# NSW PARLIAMENTARY LIBRARY RESEARCH SERVICE

# **Prospects for the 2003 Legislative Council Election**

by

**Antony Green** 

**Background Paper No 3/03** 

# **RELATED PUBLICATIONS**

- Antony Green, 1999 New South Wales Legislative Council Election, Background Paper 2/2000
- Antony Green, *Electing the New South Wales Legislative Council 1978 to 1995: Past Results and Future Prospects*, Background Paper 2/1995
- Gareth Griffith and Sharath Srinivasan, *State Upper Houses in Australia*, Background Paper 1/2001

ISSN 1325-5142 ISBN 0731317270

February 2003

© 2003

Except to the extent of the uses permitted under the *Copyright Act 1968*, no part of this document may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means including information storage and retrieval systems, with the prior written consent from the Librarian, New South Wales Parliamentary Library, other than by Members of the New South Wales Parliament in the course of their official duties.

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of the New South Wales Parliamentary Library.

# NSW PARLIAMENTARY LIBRARY RESEARCH SERVICE

David Clune (MA, PhD, Dip Lib), Manager	(02) 9	230 2	484
Gareth Griffith (BSc (Econ) (Hons), LLB (Hons), PhD), Senior Research Officer, Politics and Government / Law	(02) 9	230 2	356
Talina Drabsch (BA, LLB), Research Officer, Law	(02) 9	230 2	768
Rowena Johns (BA (Hons), LLB), Research Officer, Law	(02) 9	230 2	003
Roza Lozusic (BA, LLB), Research Officer, Law	(02) 9	230 3	085
Stewart Smith (BSc (Hons), MELGL), Research Officer, Environment	(02) 9	230 2	798
John Wilkinson (BA (Hons), MA), Research Officer, Economics	(02) 9	230 2	.006

Information about Research Publications can be found on the Internet at: <a href="http://www.parliament.nsw.gov.au/WEB\_FEED/PHWebContent.nsf/PHPages/LibraryPublication">http://www.parliament.nsw.gov.au/WEB\_FEED/PHWebContent.nsf/PHPages/LibraryPublication</a>

Advice on legislation or legal policy issues contained in this paper is provided for use in parliamentary debate and for related parliamentary purposes. This paper is not professional legal opinion.

# Prospects for the 2003 Legislative Council Election

# Contents

4		Page
1	Introduction	. 1
2 2.1 2.2 2.3 2.4 2.5	Origins of the Legislative Council and its Electoral System A Brief History of the Legislative Council Changes to the Ballot Paper since 1978 The New Ballot Paper for 2003 Changes to the Registration of Political Parties Parties Registered to Contest the 2003 Election	3 5 7 8 .10
3 3.1 3.2 3.3 3.4 3.5 3.6	Counting Votes for the Legislative Council	11 13 14 14 16 16 17 17 18
3.7	Comparison with the Senate	. 19
4 4.1	Lessons from Past Legislative Council Elections Table 4: Possible Legislative Council Result based on 2001 Senate Vote First Choice Parties and Candidates Table 5: Percentage of Vote Cast for Number 1 candidate in Party Groups Table 6: Percentage of Group Ticket Votes Table 7: Vacancies filled on distribution of initial surplus to quota votes Table 8: Percentage of Votes Staving within a Group - 1999 Election	20 20 22 22 23 23 23
4.2	Between Group Preference Flows Before Ticket Voting Table 9: Flow of Preferences from Excluded Candidates 1978-84	24
4.3 4.4	The Political Impact of Ticket Voting Table 11: Final Quota by Source – Malcolm Jones (Outdoor Recreation) Lessons from the 1999 Election	. 25 . 26 . 27 . 27
	Table 12: Preferences per Ballot Paper, 1999 Legislative Council Election	.28
5 5.1 5.2	Prospects for the 2003 Election Likely Performance of the Electoral System Problems that Remain with the Council's Voting System	<b>31</b> .31 .31
Appe 1	endices Past Legislative Council Election Results	33
2	1999 'Below the line' Vote Ballot Paper Survey results	35

### Acknowledgments

I would like to thank NSW Electoral Commissioner, Mr John Wasson, for making available the data set of below the line votes from the 1999 New South Wales Legislative Council election. I would also like to thank staff of the State Electoral Office for their assistance, in particular the help of Mr Terry Jessop.

### The Author

Antony Green is an Election Analyst with ABC Television, and has worked for the ABC on every federal, state and territory election coverage since 1989. He also writes regularly on electoral matters for the Sydney Morning Herald.

Antony studied at Sydney University, obtaining a Bachelor of Science in mathematics and computing, and a Bachelor of Economics with Honours in politics.

Antony has prepared many publications for the Parliamentary Library on different aspects of New South Wales electoral politics.

#### Party Abbreviations

- ALP Labor Party
- CDP Christian Democratic Party
- CTA Call to Australia
- DEM Australian Democrats
- GRN Greens
- IND Independents
- LIB Liberal Party
- NAT National Party
- OTH Others

# 1 Introduction

At the 1999 New South Wales election, voters were presented with an unusual physical challenge in trying to cast their votes for the Legislative Council. A record 264 candidates nominated for 81 groups on a ballot paper measuring one metre by 700mm. Quickly nicknamed the 'tablecloth', the ballot paper also created novel administrative problems for polling officials and Electoral Office staff, ranging from the need to increase the width of voting booths and provide larger ballot boxes, to hiring larger forklifts, trucks and planes to cope with the extra weight of paper.

As expected, the problems encountered in 1999 have produced a legislative response. Changes for the 2003 election include:

- Tightened rules for the registration of political parties. (See Section 2.4)
- Changes to the operation of group ticket or 'above the line' voting to prevent parties from automatically feeding preferences to other parties. (See Section 2.3)
- Groups will have to nominate at least 15 candidates before they have access to a group ticket voting square, forcing most parties to nominate more candidates and effectively increasing the deposit fee.
- A new form of 'above the line' voting will be introduced, allowing voters to express preferences for parties, in the same way they can express preferences for candidates 'below the line'. (See Section 2.3)

This research paper sets out to explain the complex procedures used to elect the Legislative Council, and also to speculate on how the new rules of the game will work at the 2003 election. The publication is arranged as follows:

<u>Section 2</u> provides some historical background on the Legislative Council and its electoral system. A brief history of the Legislative Council is provided, along with background on changes to the ballot paper and the registration of political parties since 1978. A brief summary of the new procedures for the 2003 election is provided, along with a list of parties registered to contest the election.

<u>Section 3</u> explains in detail the counting procedures and calculations used in the count. What is a quota? How are preferences distributed from excluded candidates? What are surplus to quota votes for elected candidates and how are they determined? How is the New South Wales system different from those used to elect the Commonwealth Senate and Tasmanian House of Assembly?

<u>Section 4</u> looks at past Legislative Council elections for evidence on how voters fill in their ballot papers. The tendency for voters to number straight down party groups or to use the group ticket voting square is demonstrated, and the political impact of group ticket voting explained. The results of new research by the author on below the line voting from the 1999 election is also provided as a guide to the way voters for particular parties direct preferences.

<u>Section 5</u> speculates on how the new electoral system will operate in 2003. Details of past elections are provided in <u>Appendix 1</u>, while details of the 1999 ballot paper survey are set out in <u>Appendix 2</u>.

#### **Some Important Definitions**

- <u>Proportional Representation (PR)</u>: Any electoral system that attempts to elect representatives of parties in numbers roughly proportional to their proportion of the vote. Many forms exist around the world.
- <u>Proportional Representation by Single Transferable Vote (PR-STV)</u>: The generic term for the form of proportional representation used for elections in Australia. There are minor variations in the form of PR-STV used in different states. (See Section 3 for details.)
- <u>Quota</u>: Under PR-STV, the number of votes required for election, and also the number of votes set aside during the count as electing a candidate. (See Section 3.3.)
- <u>Surplus to Quota votes</u>: Votes above the number required to elect a candidate, and which under PR-STV are then distributed as preferences to other candidates. (See Sections 3.4 and 3.5 for details.)
- <u>Partial Quota</u>: Used in this publication to refer to the total vote for parties, expressed in terms of quotas, after the election of all candidates achieving a full quota during the initial stages of the count.
- <u>Group ticket voting (GTV)</u> or <u>'above the line' voting</u>: The option available in Senate and New South Wales elections where voters can select to vote for a group's ticket of preferences rather than vote for individual candidates. (See Section 2.2 for details of the ballot paper.)
- <u>'Below the line' votes</u>: The option available in Senate and New South Wales elections where voters express preferences for individual candidates. (See Section 2.2 for details of the ballot paper.)
- <u>Groups</u>: On the Legislative Council ballot paper, candidates can 'group' themselves together and be allocated a column on the ballot paper. A group does not have to be a political party, and a group can also consist of two or more political parties.

Primary Vote: The first preference or 'Number 1' vote on a ballot paper.

- <u>Preferences</u>: All numbers on a ballot paper other than the primary vote. The word is also often loosely used to mean the *distribution of preferences*, which is the process where preferences of ballot papers are examined, and the ballot papers transferred to other candidates in the count.
- <u>Effective Candidate</u>: Either the top of ticket candidate for a group that receives less than a quota of votes, or the top remaining candidate on any group that receive more than a quota of votes.

#### Other publications

For further information on elections, see the following Library publications by the same author: Electing the New South Wales Legislative Council 1978 to 1995: Past Results and Future

Prospects (Background Paper No 2/1995) New South Wales Legislative Council Election 1995 (Background Paper No 2/1996 New South Wales Legislative Council Elections 1999 (Background Paper No 2/2000).

# 2 Origins of the Legislative Council and its Electoral System

# 2.1 A Brief History of the Legislative Council<sup>1</sup>

When the Australian colonies were first granted responsible government in the 1850's, a system of bicameral or two chamber Parliaments was established on the Westminster model in each of the then colonies. Broadly, each colonial Parliament consisted of a lower house elected by a broad male franchise, and an upper house that was nominated or elected on a very restricted franchise, mainly to protect landed interests from an excess of popular democracy in the lower house.

This bicameral model was established in NSW in May 1856 and it replaced the unicameral or single chamber Legislative Council that had existed from 1824. In NSW, the Legislative Assembly or lower house was first elected on a property franchise, with virtually full adult male franchise introduced in 1858, a right not granted in Britain until 1918. The NSW Legislative Council or upper house was designed as a safe, revising, deliberative and conservative element between the lower house and the Governor. Membership was for life and there was no upper limit on the number of members. Thirty-two members took their seats at the first sitting in 1856 and the Council reached a peak of 125 members in 1932.

In both NSW and Queensland, members were appointed by the Governor on the advice of the government of the day. In the other colonies, Councils were elected on a restricted property ownership franchise. These elected chambers proved by and large more effective in protecting conservative interests. Today the Legislative Councils in Western Australia, Victoria, South Australia and Tasmania retain essentially the same powers that they had on their establishment, though all are now popularly elected. In these states, the Councils have been democratised rather than reformed.

The absence of an upper limit on the number of members of the Council in both Queensland and New South Wales provided a device for governments to "swamp" the Council in an attempt to resolve deadlocks between the two Houses. In NSW the practice of "swamping" the Council with additional members who, in theory, could be relied upon to support the government, was used on a number of occasions, but the newly appointed members did not always vote as expected.

Abolition of the Legislative Council was part of Labor Party policy in both Queensland and NSW. In Queensland, after four previous unsuccessful attempts, a "suicide squad" of 14 Labor members appointed to vote themselves out of office, led to the abolition of the Council in 1922. Similar attempts by NSW Labor Premier Jack Lang in 1925 and 1926 failed when some of his 25 new appointees to the Council failed to support a Bill for its abolition.

Lang's attempts at abolition encouraged the non-Labor parties to embark on a policy of reform of the Council. In 1929 the Bavin Government amended the Constitution Act to require a referendum before the composition or powers of the Council could be altered. Bavin also secured the passage of a Bill through both Houses in 1929 to provide for a Council of 60 members elected by the members of both House, but the Bill was never submitted to a referendum at the time because of the economic crisis.

The requirement to hold a referendum for abolition of the Council was tested by the new Lang Government in 1930 when a Bill to abolish the Council was passed by both Houses. However, presentation of the Bill for assent by the Governor was restrained by a Court injunction requiring approval of any change at a referendum before assent by the Governor.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> For full information on the Legislative Council, see "The Role of the NSW Legislative Council", Parliament of NSW Legislative Council Information Sheet No. 25, August 1990. See also Ken Turner, <u>House of Review, The NSW Legislative Council, 1934-68</u>, Sydney University Press, 1969; R.S. Parker, <u>The Government of NSW</u>, University of Queensland Press, 1978, pp197-218, Ken Turner, "New Rules of the Game" in Ernie Chaples, Helen Nelson and Ken Turner, <u>The Wran Model</u>, Oxford University Press 1985, pp79-81; and Barbara Page, <u>The Legislative Council of NSW: Past Present and Future</u>, Background Paper 1990/1, NSW Parliamentary Library. For interstate comparison, see Joan Rydon, "Upper Houses - The Australian Experience", in G.S. Reid (ed), <u>The Role of Upper Houses Today</u>, Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Workshop of the Australian Study of Parliament Group, 1983, pp22-42.

