

that the section of the Civil Service Act dealing with irregularities in examinations and appointments be strengthened so as to provide some form of disciplinary action in this regard.

3. *Application Form*

The Committee reviewed the Civil Service application form and respectfully suggests that question 26, which reads as follows, should be amended:

“Have you ever been charged with offences other than minor traffic violations?”

We would point out that an applicant registering in the affirmative to this question, may have been charged with an offence but subsequently acquitted. Under such a circumstance, the present wording of the question does, in our view, place such an applicant in a highly prejudicial position before the Examining Board. We therefore recommend that question 26 read as follows:

“Have you ever been *convicted* of an offence other than minor traffic violations?”

4. *Departmental Ratings*

Your Committee is of the opinion that in the interest of the Civil Service as a whole, and in order to assure equality to all civil servants regardless of the department to which they may be assigned, the basic working conditions, rights, privileges, and responsibilities should be clearly defined by the Commission and impartially applied to all departments, without exception. In this respect, your Committee is informed that in the annual efficiency rating compiled for each employee there is a variation in the method of determining individual efficiency assessments. This variation occurs in situations where departments have developed their own standards, while yet others employ procedures adopted by the Commission itself. It is, therefore, recommended that a standard rating form should be adopted throughout the entire Civil Service, and we further recommend that the employee attest that he has been informed of his rating and has discussed it with an officer of his department.

5. *Nepotism within a Department*

The Commission members were questioned on their policy with respect to “family compacts” existing within a department. The Commission has no firm ruling which would prevent a department from employing several members from the same family. It was indicated, however, that certain departments had assumed responsibility in discouraging such a practice. The Committee concurs in this action and furthermore recommends that the Commission introduce a uniform regulation with a view to discouraging nepotism in the public service.

6. *Departmental Competitions*

The Committee reviewed the responsibility of personnel officers within a department and their influence in departmental competitions for promotion. The Commissioners agreed that in the interest of assuring impartiality, and to avoid the possibility of favouritism, personnel officers should be rotated frequently between departments.

7. *Delay in Filling Vacancies*

It was drawn to the attention of the Committee that positions on occasion remain vacant for lengthy periods despite an apparent attempt by the Commission to fill the vacancy. It is suggested that while the delay may not be intentional, it may lead to a circumstance which will encourage the pre-selection of certain applicants without regard to the usual procedure required