

(No. 19.)

1928

TASMANIA

THE PARLIAMENT OF TASMANIA

REPORT ON GENERAL ELECTION

30th MAY, 1928

WITH STATISTICS OF OTHER ELECTIONS HELD IN  
TASMANIA FROM 1903 TO 1928

BY

D'ARCY W. ADDISON, C.M.G., I.S.O., M.V.O., Chief Electoral Officer for the  
State of Tasmania

*Presented to both Houses of Parliament by His Excellency's Command*



Tasmania:

JOHN VAIL, GOVERNMENT PRINTER, HOBART

1928

**REPORT ON GENERAL ELECTION HELD ON THE  
30th MAY, 1928.**

*Office of Chief Electoral Officer for the State,*

*Hobart, 24th September, 1928.*

SIR,

I HAVE the honour to submit my report on the General Election held on the 30th May, 1928.

Parliament was dissolved by His Excellency the Governor on the 16th April, 1928, and the following dates were fixed in connection with the Election:—

Issue of writs . . . . .	20th April, 1928.
Nominations . . . . .	2nd May, 1928.
Poll . . . . .	30th May, 1928.
Writs returned . . . . .	15th June, 1928.

The number of nominations received totalled 72, the candidates being distributed throughout the five Divisions as follows:—

Bass . . . . .	14
Darwin . . . . .	12
Denison . . . . .	17
Franklin . . . . .	16
Wilmot . . . . .	13
Total . . . . .	72

This number represents a decrease of two candidates as compared with 1925, and five as compared with the 1922 General Election. At the 1928 Election 12 candidates lost their deposits, which is five less than the previous Election.

The following figures, which are dealt with in detail in the various tables accompanying this report, indicate the total enrolment for the State and the voting for each Division, as follows:—

Division.	Electors Enrolled.	Total No. of Votes Recorded.
Bass . . . . .	22,292	17,764
Darwin . . . . .	23,012	19,373
Denison . . . . .	22,654	18,950
Franklin . . . . .	22,968	18,646
Wilmot . . . . .	21,030	16,946
Total . . . . .	111,956	91,679

This table shows a higher number of votes recorded than at any previous State Election, and that the percentage of votes cast upon the basis of the electors enrolled was 81.9. The percentage of informal votes, 3.24, is the highest since 1919, being over 1 per cent. above the 1925 figures and 2.27 per cent. above those of 1916. A return showing the percentage of the chief classes of informality in each division is submitted herewith.

5817 absent votes were recorded, of which 5604 were valid. 1154 postal votes were received. In both cases this represents an increase as compared with the 1925 Election, the increase in postal votes amounting to approximately 50 per cent.

Votes recorded under Section 116 (a), which deals with errors and omissions in the roll, were not so numerous on this occasion as compared with the previous General Election. This may be taken as an indication that the rolls were in a good state, and consequently reduced the necessity of having recourse to the provisions of this section.

Attention is drawn to the appended Tables 8, 9, and 10, which furnish an analysis of the votes cast under the above headings.

The number of polling-places open throughout the State totalled 456, which is eight more than were required at the last General Election and 1173 officials were engaged in dealing with the requirements of the Election.

An opportunity was taken of conferring with the divisional returning officers regarding the publication of polling-place details, and their unanimous opinion, after the most careful consideration, was to the effect that the publication of polling-place details tends to violate the secrecy of the ballot. It is therefore strongly urged that the practice followed by the Commonwealth, in only publishing divisional totals, be adopted by the State.

In the early stages of the Election the opportunity was taken to personally examine the conditions in the whole of the electoral divisions. As a result of such inspection, expert assistance was provided in divisions where it was anticipated that keen contests would be experienced. Care was also taken to place in the hands of the divisional returning officers, at an early date, such material and equipment as was required in the conduct of the Election. This provided these officers with the opportunity of concentrating on matters of organisation and administration, and it is pleasing to note that, having secured a record poll, no hitch of any importance occurred. I have to express my appreciation of the efficiency and care displayed in this connection by all concerned.

At the termination of the Election a conference of the whole of the divisional returning officers was held, at which matters of administration and legislation requiring adjustment were fully discussed, and, as a result of this conference, recommendations have been made to provide amended legislation for the improvement of the working of the electoral system. The principal recommendations are as follows:—

*Simplification of Postal Voting.*—In the recent amendments made by the Federal Government, under the provisions of the Commonwealth Electoral Act, it has been provided that it is only necessary for an elector to witness an application for a postal vote certificate, and the authorised witness to witness the elector's signature on the postal vote certificate. It was recommended by the conference that this practice be adopted in future State Elections. Under State legislation an authorised witness is required to witness the elector's signature on an application for a postal vote certificate as well as on the postal vote certificate.

It was also recommended that the use of printed ballot-papers be permitted after the receipt of nominations. This will greatly facilitate the working of this section, and will bring State operations into line with those of the Commonwealth.

*Assistance to Persons Physically Incapacitated.*—As provision has been made under Section 117 for assistance to persons who are physically incapacitated in voting as ordinary voters, it has been suggested that assistance should be granted to the electors similarly incapacitated when voting as postal voters. The amendment which has been submitted will, if adopted, give effect to this recommendation.

Section 155 (a) of the Electoral Act provides that persons shall not exhibit or leave in the polling-booth any card or paper having thereon any direction or instruction as to how an elector should vote or to the method of voting. Under the Commonwealth Act an illiterate voter is permitted to take into the booth, and to exhibit to the presiding officer, a marked card, in order to assist him in voting, and it is recommended that similar provision be made in the State Act.

I desire to record my high appreciation and thanks for the valuable services rendered by the Deputy Chief Electoral Officer (Mr. C. A. Blakney), and the Divisional Returning Officers for Bass (Mr. A. J. Simmons), Darwin (Mr. N. J. Warmbrunn), Denison (Mr. L. Ainsworth), Franklin (Mr. E. A. J. Benjafield), and Wilmot (Mr. A. R. Cooke), mainly to whose efforts can be attributed the successful conduct of the Election.

Statistical tables compiled by the Deputy-Statistician (Mr. L. F. Giblin), together with his observations in relation to various phases of the Election, are appended hereto.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

D. W. ADDISON,

Chief Electoral Officer.

The Honourable the Chief Secretary.

STATISTICAL TABLES—GENERAL ELECTION, 30<sup>TH</sup> MAY, 1928. (WITH COMPARISONS WITH PREVIOUS ELECTIONS.)

TABLE 1.—*Electors, Voters, and Informal Votes—General Election, 30th May, 1928.*

	Estimated Population 31st March, 1928.	Electors on Roll.		Votes Recorded.		Informal Votes.		Valid Votes Recorded.
		Number.	Per 1000 of Population.	Number.	Percentage on Electors.	Number.	Percentage on Votes Recorded.	
Bass.....	40,910	22,292	545	17,764	79·7	691	3·38	17,163
Darwin.....	46,950	23,012	490	19,373	84·2	628	3·24	18,745
Denison.....	40,210	22,654	563	18,950	83·7	519	2·74	18,431
Franklin.....	43,360	22,968	530	18,646	81·2	527	2·83	18,119
Wilmot.....	40,610	21,030	518	16,946	80·6	698	4·12	16,248
Total.....	212,040	111,956	528	91,679	81·9	2973	3·24	88,706

The number of votes recorded is the number of votes, formal and informal, that were admitted to the scrutiny. Up to 1922 this number did not differ much from the number of ballot-papers issued, but in 1928, as in 1925 and 1922, owing to amendments of the Act and regulations, a large number of persons filled in voting-papers on the strength of their claim that their names should be on the roll. In the majority of cases this claim was not sustained, and the vote was disallowed. These attempted votes are not counted as "votes recorded" in the above and subsequent tables.

TABLE 2.—*Comparative Summary.—State General Elections since 1916.*

	30th May 1928.	3rd June, 1925.	10th June, 1922.	31st May, 1919.	25th March, 1916.
<b>Electors on Roll—</b>					
Male.....	55,058	56,667	51,958	53,295	54,466
Female.....	56,898	58,234	55,591	54,336	52,855
Total.....	111,956	114,901	110,549	107,541	107,321
Males—per cent. of total.....%	49·2	49·3	49·7	49·5	50·8
Electors per 1000 of population.....	528	542	514	529	576
<b>Votes Recorded:—</b>					
Male.....	46,769	41,322	38,457	37,037	41,427
Female.....	44,910	35,959	31,295	34,027	37,557
Total.....	91,679	77,281	69,752	71,064	78,984
Males—per cent. of total.....%	51·0	53·5	55·1	52·1	52·5
<b>Voters—Percentage to Electors on Roll:—</b>					
Male.....%	84·94	72·92	70·0	69·6	76·06
Female.....%	78·94	61·75	56·3	62·6	71·05
Total.....%	81·90	67·26	63·1	66·1	73·10
Valid votes recorded.....	88,706	75,567	67,918	68,250	74,514
<b>Informal Votes.—</b>					
Number.....	2973	1714	1834	2814	4470
Percentage to votes recorded.....%	3·24	2·22	2·63	3·96	5·66
Number of candidates.....	72	74	77	57	46
Number of deposits forfeited.....	12	17	19	4	3
Number of members elected at first count.....	7	6	2	13	11
Total number of counts.....	452	381	439	264	117
Greatest number of counts for one division.....	126	118	160	126	54

The number of electors on the roll is 3000 less than in 1925, though greater than at any previous election. The decrease in population in the three years was only about 2000, of which adults would form not much more than half. It may be inferred, therefore, that the rolls in 1925 were inflated by about 2000 compared with 1928. The numbers on the roll in 1928 appear to correspond very closely with the adult population of the State.

