(No. 17.)

1931

TASMANIA

THE PARLIAMENT OF TASMANIA

REPORT ON GENERAL ELECTION

9th MAY, 1931

(WITH STATISTICS OF EARLIER ELECTIONS HELD IN TASMANIA)

AND

RESULTS OF LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL ELECTIONS HELD IN 1929, 1930, AND 1931

BY

EDWARD PARKES, Chief Electoral Officer for the State of Tasmania

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

Tasmania:

WALTER E. SHIMMINS, GOVERNMENT PRINTER, HOBART

1931

59227

REPORT ON GENERAL ELECTION HELD ON THE 9th MAY, 1931.

SIR,

I HAVE the honour to submit the following report upon Parliamentary Elections held during the past three years.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

The House of Assembly was dissolved by His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor on the 25th March, 1931, and the following dates were fixed for the purposes of the Election:—

Issue of Writs	30th March, 1931.
Nominations	10th April, 1931.
Poll	9th May, 1931.
Return of Writs	22nd May, 1931.

The nominations totalled 70 (Bass, 11; Darwin, 13; Denison, 19; Franklin, 15; Wilmot, 12), the lowest number since 1916, when only 48 nominations were received for the 30 seats. The highest number of nominations was recorded in 1919, when there were 88 candidates. Upon the present occasion 16 candidates lost their deposits, having failed to secure votes equal to one-fifth part of the quota at the time of their exclusion from the count. The enrolment for the various divisions and the total number of votes recorded are shown in the following table:—

Division.	Electors Enrolled.	Total Number of Votes Recorded.	Percentage.
Bass	23,691	22,429	94·7
Darwin	24,693	23,499	95·2
Denison	23,581	22,484	95·3
Franklin	24,280	23,176	95·5
Wilmot	22,485	21,191	94·2
Total	118,730	112,779	95·0

The compulsory voting clauses of the Electoral Act came into operation for the first time (so far as the House of Assembly Elections are concerned) at the Election now under review, and the results are seen in the very high percentage of votes recorded. The average for all divisions was 95 per cent., as compared to 63·1 per cent. in 1922, 67·26 per cent. in 1925, and 81·9 per cent. in 1928. The heavy vote recorded in 1928 may be attributed to the adoption of compulsory voting at the last preceding Federal Election, and the responsibilities then imposed upon electors were evidently reflected in the increased vote at the following State Election. It is perhaps appropriate to mention here that the introduction of compulsory voting at State Elections has worked smoothly from an administrative point of view, and electors generally have accepted without demur this added responsibility.

The issue of "failure to vote" notices was completed some time ago in all divisions, and as it is the policy of the electoral administration to apply the compulsory sections of the Act with moderation, only in very occasional instances has it been found necessary to resort to legal action against electors who failed to vote.

The absent votes recorded at this Election totalled 6154, a figure which is again inordinately high. Experience has shown that the privileges conferred upon electors by the absent voting sections of the Act are often misused, and there is no doubt that many electors who could vote within their own subdivisions prefer to vote elsewhere. A large "absent vote" means that the Election proceedings cannot be concluded with promptness. As a

matter of fact, the time taken to produce the final result under the Hare-Clark system is attributed frequently, but erroneously, to the so-called intricacies of the counting process, whereas the delay between the poll and the final result is due mainly to the fact that absent votes for each division must be awaited from various parts of the State before the count can proceed. No solution of this difficulty can be found, as it is not conceivable that absent voting rights could be withdrawn from electors. Similar delays do not arise where postal votes are concerned, as these votes are automatically excluded if they are not received by the returning officer before the close of the poll.

The amendments of the Electoral Act passed by Parliament last session have facilitated the conduct of Parliamentary Elections, and a number of minor anomalies existing in the main Act have been removed. In particular, postal voting was simplified to the desirable extent of permitting electors to witness applications for postal votes instead of authorised witnesses being required to do so as hitherto. The most important alteration embodied in the amending Act provided for compulsory enrolment. Commonwealth rolls compiled under a system of compulsory enrolment have been used by the State for House of Assembly elections for some years past, but in making the rolls for the Legislative Council a fundamental change has been made (*vide* a later paragraph of this report). The remaining amendments amounted to a consolidation of the offence clauses of the main Act. This latter revision was necessary, although electoral offences beyond technical breaches (such as failure to vote and failure to enrol), are practically unknown in this State, as witness the fact that prosecutions for false enrolment claims have been found necessary only on one occasion in many years.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

It has been decided to embody in future reports issued after each General Election a brief summary of the Legislative Council Elections held during the intervening period. These details have not hitherto been available from readily accessible records.

Appendix A of this report indicates that the increased vote following on the introduction of compulsory voting has not been pronounced in Legislative Council Elections. The figures showing the percentage of votes to total enrolment in the Elections of 1929, 1930, and 1931 must, however, be accepted with reserve, as the rolls (prepared under the old system) were defective, and contained many names which have since been removed. Electoral officers are convinced that the previous method of preparing Legislative Council rolls from assessment rolls left much to be desired, and in the amending Bill passed last session Parliament imposed upon Council electors the very reasonable duty of claiming enrolment. A considerable improvement, even in the short time which has elapsed since the Act was amended, has been made in Legislative Council rolls. This much needed change has involved practically no additional expense, and there is every reason to believe that the new method will enable returning officers to produce accurate rolls.

One of the remaining difficulties in the latter direction lies in the existing Legislative Council boundaries. It is almost impossible in some instances for returning officers to determine the divisions for which electors should be enrolled: this is a source of irritation to the electors, and leads to inaccuracies in the rolls. These difficulties would be solved if the Council boundaries could be redefined so as to coincide with boundaries of grouped municipalities, as electors in any one municipality would then be aware of their Legislative Council division also. An important aspect of the boundary question is revealed in the disparity which now exists in the enrolment strength of the various divisions. For example, one division with 1210 electors and another division with 6818 electors each returns one member to the Council, and, although this is a question which does not come strictly within the scope of this report, it seems that, sooner or later, a redefinition of boundaries will have to be seriously considered.

I record with appreciation the services of the Assistant Chief Electoral Officer (Mr. C. A. Blakney), who is also in charge of the Franklin Division; the assistance of the central electoral staff; and the valued help of the Divisional Returning Officers for Bass (Mr. A. J. Simmons), Darwin (Mr. H. S. Warren), Denison (Mr. L. Ainsworth), and Wilmot (Mr. A. R. Cooke). To these experienced officers, who carried out their responsibilities with thoroughness and despatch, may be attributed the efficient conduct of the election proceedings under review.

I am also indebted for the assistance given by the Deputy-Statistician (Mr. E. T. McPhee), who compiled the statistical tables appended hereto, together with the several analyses of the vote recorded upon this occasion.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

E. PARKES,
Chief Electoral Officer.

The Honourable the Chief Secretary.

Appendix A.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL ELECTIONS, 1929-1931.

1929.

DIVISIONS OF HOBART, PEMBROKE, AND MEANDER.

Issue of Writ	15th April, 1929
Nominations	24th April, 1929
Poll (fixed by statute)	7th May, 1929
Return of Writ	21st May, 1929

Division of Hobart.

Electors Enrolled, 8091. Electors Who Voted, 5184. Percentage of Electors Who Voted, 64.

Candidates.

Cleary, J.	Lloyd, W. E.	Propsting, W. B.	Informal.	Total.
937	1537	2591	119	5184

Hon. William Bispham Propsting elected.

Division of Pembroke.

Electors Enrolled, 2283. Electors Who Voted, 1676. Percentage of Electors Who Voted, 73.

Candidates.

Howard, I. H.	Murdoch, J.	Informal.	Total.
276	1371	29	1676

Hon. James Murdoch elected.

Division of Meander.

Electors Enrolled, 2719. Electors Who Voted, 1934. Percentage of Electors Who Voted, 71.

Candidates.

Blyth, E. F. B.	Cameron, D. N.	Clements, E. T.	Nichols, H. A.	Informal.	Total.	
678	139	356	725	36	1934	
56	—139	34	49			Cameron excluded
734		390	774			
151		—390	239			Clements excluded
885			1013			

Hon. Hubert Allan Nichols elected.

1930.

DIVISIONS OF HUON, LAUNCESTON, AND MERSEY.

Issue of Writ	7th April, 1930
Nominations	14th April, 1930
Poll (fixed by statute)	6th May, 1930
Return of Writ	20th May, 1930

Division of Huon.

Electors Enrolled, 3529. Electors Who Voted, 2574. Percentage of Electors Who Voted, 73.

Candidates.

Calvert, W. H. F.	Ryan, D. E.	Informal.	Total.
1579	944	51	2574

Hon. William Henry Fairfax Calvert elected.

Division of Launceston.

Hon. Tasman Shields returned unopposed.

Division of Mersey.

Hon. Alexander Lillico returned unopposed.

1931.

DIVISIONS OF DERWENT, TAMAR, AND WESTMORLAND.

Issue of Writ	10th April, 1931
Nominations	17th April, 1931
Poll (fixed by statute)	5th May, 1931
Return of Writ	15th May, 1931

Division of Derwent.

