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Foreword


On 5 September 2011, the Minister established the Referendum Commission on the Twenty-Ninth Amendment of the Constitution (Judges’ Remuneration) Bill 2011 by order to carry out the functions conferred on it by the Referendum Act 1998, as amended by the Referendum Act 2001, in respect of the referendum.

On 13 September 2011, the Minister established the Referendum Commission on the Thirtieth Amendment of the Constitution (Houses of the Oireachtas Inquiries) Bill 2011 by order to carry out the functions conferred on it by the Referendum Act 1998, as amended by the Referendum Act 2001, in respect of the referendum.

Following my nomination by the Chief Justice, I became Chairman of each Commission, the other four members being the specified ex officio appointees. While there were legally two separate Commissions with separate budgets, the Commissions were able to effect efficiencies in performing their functions as there was considerable overlap and the timetable for both was the same. To reflect this reality, it is proposed in this report to use “the Commission”, in the singular, although in reality there were two Commissions at all times each dealing with its own statutory remit. The work of the two Commissions on the two referendums is covered in this single report.

Dr Bryan M. E. McMahon
Retired Judge of the High Court
Chairman
Referendum Commission

March 2012
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Establishment of the Referendum Commissions

Under the Referendum Act 1998, on each occasion that a referendum falls to be held, the Minister for the Environment, Community and Local Government may, at his discretion, establish a Referendum Commission. A Commission is established by means of an Establishment Order made by the Minister in respect of the proposed referendum. The Act of 1998 provides that the Chairman of the Commission shall be a former judge of the Supreme Court or the High Court or a judge of the High Court.

On 5 September 2011, the Minister made an Establishment Order in respect of the referendum on the Twenty-Ninth Amendment of the Constitution (Judges’ Remuneration) Bill 2011. Dr Bryan McMahon, a retired judge of the High Court, accepted the nomination of the Chief Justice to act as Chairman of the Referendum Commission established by the Minister.

On 13 September 2011, the Minister made an Establishment Order in respect of the referendum on the Thirtieth Amendment of the Constitution (Houses of the Oireachtas Inquiries) Bill 2011. Dr Bryan McMahon, also accepted the nomination of the Chief Justice to act as Chairman of this Referendum Commission.

The other, ex officio, members of the Commission are:

- Mr Kieran Coughlan, Clerk of Dáil Éireann,
- Ms Deirdre Lane, Clerk ofSeanad Éireann,
- Ms Emily O’Reilly, Ombudsman,
- Mr John Buckley, Comptroller and Auditor General.

On 26 September 2011, the Minister for the Environment, Community and Local Government, by order, appointed Thursday 27 October 2011 as the date on which the referendums would be held.

Role of the Referendum Commission

Since 2001, the Commission’s primary role has been –

a) to prepare one or more statements containing a general explanation of the subject matter of the proposal and of the text thereof in the relevant Bill and any other information relating to those matters that the Commission considers appropriate;

b) to publish and distribute those statements in such manner and by such means including the use of television, radio and other electronic media as the Commission considers most likely to bring them to the attention of the electorate and to ensure as far as practicable that the means employed enable those with a sight or hearing disability to read or hear the statements concerned;

c) to promote public awareness of the referendum and encourage the electorate to vote at the poll.

The Commission is satisfied that it has fully performed that role and has remained independent and neutral throughout the process. The Commission wishes to acknowledge, however, that there is some continued public misapprehension as to its role. Some still believe that it is obliged to or ought to advance the “yes” and “no” arguments in relation to each referendum proposal. A change in the law in 2001 no longer permits the Commission to represent the issues in this manner.

Funding of the Referendum Commission

The Commission in respect of the referendum on the Twenty-Ninth Amendment of the Constitution (Judges’ Remuneration) Bill 2011 was allocated a budget of €0.75 million by the Department of Justice and Equality. The Commission in respect of the referendum on the Thirtieth Amendment of the Constitution (Houses of the Oireachtas Inquiries) Bill 2011 was allocated a budget of €1.5 million by the Department of Public Expenditure and Reform bringing the total budget to €2.25 million for the joint information campaign. This compared with a budget of €5 million for the first Lisbon Treaty campaign and €4.2 million for the second Lisbon Treaty campaign.

An audit of the accounts of the Referendum Commission confirmed that proper financial procedures were followed. The audit identified no weaknesses in the Commission’s systems of control and confirmed that proper books of account were kept. Procedures for procurement were also found to be in accordance with Department of Finance Public Procurement guidelines.

As a result of its campaign strategy, and the short period available for the campaign, the Commission ran a very cost-effective campaign which resulted in the return of nearly €1 million of its budget to the funding Departments. A breakdown of the expenditure incurred in the referendum campaign is given in Appendix 1.

The secretariat to the Referendum Commission was provided by staff from the Standards in Public Office Commission and the Office of the Ombudsman. These staff costs were borne by the Office of the Ombudsman and the Standards in Public Office Commission and were not paid out of the budgets for the information campaign. Neither the Chairman nor the other members of the Referendum Commission received any payment for Commission work.
Procurement
The Referendum Commission has no ongoing legal existence and only comes into being once established by Ministerial order. During 2010 there were reports that there might be referendums in early 2011. Having regard to previous experience relating to the late establishment of Referendum Commissions, the four “ordinary” or ex officio members of the Commission and the Secretary designate of the Commission decided that it would be appropriate to put provisional arrangements in place to facilitate the smooth running of any future referendum campaign having regard to the provisions of EU Regulations and Directives relating to procurement. As it would be likely that any future Referendum Commission would require the services of marketing/project management/communications consultants to advise and assist it in the planning and execution of a public information advertising and media campaign, and as there was no contract in place, it was decided that the Office of the Ombudsman would publish a Prior Information Notice which would have the effect of reducing the period contractors would have to tender for the service if such tenders were sought. Accordingly, on 26 October 2010, the Office of the Ombudsman published a Prior Information Notice.