The Stevens Government, elected following Lang's dismissal in 1932, secured the appointment of 21 members to the Council to offset Lang's 25 appointees and revived Bavin's 1929 reform of the Council which was based on the findings of the 1918 Bryce Committee into the powers of the House of Lords. The main features of the Stevens reforms, approved at a referendum in 1933, were:

- Reconstitution with 60 members elected for fixed 12 year terms, with 15 members retiring on rotation each 3 years.
- Members were to be elected by proportional representation in a secret ballot by the members of the two Houses.
- The right of the Council to veto passage of the appropriation bill for annual services was removed.
- With all other Bills, where a deadlock occurred between the two Houses, then following a series of procedures over 9 months, the Bill could be submitted to a referendum of the electors for approval.

The ability to send a Bill to the people without the Council's agreement has been used only once, as part of Labor's unsuccessful attempt to abolish the Council in 1961. The Bill was ultimately rejected with a 'No' vote of 57.6% at a referendum held in April 1961.

The Wran Government had reform rather than abolition of the Legislative Council as one of its priorities on election in 1976. As the only Legislative Council in the country not popularly elected, and with no reform proposal of their own, it was hard for the Liberal and National Parties to oppose reform. However, they used their Council majority to reject Labor's proposed "list" system of proportional representation, and following negotiations between the two houses, a compromise was reached. The main features of the agreed reforms were :

- The Council was to be composed of 45 members elected for three terms of the Legislative Assembly, a maximum of nine years. One third of the Council was to retire at each Assembly election.
- A system of proportional representation similar to the Commonwealth Senate was adopted.
- Optional preferential voting was to be used, with voters required to indicate at least 10 preferences.
- Under transitional arrangements, 32 members retired and 28, broken into two groups of 14, retained their seats. These two groups were to be replaced by 15 members elected at the 1981 and 1984 elections. The Council was therefore composed of 43 members from 1978-81, and 44 members from 1981-84.

The proposal was accepted at a referendum held on 17 June 1978, with 84.8% of votes cast voting 'Yes' (corresponding to 73.2% of enrolled voters). It received a majority of the vote in every electorate. The first popular election for the Legislative Council was conducted in conjunction with the 1978 state election.

The introduction of four-year terms for the Legislative Assembly from 1984 returned the maximum term of Councillors to 12 years. The Greiner government acted to shorten terms, and following a referendum passed at the 1991 election, the Council was restructured to consist of 42 members serving two terms of the Assembly, an eight year maximum, with half of the members (21) retiring at each election<sup>2</sup>. The minimum number of preferences required for a formal vote was also increased from 10 to 15, and procedures for filling casual vacancies brought in to line with Senate practice. The changes reduced the quota for election from 6.25% to 4.55%, and the first election for 21 members took place in March 1995.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The terms of three councillors were also terminated, and the terms of most other continuing Councillor shortened.

# 2.2 Changes to the Ballot Paper since 1978

The procedures for counting Legislative Council votes are contained in Schedule 6 of the Constitution Act. Entrenched in the Constitution when popular election was adopted in 1978, this detail can only be changed by referendum. The method of voting and counting remain unchanged to this day, apart from an increase from 10 to 15 in the minimum number of preferences as introduced by the 1991 referendum.

While the counting system remains unchanged, the way voters cast their ballots has been significantly modified as details of the ballot paper were not entrenched in the constitution. In the same way the 1978 amendments copied procedures for Commonwealth Senate elections, the NSW ballot paper was modified before the 1988 election to match new Senate procedures introduced in 1984, most importantly with the introduction of 'Group Ticket Voting'.

			SCHE	DURE 4A				
You may vote in			BALLO	T-PAPER	NEW SO	UTH WALES	Intion of 15 Members of Intional District Elector	I Legislative Council enrolled
one of two ways	GROUP A	GROUP B	GROUP C	GROUP D	GROUPE		GROUP G	1
either 🕨	Ticket	Ticket	Title	Totel	tert tert		-	
Place the number "I" in one and one any of mess equates to induste the volve (sciet you with its adapt at your whe	•	·			0.0.			
	1.1							
	GROUP A	GROUP B	GROUP C	GROUP D	GROUPE	GROUP F	GROUP G	
		WILLIAMS	WRIGHT			SCHMIDT	BROOKMAN	
or	MILLER	POOERS	C LEYY	HANSON D Refert lan	ASSA!	TYAN		PASCALIS
Tes he notes T. T. T. Y. Y. T.	MORGAN	COWAN					C PRENCH	
opposite the names of 10 candidates in order of your preisnence for them. If you with to note for additional candidates, place interview of the additional candidates, place			PAGANO	PEREZ	CRAWFORD			
number "11" in the squares apposite the names of more addressed candidates in order of your preferences for them			WOOD HANY				WILSON	
	- JONES		YOUNG					0.33
	C LOHNSON		TAYLOR					
	WATSON .		C BROWN					
	C FONG		C 142					
	RLACK Cive		HAYES					

As the example above shows, since 1988 the Council ballot paper has been divided by a thick black horizontal line. Voters have the opportunity to vote for candidates in the traditional way by numbering squares 'below the line', or to vote 'above the line' by selecting one of the group ticket voting squares. All votes cast 'above the line' have their preferences distributed according to tickets lodged with the Electoral Commissioner before the election. The ballot paper example above, taken from 1988, has two significant differences from elections since 1991. First, the provision that allowed two group ticket voting squares for a party above the line has been abandoned. Secondly, party names now appear on the ballot paper.

The exact detail of how Group Ticket Voting works has varied since first being introduced in 1988, and will change again for the 2003 election. However, at its simplest technical level, Group Ticket Voting meets the requirements of Schedule 6 of the Constitution Act by 'implying' a sequence of preferences for candidates on the ballot paper. A voter may vote for a single GTV square above the line (or sequence of squares at the 2003 election), and this is taken to imply a vote for a sequence of candidates below the line.

When first introduced in 1988, Group Ticket Voting had a number of differences from procedures used for Senate elections and later Council elections. The main differences were:

• Each group on the ballot paper could lodge one or two tickets of preferences for candidates on the ballot paper. The first preferences of the group had to be for the candidates of that group, in the order they appeared on the ballot paper, followed by preferences for other parties. The ticket had to have a minimum of 10 preferences.

- If two group tickets were lodged by a group, two group voting ticket squares would appear at the top of the column for that group. Voters chose which ticket vote to use by selecting one of the two squares.
- Party names did not to appear on the ballot paper.

At the 1988 election, eleven of the twelve groups on the ballot paper lodged one group ticket vote. The Australian Marijuana Party did not lodge a group ticket vote and therefore had no group voting square. No party lodged two tickets, as to do so would have presented voters with an unfamiliar form of voting. With party names not appearing on the ballot paper, the two squares would have made no sense unless voters received a how-to-vote card from that party explaining the meaning of the two squares. The solution for the Australian Democrats, a party that normally lodges split tickets, was to simply exhaust its preference ticket before reaching the Labor or Liberal/National Parties.

Before the 1991 election, the rules for ticket voting were altered to bring them into line with Senate practice. Beginning in 1991, the following rules applied for group ticket voting:

- Each group on the ballot paper could lodge up to three tickets of preferences. The first preferences had to be for the candidates of that group, in the order they appear on the ballot paper. The ticket had to have a minimum of 10 preferences, increased to 15 at the 1995 election.
- Where a party split preferences by lodging two or three tickets, the number of above the line votes was evenly divided between the tickets.
- Registration of political parties was transferred from the Electoral Funding Act to the Parliamentary Electorates and Elections Act. At the same time, party names were to be included on the ballot paper.

The use of group ticket voting had important political implications, and was in large part responsible for the substantial increase in candidates and parties contesting the 1999 election. (The political implications of group ticket voting are discussed in Section 4.)

# 2.3 The New Ballot Paper for 2003

The new rules for the 2003 election will retain the existing Legislative Council ballot paper, introduce a new option for voting above the line, and greatly modify the manner in which ticket votes are taken to imply preferences below the line.

In summary, the new system will operate as follows

- The nomination fee remains at \$500 per candidate for individuals, for groups of 2-10 candidates, and for groups of 22 or more candidates. However, groups of 11-21 candidates have their deposit capped at \$5,000 for the group.
- Group ticket voting squares will only be allowed for groups of 15 or more candidates. Groups do not have to be parties to receive a group voting square, but only registered parties will have the advantage of having their name printed with the square.
- Group ticket votes will now only imply preferences for the candidates of that group, and the ticket will have no preferences for other groups on the ballot paper. This is the reason why a group ticket voting square is only available for groups with 15 or more candidates, as the group vote must meet the constitutional requirement of having 15 preferences.
- To overcome the problem of candidates unfortunate enough to die or otherwise be disqualified, all groups with a group ticket voting square must nominate a second group with a group voting square to which preferences will be directed if the first group finds itself with less than 15 candidates by polling day.
- Voters will have a new option for voting above the line. In the same way voters can direct preferences to candidates below the line, voters will now be able to direct preferences to groups and parties above the line. A voter can now vote 1, 2, 3... above the line, and this will be implied as preferences in order for all the candidates of the first group, then the second group, then the third group etc. This form of voting is only available for groups with a group voting square. Candidates of parties without a group voting square cannot receive preferences from above the line votes.

The new procedures will avoid any confusion at Senate elections by retaining the same form of ballot paper. Any voter using the new form of Legislative Council above the line voting on a Senate ballot paper would still be casting a formal vote. However, under the ticket voting rules still applying for the Senate, only the first above the line preference would apply, preferences then distributed according to the first chosen party's registered ticket vote.

The new system effectively reverts to the situation that applied before 1988, in that the only preferences that can flow between parties are those filled in by voters themselves. The tight control of preferences previously achieved through ticket voting will no longer be available.

However, the new method of voting above the line will make it easier for parties that hand out how-to-vote cards. Before the introduction of group ticket voting, a party wanting to indicate preferences would have had to list preferences for each candidate in a group on their how to vote card. Under the new system, a simpler form of preferences can be printed, such as "1 – Group G", "2 – Group L" etc. This means that parties that hand out how-to-vote cards will have the advantage of increasing their primary vote, and having greater influence over the direction of preferences. Parties without how-to-vote cards would have less publicity, and also less influence over preferences.

Unless voters receive a how-to-vote card, few will know that the new method of above the line voting applies. Votes with only a single above the line preference will effectively exhaust when the last candidate of the group is excluded. If the 90-95% above the line voting rate for minor parties continues, then the average number of preferences per vote will fall at the 2003 election, and the vast majority of minor party votes are likely to exhaust rather than flow to another party. Instead of the average 123 preferences per ticket vote in 1999 (see Table 12), ticket votes in 2003 will have only 15 preferences. This will increase the chances that the final vacancies will be filled by candidates with less than a quota of votes.

# 2.4 Changes to the Registration of Political Parties

While political parties have been part of Australian elections for more than a century, it is only in the last two decades that their existence has been formally recognised in electoral law. Party names first appeared on Tasmanian ballot papers in 1975, on Commonwealth ballot papers in 1984, and on ballot papers at New South Wales general elections in 1991.

Political parties were recognised earlier in New South Wales with their registration from 1981 under the Election Funding Act. However, this was merely to facilitate the operation of public funding, and as party names did not appear on the ballot paper for another decade, it had no practical effect on the behaviour of voters at elections.

In 1991, the provisions governing the registration of political parties were transferred to the Parliamentary Electorates and Elections Act as part of the package of reforms that saw party names included on ballot papers. For registration, parties needed to provide the Electoral Commissioner with:

- A party name not exceeding six words. The name must not be offensive or capable of being confused with an already registered party. A party abbreviation could also be registered.
- A copy of the party constitution
- Proof of 200 members
- A registered officer, deputy registered officer (optional), address of party headquarters, and an optional Party Agent if the party also wished to be registered for public funding.

The new rules also allowed for the central nomination of party candidates rather than individual lodgement with returning officers. Candidates nominating for a party could have the name of the party included on the ballot paper. Candidates with no party affiliation could choose either to have the word "Independent" shown on the ballot paper, or to have no affiliation shown

Independents are dealt with differently in other states. At Queensland and Victorian state elections, candidates representing registered parties are shown with a party affiliation, but the word "Independent" is not allowed and no affiliation is shown for all non-party candidates. South Australia has a unique facility allowing Independents to nominate up to five words indicating their political position. (e.g. Independent Ban Duck Shooting) This provision also allows candidates to appear on the ballot paper as Independent Labor or Independent Liberal.

In South Australian and West Australian Legislative Council elections, Independents and single party candidates are allocated a separate column and group ticket voting square on the ballot paper, and not lumped together in the final column as 'Ungrouped'. At the 2002 South Australian election, this produced a record ballot paper, with 48 groups and 76 candidates, including 13 party groups and another 35 single candidate columns. In Western Australia, candidates and parties are arranged vertically rather than horizontally on the ballot paper, and only one ticket of preferences can be lodged for each group, unlike the split tickets allowed elsewhere.