The percentage of electors who voted was 85 per cent. for men, 79 per cent. for women, and 82 per cent. for all voters. The highest percentages previously recorded were 73 per cent. in 1916 and 1912. In 1925 only 67 per cent. voted. The high proportion in 1928 may be put down to the institution of compulsory voting at the last Federal election, when, in Tasmania, 89 per cent. voted, compared with 46 per cent. at the previous Federal election. Compulsory voting at the Federal election no doubt broke the ice for many electors, and, in addition, there was a widespread impression that voting was compulsory at the State election also. The increase in women voters was very much greater than the increase in men.

There were 2973 informal votes, 3·24 per cent., compared with 1714, or 2·22 per cent., in 1925. This great increase in informalities may be taken to reflect the inexperience, and possibly also the lower intelligence or interest, of the electors who voted by supposed compulsion.

The number of candidates, 72, and the number of counts, 126, differ little from those numbers in 1925.

Women electors were slightly in a majority, 51 per cent., but women voters to the same degree in a minority, 49 per cent.

TABLE 3.—*Electors on Roll and Voters—Last Four General Elections.*

Electors on Roll—Males.					Voters—Male.			
	1928.	1925.	1922.	1919.	1928.	1925.	1922.	1919.
Bass.....	10,406	10,583	11,184	10,636	8,722	7,806	7,698	7,118
Darwin.....	12,195	12,174	9,459	10,203	10,573	9,226	6,721	7,319
Denison.....	10,009	11,075	12,895	11,319	8,607	8,257	9,166	8,288
Franklin.....	11,634	11,918	12,172	11,837	9,840	8,457	8,415	8,187
Wilmot.....	10,814	10,917	9,248	9,210	9,027	7,576	6,457	6,125
Total	55,058	56,667	54,958	53,205	46,769	41,322	38,457	37,037

  

Electors on Roll—Females.					Voters—Female.			
	1928.	1925.	1922.	1919.	1928.	1925.	1922.	1919.
Bass.....	11,886	11,768	12,174	11,741	9,042	7,401	6,615	7,025
Darwin.....	10,817	10,845	8,033	8,385	8,800	7,006	4,300	5,306
Denison.....	12,645	13,589	15,597	14,300	10,343	8,764	9,690	9,689
Franklin.....	11,334	11,575	10,683	10,688	8,806	6,549	5,501	6,480
Wilmot.....	10,216	10,457	9,104	9,222	7,919	6,239	5,189	5,527
Total	56,898	58,234	55,591	54,336	44,910	35,959	31,295	34,027

  

Electors on Roll—Both Sexes.					Voters—Both Sexes.			
	1928.	1925.	1922.	1919.	1928.	1925.	1922.	1919.
Bass.....	22,292	22,351	23,358	22,377	17,764	15,207	14,313	14,143
Darwin.....	23,012	23,019	17,492	18,588	19,373	16,232	11,021	12,625
Denison.....	22,654	24,664	28,492	25,619	18,950	17,021	18,856	17,977
Franklin.....	22,968	23,493	22,855	22,525	18,646	15,066	13,916	14,667
Wilmot.....	21,030	21,374	18,352	18,432	16,946	13,815	11,646	11,652
Total	111,956	114,901	110,549	107,541	91,679	77,281	69,752	71,064

The result of the alteration of the boundaries of electoral districts, which came into operation for the 1925 election, is shown in the more equal numbers in the five districts. In the 1922 election the largest number of electors in a district exceeded the smallest by 63 per cent.; in 1928 the greatest excess was less than 10 per cent. Darwin and Franklin have now most electors, and Wilmot fewest.

TABLE 4.—*Percentage of Electors Voting at General Elections since 1909.*

General Election.	Percentage of Electors Voting.		
	Male.	Female.	Total.
State, 30.4.1909.....	60.7	43.7	52.6
Federal, 13.4.1910.....	64.8	51.5	58.5
Referendum, 26.4.1911.....	61.3	51.6	56.7
State, 30.4.1912.....	77.0	69.7	73.5
State, 23.1.1913.....	n	n	67.2
Federal, 31.5.1913.....	79.0	70.8	75.0
Federal, 5.9.1914.....	81.3	73.7	77.6
State, 25.3.1916.....	76.1	71.0	73.6
Federal, 5.5.1917.....	82.0	70.0	76.0
State, 31.5.1919.....	69.6	62.6	66.1
Federal, 13.12.1919.....	65.1	52.3	58.7
State, 10.6.1922.....	70.0	56.3	63.1
Federal, 16.12.1922.....	53.4	38.0	45.6
State, 3.6.1925.....	72.9	61.8	67.3
Federal, 14.11.1925.....	89.5	88.0	88.7
State, 30.5.1928.....	84.9	78.9	81.9

The above table, giving the percentage of electors who exercised the franchise at all general elections, both State and Federal, since 1909, indicates roughly the rise and fall of political interest among the electors up to 1925. The proportion of voters, on the whole, increased greatly from 1909 to 1914, remained steady until 1917, then fell away until 1922, but shows some recovery in 1925. Both its rise and fall are much more pronounced in the case of women than of men. The proportions for the last two elections are dominated by Federal compulsory voting.

## REPRESENTATION OF PARTIES IN DIVISIONS.

There were two outstanding features of the 1928 election. The parties by any reckoning were almost equal in number; and the allegiance of a considerable number of electors to any party was very loose. Under these circumstances, a result of 15 members to each party, or 16 to 14 either way, was equally possible. The determining factor would probably be the personal strength of the individual candidates on either side. This will manifest itself in the transfer of later preferences to the opposite party and the number of votes lost to a party by exhaustion. A further complicating factor is the relative size of the unrepresented minorities of each party in all divisions put together. These various factors may be considered separately.

The first point to settle is the political allegiance of the 72 candidates. Of these, 26 described themselves as Nationalist, 35 as Labour, 10 as Independent, and 1 as Independent Labour. It is necessary to class the Independents and verify the others from the evidence of the voting-papers.

In Bass there were eight Nationalist and six Labour candidates. There was little cross-voting and no great exhaustion of votes which affected party representation.

In Darwin the position was equally clear. There were six Labour candidates, five Nationalist, and one Independent, who was evidently regarded as a Nationalist in the transfer of votes. His No. 1 preferences may therefore be counted as Nationalist.

In Denison the position was a little more involved. There were five Nationalist and eight Labour candidates, three Independents, and one Independent Labour. Of the Independents, Mr. Graham may be classed as Labour, because 80 per cent. of his votes were transferred to Labour candidates. The other two, Mr. McHugo and Mr. Stamford, by the same test, appear as equally divided between Labour and Nationalist. Half their No. 1 preferences are therefore ascribed to each party. The Independent Labour candidate, Mr. Mahoney, was not "cut up," but a full analysis of his papers has been made, and is given on page 19, from which it appears that he could not be distinguished from an official Labour candidate.

In Franklin there is greater difficulty in interpreting the No. 1 preferences. There were four Nationalist candidates, eight Labour, and four Independent. The four Independent candidates were predominantly Nationalist, and are counted as such, but they appeared to receive apparently more Labour support in the transfer of votes than the average Nationalist candidate. The same was true of Sir John Evans, an avowed Nationalist. There was, in general, considerably more than the usual amount of cross-voting, and, particularly on the Labour side, the party allegiance was loose. Consequently the score of the No. 1 preferences for Labour over-estimates the real Labour strength in the division.

For Wilmot there were seven Labour candidates, four Nationalist, and two Independent. One Independent, Mr. Cameron, was evidently considered by the electors as a Nationalist, and his No. 1 preferences are counted as Nationalist votes. The other Independent, Mr. McShane, was apparently regarded as of no party, and his No. 1 preferences are divided between parties in proportion to the next available choice on his papers when he was excluded. Here, as in Franklin, party allegiance was weak on the Labour side, but manifested itself in the number of votes lost by exhaustion rather than in cross-voting.

With the allotment of candidates, as indicated in the above paragraphs, we get the following totals for the No. 1 preferences cast for the two parties.

TABLE 5.—Party Strength as Indicated by No. 1 Preferences, 1928.

Division.	Number of 1st Choices.		Number of Quotas and Seats Won.	
	Nationalist.	Labour.	Nationalist.	Labour.
Bass .....	7795	9368	{ 3·18 3	{ 3·82 3
Darwin .....	9987	8758	{ 3·73 3	{ 3·27 3
Denison.....	8088	10,343	{ 3·07 3	{ 3·98 3
Franklin .....	10,233	7886	{ 3·95 4	{ 3·05 2
Wilmot .....	7801	8447	{ 3·36 3	{ 3·64 3
Total .....	43,904	44,802	{ 17·29 16	{ 17·71 14

NOTE.—The upper line of bracketed numbers gives the number of quotas of first choices, and the lower line the seats actually won.