Following the general election in February 2011, it became apparent that there would be a number of referendums during 2011 and it became clear that these would likely be held in conjunction with the Presidential Election on 27 October 2011.

Therefore, on 5 August 2011, the Office of the Ombudsman, on behalf of possible future Referendum Commissions, published on eTenders a request for tenders for a communications consultant/ project manager. Closing date for receipt of tenders was Friday 2 September 2011. If a future Referendum Commission decided to distribute an information guide to households, it could revive a 2009 contract with An Post for that purpose. Accordingly, it was not necessary to tender for this service.

After the Minister established the Referendum Commission in respect of the referendum on the Twenty-Ninth Amendment of the Constitution (Judges’ Remuneration) Bill 2011 and in respect of the Thirty-first Amendment of the Constitution (Houses of the Oireachtas Inquiries) Bill 2011, with the same Chairman, it was agreed to run a joint media campaign giving equal coverage to both referendums. Following a selection process, a consortium led by Murray Consultants (public relations), and including Chemistry (advertising) and Carat Ireland (media planning/buying), was selected to assist the planning and execution of the public information advertising and media campaign.

The strategy adopted was to be centred on the Guide to the referendums, delivered to all voting homes in the State, in which the Commission sought to give a general explanation of the referendum proposals. The Guide gave the main points of the proposals, and for those who wanted more detailed information there were fuller explanations of the proposals available on the Commission’s website, information that would be posted to voters on request.

This Guide was supported by an advertising campaign giving very basic headline accounts of what the referendum proposals were about, and directing people towards the Guide and website for more information. A third important element was media engagement whereby the Chairman and other Commission spokespersons gave a large number of interviews to national and regional radio stations to explain the referendum proposals.

The aim of the strategy was simple but ambitious: to try to ensure that, despite the tight timescale, voters would know by 27 October that the referendums were taking place, would understand the two referendum proposals and would recognise the importance of using their vote.

The Commission decided that it would:

1. Prepare and distribute to all voting homes a Guide to explain as factually and clearly as possible what the electorate was voting on in the two referendum proposals to change the Constitution.

2. Publish this material as well as an extended explanation of the two referendum proposals and other background material on a dedicated website.

3. Hold a press conference to announce its plans.

4. Run a national advertising campaign on television, radio, press, and online, with a variety of executions and texts, to give headline detail of the two referendum proposals and to direct voters to where more information could be obtained.

5. Offer spokespeople to be interviewed about the role of the Commission and the content of the proposals to national and regional radio. The Chairman of the Commission did two interviews on RTE’s Morning Ireland programme, a lengthy interview on the Pat Kenny Show and was also interviewed on several regional radio stations.

6. Target younger voters by taking advertising on a range of popular websites including social networking sites such as Facebook.

7. Focus the advertising message in the final week on encouraging people to vote.
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The Commission’s Information Campaign

The Guide for All Homes

The Commission decided, on cost grounds, to deliver the Guide through An Post’s Publicity Post Service rather than using the more expensive method of having a copy of the Guide addressed and posted to each individual voter on the electoral register.

Given the extremely short timescales, drafting, translating, designing, printing and distributing the Guide to every home in the State posed a significant challenge. The latest date on which distribution of the Guide could begin if there was to be any prospect of its being delivered to all homes in time was 10 October. For this to happen it had to be written, translated, checked legally, designed and sent to the printers by 28 September, just two working days after the final wording of the Oireachtas Inquiries referendum became available.

Distribution of the Guide began on Monday 10 October, a process which the service provider – An Post – expected would be completed at the latest by Friday 21 October – only six days before polling day. In the event some Guides were not delivered by this date and a small number of voters reported that they never received the Guide. Our post-campaign research, referred to later in this report, bears this out.

Had time permitted, delivery of the Guide would have taken place earlier and these issues would probably not have arisen. It is the Commission’s view that the time provided to the Commission to fulfil its mandate was highly unsatisfactory in this regard.

In line with the Official Languages Act, the Guide was published in English and Irish under the same cover. It was published in Braille and audio tape for persons with a sight disability and these versions were distributed through the National Council for the Blind. In addition, the Commission produced a special sign language video of the handbook for distribution via DeafHear and the Irish Deaf Society. This video was also available on the Commission’s website.

Website

The core content of the website was the text of the printed Guide which explained the two referendum proposals. More detailed background information relating to both was also published on the website.

The Guide was available to download off the website.

Additional features included a link to ‘check the register’ website so that a voter could check to see if he or she was registered to vote.

The site had over 55,500 unique visitors and 235,724 page views in the course of the campaign.

Other Means of Obtaining Information

The Commission Secretariat, which was provided by the Secretariat of the Standards in Public Office Commission, was available by phone or email to answer any queries raised by members of the public. In addition to the Referendum Commission’s own dedicated phone number and email address, the Commission established a lo-call number. Voters could call either of the phone numbers, or email the Secretariat, if they wanted a copy of the Guide posted to them, or if they wanted further information. The Commission advertised these numbers and the email address in the Guide sent to all homes.