Electors Enrolled, 2192. Electors Who Voted, 1311. Percentage of Electors Who Voted, 59.

Candidates.

Lloyd, W. E.	Shoobridge, L. M.	Informal.	Total.
494	755	62	1311

Hon. Louis Manton Shoobridge elected.

Division of Tamar.

Electors Enrolled, 1810. Electors Who Voted, 1435. Percentage of Electors Who Voted, 79.

Candidates.

Freeland, E. W.	Luck, A. H.	Robinson, H.	Informal.	Total.
598	499	315	23	1435
111	204	—315	...	...
709	703	...	...	...

Hon. Ernest William Freeland elected.

Division of Westmorland.

Electors Enrolled, 3141. Electors Who Voted, 2136. Percentage of Electors Who Voted, 68.

Candidates.

Cheek, J. W.	Hollingsworth, A.	Informal.	Total.
1476	558	102	2136

Hon. John William Cheek elected.

Appendix B.

STATISTICAL TABLES—GENERAL ELECTION, 9TH MAY, 1931. (WITH COMPARISONS WITH PREVIOUS ELECTIONS.)

TABLE 1.—*Electors, Voters, and Informal Votes—General Election, 9th May,* 1931.

	Estimated Population 31st March, 1931.	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	43,000	23,691	551	22,429	94·7	768	3·10	21,661
Darwin	49,520	24,693	499	23,499	95·2	768	3·27	22,731
Denison	39,780	23,581	593	22,484	95·3	775	3·45	21,709
Franklin	46,080	24,280	527	23,176	95·5	707	3·05	22,469
Wilmot	41,620	22,485	540	21,191	94·2	867	2·87	20,324
Total	220,000	118,730	540	112,779	95·0	3885	3·45	108,894

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 1922, and subsequently, owing to amendments of the Act and regulations, a large number of persons filled in voting-papers on the claim that their names should be on the roll. The majority of these claims were rejected, and the attempted votes are not included in the tables submitted herein.

The number of electors on the roll in relation to the population in the several divisions must be accepted as only roughly approximate, because so long a time has elapsed since the last census that the accuracy of the distribution of the population is doubtful. Generally, the proportion of electors varies with the proportion of females among the electors. In Denison and Bass, for instance, where female electors are in the majority, the proportions of electors to the population are highest. Where women electors are more numerous than male there is likely to be a larger proportion of unmarried females, and consequently a smaller proportion of children, or, inversely, a more adult population.

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

	9th May, 1931.	30th May, 1928.	3rd June, 1925.	10th June, 1922.	31st May, 1919.	25th March, 1916.
Estimated Population	220,000	212,000	213,000	215,100	205,000	194,000
Electors on Roll—						
Male	59,024	55,058	56,667	54,958	53,295	54,466
Female	59,706	56,898	58,234	55,591	54,336	52,855
Total	118,730	111,956	114,901	110,549	107,541	107,321
Males—per cent. of total %	49·7	49·2	49·3	49·7	49·5	50·8
Electors per 1000 of population	540	531	538	514	525	553
Votes Recorded (including informal votes):—						
Male	56,674	46,769	41,322	38,457	37,037	41,427
Female	56,105	44,910	35,959	31,295	34,027	37,557
Total	112,779	91,679	77,281	69,752	71,064	78,984
Males—per cent. of total %	50·2	51·0	53·5	55·1	52·1	52·5
Voters—Percentage to Electors on Roll :—						
Male %	96·0	84·94	72·92	70·0	69·6	76·06
Female %	94·0	78·94	61·75	56·3	62·6	71·05
Total %	95·0	81·90	67·26	63·1	66·1	73·60
Valid votes recorded	108,894	88,706	75,567	67,918	68,250	74,514
Informal Votes—						
Number	3885	2973	1714	1834	2814	4470
Percentage to votes recorded %	3·45	3·24	2·22	2·63	3·96	5·66
Number of candidates	70	72	74	77	57	48
Number of deposits forfeited	16	12	17	19	4	3
Number of members elected at first count	6	7	6	2	13	11
Total number of counts	437	452	381	439	264	117
Greatest number of counts for one division	193	126	118	160	126	54

The census of 1921 showed the proportion of adults to be 544 per 1000 of the total population of Tasmania, and in view of the declining birth rate this proportion might be very slightly higher now, so that the proportion of electors on the roll as at the 9th May, 1931 (540 per 1000 of the population) would appear to be very nearly correct.

The high proportion of electors who voted (95 per cent.) was the result of the compulsory provisions of the Act, which applied to a State election for the first time in 1931, though compulsory voting was earlier a feature of elections for the Commonwealth Parliament. The increase in the proportion of voters to electors on the roll at the election of the 30th May, 1928, as compared with previous years, was, no doubt, due to the widespread impression, derived from the Commonwealth election, that voting at State elections also was compulsory.

The proportion of informal votes (3·45 per cent.) was the highest since 1919. This high rate, however, was probably due to the number of inexperienced voters who were brought to the poll by compulsion.

The number of candidates (70) and the number of counts (437) were not greatly different from the corresponding figures in 1928.

Women electors, in conformity with the sex distribution of the population, were slightly in a majority (50·3) per cent.), but, as voters, they were in a minority to the same degree (49·8 per cent.)

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

	Electors on Roll—Male.					Voters—Male.				
	1931.	1928.	1925.	1922.	1919.	1931.	1928.	1925.	1922.	1919.
Bass	11,253	10,406	10,583	11,184	10,636	10,691	8,722	7,806	7,698	7,118
Darwin	13,195	12,195	12,174	9,459	10,203	12,690	10,573	9,226	6,721	7,319
Denison	10,533	10,009	11,075	12,895	11,319	10,055	8,607	8,257	9,166	8,288
Franklin	12,310	11,634	11,918	12,172	11,837	12,039	9,840	8,457	8,415	8,187
Wilmot	11,733	10,814	10,917	9,248	9,210	11,199	9,027	7,576	6,457	6,125
Total	59,024	55,058	56,667	54,958	53,205	56,674	46,769	41,322	38,457	37,037

	Electors on Roll—Female.					Voters—Female.				
	1931.	1928.	1925.	1922.	1919.	1931.	1928.	1925.	1922.	1919.
Bass	12,438	11,886	11,768	12,174	11,741	11,738	9,042	7,401	6,615	7,025
Darwin	11,498	10,817	10,845	8,033	8,385	10,809	8,800	7,006	4,300	5,306
Denison	13,048	12,645	13,589	15,597	14,300	12,429	10,343	8,764	9,690	9,689
Franklin	11,970	11,334	11,575	10,683	10,688	11,137	8,806	6,549	5,501	6,480
Wilmot	10,752	10,216	10,457	9,104	9,222	9,992	7,919	6,239	5,189	5,527
Total	59,706	56,898	58,234	55,591	54,336	56,105	44,910	35,959	31,295	34,027

	Electors on Roll—Both Sexes.					Voters—Both Sexes.				
	1931.	1928.	1925.	1922.	1919.	1931.	1928.	1925.	1922.	1919.
Bass	23,691	22,292	22,351	23,358	22,377	22,429	17,764	15,207	14,313	14,143
Darwin	24,693	23,012	23,019	17,492	18,588	23,499	19,373	16,232	11,021	12,625
Denison	23,581	22,654	24,664	28,492	25,619	22,484	18,950	17,021	18,856	17,977
Franklin	24,280	22,968	23,493	22,855	22,525	23,176	18,646	15,006	13,916	14,667
Wilmot	22,485	21,030	21,374	18,352	18,432	21,191	16,946	13,815	11,646	11,652
Total	118,730	111,956	114,901	110,549	107,541	112,779	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 1931 the greatest excess was less than 10 per cent. Darwin has 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	"	"	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
Federal,	12.10.1929	96·3	94·2	95·2
State,	9.5.1931	96·0	94·0	95·0

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 compulsory voting, first in the Federal sphere and later in the State.

REPRESENTATION OF PARTIES.

The election of the 9th May, 1931, drew 70 candidates, of whom 26 were endorsed nominees of the Labour Party, 33 were nominated by the Nationalist Party, and 11 described themselves as Independent.

The result was the return of 19 Nationalist, 10 Labour, and 1 Independent.

The No. 1 votes were cast directly for the three groups in each of the five electoral divisions of the State as follows:—

TABLE 5.—*Party Strength as Indicated by No.* 1 *Preferences*, 1931.

	Labour.	Nationalist.	Independent.	Total.
Bass	8058	13,603	—	21,661
Darwin	7139	13,651	1941	22,731
Denison	8739	11,653	1317	21,709
Franklin	7147	9,875	5447	22,469
Wilmot	6947	12,632	745	20,324
Total	38,030	61,414	9450	108,894

The method of election is briefly the "single transferable vote" system, and the law provides that a seat shall be allotted to each complete quota of votes in each division.

The quota in each division is ascertained by the following formula:—

$$\frac{\text{Number of valid ballot-papers}}{\text{Number to be elected} + 1} + 1 = \text{Quota.}$$

Any remainder is ignored.

