



Supply and sale of the electoral register

Standard Note: SN/PC/01020

Last updated: 12 August 2014

Author: Isobel White and Alexander Horne

Section: Parliament and Constitution Centre

This note examines the supply and sale of the full and edited versions of the electoral register. The report of the Data Sharing Review, published on 11 July 2008, recommended that the sale of the edited version should not be allowed and therefore the edited register should be abolished. The Political and Constitutional Reform Select Committee (PCR Committee) also recently called for the abolition of the edited register in its report on the Government's proposals for individual electoral registration and other electoral administration provisions. Other organisations, including credit reference agencies, debt collection agencies and direct marketing companies, have argued for the retention of the edited register.

The Government announced during the committee stage of the Electoral Registration and Administration Bill 2012-13 on 25 June 2012 that the edited register will be retained.

This Note provides details of the consultation about the edited register, the recommendation of the PCR Committee and the Government's decision that the sale of the edited register should continue.

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

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

Contents

A.	Background	3
B.	The <i>Robertson</i> judgment	3
C.	The <i>Representation of the People (England and Wales) (Amendment) Regulations 2002</i>	4
D.	Supply of copies of the full register	6
E.	Access to the full and edited registers	7
F.	Sale of copies of the full register	9
G.	Credit Reference Agencies	9
H.	Sale of the edited version of the register	10
I.	www.192.com and B4Usearch.com	10
J.	The report of the Data Sharing Review	12
K.	Consultation on the edited version of the electoral register	12
L.	Early Day Motion calling for retention of the edited register	14
M.	The PCR Committee's recommendation	14
N.	Government's decision to retain the edited register	16
O.	The <i>Electoral Registration and Administration Act 2013</i>	17

A. Background

Copies of the electoral register have been made available for sale in one form or another since at least 1832. Electoral law made provision both for the sale of the register and set the fees charged for providing copies.

After the 1997 General Election the Home Office set up a working party on electoral administration under George Howarth, then minister at the Home Office with responsibility for elections. The full report of the working party was published in October 1999.¹ The Howarth working party examined the sale of the electoral register. The data protection implications of the current position, and the possible effect on the level of registration, were weighed against its usefulness for law enforcement, including measures to prevent money laundering, and the concerns of the companies which use the electoral register. The working party recommended that:

- Electors should be allowed to decide whether their personal details should be included in the register made commercially available (Recommendation 12)
- The full register should continue to be available to electoral users, but a licensing arrangement should be agreed to ensure that its use is restricted to electoral purposes only (Recommendation 13).

The recommendations followed considerable debate in the working party, which concluded that 'in the wider economic interest of the United Kingdom, it would be wrong wholly to withdraw electoral registration data from use commercially.'² The Working Party added that 'the requirements of natural justice require that we should go further and allow the extension of consumer choice to the question of what registration information is sold on commercially.'³

The Howarth working party's recommendations on the sale of the electoral register required primary legislation and Section 9 of the *Representation of the People Act 2000* subsequently amended Schedule 2 to the *Representation of the People Act 1983* to require EROs to compile an edited version of the register which omitted the names of all those electors who had asked for their details not to be included in the version of the register that could be sold to commercial organisations.

B. The Robertson judgment

While the Government was consulting over draft regulations to implement the provisions of the *Representation of the People Act 2000*, an elector in Pontefract, Brian Robertson, requested that his name and address on the electoral register should not be supplied to commercial organisations on privacy grounds. When this was refused, he applied to the High Court for judicial review of the local Electoral Registration Officer's decision. Judgment was given on 16 November 2001.⁴

¹ *Final Report of the Working Party on Electoral Procedures* [Howarth Report], Home Office, October 1999

² *Ibid*, para 2.4.21

³ *Ibid*, para 2.4.23

⁴ [R \(on the application of Robertson\) v City Of Wakefield Metropolitan Council \[2001\] EWHC Admin 915](#)

The judgment held that the refusal of the ERO to accept this request was contrary to the Data Protection Directive and to Article 8 and Article 3 to Protocol 1 of the *European Convention on Human Rights*. Mr Justice Maurice Kay ruled that Mr Robertson was entitled by section 11(1) of the *Data Protection Act 1998* to require the ERO to stop disclosing information about him on the electoral register to commercial concerns which intended to process this for direct marketing purposes. The judge also found that the sale of copies of the register with information about Mr Robertson to commercial concerns, without giving him the opportunity to object, would be incompatible with the Convention and the *Human Rights Act 1998*: without an individual right of objection there was an unjustified, disproportionate restriction on the right to vote.