Unlike in previous referendums, the Commission managed the lo-call phone line directly, responding immediately to queries raised.

A total of 525 phone calls, through the direct line and lo-call number, and 200 emails were received in the course of the campaign. This relatively small number is possibly due to the fact that the radio, TV and print advertising directed people to the www.referendum2011.ie website and the content of the proposals was relatively straightforward to understand. It is also possible that because of the absence of any serious debate in the Oireachtas or in the media, and bearing in mind the lively Presidential campaign being conducted at the same time, the public had not become engaged with the issues until shortly before the voting date.

Just 12% of calls or emails requested a copy of the Guide to be posted to them. 30% were from people who were seeking further information on the proposals and 43% were voters enquiring about polling times, eligibility to vote and how to check the register.
The Advertising Campaign

The Commission’s advertising campaign was designed to be simple, straightforward and easy to understand. The content focused on clearly explaining the content of the two referendum proposals, with the television and radio advertising using a humorous “surprise” element to maximise viewers’ attention and recall.

TV Advertising

There were two versions featuring ordinary ‘real’ people (a waiter and a mother) each explaining the basic concepts behind the referendum proposals. In addition to this information content, the approach was designed to stimulate citizens to inform themselves fully about referendums to change the Constitution. The TV advertising was broadcast on RTÉ, TV3e, TG4, Sky Group, E4 and Setanta.

Radio Advertising

The radio advertising involved three versions that featured a cashier, a farmer and a waiter at their workplace. Each explained the content of the two referendum proposals with some humorous content at the end of the advert to ensure that voters engaged with it and found it memorable. These adverts were broadcast on national and local radio.

Free-to-Air Advertising

As has been the practice in recent referendums, the Commission was allocated all available “free-to-air” time by broadcasters in relation to the Referendums.

For the purposes of these referendums the Commission chose to record a one minute long broadcast which featured one of the main television advertisements, with a single actor then delivering a script emphasising the legal significance of the Constitution and urging the citizens to vote.

The Commission received excellent co-operation from all broadcasters in relation to the provision of free airtime at peak viewing and listening periods for these broadcasts and wishes to express its thanks to them.

Print Advertising

“I understand that on October 27th we decide whether or not judges’ pay can be reduced in line with reductions in the pay of other public servants; and decide whether or not the Dáil and Seanad can investigate individuals and make findings in relation to their conduct when inquiring into matters of public importance. Oh, and I also know how to make a really great omelette.”

The print advertising also used “real” people to inform the reader about the content of the proposals. These advertisements were published in the national press.

Online Advertising

Do you want the facts about the Referendums?

The online advertising was designed to be clear and simple. It asked if people knew about the two referendums and offered the opportunity for voters to click through various advertisements so they could be redirected to the www.referendum2011.ie website. The online advertisements featured on websites such as independent.ie, irishtimes.com, facebook.com, eircom.net and TheJournal.ie.

Engagement with the Press

The Referendum Commission launched its campaign on Tuesday 11 October 2011. It held a press conference in Dublin to unveil the detail of the information campaign and to outline clearly the content of the two referendum proposals. A press statement containing this information was also circulated to all national news desks and regional media outlets. See Appendix 2 for the press statements issued by the Commission.

At the launch of the campaign the Chairman of the Commission Dr Bryan McMahon, responded to questions from journalists and conducted a number of interviews with National broadcast media. He also did an interview with UTV news which was syndicated to regional radio stations around the State.

The launch of the campaign positioned the Commission as a credible and reliable source of information and the media coverage generated as a result was substantial and positive.
The Commission’s Information Campaign
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During the course of the campaign the Chairman appeared on RTÉ’s Morning Ireland on two occasions. In his first appearance the Chairman explained the 29th Amendment to the Constitution (Judges’ Remuneration) Bill 2011 and during the second he explained the 30th Amendment to the Constitution (Houses of the Oireachtas Inquiries) Bill 2011. On 25 October, the Chairman did an extended interview on the Pat Kenny morning radio show on RTÉ Radio 1.

On Tuesday 25 October the Commission issued a statement urging the electorate to vote on 27 October. A similar statement was issued regionally the week before. The ‘call to vote’ release received widespread coverage in national and regional media.

During the course of the campaign 18 interviews were conducted with regional radio stations across the country.

The variety of media outlets through which the Commission conveyed its information ensured that a broad audience across all demographic groups was reached.

Research findings on Commission Campaign

The Commission decided to conduct research immediately after polling day to determine the impact of different aspects of its public information campaign. This is an important tool in measuring its effectiveness and the results provide future Commissions with valuable information on which they can base future campaigns.

In light of its broad function of promoting knowledge and understanding of the referendum proposals, the Commission was particularly interested in using the research to ascertain voters’ perception of their understanding of the referendum proposals, by the time they came to vote.

The table gives the results of the questions on voters’ understanding of the proposals –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judges’ Pay Referendum</th>
<th>Oireachtas Inquiries Referendum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not understand it at all</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not understand it particularly well</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understood it to some extent</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understood it quite well</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understood it very well</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not understand it at all</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not understand it particularly well</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understood it to some extent</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understood it quite well</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understood it very well</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table gives the results of the questions on voters’ understanding of the proposals –

Clearly there was significantly greater understanding of the Judges’ Pay referendum than the Oireachtas Inquiries referendum. The Commission’s mandate is to maximise understanding and so no particular level of understanding among voters represents “success”. It is however possible to compare declared levels of understanding with those in previous referendums. For example in the two referendums on the Lisbon Treaty in 2008 and 2009, 44% said they understood it to some extent or better at the time of the first poll in June 2008. This had risen to 72% in research done immediately after the October 2009 poll.