The electoral law provides that a seat shall be allotted to each complete quota of votes in each division. In Bass, Darwin, and Wilmot there were three complete quotas in each party, indicated by the No. 1 preferences, and the result of three members to each party was never in doubt. In Denison and Franklin the position was not so clear. In Denison the Nationalists only just obtained three quotas (3·07) of No. 1 preferences, and in Franklin, Labour, in the same way, only just obtained three quotas (3·05). In this critical position, in order that the respective parties should obtain their three members, they could not afford to lose any votes on the balance by cross-voting or by exhaustion of ballot-papers. In Denison the Nationalists fulfilled this condition. The losses in transfer due to cross-voting exactly balanced on the two sides, and the losses by exhaustion,

which were small during the critical part of the count, also balanced almost exactly. The Nationalists accordingly won the three seats indicated by their three quotas of No. 1 preferences. In Franklin, on the other hand, Labour did not fulfil the necessary conditions for getting the three seats indicated by No. 1 preferences. In exhaustion of votes Labour gained 106 on balance, chiefly on account of the large number of Mr. Murdoch's papers (231) that were exhausted when he was excluded. But by cross-voting, which was very rife in Franklin, Labour lost 607 votes, whereas the Nationalists lost only 394, giving a net loss of 213 votes, which were also a gain to the opposite party. The operations of the scrutiny may be summarised thus:—

	<i>Nationalist Votes.</i>		<i>Labour Votes.</i>	
No. 1 preferences ... ..	4 quotas	less 123	...	3 quotas plus 119
Loss by exhaustion... ..		less 285	...	less 181
Loss by fractions ... ..		less 33	...	less 56
	<hr/>			<hr/>
Net gain and loss by cross-voting ... ..	4 quotas	less 441	...	3 quotas less 118
		plus 213	...	less 213
	<hr/>			<hr/>
Final result ... ..	4 quotas	less 228	...	3 quotas less 331

In the final result Labour were 103 votes further behind in getting their third quota than the Nationalists in getting their fourth quota. The last seat, therefore, went to the Nationalists.

This result does not tally with the indications given by the No. 1 preferences, but it must be remembered that the No. 1 preferences are only a guide on the assumption that cross-voting will be approximately equal on each side. Where the claim to a seat is fairly equal on the first preferences, and one party votes much more "solidly" than the other, the solid-voting party will gain the seat, even if the original figures were slightly against it. The No. 1 preferences of the other party have really a smaller average value—something less than one—because of the tendency of its supporters to give later preferences to candidates of the other party.

A comparison with previous years in respect to the quotas of No. 1 preferences and the seats won for each party in each division is given in the following table:—

TABLE 6.—Party Strength as Indicated by No. 1 Preferences, 1913-1928.  
Quotas of No. 1 Preferences and Seats Actually Won.

Division.	1913		1916		1919		1922		1925		1928		
	Non-Labour.	Labour.	Non-Labour.	Labour.	Non-Labour.	Labour.	Non-Labour.	Labour.	Non-Labour.	Labour.	Non-Labour.	Labour.	
Bass.....	Quotas .....	3.48	3.52	3.27	3.73	4.35	2.65	3.65	2.77*	3.30	3.70	3.18	3.82
	Seats won .....	3	3	3	3	4	2	3	2	3	3	3	3
Darwin ...	Quotas .....	3.43	3.57	3.45	3.55	3.68	3.32	3.95	3.05	3.40	3.60	3.73	3.27
	Seats won .....	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Denison ...	Quotas .....	3.64	3.36	3.53	3.47	3.90	3.10	4.22	2.78	3.00	4.00	3.07	3.93
	Seats won .....	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	4	3	3
Franklin...	Quotas .....	3.93	3.07	3.62	3.38	3.86	3.14	4.29	2.71	3.44	3.56	3.95	3.05
	Seats won .....	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	2	3	3	4	2
Wilmot ...	Quotas .....	4.46	2.54	4.26	2.74	4.89	2.11	5.08	1.92	3.77	3.23	3.36	3.64
	Seats won .....	4	2	4	2	4	2	4	2	3	3	3	3
All .....	Quotas .....	18.94	16.06	18.13	16.87	20.68	14.32	21.19	13.23	16.91	18.09	17.29	17.71
	Seats won .....	16	14	16	14	17	13	17	12*	14	16	16	14

\* Omitting the votes for one Independent candidate, who was elected for Bass.

NOTE.—The boundaries of divisions were altered between the 1922 and 1925 elections.

In 1928, as pointed out above, Labour, with just three (3.07) quotas of No. 1 preferences in Franklin, failed to win the third seat. From the above table it will be seen that the only time that this happened before was in 1922. In Wilmot the non-Labour parties had 5.08 quotas, but failed to win the fifth seat. In Denison, at the same election, there was a still greater discrepancy between first choices and seats. The non-Labour parties, with a much greater margin, 4.22 quotas, won only three seats. In both cases the cause was cross-voting to the Labour party, or, in other words, that a No. 1 choice for non-Labour was not a solid vote, and its average value was less than one.

## REPRESENTATION OF PARTIES IN THE STATE.

It has been always recognised that the present system of voting, while giving proportional representation in divisions as exactly as the number of members will allow, may occasionally fail to give exactly true representation for the State as a whole. If the unrepresented fractional quotas for each division, when added up for all divisions, are appreciably greater for one party than for the other, it may possibly result in under-representation by one member of the first party for the whole State, and corresponding over-representation by the other.

When parties are very equally divided, so that accurate representation would be 15 members on each side, it is possible that the results will give 16 to 14, and the party with 16 members may be the party which was slightly in the minority in the whole State.

In the seven previous elections under the present law this did not happen; but in the 1928 election the anomaly has occurred. In the table given on page 7 it will be seen that there was a moderate surplus for Labour in Wilmot, balanced by a Nationalist surplus in Darwin, but in the three other divisions there was a particularly big surplus for Labour. The fractional quotas unrepresented added up to 3.71 quotas for Labour and only 1.29 quotas for the Nationalists. If we take the total number of No. 1 preferences for each party, as arrived at above, and divide 30 members in proportion, we get the following allotment of seats due to parties and seats actually won.

*Representation of Parties in Proportion to No. 1 Preferences, and Seats Won.*

	No. 1 Preferences.	Seats in Proportion.	Seats Actually Won.
Nationalist ... ..	43,904 ...	14.85 ...	16
Labour ... ..	44,802 ...	15.15 ...	14

These figures suggest that the minority party has obtained the majority of seats; but that inference cannot fairly be made. As shown in the analysis above (page 7), the No. 1 preferences for Labour have to be discounted for not being full Labour votes, on account of the greater tendency of those reckoned Labour voters to cross-vote to the other party. Allowance for this just about cancels the small apparent Labour majority indicated by the No. 1 preferences. The parties, in fact, on the evidence of the votes were, as nearly as can be measured, equal in voting strength. The anomaly is that when two parties were practically equal, one should have obtained 16 seats and the other 14.

This anomaly is due to the unrepresented fractional remainders, and the possibility of it is inherent in the present electoral law. It can only be made impossible by the adoption of the uniform quota. (For the method of the uniform quota see Report on General Election, 1913, pp. 22-24, and for its adaptation to Tasmanian conditions, and the present method of voting, see the Report and Progress Report of the Select Committee on the Tasmanian Electoral Amendment Bill, 1914, House of Assembly Papers, No. 12 of 1915-16, and No. 31 of 1914-15.)

It must be remembered, however, that the irregularities in the present system are not great, and happen only occasionally; and are insignificant in comparison with the irregularities in the old system of single-seat electorates.

A comparison between the number of seats due to parties, on the basis of No. 1 preferences and seats actually won, is given for all elections held under the present law in the following table:—

TABLE 7.—*Representation of Parties for the Whole State, 1909-1928.**Seats in Proportion to No. 1 Preferences, and Seats Actually Won.*

		Non-Labour.	Labour.			Non-Labour.	Labour.
1909.....	Proportionate share .....	18.31	11.69	1919.....	Proportionate share .....	17.56	12.44
	Actually won .....	18	12		Actually won .....	17	13
1912.....	Proportionate share .....	16.35	13.65	1922.....	Proportionate share .....	18.07	11.42*
	Actually won .....	16	14		Actually won .....	17	12
1913.....	Proportionate share .....	15.78	13.80*	1925.....	Proportionate share .....	14.42	15.58
	Actually won .....	16	14		Actually won .....	14	16
1916.....	Proportionate share .....	15.46	14.54	1928.....	Proportionate share .....	14.85	15.15
	Actually won .....	16	14		Actually won .....	16	14

\* Omitting the votes for an Independent candidate for Wilmot in 1913 who was not elected, and one for Bass in 1922 who was elected.

## ABSENT VOTES, POSTAL VOTES, AND SECTION 116A.

Under the provisions of Section 116A, 1051 persons whose names were not on the roll claimed the right to vote, and filled in ballot-papers. Of these, 720 were rejected because their claim to be on the roll could not be sustained. The remaining 331 were admitted to the scrutiny, and 13 of them rejected for informalities, leaving 318 valid votes under Section 116A.

The number of absent votes was 6642, but these included a number whose names were not, in fact, on the roll, and 825 were rejected on this account. A further 213 were rejected for informalities, leaving 5604 valid absent votes.



These numbers can be compared only with those of the last two elections, on account of changes in the Act and regulations. Valid absent votes again show an increase, but valid votes under Section 116A dropped away a little. As in the two previous elections, of those claiming to be improperly omitted from the rolls, only about 30 per cent. made good their claim.

Postal votes showed a remarkable increase to 1154 valid votes, nearly double the number at either of the two previous elections. Postal votes for Labour candidates were, as usual, only half as numerous as for Nationalist candidates.

Tables 8, 9, and 10 show the details of voting under Section 116A and of absent and postal votes. The total number of votes disallowed owing to the voter not being on the roll, or having no right to be on the roll, was 1545, compared with 1668 in 1925 and 1473 in 1922. These votes are not counted either as votes recorded or as informal votes.

