

(No. 4.)

1925

TASMANIA

THE PARLIAMENT OF TASMANIA

REPORT ON GENERAL ELECTION

3rd JUNE, 1925

WITH STATISTICS OF OTHER ELECTIONS HELD IN
TASMANIA FROM 1903 TO 1925

BY

D'ARCY W. ADDISON, 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

1926

**REPORT OF THE GENERAL ELECTION HELD ON THE
3rd JUNE, 1925.**

Office of the Chief Electoral
Officer for the State,
Hobart, 8th December, 1925.

SIR,

I HAVE the honour to submit my report on the General Election held on the 3rd June, 1925.

Parliament was dissolved by His Excellency the Governor on the 20th April, 1925, and the following dates were fixed in connection with the Election:—

Issue of writs	27th April, 1925.
Nominations	5th May, 1925.
Polls	3rd June, 1925.
Writs returned	20th June, 1925.

The number of nominations received totalled 74, the candidates being distributed throughout the five Divisions as follows:—

Bass	17
Darwin	14
Denison	16
Franklin	13
Wilmot	14
Total	74

This number represents a decrease of 3 candidates as compared with 1922, and 14 as compared with the 1919 General Election. At the 1925 Election 17 candidates lost their deposits, which is two less than the previous Election.

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

	Electors Enrolled.		Total Votes Recorded.
Bass	22,351	..	15,207
Darwin	23,019	..	16,232
Denison	24,664	..	17,021
Franklin	23,493	..	15,006
Wilmot	21,374	..	13,815
	114,901	..	77,281

This represents a percentage of 67·3 on the total enrolment. It is interesting to note that the percentage of informal votes, namely, 2·22, is the lowest on record; 2·63 being recorded at the 1922 State Election. It will be noted in Table 11 that the percentage of informal papers at the General Election of 1916 was as high as 5·51.

Of the total votes recorded 5597 were absent votes, of which 5398 were valid, thus indicating that a considerable body of electors found it necessary to take advantage of the absent voting provisions of the Act. Under Section 116A (which deals with errors and omissions in the rolls) it is observed from the divisional returns that a comparatively large number of electors claimed to vote. This fact, however, cannot be regarded as a reliable indication of enrolment errors, for the reason that a considerable number of claims, upon examination at the scrutiny, were disallowed, thus indicating that the responsibility of exclusion rested with the elector.

The postal vote provisions proved adequate to meet the requirements of this Election, but with a view to facilitating their operation it is proposed, when a convenient opportunity occurs, to submit an amendment, with a view to withholding the issue of postal vote certificates until the nominations close, and also to authorise the issue of postal ballot-papers with the names of the candidates typewritten or printed thereon. Electors who vote by post frequently complain that the issue of a blank ballot-paper imposes a disadvantage upon them. There is no doubt that this contention is quite correct, and that the issue of a printed ballot-paper, which is not legal at the present time, would be of considerable assistance to electors who vote by post.

Four hundred and forty-eight polling-places were open throughout the State on election day, being an increase of 26 as compared with the previous General Election, and the total number of 1009 officials were engaged in connection with the conduct of this Election.

An important question arose in regard to the staffing of the booths, it being considered extremely desirable that at least two officers should be attached to each booth to guard against sudden sickness, or other contingencies that might arise in connection with the working of the booth; moreover, the presence of two officers affords a safeguard against any suggestion that the Election day proceedings were improperly carried out, or that an officer, through lack of supervision, was influenced by personal motives in any particular case.

The question of the publication of polling-place results again came under review, and we have now been able to gain a clear indication that the publication of subdivisional returns meets all reasonable requirements. The press and the public made no request for additional details, and, apart from this, regard must be paid to such questions as the secrecy of the ballot; the congestion and overloading of the telegraph service; the difficulty of safely and accurately handling polling-place results on election night; and the unwarranted expense involved. Taking everything into consideration, the publication of subdivisional results only would appear to meet all requirements.

The Election was conducted under the provisions of "The Electoral Act, 1907," and amendments thereto. According to reports received from the returning officers, no difficulty was experienced in the conduct of the Election, which is an indication of the efficiency and care displayed by all concerned, for which I desire to express my appreciation.

In conclusion, I would like to place on record the valuable services rendered by the Deputy Chief Electoral Officer (Mr. E. Parkes) and the Central Staff of the Electoral Administration.

Appended hereto will be found tables compiled by the Deputy-Statistician (Mr. L. F. Giblin), together with his observations amplifying various phases of the election.

I have, &c.,

D. W. ADDISON,
Chief Electoral Officer.

The Hon. the Chief Secretary,
Hobart.

STATISTICAL TABLES.—GENERAL ELECTION, 3RD JUNE, 1925. (WITH COMPARISONS WITH PREVIOUS ELECTIONS.)

TABLE 1.—*Electors, Voters, and Informal Votes—General Election, 3rd June, 1925.*

	Estimated Population, 30th June, 1925.	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	41,870	22,351	534	15,207	68·0	277	1·82	14,930
Darwin	47,200	23,019	488	16,232	70·5	408	2·51	15,824
Denison	42,840	24,664	576	17,021	69·0	360	2·12	16,661
Franklin	42,050	23,493	559	15,006	63·8	338	2·25	14,668
Wilnot	37,940	21,374	563	13,815	64·6	331	2·40	13,484
Total	211,900	114,901	542	77,241	67·3	1714	2·22	75,567

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 1925, as in 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 1913.*

