



**XIX  
2012**

# **BILLET D'ÉTAT**

**WEDNESDAY 25th JULY 2012**

1. Policy Council - Guernsey Overseas Aid Commission – Election of Members, p. 1833
2. Requête - Simultaneous Electronic Voting in The States of Deliberation, p. 1837

# ***B I L L E T D ' É T A T***

---

## **TO THE MEMBERS OF THE STATES OF THE ISLAND OF GUERNSEY**

---

I have the honour to inform you that a Meeting of the States of Deliberation will be held at **THE ROYAL COURT HOUSE, on WEDNESDAY, the 25<sup>th</sup> JULY, 2012, at 9 30 a.m.**, pursuant to Rule 1(4) of the Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation, to consider the items contained in this Billet d'État which has been submitted for debate.

**R.J. COLLAS**  
Bailiff and Presiding Officer

The Royal Court House  
Guernsey  
22 June 2012

## POLICY COUNCIL

### GUERNSEY OVERSEAS AID COMMISSION – ELECTION OF MEMBERS

At its meeting held on 11 March 2004 the States agreed to establish an Overseas Aid Commission to operate under the new machinery of government, the Commission comprising

- A Chairman who shall be a member of the Policy Council – appointed by the Policy Council
- Six ordinary members who need not be sitting members of the States – elected by the States on the recommendation of the Policy Council

all serving for a period of four years. Commissioners provide their services and time on an unpaid basis.

Deputy M G O'Hara was recently appointed by the Policy Council to serve as the Commission's Chairman for the next four year term, to May 2016. The Chairman until early in 2012 was Deputy C A Steere, and latterly Deputy G H Mahy.

The current terms of service of the six ordinary members of the Commission expire on 30th July 2012. At its meeting held on 14 May 2012 the Policy Council agreed, following an internal review of governance of the Guernsey Overseas Aid Commission, to limit membership of the Commission to two terms of four years as a maximum. The result of this change means that three of the current Commissioners (who had expressed a wish to continue serving) would be ineligible from standing again. Those concerned are Mrs José Day – who has served on the Commission and its predecessor the former Overseas Aid Committee for nearly twenty years, most recently as Vice Chairman – Mr Ian MacRae and Mr Glyn Allen.

The Policy Council wishes to thank Commissioners for their dedicated interest and service, and to express its appreciation for the considerable contributions they have made supporting overseas aid work. It is without doubt that the Commission's hard work over the past 20 years has resulted in relieving suffering and hardship in developing countries across the world and made a significant difference to people's lives; Commissioners should be very proud of that achievement. The Policy Council has been particularly impressed by the personal commitment, dedication and interest of Commissioners, not to mention the wealth of experience and knowledge that they have imparted into the process.

One member of the Commission – Mr Michael Dene, MBE – has decided not to seek re-election to the Commission. Like Mrs Day, Mr Dene has served both the Commission and the former Overseas Aid Committee for nearly twenty years and the Policy Council is again very grateful to Mr Dene for his invaluable contributions to the work of both the former Committee and the Commission.

The remaining two members of the Guernsey Overseas Aid Commission will – by the end of July – have completed one four year term as Commissioners. They are Mr Tim

Peet MBE and Mr Steve Mauger. Both have expressed a wish to continue serving as ordinary members.

The Policy Council has sought expressions of interest from individuals wishing to be considered as ordinary members of the Commission for the next four years and has been pleased and impressed at the high calibre of individuals who have put forward their names for consideration. Indeed, the obvious quality, experience and enthusiasm of all the candidates made the short listing process particularly difficult.

The Policy Council is pleased to nominate the following individuals to serve as ordinary members of the Commission for four years from 31 July 2012:

#### Members of the current Commission

Mr Tim Peet, age 71, a retired Surgeon, awarded the MBE in 2011 for teaching surgical skills in Uganda) retired from surgical practice in Guernsey in 1999. Mr Peet has since retiring been closely involved with the teaching of surgical skills in East Africa, including tutoring and operating with Ugandan doctors. In 2011 he was awarded the MBE in recognition of this work.