C. The Representation of the People (England and Wales) (Amendment) Regulations 2002

In May 2002, the Government published a policy paper on the sale of the register, together with new draft regulations.⁵ The consultation document described the broad principles behind the regulations as follows:

- The extent of access to, and supply and sale of, electoral registers must be that which is appropriate having regard to the nature of the data contained in the registers, including in particular that it is personal data compulsorily obtained for the specific purpose of enabling qualifying electors to vote;
- The regulatory framework must be consistent with the requirements of the European Data Protection Directive and the Data Protection Act 1998; and
- That framework must be compliant with the European Convention on Human Rights and thus the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998.

The draft regulations provided for both a full and an edited version of the electoral register to be compiled. The new registration forms to be used for the annual canvass and throughout the year for rolling registration would include an “opt out” box to allow electors to say if they wanted their details left out of the edited version of the register. The edited version would therefore omit the names of those people who had indicated that they wished their names to be excluded from it and would be available for sale without restriction. The consultation document explained the availability of the full version as follows:

The full register is to be available - in terms of access, supply and sale as is appropriate for the purpose - for the following purposes

- to allow qualifying electors to vote which is the primary purpose of the register; and
- for related electoral purposes and to facilitate the democratic process (e.g. to assist candidates and political parties);

⁵ Dep 02/1007, 13 May 2002.

The full register is to be available by way of sale and, as appropriate, supply to public authorities, but only for the purposes of facilitating the discharge of their functions in relation to security, law enforcement and crime prevention, and for statistical and reference purposes;

The full register is to be available by way of sale to private bodies where this is necessary:

- to enable a body to meet its statutory obligations in relation to security, law enforcement and crime prevention; or
- to enable a body to conduct its business in such a manner whereby the public interest benefits clearly outweigh any interference with any Convention rights.

In its response to the consultation document, the Electoral Commission stated its opposition to the principle that the register should be available for sale for commercial purposes:

1. The Commission has previously conveyed its view, in correspondence with the Government, about the issue of principle regarding the access to, and supply and sale of, electoral registers. This is restated here for the avoidance of doubt. **The view of the Commission is that electoral registers should be compiled exclusively for electoral and other limited statutory purposes and that they should not be made available for sale for commercial purposes.** The Commission calls on the Government to reconsider the issue of principle and to restrict the use of the electoral register to electoral purposes alone, together with certain limited statutory purposes.

2. The Commission recognises that the Government puts the sale of electoral registers in its historical context, in that copies of the register have been available for sale in one form or other since the 19th century. However, many circumstances have changed over the years and particularly pertinent are the relatively recent introduction of data protection principles into European law, including in the UK, and the incorporation of the European Convention on Human Rights into UK law. The expansion of mass communications and data processing has meant that the electoral register has been put to uses never previously envisaged. Its sale for direct marketing purposes has led to an individual elector resorting to litigation to protect his data protection and human rights.

3. The personal data contained in the electoral register is obtained compulsorily to enable the register to be compiled. The Commission is concerned about the balance between the rights of individual electors who provided information on this basis and the wider use of the data proposed in the draft Regulations.⁶

The *Representation of the People (England and Wales) (Amendment) Regulations 2002* came into force on 16 October 2002. The regulations made provision for an edited version of the register to be drawn up which omitted the names of those electors who had asked for their details to be excluded from this version. The edited register could be made available for sale without restriction.

⁶ Electoral Commission, *Electoral Registers – Access, Supply and Sale. Response of the Electoral Commission* [Emphasis in original]

D. Supply of copies of the full register

Under the provisions of Part VI of the *Representation of the People Regulations (England and Wales) Regulations 2001*, SI 2001/341, the Electoral Registration Officer **must** supply, free of charge, a copy of the full register on publication to:

- The British Library, the National Library of Wales, the National Library of Scotland, the Office of National Statistics, the Electoral Commission and the Boundary Commissions.
- The Returning Officer for a local government election, the Acting Returning Officer for a Parliamentary election, the Local Returning Officer for a European Parliamentary election

Under the provisions of the *Juries Act 1974* copies of the full register must also be supplied to the courts for the purposes of summoning jurors.