	3rd June, 1925.	10th June, 1922.	31 May, 1919.	25 March, 1916.	23 January, 1913.
Electors on Roll—					
Male	56,667	54,958	53,205	54,466	53,372
Female	58,234	55,591	54,336	52,855	51,920
Total	114,901	110,549	107,541	107,321	105,292
Males—per cent. of total	49·3	49·7	49·5	50·8	50·7
Electors per 1000 of population	542	514	529	575	543
Votes Recorded:—					
Male	41,322	38,457	37,037	41,427	n
Female	35,959	31,295	34,027	37,557	n
Total	77,281	69,752	71,064	78,984	70,802
Male—per cent. of total	53·5	55·1	52·1	52·5	n
Voters - Percentage to Electors on Roll:—					
Male	72·92	70·0	69·6	76·06	n
Female	61·75	56·3	62·6	71·05	n
Total	67·26	63·1	66·1	73·60	67·24
Valid votes recorded					
	75,567	67,918	68,250	74,514	68,767
Informal Votes:—					
Number	1714	1834	2814	4470	2035
Percentage to votes recorded	2·22	2·63	3·96	5·66	2·87
Number of candidates	74	77	57	45	50
Number of deposits forfeited	17	19	4	3	4
Number of members elected at first count	6	2	13	11	8
Total number of counts	381	439	264	117	108
Greatest number of counts for one division	118	160	126	54	56

n Not now ascertainable accurately.

The number of electors on the rolls shows an increase of over 4000 since the election of 1922. The proportion to population, 542 per 1000, is exactly the proportion which total adults bore to population at the census of 1921. The proportion of adults has no doubt declined since the census, but there is no reason to suppose that there is any considerable inflation of the roll.

The percentage of electors who voted was 67 per cent. For both men and women the proportion was higher than in the last elections but smaller than in 1912 or 1916, when it was 73 per cent.

The proportion of informal votes was only 2·22 per cent. of the whole, which is again the lowest figure recorded under proportional representation in Tasmania, and much lower than for any Senate election.

The number of candidates (74) was slightly less than in 1922; but on account of a large number being elected at the first count the number of counts required to complete the scrutiny shows a considerable abatement.

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

Electors on Roll—Males.					Voters—Male.			
	1925.	1922.	1919.	1916.	1925.	1922.	1919.	1916.
Bass.....	10,583	11,184	10,636	11,154	7,806	7,698	7,118	8,363
Darwin	12,174	9,459	10,203	11,024	9,226	6,721	7,319	8,168
Denison	11,075	12,896	11,319	10,787	8,257	9,166	8,288	8,414
Franklin	11,918	12,172	11,837	11,803	8,457	8,415	8,187	9,163
Wilmot	10,917	9,248	9,210	9,698	7,576	6,457	6,125	7,319
Total	56,667	54,958	53,205	54,466	41,322	38,457	37,037	41,427

Electors on Roll—Females.					Voters—Female.			
	1925.	1922.	1919.	1916.	1925.	1922.	1919.	1916.
Bass.....	11,768	12,174	11,741	11,812	7,401	6,615	7,025	8,099
Darwin	10,845	8,033	8,385	8,385	7,006	4,300	5,306	6,175
Denison	13,589	15,597	14,300	13,244	8,764	9,690	9,689	9,595
Franklin	11,575	10,683	10,688	10,313	6,549	5,501	6,480	7,258
Wilmot	10,457	9,104	9,222	9,101	6,239	5,189	5,527	6,430
Total	58,234	55,591	54,336	52,855	35,959	31,295	34,027	37,557

Electors on Roll—Both Sexes.					Voters—Both Sexes.			
	1925.	1922.	1919.	1916.	1925.	1922.	1919.	1916.
Bass.....	22,351	23,358	22,377	22,966	15,207	14,313	14,143	16,462
Darwin	23,019	17,492	18,588	19,409	16,232	11,021	12,625	14,343
Denison	24,664	28,492	25,619	24,031	17,021	18,856	17,977	18,009
Franklin	23,493	22,855	22,525	22,116	15,006	13,916	14,657	16,421
Wilmot	21,374	18,352	18,432	18,799	13,815	11,646	11,652	13,749
Total	114,901	110,549	107,541	107,321	77,281	69,752	71,064	78,984

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 1925 the greatest excess was only 15 per cent. Denison has still the greatest number of electors, but both Darwin and Franklin have considerably more male electors than Denison.

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

" Not available.

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. 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.

REPRESENTATION OF PARTIES.

The election of 1925 was marked by an apparent multiplication of parties, which had, however, little political significance, but was rather the result of some confusion in the party machinery, combined with other factors of a somewhat personal nature. The following table shows the political description of candidates as given unofficially in the daily press:—

Description.	Political Description of Candidates.	Number of Candidates.
Parties—		
Nationalist	25
Liberal	10
Labour	30
Non-Party—		
Independent Labour	2
Independent	7
		74

NOTE.—All the non-party candidates were independent not only of party but of one another. Under the circumstances it will be profitable not to follow out the fortunes of the nominal parties under proportional representation, but rather to confine attention to the main divisions of Labour and non-Labour. It happens that all the candidates can be placed with rough accuracy in one of these divisions. The record of the transfer of votes to and from the Independent candidates, as shown in the result sheets (Tables 21 to 25), is conclusive as to how they were regarded politically by the electors. In only one case, that of Mr. Jensen in Bass, some doubt might exist, because Mr. Jensen was rejected only at the last count, and consequently his votes were not transferred to other candidates. An analysis was therefore made of the ballot-papers on which Mr. Jensen was marked No. 1 (see Table 20), which shows that three-quarters of the No. 2 and No. 3 choices on these papers were for Labour candidates. The possible transfer to non-Labour candidates was not, therefore, very considerable and was, in fact, little greater in proportion to the total votes than the actual transfer of Mrs. Waterworth's votes in Denison to Labour candidates. (See Table 23). It is of interest to note that the same test applied to Mr. Jensen's papers in 1922 (see Report, 1922, p. 21) gave a quite different result. The papers on that occasion showed almost exact equality between Labour and non-Labour candidates in respect to subsequent choices, so that his votes were not counted to either Labour or non-Labour in assessing the representation of the two groups.