Mr Steve Mauger is 57 and employed part time as a Membership Advisor at Beau Sejour, also working as a delivery driver. He has been an active supporter of Christian Aid for over 30 years and has acted as its Bailiwick of Guernsey Organiser. He has been a committee member of Churches Together in Guernsey and Chairman of the Fairtrade Guernsey Steering Group. Through these roles he has gained a good working knowledge of both conditions and projects in various parts of the world.

The Policy Council is confident that both these Commissioners will provide a useful level of continuity, with their experience offering great value to the workings of the new Commission.

#### New candidates

Mr Philip Bodman is a 54 year old Accountant and graduate in agricultural economics, with ten years experience in overseas development work. Mr Bodman had a scholarship with the UK's Overseas Development Administration (the predecessor to the current UK Department for International Development). As Missions Treasurer at Holy Trinity church Mr Bodman maintains an interest in providing support to overseas development projects.

Miss Judy Moore, 56, works as a Programme Lead with the Institute of Health and Social Care. She has taught disaster preparedness activities in Sri Lanka, and been directly involved in supporting small projects undertaken in Sri Lanka. Ms Moore has been a volunteer with St John Ambulance for over 30 years and has used that experience to support her voluntary work overseas.

Dr Nick Paluch is a 56 year old semi-retired Medical Practitioner and qualified (non practising) Barrister who has undertaken volunteer work in less developed countries whilst also maintaining an independent involvement in fundraising and overseas aid

support activities, including visiting several projects that have benefitted from financial support provided by Guernsey.

Ms Teresa de Nobrega is a 32 year old Advocate with experience of both visiting less developed countries and initiating various charitable fundraising activities. She is an active local supporter of a number of NGOs including UNICEF, the International Red Cross and Amnesty International.

### Principles of good governance

The Policy Council is confident that the varied expertise and balance of these candidates will enable the Commission to operate effectively and in accordance with the principles of good governance.

The proposals set out in this report take full account of the core principles of good governance as set out on page 247 of Billet d'État IV of 2011, most particularly principle 1 "focussing on the organisation's purpose and on outcomes for citizens and service users", and principle 4, "taking informed, transparent decisions and managing risk".

### Recommendation

The Policy Council recommends that the States appoints:

1. Mr Tim Peet, MBE,
2. Mr Steve Mauger;
3. Mr Philip Bodman;
4. Miss Judy Moore;
5. Dr Nick Paluch; and
6. Ms Teresa de Nobrega

to serve as an ordinary members of the Guernsey Overseas Aid Commission from 31 July 2012 to 30 July 2016.

Deputy Peter A Harwood  
Chief Minister

11 June 2012

Deputy J P Le Tocq  
Deputy Chief Minister

Deputy G A St Pier  
Deputy R Domaille  
Deputy D B Jones  
Deputy R W Sillars  
Deputy P A Luxon

Deputy A H Langlois  
Deputy K A Stewart  
Deputy A H Adam  
Deputy M G O'Hara

**(As there are no resource implications identified in this report, the Treasury and Resources Department has no comments to make.)**

The States are asked to decide:-

I.- Whether, after consideration of the Report dated 11<sup>th</sup> June, 2012, of the Policy Council, they are of the opinion:-

1. To elect Mr Tim Peet, MBE, to serve as an ordinary member of the Guernsey Overseas Aid Commission from 31 July 2012 to 30 July 2016.
2. To elect Mr Steve Mauger to serve as an ordinary member of the Guernsey Overseas Aid Commission from 31 July 2012 to 30 July 2016.
3. To elect Mr Philip Bodman to serve as an ordinary member of the Guernsey Overseas Aid Commission from 31 July 2012 to 30 July 2016.
4. To elect Miss Judy Moore to serve as an ordinary member of the Guernsey Overseas Aid Commission from 31 July 2012 to 30 July 2016.
5. To elect Dr Nick Paluch to serve as an ordinary member of the Guernsey Overseas Aid Commission from 31 July 2012 to 30 July 2016.
6. To elect Ms Teresa de Nobrega to serve as an ordinary member of the Guernsey Overseas Aid Commission from 31 July 2012 to 30 July 2016.