The Electoral Registration Officer must also supply, free of charge, copies of the full register to the following **on request**:

- Elected representatives, including MPs, MEPs, local councillors, Mayor of London and London members of the London Assembly, constituency members of the London Assembly, elected mayors, all within the registration area
- Candidates for election at a Parliamentary, local government, European Parliament or Welsh Assembly election and for election of a mayor under Part II of the *Local Government Act 2000*
- Local constituency parties
- Registered political parties
- The council which appoints the Electoral Registration Officer and any other local authority, such as Parish or Community councils which are part of the ERO's area
- Any police force in Great Britain; the Police Force of Northern Ireland; the National Criminal Intelligence Service, the National Crime Squad, the Police Information Technology Organisation and any body of constables established under an Act of Parliament
- The Security Service; GCHQ and the Secret Intelligence Service.

The Electoral Commission published a useful table showing who is entitled to receive a copy of the full register in Appendix A to its circular 06/2006, *Representation of the (England and Wales) (Amendment) Regulations 2006*.⁷

The standard prohibitions which restrict the use of the full register by these people or organisations i.e. anyone who is supplied with a free copy of the full register, are contained in Regulation 96 of the *Representation of the People (England and Wales) Regulations 2001*. Anyone supplied with a copy of the full register must not supply a copy of it or

⁷ http://www.electoralcommission.org.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0009/47169/EC06-2006-SuppliesaleandinspectionoftheRegisterofElectors_20407-15011__E__N__S__W__.pdf

disclose any information contained in it to any other person, or disclose any information contained in it which is not in the edited version.

Under Regulation 103, *Representation of the People (England and Wales) Regulations 2001*, Members of Parliament can be supplied with a copy of the full electoral register for their constituency; they are subject to these three prohibitions above and may not make use of the information in the full register 'otherwise than for the purposes in connection with the office by virtue of which he is entitled to the full register or for electoral purposes'.⁸ "Electoral purposes" is not defined in the legislation. The Electoral Commission's Circular EC 36/2002 drew the attention of Electoral Registration Officers to this and to the comments of Yvette Cooper, then Parliamentary Secretary at the Lord Chancellor's Department in the debate on the relevant regulations on 11 July 2002:

Fundamental questions were asked about the nature of "electoral purposes". It is a broad concept and it is right to adopt a liberal interpretation of what it means. It should be defined as anything to do with the process of campaigning and getting elected. Fundraising for the purposes of winning elections is part of "electoral purposes" and the regulations cover the circumstances when political parties seek to raise funds. It would be different if money were being raised to buy equipment for a local hospital or other purpose, but fundraising for the core purpose of communicating with voters and campaigning to get elected clearly counts as "electoral purposes".

The regulations apply to the period between elections—we are not talking only about when the gun has been fired and the election campaign is under way—and equally to people who are not members of political parties. If they are standing for election, they should have access to the electoral register for electoral purposes. It would be inappropriate to disadvantage people on the basis of political background or the issues on which they wanted to campaign.

It is right not to pin down "electoral purposes" too narrowly. We do not want to omit anything that counts as an important part of what political parties and those seeking to represent the people in a democracy should be able to do to communicate with voters. Voters themselves should have their human right to participate in free and fair elections recognised. In a democracy, it is crucial to sustain those principles.

E. Access to the full and edited registers

The full electoral register is a public document and it can be made available to any member of the public who wishes to consult it. However this has to be done in person and under supervision at the local electoral services office. It is not possible to make copies of part or all of the register although hand written notes can be made. The 2001 regulations were amended by the *Representation of the People (England and Wales) (Amendment) Regulations 2006* and it is now an offence to use hand written notes (produced by any inspection of the register under supervision) for marketing purposes, unless those persons are also on the edited version of the register.