On this occasion the proportion understanding the Judges’ Pay referendum to some extent or better (71%) and the Oireachtas Inquiries referendum to some extent or better (56%) compares well to the Lisbon figures.

In light of its legal obligation to promote public awareness of the referendum and encourage the electorate to vote, the Commission was also keen to use the research to inform it and future Commissions as to why those who did not vote in the referendums had not done so.

Asked why they did not vote, the most common reasons were either that circumstances did not allow them get to the polling station or that they were not interested enough. The majority of voters gave one of these reasons. Of relevance to the Commission is the 13% of non-voters who said they didn’t vote in the Judges’ Pay referendum either because they did not know enough or didn’t understand the referendum, and the 18% of non-voters who gave these reasons for not voting in the Oireachtas Inquiries referendum.

Lack of understanding was put forward by a significant number of those who voted No in either referendum as their reason for doing so. Some 27% of those who voted No in the referendum on Judges’ pay said they did so because they did not understand it, while 38% of those voting No in the referendum on Oireachtas Inquiries also said they did so because they did not understand it.

The research therefore shows that not only was it the case that a significant minority of voters did not feel they understood the referendums, but this lack of understanding influenced a significant number either to vote No or not to vote.

The research was designed mainly to assess the impact of different aspects of the Commission’s campaign. The single most important aspect of Commission campaigns is usually seen as the Guide to the referendum proposal that is delivered to all homes.

Some 61% of voters said they had received the Guide, a disappointing drop from the 77% who said in 2009 that they had received the Guide to the Lisbon Treaty. It is always the case that a proportion of voters who received the Guide will not recall this and will say they had not received it. This does not, however, explain the significant drop in those reporting that they received it. During the latter stages of the campaign the Commission received a number of phone calls from voters who said they had not received the Guide, and the media also reported on this phenomenon.

The Guide was distributed by An Post who were retained to deliver it to all homes. The delivery was done using their Publicity Post Service which is substantially cheaper than the other option of addressing it and posting it to each registered voter.

In previous referendums the Guide has been delivered at least a week and sometimes several weeks earlier in the run up to polling day. Therefore if the delivery is late for some reason to certain areas, there will normally be time to rectify this. On this occasion, however, the fact that the Commission was given very little time to prepare and execute its campaign meant that no leeway was available. This may have been a significant factor in the lower level of delivery.

Of those who received the Guide, 32% said they read all or most of it, 37% read certain parts and 30% said they did not read any of it.

On this occasion the proportion understanding the Judges’ Pay referendum to some extent or better (71%) and the Oireachtas Inquiries referendum to some extent or better (56%) compares well to the Lisbon figures.

In light of its legal obligation to promote public awareness of the referendum and encourage the electorate to vote, the Commission was also keen to use the research to inform it and future Commissions as to why those who did not vote in the referendums had not done so.

Asked why they did not vote, the most common reasons were either that circumstances did not allow them get to the polling station or that they were not interested enough. The majority of voters gave one of these reasons. Of relevance to the Commission is the 13% of non-voters who said they didn’t vote in the Judges’ Pay referendum either because they did not know enough or didn’t understand the referendum, and the 18% of non-voters who gave these reasons for not voting in the Oireachtas Inquiries referendum.

Lack of understanding was put forward by a significant number of those who voted No in either referendum as their reason for doing so. Some 27% of those who voted No in the referendum on Judges’ pay said they did so because they did not understand it, while 38% of those voting No in the referendum on Oireachtas Inquiries also said they did so because they did not understand it.

The research therefore shows that not only was it the case that a significant minority of voters did not feel they understood the referendums, but this lack of understanding influenced a significant number either to vote No or not to vote.

The research was designed mainly to assess the impact of different aspects of the Commission’s campaign. The single most important aspect of Commission campaigns is usually seen as the Guide to the referendum proposal that is delivered to all homes.

Some 61% of voters said they had received the Guide, a disappointing drop from the 77% who said in 2009 that they had received the Guide to the Lisbon Treaty. It is always the case that a proportion of voters who received the Guide will not recall this and will say they had not received it. This does not, however, explain the significant drop in those reporting that they received it. During the latter stages of the campaign the Commission received a number of phone calls from voters who said they had not received the Guide, and the media also reported on this phenomenon.

The Guide was distributed by An Post who were retained to deliver it to all homes. The delivery was done using their Publicity Post Service which is substantially cheaper than the other option of addressing it and posting it to each registered voter.

In previous referendums the Guide has been delivered at least a week and sometimes several weeks earlier in the run up to polling day. Therefore if the delivery is late for some reason to certain areas, there will normally be time to rectify this. On this occasion, however, the fact that the Commission was given very little time to prepare and execute its campaign meant that no leeway was available. This may have been a significant factor in the lower level of delivery.

Of those who received the Guide, 32% said they read all or most of it, 37% read certain parts and 30% said they did not read any of it.
In preparing its Guide for voters, the Commission devoted some time to striking the balance between
(i) providing information at a basic level that would be understood by voters but might be seen by
some as too simple, and
(ii) providing information at a more detailed level that would inform those already interested in the
issues but might be difficult to understand for many voters. Asked what they thought of the level
of detail in the Guide 33% found it too detailed, 9% too basic with 35% saying it had about the
right level of detail.