## REQUÊTE

### SIMULTANEOUS ELECTRONIC VOTING IN THE STATES OF DELIBERATION

THE HUMBLE PETITION of the undersigned Members of the States of Deliberation SHEWETH THAT:-

1. At their November 2011 meeting the States of Deliberation considered a Report of the States Assembly and Constitution Committee entitled “Simultaneous Electronic Voting in the States of Deliberation” (Article 18 of Billet d’État XIX of 2011), which is reproduced as an appendix to this Requête.

2. The Propositions on that Article were:

“1) To agree to the introduction of a system of simultaneous electronic voting in the States of Deliberation.

(2) To authorise the Treasury and Resources Department to approve the acceptance of tenders and a capital vote for the installation of a system of simultaneous electronic voting in the Royal Court Chamber charged to the routine capital allocation of the Treasury and Resources Department - Courts and Law Officers.

(3) To direct the States Assembly and Constitution Committee to report to the States regarding any amendments to the Rules of Procedure required to enable the use of a system of simultaneous electronic voting in the States of Deliberation”;

but on 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2011 the States resolved, by 21 votes Pour, 23 Contre, with 1 abstention and 2 not present to NEGATIVE those propositions.

3. Since that Resolution of the States, a General Election has taken place with nearly a majority of the States being 22 newly elected members, and 23 re-elected. Your Petitioners are of the view that the case for simultaneous electronic voting and the costs associated therewith are similar now to those put forward in the States Assembly and Constitution Committee report appended to this Requête. Your petitioners note that the majority of the States members following the 2012 General Election have supported recorded voting in elections to offices, and believe that most would now support the installation of simultaneous electronic voting equipment in the Royal Court Chamber; the use of which in your Petitioners’ opinion would bring about efficiencies and savings, as well as resulting in an open and transparent system if used for decisions taken in the States of Deliberation.

THESE PREMISES CONSIDERED, YOUR PETITIONERS humbly pray that the States may be pleased to resolve:

- (1) To agree to the introduction of a system of simultaneous electronic voting in the States of Deliberation.

(2) To authorise the Treasury and Resources Department to approve the acceptance of tenders and a capital vote for the installation of a system of simultaneous electronic voting in the Royal Court Chamber charged to the routine capital allocation of the Treasury and Resources Department - Courts and Law Officers.

(3) To direct the States Assembly and Constitution Committee to report to the States regarding any amendments to the Rules of Procedure required to enable the use of a system of simultaneous electronic voting in the States of Deliberation.

AND YOUR PETITIONERS WILL EVER PRAY

GUERNSEY

This 22 day of May 2012

M Lowe

R Perrot

G St Pier

D De Lisle

M Hadley

Robert Jones

P Harwood

R Sillars

K Stewart

S James

Lester Queripel

M Le Clerc

R Domaille

H Soulsby

C Green

G Collins

J Kuttelwascher

J Gollop



**STATES ASSEMBLY AND CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE****SIMULTANEOUS ELECTRONIC VOTING IN THE STATES OF DELIBERATION**

The Presiding Officer  
The States of Guernsey  
Royal Court House  
St. Peter Port

12<sup>th</sup> September 2011

Dear Sir

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This report recommends the States to agree to –

- the introduction of a system of simultaneous electronic voting in the States of Deliberation;
- authorise the Treasury and Resources Department to approve the acceptance of tenders and a capital vote for the installation of a system of simultaneous electronic voting in the Royal Court Chamber charged to the routine capital allocation of the Treasury and Resources Department – Courts and Law Officers;
- direct the States Assembly and Constitution Committee to report to the States regarding any amendments to the Rules of Procedure required to enable the use of a system of simultaneous electronic voting in the States of Deliberation.