The ease with which parties were registered in NSW was one of the causes of the giant ballot paper in 1999. Many registered parties appeared to have overlapping party memberships, and seemed to consist of names derived from petition drives rather than formal acceptance of party membership. It also appeared many parties were closely related, and attractive party names were adopted that did not always reflect the opinions of the people who had set up the party. When combined with the control of preferences allowed by group ticket voting, multiple party registrations became an effective way to channel preferences to a preferred candidate. Several candidates elected in 1999 achieved their quota thanks to very complex flows of preferences that would have been impossible without group ticket voting. (See Section 4.3)

As well as the new ticket voting rules for the 2003 election outlined in Section 2.3, tightened rules for the registration of parties have been adopted. In summary, the new rules require:

- A party name not exceeding six words. The name must not be offensive or capable of being confused with an already registered party. A party abbreviation can also be registered.
- A copy of the party constitution
- Proof of 750 members, with tighter regulation to ensure that voters on the party register are actually members, and that no member can count towards the registration of multiple parties.
- A registered officer, deputy registered officer (optional), address of party headquarters, and an optional Party Agent if the party also wished to be registered for public funding.
- Be accompanied by a fee of \$2,000
- Parties must be registered at least a year ahead of any election if they wished to participate as a party in terms of names appearing on ballot

In addition, the Electoral Commissioner has been granted extra powers to assess whether parties had a real membership on registration. Each year, registered parties must also demonstrate that they continue to maintain the minimum membership to retain registration.

# 2.5 Parties Registered to Contest the 2003 Election

Registration of parties for the 2003 election closed in March 2002. A subsequent court case raised questions concerning the power of the Electoral Commissioner to reject a registration, a problem resolved by further legislation. The legal problem allowed the late registration of Save Our Suburbs as a political party.

A full list of parties and registered officers is provided on the State Electoral Office's website at <u>www.seo.nsw.gov.au</u>. Five hundred words statements of each party's political philosophy and polices are also provided on the site.

The following are the names of the registered parties.

Australian Democrats (NSW Division) Australian Family Alliance Australian Labor Party (NSW Branch) Australians Against Further Immigration Christian Democratic Party (Fred Nile Group) **Country Labor Party** Four Wheel Drive Party Horse Riders Party Liberal Party of Australia New South Wales Division National Party of Australia - NSW No Privatisation People's Party One Nation NSW Political Party **Outdoor Recreation Party** Peter Breen – Reform the Legal System Save Our Suburbs Socialist Alliance The Fishing Party The Greens The Shooters Party Unity Party

# 3 Counting Votes for the Legislative Council

# 3.1 The Use of Proportional Representation<sup>3</sup>

Since the introduction of proportional representation for the Senate in 1949, it has generally been considered appropriate that where a parliament consists of two popularly elected chambers, different electoral system should be used in each chamber. This has been the case in Tasmania since 1909, and was the model adopted for upper house reform in South Australia in 1975, New South Wales in 1978 and Western Australia in 1989. There are no upper houses in Queensland and the two Territories, while Victoria is the only state using the same electoral system to elect both houses. With the Labor Party having gained control of the Legislative Council for the first time in Victorian history<sup>4</sup> at the 30 November 2002 state election, the Bracks government has firmly committed itself to introducing proportional representation for the Council at the next state election.

When popular election for the NSW Legislative Council was introduced in 1978, the ballot paper and counting procedures adopted were those then used for the Commonwealth Senate.<sup>5</sup> The one significant difference from Senate procedures was the decision to use optional preferential voting, with only 10 preferences required for a formal vote, increased to 15 in 1991. Optional preferential voting was insisted upon by the Labor Party, concerned it had been politically damaged by the high informal vote generated when a record number of candidates contested the 1974 Senate election.

Subsequently, the Senate's electoral system was modified in 1984, with the adoption of group ticket voting and the printing of party names on the ballot paper. Two significant counting changes were also adopted, with the abandonment of random sampling in determining preference distributions, and a change in the votes to be examined in determining surplus votes. (See Section 3.7 for more details.) The changes to the Senate ballot paper were later adopted in NSW, with ticket voting introduced in 1988 and party names added in 1991. However, the changed counting procedures could not be introduced in NSW without a referendum to amend Schedule Six of the Constitution.

In political science literature, the Legislative Council's electoral system is known as "proportional representation by single transferable vote" (PR-STV). Another common term in Australia is "quota preferential". Most countries that use electoral systems based on proportional representation use counting methods that achieve proportionality based on primary votes rather than through the use of preferences.

The reason Australia uses PR-STV is mainly historical. The system was strongly advocated by electoral reformers in the 19th century, and the support given to the system by Tasmanian Attorney-General Andrew Inglis Clark saw it adopted in his state, on a trial basis in 1896 and permanently from 1909. The Tasmanian system was also used for three NSW Legislative Assembly elections between 1920 and 1925. PR-STV was then introduced for the Senate in 1949, with some technical differences from Tasmanian usage, and the Senate system with some variation has since been adopted to elect Legislative Councils in New South Wales, South Australia and Western Australia

The South Australian Legislative Council consists of 22 members, and like the NSW Council, is elected from a state-wide electorate for staggered terms, 11 MLCs elected in conjunction with each lower house election. The Western Australian Council is elected from 6 provinces, with representation strongly biased towards non-metropolitan areas, and the whole chamber facing

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> For a summary of the various forms of proportional representation, see Gerard Newman, <u>Electoral Systems</u>, Current Issues Paper No.3 1989-90, Legislative Research Service, Commonwealth Parliamentary Library, September 1989

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Technically, Labor controlled the Victorian Legislative Council election after the 1985 state election, following a victory in the tied election for Nunawading Province, Labor winning after a hat draw. However, Labor only controlled the Council until this result was overturned in the courts. No legislation was passed in this period.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> The original electoral system proposed by the Labor Party had been the List PR system then in use for the South Australian Legislative Council. Adopting the Senate procedures was a compromise agreed to during negotiations over passage of the reform legislation. After the changes to the Senate in 1984, South Australia abandoned its unique system in favour of the new Senate procedures in 1985.

election every four years. The current proposal to change the Victorian Legislative Council will divide the state into eight provinces, each electing five MLCs, with the whole council facing election every four years.

In Tasmania, where PR-STV is used to elect the lower house of Parliament, the system has been modified to randomise the order in which candidates appear in party groupings. With the banning of how-to-vote cards, this has produced an electoral system that gives greater emphasis to support for candidates rather than parties. The Tasmanian version of PR-STV is referred to as the Hare-Clark system, and has also been used (with minor technical differences) for ACT elections since 1995. (See section 3.6 for details of the difference between the NSW and Tasmanian systems.)

The main features of PR-STV compared to other forms of proportional representations are :

- Voters are able to choose between candidates both within and between parties. This is different from European 'list' systems of proportional representation, which generally only allow one vote for a pre-determined list of party candidates. Where choice of candidate is allowed, it is only between candidates from one party.
- To be elected, a candidate must achieve a quota of votes.
- Where a candidate receives more than the quota, a number of votes equal to the quota is set aside to elect the candidate, and the candidate's surplus to quota votes are distributed as preferences. The differences between the various PR-STV systems used in Australia come about mainly through technical differences in the definition of surplus to quota votes, and the method used to distribute such votes as preferences.
- During the count, if no candidate possesses a quota, and vacancies remain to be filled, then the candidate with the lowest vote is excluded and their preferences distributed.
- When a candidate is elected, the votes that make up their quota for election can consist of primary votes, the preferences of surplus to quota votes from elected candidates, and preferences from candidates excluded in the count.
- Proportionality is achieved not in relation to the primary vote received by candidates and parties, but by a complex interaction between primary votes and preferences.

Outside of the Hare-Clark elections in Tasmania and the ACT, where ticket voting is banned, few voters exercise their right to choose between candidates. Based on election results, most voters are happy to follow party how-to-vote cards, numbering straight down the party ticket, and since the introduction of group ticket voting, by simply voting above the line for a group voting square. (See section 4.1)

In summary, the count proceeds by repeating the following steps.

- (1) Counting the Primary or First Preference Votes. Along with checks for formality, a simple tally of all votes received by candidates is conducted. (See Section 3.2 for details on how primary votes are classified.)
- (2) Determination of the quota. The quota of votes for election is determined by dividing the total formal vote by one more than the number of vacancies to be filled, and after ignoring fractions, adding 1. (See Section 3.3 for detail)
- (3) Elect any candidates with a quota of votes. Candidates with votes equal to or in excess of a quota are elected in descending order of votes, and if there are surpluses to be distributed, the count proceeds to (4). If the number of candidates remaining in the count is equal to the number of vacancies remaining, then all remaining candidates are declared elected. (This completes the count, and these candidates will have been elected with less than a quota.)
- (4) Distribute surplus of elected candidates. The surpluses of all candidates elected at step (3) are distributed. (See Section 3.4 below on how surplus votes are identified and

preferences distributed.) This takes place in the order that candidates were elected. When all surplus votes have been distributed, if any candidate has achieved a quota, go to (3). If no candidate possesses a quota, proceed to (5).

(5) Distribute preferences of candidate with lowest vote. The candidate with the lowest current vote is excluded. If the number of candidates remaining in the count is equal to the number of vacancies yet to be filled, all remaining candidates are simply declared elected and the count is finished. Otherwise, the ballot papers of the excluded candidate are distributed according to the next available preference on each ballot paper. Any votes that have no further valid preferences are set aside as exhausted. If after the distribution, no candidate has achieved a quota, repeat (5). If a candidate has achieved a quota, go to (3).

#### 3.2 Classifying Primary Votes.

To simplify counting procedures, the NSW Electoral Office has in the past classified primary votes into three categories. These were:

<u>Ticket Votes</u>: All votes where the 'ticket' or 'above the line' option has been used. This accounts for the vast majority of ballot papers and keeping a separate total greatly simplifies the count.

<u>Block Votes</u>: A 'below the line' vote for a party with a full list of 15 candidates (10 prior to 1995), where a voter simply numbers the list down the column, and gives no preferences beyond to other groups. Called block votes, keeping a separate total helps to ease the count, particularly in the initial stages, when repeated distributions of surplus votes take place. It also simplifies the process of random sampling.

<u>1st Preference</u>: All 'below the line' votes for candidates other than those classified as Block Votes.

As an example, in 1999, the lead candidate on the Labor Party ticket was Jeff Shaw with 1,320,045 votes. This consisted of 1,306,409 Labor Party ticket votes (98.97%), and as Labor had lodged two tickets, 653,205 were allocated to Ticket A, and 653,204 to Ticket B. (The allocation of the spare vote between tickets is decided randomly.) Another 5,213 votes were block votes (0.39%) and 8,423 (0.64%) were other below the line votes.

In 2003, new classifications will need to be introduced. Votes cast with a single above the line vote will effectively be the same as block votes. However, voters using the new option of expressing preferences above the line will be casting a vote similar to that of a below the line vote. This will complicate the process of random sampling used in distributing preferences.

# 3.3 Calculation of the Quota.

The quota of votes for election is determined by dividing the total formal vote by one more than the number of vacancies to be filled, and after ignoring fractions, adding 1. In 1999, there were 3,557,762 formal votes and 21 vacancies. The quota was calculated as follows.

Quota = [Formal votes  $\div$  (vacancies + 1)] + 1 = [3557762  $\div$  (21+1)] + 1 = 161716 + 1 (ignoring fractions) = 161717 votes

In percentage terms, this corresponds to approximately 4.55% of the vote. It is common to see the vote for a party expressed in quota terms. At the 1999 Legislative Council election, Labor recorded 37.27% of the vote, which corresponded to 8.20 quotas. Assuming votes stayed within party tickets (which they generally do), this meant Labor had eight full quotas of votes, effectively electing eight MLC's, with a partial quota of 0.20. This extra partial quota comes into play with the distribution of preferences, either attracting preferences from other parties to be turned into a 9<sup>th</sup> full quota, or being distributed to other parties as preferences.

In NSW, because only 15 preferences are required for a formal vote, the votes on many ballot papers "exhaust" at the point where no further valid preferences are shown. Votes with exhausted preferences are effectively excluded from the count. The more exhausted votes there are, the less votes with continuing preferences will remain in the count, and the greater the likelihood that the final vacancies will be filled by candidates with less than a full quota of votes.

# 3.4 Determination of Surplus – Candidates Elected on Primary Vote<sup>6</sup>

Under PR-STV, if a candidate is declared elected and has in excess of a quota of votes, there needs to be a procedure to determine which of the candidate's votes will be set aside as the quota for election, and which will be surplus to quota votes distributed as preferences. This is best explained by example.

At the 1999 NSW Legislative Council election, the primary count saw three candidates declared elected in excess of a quota of votes. In order of election, the candidates were Jeff Shaw (Labor), Patricia Forsyth (Liberal) and David Oldfield (One Nation). For each of these elected candidates, it was necessary to put aside a quota of votes as their quota for election, and then to distribute the preferences of votes deemed as being surplus to their quota.

