



Public bill and general committees: pay for chairs

Standard Note: SN/PC/03718

Last updated: 19 February 2014

Author: Richard Kelly

Section Parliament and Constitution Centre

From 1 November 2005, Members who serve on the Panel of Chairs who are not chairs of select committees have received additional salaries, depending on their length of service on the Panel.

This note outlines the background to proposals for introducing salaries for the chairs of standing committees (now public bill and general committees), which were agreed by the House on 13 July 2005.

Responsibility for paying Members' salaries transferred to the Independent Parliamentary Standards Authority (IPSA) in May 2010; and provisions in the *Constitutional Reform and Governance Act 2010* giving it responsibility for determining Members' salaries came into force in May 2011. IPSA issued its first determination in January 2013, setting salaries for April 2013 and April 2014. It issued a further determination in December 2013, setting the salaries of committee chairs from April 2015.

On 19 March 2013, the House agreed a resolution setting out which chairs were entitled to an additional salary.

The additional salary rates for members of the Panel of Chairs, for 2013/14 to 2015/16, determined by IPSA, are as follows:

Length of service	Additional salary (£ per annum)		
	from 1 April 2013	from 1 April 2014	from 1 April 2015
Less than one year	2,940	2,970	3,000
1-3 years	8,248	8,331	8,415
3-5 years	11,193	11,305	11,419
5 years or more	14,728	14,876	15,025

A separate standard note covers the background to pay for chairs of select committees.

This information is provided to Members of Parliament in support of their parliamentary duties and is not intended to address the specific circumstances of any particular individual. It should not be relied upon as being up to date; the law or policies may have changed since it was last updated; and it should not be relied upon as legal or professional advice or as a substitute for it. A suitably qualified professional should be consulted if specific advice or information is required.

This information is provided subject to [our general terms and conditions](#) which are available online or may be provided on request in hard copy. Authors are available to discuss the content of this briefing with Members and their staff, but not with the general public.

Contents

1	Background	2
2	The Review Body on Senior Salaries Report	3
3	Implementation of the SSRB's recommendations	5
3.1	The Government's Motion	5
3.2	The House's decision	6
3.3	The uprating of salaries 2005-2013	8
4	Panel of Chairs – additional salaries, since 2013	8
4.1	Transfer of responsibility for determining Members' pay to the Independent Parliamentary Standards Authority	8
5	Pensions	10
	Appendix 1: Motion on Pay for Chairmen of Standing Committees (13 July 2005)	11
	Appendix 2: Levels of public bill and general committee chairmen's salaries	12
	(a) Salary determined in accordance with resolutions of the House of Commons	12
	(b) Salary determined by the Independent Parliamentary Standards Authority	12

1 Background

On 14 May 2002, when the House debated the Modernisation Committee's report on select committees, it endorsed in principle a recommendation from the Modernisation Committee that select committee chairs should receive an additional salary to reflect the additional duties and responsibilities that chairing committees imposed upon them.¹ It also requested that the Review Body on Senior Salaries (SSRB) should "be invited to consider what additional remuneration is appropriate for chairmen of select committees".²

The SSRB's report was laid in June 2003.³ Then on 30 October 2003, the House voted to introduce pay for select committee chairmen.⁴

In its 2004 review of Parliamentary Pay and Allowances, the SSRB recommended that no changes should be made to the salaries of select committee chairs.⁵ But the question of pay for standing committee chairs was raised at a late stage of this review. The SSRB indicated

¹ HC Deb 14 May 2002 cc723-726

² *Ibid*

³ Review Body on Senior Salaries, *Pay for Select Committee Chairmen in the House of Commons*, Report No 55, Cm 5673

⁴ HC Deb 30 October 2003 cc448-507; fuller details of this are provided in the Library Standard Note, SN/PC/2725, *Modernisation: Select committees – pay for chairs*

⁵ Review Body on Senior Salaries, *Review of Parliamentary Pay and Allowances 2004*, Report No 57, Cm 6354-I, paras 2.26-2.29

that it would be “pleased to examine the issue, provided that we were given a remit to do so”.⁶

Note 1: on 1 November 2006, the House agreed to reforms to public bill procedure and accordingly renamed standing committees that consider public bills and other standing committees. They became public bill committees and general committees, respectively. These committees are chaired by members of the Panel of Chairs (formerly the Chairmen’s Panel).