**REPORT****BACKGROUND**

1. On 17<sup>th</sup> May 2002, after consideration of the Joint Report, dated 11<sup>th</sup> April 2002, of the States Advisory and Finance Committee and the States Procedures and Constitution Committee regarding the Machinery of Government in Guernsey<sup>1</sup> the States Resolved, *inter alia*:

*“To direct the States Procedures and Constitution Committee to report to the States and submit appropriate proposals...for...voting in the States of Deliberation, to include provision for simultaneous electronic voting.”*

---

<sup>1</sup> Billet d’État VII of 2002, p. 567

2. Prior to approval by the States in April 2005 of essential maintenance and refurbishment works at the Royal Court House, there were practical limitations which precluded the serious consideration of the installation of a simultaneous electronic voting system (hereinafter referred to as 'SEV'). This included inadequate desk space, an audio system which could not accommodate SEV and the presence of asbestos which would have made any installation difficult and expensive.
3. Essential maintenance works undertaken in 2006 provided the opportunity to equip and adapt the Royal Court chamber for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. The maintenance works involved, *inter alia*, the removal of asbestos from the building and the installation of a new audio system. The opportunity was taken to reconfigure the layout of the seating in order to create wider desks, more legroom and improved sightlines for Members sat adjacent to the bench.
4. Included within the contract was the installation of a 'Digital Signal Processing' (DSP) audio system, similar to that which had been installed in the new Criminal Courts 1 and 2, tailored specifically to handle both Court and States proceedings. DSP has many advantages including the capacity to add wireless electronic voting facilities as an integral element either at the time of installation or at a later date. A further benefit of DSP is compatibility of components, units, software and hardware.
5. The work undertaken included the installation of the necessary cabling to allow for the installation of the audio system and the ability to introduce an electronic voting system at a later date. The use of wireless voting units would mean that some ushers' time would be required in setting out the equipment before each session and storing it at the end of the session.
6. In September 2006 the then House Committee reported to the States<sup>2</sup> that whilst it was of the view that electronic voting would provide a number of positive benefits over the current system of voting, it had concluded that the level of expenditure required to implement such a system could not be justified at that time. The States subsequently resolved "*that a system for simultaneous electronic voting not be introduced in the States of Deliberation at this time*".

#### VOTING IN THE STATES OF DELIBERATION

7. At present, voting in the States of Deliberation is conducted by Members simultaneously calling out '*pour*' or '*contre*' (known as '*de vive voix*') in response to propositions, unless a Member requests a roll-call vote (known as an '*appel nominal*') whereby Members call out their votes in turn in response to a roll-call conducted by H. M. Greffier. Members present but wishing to abstain respond by saying '*je ne vote pas*'.

---

<sup>2</sup> Billet d'État XVI of 2006, p. 1745

8. SEV allows Members to vote simultaneously using a delegate handset. Votes are cast by activating one of three buttons: '*pour*', '*contre*' or '*je ne vote pas*'. The results of votes are recorded and can be visually displayed immediately on a computer, printed or saved. Such a system was introduced by the States of Jersey in 2004 as a replacement for the '*appel nominal*'. The States of Jersey opted at that time to retain the 'standing vote' (Jersey's equivalent to the '*de vive voix*') as it was considered more suited and less time consuming for non-controversial, routine matters.
9. Many parliaments world-wide now use SEV systems, including the U. S. Congress and the European Parliament. Whilst voting in the U. K. Parliament at Westminster is still carried out traditionally, the Scottish Parliament and Welsh Assembly use SEV systems as does Tynwald in the Isle of Man. Indeed, some members of the Committee have seen the Manx system in operation and found it to be effective and efficient. It is understood that the technology employed there is somewhat outdated and does not, therefore, serve as a suitable model for Guernsey.

#### **ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THE ADOPTION OF ELECTRONIC VOTING**

10. The following main advantages of SEV over the current systems of voting have been identified:
  - (a) It would remove any possibility of the perceived effect of one Member's vote influencing another's: in the Committee's opinion a Member should decide how to vote by force of argument in debate, not by how another Member has voted;
  - (b) It would ensure total accuracy: votes could not be questioned;
  - (c) It would create a more open and transparent system of government, as a record of individual Members' voting would be retained and available upon request by Members of the States, the media, the public, States departments and committees;
  - (d) The system would potentially save time compared to the '*appel nominal*'. Where there are a large number of votes during one meeting, the time savings would clearly accrue. Each '*appel nominal*' takes approximately three minutes. At the February 2011 session of the States a total of 14 '*appels nominal*' were requested which took up about three-quarters of an hour of States' time.
11. The following main disadvantages of SEV over the current systems of voting have been identified:
  - (a) The media and members of the public following the business of the Assembly on the radio would not be able to hear whether individual Members had voted *pour* or *contre*;