For the election of a "House" of 30 members there will therefore be 35 theoretical quotas, which, however, because of "exhaust" votes, will not become complete.

Following the precedent of earlier reports, an attempt will be made to weigh the ultimate voting strength of the two main parties by allotting to each faction the votes received by the Independent candidates according to the party predilections of their supporters, so far as these can be ascertained, and to give broadly the representation secured by each party. The distribution of these votes is dealt with later.

The following table shows for each division, and for the State as a whole, the number of first preference votes (attributed to each party after allocating the votes of the unsuccessful Independent candidates), the number of quotas, and the seats won by each party:—

TABLE 6.—*Party Strength in Divisions as Indicated by No. 1 Preferences*—1931.

Division.	Labour.			Nationalist.			Independent.		
	First Preferences.	No. of Quotas.	Seats Won.	First Preferences.	No. of Quotas.	Seats Won.	First Preferences.	No. of Quotas.	Seats Won.
Bass.....	8058	2·60	2	13,603	4·40	4	—	—	—
Darwin ...	8066	2·48	2	14,665	4·52	4	*	—	—
Denison ...	9292	3·00	2	12,417	4·00	4	*	—	—
Franklin...	7301	2·27	2	12,892	4·02	3	2276	0·71	1
Wilmot	7139	2·46	2	13,185	4·54	4	*	—	—
Total ...	39,856	12·81	10	66,762	21·48	19	2276	0·71	1

* In these divisions votes for Independent candidates have been allotted as described hereafter.

A standard of representation is furnished by the fact that the number of members for the State as a whole (30) is 14·3 per cent. below the number of quotas (35). The number of quotas of votes allotted to the Labour Party throughout the State was 12·81, but the seats won were 22 per cent. less (10), whereas the seats obtained by the Nationalists (19) were only 11·5 per cent. below the quotas of first preference votes. The successful Independent candidate won his seat with less than three-fourths of a quota of first preference votes. In other words, there were 2·81 quotas of Labour votes made up of unrepresented fractions for 10 members elected and only 2·48 quotas of Nationalist voters unrepresented for 19 members elected, while the first votes for the successful Independent candidate did not represent a quota.

The disparity between the number of quotas and the number of seats won was most prominent in Denison, where, with three quotas of first votes the Labour Party secured only two seats, while with just four quotas the Nationalists secured four seats. This result cannot be ascribed to less solid voting on the part of Labour supporters in casting their subordinate preferences, because, as will be stated later, the cross votes amounted to practically 5 per cent. for both parties. In the course of the Denison count, after the election of the third candidate (Mr. Mahoney), there were two Nationalist candidates and one Labour candidate elected, and there were two Labour and two Nationalist candidates still "fighting it out" on somewhat equal terms. These remaining candidates, and the number of votes polled by each prior to the transfer of Mr. Mahoney's surplus, were:—

Labour—Cosgrove, 2821; Dwyer-Gray, 2830; total Labour votes, 5651.

Nationalists—Grant, 3021; Soundy, 2964; total Nationalist votes, 5985.

Although the weight of live votes, at this stage, was 100 : 106, the representation of these voters must be as 1 : 2. Such a result is a defect in the method of calculating the quota and the loss by unrepresented fractional remainders. The remedy would appear to lie in the adoption of the uniform quota (see Report on General Elections, 1913, pp. 22-24).

The following table shows the party strength as indicated by the quotas of No. 1 preferences, and the seats actually won by Labour and non-Labour groups at each general election since 1913. Independent votes have been distributed as described elsewhere in the context, and the total for the State is the aggregate of the results for the five divisions.

TABLE 7.—*Party Strength as indicated by No. 1 Preferences*, 1913-31.

Division.	1913		1916		1919		1922*		1925		1928		1931†	
	Non-Labour.	Labour	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	4·40	2·60
Seats won ..	3	3	3	3	4	2	3*	2*	3	3	3	3	4	2
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	4·52	2·48
Seats won ...	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	2
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	4·00	3·00
Seats won ...	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	4	3	3	4	2
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	4·02	2·27
Seats won ...	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	2	3	3	4	2	3†	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	4·54	2·46
Seats won ..	4	2	4	2	4	2	4	2	3	3	3	3	4	2
All—														
Quotas	18·94	16·06	18·13	16·87	20·68	14·32	21·19	13·23	16·91	18·69	17·29	17·71	21·48	12·81
Seats won ...	16	14	16	14	17	13	17*	12*	14	16	16	14	19†	10†

* Omitting the votes for one Independent candidate who was elected for Bass.
† Omitting the votes for one Independent candidate who was elected for Franklin.
NOTE.—The boundaries of divisions were altered between the 1922 and 1925 elections.

Other examples of unequal representation, similar to that which occurred in Denison in 1931, and already alluded to, will be found throughout the period covered by the above table. The most striking case, in its effect on the representation of parties throughout the whole electorate of the State, was in 1922. In that year the non-Labour party had 4·19 unrepresented fractional quotas again Labour's 1·23. The distribution nearest to equality required that non-Labour should have one more member and Labour one less, though if two more members had gone to non-Labour and two less to Labour the disparity would not have been serious. In that year the non-Labour party lost by unrepresented fractions in every division, whereas the losses of the Labour party in some divisions were counterbalanced by gains in others. A similar inequality, though less serious, occurred in 1919 by larger fractional losses to the non-Labour party in most divisions.

The number of quotas shown in the immediately preceding tables for the State as a whole is the sum of the quotas for each division, which, of course, are not uniform. The following figures show the representation due to each party, based directly on the total number of first votes polled by each in the whole of the electorates or on the number of uniform quotas and the number of seats won.

Strength of Parties on the Basis of No. 1 Preferences and Seats Won.

(The State as a Single Electorate.)

	No. 1 Preferences.	Seats in Proportion.	Seats Won.*
Labour	39,856	10·98	10
Nationalist	66,762	18·39	19

* Excluding one successful Independent candidate whose supporters showed no decided preference for either party.

On the basis of equal representation, therefore, the Labour party should have had one more member (11) and the Nationalists should have had one less (18). Such imperfections, however, are insignificant in comparison with the results of the old system of single-seat electorates.

The results given in Table 7 show no case where the difference between the actual representation and the theoretically requisite representation has prejudiced the position of either party in Parliament.

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 8.—*Representation of Parties for the Whole State,* 1909-1928.

Seats in Proportion to No. 1 Preferences, and Seats Actually Won.

		Non-Labour.	Labour.
1909.....	Proportionate share	18·31	11·69
	Actually won	18	12
1912.....	Proportionate share	16·35	13·65
	Actually won	16	14
1913.....	Proportionate share	15·78	13·80*
	Actually won	16	14
1916.....	Proportionate share	15·46	14·54
	Actually won	16	14
1919.....	Proportionate share	17·56	12·44
	Actually won	17	13
1922.....	Proportionate share	18·07	11·42*
	Actually won	17	12
1925.....	Proportionate share	14·42	15·58
	Actually won	14	16
1928.....	Proportionate share	14·85	15·15
	Actually won	16	14
1931.....	Proportionate share	18·39*	10·98
	Actually won	19	10

* Omitting the votes for an Independent candidate.

The Labour Party had one more member than was required for equitable proportional representation in 1922; was one member short in 1928; and was one member short in 1931.

A brief summary of the results of the 1931 election for each division is appended, together with what evidence is available of the party leanings of the supporters of the Independent candidates.

In Bass there were 11 candidates, of whom 4 were Labour and 7 Nationalist. There was little cross-voting, and little exhaustion of votes which affected party representation relatively.

The No. 1 votes cast were: Labour, 8058; Nationalist, 13,603 (2 : 3·37); and the seats won were: Labour, 2; Nationalist, 4.

In Darwin there were 5 Labour candidates, 6 Nationalists, and 2 Independents (Mr. Brown and Mr. Medwin). The No. 1 votes were: Labour, 7139; Nationalist, 13,651; Independent, 1941 (relatively 2 : 3·82 : ·54); and the seats won were: Labour, 2; Nationalist, 4. The sympathies of Mr. Brown's supporters were distinctly towards Labour. With regard to Mr. Medwin, the position is not so clear, because his votes were not distributed. Consequently the only available indication of his party sympathies is from the votes transferred to him. These votes numbered 710, of which 278 were from the Labour Party (including 67 from Mr. Brown, whose supporters have been shown to lean strongly to Labour) and 437 from the Nationalists. Mr. Medwin's No. 1 votes have therefore been distributed on this basis. In the previous Parliament Mr. Medwin was a declared Labour member.

In Denison there were 7 Labour candidates, 9 Nationalists, and 3 Independents—total, 19. The No. 1 votes were: Labour, 8739; Nationalist, 11,653; Independent, 1317 (relatively 2 : 2·67 : 0·31); and the seats won were: Labour, 2; Nationalist, 4. In this division slightly more than 5 per cent. of the transferred votes of Labour candidates went to the Nationalist party, and slightly less than 5 per cent. of the transferred votes from the Nationalists went to Labour. None of the Independent candidates in this division was successful, and, taken together, their No. 1 votes were distributed in the proportions of 42 per cent. to Labour and 58 per cent. to Nationalist candidates.