The Electoral Commission's guidance for Electoral Registration Officers gives advice about making the full register of electors available for consultation by members of the public. The

⁸ Regulation 103, *Representation of the People (England and Wales) Regulations 2001*

guidance also suggests that where EROs are satisfied that library or other council staff can offer an appropriate level of supervision, more copies of the full register can be made available in addition to the one in the electoral services department:

The full register of electors

3.1 The full register must be made available for public inspection, under supervision, at the Electoral Registration Officer's office and at such places, if any, in their registration area that will allow members of the public reasonable facilities for that purpose.

3.2 Electoral Registration Officers have responsibility for the level and nature of supervision of the registers under their control. The regulations are not prescriptive with regard to the method of supervision to allow Electoral Registration Officers flexibility in their provision. Electoral Registration Officers should, however, satisfy themselves that people who inspect the full register are supervised in such a way that it prevents unauthorised copying or theft of all or any part of the register. It may be appropriate to provide training or guidance notes to those staff who will be supervising the register.

3.3 Supervision is designed to discourage large-scale hand-copying of the registers or any other attempt to subvert the rules. It is an offence to make copies of the full register, other than by handwritten notes. It is an offence to use any handwritten notes for marketing purposes.

3.4 Most registers are made available for inspection in paper form, but access may be provided by using an electronic copy of the register. Care must be taken to address the security implications of providing the register for inspection electronically, particularly with regard to preventing a person from downloading, transmitting electronically or printing this information or copying by any other means. Any search facility should be by address only and not by name, as this is specifically prohibited.

3.5 Where Electoral Registration Officers are sufficiently confident that library or other council staff can offer an appropriate level of supervision, more copies can be made available. If electors are accustomed to inspecting the register at a certain place and continue to demand it, Electoral Registration Officers may wish to meet that demand, providing that the supervision requirement can be met. The Electoral Registration Officer should be satisfied that the local authority library to which they supply a copy is able to provide the supervision required. This could be done, for example, by sending a copy of the legislation and obtaining a signed letter or email from the library manager stating that they will follow the requirements. The Electoral Registration Officer might also add a guidance note to accompany the register for library staff. While the librarian, and/or the appropriate supervisor, would be responsible for any failure to apply the legislation, the Electoral Registration Officer may wish to take legal advice if they are concerned that they have not taken the necessary steps to avoid a breach of the regulations.

3.6 Any venue which is not able to meet the inspection requirement should not be given a copy of the full register, nor would it be appropriate to supply the edited register to such locations as this may confuse electors who, on any inspection, find that they are not listed where they have chosen to opt out of their details appearing on the edited register. Libraries and archive units may apply for a copy of the full register and if this is the case they take full responsibility for complying with the rules regarding inspection under supervision.

The edited register of electors

3.7 There are no restrictions on access to the edited register. No supervision is required and so it may be made available for public inspection at any place the Electoral Registration Officer sees fit.⁹

F. Sale of copies of the full register

A copy of the full register can only be sold to those organisations listed in Regulations 113 and 114 of the *Representation of the People (England and Wales) Regulations 2001*. These organisations are:

- Government departments (including the Environment Agency, the Financial Services Authority and any body which carries out the vetting of any person for the purpose of safeguarding national security)
- Credit reference agencies

The standard prohibitions apply to the persons to whom the full register is sold, who must not use the register other than for the purposes set out in the regulations authorising the sale.¹⁰

G. Credit Reference Agencies

Parker's Law and Conduct of Elections notes that:

The registration officer is required to sell a copy of the full register, any notice amending it or the list of overseas electors to a credit reference agency which satisfies the conditions described below on request from the agency and on the conditions described in para 3.136 above and payment of a fee calculated in the manner described in para 3.135 above (regulation 114(1) of the 2001 Regulations, as inserted by regulation 15 of the 2002 Regulations)...The agency must be registered under the *Consumer Credit Act 1974, Part III*, by virtue of section 147 of that Act and carrying on the business of providing credit reference services. The agency carries on such services where it furnishes persons with information relevant to the financial standing of individuals, which is information collected by the agency for the purpose of so furnishing it (regulation 114(5)).