TABLE 8.—*Votes under Section 116A and Absent Votes.*

Division.	Votes under Section 116A.				Absent Votes.			
	Papers Received.			Admitted to Scrutiny.	Papers Received.			Admitted to Scrutiny.
	Males.	Females.	Total.		Males.	Females.	Total.	
Bass.....	101	112	213	75	661	577	1238	1110
Darwin.....	98	56	154	20	672	383	1055	929
Denison.....	76	107	183	60	953	619	1572	1394
Franklin.....	213	159	372	154	855	595	1450	1266
Wilmot.....	77	52	129	22	752	575	1327	1118
Total.....	565	486	1051	331	3893	2749	6642	5817

TABLE 9.—*Valid Postal Votes in Parties.*

Division.	Non-Labour.	Labour.	Total.
Bass.....	132	50	212
Darwin.....	94	49	143
Denison.....	337	194	531
Franklin.....	132	44	176
Wilmot.....	68	24	92
Total.....	763	391	1154

TABLE 10.—*Summary of Absent and Postal Voting.*

	1928.	1925.	1922.	1919.	1916.
Valid Absent Votes.....	5604 (a)	5398 (a)	5032 (a)	1875 (b)	2901 (b)
Valid Votes under Section 116A.....	318	353	296	...	...
Valid Postal Votes.....	1154	591	658	640	950

(a) Voting outside subdivision in which enrolled.

(b) Voting outside division in which enrolled.

#### INFORMAL VOTES.

The number of informal votes increased from 1714 in 1925 to 2973 in 1928, and the proportion of informal votes increased from 2.22 per cent. to 3.24 per cent. The increase is common to all divisions (though greatest in Bass and Wilmot), and to both the chief types of informality—failure to number 1, 2, 3, and not attempting to indicate any preference. The increase is probably due to the increased poll bringing in inexperienced electors in unusual numbers. The proportion, however, is still very much lower than for recent elections for single seats in the House of Representatives. (See Table 14.)

Table 12 gives a summary of the percentage occurrence of the chief kinds of informality since 1909. The figures for 1916 and 1919 are slightly exaggerated by the inclusion for those years of the voting papers of electors who were not on the roll, but the number of such voters up till 1922 was insignificant.

Table 14 gives a summary of informal votes at all general elections in Tasmania, State and Federal, since 1903.

TABLE 11.—*Informal Ballot-papers, General Election, 1928, showing Specific Sources of Informality in each Division.*

	Bass.	Darwin.	Denison.	Franklin.	Wilmot.	All Divisions.
Total Number of Ballot-papers Polled ....	17,764	19,373	18,950	18,646	16,946	91,679
Defective Preference Numbering .....	354	369	306	221	317	1567
Three x's, three 1's (Uniform Marking), &c.	295	211	193	232	237	1108
Various Other Defects .....	124	48	20	74	144	298
Total Informal Ballot-papers .....	601	628	519	527	698	2973
Percentage of Informals to Total Paper Polled .....	3.38	3.24	2.74	2.83	4.12	3.24
Defects in Postal Voting .....	6	1	5	2	...	14

TABLE 12.—*Informal Ballot-papers, 1909-1928.—Percentage of Chief Classes of Informality in each Division.*

Principal Sources of Informality.		Percentage of Informal Ballot-papers.					
		Bass.	Darwin.	Denison.	Franklin.	Wilmot.	All Divisions.
Defective preference choice numbering.....	Year.	1.47	1.19	1.45	1.20	2.22	1.49
	1909	a	a	a	a	a	a
	1912	.88	1.21	1.34	1.25	1.09	1.16
	1913	1.14	1.32	1.48	.95	2.05	1.36
	1916	.81	1.17	1.32	1.36	1.29	1.27
	1919	1.09	1.17	1.30	1.19	1.77	1.29
	1922	.97	1.42	1.21	1.05	1.01	1.14
	1925	1.99	1.90	1.61	1.19	1.87	1.71
	1928						
Uniformly marking as follows :—  <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">x</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">—</div> </div> and so failing to distinguish preference.	1909	.72	1.26	.91	1.17	.83	.97
	1912	a	a	a	a	a	a
	1913	1.23	1.50	1.53	1.53	1.09	1.38
	1916	2.35	3.40	3.68	4.88	2.42	3.49
	1919	2.28	2.95	1.34	1.62	2.58	2.08
	1922	.75	1.22	.77	1.37	1.30	1.06
	1925	.57	.89	.65	1.02	.78	.78
	1928	1.32	1.09	1.02	1.24	1.40	1.20
Sundry defects .....	1909	.37	.47	.43	.27	.39	.40
	1912	a	a	a	a	a	a
	1913	.38	.36	.48	.39	.21	.37
	1916	.39	.77	.67	.69	1.06	.81
	1919	.24	.24	.86	.37	2.19	.61
	1922	.21	.17	.51	.30	.13	.29
	1925 b	.28	.20	.6	.18	.61	.30
	1928 b	.07	.24	.11	.40	.85	.33
All forms of informalities.....	1909	2.56	2.92	2.79	2.64	3.44	2.86
	1912	2.63	2.97	2.67	2.78	3.26	2.85
	1913	2.49	3.07	3.35	3.17	2.39	2.91
	1916	3.88	5.49	5.63	6.52	5.53	5.66
	1919	3.33	4.36	3.02	3.34	6.06	3.96
	1922	2.05	2.56	2.58	2.86	3.20	2.63
	1925	1.82	2.51	2.12	2.25	2.40	2.22
	1928	3.38	3.23	2.64	2.83	4.12	3.24

a Details not ascertained. b Excluding defects in voting by post, as given at the foot of Table 10. These have been included in previous years, but the number is so small that the figures are comparable without appreciable error.

TABLE 13.—*Votes Lost by Exhaustion.*

	1928.	1925.	1922.	1919.	1916.	1913.	1912.	1909.
Bass.....	278	485	1193	645	500	899	875	251
Darwin.....	331	914	191	454	461	655	531	87
Denison.....	321	224	400	392	763	1212	65	708
Franklin.....	466	918	592	389	725	42	1160	696
Wilmot.....	1152	518	291	366	451	390	306	159
Total.....	2548	3059	2499	2246	2900	3198	2937	1901
Percentage of Total Votes.....	2·9	4·0	3·7	3·3	3·9	4·7	4·0	3·9

The number of votes exhausted because of the failure of electors to record enough preferences was 2548, or 2·9 per cent. of the total. The number varies greatly according to the accidental circumstances of the election in each division, but the total for the State remains fairly steady. The large numbers, *e.g.*, 1152, in Wilmot in 1928, occur when members of only one party are left in the count, and are due to the elector restricting preferences to members of his own party. The loss of votes by exhaustion on this account, of course, makes no difference in the representation of parties.

TABLE 14.—*Elections held in Tasmania, 1903-1928—Informal Ballot-papers.*

General Elections.		Electors Contested.	Date of Election.	Total Number of Ballot-papers.	Number of Informal Papers.	Percentage of Informal Papers.	Method of Marking Paper.
Federal.	State.						
...	Assembly	31	2. 4. 1903	No. 23,261	No. 345	$\frac{1}{100}$ 1·48	Striking out all names but one
Senate.....	...	1 (all)	16. 12. 1903	37,021	1441	3·89	× opposite three names
Representatives.....	...	5					
...	Assembly	27	16. 3. 1906	40,322	487	1·21	Striking out all names but one
Senate.....	...	1	12. 12. 1906	48,879	2192	4·48	× opposite three names
Representatives.....	...	4					
...	Assembly	5	30. 4. 1909	50,402	1442	2·86	Preference 1, 2, 3
Senate.....	...	1	13. 4. 1910	57,609	1893	3·29	× opposite three names
Representatives.....	...	5					
Referendum (Leg. Powers).....	...	...	26. 4. 1911	58,020	673	1·16	× opposite name
...	Assembly	5	30. 4. 1912	76,052	2166	2·85	Preference 1, 2, 3
...	Assembly	5	23. 1. 1913	70,812	2035	2·87	Preference 1, 2, 3
Senate.....	...	1	31. 5. 1913	80,398	4927	6·13	× opposite three names
Representatives.....	...	5					
Senate (Dissolution)	...	1	5. 9. 1914	82,253	3871	4·71	× opposite six names
Representatives.....	...	4					
...	Assembly	5	25. 3. 1916	78,984	4348	5·51	Preference 1, 2, 3
Senate.....	...	1	5. 5. 1917	82,608	3075	3·72	× opposite three names
Representatives.....	...	4					
...	Assembly	5	31. 5. 1919	71,064	2757	3·88	Preference 1, 2, 3
Senate.....	...	1	13. 12. 1919	65,716	6364	9·68	Preference 1 to 7
Representatives.....	...	5					
...	Assembly	5	10. 6. 1922	69,752	1834	2·63	Preference 1, 2, 3
Senate.....	...	1	16. 12. 1922	51,220	4750	9·27	Preference 1 to 7
Representatives.....	...	5					
...	Assembly	5	3. 6. 1925	77,281	1714	2·22	Preference 1, 2, 3
Senate.....	...	1	14. 11. 1925	102,742	11,578	11·27	Preference 1 to 9
Representatives.....	...	5					
...	Assembly	5	30. 5. 28	91,679	2973	3·24	Preference 1, 2, 3

TABLE 15.—*Elective Franchise, House of Assembly.—Brief History of the Elective Franchise for House of Assembly in Tasmania, showing the more important Stages of its Development since the Year 1870.*