In Franklin there were 15 candidates, of whom 5 were Labour, 6 Nationalists, and 4 Independents. The No. 1 votes were: Labour, 7147; Nationalist, 9875; Independent, 5447 (relatively 2 : 2·76 : 1·52); and the seats won were: Labour, 2; Nationalist, 3; Independent, 1. The voting in this division was not so closely regimented as elsewhere. Besides being greater in number, the Independent candidates for Franklin included Mr. Watkins, who, on the eve of the election, severed his long association with the Labour Party. Other Independent candidates—Messrs. Murdoch and Pearsall—received a far greater support than any other Independent candidate, with the exception of Mr. Medwin in Darwin.

Judged by the predilections of their supporters, Messrs. Murdoch and Pearsall may be classed as full-strength Nationalists; Mr. Watkins' supporters, so far as they can be judged by transfer votes credited to him, were evenly divided between the two prime parties; and Mr. Collis' supporters were apparently 40 per cent. Labour and 60 per cent. Nationalist. In measuring the strength of the two parties the allocation of the Independent votes has been made accordingly. The transfer of votes from Labour candidates gave 6·6 per cent. to Nationalists, but of the Nationalist transfers only 4·8 went to Labour candidates.

Wilmot Division drew 12 candidates—5 Labour, 5 Nationalist, and 2 Independent. The No. 1 votes were: Labour, 6947; Nationalist, 12,632; Independent, 745 (relatively 2 : 3·63 : 0·21); and the seats won were: Labour, 2; Nationalist, 4. The Independent candidates received little support, and subsequently about 26 per cent. of their votes went to Labour and 74 per cent. to Nationalists. Again the allegiance of the Labour supporters, as indicated by their No. 1 votes, was not fully maintained. About 10 per cent. of Labour's transferred votes went to Nationalists, against about 4 per cent. Nationalist votes transferred to Labour.

Absent Votes, Postal Votes, and Section 116A.

Under the provisions of Section 116A, 1203 persons whose names were not on the roll claimed the right to vote, and filled in ballot-papers. Of these, 788 were rejected because their claim to be on the roll could not be sustained. The remaining 415 were admitted to the scrutiny, and 27 of them rejected for informalities, leaving 388 valid votes under Section 116A.

The number of absent votes was 7452, but these included a number whose names were not, in fact, on the roll, and 1298 were rejected on this account; a further 193 were rejected for informalities, leaving 5961 valid absent votes. These numbers cannot be satisfactorily compared with previous years, on account of changes in the Act and Regulations. The larger numbers for 1931 are due, in the main, to the introduction of compulsory voting.

Taking together the claims under Section 116A and attempts to vote under provisions for electors absent from their usual subdivisions, the number of votes disallowed owing to the voter not being on the roll or having no right to be on the roll was 2086, or about 24 per cent. of the applicants. The numbers of these votes disallowed in previous years were—1928, 1545; 1925, 1668; 1922, 1473. These disallowed votes are not counted either as votes recorded or as informal votes.

TABLE 9.—*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	154	191	345	133	670	673	1343	1031
Darwin	90	64	154	13	814	584	1398	1203
Denison	73	92	165	111	817	682	1499	1250
Franklin	171	131	302	111	919	696	1616	1371
Wilmot	140	97	237	17	895	701	1596	1299
Total	628	575	1203	415	4115	3336	7452	6154

TABLE 10.—*Valid Postal Votes in Parties.*

Division.	Non-Labour.	Labour.	Total.
Bass	315	108	423
Darwin	254	82	336
Denison	416	238	654
Franklin	255	87	342
Wilmot	205	41	246
Total	1445	556	2001

TABLE 11.—*Summary of Absent and Postal Voting.*

	1931.	1928.	1925.	1922.	1919.	1916.
Valid Absent Votes	5961 (*a*)	5604 (*a*)	5398 (*a*)	5032 (*a*)	1875 (*b*)	2901 (*b*)
Valid Votes under Section 116A	388	318	353	296	...	...
Valid Postal Votes	2001	1154	591	658	640	950

(*a*) Voting outside subdivision in which enrolled. (*b*) Voting outside division in which enrolled.

INFORMAL BALLOT-PAPERS.

The proportion of informal ballot-papers to the total number of ballot-papers at the election of 1931 was higher, at 3·44 per cent., than in any year since 1919, when the proportion was 3·96 per cent. The higher proportion in the later year was due, no doubt, to the number of inexperienced electors brought to the poll by compulsion.

A summary of the proportion of informal ballot-papers in each division at each General Election since 1909 is as follows:—

TABLE NO. 12.—*Percentage of Informal Ballot-papers, 1909-1931.*

	Bass.	Darwin.	Denison.	Franklin.	Wilmot.	All Divisions.
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
1931	3·10	3·27	3·45	3·05	2·87	3·44

* The proportions in these years were exaggerated by the inclusion of votes by persons who were not on the roll.

TABLE 13.—*Elections held in Tasmania, 1903-1931—Informal Ballot-papers.*

General Elections.		Electorates Contested.	Date of Election.	Total Number of Ballot-papers.	Number of Informal Papers.	Percentage of Informal Papers.	Method of Marking Paper.
Federal.	State.			No.	No.	%	
...	Assembly	31	2. 4. 1903	23,261	345	1·48	Striking out all names but one
Senate	...	1 (all)	16. 12. 1903	37,021	1441	3·89	× opposite three names
Representatives	...	5	16. 12. 1903	37,013	1164	3·14	× opposite one name
...	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	12. 12. 1906	40,194	1583	3·94	× opposite one name
...	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	13. 4. 1910	57,609	1447	2·51	× opposite one name
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	31. 5. 1913	80,398	2470	3·07	× opposite one name
Senate (Dissolution)	...	1	5. 9. 1914	82,253	3871	4·71	× opposite six names
Representatives	...	4	5. 9. 1914	65,103	1549	2·38	× opposite name
...	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	5. 5. 1917	65,873	2021	3·07	× opposite name
...	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	13. 12. 1919	65,716	3304	5·03	Preference 1, 2, 3
...	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	16. 12. 1922	51,220	3304	6·45	Preference 1, 2, 3
...	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	14. 11. 1925	102,742	5027	4·89	Preference 1, 2, 3
...	Assembly	5	30. 5. 1928	91,679	2973	3·24	Preference 1, 2, 3
Senate	...	1	17. 11. 1928	106,153	16,694	15·73	Preference 1 to 6
Representatives	...	5	17. 11. 1928	106,153	6842	6·45	Preference 1, 2, 3
Representatives	...	5	12. 10. 1929	110,927	2064	1·86	Preference 1, 2, 3
...	Assembly	5	9. 5. 1931	112,779	3885	3·45	Preference 1, 2, 3

Exhausted Ballot-Papers.

Table 14.—*Votes Lost by Exhaustion.*

	1931.	1928.	1925.	1922.	1919.	1916.	1913.	1912.	1909.
Bass	114	278	485	1133	645	500	899	875	251
Darwin	428	331	914	191	454	461	655	531	87
Denison	412	321	224	400	392	763	1212	65	708
Franklin	463	466	918	592	389	725	42	1160	696
Wilmot	1043	1152	518	291	366	451	390	306	159
Total	2460	2548	3059	2607	2246	2900	3198	2937	1901
Percentage of Total Votes	2·3	2·9	4·0	3·8	3·3	3·9	4·7	4·0	3·9

The figures in the above table represent the number of votes which were discarded during the actual count because there was no further choice marked on them which could be made effective. These votes do not, in all cases, indicate unrepresented electors, because many of them had contributed to the election of successful candidates before they became exhausted.

The results of an analysis of exhausted votes are given below, and show how many had been partially effective and how many had not:—

	Partially Effective.	Ineffective.	Total.
Bass	7	107	114
Darwin	301	127	428
Denison	11	401	412
Franklin	60	403	463
Wilmot	627	416	1,043
	1,006	1,454	2,460

This analysis shows the vagaries of the results, which, viewed apart from the particular related circumstances, are of little significance.

Table 15.—*Brief Sketch of the Development of the Elective Franchise for House of Assembly in Tasmania since the Year* 1870.

Year.	Adult Persons (Estimated).	Estimated 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.	Per Cent. to— Adult Pop.	
											A.—Adult Males.
1870...	48,210	100,038	30	30	30	...	...	11,171*	11·17	23·17	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.—Adult 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...	116,400	214,777	30	5	...	...	5	110,549	51·47	94·96	Ditto
1925...	116,100	213,469	30	5	...	...	5	114,901	53·83	98·96	Ditto
1928...	115,300	211,900	30	5	...	...	5	111,956	53·06	97·11	Ditto
1931...	120,000	220,000	30	5	...	...	5	118,730	53·97	98·94	Ditto

* Males only.

VOTING IN SUBDIVISIONS.

The following tables, 16 to 20, give for each division the number of first choices for each candidate at the ordinary poll 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 informal papers, are also given for the same subdivisions. The candidates are grouped in parties, and the total votes are given for the groups. Although the Independent candidates are grouped together, they must not be considered as a political party group, as in the case of the Labour and Nationalist parties.