It appears then that if the votes for the Independent Labour candidates are counted as Labour votes and those for all other Independent candidates as non-Labour votes that the political choice of the electors will be measured with substantial accuracy. This has been done in Table 5 below, with a comparison of the number of seats won by either group with the number to which it was entitled on the votes. Table 6 gives a summary of similar results for the last six elections. It will be observed that the final result for the whole State of 16 Labour members to 14 non-Labour members gives to parties the most exact representation possible in proportion to numerical strength. In each of the three preceding elections there had been a slight divergence between the strength of parties and representation. This divergence was trifling in comparison with the vagaries of elections without proportional representation, but it is satisfactory to find the results in 1925 recovering the greater exactness which they had in the first three elections under the present system.

For the separate divisions there is the same correspondence between voting strength and representation, except in Denison, where it appears at first sight that by a very small margin non-Labour was entitled to an additional seat. An examination of the result sheet (Table 23), however, shows that Mrs. Waterworth, and to a less degree Colonel Payne, received a considerable number of Number 1 choices from electors who gave their next choice to Labour candidates. The number of votes which thus passed to Labour candidates was 274, and if only half of these are counted as Labour votes it would be enough to justify four seats for Labour in Denison. As it happened, the fourth seat was nearly lost to the Labour party through exhaust votes. About 160 ballot-papers of apparently Labour electors were exhausted through not expressing enough preferences. The same cause actually lost a seat to non-Labour in the 1922 election for the same electorate.

TABLE 5.—Party Strength as indicated by No. 1 Preferences, 1925—Labour and Non-Labour.

Division.	Number of 1st Choices.		Proportionate Share and Seats Actually Won.	
	Non-Labour.	Labour.	Non-Labour.	Labour.
Bass	7043	7887	2·83 3	3·17 3
Darwin	7676	8148	2·91 3	3·09 3
Denison	7144	9517	2·57 2	3·43 4
Franklin	7207	7461	2·95 3	3·05 3
Wilmot	7262	6222	3·23 3	2·77 3
Total	36,332	39,235	14·49 (a) 14	15·51 (a) 16
			14·42 (b)	15·58 (b)

NOTE.—The upper figures of each bracket represent the proper allotment of members to the party on the assumption that the No. 1 preference indicates the party vote and the lower figure the seats actually won. The total (a) obtained by adding the shares for each division is the proper total on the basis of electorates of unequal size, and consequently votes of unequal value. If each vote should have equal weight throughout the State, the total (b) gives the proper share for each party, as would be given by the uniform quota.

TABLE 6.—Party Strength, General Elections, 1912-25, showing Seats Due to Parties in Proportion to No. 1 Preferences Recorded, and Seats Actually Won.

Division.	Seat.	1912.		1913.		1916.		1919.		1922.		1925.	
		Non-Labour.	Labour.	Non-Labour.	Labour.	Non-Labour.	Labour.	Non-Labour.	Labour.	Non-Labour.	Labour.	Non-Labour.	Labour.
Bass	Proper share	3.11	2.89	2.98	3.02	2.81	3.19	3.73	2.27	3.13	2.37	2.83	3.17
	Actually won	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	2	3	2	3	3
Darwin	Proper share	2.83	3.17	2.93	3.07	2.96	3.04	3.15	2.85	3.39	2.61	2.91	3.09
	Actually won	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Denison	Proper share	3.07	2.93	3.12	2.88	3.62	2.98	3.34	2.66	3.62	2.38	2.57	3.13
	Actually won	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	4
Franklin	Proper share	3.44	2.56	3.37	2.63	3.11	2.89	3.31	2.69	3.67	2.33	2.95	3.05
	Actually won	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	2	3	3
Wilmot	Proper share	3.96	2.04	3.35	2.17	3.65	2.35	4.19	1.81	4.36	1.64	3.23	2.77
	Actually won	4	2	4	2	4	2	4	2	4	2	3	3
All	Proper share (a)	16.41	13.59	15.75	13.77	15.55	14.45	17.72	12.28	18.17	11.33	14.49	15.51
	Proper share (b)	16.35	13.65	15.78	13.80	15.46	14.54	17.56	12.44	18.07	11.42	14.42	15.58
	Actually won	16	14	16	14	16	14	17	13	17†	12	14	16

(a) Division quota. (b) Uniform quota. † Votes of one Independent candidate not allocated to parties.

ABSENT VOTES, POSTAL VOTES, AND SECTION 116A.

Under the provisions of Section 116A, 1259 persons whose names were not on the roll claimed the right to vote and filled in ballot-papers. Of these, 891 were rejected because their claim to be on the roll could not be sustained. The remaining 368 were admitted to the scrutiny, and 15 of them rejected for informalities, leaving 353 valid votes under Section 116A.

The number of absent votes was 6374, but these included a number whose names were not, in fact, on the roll, and 777 were rejected on this account. A further 199 were rejected for informalities, leaving 5398 valid absent votes.

All the numbers in the two preceding paragraphs show an increase of something like 10 per cent. over those for the election of 1922, with which alone they can be compared on account of changes in the Act and regulations.

Postal votes, on the other hand, were 591 or 67 less than in 1922. Labour candidates received five postal votes per 1000 total votes, and non-Labour candidates 11 postal votes per 1000 total votes. The proportion of Labour postal votes was the same as in 1922, but the non-Labour proportion dropped from 13 to 11 per 1000.

Tables 7, 8, and 9 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 1668, compared with 1473 in 1922. These votes are not counted either as votes recorded or as informal votes.

TABLE 7.—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	120	93	213	91	527	293	820	745
Darwin	123	83	206	21	604	249	853	751
Denison	176	166	342	125	1435	871	2306	2069
Franklin	209	127	336	123	893	467	1360	1154
Wilmot	94	68	162	8	595	440	1035	878
Total	722	537	1259	368	4054	2320	6374	5397

TABLE 8.—Valid Postal Votes in Parties.