- (b) Appropriate SEV systems offering the necessary degree of security and reliability are relatively expensive when compared to the current systems which do not cost anything to operate.
12. Disadvantage (a) could be addressed by giving Members of the States the option to request H. M. Greffier to announce the record of individual voting following the casting of votes. However, this would reduce the time savings achieved by using the SEV system. The results could be added to the States website and printed versions of the record could also be available to Members of the States, the media and the public upon request or via printers located in the Members' and media rooms.
  13. The States Assembly and Constitution Committee, having by a majority concluded that the merits of SEV outweigh the disadvantages, has established the cost of installing an appropriate system.

#### **ESTIMATED COSTS**

14. Given the technical nature of this matter, the Committee sought professional advice with a view to obtaining a budget estimate for the provision of a suitable SEV system which incorporates -
  - reliability and serviceability
  - fail-proof security
  - ability to be integrated with the DSP audio system
  - cost-effectiveness
  - ease of use
  - ease of installation with minimum disruption to the furniture
  - efficient use of desk space, allowing maximum space to be retained for Members'/Advocates' papers.
15. The Committee was advised that whilst there are a number of electronic voting systems on the market, relatively few cater specifically for parliamentary voting. Many of the 'cheaper' systems would be quite unsuitable as they are engineered for commercial use such as television (ask the audience) shows or educational (multi-question) polling and these do not have the necessary degree of security, reliability and integrity of specialist parliamentary systems.
16. The Committee has been provided with a budget estimate of £20,000 for the procurement and installation of a wireless SEV system specifically designed, tried and tested for parliamentary voting and capable of being fully integrated with the DSP audio system. The main advantages of a wireless system is that –
  - its installation does not entail any rewiring under the benches
  - it does not compromise the décor of the room
  - the handsets can be moved or stored until required, thus minimising obtrusive clutter.

17. The voting handsets of the system identified are small (similar to a small television remote control) with just three buttons. The system allows a full analysis of results and the ability for the results to be printed out. The system is proven to be reliable and secure.
18. A further security measure provided is a facility for H. M. Greffier to exclude voting by Members not present at the roll call and who have not subsequently been *relevé(e)*. The proposed amendment to the Rules of Procedure referred to in paragraph 22 will include a provision to prohibit Members from removing voting handsets from the States Chamber.
19. The budget cost of £20,000 includes:
  - 50 delegate handsets
  - central console and power supply
  - all necessary receivers, aerials, interfaces and software
  - delivery and installation / programming.
20. Costs have reduced considerably since 2006. The present estimated cost of £20,000 compares most favourably with the estimated cost of £30,000 in 2006.

#### **VOTING BY *VIVE VOIX* AND *APPEL NOMINAL***

21. The Committee is of the opinion that if the States approve the introduction of simultaneous electronic voting, use of the '*vive voix*' should be retained, as it is more suited and less time-consuming for non-controversial, routine matters and to preserve a traditional practice. However, the SEV system would, of course, be available for use if any Member called for a recorded vote before the Presiding Officer ruled that the matter had been carried or lost, or immediately after such a ruling, just as, at the present time, any member can call for an '*appel nominal*' under Rule 14(2) of the Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation. The Committee favours the retention of voting by '*appel nominal*' in the event of a breakdown in the electronic voting system.

#### **AMENDMENT TO RULES OF PROCEDURE / OUTLINE OF VOTING PROCEDURE**

22. If the States approve the introduction of SEV the Committee will propose appropriate amendments to the Rules of Procedure to facilitate the use of SEV in the States of Deliberation. Detailed discussions in that regard will be required with both the Presiding Officer and H.M. Greffier but the Committee envisages a procedure on the lines set out below.
23. When a recorded vote is required the Greffier will announce that the voting is open. Members will then have 15 seconds in which to record their vote by pressing a button. During that period Members would be able to change their vote. At the end of the period the Greffier would announce that voting was

closing. The overall result (i.e. without names) would be displayed on a screen on the Greffier's desk and/or the Presiding Officer's desk. He would then announce the result of the vote in the usual manner.