TABLE 16.—*First Choices for Candidates by Subdivisions—Division of Bass.*

(Quota, 3095.)

Subdivision.	Electors.						First Choices Obtained by Candidates.													Votes.	
	On Roll.			Who Voted.			Labour.					Nationalist.									
	Males.	Females.	Total.	Males.	Females.	Total.	Becker.	Davies.*	Higgins.	Shaw.*	Total Labour.	Barber.*	James.*	Murphy.*	Ockerby.*	Postle.	Saunders.	Thompson.	Total Nationalist.	Valid Votes Recorded.	Informal.
Flinders	245	193	438	213	157	370	6	137	1	14	158	23	32	27	22	3	1	83	191	349	21
George Town	263	235	498	226	193	419	7	162	2	5	176	2	14	51	5	7	148	11	238	414	5
Launceston, Central	1205	1580	2785	1035	1412	2447	133	141	71	473	818	456	298	201	234	120	91	135	1535	2353	94
Launceston, East	2047	2887	4934	1831	2510	4341	265	281	112	541	1199	801	719	390	491	225	131	255	3012	4211	130
Launceston, North	2150	2345	4495	1929	2104	4033	299	400	456	787	1942	768	184	272	261	218	84	118	1905	3847	186
Launceston, West	1738	2124	3862	1555	1885	3440	168	247	111	845	1371	494	323	289	343	204	68	213	1934	3305	135
Lilydale	702	571	1273	643	486	1129	90	112	21	61	284	90	33	344	28	79	186	64	824	1108	21
Portland	387	320	707	326	266	592	135	112	10	14	271	67	62	68	19	19	6	62	303	574	18
Ringarooma	1104	835	1939	981	748	1729	307	326	63	38	734	210	121	378	20	69	32	115	945	1679	50
Scottsdale	712	664	1376	615	561	1176	60	128	12	15	215	73	63	655	31	48	34	26	930	1145	31
St. Leonards	700	684	1384	588	572	1160	91	131	62	94	378	200	105	130	83	84	45	101	748	1126	34
Absent Votes	...	...	...	497	534	1031	86	118	31	116	351	159	127	114	80	56	42	73	651	1002	29
Votes under Sec. 116A	...	...	...	54	79	133	17	16	6	14	53	28	11	16	7	2	5	3	72	125	8
Postal Votes	...	...	...	198	231	429	24	31	6	47	108	75	63	54	60	11	9	43	315	423	6
Total	11,253	12,438	23,691	10,691	11,738	22,429	1688	2342	964	3064	8058	3446	2155	2989	1684	1145	882	1302	13,603	21,661	768

* Elected. No forfeited deposit.

TABLE 17.—*First Choices for Candidates by Subdivisions—Division of Darwin.*

(Quota 3248.)

Subdivision.	Electors.						First Choices Obtained by Candidates.																Votes.	
	On Roll.			Who Voted.			Labour.						Nationalist.							Independent.				
	Males.	Females.	Total.	Males.	Females.	Total.	Belton.	D'alton.*	Gray. (a)	Kelly.*	McGrath. (a)	Total Labour.	Butler.*	Hobbs.*	McFie.*	Marriott.*	Paul. (a)	Wright.	Total Nationalist.	Brown. (a)	Medwin.	Total Independent.	Valid Votes Recorded.	Informal.
Circular Head	1646	1306	2952	1483	1162	2645	211	175	38	133	22	579	487	101	94	203	116	99	1100	165	676	841	2520	125
Devonport	1379	1559	2938	1233	1355	2588	117	175	22	197	23	534	433	60	1043	232	8	54	1830	7	109	116	2480	108
Emu Bay	1893	1798	3691	1692	1564	3256	206	174	183	90	217	870	987	114	128	692	19	114	2049	16	197	213	3132	124
Gormanston	316	168	484	256	137	393	22	112	4	176	3	317	15	3	4	29	1	1	53	1	8	9	379	14
Kentish	1380	1117	2497	1291	1012	2303	79	93	11	174	4	361	1388	41	212	130	1	65	1837	30	41	71	2269	34
King Island	322	259	581	291	218	509	99	3	3	3	4	112	12	87	16	226	1	20	362	4	13	17	491	18
Leven	1657	1577	3234	1540	1404	2944	73	88	18	380	10	569	689	768	58	173	19	490	2197	10	103	113	2879	65
Penguin	697	639	1336	622	554	1176	46	20	8	71	14	159	444	187	91	106	7	123	958	5	24	29	1146	30
Queenstown	1140	755	1895	1035	659	1694	55	973	15	208	10	1261	59	36	19	176	3	11	304	4	61	65	1630	64
Strahan	221	177	398	183	135	318	11	164	1	27	4	207	9	4	8	60	3	...	84	2	14	16	307	11
Table Cape	1497	1348	2845	1396	1180	2576	394	71	21	95	22	603	896	115	58	378	32	138	1617	11	274	285	2505	71
Waratah	313	234	547	258	207	465	36	42	25	203	25	331	26	9	25	33	1	1	95	6	21	27	453	12
Zeehan	734	561	1295	603	474	1077	37	401	6	254	12	710	69	11	68	127	4	5	284	4	37	41	1035	42
Absent Votes	...	...	...	688	515	1203	113	150	22	150	18	453	249	70	96	163	9	45	632	6	67	73	1158	45
Votes under Sec. 116A	...	...	...	7	6	13	...	...	...	2	1	3	1	3	1	...	...	2	7	...	1	1	11	2
Postal Votes	...	...	...	112	227	339	24	19	1	23	3	70	82	50	37	60	1	12	242	3	21	24	336	3
Total	13,195	11,498	24,693	12,690	10,809	23,499	1523	2660	378	2186	392	7139	5846	1659	1953	2788	225	1180	13,651	274	1667	1941	22,731	768

* Elected. (a) Forfeited deposits, 4.

TABLE 18.—*First Choices for Candidates by Subdivisions—Division of Denison.*

(Quota 3102.)

Subdivision.	Electors.						First Choices Obtained by Candidates.																				Votes.	
	On Roll.			Who Voted.			Labour.								Nationalist.										Independent.					
	Males.	Females.	Total.	Males.	Females.	Total.	Bates.	Cleary. (a)	Cosgrove.	Dwyer-Gray.*	Mahoney.*	Tyler.	Woods.	Total Labour.	Gilmore(a)	Grant.*	Lewis.	McPhee.*	O'Conor(a)	Richardson. (a)	Soundy.*	Susman.(a)	Turner.*	Total Nationalist.	Counsel.	Dicker. (a)	Park. (a)	Total Independent.	Valid Votes Recorded.	Informal.
Hobart Central	1375	1566	2941	1188	1383	2571	102	81	179	200	520	175	99	1356	40	138	82	365	27	15	73	23	191	954	52	38	34	124	2434	137
Hobart East	927	1081	2008	766	921	1687	75	32	134	104	266	116	45	772	33	155	54	314	35	2	30	24	128	775	40	21	21	82	1629	58
Hobart North	2299	2744	5043	2047	2398	4445	134	103	225	300	569	276	299	1906	96	194	127	876	63	33	348	49	360	2146	64	57	88	209	4261	184
Hobart South	1584	2286	3870	1351	1950	3301	69	53	135	229	249	174	89	998	46	220	121	938	50	11	81	34	448	1949	139	53	73	265	3212	89
Hobart West	1618	1950	3568	1395	1734	3129	81	83	350	243	274	206	94	1331	43	184	78	556	43	31	147	32	364	1478	92	54	59	205	3014	115
New Town	1763	2183	3946	1524	1904	3428	81	76	126	220	218	202	158	1081	65	236	143	987	60	24	186	32	341	2074	87	30	63	180	3335	93
Queenborough	967	1238	2205	834	1069	1903	51	22	66	60	152	98	64	513	16	168	94	542	35	17	64	25	235	1196	62	39	37	138	1847	56
Absent Votes	...	...	...	699	551	1250	24	40	95	97	140	54	39	489	24	81	33	293	15	12	53	21	107	639	38	22	27	87	1215	35
Votes under Sec. 116A	...	...	...	47	64	111	3	6	11	10	22	6	5	63	1	4	2	18	2	2	3	...	6	38	1	3	3	7	108	3
Postal Votes	...	...	...	204	455	659	20	12	84	23	53	21	17	230	20	79	20	179	6	5	41	8	46	404	10	5	5	20	654	5
Total	10,533	13,048	23,581	10,055	12,429	22,484	640	508	1405	1486	2463	1328	909	8739	384	1459	754	5068	336	152	1026	248	2226	11,653	585	322	410	1317	21,709	775

* Elected. (a) Forfeited deposits, 7.

TABLE 19.—*First Choices for Candidates by Subdivisions—Division of Franklin.*

(Quota 3210.)