On the initial count, Shaw had 1,320,045 votes, made up of 1,306,409 Labor Party ticket votes (98.97%), 5,213 block votes (0.39%) and 8,423 (0.64%) other below the line votes. Of these votes, 161,717 needed to be set aside as the quota electing Shaw, and the surplus of 1,158,328 votes distributed as preferences. The question is, which votes will be part of the quota, and which will be distributed as preferences?

The first step is to calculate a "transfer value" using the following formula.

Transfer Value = Surplus Votes ÷ (Votes transferred - Exhausted Preferences)

At Senate elections, the transfer value is used as a 'discount rate', with the preferences of all surplus to quota votes counted and distributed, but transferred at a reduced face value. (See Section 3.7 for more details.) In the Legislative Council, the Transfer Value is used to determine how many physical votes should be transferred at full value as preferences. These votes are then chosen as a random sample.

In the above formula, it may seem odd to have exhausted preferences this early in the count, given 15 preferences are required for a formal vote. However, a vote with a '1' for Jeff Shaw

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Calculations in this section are based on the Statistical Returns for the 1999 Legislative Council election.

followed by 14 other preferences indicating '2' would be formal. In 1999, there were 19 formal votes for Shaw where it was not possible to determine a second preference. Exhausted preferences are left as part of the quota for the elected candidate, effectively meaning more votes with preferences are distributed to continuing candidates.

As Shaw was elected on the first count in 1999, the "Votes Transferred" in the above formula is defined as his primary vote. The formula becomes:

Transfer Value =  $1,158,328 \div (1,320,045 - 19)$ = 0.877504

The next step was to examine all of Shaw's votes and tally the next available preferences. (As Forsythe and Oldfield were declared elected at the same count, any ballot paper indicating one of them as 2<sup>nd</sup> preference was passed to the 3<sup>rd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> preference candidate.) The total of Shaw's preferences to each candidate was then multiplied by the transfer value to determine how many of the votes were to be retained as part of Shaw's quota, and how many were to be transferred as preferences to other candidates.

The full count of Shaw's votes showed that 1,317,686 had indicated preferences to the second Labor candidate, John Della Bosca. Applying the transfer value:

Votes Transferred = Preferences  $\times$  Transfer value = 1,317,686  $\times$  0.877504 = 1,156,275

As a result, of all votes for Shaw that indicated preferences to Della Bosca, 1,156,275 were transferred to Della Bosca, and the balance, (1,317,686 - 1,156,275 = 161,411) were set aside as part of Shaw's quota.

Similar calculations are applied to other transfers. For instance, 13 votes for Shaw showed next preference for Peter Breen from Reform the Legal System. At Transfer value, this became 11 votes distributed to Breen, and 2 left as part of Shaw's set aside quota.

In NSW, the method by which votes are transferred is a random sampling of ballot papers, followed by their physical transfer to the 'pile' of another candidate<sup>7</sup>. In the case of the 13 Shaw votes indicating preferences to Breen, a sample of 2 votes was taken and set aside as part of Shaw's quota, while the other 11 votes were transferred to Breen's 'pile'. The same takes place for all candidates, in the case of votes showing preferences to Della Bosca, a sample of 161,411 is required to be set aside.

This sampling is slightly simplified by the initial classification of votes in Ticket, Block and below the line votes. All votes allocated as being Ticket A are identical, as are Ticket B votes and block votes, so there is no need to random sample, all votes being identical. However all below the line preference votes, and in 2003, all above the line preference votes, will need to be sampled. From the original classification, it is possible to determine the destination of all votes cast for Shaw.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> The count is now carried out using computers, so ballot papers are no longer physically transferred.

		Set aside as	Distributed as
	Total Votes	Quota for Shaw	Preferences
ALP Ticket 1	653,205	80,015	573,190
ALP Ticket 2	653,204	80,015	573,189
Block Votes	5,213	638	4,575
Exhausted 2 <sup>nd</sup> Preferences	19	19	
Other Below the line	8,404	1,030	7,374
Total Votes	1,320,045	161,717	1,158,328

#### Table 1: Quota and Surplus to Quota votes for Jeff Shaw (Labor) 1999

The same series of counts and classifications were then carried out for the votes of Forsythe and Oldfield. Once the preferences for all three elected candidate had been distributed, two other candidates had in excess of a quota, the second candidates on the Labor and Coalition tickets, Della Bosca (Labor) and Gardiner (National). One Nation did not have enough votes to immediately elect a second candidate.

Slightly different procedures apply to the determination of surplus to quota votes for candidates elected after the first count, as outlined below.

### 3.5 Determination of Surplus – Candidates Elected during the Count

After tallying primary votes, John Della Bosca (Labor) had 1,137 votes. After the election of the first three candidates on the primary count and distribution of their surplus votes, Della Bosca's total vote was 1,157,446, having received 1,156,275 votes as preferences from Shaw, 9 from Forsythe and 25 from Oldfield.

For candidates elected after the first count, the votes examined in determining the surplus are the votes received at the last count. In this case, it is only the votes received as preferences from the three elected candidates that are used in the Transfer Value formula and used in sampling to distribute preferences. It is important to note that Della Bosca's 1,137 primary votes are not included in the calculation, nor are they examined for preferences. (Different procedures apply at Senate elections. See Section 3.7).

Della Bosca was declared elected, and 160,567 of the preferences received were set aside for his quota, along with his 1,137 primary votes and 13 votes with exhausted preferences. The remaining 995,729 votes transferred to him at the last count were then to be distributed as surplus to quota votes.

So Della Bosca's transfer value is:

Transfer Value = Surplus Votes / (Votes transferred - Exhausted Preferences) =  $995,729 \div (1,156,309 - 13)$ = 0.861137

It is important to emphasis that in counting out Della Bosca's preferences, only those votes received as surplus preferences from Shaw, Forsythe and Oldfield are examined. The 1,137 primary votes for Della Bosca are not part of the votes distributed, and their preferences are never counted.

Again, it is possible to define the quota for Della Bosca. Note that only 5,342 of the 7,374 'Other' below the line votes for Shaw were distributed to Della Bosca.

		Set aside as Quota	Distributed as
	Total Votes	for Della Bosca	Preferences
Primary Votes	1,137	1,137	
ALP Ticket 1	573,190	79,595	493,595
ALP Ticket 2	573,189	79,595	493,594
Block Votes	4,575	635	3,940
Exhausted 2 <sup>nd</sup> Prefs	13	13	
Other Below the line	5,342	742	4,600
Total Votes	1,157,446	161,717	995,729

Table 2: Quota and Surplus to Quota votes for John Della Bosca (Labor) 1999

It is possible to do the same classification for all elected candidates. Table 3 below shows how the 1,306,409 Labor ticket votes and 5,213 block votes were distributed between the Labor candidates. The first two columns show primary and preference votes not examined in the distribution of preferences, while the 'below the line' column shows, at each count, how many of Shaw's non-block and non-ticket votes were distributed down the ticket. The other 3,379 Shaw below the line votes ended up with other Labor candidates, or leaked to candidates of other parties. In other words, only 0.25% of the vote for Jeff Shaw did not go straight down the Labor ticket. The number actually leaking out of the Labor ticket would have been even less.

Table 5. Distribution of Labor vote down the ticket from Jen Snaw 198	Distribution of Labor Vote down the ticket from	Jeff Shaw 199
---	---	---------------

Candidate	Primary	Preferences	Ticket	Block	Below the Line	Total
Shaw			160,030	638	1,049	161,717
Della Bosca	1,137		159,190	635	755	161,717
Obeid	157	227	160,044	639	650	161,717
Burnswoods	346	386	159,756	637	592	161,717
Macdonald	353	212	159,964	639	549	161,717
Hatzistergos	265	50	160,277	640	485	161,717
Burgmann	866	280	159,480	636	455	161,717
Tsang	722	159	159,774	638	424	161,717
Fazio	118	26	27,894	111	66	28,215
Totals			1,306,409	5,213	5,025	

The same surplus calculations occur when a candidate is declared elected later in the count on the preferences of excluded candidates. In 1999, count 254 saw Jeremy Matthew of the Marijuana Smokers Rights Party excluded from the count. Of his 47,237 votes, 40,194 were ticket votes with next preference for Malcolm Jones of the Outdoor Recreation Party. Of Matthew's 6,304 below the line votes, only 272 had next preference for Jones. There were also 739 ticket votes originally transferred from the Timbarra Clean Waters Party that had next preference for the Australian Democrats.

Jones's surplus to quota votes were distributed at Count 255. As noted above, the calculation includes only the last votes transferred to Jones. So in the Transfer Value formula, only the 40,466 votes transferred at Count 254 from Matthew are examined. The 146,716 existing votes for Jones, including votes from 21 different group voting tickets, were not examined to determine preferences. 173 votes exhausted at this point, giving the following transfer value.

Transfer Value = Surplus Votes / (Votes transferred - Exhausted Preferences) =  $25,465 \div (40,466 - 173)$ = 0.631996

With 173 exhausted votes, the sample of preferences was 40,194 Marijuana Smokers Rights ticket votes with next available preference for Peter Wong of Unity, and 99 below the line votes. After using the transfer value to sample the votes, a total of 25,404 votes were transferred to Wong.

On occasions, a large number of exhausted votes means the transfer value formula can produce a value greater than 1. In 1999, Peter Breen was elected when Brian Burston of One Nation was excluded, the One Nation group ticket vote flowing to Breen. However, when

Breen's surplus was distributed at Count 263, there were no more valid preferences on the One Nation ticket. The transfer value formula became:

Transfer Value = 
$$57,279 \div (60,264 - 60,158)$$
  
= 1

The value was rounded to one, as votes cannot be distributed at greater than their face value. The effect of this was that no sampling occurred. As all ticket votes exhausted, the effect was that all below the line votes had their preferences distributed. Exhausted votes always result in an over-sampling of votes that continue to have valid preferences.

The method of using transfer values to sample votes and physically transfer ballot papers was copied from the system in use in the Senate in 1978. It was abandoned in 1984 for the Senate and New South Wales is now the only state to random sample votes rather than count all preferences. Random sampling was originally a simplification to ease the count. As the vote is now conducted using a computer system, there is no reason why random sampling should be retained. The only reason for its continued use is that it is required by Schedule 6 of the Constitution.

# 3.6 Comparison with Tasmania<sup>8</sup>

The Tasmanian variant of PR-STV is usually called the Hare-Clark electoral system, named after Thomas Hare, its English proponent, and Andrew Inglis Clark, the state Attorney-General who introduced it to Tasmania. Hare-Clark has a long history in Tasmania. Originally candidates were listed in alphabetic order on the ballot paper, as they still are in Ireland. Party groupings were introduced in 1943, party names in 1975, and 'Robson rotation' to randomise the order candidates appear in party groupings in 1980.

As Tasmania is guaranteed five House of Representatives seats by Section 24 of the Commonwealth Constitution, the state has been able to use the seats as multi-member constituencies to elect the state's lower house of parliament. The five constituencies reflect the geographic divisions of the state, and have remained relatively unchanged since 1901. Hare-Clark has been in use for Tasmanian elections since 1909, and has thrived on and in fact encouraged a very personal form of politics. It produces the situation where candidates of the same political party often compete against each other, with sitting members defeated as often by candidates of their own party as by candidates of opposing parties.

The main differences between Hare-Clark voting and the NSW Legislative Council are:

- There is no group ticket voting. Votes must be cast for individual candidates.
- While groups across the ballot paper appear in a fixed order, the order candidates appear within a group is randomised, each candidate for a group having equal chance of appearing at the top of the group. This process is called Robson rotation, named after Neil Robson, an opposition Liberal MP whose private members bill introduced the ballot paper.
- Voters must fill in as many preferences as there are vacancies to be filled. Currently, five MPs are elected per electorate, requiring five preferences.
- Unlike the Legislative Council election, conducted in conjunction with the lower house election, the Tasmanian state elections take place for only the lower house. The Tasmanian Legislative Council is elected from single member electorates, elections staggered over six-years, polls conducted on a fixed and separate election date.
- It is illegal to hand out publicity material outside polling places, and publishing advertisements showing suggested order of preferences is effectively banned.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> For detail on the Tasmanian electoral system see Terry Newman's book <u>Hare-Clark in Tasmania</u>, Joint Library Committee of the Parliament of Tasmania

- When the preferences of surplus to quota votes are distributed, all preferences are counted and transferred, but at a reduced value based on the transfer value. There is no random sampling of ballot papers, and vote transfers are carried out using worksheets.
- Every individual transfer of votes is classified as a separate count, which creates a different definition of the votes transferred at the last count.
- By-elections are conducted by count-backs of votes cast at the last election.

Together, these differences mean that Tasmanian elections are conducted as contests between candidates as well as between parties. Within parties, the vote is more evenly distributed between candidates, and voters have complete control over the distribution of preferences.

# 3.7 Comparison with the Senate

In 1984, the form of the Senate ballot paper was modified to introduce group ticket voting and to include party names on the ballot paper. These changes have since been adopted for the Legislative Council.