24. The Greffier's computer would have a display of the voting of each individual Member. At the conclusion of voting Greffe staff would arrange for the result to be made available electronically and for printouts (where necessary) of the full result, with names, to be displayed in the States Members' Room, with copies being available for the media.
25. Immediately after a vote has been declared by the Presiding Officer any Member will be able to request that the Greffier reads out the list of names of either all the "pour" votes or all the "contre" votes or all the abstentions, or indeed all three lists. This latter procedure is followed in Jersey. The Committee understands that whilst such requests are made in approximately 80% of votes, they are not considered to impact adversely on the efficient running of the Assembly in that Island.

#### **STATEMENT OF DISSENT**

26. Deputy M. J. Fallaize opposes the proposals contained in this Report and favours maintaining the present voting system. He will, therefore, speak and vote against these proposals in the States of Deliberation.

#### **CONSULTATION**

27. The Presiding Officer, H. M. Greffier and the Law Officers have been consulted regarding this matter. All are in agreement that this is a political matter and none has identified any problem with the introduction of SEV in the event that the States so decide.

#### **FINANCIAL AND MANPOWER IMPLICATIONS**

28. The budgetary responsibility for the provision of equipment for use in the Royal Court House rests with the Treasury and Resources Department. The Committee has been advised by the Treasury and Resources Department that, if the States approve the propositions set out at the end of this report, the existing capital allocation for Courts and Law Officers will be reprioritised to fund a capital vote to enable the introduction of simultaneous electronic voting.
29. The introduction of SEV would have no implications for the manpower resources of the States.

## **PRINCIPLES OF GOOD GOVERNANCE**

30. The Committee considers that the proposals contained in this report comply with the relevant Principles of Good Governance.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

31. The States Assembly and Constitution Committee recommends the States to agree to:
- (1) the introduction of a system of simultaneous electronic voting in the States of Deliberation;
  - (2) authorise the Treasury and Resources Department to approve the acceptance of tenders and a capital vote for the installation of a system of simultaneous electronic voting in the Royal Court Chamber charged to the routine capital allocation of the Treasury and Resources Department – Courts and Law Officers;
  - (3) direct the States Assembly and Constitution Committee to report to the States regarding any amendments to the Rules of Procedure required to enable the use of a system of simultaneous electronic voting in the States of Deliberation.

Yours faithfully

I. F. RIHOY

Chairman

States Assembly and Constitution Committee

Members of the Committee are

Deputy I. F. Rihoy (Chairman)  
Deputy M. M. Lowe (Vice-Chairman)  
Deputy T. M. Le Pelley  
Deputy S. L. Langlois  
Deputy M. J. Fallaize

**(NB The Treasury and Resources Department has no comments on this Report.)**

The States are asked to decide:-

XVIII.- Whether, after consideration of the Report dated 12<sup>th</sup> September, 2011, of the States Assembly And Constitution Committee, they are of the opinion:-

- (1) To agree to the introduction of a system of simultaneous electronic voting in the States of Deliberation.
- (2) To authorise the Treasury and Resources Department to approve the acceptance of tenders and a capital vote for the installation of a system of simultaneous electronic voting in the Royal Court Chamber charged to the routine capital allocation of the Treasury and Resources Department – Courts and Law Officers.
- (3) To direct the States Assembly and Constitution Committee to report to the States regarding any amendments to the Rules of Procedure required to enable the use of a system of simultaneous electronic voting in the States of Deliberation.



**(NB In pursuance of Rule 17(2) (a) of the Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation, the views received from Departments and Committees consulted by the Policy Council, as appearing to have a particular interest in the subject matter of the Requête, are set out below.)**

## **STATES ASSEMBLY AND CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE**

The Chief Minister  
Policy Council  
Sir Charles Frossard House  
St Peter Port  
GY1 1FH

7<sup>th</sup> June 2012

Dear Deputy Harwood

Thank you for your letter of the 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2012 with which you enclosed a Requête regarding the introduction of Simultaneous Electronic Voting (“SEV”) in the States of Deliberation.