Note 2: On 4 March 2010, the House agreed with a recommendation from the Select Committee on the Reform of the House of Commons that references to “chairman” etc in Standing Orders should be replaced by references to “chair” etc.⁷

2 The Review Body on Senior Salaries Report

On 18 October 2004, the Prime Minister wrote to the SSRB asking it to consider:

... if the House of Commons decided it was appropriate to give additional pay to the Chairmen of Standing Committees, how could this best be achieved? It would be helpful to have your advice on the appropriate level of pay and the appropriate structure for its payment, given the varying workload of Chairmen.⁸

The SSRB’s report to the Prime Minister was laid before the House on 6 July 2005.⁹

The SSRB reviewed the workload of existing members of the Panel of Chairs. It found that “the workload of Panel members is very variable”, identified a number of reasons for this and presented some analysis of the time spent on Panel duties by its members.¹⁰ It also summarised the arguments it had received both for and against additional pay for general committee chairs, and concluded:

On balance, we consider that a good case can be made for additional payment for at least those Chairmen of Standing Committees undertaking more substantial duties. Payment could support membership of the Panel as a possible step in a career path leading ultimately to the role of Deputy Speaker, or possibly even Speaker. However payment would also require a minimum time commitment on the part of the individual to be formalised, and some of the flexibility of the current arrangements, which has both advantages and disadvantages, would undoubtedly be lost. We now turn to consideration of the payment options.¹¹

It identified five different approaches to structuring the payment to reflect that, although the job weight of a general committee chair was the same as that of a select committee chair, different members of Panel of Chairs were able to offer differing levels of commitment to the Panel. In summary its five approaches were:

- Option 1: Tiered structure, based on length of service (which, it noted, was “argued strongly for” by the Chairman of Ways and Means);

⁶ Review Body on Senior Salaries, *Pay for Standing Committee Chairmen in the House of Commons*, July 2005, Cm 6566, paras 1.5-1.6

⁷ HC Deb 4 March 2010 cc1086-1088

⁸ Review Body on Senior Salaries, *Pay for Standing Committee Chairmen in the House of Commons*, July 2005, Cm 6566, Appendix A

⁹ HC Deb 6 July 2005 12WS

¹⁰ Review Body on Senior Salaries, *Pay for Standing Committee Chairmen in the House of Commons*, July 2005, Cm 6566, paras 2.5-2.6

- Option 2: A two-tier Panel, with higher payment for members undertaking minimum time commitment;
- Option 3: Substantially reduced Panel, with higher uniform payment for all members;
- Option 4: Payment per session chaired; and
- Option 5: Uniform lower payment for all Panel members.

It provided an indication of the costs associated with the five options.

It concluded that the two-tier Panel was, in its professional view, “the best way to match contribution and reward”. It expressed a number of concerns about Option 1:

In our professional view, Option 2 would represent the best way to match contribution and reward, whilst ensuring equivalence with the pay of Select Committee Chairmen in appropriate cases, and avoiding pressure to reduce the Panel to a size below the numbers needed to ensure that all the business of the House is chaired in the busiest weeks. It clearly comes closest to what would be good practice in the design of normal remuneration systems, and avoids some of the rough justice of the alternatives in which effort and reward are more loosely related.

Option 1 (the preferred solution of the Chairman of Ways and Means) would fail to establish a direct link between contribution and reward and would be without precedent in increasing Parliamentary pay by reference to length of service. We also question whether it would in practice prove any easier to manage than the other options. However, we note the firm view of the Chairman of Ways and Means that Option 1 would better match the culture of the House. We are not in a position to dispute this view and we do not regard Option 1 as unacceptable if the House is disposed to prefer it. However in this case it will in our view be important for the House to be clear, before payment is introduced, what administrative or other measures (such as minimum time commitments) are to be put in place in order to ensure that the different levels of reward are correlated as far as possible with the different contributions of Panel members.