The credit reference agencies purchase the electoral register because it provides proof to lenders that applicants for credit do in fact live at the address given and that they are not attempting to obtain credit fraudulently using a false name and address. There are three main credit reference agencies operating in the United Kingdom; Experian Ltd, Equifax plc and Callcredit plc. Electoral registers are compiled locally and there is not a single register for the whole country. The credit reference agencies therefore have to purchase the

⁹ *Managing electoral registration in Great Britain: guidance for Electoral Registration Officers*, Electoral Commission, 2014. The current version of this guidance is available at: http://www.electoralcommission.org.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0005/160691/ERO-Guidance-Manual-2014.pdf

¹⁰ Regulation 112, *Representation of the People (England and Wales) Regulations 2001*

registers for each area separately and they do this in December each year shortly after the publication of the register following the autumn canvass; they also purchase the monthly updates to the register.

For further information about credit reference agencies see the Library Standard Note SN/BT/4070.¹¹

H. Sale of the edited version of the register

There are no restrictions on the sale of the edited version of the register or on the uses that can be made of it. The Electoral Registration Officer must supply a copy of it to any person on payment of a fee.

The current fees are as follows:

- in data format, £20 plus £1.50 for each 1,000 entries (or remaining part of 1,000 entries) in it
- in printed format, £10 plus £5 for each 1,000 entries (or remaining part of 1,000 entries) in it¹²

I. www.192.com and B4Usearch.com

Since the introduction of the edited version of the register in 2002 it has been possible for electors to tick a box on the annual canvass form to 'opt out' of appearing in the version of the register which is available for sale without restriction to commercial concerns. In theory it is therefore possible for an individual to prevent the sale of their personal details to companies who purchase the edited version of the electoral register. However, websites such as 192.com and B4Usearch.com have been able to circumvent this by using old electoral registers to build their databases because these registers were compiled before the law was changed. Some of the information in the old registers compiled before 2002 may be current.

The companies are not acting illegally by providing this information but they are exploiting a loophole in the regulations as the information was originally provided by the electors before it was possible to 'opt out' of the register which can be sold.

A PQ in April 2006 asked whether companies using the information provided before electors were able to 'opt out' could be prevented from doing so:

Mr. Benyon: To ask the Minister of State, Department for Constitutional Affairs what assessment she has made of the viability of amending the Electoral Administration Bill so that voters who currently opt to appear on the edited version of the register could block third parties using personal details which appear on historic registers which were published only as full versions without the choice to appear on an edited version.

¹¹ Available at: <http://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/research/briefing-papers/SN04070/credit-reference-agencies>

¹² Regulation 110(2) *Representation of the People (England and Wales) Regulations 2001*

Bridget Prentice: The Representation of the People Regulations 2002 provide that electors may opt out of the edited version of the register of electors if they do not want their details to be sold to anyone for any purpose. Any attempt to use legislation to impose a retrospective ban on the use of information derived from pre-2002 electoral registers, though, is likely to be impracticable and unenforceable since this may be provided by commercial organisations based outside of the UK against whom the sanctions of UK law cannot be applied. Electors who do not want their details to be used by commercial organisations may wish to approach the mailing or telephone preference services requesting deletion from company records or publicly available websites or otherwise make a request directly to an individual organisation. If an organisation fails to comply with such a request an elector may pursue the issue with the Information Commissioner's Office.¹³

Following complaints from electors, the Association of Electoral Administrators sought advice from the then Department for Constitutional Affairs on the activities of the website B4Usearch.com and the company's compliance with requests from individuals to remove their personal details from the website. The DCA sent the following reply to the Association on 24 May 2006:

...we have ascertained from the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) that if an organisation offers, as we understand b4u.co.uk has, to comply with requests from individuals to remove those individuals' details from their electoral register-based online directories it would not be within the reasonable expectations of an individual that their data continues to appear on the website in question after they have made a removal request. It is, therefore, the view of the ICO that if b4u.co.uk fails to comply with such a removal request the processing of that individual's personal data could be considered not to be 'fair' for the purposes of the Data Protection Act (DPA). It could thus be considered unlikely that the processing of personal data would be compliant with the first principle of the DPA (which states that "Personal data shall be processed fairly"). In these circumstances the ICO has the power to serve an enforcement notice on the offending organisation in respect of the first principle of the DPA if voluntary compliance is not possible.