However, there are several differences in the formality rules for ballot papers and how votes are counted. The major differences are:

- Senate elections are conducted using compulsory preferential voting. Group Voting Tickets
  must show preferences for all candidates. Some 'saving' provisions are provided so that
  below the line votes are not unfairly excluded from the count. A formal ballot paper must
  show preferences for at least 90% of candidates, and up to three 'acceptable' sequence
  errors are allowed in preferences.
- When the preferences of surplus to quota votes are distributed, all preferences are counted and transferred, but at a reduced value based on the transfer value. There is no random sampling of ballot papers, and vote transfers are carried out using worksheets. Votes usually retain their reduced transfer value for the rest of the count.
- When a candidate is declared elected, all votes held by a candidate at that point are examined. This means there is no difference between candidates elected on the primary count, and candidates elected at subsequent counts. This means that primary votes of candidates will be examined even if they are elected on preferences. Looking at the example from Section 3.5, the 146,716 votes for Malcolm Jones of the Outdoor Recreation Party would have been examined for preferences under the Senate system, not just the 40,466 votes transferred from Marijuana Smokers Rights. This could have produced quite a different flow of preferences from the distribution of Jones's surplus.

Overall, the differences in the Senate system are only minor, but the different method of defining the votes to be examined in determining the surplus give more weight to the votes of candidates that achieve a quota than those that are excluded. However, it would be impossible to introduce the Senate system, or to even abandon random sampling, without a referendum to change Schedule 6 of the NSW Constitution Act.

# 4 Lessons form Past Legislative Council Elections

While PR-STV is normally classed as a form of proportional representation, the use of preferences to fill the final vacancies distorts the proportionality that would be achieved based only on the primary vote. This was shown at the 1998 Senate election, when One Nation outpolled the Australian Democrats in five of the six states, yet One Nation elected only one Senator to five for the Australian Democrats. Victoria was the one state where the Democrats out-polled One Nation and also the state where the Democrats recorded their highest vote, yet perversely it was the only state not to elect a Democrat Senator.

The reason for this paradox is that quota-preferential voting is proportional based not on the primary vote, but on the complex interplay of primary votes and preferences. Where under European systems of proportional representation, the allocation of final seats would be based on simple mathematical formula to achieve the most proportional result, under PR-STV, the filling of the final seats is achieved by distributing the preferences of candidates excluded from the count. In the case of the 1998 Senate election, the Democrats benefited from receiving the overwhelming majority of preferences from excluded candidates, while One Nation received very few.

Electing 21 members with a much lower quota than the Senate means Legislative Council elections should be more proportional. The low quota means that the major parties generally achieve representation in proportion to their primary vote. The distortions created by preferences have generally occurred with minor party representation, especially since the introduction of group ticket voting.

As an example, consider table 4.1, which shows the results of the 2001 Senate election by party, but applies the Legislative Council quota of 4.55%.

			Leg. Cour	ncil Quotas
Party	Votes	% Vote	Filled	Partial
The Greens	169 139	4.36		0.9592
Christian Democratic Party	72 697	1.87		0.4123
Progressive Labour Party	68 483	1.77		0.3884
Australian Labor Party/Country Labor	1 299 488	33.50	7	0.3692
Australian Democrats	240 867	6.21	1	0.3659
Pauline Hanson's One Nation	216 522	5.58	1	0.2279
Help End Marijuana Prohibition	35 526	0.92		0.2015
Liberal/Nationals	1 620 235	41.76	9	0.1881
The Fishing Party	27 591	0.71		0.1565
No GST	25 734	0.66		0.1459
Lower Excise Fuel and Beer Party	23 767	0.61		0.1348
Australians Against Further Immigration	21 012	0.54		0.1192
Unity	19 731	0.51		0.1119
Peter Breen - Reform The Legal System	8 199	0.21		0.0465
Helen Caldicott's Our Common Future	5 358	0.14		0.0304
Republican Party of Australia	5 101	0.13		0.0289
Nuclear Disarmament Party	4 596	0.12		0.0261
Non-Custodial Parents Party	4 071	0.10		0.0231
Group L	2 402	0.06		0.0136
Citizens Electoral Council	2 370	0.06		0.0134
Ungrouped	2 013	0.05		0.0114
Advance Australia Party	1 936	0.05		0.0110
Group U	1 364	0.04		0.0077
Group N	1 241	0.03		0.0070

#### Table 4: Possible Legislative Council Result based on 2001 Senate Vote

Using the example from Table 4, the following points can be made to explain how PR-STV works.

- As will be shown in section 4.1, almost all votes for a party are votes for all candidates of the party. For that reason, even though the electoral system is a contest between candidates, it is fair to express results as a contest between parties. The Liberal/National Party total of 9.1881 quotas means the group will fill nine quotas on the primary count and elect nine Councillors, with part of a quota left over. Similarly, Labor would have elected seven councillors, and the Australian Democrats and One Nation one each.
- After the filling of all initial quotas, parties electing candidates on the primary count will most likely have a partial quota remaining. In Table 4, after electing the first nine candidates in their group, a 'partial quota' of 0.1881 would remain with the 10<sup>th</sup> candidate on the Liberal/National ticket. There is a small leakage out of the ticket in this initial phase, as explained in section 4.1, but this hardly changes the partial quota. All groups that fail to elect a candidate will also have a partial quota, equal to their initial primary vote.
- Effectively the partial quota of a party with more than a quota of votes slides down the ticket to the next candidate as each quota is filled. In the case of the 1999 NSW election, after electing all MLCs possessing full quotas, the Labor Party partial quota ended up with the 9<sup>th</sup> candidate in Amanda Fazio, the Liberal/National Party partial quota with the 7<sup>th</sup> candidate Greg Hansen, and the One Nation partial quota with the second candidate Brian Burston.
- After the election of candidates from groups with more than a quota of votes, most votes in the count remain with the highest placed remaining candidate in each group. As the count proceeds, a point is reached where only one candidate remains from each group. Most votes for excluded candidates stays within the same group.
- The results in Table 4 have been ordered by the size of the partial quota remaining for each group. Even though Labor and the Coalition have elected the overwhelming majority of MLCs, this has no impact once the initial quotas have been filled. The battle to fill the final three vacancies is a contest on preferences between the remaining partial quotas.
- Under simple PR systems with no preferences, there are two methods adopted to fill the final vacancies. The "highest remainder" method allocates the final seats to the parties with the largest partial quotas. In Table 4, the Greens, Christian Democrats and Progressive Labor Party would fill the final vacancies. "Highest remainder" methods can distort proportionality in an arbitrary way and are now rarely used. The more common method in Europe is the "highest average" method, where all seats are allocated to try and equalise the average number of votes used to elect MPs from different parties.
- Under PR-STV, final vacancies are filled through the distribution of preferences. In the example from Table 4, with almost a full quota, the Greens would be certain to win the 19<sup>th</sup> seat. However, preferences would be crucial to filling the final vacancies, as the partial quotas of the Christian Democrats and Progressive Labor Party are only slightly higher than those for Labor and the Australian Democrats. Who wins the final vacancies will determine the final balance of power, so all parties have an interest in controlling preferences to fill the final vacancies.
- The less votes that show full preferences, the more votes will 'exhaust' their available preferences before the end of count. The more exhausted votes, the greater the advantage to the party with the highest initial partial quota, and the more the system operates like simple proportional representation with a 'highest remainder' method of filling final vacancies. This was the case before the introduction of group ticket voting, as is demonstrated in Section 4.2.
- The introduction of group ticket voting, by implying party preferences for votes that selected the group ticket voting square, hugely increased the average number of preferences per ballot paper. The result has been that more votes remained 'live' through the count rather than exhausting preferences. As will be shown in Section 4.3, group ticket voting re-wrote the rules for Legislative Council elections by allowing parties to be elected with extremely complex flows of preferences despite polling poorly on primary votes.

At a practical level, two types of preferences can be identified in PR-STV elections. These are:-

- Within group preferences between candidates of the same group. As Section 4.1 demonstrates, overwhelmingly between candidate preferences stay within a group until the last candidate of that group is excluded.
- Between group preferences, distributed when the last candidate of a group is excluded. It is between group preferences that determine the final vacancies at an election and which parties have a strong interest in influencing. Section 4.2 looks at how between group preferences worked before above the line voting was introduced, and Section 4.3 looks at the distortions introduced by ticket voting.

Section 4.4 then uses new research conducted by the author on below the line votes from 1999 election to analyse how voters for groups distributed preferences without the assistance of how-to-vote cards. Below the line votes were heavily influenced by party names on the ballot papers, and as is shown in the section and supporting tables in Appendix 2, there are clear patterns of preferred party in the flow of preferences for some groups. It also appears from comparing below the line preferences flows with the direction of preferences in registered group ticket votes that some voters were deceived by some party names.

# 4.1 First Choice Parties and Candidates

While PR-STV allows voters a choice of candidate, it is clear from past results that few voters bother to exercise this right. As Table 5 shows, most voters simply accept the ticket of candidates offered by their party of choice.

Percentage of Party Vote Selecting Number 1 Candidate								
Election	1978	1981	1984	1988	1991	1995	1999	
Labor	98.25	98.35	98.17	98.30	98.59	98.74	99.56	
Liberal/National	98.44	98.40	96.65	99.08	98.55	99.40	99.61	
Australian Democrats	95.44	91.64	95.98	99.23	98.69	98.26	98.28	
Christian Democrats		90.85	94.94	99.23	99.19	99.48	99.74	
Greens					99.23	98.11	98.76	
Shooters Party						98.88	99.60	
One Nation							99.70	
All others	78.36	74.15	72.83	96.35	95.00	97.30	99.33	
Totals	97.04	97.09	96.94	98.58	98.48	98.79	99.48	

Table 5 : Percentage of Vote Cast for the Number 1 Candidate in Party Groups

SOURCE : All calculations by author, based on State Electoral Office Statistical Returns. The Christian Democrats were known as Call to Australia prior to 1999. Totals include ticket votes since 1988.

	Percentage of Vote using Group Voting Square					
Election	1988	1991	1995	1999		
Labor	84.70	92.60	92.78	98.54		
Liberal/National	93.56	91.87	95.75	98.33		
Australian Democrats	75.32	77.90	78.83	88.42		
Christian Democrats	52.38	63.35	77.49	89.62		
Greens		80.16	79.20	87.05		
Shooters Party			88.68	94.32		
One Nation				94.40		
All others	74.26	78.37	81.93	93.09		
Totals	85.86	89.29	90.93	96.19		

#### Table 6: Percentage of Voters using Group Ticket Voting Option

SOURCE : All calculations by author, based on State Electoral Office Statistical Returns

The following points can be made about the distribution of votes by candidate.

- Even before the introduction of ticket voting in 1988, the overwhelming majority of votes were cast for the first candidate on each party group, especially for the major parties.
- The rate of top of ticket voting increased with the introduction of ticket voting in 1988, mainly due to an increase in top of ticket voting for minor parties.
- The further increase of top of ticket and group ticket voting in 1999 was probably a consequence of the 'tablecloth' ballot paper.

Even before the introduction of group ticket voting, it is clear most voters simply numbered straight down the ticket of their preferred party. As a result, at all elections since 1978, most vacancies have been filled in the initial stages of the count during the distribution of the surplus votes of No. 1 candidates on party groupings, as shown in table 7.

Seats Filled On								
Election	1978	1981	1984	1988	1991	1995	1999	
Within group preferences	13	14	13	12	13	15	15	
Between group preferences	2	1	2	3	2	6	6	
Vacancies filled	15	15	15	15	15	21	21	

#### Table 7: Vacancies Filled on Distribution of Initial Surplus to Quota Votes

SOURCE : 'Within group' preferences means candidates elected on the distribution of preferences from candidates elected on the primary count. 'Between group' preferences means candidates elected after the process of distributing preferences from candidates with the lowest count began.

Table 8 is drawn from analysis of all below the line votes at the 1999 election. It clearly demonstrates how small are the numbers of 'free votes' available to leak out of a group before the exclusion of the final candidate in the group. Overwhelmingly, until the final candidate in a group is excluded, votes stay with candidates in the group.

Tuble 0. Terbentage 0	· • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	ing mann a Group			
	Ticket	Vote for all	Other Votes	'Free'	
	Vote	Cands. in group	staying in group	Votes	
Labor	98.54	0.86	0.31	0.29	
Liberal/Nation	98.33	1.01	0.33	0.33	
One Nation	94.40	4.08	0.34	1.18	
Australian Democrats	88.42	7.98	2.95	0.64	
Christian Democrats	89.62	8.26	2.06	0.06	
Greens	87.05	8.58	3.82	0.55	
Other Parties	93.20	4.18	2.24	0.37	
Totals	96.19	2.48	0.95	0.39	

SOURCE: Calculations by author based on ballot paper data provided by the State Electoral Office. "Other votes staying in group" includes several categories of below the line vote that while not voting for all candidates in a group, are effectively locked into the group until the final candidate is excluded. A small number of votes classed as 'Free' may not in fact leak from the ticket, or may return to the ticket after a brief sojourn with another candidate.