So far as the other options are concerned, we consider that Options 3 and 4 also represent credible solutions to the problem, and we regard them as acceptable, although inferior to Option 2: in the case of Option 3, because it might not ensure that Chairmen were available for all the business of the House in the busiest weeks; and in the case of Option 4, because it would not reward members for making themselves available to do whatever comes up, however short the notice. We are less attracted to Option 5, which strays furthest from the fundamental concept of relating reward to contribution.¹²

It made the following recommendations.

Recommendation 1: We recommend that whatever allowance structure is decided upon, the allowance(s) should be set by reference to the uprated level of the payment to Select Committee Chairmen (i.e. £13,107 as from 1 April 2005), and thereafter should be uprated annually on the same basis as the pay of MPs and Ministers generally, i.e. by reference to movement in the mid-point of Senior Civil Service pay bands.

¹¹ *Ibid*, para 2.11

¹² *Ibid*, paras 2.27-2.29

Recommendation 2: We recommend that, like the additional payment for Select Committee Chairmen, the additional pay for Standing Committee Chairmen should be treated for pension's purposes in a similar way to Ministers' pay.

Recommendation 3: We recommend that it would not be appropriate for any Members of Parliament who both serve on the Chairmen's Panel and chair a Select Committee to receive payment in respect of both roles.

Recommendation 4: We recommend that before payment of Standing Committee Chairmen is introduced, the House should give consideration to the question of Chairmen's outside interests, and payment for activities outside the House.¹³

3 Implementation of the SSRB's recommendations

3.1 The Government's Motion

In response to the SSRB report, the Government tabled a motion to introduce, with effect from 1 November 2005, a salary, in addition to that which they received as a Member of Parliament, for the members of the Panel of Chairs. The motion, which is quoted in full in Appendix 1, allowed for a tiered structure of salary which differed slightly from that proposed by the Chairman of Ways and Means to the SSRB (see Table 1).

The motion allowed for past service to be taken into account in determining the initial level of additional salary, from 1 November 2005, and breaks in service to be discounted. However, Members who were both a chair of a select committee and a member of the Panel of Chairs were only to be entitled to one additional salary. The salary was to be uprated annually in line with Members' pay.

Table 1: Tiers proposed by the Government and the Chairman of Ways and Means (£ per annum)

Length of service	Salary (£)		
	Government proposal	Chairman of Ways and Means' proposal (1)	(2)
Less than one year	2,615	nil	nil
After 1 year		4,719	4,500
1 – 3 years	7,340		
After 4 years		7,864	7,500
3-5 years	9,960		
At least 5 years	13,107		
After 7 years		13,107	12,500

Notes

(1) these figures take into account pay rises received by the chairmen of select committees since their salaries were introduced

(2) the Chairman of Ways and Means' original proposal was based on the initial level of select committee chairmen's additional salary (£12,500)

In contrast to the position with pay for select committee chairs, the House was not initially asked for an opinion on the merits of an additional salary for general committee chairs. Instead, the Government tabled a motion setting out an approach to introduce pay for general committee chairs with effect from 1 November 2005.

¹³ *Ibid*, pp13-14

3.2 The House's decision

The House debated the Government's proposals for paying the general committee chairs along with motions on the membership of various select committees and other House motions on 13 July 2005. Geoff Hoon, the Leader of the House, reviewed the SSRB's report and outlined why the Government's proposal for a pay structure more closely resembled that of the Chairman of Ways and Means than the SSRB's. He also argued that the principle of rewarding "an alternative career route for Members who choose not to become Ministers or prefer to serve the House in different ways" had already been established:

... [The SSRB] found that there was a good case for making an additional payment, at least to Chairmen of Standing Committees undertaking more substantial duties. They outlined a range of options for methods of payment. They concluded that a two-tier panel, with higher payments for members undertaking a minimum time commitment, would represent the best way to match contribution and reward, but they found that a tiered structure of payment based on length of service, as proposed by the Chairman of Ways and Means, was acceptable if the House was disposed to prefer it.