Subdivision.	Electors.						First Choices Obtained by Candidates.																		Votes.	
	On Roll.			Who Voted.			Labour.						Nationalist.							Independent.						
	Males.	Females.	Total.	Males.	Females.	Total.	Brooker.	Dwyer.*	Hohne.(a)	McGann.	Ogilvie.*	Total Labour.	Baker.*	Burgess.	Evans.*	Piggott.	Rennie.(a)	Seabrook.*	Total Nationalist.	Collis.(a)	Murdock.	Pearsall.	Watkins.*	Total.	Valid Votes Recorded.	Informal.
Clarence	1045	1174	2219	934	1023	1957	25	56	21	8	276	386	496	24	140	90	5	107	862	46	207	134	272	659	1907	50
Esperance	905	744	1649	913	567	1480	112	54	49	4	353	572	279	68	58	114	9	182	710	7	24	33	87	151	1433	47
Glenorchy	628	603	1231	536	519	1055	113	33	3	80	114	343	179	10	110	76	10	29	414	21	20	37	178	256	1013	42
Huon	1119	1013	2132	1039	879	1918	19	100	28	8	204	359	357	95	183	263	27	315	1240	16	32	86	125	259	1858	60
Kingborough	1183	1045	2228	1032	899	1931	13	135	23	6	222	399	283	24	107	88	18	107	627	44	106	585	121	856	1882	49
Moonah	1971	2068	4039	1784	1828	3612	137	187	70	393	860	1647	669	37	213	105	54	111	1189	50	58	45	496	649	3485	127
Nelson	1518	1913	3431	1334	1635	2969	68	85	91	12	438	694	908	76	222	231	63	115	1615	67	50	151	303	571	2880	89
New Norfolk	1417	1298	2715	1248	1123	2371	48	406	21	74	414	963	423	72	148	55	21	86	805	34	44	223	204	505	2273	98
Port Cygnet	771	681	1452	709	590	1299	11	201	15	17	244	488	191	52	170	44	12	103	572	5	46	66	70	187	1247	52
Richmond	536	449	985	487	382	869	11	46	11	3	222	293	127	9	22	60	2	55	275	14	172	25	66	277	845	24
Sorell	600	514	1114	548	442	990	5	23	22	3	97	150	160	16	33	74	6	160	449	25	160	92	94	371	970	20
Spring Bay	232	184	416	177	134	311	3	25	7	2	47	84	36	4	2	4	4	61	111	1	57	11	40	109	304	7
Tasman	385	284	669	345	242	587	4	35	17	2	98	156	116	8	26	14	...	55	219	25	81	37	54	197	572	15
Absent Votes	...	...	...	765	606	1371	36	125	19	38	262	480	274	32	106	65	14	87	578	31	71	70	125	297	1355	16
Votes under Sec. 116A	...	...	...	56	55	111	...	7	1	6	33	47	11	4	7	7	1	6	36	1	5	3	13	22	105	6
Postal Votes	...	...	...	132	213	345	7	13	15	5	46	86	74	1	46	13	6	33	173	2	23	28	28	81	340	5
Total	12,310	11,970	24,280	12,030	11,137	23,176	612	1531	413	661	3930	7147	4583	532	1593	1303	252	1612	9875	389	1156	1626	2276	5447	22,469	707

* Elected. (a) Forfeited deposits, 3.

TABLE 20.—*First Choices for Candidates by Subdivisions—Division of Wilmot.*

(Quota 2904.)

Subdivision.	Electors.						First Choices Obtained by Candidates.															Votes.	
	On Roll.			Who Voted.			Labour.						Nationalist.						Independents.				
	Males.	Females.	Total.	Males.	Females.	Total.	Jensen.*	Lane. (a)	Ogilvie.*	Osborne.	Shoobridge.	Total.	Atkinson.*	Best.	Burbury.*	Campbell.*	Lee.*	Total.	Whitham. (a)	Williams.	Total.	Valid Votes Recorded.	Informal.
Beaconsfield	928	876	1804	787	718	1505	93	16	58	32	29	228	39	10	29	879	73	1030	9	197	206	1464	41
Bothwell	383	312	695	317	265	582	149	14	85	19	18	285	34	11	67	49	73	234	4	1	5	524	58
Brighton	886	719	1605	777	616	1393	160	10	201	11	66	448	142	66	414	155	86	863	14	14	28	1339	54
Campbell Town	698	623	1321	596	517	1113	208	21	179	177	42	627	63	22	194	60	67	406	21	21	42	1075	38
Deloraine	1526	1362	2888	1411	1178	2589	295	36	116	107	22	576	270	721	175	390	275	1831	46	42	88	2495	94
Evandale	1383	1407	2790	1209	1208	2417	364	53	165	153	60	795	352	125	159	551	237	1424	48	43	91	2310	107
Fingal	817	745	1562	736	644	1380	255	51	256	248	35	845	135	22	136	46	97	436	38	11	49	1330	50
Glamorgan	256	231	487	225	198	423	118	4	50	14	18	204	24	4	79	81	13	201	3	1	4	409	14
Hamilton	629	470	1099	506	367	873	172	6	202	17	48	445	76	11	113	104	76	380	14	5	19	844	29
Latrobe	1221	1196	2417	1103	1058	2161	213	126	129	59	28	555	671	210	97	242	266	1486	26	31	57	2098	63
Longford	1070	1070	2140	937	919	1856	204	23	283	92	47	649	133	153	145	193	457	1081	15	48	63	1793	63
Oatlands	888	755	1643	793	660	1453	174	9	200	17	47	447	162	49	397	127	148	883	15	9	24	1354	99
Westbury	1048	986	2034	975	877	1852	164	26	117	45	23	375	127	217	130	442	448	1364	10	24	34	1773	79
Absent Votes	...	...	...	711	588	1299	148	31	158	41	37	415	177	86	176	222	128	789	17	10	27	1231	68
Votes under Sec. 116A	...	...	...	31	16	47	7	...	4	...	3	14	5	4	4	8	4	25	...	...	...	39	8
Postal Votes	...	...	...	85	163	248	13	4	11	8	3	39	43	21	26	62	47	199	4	4	8	246	2
Total	11,733	10,752	22,485	11,199	9992	21,191	2737	430	2214	1040	526	6947	2453	1732	2341	3611	2495	12,632	284	461	745	20,324	867

* Elected. (a) Forfeited deposits, 2.

SUMMARISED RESULT-SHEETS.

The following tables, 22 to 26, give the result-sheet for each division in a summarised form. All the counts involved in the transfer of the votes of an excluded candidate are grouped as one count, and the number of votes which have accrued to each surviving candidate from such count, and the progressive results for each surviving candidate are shown. The 193 counts for Denison, *e.g.*, are thus reduced to 16 major counts, one for each transferred surplus, and one for the distribution of the votes of each excluded candidate. The space required to show the essential features of the poll is thus very much reduced, and the results can be read with comparative ease.

TABLE 22. RESULT SHEET—DIVISION OF BASS.

Electors on Roll, 23,691. Valid Votes, 21,661. Quota, 3095. Informal Papers, 768 = 3·10 per cent.

Count No.	CANDIDATES. LABOUR. Becker.	Davies.	Higgins.	Shaw.	Total Labour.	NATIONALIST. Barber.	James.	Murphy.	Ockerby.	Postle.	Saunders.	Thompson.	Total Nationalist.	Exhaust.	Loss by Fractions.	Total Valid Votes.	Remarks.
1	1688	2342	964	3064	8058	**3446**	2155	2989	1684	1145	882	1302	13,603	....	....	21,661	*Barber elected*
2	28	14	5	4	51	—351	107	48	56	43	18	24	296	....	4	....	Barber's surplus dis.
3-4	1716 24	2356 31	969 8	3068 12	8109 75	3095	2262 164	3037 398	1740 69	1188 162	900 —900	1326 29	13,548 822	....	4 3	21,661	Saunders excluded
5	1740	2387	977	3080	8184	3095	2426	3435	1809	1350	....	1355	13,470	....	7	21,661	*Murphy elected*
	5	9	2	1	17	....	103	—340	57	82	....	75	317	1	5	....	Murphy's surplus dis.
6-9	1745 205	2396 351	979 —979	3081 367	8201 923	3095	2529 15	3095	1866 22	1432 10	....	1430 6	13,447 53	1	12 3	21,661	Higgins excluded
10	1950	2747	....	**3448**	8145	3095	2544	3095	1888	1442	....	1436	13,500	1	15	21,661	*Shaw elected*
	115	226	..	—353	341	....	3	....	3	....	....	1	7	....	5	....	Shaw's surplus dis.
11-18	2065 46	2973 105	.... ..	3095	8133 151	3095	2547 554	3095	1891 343	1442 360	....	1437 —1437	13,507 1257	1 21	20 8	21,661	Thompson excluded
19	2111	3078	....	3095	8284	3095	**3101**	3095	2234	1802	....	....	13,327	22	28	21,661	*James elected*
	....	....	....	....	....	....	— 6	....	3	3	....	....	6	....	....	....	James' surplus dis.
20	2111 67	3078 78	....	3095	8284 145	3095	3095	3095	2237 908	1805 —1145	....	....	13,327 908	22 92	28	21,661	Postle's primaries dis.
	2178	**3156**	....	3095	8429	3095	3095	3095	**3145**	660	....	....	13,090	114	28	21,661	*Davies and Ockerby elected*
	—2178	—61	....	....	—2239	....	....	....	— 50	—660	....	....	—710	2949	....	....	
	....	3095	....	3095	6190	3095	3095	3095	3095	....	....	....	12,380	3063	28	21,661	

NOTE.—The heavy line indicates the end of the official count.