The ICO subsequently issued an enforcement notice against the B4Usearch website as the report of the Data Sharing Review published in July 2008 later noted:

In July 2006 - after receiving almost 1600 complaints - the Information Commissioner's Office issued an enforcement notice against the *B4U* website, which offered a free 'people search' facility, using data from the pre-2002 'full' Electoral Roll. Complainants included a police officer whose family's names and address, along with a map to their house, appeared on the website; and an individual who had previously been a victim of identity fraud. Following an investigation, the ICO found that – because of the way that the pre-2002 register had been used – the website did not comply with the first principle of the Data Protection Act.¹⁴

¹³ HC Deb 18 April 2006 c42W

¹⁴ The Data Sharing Review, by Mark Walport and Richard Thomas. Ministry of Justice, July 2008. Available at <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/http://www.justice.gov.uk/docs/data-sharing-review.pdf>, p72

J. The report of the Data Sharing Review

On 11 July 2008 the Ministry of Justice published the report of the Data Sharing Review which had been set up by the Government in December 2007 to examine the operation of the Data Protection Act 1998 and to make recommendations on the powers and sanctions available to the Information Commission and the courts in the legislation governing data sharing and data protection.¹⁵ The authors of the review commented that they had

...focused primarily on the issues surrounding the sharing of personal information that have given rise to recent problems and anxieties: how is data shared? by whom? with what authority? for what purposes? with what protections and safeguards?¹⁶

One of the final recommendations of the review was that:

The Government should remove the provision allowing the sale of the edited electoral register. The edited register would therefore no longer serve any purpose and so should be abolished. This would not affect the sale of the full register to political parties or to credit reference agencies.¹⁷

In making this recommendation the authors of the report said:

In any event, we feel that selling the edited register is an unsatisfactory way for local authorities to treat personal information. It sends a particularly poor message to the public that personal information collected for something as vital as participation in the democratic process can be sold to 'anyone for any purpose'. And there is a belief that the sale of the electoral register deters some people from registering at all. We are sympathetic to the strong arguments made by the Association of Electoral Administrators and the Electoral Commission that the primary purpose of the electoral register is for electoral purposes.¹⁸

K. Consultation on the edited version of the electoral register

In November 2009 the Labour Government announced a consultation on the impact of accepting Recommendation 19 of the Data Sharing Review, in particular the impact the abolition of the edited register would have on businesses, charities and the privacy of individuals. The consultation paper was issued by the Ministry of Justice on 24 November 2009 and set out the arguments for and against abolishing the edited register.¹⁹

The consultation paper was sent to a number of organisations which the Ministry of Justice identified as having an interest in the issue; the paper noted the significant use made of the edited register by credit reference agencies, debt collection agencies and direct marketing companies.²⁰

¹⁵ The Data Sharing Review, by Mark Walport and Richard Thomas. Ministry of Justice, July 2008

¹⁶ Ibid, p1

¹⁷ Ibid, Recommendation 19

¹⁸ Ibid, p 73

¹⁹ *Electoral registers: proposed changes to the edited register*, Ministry of Justice consultation paper [CP 46/09], 24 November 2009

²⁰ *ibid*, p24

The consultation ended on 23 February 2010. The previous Government did not publish the responses it had received; the consultation had ended shortly before the start of the general election campaign. The Electoral Commission supported the abolition of the edited register saying that “electoral registers should be used for purposes exclusively related to elections and referendums”.²¹

The Commission summarised its response to the consultation paper:

- The Commission does not believe that the register should be made available for direct marketing purposes and therefore we do not support the continued existence of the edited version of the electoral register.
- The edited register should be abolished as soon as is practicable –ideally the law should be changed to coincide with the publication of a revised register on 1 December in a given year.
- The abolition of the edited register may provide reassurance for electors at a time when they will – as part of the transition to individual electoral registration - be asked to supply additional personal information when registering to vote.
- If the edited register were to be maintained then as an absolute minimum the Commission believes that the current “opt out” provision should be replaced with one which allows electors to “opt in”, backed up with improved guidance for the public about the edited register.²²