I have considered those options carefully, and I have worked closely with the Chairman of Ways and Means to structure a manageable system that is both open and transparent to the House. It is the strong advice of the Chairman that a two-tier panel would be unworkable and divisive, and that a tiered system based on experience is the option most suited to the needs of the House. He has assured me that there will be a linkage between pay and work load—the more experienced members of the Panel will be expected to do more work—and performance will be properly managed. While in the past there was no reason to eject a Panel member who was able to commit only occasional hours to the Panel, this will no longer be the case. Members who are, for whatever reason, not able to contribute as expected to the Panel will be discharged and their remuneration will cease with immediate effect.

[...]

I do not intend to debate with my hon. Friend the principle, which has previously been established on the basis that there should be an alternative career route for Members who choose not to become Ministers or prefer to serve the House in different ways. [*Interruption.*] I chose my words carefully.

The proposition that we should not recognise the considerable skill required to chair a Committee effectively is wrong. I served on a number of Finance Bill Committees when I first came to the House. Chairing the Committee was an extremely difficult and delicate task that required a considerable understanding of the rather complex proposals contained in the Bill. We need to give some recognition to those who serve the House in that way. It is not a task that gets any kind of public approval or even respect, as it is highly unlikely that members of the public would appreciate the substantial amount of time given over to those responsibilities by a relatively limited number of Members.¹⁴

Mr Hoon noted that the House was asked to consider an alternative structure. Eric Forth tabled an amendment to provide a "two-tier structure, with half pay for those with less than two years' service".¹⁵

Chris Grayling, the Shadow Leader of the House, expressed some disquiet at the decision not to adopt the SSRB's preferred approach:

¹⁴ HC Deb 13 July 2005 cc853-854

¹⁵ *Ibid* c856

... The structure of the proposal on the table today has been discussed by the SSRB, although it is not its original proposal, as the Leader of the House pointed out. It is, however, a proposal that the body has studied and to which it makes reference in its report. Having had conversations with the Leader of the House and with the Chairman of Ways and Means, I understand the reservations about the SSRB recommendation. I was initially taken with the concept of an A list of senior Chairmen and a B list of those in more junior positions. I understand the questions about the viability of such a proposal, but it remains my view that a fragmented, time-based system such as that set out in the motion would not be the right way forward.¹⁶

He also echoed Eric Forth's concerns about increments in the salary being linked to length of service for the first time in connection with Parliamentary salaries.¹⁷

There was also disquiet about the principle of extra payments. Andrew Mackinlay, who had earlier intervened on the Leader of the House,¹⁸ argued that:

... I am confused. We are elected to this place as Members of Parliament and it is part of our job to decide how we discharge that duty. I can understand that the principal Officers of the House and senior members of the Government should receive substantial payment, but the whole drift towards extra payments is unhealthy for democracy. There is vast disparity in the pay of Ministers and we are aggravating that situation by paying Chairmen of Select Committees—and we now propose to extend that further. That is unhealthy. We should be working towards a situation where every Member of Parliament is deemed equal. He or she should defend stewardship of their office before the electorate when they seek re-election. There should be no additional payments such as those we instigated in the last Parliament and are likely to extend this evening. That will make things extraordinarily difficult.¹⁹

In moving his amendment, Eric Forth criticised the proposed graduations in pay and even expressed concern at his own two-tier structure but argued that it would better meet the “test of recruitment, retention and recognition”:

... The argument, as I understand it, is that some measure of the effectiveness of the new Panel members has to be made before they can go on to the full rate of pay. I am not sure about the merits of that argument, but even if we accept that, I am afraid that the motion before us is a complete dog's dinner. The graduations suggested here are almost incomprehensible and would fail almost completely to meet the tests of recruitment, retention and recognition by their very definition. That is why the amendment in my name, which, happily, has been selected, recognises the probationary element—which I am reluctant to do, but inevitably, I think, have to—but makes it much simpler, cleaner and neater.²⁰

In the event, the House rejected Eric Forth's amendment by 220 votes to 85.²¹ It then went on to approve the Government's motion by 226 votes to 74.²²

Accordingly, from 1 November 2005, the Members of the Panel of Chairs who are not chairs of select committees have received additional salaries.