Division.	Non-Labour.	Labour.	Total.
Bass.....	126	55	181
Darwin	27	25	52
Denison	137	78	215
Franklin.....	68	20	88
Wilmot	37	18	55
Total	395	196	591

TABLE 9. Summary of Absent and Postal Voting.

	1925.	1922.	1919.	1916.	1913.	1912.
Valid Absent Votes	5398 (a)	5032 (a)	1875 (b)	2901 (b)
Valid Votes under Section 116A	353	296
Valid Postal Votes	591	658	640	950	1772	1664

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

INFORMAL VOTES.

Informal votes amounted to only 2.22 per cent. of the total, compared with 2.63 per cent. in 1922. This percentage is the lowest so far under proportional representation, and is less than that for any election of the House of Representatives in Tasmania, even when it was necessary only to mark a single candidate with a × (see Table 13.) Full details of different kinds of informality have not been taken out for this election, but a summary is given for each division in Table 11. It appears that the improvement on last election is due to less frequent marking of three crosses instead of 1, 2, 3, and that improvement, as pointed out in the last report, might reasonably be expected from the change in the Federal system of voting.

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

TABLE 10.—Informal Ballot-papers, General Election, 1925, showing Specific Sources of Informality in each Division

	Bass.	Darwin.	Denison.	Franklin.	Wilmot.	All Divisions.
Total Number of Ballot-papers Polled.	15,207	16,232	17,021	15,006	13,815	77,281
Defective Preference Numbering	147	231	206	157	139	880
Three ×'s, three 1's, &c.	87	145	110	153	108	603
Various other Defects	49	32	44	28	84	231
Total Informal Ballot-papers	277	408	360	338	331	1714
Percentage of Informals to total Papers Polled	1.82	2.51	2.12	2.25	2.40	2.22
Defects in Postal Voting	4	1	15	4	...	24

TABLE 11.—*Informal Ballot-papers, 1909-1925.—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.						
	1909	1·47	1·19	1·45	1·20	2·22	1·49
	1912	<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>
	1913	·88	1·21	1·34	1·25	1·09	1·16
	1916	1·14	1·32	1·48	·95	2·05	1·31
	1919	·81	1·17	1·32	1·36	1·29	1·19
	1922	1·09	1·17	1·30	1·19	1·77	1·29
	1925	·97	1·42	1·21	1·05	1·01	1·14
Uniformly marking as follows : — <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;">×</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;">1</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;">—</div> </div> and so failing to distinguish preference.	1909	·72	1·26	·91	1·17	·83	·97
	1912	<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>
	1913	1·23	1·50	1·53	1·53	1·09	1·38
	1916	2·35	3·40	3·68	4·88	2·42	3·44
	1919	2·28	2·95	1·34	1·62	2·58	2·08
	1922	·75	1·22	·77	1·37	1·30	1·05
	1925	·57	·89	·65	1·02	·78	·78
	Sundry defects	1909	·37	·47	·43	·27	·39
1912		<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>
1913		·38	·36	·48	·39	·21	·37
1916		·39	·77	·87	·69	1·06	·76
1919		·24	·24	·36	·37	2·19	·61
1922		·21	·17	·51	·30	·13	·29
1925 (<i>b</i>)		·28	·20	·6	·18	·61	·30
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	5·51
	1919	3·33	4·36	3·02	3·34	6·06	3·88
	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

a Details not ascertained. *b* Excluding informalities 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 12.—*Votes Lost by Exhaustion.*

	1925.	1922.	1919.	1916.	1913.	1912.	1909.
Bass	485	1133	645	500	899	875	251
Darwin	914	191	454	461	655	531	87
Denison	224	400	392	763	1212	65	708
Franklin	918	592	389	725	42	1160	696
Wilmot	518	291	366	451	390	306	159
Total	3059	2499	2246	2900	3198	2937	1901
Percentage of Total Votes	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 3059, or about 4 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. It is largely due to the habit of restricting preferences to members of the elector's party, but the increased percentage of the last two elections is probably due, to some extent, to differences within the broad party groups.

TABLE 13 — Elections held in Tasmania, 1903-1925.— 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	1.48	Striking out all names but one
Senate	1 (all)	16.12.1903	37,021	1441	3.89	× opposite three names
Representatives	5		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		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			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			2470	3.07	× opposite one name
Senate (Dissolution)	1	5.9.1914	82,253	3871	4.71	× opposite six names
Representatives	4			65,103	1549	2.38
...	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			65,873	2021	3.07
...	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			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			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			5027	4.89	Preference 1, 2, 3

TABLE 14.—*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 Population (previous 31st Dec.	Electoral 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.	
											A.—Adult Males.
1870...	48,559	100,765	30	30	30	11,171*	11·08	23·00	Property value of £7
1871...	49,050	101,785	32	32	32	13,801*	13·56	28·14	Ditto
1872...	49,600	102,925	32	32	32	14,001*	13·60	28·24	Salary £80 annually
1881...	56,919	118,713	32	32	32	15,659*	13·26	27·51	Ditto
1891...	75,562	152,619	36	28	20	8	...	25,932*	16·98	34·32	Salary or wage £60
1901...	87,232	174,011	38	29	20	9	...	39,002*	22·41	44·71	Ditto
1902...	88,269	176,080	35	35	35	39,495*	22·43	44·74	Manhood Suffrage
1906...	92,543	184,607	35	35	35	89,029	48·23	96·20	B.—Universal Suffrage
1908...	94,758	189,024	35	35	35	86,361	45·69	91·14	Ditto
1909...	100,629	191,272	30	5	5	98,230	51·36	97·62	Ditto
1911...	101,900	193,803	30	5	5	102,326	52·80	100·40	Ditto
1912...	101,500	192,925	30	5	5	103,513	53·66	102·00	Ditto
1913...	103,540	195,927	30	5	5	105,292	53·73	101·68	Ditto
1916...	104,600	197,536	30	5	5	107,321	54·31	102·61	Ditto
1919...	108,300	202,843	30	5	5	107,541	53·00	99·30	Ditto
1922...	118,500	218,316	30	5	5	110,549	50·62	93·30	Ditto
1925...	118,200	217,839	30	5	5	114,901	52·74	97·20	Ditto

* Males only.