The present States Assembly and Constitution Committee does not necessarily concur with the content of its predecessor’s report considered by the States of Deliberation on the 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2011. Indeed, it considers that report was not necessarily as balanced and proportionate as it might have been.

In the preamble to the prayer of the Requête the requérants state that simultaneous electronic voting will achieve greater transparency and greater efficiency. The Committee considers that these two objectives are not necessarily compatible.

It is certainly possible to conceive of a system of electronic voting which would provide for greater transparency and another which would be less time-consuming than the present oral system, but the Committee is at best sceptical that any system of electronic voting will be both more transparent and less time-consuming. Should the States resolve to introduce SEV, the Committee considers it likely that the Assembly will need to choose between a system which is either more transparent but more time-consuming than the present oral system or one which is less time-consuming but certainly no more transparent, and arguably less so, than the present system. The Requête does not address that dichotomy.

The Committee is of the opinion that the States of Deliberation should be afforded the opportunity to consider a balanced and comprehensive report which fairly weighs the arguments for and against – and indeed the costs of – different systems of SEV and which lays out in full the practical and procedural effects of establishing such a system in advance of members being asked to vote for or against the concept.

The Committee fully endorses the case that the newly-elected Assembly should be invited to take its own position in respect of SEV. Taking that and the above into account, it is the Committee's intention to propose an amendment to the propositions, the effect of which, if approved, will be to delete propositions one to three as drafted and replace them with a single proposition to direct the States Assembly and Constitution Committee and the Treasury and Resources Department jointly and as expeditiously as possible to present to the States of Deliberation the sort of comprehensive report on SEV described in paragraph five of this letter.

Yours sincerely

M. J. Fallaize,  
Chairman,  
States Assembly and Constitution Committee

## **TREASURY AND RESOURCES DEPARTMENT**

The Chief Minister  
Policy Council  
Sir Charles Frossard House  
La Charroterie  
St Peter Port  
Guernsey  
GY1 1FH

12 June 2012

Dear Chief Minister

### **Requête – Simultaneous Electronic Voting in the States of Deliberation**

Thank you for your letter of 22 May 2012 enclosing the wording of the Requête proposed by Deputy Mary Lowe seeking the introduction of a system of simultaneous electronic voting in the States of Deliberation.

My Board had the opportunity to discuss this matter at its meeting held on Tuesday 29 May when it was noted that the Requête is silent on the subject of costs. However, given the relatively short period of time that has elapsed since a Report on the same subject from the States Assembly and Constitution Committee was debated and rejected by the States last December, it is conceivable that the costs will have remained broadly similar to those that were identified in that Report, but there can be no certainty until tenders have been received.

Arguably, this places a constraint upon my Department because it would appear to be implicit, within the terms of the Requête, that the cost of any new system should be held to around £20,000. Adhering to this implicit direction could result in a limited system being put in place.

In addition, while £20,000 can be made available from the existing routine capital allocation of the Courts and Law Officers, my Board understands that sum may need to be restored within the 2013 allocation to enable prioritised projects to proceed.

Yours sincerely

Gavin St Pier

Minister  
Treasury and Resources Department

**(NB The Policy Council has no comments to make as this relates to a parliamentary matter)**

The States are asked to decide:-

II.- Whether, after consideration of the Requête dated 22<sup>nd</sup> May, 2012, signed by Deputy M M Lowe and seventeen other Members of the States, they are of the opinion:-

1. To agree to the introduction of a system of simultaneous electronic voting in the States of Deliberation.
2. To authorise the Treasury and Resources Department to approve the acceptance of tenders and a capital vote for the installation of a system of simultaneous electronic voting in the Royal Court Chamber charged to the routine capital allocation of the Treasury and Resources Department - Courts and Law Officers.
3. To direct the States Assembly and Constitution Committee to report to the States regarding any amendments to the Rules of Procedure required to enable the use of a system of simultaneous electronic voting in the States of Deliberation.