¹⁶ *Ibid* c866

¹⁷ *Ibid* cc867-868

¹⁸ *Ibid* c854

¹⁹ *Ibid* c881

²⁰ *Ibid* c887

²¹ *Ibid* c922

²² *Ibid* c924

3.3 The uprating of salaries 2005-2013

The level of the salary depended on an individual chair's length of service on the Panel of Chairs. It was also uprated in line with increases in Members' salaries.

From 1 November 2005, the members of the Panel who had served for at least five years received an additional salary of £13,107 – that was the same as the chairs of select committees in receipt of an additional salary.

In 2006/07, the uprating of Members' salaries was staged. The salaries of chairs followed suit, in line with the House's decision of 18 May 2006.²³

In January 2008, the House abolished the uprating mechanism that had been introduced in 1996 and endorsed the Government's decision to establish a review chaired by Sir John Baker into the level and uprating of Members' salaries. Sir John reported on 17 June 2008 and the House debated his report on 3 July 2008.

Sir John recommended that Members' pay should increase in line with the Public Sector Average Earnings Index. The Government disagreed and suggested that MPs should receive the median average of the settlements of a wide basket of public sector workforces. The House agreed with the Government.²⁴ The SSRB calculated the annual increase; informed the Speaker; and it was implemented automatically.

Salaries increased in line with this approach in 2009 and 2010. In January 2011, the SSRB informed the Speaker of the proportion by which salaries should increase on 1 April 2011. However, on 21 March 2011, the House agreed to a freeze in Members' salaries for two years, in line with public sector pay generally.²⁵

Appendix 2 details the annual level of the additional salaries of general committee chairs, since they were introduced.

4 Panel of Chairs – additional salaries, since 2013

4.1 Transfer of responsibility for determining Members' pay to the Independent Parliamentary Standards Authority

Under the *Parliamentary Standards Act 2009*, responsibility for paying Members' salaries transferred to the Independent Parliamentary Standards Authority (IPSA) in May 2010; and provisions in the *Constitutional Reform and Governance Act 2010* subsequently gave it responsibility for determining Members' salaries.²⁶

Before it issued its first determination on Members' pay in January 2013, IPSA paid salaries in accordance with resolutions of the House of Commons.²⁷ However, once it issued a

²³ HC Deb 18 May 2006 c1164

²⁴ For further details on the establishment of Sir John Baker's review, and for details of his and the Government's alternative proposals, see House of Commons Library Research Paper RP 09/29, *Members' pay and the independent review process*, 31 March 2009

²⁵ HC Deb 21 March 2011 c824

²⁶ The *Constitutional Reform and Governance Act 2010 (Commencement No 5) Order 2011*, SI 2011/1274, brought into force provisions that transferred responsibility for determining Members' pay to the Independent Parliamentary Standards Authority on 17 May 2011

²⁷ *Constitutional Reform and Governance Act 2010* (chapter 25), section 29(3) stated that "Until the first determination under section 4(4) of that Act comes into effect, the amounts of the salaries payable by the Independent Parliamentary Standards Authority under section 4 of that Act are to be determined in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the House of Commons"

determination, salaries were paid to Members in accordance with sections 4 and 4A of the *Parliamentary Standards Act 2009*, as amended. Subsection 4A(2) allowed IPSA to pay additional salaries to “members while holding an office or position specified for the purposes of this subsection in a resolution of the House of Commons”.²⁸

On 19 March 2013, the House of Commons agreed a resolution (for the purposes of subsection 4A(2)) which set out who was entitled to an additional salary and what should be done in cases where an individual appeared to qualify for more than one additional salary:

That—

(1) Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), the following offices or positions are specified for the purposes of section 4A(2) of the *Parliamentary Standards Act 2009*, with effect from 1 April 2013—

(a) the Chair of a select committee appointed under Standing Order No. 152 (Select Committees related to government departments), the Administration Committee, the Backbench Business Committee, the Environmental Audit Committee, the European Scrutiny Committee, the Finance and Services Committee, the Liaison Committee, the Political and Constitutional Reform Committee, the Select Committee on Procedure, the Committee of Public Accounts, the Select Committee on Public Administration, the Regulatory Reform Committee, the Committee of Selection, the Committee on Standards, the Joint Committee on Human Rights or the Joint Committee on Statutory Instruments; and

(b) a member of the Panel of Chairs appointed under Standing Order No. 4 (Panel of Chairs), other than a member who is the Chair of a committee specified in sub-paragraph (a) or a member who is entitled to an additional salary by virtue of any provision of the *Ministerial and other Salaries Act 1975*.