VOTING IN SUBDIVISIONS.

The following Tables, 15 to 19, 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 15.—First Choices for Candidates by Subdivisions—Division of Bass.
(Quota 2183.)

Subdivision.	Electors.				First Choices obtained by Candidates.												Votes.									
	On Roll.		Who Voted.		National.						Liberal.						Labour.				Independent Labour.		Invalid Votes Recorded.			
	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Murphy.	Pullen.	Shields.	Sullivan.	Thompson.	Total.	Bryant.	Copplestone.	James.	Newton.	Proctor.	Rose.	Total.	Beker.	Guy.	Holmes.	Shaw.	Total.		Independent Labour.	Marshall.	Informal.
Flinders	254	183	154	86	4	1	5	...	35	45	1	1	16	59	...	77	4	49	...	1	54	27	30	7	233	
George Town	244	232	476	170	5	3	2	...	28	38	1	9	32	40	...	111	25	90	...	1	123	44	1	6	317	
Launceston, Central.....	1214	1683	2897	791	31	34	37	22	144	268	11	2	317	180	6	544	144	302	11	194	651	203	78	28	1744	
Launceston, East	1771	2541	4319	1538	26	79	65	8	251	429	7	16	639	344	34	1048	182	545	15	225	967	195	133	35	2772	
Launceston, North	1922	2128	4050	1348	40	57	36	10	68	211	5	8	246	134	27	423	214	1099	33	244	1590	293	57	59	2576	
Launceston, West	1556	1898	3454	1159	35	60	103	14	162	374	6	9	282	188	9	499	132	529	15	396	1072	183	55	37	2183	
Lilydale	784	674	1458	541	30	6	3	1	37	77	1	19	42	104	340	1	507	112	107	41	37	287	36	6	13	923
Portland	382	306	688	265	1	1	5	...	38	56	3	10	38	18	11	82	186	32	6	13	237	26	4	11	405	
Ringarooma	1230	931	2161	810	1	119	240	3	28	111	32	56	17	32	22	947	453	151	32	45	681	140	27	18	1385	
Scottsdale	755	700	1455	508	263	6	1	1	18	289	...	82	52	9	22	108	76	26	218	6	326	31	11	16	930	
St. Leonards	471	492	963	291	17	12	3	...	51	83	3	4	67	75	21	171	34	110	15	38	197	66	14	7	531	
Absent Votes	485	28	16	8	3	51	106	1	14	97	76	47	242	84	120	29	47	280	52	29	29	36	709
Votes under Sec. 116A	48	...	2	1	1	5	9	11	5	4	21	12	22	5	9	48	11	2	2	91	
Postal Votes	65	3	5	7	...	25	40	58	22	5	85	7	24	1	13	45	10	1	1	4	
Total	10,583	11,768	22,351	7806	597	289	286	61	1032*	2265	42	202	3008*	1286*	633	4330	1665*	3206*	428	1269*	6508	1319	448	277	14,930	

* Elected.

TABLE 16.—First Choices for Candidates by Subdivisions—Division of Darwin.
(Quota 2261).

Subdivision.	Electors.				First Choices obtained by Candidates.												Votes.							
	On Roll.		Who Voted.		National.						Labour.						Liberal.			Informal.	Valid Votes Recorded.			
	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Total.	Ireland.	Jones.	Marriott.	McFie.	Nichols.	Vertigan.	Total.	Belton.	Bunnell.	Hurst.	Kelly.	Lane.	Trenor.	Total.			Charleston.	Hobbs.	Total.
Circular Head	1572	1179	2751	595	1597	18	32	169	48	77	11	355	605	51	182	110	62	3	1013	22	164	186	43	1554
Devonport	1966	1502	3468	1042	2022	198	5	170	632	45	160	1210	167	37	46	77	378	2	707	33	56	56	49	1973
Ernu Bay	1578	1371	2949	916	1993	40	31	417	79	66	19	652	292	98	558	248	46	9	1091	43	136	179	71	1922
Gormanston	286	164	450	126	348	2	...	29	5	...	36	684	178	34	70	118	125	3	528	190	166	356	35	1568
Kentish	1395	1189	2584	661	1603	25	21	74	339	133	92	684	178	34	70	118	125	3	528	190	166	356	35	1568
King Island	305	233	538	118	309	14	...	68	16	23	8	129	108	6	1	1	3	...	119	10	48	58	3	306
Leven	1567	1127	2694	976	2103	23	7	131	42	498	114	815	199	16	97	297	20	2	631	206	407	613	44	2059
Penguin	650	583	1233	458	830	15	1	77	44	63	103	303	104	17	96	51	8	1	277	74	162	236	14	816
Queenstown	762	602	1364	452	1082	4	4	120	7	135	115	11	18	510	20	231	905	...	6	6	36	1046
Strahan	197	137	334	97	243	8	1	31	2	42	42	4	15	124	6	...	191	10	233
Table Cape	1386	1323	2709	933	1695	23	259	303	73	95	34	787	499	19	86	34	27	2	667	58	162	220	21	1674
Waratah	466	261	727	349	540	3	2	65	4	...	2	76	114	14	41	260	8	3	440	1	11	12	12	528
Zeehan	744	549	1293	610	1037	10	7	120	8	13	...	158	153	19	53	555	38	18	831	5	24	29	19	1018
Absent Votes	526	751	10	13	76	62	45	20	236	183	15	70	101	27	12	408	35	48	83	34	717
Votes under Sec. 116A	14	21	1	...	1	...	1	9	4	14	...	7	2	4	17
Postal Votes	19	58	2	17	3	7	25	...	3	10	6	52
Total	12,174	10,845	23,019	9226	16,232	396	383	1856*	1307*	1059	565	5626	2790*	348	1354*	2585*	780	291	8148	684	1366*	2050	408	15,924

* Elected.