A clear majority of those who received it found it helpful as shown in the table. 63% found the material
on the Judges' Pay referendum either very helpful or quite helpful, while the corresponding figure for the
referendum on Oireachtas Inquiries was 53%.

Voters were also asked if they felt the Referendum Commission should retain its current role of
explaining the subject matter of referendum proposals, or whether it should also give the
arguments for and against the proposal. Some 33% felt the Commission mandate should remain
unchanged while 58% believed that as well as explaining the subject matter it should give the
arguments for and against. 9% gave no opinion.

The Referendum Act 1998 provides that a body may apply to the Referendum Commission for
a declaration that it is an approved body for the purposes of a referendum. Approved bodies are
entitled to appoint agents to attend at the issue and opening of postal voters’ ballot papers, at polling
stations and at the counting of votes. Members of both Houses of the Oireachtas, who currently have
the right to appoint such agents, would continue to have this right.

In order to become an approved body, an applicant must fulfil certain conditions –

1. the body must be a body corporate or unincorporated body which, or a branch of
which, is established in the State, governed by
a constitution, a memorandum of association or
other such document or other written rules and
having a membership of not less than 300;

2. the body must have an interest in the referendum
and have a name which is not identical to, or does
not closely resemble, the name of a political party
registered in the Register of Political Parties. A
political party for the time being registered in the
Register of Political Parties is deemed to be a
body for the purposes of the Act and need not
establish compliance with the above conditions;

3. applications must be made on the official form,
which is available from the Commission and must
be submitted within such time as the Commission
may specify.

The Commission may also revoke a declaration
made by it in relation to a body where it is satisfied
that false information has been furnished to it. The
Act also provides, under section 9, that it will be an
offence knowingly to provide false information in
relation to an application.

Advertisements were placed in the national press
inviting applications from bodies seeking approval
for the purposes of the referendum. The closing
date was 7 October 2011. Following the application
process the Commission approved three bodies. These bodies are listed in the following table.

An application was received from the Green Party,
16/17 Suffolk Street, Dublin 2, after the closing date.
The application was not considered because it was
received late.

### Chapter 4
Approval of Bodies for the Purposes of
the Referendum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved Body</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fianna Fáil</td>
<td>66-66 Lower Mount St, Dublin 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Democrats</td>
<td>47 O'Connell St, Limerick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Solidarity Party</td>
<td>14 North Frederick St Dublin 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Referendum Commission may refuse to make
a declaration if a body does not fulfil the relevant
conditions, or fails to provide the Commission with
reasonable information or documentation which
the Commission considers necessary to determine
the application.
Chapter 5

Recommendations

The Referendum Commission considers that the period of time given to it in 2011 to carry out its functions was grossly inadequate. To set out the context for some important recommendations on the conduct of future referendums, the Commission would like to detail some of the key factors which made it more difficult for the Commission to carry out its statutory functions in 2011.

(i) The timescale given to the Commission in 2011 was exceptionally short. There were just five weeks between the passage of both sets of legislation through the Oireachtas and polling day. Each Bill underwent amendment at relatively late stages in the legislative process, and the final wording of the Oireachtas Inquiries proposal only became available on 23 September 2011.

(ii) The Commission therefore had just five weeks to prepare its explanation of the referendum proposals, to write the text of the Guide and to translate, design, print and distribute this publication throughout the country. As explained earlier in this report, the Commission had a mere two working days to finalise the text of the Guide and deliver it to the printers. It is a measure of the professionalism and hard work of everyone involved that the Commission succeeded in executing a complex project in a timescale that would have been considered utterly unacceptable in the commercial world.

(iii) There was uncertainty over the wording of the referendums until very late in the day, as evidenced by the amendments to the wording of both proposals which were made late in the legislative process. This added to the challenge of explaining the proposals in the short time available.

(iv) Ideally the Commission should have time to monitor in an ongoing way the campaign through research and other means, and explain, elaborate and amend its messages and materials if necessary. There was no such opportunity available this time due to the shortness of the campaign.

The manner in which referendums are conducted in this country, as evidenced above, contrasts with the recommendations the Council of Europe’s Code of Good Practice on Referendums (March 2007). These were produced by the European Commission for Democracy Through Law (the Venice Commission).

The following extracts from the Code are instructive.

Democracy Through Law (the Venice Commission).

The manner in which referendums are conducted in countries of the Council of Europe should be such as to ensure that the positions of the executive and legislative authorities or persons sharing their viewpoint in the conduct of an referendum should be considered. This implies that the text submitted to a referendum and an explanatory report or gazette sufficiently far in advance of the vote;

they must be published in the official gazette sufficiently far in advance of the vote;

they must be sent directly to citizens and be received sufficiently far in advance of the vote;

the explanatory report must give a balanced presentation not only of the viewpoint of the executive and legislative authorities or persons sharing their viewpoint but also of the opposing one.

The Commission recommends that the Minister should consider –

1. Reviewing as a matter of urgency the referendum process, including the statutory remit of the Referendum Commission, having regard to the Council of Europe’s Code of Good Practice on Referendums (March 2007). The review should have particular regard to the need for voters to be given sufficient time, to have access to impartial information, and for a clear question being put to voters. Regard should also be had for the need to have balanced campaign material from the proposal’s supporters and opponents available to electors. Allowance might also be made for either strict or proportional equality between parties rather than the current strict equality (where proportional relates to the strength of the parties to the debate).

2. Giving the Commission a period of at least three months to explain properly a referendum proposal. Where procurement of services is required, an additional two months is needed.