(2) If a Member already holds an office or position referred to in paragraph (1)(a), then any other office or position referred to in paragraph (1)(a) is not specified for the purposes of section 4A(2) of the *Parliamentary Standards Act 2009* in respect of any period for which that other post or position is held by that Member.

(3) Any office or position referred to in paragraph (1)(a) for the purposes of section 4A(2) of the *Parliamentary Standards Act 2009* is not specified for the purposes of that section in respect of any period in which it is held by a Member who is also entitled to an additional salary by virtue of any provision of the *Ministerial and other Salaries Act 1975*.

(4) Any reference to any committee in paragraph (1)(a) shall, if the name of the committee is changed, be taken to be a reference to the committee by its new name.²⁹

IPSA issued its first determination in January 2013, setting salaries for April 2013 and April 2014. It issued a further determination in December 2013, setting the salaries of members of the Panel of Chairs (and of select committees chairs) from April 2015.

The additional salary rates for members of the Panel of Chairs, for 2013/14 to 2015/16, determined by IPSA, are as follows:

²⁸ *Parliamentary Standards Act 2009* (chapter 13), section 4A(2)

²⁹ [HC Deb 19 March 2013 cc900-902](#)

Length of service	Additional salary (£ per annum)		
	from 1 April 2013	from 1 April 2014	from 1 April 2015
Less than one year	2,940	2,970	3,000
1-3 years	8,248	8,331	8,415
3-5 years	11,193	11,305	11,419
5 years or more	14,728	14,876	15,025

Sources: Independent Parliamentary Standards Authority, [Reviewing MPs' Pay and Pensions: A First Report](#), January 2013, Annex A; Independent Parliamentary Standards Authority, [MPs' Pay and Pensions – Final Report](#), December 2013, Annex B

5 Pensions

In outlining the arrangements for the additional salaries for standing committee chairs, Geoff Hoon confirmed that “the emoluments are pensionable and will continue to be pensionable so long as they are in payment”.³⁰ The regulation to implement this was laid on 29 March 2006 but the provisions on pensions for standing committee chairs were back-dated to have effect from 13 July 2005,³¹ when the House agreed the Resolution on additional salaries.

All serving Members of the House of Commons may participate in the Parliamentary Contributory Pension Fund (PCPF). The basic MPs' scheme is a final salary scheme.³²

Members of the Panel of Chairs are also eligible for benefits from the supplementary career average scheme for certain office holders (namely, the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of Ways and Means, paid Select Committee Chairs and the Members of the Panel of Chairs). These benefits are calculated in the same way as Ministers' pensions, based on the additional pay they receive as an office holder.³³

Members can opt to contribute at one of three rates, with pension benefits building up at different rates depending on the contribution rate. Nearly all MPs contribute and accrue benefits at the highest level.³⁴ The current rates are:

- 13.75 per cent for Members with an accrual rate of 1/40th;
- 9.75 per cent for Members with an accrual rate of 1/50th;
- 7.75 per cent for Members with an accrual rate of 1/60th.

IPSA has announced details of a new pension scheme for MPs to be introduced following the 2015 general election. The new scheme would provide benefits based on career average revalued earnings, individuals would have a normal pension age linked to their State Pension age; and there would be protection for those closest to retirement (enabling them to remain in the existing scheme).³⁵

³⁰ HC Deb 13 July 2005 c856

³¹ [The Parliamentary Pensions \(Amendment\) Regulations 2006](#), SI 2006/920

³² This is an IPSA scheme made under section 40 and Schedule 6 of the [Constitutional Reform and Governance Act 2010](#)

³³ Independent Parliamentary Standards Authority, [MPs' Pensions – Report on the Consultation](#), March 2012, p12, para 4; [HC Deb 30 October 2003 c 451](#)

