

13. What increase did the first reclassification add to the cost of working the Railway Department?—It put £54,000 on to it.

14. In addition to what it was previously?—Yes.

15. In 1901 there was a further reclassification?—Yes.

16. What did that add to the salaries of the Railway employees?—The classification which came into operation in 1902 put on to the clerks as against the 1897 classification an increased pay of £19 per head per annum.

17. Then we come to the 1908 classification?—That put on £46 per head over 1897, and £28 over the 1902 scale.

18. A total expenditure of £147,000 on to the salaries of the Railway employees, including the First Division?—Yes. Taking the actual position attained by clerks under the various classifications over a period of nineteen years, the increase for clerks under the 1908 scale would be £47 a head as compared with the 1896 classification, and £28 as against the 1902. A clerk working under the scale of 1907 would in nineteen years receive £890 more than if he had worked the same period under the 1896 classification, and £530 more than under the 1902 classification. Stationmasters would be benefited to the extent of £735 comparing 1896 and 1902, and £375 comparing 1902 and 1908. At the present time the tenth grade work up to £200 in twelve years, whereas it used to take them from fourteen to sixteen years to get to £150 under the classification of 1896.

19. *Mr. Dennehy.*] I intend, with your permission, Mr. Chairman, to make a statement in regard to the percentage basis from 1906. Mr. McVilly has taken it from 1901, and I desire to put a statement in as evidence. (To witness): I will take one grade, £260 to £300: is it not a fact that that grade has been reduced not only in a percentage basis, but also in the number of members employed in the grade since 1907—that was the year we got the classification that was to benefit the whole service?—There is one man less; but look at the increase in the following higher grades of £310–£350 and £355–£650.

20. I make it eighty-six in 1907 and seventy-five in 1910?—There is one man less in the grade at the present time.

21. We have not the figures for 1911, but only the figures to 1st April, 1910?—I am taking the staff as it exists to-day. I say you are not correct.

22. Well, we are at a disadvantage, because we have based our facts on the D.-3 list for 1910, and we are not aware of the figures in the D.-3 list for 1911?—The number I have stated is correct.

---

FRIDAY, 15TH SEPTEMBER, 1911.

RICHARD WILLIAM MCVILLY further examined. (No. 4.)

1. *By Mr. Dennehy.*] As you are aware, Mr. McVilly, Schedule A shows the number of positions in the Railway Department which have been reduced in grade during the last three years, and in your answer to that you quoted the number of officers at certain salaries in 1901 and 1911?—I quoted 1901, 1907, 1910, and 1911.

2. The question I wish to put to you is this: did you say yesterday that the officers occupying the positions referred to in Schedule A would in the ordinary course of events reach by the usual increments the position and salaries that their predecessors reached?—I said that provided the Department considered the positions were worth the salary, and providing the officers holding the positions worked through the grade they are now in, they would ultimately attain the same salaries as their predecessors.

3. Do you consider that the Department does not consider the positions worth the salaries?—I am not here to discuss what the Department considers—I am here to state facts.

4. But I am here to put questions?—Well, I am not going to say what the Department considers—that is not my business.

5. Well, are you aware that with regard to many of those positions shown in the schedule that the officers filling those positions cannot reach the salaries drawn by their predecessors by the time they retire on superannuation?—I do not think we need discuss the question as to what is going to happen before the officers retire on superannuation.

6. Still, a while ago you said they would reach those salaries providing the Department thought the positions were worth the money?—Yes