The credit reference agency Experian argued for the retention of the edited register in its response to the consultation paper.²³ Experian disagreed with the suggestion that the edited register discouraged people from registering to vote and gave details of a survey it had carried out about this issue:

Critically the survey of over 28,000 people resulted in 4,600 responses and shows that of those people that do not register, any commercial use of their data is most definitely not the issue. Voter disinterest and apathy accounted for nearly a third of the total with a significant number believing themselves not entitled to register or not registering because they were registered elsewhere or in transit. Voter disinterest was particularly the case for younger people.²⁴

A cross-industry group, which had been formed to consider the credit industry’s response to the consultation paper, also opposed the abolition of the edited register.²⁵

²¹ Electoral Commission [response](#) to the consultation paper *Electoral registers: proposed changes to the edited register*, February 2010

²² *Ibid*

²³ Experian’s response to the consultation paper *Electoral registers: proposed changes to the edited register*, February 2010

²⁴ *Ibid*, p23

²⁵ Credit industry’s response to the consultation paper *Electoral registers: proposed changes to the edited register*, February 2010

L. Early Day Motion calling for retention of the edited register

Early Day Motion 215 tabled on 14 June 2010 called for the retention of the edited register, there were 49 signatories:

That this House believes that the edited electoral register provides very significant social and economic benefits for the UK as a whole; notes that the edited electoral register does this by helping charities to fundraise, helping reunite lost friends and family (including the 3,000 people found by the Salvation Army), locating and connecting organ and bone marrow donors, enabling adoption organisations to find biological parents of adoptive children, and assisting businesses provide age verification, to reduce credit card fraud, minimise identity theft, pursue bad debts, repatriate dormant financial assets to their rightful owners, and support probate; and opposes all steps which might further significantly restrict access to or abolish the edited electoral register.²⁶

M. The PCR Committee's recommendation

The Political and Constitutional Reform Committee examined the Government's proposals for individual electoral registration and other electoral administration matters and published a report on 4 November 2011. The Committee considered evidence about the different ways of encouraging people to register to vote and noted that electoral administrators believed the sale of the edited register discouraged people from registering to vote.²⁷ The Electoral Commission and the Association of Electoral Administrators both reiterated in their written evidence to the Committee their support for the abolition of the edited register.

The Committee received written evidence in support of retaining the edited register. 192.com stated that it welcomed the introduction of individual electoral registration and argued that:

the Edited Register has significant social and economic benefits. Businesses rely on it to verify potential suppliers and customers, tackle credit card fraud, meet obligations where supplying age-restricted goods or when tracing debtors. For charities, it helps reunite lost friends and families (including 3,000 found annually by the Salvation Army), underpins locating and connecting organ donors, locating natural parents of adoptees and supports fundraising. Local government relies on it for purposes not permitted with the Full Register such as debt recovery. Individuals rely on it for finding lost family members and for building trust in strangers that they are about to transact with.

6. The introduction of IER offers an important opportunity to enhance the collection and administration of voter registration and, concomitantly, improve the Edited Register by ensuring citizens are given an annual choice on whether to opt-out and improving consent through standardised guidance.²⁸

²⁶ <http://www.parliament.uk/edm/2010-12/215>

²⁷ Political and Constitutional Reform Committee, *Individual Electoral Registration and electoral administration*, HC 1463, 2010-12, para 42

²⁸ [Written evidence](#) submitted to the PCR Committee by 192.com

192.com also cited research which it had commissioned from Europe Economics which found that there would be "very considerable adverse economic effects together with social impact" if the Edited Register were abolished.²⁹

The Political and Constitutional Reform Committee recommended that the edited register should be abolished:

41. The edited register is available for general sale and is used by organisations for commercial activities, such as marketing, as well as by the political parties for campaigning. Electors who do not want their details to appear on the edited register need to opt out. The Ministry of Justice consulted on the future of the edited register in 2009-10; the Government's response to the consultation has not been published, possibly due to the change of Government in 2010.