3. The establishment of a permanent independent body as recommended by previous referendum commissions – such as the proposed Electoral Inquiries proposal – including those of the Referendum Commission. This would be a permanent and ongoing body which, in the case of referendums, would have ample time to prepare and promote public awareness of important constitutional amendments.

In the alternative, and in the absence of such an independent body, amending the Referendum Act 1998 in order to allow the Commission to be established in advance of the date on which a Referendum Bill is initiated in Dáil Éireann. This would allow the Commission to carry out essential preliminary work and prepare to explain properly complex proposals to amend the Constitution.

Finally, the Commission notes that the Taoiseach has recently said he will set up a Referendum Commission in Spring 2012 so that it will have adequate time to prepare for future referendums. While we are unaware of the precise proposal the Taoiseach has in mind we very much welcome his acknowledgement that giving the Commission a short time in which to explain referendum proposals can lead to public confusion.

3.1. Freedom of voters to form an opinion

a) Administrative authorities must observe their duty of neutrality... which is one of the means of ensuring that voters can form an opinion freely.

b) Contrary to the case of elections, it is not necessary to prohibit completely intervention by the authorities in support of or against the proposal submitted to a referendum. However, the public authorities (national, regional and local) must not influence the outcome of the vote by excessive, one-sided campaigning. The use of public funds by the authorities for campaigning purposes must be prohibited.

c) The question put to the vote must be clear; it must not be misleading; it must not suggest an answer; electors must be informed of the effects of the referendum; voters must be able to answer the questions asked solely by yes, no or a blank vote.

d) The authorities must provide objective information. This implies that the text submitted to a referendum and an explanatory report or balanced campaign material from the proposal’s supporters and opponents should be made available to electors sufficiently in advance, as follows:

(i) they must be published in the official gazette sufficiently far in advance of the vote;

(ii) they must be sent directly to citizens and be received sufficiently far in advance of the vote;

(iii) the explanatory report must give a balanced presentation not only of the viewpoint of the executive and legislative authorities or persons sharing their viewpoint but also of the opposing one.

3.2. Voting in a referendum

a) Functions relating to the conduct of referendums should be exercised exclusively by the Referendum Commission.

b) There should be no attempt to create a climate of fear, by any method, in respect of the terms of a referendum: in particular, that the vote will be invalidated by a lack of prepayment of the necessary fees.

3.3. Rights of the voter

a) Each voter shall be entitled to one vote.

b) They must be allowed to register their vote in the presence of one other elector.

c) They must be allowed to vote in a manner that does not identify them.

3.4. Voting in a referendum

a) The voter should have the opportunity to view a copy of the text of the proposal.

b) A voter should have the opportunity to vote by absent vote, provided sufficient time is given to receive the detailed explanatory information and the referendum guide.

3.5. Acceptability of the text of a referendum

a) The text of the proposal should be placed before the voter, in a manner that permits his/her decision to be considered in the context of the proposal itself.

b) The text of the proposal should be printed in a clear, unambiguous manner.

3.6. Voting in a referendum

a) The voter should be allowed to vote for one side only.

b) They should be able to vote “yes”, “no” or abstain.

c) They should be able to cast a spoiled ballot as a means of protest.

3.7. Voting in a referendum

a) The politician should not have any role in the voting process.

b) The politician should not have any role in the counting of votes.

3.8. Voting in a referendum

a) The voter should be allowed to cast a spoiled ballot as a means of protest.

b) They should be able to vote “yes”, “no” or abstain.

c) They must be allowed to register their vote in the presence of one other elector.

3.9. Voting in a referendum

a) They must be allowed to vote in a manner that does not identify them.

b) The voter should have the opportunity to view a copy of the text of the proposal.

3.10. Voting in a referendum

a) The voter should be allowed to vote for one side only.

b) They should be able to vote “yes”, “no” or abstain.

c) They should be able to cast a spoiled ballot as a means of protest.

3.11. Voting in a referendum

a) The politician should not have any role in the voting process.

b) The politician should not have any role in the counting of votes.

3.12. Voting in a referendum

a) The voter should be allowed to cast a spoiled ballot as a means of protest.

b) They should be able to vote “yes”, “no” or abstain.

c) They must be allowed to register their vote in the presence of one other elector.

3.13. Voting in a referendum

a) They must be allowed to vote in a manner that does not identify them.

b) The voter should have the opportunity to view a copy of the text of the proposal.

3.14. Voting in a referendum

a) The voter should be allowed to vote for one side only.

b) They should be able to vote “yes”, “no” or abstain.

c) They should be able to cast a spoiled ballot as a means of protest.

3.15. Voting in a referendum

a) The politician should not have any role in the voting process.

b) The politician should not have any role in the counting of votes.

3.16. Voting in a referendum

a) The voter should be allowed to cast a spoiled ballot as a means of protest.

b) They should be able to vote “yes”, “no” or abstain.

c) They must be allowed to register their vote in the presence of one other elector.

3.17. Voting in a referendum

a) They must be allowed to vote in a manner that does not identify them.

b) The voter should have the opportunity to view a copy of the text of the proposal.

3.18. Voting in a referendum

a) The voter should be allowed to vote for one side only.

b) They should be able to vote “yes”, “no” or abstain.

c) They should be able to cast a spoiled ballot as a means of protest.

3.19. Voting in a referendum

a) The politician should not have any role in the voting process.

b) The politician should not have any role in the counting of votes.

3.20. Voting in a referendum

a) The voter should be allowed to cast a spoiled ballot as a means of protest.

b) They should be able to vote “yes”, “no” or abstain.

c) They must be allowed to register their vote in the presence of one other elector.