TABLE 26. RESULT SHEET—DIVISION OF WILMOT.

Electors on Roll, 22,485. Valid Votes, 20,324. Quota, 2904. Informal Papers, 867 = 2·87 per cent.

Count No.	CANDIDATES.															Exhaust.	Loss by Fractions.	Total Valid Votes.	Remarks.
	LABOUR.						NATIONALIST.						INDEPENDENT.						
	Jensen.	Lane.	Ogilvie.	Osborne.	Shoobridge.	Total Labour.	Atkinson.	Best.	Burbury.	Campbell.	Lee.	Total Nationalist.	Whitham.	Williams.	Total Independent.				
1	2737	430	2214	1040	526	6947	2453	1732	2341	**3611**	2495	12,632	284	461	745	....	....	20,324	*Campbell elected*
2	16	4	3	1	6	30	181	131	166	—707	159	637	5	30	35	....	5	....	Campbell's surplus dis.
3-4	2753	434	2217	1041	532	6977	2634	1863	2507	2904	2654	12,562	289	491	780	....	5	20,324	Whitham excluded
	14	3	5	8	23	53	36	17	53	....	36	142	—289	91	91	....	3	....	
5-7	2767	437	2222	1049	555	7030	2670	1880	2560	2904	2690	12,704	....	582	582	....	8	20,324	Lane excluded
	141	— 437	104	98	27	370	26	13	7	....	11	57	....	6	6	1	3	....	
8	**2908**	....	2326	1147	582	6963	2696	1893	2567	2904	2701	12,761	....	588	588	1	11	20,324	*Jensen elected*
	— 4	....	2	....	....	2	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	2	....	Jensen's surplus dis.
9-16	2904	....	2328	1147	582	6961	2696	1893	2567	2904	2701	12,761	....	588	588	1	13	20,324	Shoobridge excluded
	....	....	285	160	—582	445	10	14	34	....	23	81	....	35	35	16	5	....	
17-27	2904	....	2613	1307	....	6824	2706	1907	2601	2904	2724	12,842	....	623	623	17	18	20,324	Williams excluded
	....	....	65	78	....	143	137	77	127	....	89	430	....	—623	—623	46	4	....	
28-46	2904	....	2678	1385	....	6967	2843	1984	2728	2904	2813	13,272	....	....	....	63	22	20,324	Osborne excluded
	....	....	913	—1385	....	913	21	24	25	....	48	118	....	....	....	353	1	....	
47	2904	....	**3591**	....	....	6495	2864	2008	2753	2904	2861	13,390	....	....	....	416	23	20,324	*Ogilvie elected*
	....	....	— 687	....	....	—687	12	15	14	....	16	57	....	....	....	627	3	....	Ogilvie's surplus dis.
	2904	....	2904	....	....	5808	**2876**	2023	**2767**	2904	**2877**	13,447	....	....	....	1043	26	20,324	*Atkinson, Burbury, and Lee elected*
	....	....	....	....	....	....	28	—2023	137	....	27	192	....	....	....	1831	....	....	Best excluded
	2904	....	2904	....	....	5808	2904	....	2904	2904	2904	11,616	....	....	....	2874	26	20,324	

NOTE.—The heavy line indicates the end of the official count.

WALTER E. SHIMMINS,
GOVERNMENT PRINTER, TASMANIA.

TABLE 23. RESULT SHEET—DIVISION OF DARWIN.

Electors on Roll, 24,693. Valid Votes, 22,731. Quota, 3248. Informal Papers, 768 = 3·27 per cent.

Count No.	CANDIDATES. LABOUR. Belton.	D'alton.	Gray.	Kelly.	McGrath.	Total Labour.	NATIONALIST. Butler.	Hobbs.	McFie.	Marriott.	Paul.	Wright.	Total Nationalist.	INDEPENDENT. Brown.	Medwin.	Total Independent.	Exhaust.	Less by Fractions.	Total Valid Votes.	Remarks.
1	1523	2660	378	2186	392	7139	**5846**	1659	1953	2788	225	1180	13,651	274	1667	1941	...	...	22,731	*Butler elected*
2	47	45	17	49	7	165	—2598	587	492	475	68	623	2,245	20	161	181	...	7	....	Butler's surplus dis.
3	1570	2705	395	2235	399	7304	3248	2246	2445	**3263**	293	1803	13,298	294	1828	2122	..	7	22,731	*Marriott elected*
	..	..	....	...	.	.	.	4	3	— 15	1	3	11	.	1	1	.	3	....	Marriott's surplus dis.
4-6	1570	2705	395	2235	399	7304	3248	2250	2448	3248	294	1806	13,294	294	1829	2123	...	10	22,731	
	6	2	..	3	...	11		60	55	...	—294	119	234	3	42	45	1	3	....	Paul excluded
7-9	1576	2707	395	2238	399	7315	3248	2310	2503	3248	.	1925	13,234	297	1871	2168	1	13	22,731	
	56	73	17	22	9	177	..	24	10	.	.	14	48	—297	67	67	1	4	....	Brown excluded
10-12	1632	2780	412	2260	408	7492	3248	2334	2513	3248	...	1939	13,282		1938	1938	2	17	22,731	
	45	68	174	83	—408	370	.	9	8	..	.	5	22	..	13	13	...	3	....	McGrath excluded
13-17	1677	2848	586	2343		7454	3248	2343	2521	3248	..	1944	13,304	..	1951	1951	2	20	22,731	
	125	196	—586	189	..	510	..	20	14	..	..	7	41		23	23	9	3	....	Gray excluded
18-26	1802	3044	.	2532	...	7378	3248	2363	2535	3248	..	1951	13,345	.	1974	1974	11	23	22,731	
	—1802	689	.	668	...	1357	..	148	74	..	..	43	265	...	96	96	83	1	.	Belton excluded
27	..	**3733**	.	3200	..	6933	3248	2511	2609	3248	..	1994	13,610	.	2070	2070	94	24	22,731	*D'alton elected*
		—485	.	341	..	341	.	61	13	..	.	3	77	.	23	23	41	3	...	D'alton's surplus dis.
28	..	3248	..	**3541**	....	6789	3248	2572	2622	3248	..	1997	13,687	.	2093	2093	135	27	22,731	*Kelly elected*
			..	—293		—293		10	15	..	.	9	34		56	56	200	3	....	Kelly's surplus dis.
29-30	..	3248	.	3248	....	6496	3248	2582	2637	3248	..	2006	13,721	.	2149	2149	335	30	22,731	Wright excluded
	.	.	....				.	666	815	..	..	—1803	1481	..	228	..	93	1	....	Wright's first and second votes distributed
		3248		3248		6496	3248	**3248**	**3452**	3248		203	13,399		2377	..	428	31	22,731	*Hobbs and McFie elected*
	...	.		...	.	...		..	—204			—203	—407	.	—2377	.	2784	..	..	Medwin excluded
	...	3248		3248		6496	3248	3248	3248	3248	.	....	12,992	....	..	....	3212	31	22,731	

NOTE.—The heavy line indicates the end of the official count.

TABLE 24. RESULT SHEET—DIVISION OF DENISON.

Electors on Roll, 23,581. Valid Papers, 21,709. Quota, 3102. Informal Papers, 775 = 3·45 per cent.