As an example of how little votes for lower-order candidates in groups affect the count, at the 1999 election, the task of excluding candidates with the lowest total of votes began at count 17 with the exclusion of Robert Minale (Republic 2000/People First). This was a quick process, as Minale in fact received no votes. The next five counts excluded candidates with only one vote. In all, 36 counts were conducted before the first candidate with 10 votes was excluded, and a further 24 before a candidate with 20 votes was reached. Count 142 was the first count where a candidate with 100 votes was excluded, and Count 177 the first with more than 500 votes. It was count 181 before the first candidate with a ticket vote was excluded. With the exclusion of Sonia Cousins (DEM) at Count 195, 70 candidates remained in the count, one from each remaining group on the ballot paper. The distribution of all the below the line votes up to this point had had no impact on the order in which parties finished in the count. It was only with the distribution of ticket votes from groups beginning with Count 196 that the process of filling the final vacancies began.

# 4.2 Between Group Preference Flows Before Ticket Voting

At the point in the count where only one candidate remains for each group, the exclusion of candidates begins to deal with preferences flowing between groups, effectively the transfer of partial quotas. It is in the interests of parties, both major and minor, to ensure that if their partial quota cannot be turned into an elected position for themselves, that the distribution of their preferences will have a say in who is elected.

Before the introduction of ticket voting, this was very difficult. The Labor Party and Liberal/National Parties nominated lists of 10 candidates for elections between 1978 and 1984, the minimum number of preferences required at the time, and both parties tended to issue how-to-vote cards showing preferences for only one party ticket. Minor parties, unable to distribute many how-to-vote cards, had difficulty having any control over preferences. As party names did not appear on the ballot paper, voters trying to make up their own minds who to vote for faced difficulty in determining which parties appeared on the ballot paper.

One tactic often adopted by smaller parties before the printing of party names was to nominate a high profile candidate to lead the ticket. This worked for the Queensland National Party in 1980 when it nominated Flo Bjelke-Petersen to lead its Senate team. The early success of the Call to Australia may in part be due to the high profile of its lead candidates Fred Nile, Jim Cameron and Elaine Nile, especially compared to the candidates of other minor parties. The 1991 election, the first to include party names on the ballot paper, saw the vote for the Australian Democrats more than double, while the vote for Call to Australia has failed to reach its pre-1991 levels.

A feature of the distribution of preferences prior to ticket voting was the high rate of exhausted preferences. Table 9 shows the highest preferences flows when a group's final candidate was excluded at elections between 1978 and 1984.

Candidate (Party)	Initial Party Quota	Quota at Distribution	Best flow of preferences
1978			
Oliveri (Ind)	0.08	0.08	32.0% to Lib/Nat
Livesey (Marijuana)	0.15	0.16	26.7% to Labor
Brown (Family Action)	0.21	0.30	44.8% to Lib/Nat
Mundey (Communist)	0.46	0.50	54.2% Exhausted
1981			
Buckley (Republican)	0.06	0.10	31.2% Exhausted
Suter (Environment Action)	0.11	0.14	32.0% Exhausted
Symonds (ALP)	0.29	0.27	86.9% Exhausted
McLennan (CTA)	0.46	0.42	45.6% Exhausted
1984			
Wisby (Progress)	0.04	0.07	42.2% to Democrats
Walsh (Concerned Citizens)	0.08	0.11	53.0% Exhausted
Walker (ALP)	0.50	0.52	89.6% Exhausted

#### Table 9: Flow of Preferences from Excluded Candidates 1978-84

Source: Calculations by author from SEO returns

When preferences did flow to other parties, the flows were much weaker than occurred after ticket voting was introduced. The high rate of exhausted preferences also advantaged groups with a high partial quota. This was clearly demonstrated at the 1984 election.

		To	Total Quotas for Group					
Party	% Vote	Count 1	Count 40	Count 41				
Labor	46.88	7.50	7.52	7.00				
Liberal/National	42.61	6.82	6.79	6.82				
Call to Australia	6.09	0.97	1.02	1.02				
Australian Democrats	3.15	0.50	0.57	0.59				
Others	1.27	0.21						
Exhausted			0.11	0.57				

#### Table 10: Selected Quota Totals – 1984 Legislative Council Election

Source: Calculations by author from SEO returns

At Count 40, three candidates remained in the contest for the final vacancy. Jakins (Liberal/National) had 0.79 quotas, Griffiths (Democrat) 0.57, and Walker (Labor) 0.52. As the candidate with the lowest vote, Walker was excluded. In line with Labor's how-to-vote card with only 10 preferences, 89.6% of Walker's preferences exhausted. Jakins then had 0.82 quotas, Griffiths 0.59, and Jakins was declared elected.

Despite Labor's higher vote, it received the same number of seats as the Coalition<sup>9</sup>. Had Labor been able to exercise more control over its preferences, it would have been able to help elect the Democrat candidate rather than see the seventh Coalition candidate elected on the exhaustion of votes. Had ticket voting applied in 1984, then instead of 89.6% of preferences exhausting, over 95% of Labor votes would have been ticket votes and remained in the count with preferences. With ticket voting, the final result would most probably have been Labor 7 seats, Liberal/National 6 with one each for the Call to Australia and Australian Democrats.

The political imperative of ticket voting in 1988 was to allow major parties to have greater control over their preferences at the end of the count. The addition of party names to the ballot paper that followed in 1991 was a change pushed by the Australian Democrats and adopted by the Greiner government to enable passage of its electoral changes through the Legislative Council.

Once introduced, ticket voting and party names on the ballot paper, combined with the cut in quota in 1995, have had unintended consequences. Instead of advantaging major parties in

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> If the lower 4.55% quota that has applied since 1995 had been in place in 1984, Labor would have won 10 seats to the Coalition's nine. One consequence of the lower quota is that the seats won by the major parties are more likely to be proportional to their vote.

controlling their preferences, ticket voting has advantaged minor parties, and even 'micro' parties, by allowing them to control their preferences in a way that would otherwise be impossible. In addition, instead of party names becoming a tool to assist voters in making an informed choice in voting, in 1999 party names became a tool used to deceive voters.

# 4.3 The Political Impact of Ticket Voting

Ticket voting has changed the contest for vacancies by increasing the average number of votes per ballot paper. As shown in Table 9, when the final candidate of a party was excluded before the introduction of ticket voting, large numbers and in some cases the majority of preferences from that party 'exhausted'. Since ticket voting was introduced, the number of exhausted preferences at each exclusion has fallen to single figure percentages. Since ticket voting, where large numbers of votes have exhausted, it has been because a group ticket did not have enough preferences. At the 1999 election, by the second last count, only six tickets representing 31,271 votes had exhausted their preferences, with a final 57,173 surplus ticket votes from One Nation exhausting at the last count and delivering the final vacancy to Fred Nile with the highest remaining vote.

Above the line voting has allowed votes to be passed from party to party in a way that would not otherwise have been possible. For example, in 1999, 1,834 votes were cast for the No Privatisation People's Party, which had lodged two group ticket votes. When the party's final candidate Samir Bargashoun was excluded, both tickets were transferred to Steven Wright of A Fair Go For Families. When Wright was excluded, 917 votes followed Ticket 1 to Malcolm Jones of Outdoor Recreation (preference 9), and eventually formed part of his final quota. Another 917 votes were transferred to Brandon Raynor of Earthsave (preference 8) and then when he was excluded, to Peter Breen of Reform the Legal System (preference 20) and eventually formed party of his quota. Ticket votes made up 88% of the vote for the No Privatisation People's Party, meaning 88% of preferences flowed exactly as decreed by the party. This effective and complex flow of preferences could not have been achieved in any other way.

The complex flows of preferences are also revealed in the composition of quotas for candidates elected in 1999. For example, Table 11 breaks down by source the quota of votes that elected Malcolm Jones of the Outdoor Recreation Party.

Jones was elected ahead of five other minor party candidates, all of whom had substantially higher percentages of the primary vote. The Outdoor Recreation Party was only one of 22 different parties responsible for Jones's election, and eight of those parties recorded a higher primary vote. Building a quota in this way would have been impossible without ticket voting, and as research in Section 4.4 shows, many people voting below the line for some of the micro parties listed in Table 11, actually directed preferences elsewhere and not at all in accordance with the group ticket vote.

Table TT. Composition of Quota - Marco	Table 11. Composition of Quota - Marcolin Jones (Outdoor Recreation Party) - 1999									
Ticket Votes	Votes	% Vote	% of Quota	Preference						
Gun Owners & Sporting Hunters	23 965	0.67	14.8	3						
Country Party	19 350	0.54	12.0	5						
Marijuana Smokers Rights	14 791	0.42	9.1	8						
Three Day Weekend Party	11 536	0.32	7.1	3						
Australians Against Further Immigration	10 175	0.29	6.3	9						
Gay and Lesbian Party	9 196	0.26	5.7	6						
Animal Liberation	7 499	0.21	4.6	11						
Four Wheel Drive Party	7 353	0.21	4.5	3						
Outdoor Recreation Party	6 734	0.19	4.2	1						
Riders' and Motorists' Party	6 377	0.18	3.9	7						
The Seniors Party	6 324	0.18	3.9	6						
Marine Environment Conservation	5 601	0.16	3.5	8						
Wilderness Party	5 839	0.16	3.6	5						
Fair Tax Party	4 800	0.13	3.0	18						
No GST/Mick Gallagher for Australia	4 504	0.13	2.8	5						
Womens Party/Save the Forests	4 432	0.12	2.7	7						
Outside Newcastle Sydney Wollongong	2 775	0.08	1.7	9						
Republic 2001/People First	2 741	0.08	1.7	16						
No Badgerys Creek Airport	1 839	0.05	1.1	5						
Elect The President	1 600	0.04	1.0	23						
Reclaim Australia	1 475	0.04	0.9	9						
No Privatization Peoples Party	917	0.03	0.6	9						
Below the Line Votes										
Jones primary votes	494	0.01	0.3	1						
Below the line votes as preferences	1 400	0.04	0.9							
Total when elected	161 717	4.55	100							

Table 11: Composition of Quota - Malcolm Jones	(Outdoor Recreation Party) - 1999
--	-----------------------------------

SOURCE: Calculations by author derived from 1999 election results See New South Wales Legislative Council Elections 1999 (Background Paper 2/2000) pp30-35 for composition of all elected candidates.

# 4.4 Lessons from the 1999 Election

The 1999 election was the first at which all below the line votes for the Legislative Council were entered into a data entry system, and the count then conducted using computerised scrutiny. As a result, it has been possible to analyse the ballot papers used in 1999, to assess the way people voted, and how much difference there was between the preferences of below the line votes and the preferences on group ticket votes. The data set consists only of valid preferences on formal ballot papers. Why certain votes were informal, or why sequences of preferences exhausted cannot be assessed.

Table 12 provides a simple summary of the number of valid preferences on all ballot papers above and below the line. Note that with group ticket votes, a number of parties lodged preference tickets with numbering problems, and as with below the line votes, only valid preferences are counted from these tickets.

In excess of 85 percent of above the line votes had more than 30 preferences, the reverse of below the line votes where more than 85% had 30 valid preferences or less. Most below the line voters only numbered the minimum number of 15 preferences. Of votes with only 15 preferences, 10,115 were block votes for the three groups that stood a full ticket of 15 candidates. It appears that many more voters attempted to fill in all 264 squares than actually achieved the feat. Of the 649 votes with a correct sequence of 264 preferences, one was a donkey vote, starting at the top left with Peter Breen, then dutifully filling in all the remaining squares across and down the ballot paper.

	'Below the li	ne' Votes	'Above the li	ne' Votes
Valid Preferences	No. of Votes	% of Votes	No. of Votes	% of Votes
Less than 15	3 892	3.10	2 669	0.08
15	68 880	54.84	55 968	1.64
16 – 20	19 873	15.82	99 319	2.90
21 – 30	16 797	13.37	373 992	10.93
41 – 40	8 020	6.39	132 671	3.88
41 – 50	2 760	2.20	34 020	0.99
51 – 100	2 920	2.32	1 475 404	43.11
101 – 150	767	0.61	114 606	3.35
151 – 200	436	0.35	165 189	4.83
201 – 250	287	0.23	0	
251 – 260	133	0.11	7 259	0.21
261 – 263	180	0.14	0	
264	649	0.52	960 956	28.08
Totals Votes	125 594		3 422 053	
Average Preferences	23		125	
Median Preferences	15		81	

Table 12. Valid Frederences per ballot paper, 1999 Legislative Council election
---

SOURCE: Calculations by author based on ballot paper data provided by State Electoral Office, and by analysis of group ticket votes lodged at the 1999 election. Includes only valid preferences, excluding duplicate and omitted numbers.