3.21. Voting in a referendum

a) They must be allowed to vote in a manner that does not identify them.

b) The voter should have the opportunity to view a copy of the text of the proposal.
Chapter 6
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Appendix 1
Expenditure on the Information Campaign

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Judges’ Pay</th>
<th>Oireachtas Inquiries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advertising (excluding press)</td>
<td>302,655</td>
<td>302,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal costs</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>13,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press &amp; other public awareness promotions</td>
<td>78,034</td>
<td>78,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal &amp; other distribution costs</td>
<td>97,048</td>
<td>97,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing &amp; design of publications</td>
<td>129,226</td>
<td>129,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other administration costs</td>
<td>6,428</td>
<td>6,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translations</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous (office supplies etc)</td>
<td>4,449</td>
<td>4,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Total Expenditure to date</td>
<td>625,954</td>
<td>632,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Estimates of invoices outstanding</td>
<td>25,750</td>
<td>25,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Expenditure</td>
<td>651,704</td>
<td>658,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original budget</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Surplus to be surrendered</td>
<td>98,296</td>
<td>841,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of which the following has been returned</td>
<td>98,206</td>
<td>840,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance to be returned</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1,542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Subject to Final Accounts
The Commission issued three
national press releases in the
course of the campaign.

1. Referendum Commission launches
public information campaign on the
October 27 referendums

Main points of Judges’ Pay and Oireachtas
Inquiries referendums explained

Tuesday 11 October 2011: The Referendum Commission
has today launched its public information campaign
designed to explain the referendum proposals on
Judges’ Pay and Oireachtas Inquiries in advance of
polling on October 27.

Speaking at the launch, the Chairperson of the
Referendum Commission, Dr Bryan McMahon, said,
“The referendums are on two separate proposals to
make two distinct changes to the Constitution. The
first is on whether the pay of judges can be reduced
in certain circumstances. The second proposes to
give the Houses of the Oireachtas express power
to conduct inquiries into matters of general public
importance and, in doing so, to make findings of fact
about any person’s conduct.”

He said the proposals could be explained briefly
as follows.

If the referendum on Judges’ Pay is passed, the
proposed change to the Constitution would

1. allow for a law to be passed reducing the pay
of judges proportionately if the pay of public
servants is being or has been reduced and that
reduction is stated to be “in the public interest”.
At present the Constitution does not allow for the
reduction of the remuneration of sitting judges.

2. allow for a law to be passed making judges
subject to the “Public Service Pension Levy” and
to any other future similar charge or charges. At
present, Judges pay tax and the Universal Social
Pension Levy, although they can voluntarily
make an equivalent contribution.

The referendums on the Twenty-Ninth and Thirtieth Amendments of the Constitution are important, it was enacted by a vote of the Irish
people in 1937 and can only be changed if the Irish
people vote to change it.”

The Commission has produced more detailed
information for those who wish to know more about
the proposed changes. This is available online at
www.referendum2011.ie. The Commission has a public
information phone line at 1890 270970.

“Our role is to explain the proposals in general
terms”, said Dr McMahon. “Others will seek to
persuade you to vote yes or to vote no to each of the
proposals. You should listen to the debate and then
make up your own mind on how you wish to vote.”

Nationwide distribution of the Commission’s Guide
to the referendums to two million homes began
yesterday and will take ten days to complete. This
guide highlights the main points of the referendums
in a simple way. It gives the current wording of
the relevant parts of the Constitution, and the
proposed new wordings. The other elements of the
Commission’s public information campaign have
also begun with advertising appearing on radio,
television, in newspapers and online giving brief
explanations of the proposals.

In concluding remarks Dr McMahon said: “We
would urge all voters to read the Guide which will
be delivered to their homes over the next ten days.
These are entirely separate proposals, and you
can take a different view on each if that is what
you decide. The most important thing is to inform
yourself and then use your vote. The Constitution
is important, it was enacted by a vote of the Irish
people in 1937 and can only be changed if the Irish
people vote to change it.”

Ends
2. Referendum Commission calls on people to vote in the October 27 referendums

Be Informed: Read the Guide or log on to referendum2011.ie

Tuesday 25 October 2011. The Referendum Commission has urged the electorate to vote in the referendums on Judges’ Pay and Oireachtas Inquiries which take place on Thursday October 27, the same day as the Presidential election.

The Commission, the independent body set up to explain the referendum proposals, said voters should take a few minutes to read its Guide to the referendums which has been distributed to the two million voting households in the State. Alternatively they can read an explanation of the proposals at www.referendum2011.ie.

Dr Bryan McMahon, Chairperson of the Referendum Commission said, “The referendum proposals are straightforward and easy to understand. One is about whether the pay of judges can be reduced in certain circumstances and the other is about the country explains the two referendum proposals in a simple and clear way and also outlines the wording of the proposed amendments to the Constitution.

On polling day people will be handed three ballot papers, one for the Presidential election, one for the Constitutional amendment relating to judges’ remuneration and one for the constitutional amendment relating to Oireachtas Inquiries. People voting in the Dublin West constituency will be given a fourth ballot paper so that they can vote in the bye-election.

Judges’ Pay ballot paper

The ballot paper on Judges’ Pay will ask you if you approve the proposal to amend the Constitution contained in the Twenty-Ninth Amendment of the Constitution (Judges’ Remuneration) Bill 2011. The ballot paper will be green in colour.