³⁴ Independent Parliamentary Standards Authority, [MPs' Pensions – Report on the Consultation](#), March 2012, para 19

³⁵ Independent Parliamentary Standards Authority, [MPs' Pay and Pensions – Final Report](#), December 2013; For more detail, see Library Note SN 6283 [MPs' Pension Scheme – 2012 onwards](#) (December 2013)

Appendix 1: Motion on Pay for Chairmen of Standing Committees (13 July 2005)

The text of the motion, tabled by Geoffrey Hoon, the Leader of the House, to enable the House to reach a decision on whether to introduce a salary, in addition to that received as a Member, for the chairmen of standing committees:

PAY FOR CHAIRMEN OF STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr Geoffrey Hoon

That this House—

- (1) takes note of the Report of the Review Body on Senior Salaries on Pay for Standing Committee Chairmen in the House of Commons presented to Parliament on 6th July (Cm 6566); and
- (2) expresses the opinion that—
 - (a) with effect from 1st November 2005, the salary of a Member should be higher by the amount specified in sub-paragraph (b) than the figure determined in accordance with the provisions of the Resolution of the House of 10th July 1996 in respect of any period during which the Member has been nominated by the Speaker to act as a temporary chairman of committees in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No. 4 (Chairmen's Panel) ('a member of the Panel'), other than to the extent that the provisions of sub-paragraph (d) apply;
 - (b) for a Member who has served on the Panel for less than one year, the additional amount should be £2,615; for a Member who has served on the Panel for at least one year but less than three years, the additional amount should be £7,340; for a Member who has served on the Panel for at least three years and less than five years, the additional amount should be £9,960; and for a Member who has served on the Panel for at least five years, the additional amount should be £13,107; and for the purposes of this sub-paragraph length of service should include membership of the Panel before 1st November 2005 and should be calculated irrespective of breaks in service;
 - (c) a period should begin for the purpose of sub-paragraph (a) on the day on which the Member is appointed to the Panel, or on 1st November 2005, whichever is the later; and end on the day on which the Member ceases to be a member of the Panel;
 - (d) there should be disregarded for the purpose of sub-paragraph (a) any period in respect of which the Member is receiving additional payment as Chairman of a Select Committee;
 - (e) the provisions of paragraph (2) of the Resolution of the House of 10th July 1996 relating to Members' Salaries (No. 2) should apply, with effect from 1st April 2006, to a salary determined in accordance with sub-paragraphs (a) and (b) as they apply in relation to a salary determined in accordance with the provisions of that Resolution; and
 - (f) the Speaker should have authority to interpret these provisions.

Appendix 2: Levels of public bill and general committee chairmen's salaries

(a) Salary determined in accordance with resolutions of the House of Commons

£ per annum	Length of service			
	Less than one year	1-3 years	3-5 years	At least 5 years
from 1 November 2005	2,615	7,340	9,960	13,107
from 1 April 2006	2,642	7,414	10,060	13,239
from 1 November 2006	2,668	7,487	10,160	13,370
from 1 April 2007	2,708	7,600	10,313	13,571
from 1 November 2007	2,737	7,679	10,421	13,713
from 1 April 2008	2,802	7,862	10,669	14,039
from 1 April 2009	2,867	8,045	10,918	14,366
from 1 April 2010	2,910	8,166	11,082	14,582
from 1 April 2011	2,910	8,166	11,082	14,582
from 1 April 2012	2,910	8,166	11,082	14,582

(b) Salary determined by the Independent Parliamentary Standards Authority

£ per annum	Length of service			
	Less than one year	1-3 years	3-5 years	5 years or more
from 1 April 2013	2,940	8,248	11,193	14,728
from 1 April 2014	2,970	8,331	11,305	14,876
from 1 April 2015	3,000	8,415	11,419	15,025

Sources: Independent Parliamentary Standards Authority, [Reviewing MPs' Pay and Pensions: A First Report](#), January 2013, Annex A; Independent Parliamentary Standards Authority, [MPs' Pay and Pensions – Final Report](#), December 2013, Annex B