TABLE 17.—First Choices for Candidates by Subdivisions—Division of Devon.
(Quota 2381.)

Subdivision.	Electors.			First Choices obtained by Candidates.										Votes.												
	On Roll.			Who Voted.			National.					Labour.					Independent Labour.	Independent.	Informal.	Valid Votes Recorded.						
	Males.	Females.	Total.	Males.	Females.	Total.	Hammond.	Farvis.	McPhee.	Payne.	Soundy.	Wilson.	Total.	Clary.	Cosgrove.	Galley.					Lyons.	Metz.	Ogivate.	Woods.	Total.	
Hobart Central	1500	1673	3173	988	968	1956	121	19	50	119	61	104	25	499	134	261	257	105	92	107	170	1056	303	42	56	1900
Hobart East	1112	1212	2324	671	635	1306	138	21	25	82	58	79	29	432	98	132	135	50	19	99	80	613	215	17	29	1277
Hobart North	2394	2927	5321	1536	1771	3307	190	43	41	251	103	580	24	1232	286	306	316	157	23	166	453	1707	230	79	59	3248
Hobart South	1719	2367	4086	974	1319	2293	345	39	85	133	202	248	48	1110	125	146	304	114	16	99	140	944	101	90	48	2245
Hobart West	1712	2039	3751	1065	1133	2198	136	21	25	160	86	221	17	726	173	335	236	116	21	136	182	1199	158	65	50	2148
New Town	1684	2106	3790	928	1192	2120	171	15	35	197	202	325	67	1012	133	102	204	230	33	88	166	956	49	65	38	2082
Queenborough	954	1265	2219	628	801	1429	147	16	17	230	91	169	19	689	80	126	149	75	10	45	128	613	53	41	33	1396
Absent Votes	1300	769	2069	155	28	25	167	162	223	42	802	165	178	210	135	22	159	138	1007	162	59	39	2080
Postal Votes	67	58	125	11	1	1	9	8	14	1	45	9	7	14	4	18	61	12	2	5	120
Total	11,075	13,589	24,664	8257	8764	17,021	1524	205	258	1436*	994	1989*	276	6682	1208*	1612*	1835*	998	167	922	1490*	8282	1285	462	360	16,661

* Elected.

TABLE 18.—First Choices for Candidates by Subdivisions—Division of Franklin.
(Quota 2096).

Subdivision.	Electors.						First Choices obtained by Candidates.												Votes.					
	On Roll.			Who Voted.			National.			Labour.						Independent.			Total.	Invalid Recorded.				
	Males.	Females.	Total.	Males.	Females.	Total.	Cummins.	Evans.	Johnson.	Total.	Lewis.	Lyden.	Ogilvie.	Sheldan.	Thompson.	Triffin.	Watkins.	Total.			Murdoch.	Pearsall.	Piggott.	
Clarence.....	970	1135	2105	660	702	1362	181	176	12	369	10	18	317	87	6	1	53	492	283	102	85	470	31	1331
Esperance.....	810	760	1570	549	382	931	73	44	135	252	3	10	388	58	8	25	30	522	8	36	105	139	18	913
Glenorchy.....	826	593	1219	363	281	644	66	119	10	195	51	21	201	45	12	...	30	360	21	21	31	73	16	698
Huon.....	973	904	1877	674	463	1137	173	193	9	375	2	5	182	47	1	83	13	339	19	99	277	395	28	1109
Kingborough.....	1105	964	2069	731	524	1255	95	169	23	287	7	6	216	63	48	19	34	393	18	422	110	550	25	1230
Moonah.....	1897	1903	3800	1278	1122	2400	167	286	13	468	151	392	756	259	52	2	87	1699	69	32	75	176	59	2341
Nelson.....	1391	1789	3180	827	931	1758	170	444	11	625	34	31	361	134	44	...	179	783	73	103	145	321	29	1729
New Norfolk.....	1516	1384	2900	931	666	1597	83	171	19	273	172	27	604	123	13	45	85	1071	73	80	65	218	35	1562
Port Cygnet.....	747	673	1420	465	310	775	35	162	39	236	12	13	233	24	8	38	58	386	22	40	60	122	31	744
Richmond.....	519	423	942	294	172	466	37	38	6	81	8	3	132	32	...	15	21	211	138	6	17	161	13	453
Sorell.....	612	525	1137	385	215	600	32	41	6	79	7	1	99	15	6	1	26	155	304	28	27	359	7	593
Spring Bay.....	366	221	587	196	97	293	21	23	4	48	17	5	117	17	5	1	12	174	64	5	...	69	2	291
Tasman.....	386	301	687	252	166	418	24	74	...	98	1	1	119	12	13	...	27	173	83	33	30	136	11	407
Absent Votes.....	741	413	1154	90	211	9	310	33	38	348	65	25	13	84	606	92	61	62	215	23	1131
Votes under Section 116A.....	70	53	123	8	9	...	17	6	3	39	10	3	1	15	77	4	11	9	24	5	118
Postal Votes.....	41	52	93	15	97	1	43	18	1	1	20	6	7	12	25	5	88
Total.....	11,918	11,575	23,493	8437	6549	15,006	1270	2187*	297	3754	514	574	4120*	992*	247	244	760*	7461	1277*	1076	1100*	3453	338	14,868

* Elected.

TABLE 19.—First Choices for Candidates by Subdivisions—Division of Wilmot.
(Quota 1927).