If people approve they can mark an ‘X’ in the Tá/Yes square and if they do not approve they can mark ‘X’ in the Níl/No square.

Oireachtas Inquiries ballot paper

The ballot paper on Oireachtas Inquiries will ask if you approve the proposal to amend the Constitution contained in the Thirtieth Amendment of the Constitution (Houses of the Oireachtas Inquiries) Bill 2011. This ballot paper will be blue.

If people approve they can mark an ‘X’ in the Tá/Yes square and if they do not approve they can mark ‘X’ in the Níl/No square.

Referendum on the pay of judges

If the referendum on Judges’ Pay is passed, the proposed change to the Constitution would allow for a law to be passed reducing the pay of judges proportionately if the pay of public servants is being or has been reduced and that reduction is stated to be “in the public interest”. At present the Constitution does not allow for the reduction of the remuneration of sitting judges.

allow for a law to be passed making judges subject to the “Public Service Pension Levy” although they can voluntarily make an equivalent contribution.

Referendum on inquiries by the Oireachtas

The referendum on Oireachtas Inquiries proposes to give the Houses of the Oireachtas (the Dáil and Seanad) express power to conduct inquiries into matters of general public importance and, in doing so, to make findings of fact about any person’s conduct.

At present, the Constitution does not give power to the Houses of the Oireachtas to conduct such inquiries. The proposed change to the Constitution would mean that

1. The Dáil and the Seanad, either separately or together, would have the power to conduct an inquiry into any matter that either or both consider to be a matter of general public importance. Legislation would be required to be introduced to set out the details of how such inquiries would take place.

2. When conducting any such inquiry, either or both Houses would have the power to inquire into the conduct of any person and the power to make relevant findings about that person’s conduct.

3. The Dáil and/or the Seanad would have the power to determine the appropriate balance between the rights of people involved in any such inquiry and the requirements of the public interest. When doing so, they would be obliged to have regard to the principles of fair procedures. These principles have been established by the Constitution and by the Courts.

E nds
3. Referendum Commission statements were accurate, reliable and independent

Statement from Referendum Commission

Sunday October 30: The Referendum Commission has noted comments by the Minister for Public Expenditure and Reform Mr Brendan Howlin concerning the role of the Referendum Commission in the recent referendum campaign.

Mr Howlin refers to a statement which he says was made by the chairperson of the Commission Dr Bryan McMahon. In fact this statement was made by the Referendum Commission itself in fulfilment of its statutory role of giving a general explanation of referendum proposals.

Mr Howlin’s criticism is therefore of the Referendum Commission, which is obliged by law to be independent of Government in its actions and to be neutral in the carrying out of its statutory functions. The membership of the Commission is set down in the Referendum Act. Its Chairman must be a sitting High Court judge, or a retired judge of the Supreme Court or the High Court appointed by the Chief Justice at the request of the Minister for the Environment. Retired High Court judge Dr Bryan McMahon was appointed to chair the Commission for the two referendums that have just taken place. Its other members are: The Ombudsman Emily O’Reilly; the Comptroller and Auditor General John Buckley; the Clerk of the Dáil Mr Kieran Coughlan; and the Clerk of the Seanad Ms Deirdre Lane.

The Commission regrets that Mr Howlin has sought to personalise the issue by criticizing the Commission Chairperson over the Commission’s explanation to voters of the referendum proposal in relation to Oireachtas Inquiries.

In the wake of the referendum outcome, Mr Howlin has referred to an aspect of the Commission’s explanation relating to the referendum on Oireachtas Inquiries. In the relevant part of the Commission’s explanation the Commission said in relation to Oireachtas Inquiries: “that the House or Houses would have discretion as to the procedures to be applied in any given case. The balance struck in any given case may have important implications for people affected by an inquiry. It is not possible to state definitively what role, if any, the courts would have in reviewing the procedures adopted by the Houses.”

This formed part of the statement on the referendum which the Commission is obliged by law to produce. The text was published on our website www.referendum2011.ie. The Chairperson gave a number of media interviews which were based entirely on the Commission’s agreed view.

The statement to which the Minister refers was prepared by the Commission as a whole with the assistance of independent external legal advice. The Commission is absolutely satisfied as to the accuracy and reliability of this statement, and is satisfied that it carried out its duty with the independence and neutrality required by law.

Note to Editors
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1. The membership of the Commission is set down in the Referendum Act. Its Chairman must be a sitting High Court judge, or a retired judge of the Supreme Court or the High Court appointed by the Chief Justice at the request of the Minister for the Environment. Retired High Court judge Dr Bryan McMahon was appointed to chair the Commissions for the two referendums that have just taken place. Its other members are: The Ombudsman Emily O’Reilly; the Comptroller and Auditor General John Buckley; the Clerk of the Dáil Mr Kieran Coughlan; and the Clerk of the Seanad Ms Deirdre Lane.

2. Extract from the Referendum Act 2001

The Commission shall have, in addition to any functions conferred on it by any other provisions of this Act, the following principal functions in relation to the referendum in respect of which it is established

   a) to prepare one or more statements containing a general explanation of the subject matter of the proposal and of the text thereof in the relevant Bill and any other information relating to those matters that the Commission considers appropriate;

   b) to publish and distribute those statements in such manner and by such means including the use of television, radio and other electronic media as the Commission considers most likely to bring them to the attention of the electorate and to ensure as far as practicable that the means employed enable those with a sight or hearing disability to read or hear the statements concerned;

   c) to promote public awareness of the referendum and encourage the electorate to vote at the poll