 April 1978
for adult servicemen of the rank of Corporal and below based on the evidence
(annual^(a) and weekly rates)

Scale B (men committed to 6 years or more but less than 9 years' service) ^(b)	Band					
	1		2		3	
	Annual	Weekly	Annual	Weekly	Annual	Weekly
	£	£	£	£	£	£
Corporal I ...	4,438	85·12	4,774	91·56	5,136	98·49
Corporal II ...	4,187	80·29	4,522	86·73	—	—
Lance Corporal I ...	3,949	75·74	4,285	82·18	4,646	89·11
Lance Corporal II ...	3,727	71·47	4,062	77·91	—	—
Lance Corporal III ...	3,515	67·41	3,851	73·85	—	—
Private I ...	3,515	67·41	3,851	73·85	4,212	80·78
Private II ...	3,318	63·63	3,654	70·07	—	—
Private III ...	3,128	59·99	3,464	66·43	—	—
Private IV ...	2,953	56·63	—	—	—	—

^(a) Rounded to the nearest £.

^(b) Scale A (men committed to less than 6 years' service)—deduct £2·10 a week from the above rates.

Scale C (men committed to, or who have completed, more than 9 years' service)—add £3·15 a week to the above rates.

APPENDIX 2

Table 2·1

Scales of military salary inclusive of the X factor introduced at
1 April 1978 for officers up to Brigadier
(annual rates ^(a))

Rank								Military salary
								£
Brigadier	11,545
Colonel	after 8 years	10,563	
						6	10,311	
						4	10,063	
						2	9,881	
						on appointment	9,746	
Lieutenant Colonel	after 8 years	8,997	
						6	8,789	
						4	8,581	
						2	8,373	
						on appointment	8,169	
Major	after 8 years	7,457	
						7	7,311	
						6	7,165	
						5	7,019	
						4	6,877	
						3	6,731	
						2	6,585	
						1	6,439	
						on appointment	6,296	
Captain	after 6 years	5,917	
						5	5,793	
						4	5,668	
						3	5,548	
						2	5,424	
						1	5,303	
on appointment	5,179							
Lieutenant	after 4 years	4,661	
						3	4,559	
						2	4,457	
						1	4,351	
on appointment	4,249							
Second Lieutenant	3,478	

^(a) Annual salaries are derived from daily rates in whole pence and rounded to the nearest £.

Table 2-2

Scales of military salary inclusive of the X factor introduced at 1 April 1978
for Warrant Officers and senior NCOs
(annual ^(a) and weekly rates)

Scale B (men committed to 6 years or more but less than 9 years' service) ^(b)	Band							
	4		5		6		7	
	Annual	Weekly	Annual	Weekly	Annual	Weekly	Annual	Weekly
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Warrant Officer 1 ...	4,661	89·39	4,946	94·85	5,252	100·73	5,577	106·96
Warrant Officer 2 ...	4,438	85·12	4,723	90·58	5,030	96·46	5,355	102·69
Staff Sergeant ...	4,223	80·99	4,508	86·45	4,814	92·33	5,139	98·56
Sergeant ...	4,022	77·14	4,307	82·60	4,614	88·48	—	—

Table 2-3

Scales of military salary inclusive of the X factor introduced at 1 April 1978
for adult servicemen of the rank of Corporal and below
(annual ^(a) and weekly rates)

Scale B (men committed to 6 years or more but less than 9 years' service) ^(b)	Band					
	1		2		3	
	Annual	Weekly	Annual	Weekly	Annual	Weekly
	£	£	£	£	£	£
Corporal I ...	3,756	72·03	4,019	77·07	4,303	82·53
Corporal II ...	3,537	67·83	3,800	72·87	—	—
Lance Corporal I ...	3,332	63·91	3,595	68·95	3,880	74·41
Lance Corporal II ...	3,150	60·41	3,413	65·45	—	—
Lance Corporal III ...	2,982	57·19	3,245	62·23	—	—
Private I ...	2,982	57·19	3,245	62·23	3,530	67·69
Private II ...	2,829	54·25	3,092	59·29	—	—
Private III ...	2,686	51·52	2,949	56·56	—	—
Private IV ...	2,526	48·44	—	—	—	—

^(a) Rounded to the nearest £.

^(b) Scale A (men committed to less than 6 years' service)—deduct £2·10 a week from the above rates.

Scale C (men committed to, or who have completed, more than 9 years' service)—add £3·15 a week to the above rates.