Subdivision.	Electors.				First Choices obtained by Candidates.												Votes.									
	On Roll.		Who Voted.		National.				Liberal.				Labour.				Independent.			Total.	Informal.					
	Males.	Females.	Total.	Males.	Females.	Total.	Best.	Blyth.	Campbell.	Total.	Lee.	Peters.	Total.	O'Keefe.	Osbourne.	Palamountain.	Reece.	Shoobridge.	Total.			Cameron.	Newman.			
Beaconsfield	838	830	1668	592	552	1144	15	27	5	500	547	56	62	401	2	8	8	13	489	25	2	27	25	1119		
Bothwell	374	303	677	197	158	355	8	12	11	2	33	30	212	7	1	6	31	8	265	1	16	17	10	845		
Brighton	854	777	1631	539	373	912	49	20	36	54	159	31	43	17	2	9	28	26	323	17	355	372	15	897		
Campbell Town	638	589	1227	463	372	835	11	25	16	79	131	53	1	54	391	23	44	562	43	21	64	24	811			
Deloraine	1494	1395	2889	1005	754	1759	124	219	158	103	604	123	22	145	376	49	10	13	505	460	9	469	36	1723		
Evandale	1051	1119	2170	664	616	1280	47	81	8	218	354	104	29	133	456	81	43	17	619	152	6	158	16	1264		
Fingal	743	679	1422	512	387	899	51	11	19	20	101	66	5	71	364	75	149	22	27	668	51	5	56	13	886	
Grahamston	223	223	446	150	122	272	13	14	17	21	65	5	4	9	90	11	1	8	24	8	142	3	45	51	5	267
Hamilton	544	423	967	250	183	433	25	10	31	1	67	11	11	22	165	18	...	6	19	32	270	11	51	62	12	421
Latrobe	1198	1267	2465	783	685	1468	67	55	149	89	310	156	3	139	378	97	45	30	4	17	571	395	1	396	32	1436
Longford	1079	1095	2174	692	674	1366	34	124	17	68	243	282	4	286	570	45	17	5	10	16	663	134	9	143	31	1335
Oatlands	842	741	1583	471	334	805	38	22	23	20	103	58	3	61	305	21	...	13	47	41	427	41	157	198	16	789
Westbury	1039	1016	2055	732	614	1346	180	155	27	248	610	250	11	261	222	95	4	4	18	5	348	97	2	99	28	1318
Absent Votes	494	384	878	38	47	60	118	263	89	5	94	254	60	12	9	10	15	360	66	28	94	67	811
Votes under Sec. 116A	6	2	8	...	1	...	1	2	1	...	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	7	
Postal Votes	26	29	55	...	5	1	7	13	10	...	10	8	14	...	14	...	55	
Total	10,917	10,457	21,374	7576	6239	13,815	700	828	578	1499*	3605	1325*	110	1435	4125*	1037*	328	197	252	283*	1511*	711	2222	331	13,484	

* Elected.

TABLE 20.—Analysis of Mr. Jensen's First Choice Ballot-papers.—Division of Bass.

Choices.	Jensen (Independent Labour), 1319.																		Grand Total.	
	Labour.					Non-Labour.														
	Becker.	Guy.	Holmes.	Shaw.	Total.	Bryant.	Coplestone.	James.	Marshall.	Murphy.	Newton.	Proctor.	Pullen.	Rose.	Shields.	Sullivan.	Thompson.	Total.		Exhaust.
2	318	536	38	83	975	3	6	79	98	15	25	14	2	2	28	10	62	344	...	1319
3	446	379	70	89	984	6	11	33	56	22	58	23	15	10	43	9	49	335	...	1319
4	157	102	259	263	781	10	8	48	69	19	56	23	19	15	44	10	60	381	157	1319
5	51	50	194	216	511	12	12	57	71	11	32	23	15	13	46	17	80	389	419	1319
6	12	18	34	44	108	9	16	54	116	21	34	26	12	9	59	27	75	458	753	1319
7	5	3	8	6	22	6	8	9	13	8	13	6	3	8	28	5	20	127	1170	1319
8	4	3	5	6	18	3	2	9	8	5	12	4	13	5	11	9	9	90	1211	1319
9	1	...	6	...	7	3	10	3	5	8	4	6	8	15	5	7	...	74	1238	1319
10	1	1	4	3	9	5	2	4	6	10	5	3	7	7	2	4	6	61	1249	1319
11	2	1	5	3	11	2	7	3	3	3	8	7	2	5	1	3	4	48	1260	1319
12	1	2	5	3	11	6	1	...	2	4	3	10	5	5	4	2	2	44	1264	1319
13	2	2	2	...	6	...	4	1	1	1	1	2	3	7	2	5	1	34	1279	1319
14	2	1	1	6	10	4	1	2	2	2	2	...	3	6	1	1	3	27	1282	1319
15	2	...	2	2	6	3	4	...	1	3	...	3	1	2	10	3	...	30	1283	1319
16	...	1	...	1	2	6	1	5	3	1	3	...	1	12	...	32	1285	1319
17	1	6	7	3	3	3	2	...	3	...	3	1	9	27	1285	1319

SUMMARISED RESULT SHEETS.

The following Tables, 21 to 25, give the result sheet in each division. The results are, as in 1922, given in a summarised form very similar to that adopted by the English Proportional Representation Society. 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 118 counts for Bass, *e.g.*, are thus reduced to 15 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.

(No

Ca

Bec
Bry
Cop
Gu
Ho

Ja
Je
M
M
N

Pr
P
R
S
S

T

T

T

TABLE 25.—Result Sheet—Division of Wilmot.
Number of Valid Votes, 13,484. Quota, 1927. Informal Votes, 331, or 2.40 per cent.