On average, below the line voters filled in only 23 preferences, though the median figure of 15 preferences may be a more meaningful measure. Amongst above the line votes, where all votes carried the number of valid preferences from the registered ticket, the average number of preferences per vote was 125. Two groups, the Communist Party and the Liberal / National Party had tickets of 264 preferences, while Labor's ticket had only 81 preferences, the Greens 101, Australian Democrats 161, One Nation 25 and the Christian Democrats 114, though this cancelled at preference 76 due to a numbering error. The registered ticket for the Responsible Gambling Party finished at the 8<sup>th</sup> preference due to a duplicated 9<sup>th</sup> preference.

A full analysis of below the line votes for all parties can be found in Appendix 2. Explanatory notes on the terms used can be found at the start of the Appendix. However, a number of broad comments can be made on the preference strategies of different parties, and the differences between those strategies and the behaviour of below the line voters.

- The smaller the vote for parties, the more widely the preferences of below the line votes were distributed. Also, the smaller the vote, the more likely that immediate next preferences were influenced by position on the ballot paper. The Australian Democrats and Greens both received strong flows of preferences from minor parties on the top line of the ballot paper. Position on ballot paper must explain the strong leakage of Reform the Legal System preferences to the Marijuana Smokers Rights Party. This leakage almost certainly represents donkey votes. Another form of donkey voting assisted Reform the Legal System, where many voters having filled in a series of preferred parties, then appeared to start numbering remaining candidates from the top-left of the ballot paper.
- Preferences from most of the larger parties formed logical preference clusters. There was a
  strong swap of below the line preferences between the Greens and Australian Democrats.
  Both Labor and Coalition voters showed preference for the Australian Democrats over the
  Greens. Coalition and Christian Democrat voters showed strong preferences for each other
  above all other groups, though both One Nation and the Shooters Party had some appeal
  as preferences for more conservative voters. Most parties of the left showed strong
  preferences for the Greens in line with group ticket votes.
- Some parties clearly made tactical decisions on preferences that were not known to below the line voters. The Labor group ticket votes gave first preferences to Unity ahead of the Greens and Australian Democrats. Few below the line voters used such a sequence of preferences, most going directly to the Greens and Australian Democrats.

- The Australian Democrats may lodge a split ticket of preferences between Labor and Liberal, but a higher proportion of their below the line votes listed Labor ahead of the Coalition.
- There were 19 tickets with first effective preference for the Outdoor Recreation Party. One Nation, Marijuana Smokers Rights, Gun Owners and Sporting Hunters Rights, Country Party, Three Day Weekend Party, Australians Against Further Immigration, Gay and Lesbian Party, Animal Liberation, Four Wheel Drive Party, Riders' and Motorists' Party, Seniors Party, Marine Environment Conservation Party, Wilderness Party, Women's Party/Save the Forests, Australia First, Republic 2001/People First, Outside Sydney Newcastle Wollongong Party, No Privatisation Peoples Party, No Badgerys Creek Airport, Elect the President and Reclaim Australia
- Of these groups, Marijuana Smokers Right, Gay and Lesbian Party, Wilderness Party, Women's Party/Save the Forests, Australia First, Outside Sydney NewcasIte Wollongong and No Badgerys Creek Airport had actually given first preference to Glen Druery of People First. Druery had also received the effective preferences of the Responsible Gambling Party, Godfrey Bigot People Before Politics and the Hotel Patrons Party. As outlined below, a number of the parties directing preferences to Jones and Druery seemed to have names that may have confused voters, with below the line votes for several heavily favouring the Greens and other parties on the centre-left.

Full details of effective preferences on ticket and below the line votes can be found for each party in Appendix 2. However, it does appear that below the line voters for some parties had very different views of what those parties stood for, compared to the registered ticket votes. The following parties displayed a considerable variation between the direction of ticket votes, and the direction of preferences for people voting below the line.

#### **Shooters Party**

Preferences on Ticket vote: (12) Australian Family Alliance, (17) Unity, (22) Registered Clubs, (28) Christian Democrats.

Below the line votes: 42.4% to One Nation, 15.3% Christian Democrats, 13.5% Liberal/National

#### Marijuana Smokers Rights Party

Preferences on Ticket vote: (3) Glen Druery, (8) Outdoor Recreation party

Below the line votes: 41.0% Greens, 14.0% Reform the Legal System, 11.9% Australian Democrats

#### **Country Party**

<u>Preferences on Ticket vote</u>: (5) Outdoor Recreation Party <u>Below the line votes</u>: 24.0% Australian Democrats, 20.9% Liberal/National, 12.4% Reform the Legal System, 10.1% One Nation

#### **Australians Against Further Immigration**

<u>Preferences on Ticket vote</u>: (9) Outdoor Recreation Party <u>Below the line votes</u>: 42.0% One Nation, 10.1% Greens

#### Gay and Lesbian Party

<u>Preferences on Ticket vote</u>: (3) Glen Druery, (6) Outdoor Recreation Party <u>Below the line votes</u>: 33.2% Greens, 28.8% Australian Democrats, 12.4% Labor Party

#### **Animal Liberation**

<u>Preferences on Ticket vote</u>: (11) Outdoor Recreation Party <u>Below the line votes</u>: 44.3% Greens

#### Seniors Party

Preferences on Ticket vote: (6) Outdoor Recreation Party Below the line votes: 20.3% One Nation, 12.6% Australian Democrats, 11.6% Christian Democrats, 10.6% Greens, 10.1% Australians Against Further Immigration

#### **Marine Environment Conservation Party**

<u>Preferences on Ticket vote</u>: (8) Outdoor Recreation Party <u>Below the line votes</u>: 58.9% Greens, 11.3% Australian Democrats

#### Wilderness Party

<u>Preferences on Ticket vote</u>: (3) Glen Druery, (5) Outdoor Recreation Party <u>Below the line votes</u>: 51.2% Greens, 12.7% Australian Democrats, 11.7% Australians Against Further Immigration

#### Women's Party / Save the Forests

<u>Preferences on Ticket vote</u>: (5) Glen Druery, (7) Outdoor Recreation Party <u>Below the line votes</u>: 47.7% Greens, 11.9% Australian Democrats

#### **Australia First**

<u>Preferences on Ticket vote</u>: (9) Glen Druery, (10) Outdoor Recreation Party <u>Below the line votes</u>: 32.4% One Nation, 21.9% Australians Against Further Immigration, 12.4% Christian Democrats

# 5 Prospects for the 2003 Election

# 5.1 Likely Performance of the Electoral System

From the discussion in the previous section, the following conclusions can be drawn about how the new electoral system will operate in 2003.

- The new system of registered parties means there will be a substantial fall in the number of groups on the ballot paper in 2003. However, as parties must stand 15 candidates to obtain a group ticket voting square, the number of candidates may be the same, even though the number of groups will fall. Unlike past elections, there will be few groups with only 2 or 3 candidates.
- It is likely that more parties will run joint groups. As preferences cannot flow between groups via ticket votes, it is a more useful strategy for parties to run joint tickets, rather than separate tickets with preference swaps as in the past. Joint tickets may also provide an advantage in giving more space next to the group ticket voting square for the listing of party names.
- There is evidence from past elections that the minor party vote increases with the number of candidates contesting. With less parties contesting in 2003, the major party vote should increase from the record low 64.7% in 1999.
- As noted in Table 12, group ticket voting in 1999 resulted in above the line votes having an average of 123 preferences per vote. This will plummet in 2003, as group ticket votes can only show preferences for a single group, meaning most group votes will have between 15 and 21 preferences.
- It is unlikely that many people will know of the new above the line voting option to direct preferences to parties. As a result, only people who receive a how-to-vote card directing preferences are likely to use this option. This means that Labor and the Coalition, who hand out the most how-to-vote cards, will be in a powerful position in being able to direct any surplus preferences to another party, if they choose to do so. The Greens and Australian Democrats, the other parties that hand out significant numbers of how to vote cards, will also have a strong chance of directing any surplus votes. Minor parties that do not hand out how-to-vote cards are likely to see their votes exhaust preferences when the last candidate of the group is excluded.
- There is certain to be a huge increase in the number of votes with preferences that exhaust when the last candidate of the voter's chosen party is excluded. This will mean that the parties with the highest partial quotas at the start of the count are the parties most likely to fill the final vacancies. It is possible that several seats will be filled by candidates and parties with less than a quota of votes.
- The new system will prevent parties winning election on complex flows of preferences. However, it will not prevent parties with only a small primary vote from winning seats. Any party that achieves 2% of the vote could win the final vacancy given a high rate of votes with exhausted preferences. If either of the major parties receive more than 2% above their allotment of full quotas, they will also have a better chance of winning a seat under the new system than previously. It is still conceivable that a party could win election despite receiving only 1% of the vote.

# 5.1 Problems that Remain with the Council's Voting System

The new system appears to be a compromise that has avoided the need for a referendum. However, there are still problems with the Legislative Council's electoral system that can only be addressed with a referendum. Amongst these are:

• Too much detail in Schedule 6 of the Constitution Act. Any change requiring a referendum should look at removing excessive procedural detail from the constitution.

- Random sampling of votes. With the count now carried out using computers, there is no need for random sampling, as the transfer value could be used to transfer votes at fractional value. Random sampling adds an entirely unnecessary complication to the count, as well as the possibility of sampling error affecting the result.
- Determination of surplus to quota votes. Tasmania and the ACT both use a similar method
  of determining surplus to quota votes as NSW, but both with a subtle difference. The
  Senate and upper houses in other states all use an entirely different method of determining
  which votes to examine for preferences. There are merits in both the NSW and Senate
  systems, but if other aspects of Schedule 6 are addressed, so should the question of
  defining surplus to quota votes.
- Completely different approaches could be looked at for electing the Legislative Council, such as introducing a 'threshold' quota for election, using European style proportional representation systems, or adopting the Victorian and Western Australian systems of using provinces with our without staggered terms.

It should be noted that none of these more fundamental issues with the electoral system can be addressed without a referendum to change the Constitution.

# **APPENDIX** 1

# Past Legislative Council Election Results

#### Table A1: Numbers of Candidates and Groups contesting election

Election	1978	1981	1984	1988	1991	1995	1999
Groups	8	9	8	13	12	28	81
Candidates	46	48	43	56	54	99	264

NOTE: Groups total includes 'Ungrouped' column.

#### Table A2: Percentage Vote by Party, Legislative Council Elections 1978-99

	1978	1981	1984	1988	1991	1995	1999	
Labor Party	54.9	51.8	46.9	37.5	37.3	35.3	37.3	
Liberal / National Party	36.3	33.8	42.6	46.1	45.3	38.5	27.4	
Australian Democrats	2.8	4.0	3.2	2.7	6.7	3.2	4.0	
Call to Australia / CDP		9.1	6.1	5.7	3.6	3.0	3.2	
Greens				1.6	3.3	3.7	2.9	
Shooters Party						2.8	1.7	
A Better Future for Our Childre	n					1.3	0.4	
Pauline Hanson's One Nation							6.3	
Reform the Legal System							1.0	
Unity							1.0	
Outdoor Recreation Party							0.2	
Others	6.0	1.3	1.2	6.3	3.6	12.2	14.6	
Informal	4.1	6.8	6.7	8.1	5.7	6.1	7.2	

NOTE: The Call to Australia changed its name to Christian Democratic Party before the 1999 election

#### Table A3: Seats Won by Party, Legislative Council Elections 1978-95

	1978	1981	1984	1988	1991	1995	1999
Labor Party	9	8	7	6	6	8	8
Liberal / National	6	5	7	7	7	8	6
Call to Australia / CDP		1	1	1	1	1	1
Australian Democrats		1		1	1	1	1
Greens						1	1
Shooters Party						1	
A Better Future for Our Children						1	
Unity							1
One Nation							1
Reform the Legal System							1
Outdoor Recreation Party							1
Seats Elected	15	15	15	15	15	21	21

NOTE: The Call to Australia changed its name to Christian Democratic Party before the 1999 election

#### Table A4: Party Composition of Legislative Council based on elections, 1978-98

	ALP	LIB/NAT	СТА	DEM	GRN	IND*	OTH*	Seats	
1978	23	20						43	
1981	24	18	1	1				44	
1984	24	18	2	1				45	
1988	21	19	3	2				45	
1991	18	20	2	2				42	
1995	17	18	2	2	1		2	42	
1999	16	14	2	2	2		6	42	
Current	16	13	2	1	2	2	6	42	

\* - See note to Table A6

	N	SW Sena	te	Legis	slative Co	uncil
Party	1996	1998	2001	1991	1995	1999
Labor	37.2	38.7	33.5	37.3	35.3	37.3
Liberal/National	41.4	36.6	41.8	45.3	38.5	27.4
Democrat	9.5	7.3	6.2	6.7	3.2	4.0
Greens	2.7	2.2	4.4	3.3	3.7	2.9
Call to Australia	2.0	1.5	1.9	3.6	3.0	3.2
Shooters Party	2.0				2.8	1.7
One Nation		9.6	5.6			6.3
Independents/Others	5.2	4.1	6.6	3.8	13.5	17.2
Informal Vote	3.7	3.4	3.5	5.7	6.1	7.2

Table A6: Party Composition of Retiring	and Continuing Legislative Councillors.
---	---

	ALP	LID/NAT	CDP	DEM	GRN	IND*	OTH*	Seats
Retiring	8	5/2	1		1	2	2	21
Continuing	8	4/2	1	1	1		4	21
Total	16	9/4	2	1	2	2	6	42

\* The two independents whose terms end in 2003 are Richard Jones, originally elected as an Australian Democrat, and Helen Sham-Ho, originally elected to represent the Liberal Party. The two 'Others' whose terms end in 2003 are Alan Corbett (A Better Future for Our Children) and John Tingle (Shooters Party). The four 'Others' whose terms end in 2007 are Peter Breen (Reform the Legal System), Malcolm Jones (Outdoor Recreation Party), David Oldfield (One Nation) and Peter Wong (Unity).