Year.	Adult Persons (Estimated).	Total Mean Population.	Elected Parliamentary Representatives.	Electoral Divisions.	Constituencies.			Electors Enrolled.			Lower Range of Electors' Qualification to Franchise in Possession of—
					One- Member.	Two- Member.	Six- Member.	No.	Per Cent. to—		
									Total Pop.	Adult Pop.	
1870...	48,210	100,038	30	30	30	...	...	11,171*	11.17	23.17	A.—Adult Males. Property value of £7
1871...	48,820	101,393	32	32	32	...	...	13,801*	13.61	28.27	Ditto
1872...	49,380	102,467	32	32	32	...	...	14,001*	13.67	28.35	Salary £80 annually
1881...	55,750	116,280	32	32	32	...	...	15,659*	13.47	28.09	Ditto
1891...	73,260	147,969	36	28	20	8	...	25,932*	17.53	35.40	Salary or wage £60
1901...	86,490	172,525	38	29	20	9	...	39,002*	22.61	45.09	Ditto
1902...	87,810	175,173	35	35	35	...	...	39,495*	22.54	44.98	Manhood Suffrage
1906...	92,370	184,272	35	35	35	...	...	89,029	48.31	96.38	B.—Universal Suffrage
1908...	93,980	187,485	35	35	35	...	...	86,361	46.07	91.89	Ditto
1909...	100,070	190,227	30	5	...	...	5	98,230	51.64	98.18	Ditto
1911...	99,960	190,120	30	5	...	...	5	102,326	53.82	102.40	Ditto
1912...	100,400	190,769	30	5	...	...	5	103,513	54.27	103.10	Ditto
1913...	102,700	194,361	30	5	...	...	5	105,292	54.17	102.50	Ditto
1916...	102,900	194,265	30	5	...	...	5	107,321	55.25	104.30	Ditto
1919...	109,400	204,959	30	5	...	...	5	107,541	52.47	98.30	Ditto
1922...	116,600	214,777	30	5	...	...	5	110,549	51.47	94.82	Ditto
1925...	115,800	213,469	30	5	...	...	5	114,901	53.83	99.24	Ditto
1928...	114,400	211,000†	30	5	...	...	5	111,956	53.06	97.86	Ditto

\* Males only. † Estimated.

#### VOTING IN SUBDIVISIONS.

The following tables, 16 to 20, give for each division the number of first choices for each candidate in each subdivision, and in absent votes, votes under Section 116A, and postal votes. The number of electors on the roll, and electors who voted, by sexes, and the number of informalities, are also given for the same sub-headings. The candidates are grouped in parties, and the totals given for parties. The totals are also given for Independent candidates, but these totals must not be taken to indicate a party vote as in the case of the other grouped totals.

TABLE 16.—First Choices for Candidates by Subdivisions—Division of Bass.  
(Quota 2452.)

Subdivision.	Elector.				First Choices obtained by Candidates.												Votes.						
	On Roll.		Who Voted.		National.						Labour.						Valid Votes Recorded.	Informal.					
	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	James.*	Kidd.(a)	Leifvare.(a)	Murphy.	Ockerby.*	Salisbury.	Thomson.*	Total.	Becker.*	Davies.	Guy.*	Higgins.			Holmes.(a)	Shaw.*	Total.		
Flinders .....	252	180	432	204	123	327	1	14	6	13	7	4	70	116	9	103	41	1	40	195	311	16	
George Town .....	245	241	486	192	176	368	4	39	13	34	5	9	41	155	28	118	25	10	10	198	353	15	
Launceston, Central .....	1142	1605	2747	896	1103	1929	7	245	9	42	293	98	157	878	170	104	297	8	360	977	1855	74	
Launceston, East .....	1839	2689	4528	1408	1790	3198	21	559	27	59	519	238	258	1768	332	134	463	18	379	1332	3100	98	
Launceston, North .....	1938	2203	4141	1506	1611	3117	6	233	20	51	287	94	87	801	324	162	960	20	465	2169	2970	147	
Launceston, West .....	1545	1954	3499	1198	1384	2582	39	228	10	56	377	142	161	1036	290	182	438	12	542	1460	2496	86	
Lilydale .....	686	608	1294	532	440	972	22	62	21	50	192	38	37	99	141	99	94	10	26	58	428	28	
Portland .....	386	311	697	301	239	540	21	23	1	41	19	4	23	67	199	235	49	7	3	324	523	17	
Ringarooma .....	1186	908	2094	918	672	1590	46	60	134	137	10	39	123	661	508	112	167	25	33	82	877	52	
Scottsdale .....	667	631	1301	514	496	1010	8	36	28	464	19	15	37	655	80	26	38	10	179	10	343	958	13
St. Leonards .....	520	553	1073	361	367	728	25	64	9	35	59	37	74	398	72	37	171	20	9	58	367	33	
Absent Votes .....	...	...	...	601	509	1110	32	131	40	71	101	52	78	514	156	66	184	24	35	104	599	1083	37
Votes under Sec. 116A .....	...	...	...	34	41	75	2	8	1	2	6	1	6	26	12	...	22	3	1	11	49	75	...
Postal Votes .....	...	...	...	127	91	218	5	43	4	8	29	16	26	132	13	9	36	4	2	16	80	212	6
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>10,106</b>	<b>11,886</b>	<b>22,292</b>	<b>8722</b>	<b>9042</b>	<b>17,764</b>	<b>454</b>	<b>1745</b>	<b>481</b>	<b>1183</b>	<b>1749</b>	<b>805</b>	<b>1384</b>	<b>7795</b>	<b>2210</b>	<b>1301</b>	<b>2963</b>	<b>549</b>	<b>357</b>	<b>2088</b>	<b>9368</b>	<b>17,163</b>	<b>601</b>

\* Elected. (a) Forfeited deposit.

TABLE 17.—First Choices for Candidates by Subdivisions—Division of Darwin.  
(Quota 2678.)

Subdivision.	Electors.						First Choices obtained by Candidates.											Votes.					
	On Roll.			Who Voted.			National.						Labour.					Independent.	Valid Votes Recorded.	Informal.			
	Males.	Females.	Total.	Males.	Females.	Total.	Hobbs.*	McFie.*	McInnes.	Marriott.*	Parsons.	Total.	Belton.*	Kelly.*	Lane.	Medwin.*	O'Donnell.				Steel.	Total.	Whittic.
Circular Head .....	1581	1248	2829	1275	984	2259	152	119	71	823	14	673	324	110	56	477	34	7	36	796	89	2136	73
Devonport .....	1268	1480	2748	1044	1149	2193	90	783	49	375	22	1269	156	86	477	91	191	14	77	1015	50	2114	79
Erna Bay .....	1595	1597	3192	1278	1189	2467	152	55	61	667	33	968	487	175	91	4	1	37	7	301	410	2893	74
Gormanston .....	249	140	389	213	126	339	3	3	2	22	...	20	16	236	4	1	26	45	20	538	88	393	6
Kentish .....	1302	1097	2399	1027	808	1835	138	456	248	194	129	1165	156	169	117	117	26	45	20	538	88	1786	49
King Island .....	281	220	504	233	152	385	60	23	8	156	30	272	72	4	2	1	...	7	86	16	374	11	
Leven .....	1509	1479	2988	1229	1207	2436	822	51	52	190	406	1521	164	396	28	58	16	44	706	127	2854	82	
Penguin .....	635	603	1238	533	490	1023	260	79	70	205	74	688	80	73	13	22	10	5	203	104	905	28	
Queensdown .....	834	634	1468	735	518	1253	24	12	21	155	...	212	174	411	25	39	283	81	963	11	1206	47	
Strahan .....	200	158	358	158	110	268	7	7	...	38	1	53	36	193	5	...	13	8	195	5	253	15	
Table Cape .....	1400	1287	2687	1143	966	2109	178	71	169	532	27	977	421	60	41	98	5	37	662	410	2049	60	
Waratah .....	420	296	716	386	223	559	15	9	6	61	4	95	91	275	4	20	26	28	441	10	546	13	
Zeehan .....	918	578	1496	719	485	1204	23	24	5	151	4	207	166	484	38	79	165	32	958	9	1169	55	
Absent Votes .....	...	...	...	580	349	929	80	56	20	162	32	350	139	165	50	42	36	21	452	72	874	56	
Votes under Sec. 116a .....	...	...	...	13	7	20	8	...	1	3	...	7	...	7	2	...	4	...	2	10	3	20	
Postal Votes .....	...	...	...	57	87	144	34	...	11	32	9	87	...	15	6	...	1	...	49	7	143	1	
<b>Total</b> .....	12,195	10,817	23,012	10,573	8800	19,373	2041	1703	779	3266	785	8674	2477	2805	954	1171	674	677	8756	1413	18,745	628	

\* Elected. (a) No forfeited deposit.

TABLE 18.—First Choices for Candidates by Subdivisions—Division of Denison.  
(Quota 2634.)

Subdivision.	Electors.						First Choices obtained by Candidates.													Votes.							
	On Roll.			Who Voted.			National.						Labour.						Independent Labour.	Independent.			Valid Votes Recorded.	Informal.			
	Males.	Females.	Total.	Males.	Females.	Total.	Devis.(a)	Grant.*	McPhee.*	Soundy.*	Walch.	Total.	Brown.	Cherry.	Cosgrove.*	Culley.	Dwyer.*	Lloyd.	Phillips.(a)	Woods.*	Total.	Mahoney.			Graham.(a)	McHugo.	Stamford.
Hobart Central .....	1828	1525	2353	1004	1165	2169	16	138	196	86	114	530	110	65	164	128	197	39	35	166	905	462	41	117	23	2098	71
Hobart East .....	917	1043	1963	694	735	1429	31	167	160	44	78	480	76	49	120	74	116	57	20	74	586	230	21	70	16	1398	36
Hobart North .....	2191	2721	4912	1746	2095	3841	18	265	462	456	168	1369	223	118	210	171	259	100	73	407	1561	462	42	263	31	3728	118
Hobart South .....	1487	2131	3631	1074	1511	2585	14	339	493	151	265	1262	142	53	129	123	193	56	22	147	871	229	17	101	39	2319	65
Hobart West .....	1508	1871	3379	1128	1446	2574	11	226	297	172	121	827	120	97	266	124	243	142	45	199	1286	244	16	136	36	2435	79
New Town .....	1617	2130	3777	1194	1564	2758	12	241	558	254	208	1273	140	98	109	182	298	48	51	227	1038	94	15	181	45	2701	57
Queenborough .....	921	1218	2139	709	895	1604	9	175	370	100	124	778	93	33	110	60	99	27	29	138	589	124	6	55	8	1560	44
Absent Votes .....	...	...	...	858	536	1394	9	138	233	108	98	536	64	63	69	62	90	29	17	103	497	120	14	106	28	1316	48
Votes under Sec. 116A .....	...	...	...	25	85	60	...	4	6	4	3	17	6	3	10	...	5	1	...	8	33	7	...	2	1	60	...
Postal Votes .....	...	...	...	175	361	536	...	81	97	48	7	306	3	16	98	...	14	3	1	24	174	20	...	4	26	531	5
Total .....	10,003	12,645	22,654	8607	10,343	18,950	121	1774	2872	1423	1258	7443	977	595	1235	939	1461	502	293	1493	7545	1982	176	1037	223	18,431	19

\* Elected. (a) Forfeited deposits, 4.