Candidates	Party *	1 (Count 1)		2 (Count 2)		3 (Count 3)		4 (Counts 4-6)		5 (Counts 7-11)		6 (Counts 12-19)		7 (Counts 20-27)		8 (Counts 28-41)		9 (Counts 42-56)		10 (Count 57)		11 (Counts 58-81)		12 (Count 82)		Order Elected								
		No. of Primary Votes	Lyons' Surplus Distributed T.V. = 535	O'Keefe's Surplus Distributed T.V. = 235	Peters Excluded	Reece Excluded	Palamountain Excluded	Blyth Excluded	Newman Excluded	Bendall Excluded	Cameron's Surplus Distributed T.V. = 929	Osbourne Excluded	Shoobridge's Surplus Distributed T.V. = 744																					
Bendall	N	700	9	710	19	729	1	730	5	735	92	183	960	-	960	133	1540	14	1554	4	1558													
Best	N	828	7	835	17	852	1	853	2	855	107	140	1102	425	1527	140	1540	14	1554	4	1558													
Blyth	N	578	12	590	9	603	1	604	2	606	606	173	1848	105	1953	173	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927					
Cameron	I	1511	15	1526	15	1541	1	1542	4	1546	126	178	1732	195	1927	178	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927					
Campbell	N	1499	7	1506	16	1522	1	1523	2	1525	125	173	1732	195	1927	173	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927					
Lee	Lib	1325	15	1340	10	1350	1	1351	1	1352	82	78	1516	189	1705	78	1709	11	1720	1720	1720	1720	1720	1720	1720	1720	1720	1720	1720	1720				
Lyons	L	4125	2198	1927	11	1927	1	1927	6	1927	30	820	1927	820	1927	820	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927				
Newman	L	711	53	764	11	780	1	781	6	787	30	820	1927	820	1927	820	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927				
O'Keefe	L	1037	1592	2629	2	1927	1	1927	200	1927	9	66	1070	8	1078	66	1078	-1078	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927	1927				
Osbourne	L	328	78	406	2	684	1	685	2	687	9	1004	66	1070	66	1070	66	1070	1078	1078	1078	1078	1078	1078	1078	1078	1078	1078	1078	1078	1078			
Palamountain	L	197	101	298	3	437	108	545	545	545	18	1156	110	1266	110	1266	110	1266	1266	1266	1266	1266	1266	1266	1266	1266	1266	1266	1266	1266	1266			
Peters	Lib	110	3	113	116	378	378	378	378	378	18	1156	110	1266	110	1266	110	1266	1266	1266	1266	1266	1266	1266	1266	1266	1266	1266	1266	1266	1266			
Reece	L	252	70	322	3	375	3	378	3	381	3	384	37	42	37	42	37	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42		
Shoobridge	L	283	227	510	6	719	133	852	286	1138	18	1156	110	1266	110	1266	110	1266	1266	1266	1266	1266	1266	1266	1266	1266	1266	1266	1266	1266	1266	1266		
Exhaust	9	9	2	21	4	25	31	47	10	37	94	17	111	37	94	17	111	111	111	111	111	111	111	111	111	111	111	111	111	111		
Lost by fractions	9	9	2	21	4	25	31	47	10	37	94	17	111	37	94	17	111	111	111	111	111	111	111	111	111	111	111	111	111	111		
Total	...	13,484	...	13,484	...	13,484	...	13,484	...	13,484	...	13,484	...	13,484	...	13,484	...	13,484	...	13,484	...	13,484	...	13,484	...	13,484	...	13,484	...	13,484	...	13,484	...	13,484

* N=Nationalist; Lib=Liberal; L=Labour; I=Independent.

TABLE 23.—Result Sheet—Division of Denison.

Number of Valid Votes, 16,661. Quota 2381. Informal Votes, 360, or 2.12 per cent.

Table with 28 columns: Candidates, Party, 1 (Count 1), 2 (Count 2), 3 (Counts 3-4), 4 (Counts 5-6), 5 (Counts 7-10), 6 (Counts 11-15), 7 (Counts 16-22), 8 (Counts 23-32), 9 (Count 33), 10 (Counts 34-49), 11 (Count 50), 12 (Counts 51-70), 13 (Count 71), 14 (Count 72), Order Elected. Rows include Cleary, Cosgrove, Culley, Grant, Hammond, Jarvis, Lyons, McPhee, Mahoney, Metz, Ogilvie, Payne, Soundy, Waterworth, Wilson, Woods, Exhaust, and Total.

* N = Nationalist; L = Labour; I.L. = Independent Labour; I = Independent.

TABLE 24.—Result Sheet—Division of Franklin.

Number of Valid Votes, 14,668. Quota, 2096. Informal Votes, 338, or 2.25 per cent.

Table with 23 columns: Candidates, Party, 1 (Count 1), 2 (Count 2), 3 (Count 3), 4 (Counts 4-5), 5 (Counts 6-9), 6 (Counts 9-14), 7 (Count 15), 8 (Counts 16-23), 9 (Counts 23-41), 10 (Count 42), 11 (Counts 43-63), Order Elected. Rows include Cummins, Evans, Johnson, Lewis, Lyden, Murdoch, Ogilvie, Pearsall, Piggott, Sheridan, Thompson, Triffitt, Watkins, Exhaust, and Total.

* N = Nationalist; L = Labour; I = Independent.

TABLE 21.—Result Sheet—Division of Bass.

Number of Valid Votes, 14,930. Quota, 2133. Informal Votes, 277, or 1.82 per cent.

Table with columns for Candidates, Party, and counts 1 through 15. Includes sub-columns for surplus votes and excluded votes for various candidates like Becker, James, and Newton. Ends with a Total row showing 14,930 valid votes.

* N = Nationalist; Lib = Liberal; L = Labour; I.L. = Independent Labour; I = Independent.

TABLE 22.—Result Sheet—Division of Darwin.

Number of Valid Votes, 15,824. Quota, 2261. Informal Votes, 408, or 2.51 per cent.

Table with columns for Candidates, Party, and counts 1 through 12. Includes sub-columns for surplus votes and excluded votes for candidates like Belton, Kelly, and Marriott. Ends with a Total row showing 15,824 valid votes.

* N = Nationalist; Lib = Liberal; L = Labour.