Count No.	CANDIDATES.																								Remarks.
	LABOUR.								NATIONALIST.										INDEPENDENT.						
	Bates.	Cleary.	Cosgrove.	Dwyer-Gray.	Mahoney.	Tyler.	Woods.	Total Labour.	Gilmore.	Grant.	Lewis.	McPhee.	O'Conor.	Richardson.	Soundy.	Susman.	Turner.	Total Nationalist.	Counsel.	Dicker.	Park.	Total Independent.	Exhaust.	Less by Fractions.	Total Valid Votes.	
1	640	508	1405	1486	2463	1328	909	8739	384	1459	754	**5068**	336	152	1026	248	2226	11,653	585	322	410	1317		.	21,709	*McPhee elected*
2	1	1	3	5	2	1	3	16	45	450	171	—1966	39	27	692	34	461	1,919	11	2	8	21	....	10	...	McPhee's surplus dis.
3-4	641	509	1408	1491	2465	1329	912	8755	429	1909	925	3102	375	179	1718	282	2687	11,606	596	324	418	1338	....	10	21,709	
	....	....	1	..	1	1	1	4	12	25	24	....	5	—179	58	3	35	162	5	....	4	9	..	4	..	Richardson excluded
5-8	641	509	1409	1491	2466	1330	913	8759	441	1934	949	3102	380	..	1776	285	2722	11,589	601	324	422	1347	....	14	21,709	
	....	....	1	3	.	3	8	15	21	35	26	....	15	..	66	—285	90	253	9	3	1	13	..	4	....	Susman excluded
9-11	641	509	1410	1494	2466	1333	921	8774	462	1969	975	3102	395	..	1842	....	2812	11,557	610	327	423	1360	..	18	21,709	
	11	9	15	36	16	7	11	105	12	9	10		4	..	10	....	24	69	100	—327	52	152		1	..	Dicker excluded
12-19	652	518	1425	1530	2482	1340	932	8879	474	1978	985	3102	399	.	1852	.	2836	11,626	710	.	475	1185	..	19	21,709	
	2	1	10	14	6	2	2	37	21	67	54	....	—399	..	94	.	94	330	19	...	7	26	2	4	...	O'Conor excluded
20-25	654	519	1435	1544	2488	1342	934	8916	495	2045	1039	3102	....	..	1946	...	2930	11,557	729	...	482	1211	2	23	21,709	
	7	3	7	7	16	14	16	70	16	34	19	....	....	....	38	....	91	198	212	...	—482	212	...	2		Park excluded
26-39	661	522	1442	1551	2504	1356	950	8986	511	2079	1058	3102	..	....	1984	....	3021	11,755	941	...	...	941	2	25	21,709	
	....	3	4	7	7	8	1	30	—511	174	68	.	....	....	109	....	101	452	12	.	.	12	12	5	....	Gilmore excluded
40	661	525	1446	1558	2511	1364	951	9016	....	2253	1126	3102	. .	....	2093	..	**3122**	11,696	953	..	.	953	14	30	21,709	*Turner elected*
	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	5	3	....	..	..	7	....	— 20	15	..	..		.	.	5	..	Turner's surplus dis.
41-46	661	525	1446	1558	2511	1364	951	9016	.	2258	1129	3102	..	....	2100	..	3102	11,691	953	....	....	953	14	35	21,709	
	104	—525	166	93	64	28	33	488	.	14	3	....	....	....	5	..	....	22	10	..	....	10	4	1	..	Cleary excluded
47-53	765	...	1612	1651	2575	1392	984	8979	.	2272	1132	3102	....	..	2105	....	3102	11,713	963	....	. .	963	18	36	21,709	
	—765	....	308	118	122	149	32	729	...	5	8	..	..	....	....	....	....	13	19	.	..	19	3	1	..	Bates excluded
54-73	...	....	1920	1769	2697	1541	1016	8943	.	2277	1140	3102	.	...	2105	.	3102	11,726	982	....	....	982	21	37	21,709	
	...	...	56	102	55	76	78	367	..	162	146	....	....	....	192	...	....	500	—982	..	....	—982	113	2	..	Counsel excluded
74-95	...	....	1976	1871	2752	1617	1094	9310	.	2439	1286	3102	....	....	2297	..	3102	12,226	.	...	..	....	134	39	21,709	
	....	....	200	202	115	449	—1094	966	..	24	27	..	....	....	44	..	....	95	.	....	....	....	30	3	.	Woods excluded
96-144	....	....	2176	2073	2867	2066	. .	9182	. .	2463	1313	3102	..	....	2341	.	3102	12,321	. .	.	. .	....	164	42	21,709	
	...	..	33	25	25	29	....	112	..	511	—1313	..	....	..	558	....	..	1,069	.	.	. .	....	121	11	..	Lewis excluded
145-192	.	....	2209	2098	2892	2095	. .	9294	.	2974	....	3102	..	....	2899	. .	3102	12,077	.	..	..	.	285	53	21,709	
	.	....	612	732	515	—2095		1859		47	....	....	..	..	65		....	112	..	..	..	..	122	2	.	Tyler excluded
193	....	....	2821	2830	**3407**	. .	. .	9058	. .	3021	. .	3102	....	....	2964	.	3102	12,189	. .	.	....	.	407	55	21,709	*Mahoney elected*
	....	....	117	177	—305	.	. .	294		1	....	....	..	..	1	...	..	2	..	.	....	....	5	4	..	Mahoney's surplus dis.
	...	....	2938	**3007**	3102	.	..	9047	....	**3022**	....	3102	..	..	**2965**	....	3102	12,191	....	...	....		412	59	21,709	*Dwyer-Gray, Grant, and Soundy elected*
		...	—2938	95	...		....	95	...	80	...	....	....	....	137	....	..	217	...	.	....	..	2626	....	.	Cosgrove excluded
	...	....	..	3102	3102	.	. .	6204	..	3102	....	3102	....	....	3102	..	3102	12,408	.	....	.	. .	3038	59	21,709	

NOTE.—The heavy line indicates the end of the official count.

TABLE 25. RESULT SHEET—DIVISION OF FRANKLIN.

Electors on Roll, 24,280. Valid Votes, 22,469. Quota, 3210. Informal Papers, 707 = 3·05 per cent.

Count No.	CANDIDATES.																		Exhaust.	Loss by Fractions.	Total Valid Votes.	
	LABOUR.						NATIONALIST.							INDEPENDENT.								
	Brooker.	Dwyer.	Hohne.	McGann.	Ogilvie.	Total Labour.	Baker.	Burgess.	Evans.	Piggott.	Rennie.	Seabrook.	Total Nationalist.	Collis.	Murdoch.	Pearsall.	Watkins.	Total Independent.				
1	612	1531	413	661	**3930**	7147	**4583**	532	1593	1303	252	1612	9875	389	1156	1626	2276	5447	..	....	22,469	*Baker and Ogilvie elected*
2	61	11	2	1	..	75	—1373	195	475	232	49	174	1125	22	32	48	65	167	....	6	....	Baker's surplus dis.
3	673	1542	415	662	3930	7222	3210	727	2068	1535	301	1786	9627	411	1188	1674	2341	5614	....	6	22,469	
	104	269	120	121	—720	614	....	3	8	8	3	8	30	4	10	20	36	70	..	6	....	Ogilvie's surplus dis.
4-6	777	1811	535	783	3210	7116	3210	730	2076	1543	304	1794	9657	415	1198	1694	2377	5684	....	12	22,469	
	2	5	....	2	....	9	....	48	66	58	— 304	60	232	5	7	13	32	57	..	6	....	Rennie excluded
7-10	779	1816	535	785	3210	7125	3210	778	2142	1601	....	1854	9585	420	1205	1707	2409	5741	..	18	22,469	
	21	16	10	3	....	50	..	16	27	22	....	11	76	— 420	84	113	88	285	1	8	....	Collis excluded
11-17	800	1832	545	788	3210	7175	3210	794	2169	1623	....	1865	9661	..	1289	1820	2497	5606	1	26	22,469	
	102	265	—545	90	..	457	...	8	14	7	..	11	40	....	12	4	24	40	2	6	...	Hohne excluded
18-28	902	2097	..	878	3210	7087	3210	802	2183	1630	..	1876	9701	....	1301	1824	2521	5646	3	32	22,469	
	22	60	....	12	....	94	...	—802	330	82		121	533	....	57	41	56	154	11	10	...	Burgess excluded
29-48	924	2157	....	**890**	3210	7181	3210	....	2513	1712	....	1997	9432	.	1358	1865	2577	5800	14	42	22,469	
	270	481	....	—890	..	751	....	....	16	11	....	12	39	....	24	26	33	83	8	9	...	McGann excluded
49-74	1194	2638	...	....	3210	7042	3210	....	2529	1723	...	2009	9471	....	1382	1891	2610	5883	22	51	22,469	
	—1194	575	....	....	....	575	....	..	54	15	..	21	90	..	43	26	154	223	284	22	..	Brooker excluded
75	..	**3213**	....	....	3210	6423	3210	....	2583	1738	...	2030	9561	....	1425	1917	2764	6106	306	73	22,469	*Dwyer elected*
	...	— 3	....	....	..	— 3	...	....	..	...	....	....	....	..	..	..	....	....	2	1	....	Dwyer's surplus dis.
76-107	..	3210	....	....	3210	6420	3210	..	2583	1738	....	2030	9561	..	1425	1917	2764	6106	308	74	22,469	
	....	....	....	....	..	..	...	.	142	87	....	180	409	....	—1425	687	240	927	78	11	...	Murdoch excluded
108-146	..	3210	....	....	3210	6420	3210	..	2725	1825	....	2210	9970	....		2604	3004	5608	386	85	22,469	
	....	....	....	....	..	..	....	....	565	—1825	..	755	1320	.	.	258	163	421	73	11	...	Piggott excluded
147	....	3210	. .	. .	3210	6420	3210	....	**3290**		. .	2965	9465	..	.	2862	3167	6029	459	96	22,469	*Evans elected*
	....	....	..	..	....		....	....	— 80	....	....	58	58	.		8	7	15	4	3	..	Evans' surplus dis.
	....	3210	....	..	3210	6420	3210	..	3210	....	..	**3023**	9443	....	..	2870	3174	6044	463	99	22,469	*Watkins and Seabrook elected*
	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	187	187	....	..	— 2870	36	36	2647	....	....	Pearsall excluded
	....	3210	....	....	3210	6420	3210	....	3210	....	....	3210	9630	..	...	....	3210	3210	3110	99	22,469	

NOTE.—The heavy line indicates the end of the official count.