TABLE 19.—First Choices for Candidates by Subdivisions—Division of Franklin.  
(Quota 2589.)

Subdivision.	Electors.				First Choices obtained by Candidates.													Votes.								
	On Roll.		Who Voted.		National.				Labour.					Independent.				Valid Votes Recorded.	Informal.							
	Males.	Females.	Total.	Males.	Females.	Total.	Baker.*	Cummins.	Evans.*	Piggott.*	Total.	Frost.	Hohne.	Lyden.	Michael. (a)	Ogilvie.*	Reece. (a)			Sheridan.	Watkins.*	Total.	Barle.	Murdoch.	Pearson.*	Triffitt. (a)
Clarence .....	947	1102	2049	728	830	1558	212	111	109	204	686	7	16	14	14	271	6	51	88	462	54	254	109	6	1512	46
Esperance .....	868	698	1566	668	504	1172	83	60	61	195	399	37	70	11	5	410	6	49	15	603	47	19	85	37	1140	92
Glencorchy .....	556	556	1112	384	339	723	46	36	79	129	284	17	2	9	8	207	1	14	51	309	64	21	22	2	702	21
Huron .....	1049	953	2002	853	724	1577	146	138	217	441	942	28	21	8	8	241	5	24	31	356	69	21	93	28	1603	68
Kingborough .....	1091	958	2049	900	734	1634	78	60	119	228	485	126	26	1	32	219	3	12	43	462	62	23	568	6	1601	33
Moonah .....	1812	1927	3739	1416	1421	2837	224	86	224	242	776	31	36	234	9	990	3	115	392	1810	93	44	26	5	2754	83
Nelson .....	1389	1780	3169	1023	1171	2194	415	84	221	382	1102	28	47	23	19	361	4	91	194	767	128	31	103	...	2181	63
New Norfolk .....	1385	1232	2617	1076	945	2021	182	47	98	132	459	47	64	15	14	649	219	32	92	1152	123	25	189	7	1958	63
Port Cygnet .....	748	673	1421	617	496	1113	94	18	208	120	440	21	35	9	5	373	8	6	53	510	40	17	61	6	1074	99
Richmond .....	512	410	922	358	275	633	28	16	21	77	142	8	9	5	5	216	6	8	50	307	22	137	14	...	622	11
Sorell .....	620	514	1134	451	300	751	64	20	40	174	298	1	7	1	6	95	5	6	48	169	70	144	50	...	731	20
Spring Bay .....	287	215	502	205	147	352	22	14	12	15	63	5	16	8	9	85	1	7	14	145	20	115	1	...	344	8
Tasman .....	370	296	666	284	199	483	38	26	39	40	143	28	7	3	1	90	1	5	37	172	24	88	44	1	472	11
Absent Votes.....	...	...	...	737	529	1266	165	41	122	145	473	26	18	26	12	294	10	41	108	585	84	83	68	7	1250	16
Votes under Sec. 116A...	...	...	...	84	70	154	10	5	10	14	89	8	1	7	...	49	5	6	12	83	6	6	8	1	143	11
Postal Votes .....	...	...	...	56	132	178	26	18	32	26	102	4	2	3	2	20	8	2	8	44	4	12	14	...	176	2
Total .....	11,634	11,334	22,968	9840	8806	18,646	1833	780	1606	2564	6783	417	377	372	144	4570	286	489	1231	7886	910	1043	1391	106	18,119	527

\* Elected. (a) Forfeited deposits, 3.



TABLE 20.—First Choices for Candidates by Subdivisions—Division of Wilmot.  
(Quota 2322.)

Subdivision.	Electors.				First Choices obtained by Candidates.										Votes.									
	On Roll.		Who Voted.		National.				Labour.						Independents.		Valid Votes Recorded.	Informal.						
	Males.	Females.	Total.	Males.	Females.	Total.	Best.*	Campbell.*	Lee.*	Rowell.(a)	Total.	Bennett.	Jensen.*	Lyons.*	Ogilvie.*	Osborne.			Palmour-tain.(a)	Shoobridge.	Total.	Cameron.	McShane.	
Beaconsfield .....	823	814	1637	645	599	1244	27	629	70	4	730	36	205	162	6	24	13	3	449	27	3	1309	35	
Bothwell .....	373	316	689	272	230	502	27	33	25	...	85	53	30	211	43	10	8	17	372	11	4	472	30	
Brighton .....	856	750	1606	619	485	1104	113	136	56	10	315	29	43	275	78	11	1	27	464	33	254	1066	38	
Campbell Town .....	686	59	1279	569	453	1024	71	78	58	8	215	36	85	394	43	138	4	28	728	33	3	979	45	
Deloraine .....	1442	1299	2741	1140	969	2109	647	233	273	6	1159	48	48	510	24	90	5	11	731	141	7	2038	71	
Evandale .....	1084	1149	2233	844	810	1654	131	231	196	97	655	104	85	515	28	68	30	11	841	69	2	1567	87	
Fingal .....	733	693	1426	617	542	1159	52	53	63	4	172	67	114	385	78	217	12	29	902	48	5	1127	32	
Glamorgan .....	237	218	455	208	178	386	17	98	8	...	123	15	33	129	28	...	4	19	228	3	14	368	18	
Hamilton .....	572	443	1015	359	274	633	49	25	35	2	111	22	34	214	77	3	6	40	396	35	62	604	29	
Latrobe .....	1146	1181	2327	875	866	1741	234	184	389	7	814	59	94	421	23	58	26	4	685	165	2	1666	75	
Longford .....	1007	1058	2065	797	784	1581	144	102	424	8	678	60	59	503	77	76	3	35	803	28	4	1513	68	
Oatlands .....	849	736	1585	578	461	1039	76	122	106	1	305	59	59	346	78	17	11	38	608	53	23	989	50	
Westbury .....	1006	965	1972	821	717	1538	207	264	517	2	990	51	74	255	29	33	8	6	456	27	14	1487	51	
Absent Votes .....	...	...	...	626	492	1118	98	152	154	4	408	36	58	370	47	33	10	23	577	45	21	1051	67	
Votes under Sec. 116A .....	...	...	...	16	6	22	2	3	8	...	1	1	2	1	1	2	...	...	1	10	1	1	20	2
Postal Votes .....	...	...	...	41	51	92	16	31	17	...	64	2	4	16	1	1	...	...	24	4	...	92	...	
Total .....	10,814	10,216	21,030	90,7	7919	16,946	1911	2374	2394	153	6832	673	1027	4709	661	781	141	282	8274	723	419	16,248	698	

\* Elected. (a) Forfeited deposits, 2.

TABLE 21.—Analysis of Mr. Mahoney's First Choice Ballot-papers—Division of Denison.

Choices, 1	Mahoney (Independent Labour), 1982.																			
	Labour.									National.					Independent.			Total.	Exhaust.	Grand Total.
	Brown.	Cleary.	Cosgrove.	Culley.	Dwyer-Gray.	Lloyd.	Phillips.	Woods.	Total.	Davies.	Grant.	McPhee.	Sounfy.	Walch.	Graham.	McHugo.	Stamford.			
2	210	90	238	299	510	110	37	154	1648	9	36	22	17	15	41	162	32	334	...	1982
3	215	163	298	360	297	124	72	178	1707	10	24	51	23	15	40	76	36	275	...	1982
4	203	200	286	293	225	121	98	192	1618	24	20	23	38	22	30	54	16	227	137	1982
5	189	188	239	239	169	135	104	194	1457	19	30	20	31	26	40	49	32	247	278	1982
6	179	190	167	148	142	164	125	222	1337	31	24	21	14	25	39	45	49	248	397	1982
7	98	111	73	59	63	140	105	111	760	16	9	13	9	14	12	42	18	133	1089	1982
8	69	108	58	53	44	81	112	120	645	4	7	11	8	10	19	29	17	105	1232	1982
9	16	42	16	6	10	26	30	31	177	8	8	9	1	3	8	6	6	49	1756	1982
10	5	2	3	6	4	8	6	6	40	4	7	1	1	4	1	2	2	22	1920	1982
11	3	2	1	4	1	3	1	...	15	2	3	2	5	4	5	8	3	32	1935	1982
12	...	2	1	1	2	1	3	...	10	5	4	11	4	...	3	3	3	33	1939	1982
13	1	1	1	1	...	1	10	2	17	1	3	3	...	3	1	5	3	19	1946	1982
14	...	1	2	1	...	2	2	2	10	4	1	3	12	1	2	...	2	25	1947	1982
15	2	2	2	...	...	3	1	...	10	...	2	...	5	4	2	10	2	25	1947	1982
16	3	2	2	1	...	...	2	2	12	1	1	2	2	10	2	1	3	22	1948	1982
17	5	1	...	1	...	...	...	7	14	2	1	2	...	3	4	...	6	18	1950	1982

It will be observed that the Nationalists proper were marked No. 2 on only 99 out of Mr. Mahoney's 1982 No. 1 preference papers, or just 5 per cent. If half the No. 2's given to Mr. McHugo and Mr. Stamford be counted as Nationalist votes (see p. 7), this brings the total to 196, or nearly 10 per cent. A loss of 10 per cent. on No. 2 preferences is not uncommon with strictly party candidates, so that Mr. Mahoney's vote can be counted as a normal Labour vote.