42. The Electoral Commission and the Association of Electoral Administrators have both called for the publication of the edited register to cease. A 2008 survey conducted by the Local Government Association and the AEA found that "almost 9 in 10 electoral officers surveyed believed that the practice of selling the electoral register discouraged people from registering to vote".[41]

43. Some businesses, notably direct marketing agencies, rely on the edited electoral register to identify and access customers. In their written evidence to us 192.com, a people-finding website, stated that the edited register brings significant benefits to businesses and charities.[42] The Credit Services Association, which also incorporates the Debt Buyers and Sellers Group (DBSG), states that use of the full electoral register should be made available to debt collection agencies, as "not all financial crime occurs at the point credit is granted ... use of the register should be permitted throughout the lifetime of the agreement".[43] We thoroughly disagree with the CSA's proposal. Whatever benefit it might bring, we cannot justify the sale to commercial organisations of personal details gathered by the Government for electoral purposes. The Electoral Commission has suggested that if Government decides to keep the edited register that it should be changed to an opt in system, instead of opt out. We suspect that this option might well make the edited register too incomplete to be of much use. **We recommend that the edited register should be abolished.**³⁰

The Government published its response to the Political and Constitutional Reform Committee's report on 9 February 2012.³¹

There was no announcement of a decision about the sale of the register and the Government indicated that the matter was still under consideration:

The Government is aware of and considering the finely balanced arguments on the future of the edited electoral register. The Government takes the handling of personal information seriously and is committed to working to maximise registration rates. This needs to be balanced against the potential economic impact of abolishing the edited

²⁹ *Ibid*

³⁰ Political and Constitutional Reform Committee, *Individual Electoral Registration and electoral administration*, HC 1463, 2010-12

³¹ Government response to pre-legislative scrutiny and public consultation on Individual Electoral Registration and amendments to Electoral Administration law, [Cm 8245](#), February 2012

register. The Government's approach to this issue is currently under consideration in the context of the wider access regime for the electoral registers.³²

N. Government's decision to retain the edited register

The *Electoral Registration and Administration Bill 2012-13* (now the *Electoral Registration and Administration Act 2013*) made no provision for the abolition of the edited register. The Chairman of the Political and Constitutional Reform Committee, Graham Allen, pressed the Government for further information on its position on the edited register during the second day of the committee stage of the Bill:

When my Committee conducted its pre-legislative scrutiny of the Bill, it recommended the abolition of the edited electoral register. We did not feel that it was appropriate for personal details gathered by the Government for electoral purposes to be sold to commercial organisations. Sadly, on this occasion the Government did not accept our recommendation, and that is why I am pressing the Minister tonight. I want to understand this thinking and to establish whether he wishes to think about the issue further, either now or at a later stage. The Government did, however, say in their response that they were

“aware of and considering the finely balanced arguments on the future of the edited electoral register.”

My Committee feels that while the edited version of the register continues, it is important for people who are being invited to register to realise that it may be sold—I am sure that many do not know that—and that it could be used for commercial purposes. It is also important for them to know exactly how they can opt out of the edited register.

I hope that the Minister will take the opportunity to respond to the points that I have made, and to tell us whether he has had any further thoughts of the sort that he outlined in his initial response to my Committee.³³

The Minister, Mark Harper, confirmed later in the debate that the Government had decided that the edited version of the register should be retained:

We have discussed whether it should be abolished with interested parties on both sides of the debate and received numerous representations. The previous Government consulted, but did not have the opportunity to take a decision before leaving office. There are those, particularly in the electoral community, including the Electoral Commission, who argue that having an edited register acts as a disincentive to people registering, but we have seen no convincing evidence of that. On the other side of the argument, some argue that it provides significant wider social and economic benefits, and in the previous Government's consultation, 7,447 of about 7,600 responses favoured the edited register's retention for those reasons. On balance—it is a finely balanced decision—the Government believe that keeping the edited register from which voters can choose to opt out is the right decision. I know it

³² *Ibid*, para 173

³³ HC Deb 25 June 2012 c93

will be disappointing to some and welcomed by others, but that is the decision the Government have made.³⁴

O. The *Electoral Registration and Administration Act 2013*

As noted above, the [*Electoral Registration and Administration Act 2013*](#) (which introduced individual electoral registration) did not change the arrangements for the sale of the electoral register.³⁵

³⁴ *Ibid*, c101

³⁵ For more details about individual electoral registration under the Act, see: House of Commons Library Standard Note 6764, [*Individual Electoral Registration*](#)