## SUMMARISED RESULT-SHEETS.

The following tables, 22 to 26, give the result-sheet in each division in a summarised form. All the counts involved in exclusion of a candidate and the transfer of his votes are grouped as one "major" count, and the information given is the number of votes which accrue to each continuing candidate from such a major count, and the resulting total of votes for each continuing candidate. The 126 counts for Franklin, *e.g.*, are thus reduced to 14 major counts, one for each transferred surplus, and one for the distribution of the votes of each excluded candidate. The effect is that the main features of the whole count can be shown on two ordinary pages in the case of the longest count, and can be read with comparative ease.

TABLE 22.—Result Sheet—Division of Bass.

Number of Valid Votes, 17,163. Quota, 2452. Informal Votes, 601, or 3.38 per cent.

Count No.	CANDIDATES.													Total Votes Counted.	Remarks.			
	Becker (Lab.)	Brumby (Nat.)	Davies (Lab.)	Guy (Lab.)	Higgins (Lab.)	Holmes (Lab.)	James (Nat.)	Kidd (Nat.)	Lefevre (Nat.)	Murphy (Nat.)	Ockerby (Nat.)	Salisbury (Nat.)	Shaw (Lab.)			Thomson (Nat.)	Exhaust.	Loss.
1	2210	454	1201	2963	549	357	1745	144	431	1183	1749	805	2088	1284	..	8	17,163	Guy elected
2	280	2	73	511	52	11	7	..	1	1	4	2	68	2	..	..	..	Guy's sur. dis. T.V. 1724
3	2490	456	1274	2452	601	368	1752	144	432	1184	1753	807	2156	1286	..	8	17,163	Becker elected
4	..	20	3	..	610	370	19	144	27	23	8	14	..	..	..	5	..	Becker's sur. dis. T.V. 0233
5-8	..	476	1291	..	611	372	1771	..	459	1207	1761	821	2164	1286	..	13	17,163	Kidd excluded
9-13	..	11	136	..	83	372	11	..	11	16	3	5	77	8	..	6	..	Holmes excluded
14-20	..	487	1427	..	694	..	45	..	470	1223	1764	826	2241	1321	5	19	17,163	Lefevre excluded
21-29	..	558	1453	..	707	..	1827	..	..	1403	1799	862	2245	1379	6	20	17,163	Brumby excluded
30	..	..	1503	..	796	..	158	..	..	149	38	50	4	77	12	1	..	Higgins excluded
31-41	..	..	400	..	726	..	20	..	..	8	14	2	244	10	23	5	..	Shaw's sur. dis. T.V. 1680
42-63	..	..	1903	..	..	..	2005	..	..	1560	1851	914	2493	1466	41	26	17,163	Shaw elected
64	..	..	35	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	41	1	2	3	..	Shaw's sur. dis. T.V. 1680
65	..	..	1938	..	..	..	2005	..	..	1560	1851	914	2452	1467	48	29	17,163	Salisbury excluded
66	..	..	28	..	..	..	296	..	..	84	309	914	..	184	12	1	..	Murphy excluded
67	..	..	1966	..	..	..	2301	..	..	1644	2160	..	..	1651	55	30	17,163	Murphy excluded
68	..	..	65	..	..	..	346	..	..	1644	455	..	..	621	156	1	..	James and Ockerby elected
69	..	..	2031	..	..	..	2647	..	..	..	..	..	..	2272	211	31	17,163	James' sur. dis. T.V. 5635
70	..	..	6	..	..	..	195	..	..	..	..	..	..	151	37	1	..	Ockerby's sur. dis. T.V. 3582
71	..	..	2037	..	..	..	2452	..	..	2615	2615	..	..	2423	248	32	17,163	Thomson elected.
72	..	..	5	..	..	..	..	..	..	163	..	..	..	126	30	2	..	..
73	2452	..	2042	2452	..	..	2452	..	..	2452	..	..	2452	2549	278	34	17,163	..

TABLE 23.—Result Sheet—Division of Darwin.

Number of Valid Votes, 628, or 3.24 per cent.

Count No.	CANDIDATES.													Total Votes Counted.	Remarks.			
	Becker (Lab.)	Brumby (Nat.)	Davies (Lab.)	Guy (Lab.)	Higgins (Lab.)	Holmes (Lab.)	James (Nat.)	Kidd (Nat.)	Lefevre (Nat.)	Murphy (Nat.)	Ockerby (Nat.)	Salisbury (Nat.)	Shaw (Lab.)			Thomson (Nat.)	Exhaust.	Loss.
1	2210	454	1201	2963	549	357	1745	144	431	1183	1749	805	2088	1284	..	8	17,163	Guy elected
2	280	2	73	511	52	11	7	..	1	1	4	2	68	2	..	..	..	Guy's sur. dis. T.V. 1724
3	2490	456	1274	2452	601	368	1752	144	432	1184	1753	807	2156	1286	..	8	17,163	Becker elected
4	..	20	3	..	610	370	19	144	27	23	8	14	..	..	..	5	..	Becker's sur. dis. T.V. 0233
5-8	..	476	1291	..	611	372	1771	..	459	1207	1761	821	2164	1286	..	13	17,163	Kidd excluded
9-13	..	11	136	..	83	372	11	..	11	16	3	5	77	8	..	6	..	Holmes excluded
14-20	..	487	1427	..	694	..	45	..	470	1223	1764	826	2241	1321	5	19	17,163	Lefevre excluded
21-29	..	558	1453	..	707	..	1827	..	..	1403	1799	862	2245	1379	6	20	17,163	Brumby excluded
30	..	..	1503	..	796	..	158	..	..	149	38	50	4	77	12	1	..	Higgins excluded
31-41	..	..	400	..	726	..	20	..	..	8	14	2	244	10	23	5	..	Shaw's sur. dis. T.V. 1680
42-63	..	..	1903	..	..	..	2005	..	..	1560	1851	914	2493	1466	41	26	17,163	Shaw elected
64	..	..	35	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	41	1	2	3	..	Shaw's sur. dis. T.V. 1680
65	..	..	1938	..	..	..	2005	..	..	1560	1851	914	2452	1467	48	29	17,163	Salisbury excluded
66	..	..	28	..	..	..	296	..	..	84	309	914	..	184	12	1	..	Murphy excluded
67	..	..	1966	..	..	..	2301	..	..	1644	2160	..	..	1651	55	30	17,163	Murphy excluded
68	..	..	65	..	..	..	346	..	..	1644	455	..	..	621	156	1	..	James and Ockerby elected
69	..	..	2031	..	..	..	2647	..	..	..	..	..	..	2272	211	31	17,163	James' sur. dis. T.V. 5635
70	..	..	6	..	..	..	195	..	..	..	..	..	..	151	37	1	..	Ockerby's sur. dis. T.V. 3582
71	..	..	2037	..	..	..	2452	..	..	2615	2615	..	..	2423	248	32	17,163	Thomson elected.
72	..	..	5	..	..	..	..	..	..	163	..	..	..	126	30	2	..	..
73	2452	..	2042	2452	..	..	2452	..	..	2452	..	..	2452	2549	278	34	17,163	..

TABLE 23.—Result Sheet—Division of Darwin.  
Valid Votes, 18,745. Quota, 2678. Informal Votes, 628, or 3.24 per cent.

Count No.	CANDIDATES.											Total Votes Counted.	Remarks.			
	Belton (Lab.)	Hobbs (Nat.)	Kelly (Lab.)	Lane (Lab.)	McFie (Nat.)	McInnes (Nat.)	Marriott (Nat.)	Medwin (Lab.)	O'Donnell (Lab.)	Parsons (Nat.)	Steel (Lab.)			Whitliffe (Ind.)	Exhaust.	Loss
1	2477	2041	2805	954	1703	779	3266	1171	674	785	677	1413	..	..	18,745	<i>Marriott and Kelly elected</i> Marriott's sur. dist. T.V. 1800
2	24	162	..	7	151	59	588	16	3	72	9	81	..	..	..	
3	2501	2203	2805	961	1854	838	2678	1187	677	857	686	1494	4	6	18,745	Kelly's sur. dist. T.V. 0452
	52	2	127	42	1	1	..	5	11	..	6	1	..	..	..	
4-6	2553	2205	2678	1003	1855	839	..	1192	688	857	692	1495	10	5	18,745	O'Donnell excluded
	223	6	..	104	8	4	..	202	688	9	119	5	..	..	..	
7	2776	2211	..	1107	1863	843	..	1394	/	866	811	1500	3	15	18,745	<i>Belton elected</i> Belton's sur. dist. T.V. 4394
	98	1	..	51	..	1	..	21	/	..	14	..	6	4	..	
8-13	2678	2212	..	1158	1863	844	..	1415	..	866	325	1500	9	19	18,745	Steel excluded
	..	39	..	259	18	18	..	395	..	18	825	49	21	8	..	
14-20	..	2251	..	1417	1881	862	..	1810	..	884	/	1549	30	27	18,745	McInnes excluded
	..	198	..	16	377	802	..	29	..	153	/	81	6	2	..	
21-27	..	2449	..	1433	2258	/	..	1839	..	1037	..	1630	36	29	18,745	Parson's excluded
	..	488	..	17	366	/	..	23	..	1037	..	103	36	4	..	
28	..	2937	..	1450	2624	..	..	1862	..	/	..	1733	72	33	18,745	<i>Hobbs elected</i> Hobbs's sur. dist. T.V. 5307
	..	259	..	..	190	..	..	3	..	/	..	35	28	3	..	
29	..	2678	..	1450	2814	..	..	1865	..	..	..	1768	100	36	18,745	<i>McFie elected</i> McFie's sur. dist. T.V. 3788
	..	..	..	3	136	..	..	5	..	..	..	59	67	2	..	
30	..	..	..	1453	2678	..	..	1870	..	..	..	1827	167	38	18,745	Lane's primaries distributed
	..	..	..	854	..	..	..	743	..	..	..	47	164	..	..	
	2678	2678	2678	499	2678	..	2678	2613	..	..	..	1874	331	38	18,745	<i>Medwin elected</i>

TABLE 24.—Result Sheet—Division of Denison.  
Valid Votes, 18,431. Quota, 2634. Informal Votes, 519, or 2.74 per cent.

Count No.	CANDIDATES.														Total Votes Counted.	Remarks.				
	Brown (Lab.)	Cleary (Lab.)	Cosgrove (Lab.)	Oulley (Lab.)	Davis (Nat.)	Dwyer-Gray (Lab.)	Graham (Ind.)	Grant (Nat.)	Lloyd (Lab.)	Mahoney (Ill.)	McHugo (Ind.)	McPhee (Nat.)	Phillips (Lab.)	Soundy (Nat.)			Stamford (Ind.)	Walch (Nat.)	Woods (Lab.)	
2	977	595	1285	939	121	1461	176	1774	502	1982	1057	2572	293	1423	223	1258	1493	18,431	McPhee elected McPhee's sur. dist. T.V. .0828	
3 & 4	977	595	1285	939	124	1461	176	1827	502	1982	1064	2634	293	1561	223	1284	1496	18,431	Davis excluded	
5 & 6	981	596	1287	941	/	1468	182	1868	504	1989	1077	2634	294	1576	223	1302	1499	18,431	Graham excluded	
7 & 8	991	607	1311	949	80	1510	/	1881	511	2013	1093	2634	295	1583	229	1305	1508	18,431	Stamford excluded	
9-12	1002	617	1322	956	41	1519	/	1911	518	2085	1124	2634	298	1636	/	1323	1524	18,431	Phillips excluded	
13-17	1053	624	1355	995	71	1560	/	1912	545	2045	1136	2634	/	1642	/	1325	1593	18,431	Lloyd excluded	
18-27	1143	649	1401	1066	82	1662	/	1926	/	2073	1159	2634	/	1657	/	1333	1716	18,431	Cleary excluded	
28-40	1237	/	1590	1148	/	1770	/	1947	2085	1188	1188	2634	1671	1671	1337	1802	258	18,431	Culley excluded	
41-60	1404	/	1893	/	/	2077	/	1966	2139	1206	1206	2634	1677	1677	1343	2060	139	18,431	McHugo excluded	
61-82	1487	/	1999	/	/	2199	/	2171	2255	/	/	2634	1959	1959	1462	2199	65	18,431	Walch excluded	
83	1495	/	2013	/	/	2241	/	2709	2269	/	/	2634	2689	2689	/	2264	5	18,431	Grant and Soundy elected Grant's sur. dist. T.V. .1394	
84	1495	/	2015	/	/	2245	/	2634	2271	/	/	2634	2689	2689	/	2269	6	18,431	Soundy's sur. dist. T.V. .8953	
85-116	1495	/	2016	/	/	2245	/	2634	2272	/	/	2634	2684	2684	/	2275	359	18,431	Brown excluded	
/	/	/	2631	/	/	2590	/	2634	2331	/	/	2634	2634	2634	/	2634	321	18,431	Woods elected Mahoney excluded	
/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	Cosgrove & Dwyer-Gray elect.

TABLE 25.—Result Sheet—Division of Franklin.  
Valid Votes, 18,119. Quota, 2589. Informal Votes, 527, or 2.83 per cent.

Count No.	CANDIDATES.													Total Votes Counted.	Remarks.					
	Baker (Nat.)	Cummins (Nat.)	Earle (Ind.)	Evans (Nat.)	Frost (Lab.)	Hohne (Lab.)	Lyden (Lab.)	Michael (Lab.)	Murdoch (Ind.)	Ogilvie (Lab.)	Pearsall (Ind.)	Piggott (Nat.)	Reece (Lab.)			Sheridan (Lab.)	Triffitt (Ind.)	Watkins (Lab.)	Rhansst.	Loss.
1	1833	780	910	1606	417	377	372	144	1043	4570	1391	2564	286	489	106	1231	..	8	18,119	Ogilvie elected Ogilvie's sur. dist. T.V. 4334
2	18	9	53	29	169	245	157	73	38	1981	48	34	120	325	8	667	..	..	..	..
3	1851	789	943	1635	586	622	529	217	1081	2589	1439	2598	406	814	114	1898	..	6	18,119	Piggott elected Piggott's sur. dist. T.V. 1139
4 & 5	1851	789	943	1636	586	622	529	217	1081	..	1439	2589	406	815	114	1899	..	14	18,119	Triffitt excluded
6-8	1853	796	950	1652	588	630	533	218	1086	..	1470	..	408	823	..	1910	..	18	18,119	Michael excluded
9-13	1863	796	958	1657	609	649	556	..	1094	..	1490	..	429	857	..	1958	..	23	18,119	Reece excluded
14-23	1869	797	965	1665	667	690	605	..	1097	..	1511	..	..	966	..	2074	..	29	18,119	Lyden excluded
24-38	1876	798	974	1674	749	817	..	1115	..	1525	..	..	1098	136	..	2261	..	41	18,119	Frost excluded
39-44	1882	803	993	1693	..	1141	..	1134	..	1578	..	..	1234	..	..	2396	..	54	18,119	Cummins excluded
45-64	2126	..	1102	1966	..	1150	..	..	1203	..	1642	..	..	1242	..	2412	..	57	18,119	Earle excluded
65-96	2331	..	..	2275	..	1178	..	1387	..	1797	..	..	1336	..	2492	..	77	18,119	Hohne excluded	
97	2349	..	..	2301	..	..	..	..	1416	..	1841	..	2089	..	2653	..	215	18,119	Watkins elected Watkin's sur. dist. T.V. 3975	
98-125	2349	..	..	2302	..	..	..	1416	..	1842	..	..	2137	..	2589	..	226	18,119	Murdoch excluded	
126	2540	..	..	2626	..	..	..	..	..	2386	..	..	2257	..	..	..	457	18,119	Evans elected Evans' sur. dist. T.V. 1141	
..	2552	..	..	2589	..	..	..	..	2589	2398	2589	..	2258	..	2589	..	466	18,119	Sheridan excluded Baker and Pearsall elected	

TABLE 26.—Result Sheet—Division of Wilmot.  
Valid Votes, 16,248. Quota, 2322. Informal Votes, 688, or 4.12 per cent.

Count No.	CANDIDATES.													Total Votes Counted.	Loss.	Remarks.	
	Bennett (Lab.)	Best (Nat.)	Cameron (Ind.)	Campbell (Nat.)	Jensen (Lab.)	Lee (Nat.)	Lyons (Lab.)	McShane (Ind.)	Ogilvie (Lab.)	Osborne (Lab.)	Palamountain (Lab.)	Rowell (Nat.)	Shoobridge (Lab.)				Extrans.
1	673	1911	723	2374	1027	2394	4709	419	661	781	141	153	282	.. 2	16,248	5	<i>Lyons, Lee, &amp; Campbell elected</i>
2	178	77	61	..	782	..	-2387	78	541	201	150	5	307	..	..	..	<i>Lyons' sur. dist. T.V. -5069</i>
3	851	1988	784	2374	1809	2394	2322	497	1202	982	291	158	589	2	16,248	5	<i>Lee sur. dist. T.V. -0330</i>
4	851	2043	791	2374	1809	2322	..	498	1202	982	291	162	589	2	16,248	10	<i>Campbell's sur. dist. T.V. -0219</i>
5-8	851	2079	797	2322	1809	..	..	499	1202	982	291	166	589	2	16,248	5	<i>Rowell excluded</i>
9-16	856	2187	820	..	1818	..	..	505	1204	984	294	..	593	2	16,248	19	<i>Palamountain excluded</i>
17-26	877	2196	832	..	1876	..	..	509	1239	1013	..	..	712	5	16,248	23	<i>McShane excluded</i>
27	890	2326	970	..	1919	..	..	..	1308	1031	..	..	779	32	16,248	27	<i>Best elected</i>
28-44	890	2322	972	..	1919	..	..	..	1308	1031	..	..	779	32	16,248	2	<i>Best's sur. dist. T.V. -0307</i>
45-69	976	..	1012	..	2151	..	..	..	1501	1168	..	..	779	55	16,248	29	<i>Shoobridge excluded</i>
70	..	..	1177	..	2461	..	..	..	1760	1334	..	..	779	55	16,248	86	<i>Bennett excluded</i>
71-115	..	..	1181	..	2322	..	..	..	1855	1356	..	..	779	55	16,248	70	<i>Jensen elected</i>
	..	..	-1181	..	..	..	..	..	122	77	..	..	175	17	16,248	1	<i>Jensen's sur. dist. T.V. -4483</i>
	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1977	1433	..	..	977	71	16,248	71	<i>Cameron excluded</i>
	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1152	76	16,248	76	<i>Osborne excluded</i>
	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	<i>Ogilvie elected</i>