# **APPENDIX 2**

#### 1999 'Below the line' Vote Ballot Paper Survey results

#### The Data Sets

Two sets of data have been used to prepare this index. The first set consists of the registered ticket votes lodged by groups at the 1999 election. A total of 93 group tickets were lodged, 68 groups lodging one ticket, 11 groups lodging two and one group lodging three. Of these tickets, nine had sequencing errors.

The second set of data consists of below the line votes from the 1999 election. The formal preference on 125,594 below the line votes are contained in the file. For analysis purposes, a further 10,155 'block' votes (see page 13) not contained in the file have been added to totals, 5,213 for Labor, 4,798 Liberal/National and 104 Republic 2001/People First.

Only formal preferences were contained in the ballot paper file. All votes with duplicate or missing preference numbers exhausted at the point where a sequencing error occurred, and the data set did not contain these errors. All analysis is based on preferences up to the point where the sequence exhausted. The analysis of group ticket votes has also been limited to formal preferences, ignoring any preferences after the first sequencing error.

#### **Details on Groups and Parties**

In the listing that follows, groups have been listed in descending order of votes received. For each group, the group code is shown, relevant party names, the total percentage vote received by the group, and the number of candidates in the group. The number and percentage of votes cast below the line is shown, as is the number and percentage of below the line votes that showed preferences for all candidates in the group before giving preferences to any other group on the ballot paper.

#### Defining an 'Effective' preference

Out of the 264 candidates on the 1999 ballot paper, the following 12 candidates have been categorised as producing 'effective' preferences. Six were candidates elected on preferences. Three were the final candidates of parties that achieved more than a quota of votes on the primary count. The final three candidates, from the Australian Family Alliance, Australians Against Further Immigration, and the Shooters Party, were not elected in 1999, but stood for parties that are registered to contest the 2003 election.

#### **Group Candidate**

- Peter Breen (elected) А
- Q Lee Rhiannon (elected)
- Υ Arthur Chesterfield-Evans (elected)
- AD Damian Tudehope
- AE
- Amanda Fazio (9<sup>th</sup> candidate) Brian Burston (2<sup>nd</sup> candidate) Greg Hansen (7<sup>th</sup> candidate) AM
- AW
- Peter Wong (elected) AX
- ΒK Malcolm Jones (elected)
- BN Edwin Woodger
- BR Fred Nile (Elected)
- ΒZ Jim Pirie

#### Partv

Reform the Legal System Greens Australian Democrats Australian Family Alliance Labor Party One Nation Liberal/National Party Unitv Outdoor Recreation Australians Against Further Immigration **Christian Democrats** Shooters Party

#### **Exhausted Votes**

Two totals of exhausted preferences are shown. The line "exhausted showing no preferences outside of group" represents votes cast for candidates in a group, but showing no formal preferences for any other group on the ballot paper. The line "exhausted before reaching an effective preference" represents votes with preferences outside of the first preference group, but not for one of the candidates defined as effective on the previous page.

#### **Immediate Next Preference**

This is a total and percentage representing the proportion of votes from the first preference group that gave next preference to <u>any</u> candidate in another group. Totals and percentages are shown only for groups receiving a flow of more than 10%. Note that percentages are calculated as ratio of votes for the group <u>less</u> any votes exhausting before leaving the first preference group. The totals are for any candidate in the second preference group, whether that candidate is the top of ticket candidate or any other candidate of the group. Where the next preference is for a group on the ballot paper within three columns of the first preference group, this is indicated.

As immediate next preferences are for any candidate in a group, there may be discrepancies with the totals for effective next preference. For instance, 3939 Australian Democrat voters gave immediate next preference to the Labor Party, but only 2451 were an effective next preference for Labor. The missing preferences are votes that gave preferences to any of the other 14 Labor candidates, but did not include a preference for the 9<sup>th</sup> Labor candidate Amanda Fazio.

#### **Effective Next Preference**

This is the percentage of votes for the first preference party that gave preferences to one of the effective candidates defined on the previous page. Totals and percentages are shown only for groups receiving a flow of more than 10%. Note that percentages are calculated as ratio of votes for the group less any votes exhausting before reaching an effective preference.

From examining the ballot paper data, it appears many voters are confused by the electoral system and only give preferences to the first candidate in a group. The number of preferences flowing to the Labor and the Liberal/National Party groups increased if the first candidate was included as an effective candidate. However, as the purpose of this survey was to measure 'effective' preferences compared to group ticket votes, the first candidates on the Labor, Liberal/National and One Nation tickets have <u>not</u> been included as effective preferences.

#### **Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote**

This provides a listing of the effective preferences on all registered group ticket votes. The listing contains the preference numbers and parties that correspond to the list of effective candidates shown on the previous page. The group ticket listing is provided as a comparison to the effective next preferences totals. It highlights the parties where the preferences of below the line votes either corresponded to or diverged from the group vote of the party.

In the listing, <u>underlining</u> indicates a preference that resulted in group votes for a party being included in the final quota of an elected candidate. For instance, the Labor Party's group vote eventually formed part of the quota for Unity. Some group votes helped form the quota of more than one candidate. Some group votes either exhausted or finished with a candidate who failed to be elected.

#### Labor Party (Group AE, 37.27% vote, 15 candidates)

19410	1.46%	votes were cast below the line
11429	58.9%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group
8603	44.3%	exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
10557	54.4%	exhausted before reaching an effective preference

10807 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

2902	26.9%	Australian Democrats
1646	15.2%	Greens

8853 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

3488 39.4% Australian Democrats

2415 27.3% Green	IS	
------------------	----	--

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote

(Ticket 1 of 2) (16) <u>Unity</u>, (21) Greens, (30) Australian Democrats, (60) Australian Family Alliance, (67) Christian Democrats

(Ticket 2 of 2) (16) <u>Unity</u>, (21) Australian Democrats, (30) Greens, (60) Australian Family Alliance, (67) Christian Democrats

#### Liberal/National Party (Group AW, 27.39% vote, 15 candidates)

6274	1.67%	votes were cast below the line
9830	60.4%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group
7523	46.2%	exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
9474	58.2%	exhausted before reaching an effective preference

8751 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

1392 15.9% Christian Democrats

1348 15.4% One Nation

6800 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 1948 28.6% Christian Democrats
- 1228 18.1% One Nation
- 1040 15.3% Australian Democrats
- 778 11.4% Shooters Party

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (16) <u>Christian Democrats</u>, (25) Unity, (32) Outdoor Recreation, (45) Australian Family Alliance, (58) Reform the Legal System, (75) Australian Democrats, (84) Shooters Party, (95) Greens, (241) Labor Party, (258) Australians Against Further Immigration, (261) One Nation

#### Pauline Hanson's One Nation (Group AM, 6.34% vote, 5 candidates)

12644	5.60%	votes were cast below the line
9215	72.9%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group
48	0.4%	exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
1662	13.1%	exhausted before reaching an effective preference

12596 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

1939	15.4%	Liberal/National Party
		-

1440 11.4% Shooters Party

10982 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

2260	20.6%	Shooters Party
------	-------	----------------

2240 20.4% Australians Against Further Immigration

- 1959 17.8% Liberal/National Party
- 1783 16.2% Christian Democrats

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote

(Ticket 1 of 2) (8) Outdoor Recreation, (17) <u>Reform the Legal System</u>, (24) Australian Family Alliance

(Ticket 2 of 2) (9) Outdoor Recreation, (17) <u>Reform the Legal System</u>, (24) Australian Family Alliance

#### Australian Democrats (Group Y, 4.01% vote, 9 candidates)

16531	11.58%	votes were cast below the line
11400	69.0%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group
67	0.4%	exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
3213	19.4%	exhausted before reaching an effective preference

16464 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

6765	41.1%	Greens	
0705	41.170	Greens	

3939 23.9% Labor Party

13318 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

8201	61.6%	Greens
2451	18.4%	Labor Party

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote

(Ticket 1 of 2) (54) Reform the Legal System, (67) Australian Family Alliance, (72) Greens, (111) Unity, (122) Liberal/National Party, (138) Labor Party, (146) Christian Democrats, (151) Shooters Party

(Ticket 2 of 2) (54) Reform the Legal System, (67) Australian Family Alliance, (72) Greens, (111) Unity, (123) Labor Party, (137) Liberal/National Party, (146) Christian Democrats, (151) Shooters Party

#### Christian Democratic Party (Group BR, 3.17% vote, 5 candidates)

1696	10.38%	votes were cast below the line
9305	79.6%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group
32	0.3%	exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
1179	10.1%	exhausted before reaching an effective preference

11664 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

- Liberal/National Party 3915 33.6%
- 10.8% 1264 Labor Party
- 1219 10.5% One Nation

10517 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

4156	39.5%	Liberal/National Party
1436	13.7%	One Nation
1333	12.7%	Australian Democrats
1107	10.5%	Labor Party

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (12) Liberal/National Party, (21) Australian Family Alliance, (35) Shooters Party, (59) Australians Against Further Immigration

#### Greens (Group Q. 2.91% vote, 9 candidates)

13395	12.95%	votes were cast below the line	
8873	66.2%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group	
53	0.4%	exhausted showing no preferences outside of group	
2941	22.0%	exhausted before reaching an effective preference	
13342 contir	nuing votes	showed immediate next preference for	
6076	45.5%	Australian Democrats	
2069	15.5%	Labor Party	
10454 continuing votes showed effective peyt preference for			

10454 continuing votes showed effective next preterence tor

7499 71.7% Australian Democrats 15.2% Labor Party 1592

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (27) Reform the Legal System, (38) Australian Democrats, (85) Unity, (93) Labor Party, (97) Liberal/National Party

#### Shooters Party (Group BZ, 1.67% vote, 11 candidates)

3366	5.68%	votes were cast below the line
1984	58.9%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group
21	0.6%	exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
750	22.3%	exhausted before reaching an effective preference

3345 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

924	27.6%	One Nation
-		

382 11.4% Liberal/National Party

2616 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 1108 42.4% One Nation
- 399 15.3% **Christian Democrats**
- 354 13.5% Liberal/National Party

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (12) Australian Family Alliance, (17) Unity, (28) Christian Democrats, (33) Australians Against Further Immigration

#### Progressive Labour Party (Group N, 1.58% vote, 2 candidates)

866	1.55%	votes were cast below the line
503	58.1%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group
9	1.0%	exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
234	27.0%	exhausted before reaching an effective preference

857 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for 123 14.4% Greens (Group +3)

632 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

235	37.2%	Greens
138	21.8%	Australian Democrats
400	40.00/	Defense the Level Ories

- 120 19.0% Reform the Legal System
- 68 10.8% Labor Party

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (3) <u>Greens</u>, (9) Australian Democrats, (13) <u>Reform</u> the Legal System, (16) Unity

#### Marijuana Smokers Rights Party (Group B, 1.24% vote, 2 candidates)

3797	8.63%	votes were cast below the line
2588	68.2%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group
23	0.6%	exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
892	23.5%	exhausted before reaching an effective preference

3774 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

	459 423	12.2% 11.2%	Greens Gay and Lesbian Party (Group +1)
2905	continui	ng votes sl	howed effective next preference for
	1192	41.0%	Greens
	407	14.0%	Reform the Legal System

345 11.9% Australian Democrats

345 11.9% Australian Democrats

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (8) Outdoor Recreation, (40) Unity

#### Reform the Legal System (Group A, 1.00% vote, 2 candidates)

2453	6.87%	votes were cast below the line
979	39.9%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group
26	1.1%	exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
1542	62.9%	exhausted before reaching an effective preference

2427 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

146	47.2%	Marijuana Smokers Rights Party (Group +1)	
-----	-------	---	--

324 13.3% Young Australians Caring for our (Group +3)

911 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

354 38.9% Greens

1

178 19.5% Australian Democrats

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (10) Australian Family Alliance, (17) Greens, (19) Unity, (21) Outdoor Recreation

#### Unity (Group AX, 0.98% vote, 5 candidates)

•		
1228	3.53%	votes were cast below the line
795	64.7%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group
5	0.4%	exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
196	16.0%	exhausted before reaching an effective preference

1223 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

- 426 34.8% Labor Party
- 205 16.8% Australian Democrats

1032 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

308	29.8%	Labor Party
282	27.3%	Australian Democrats

183 17.7% Greens

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (10) Reform the Legal System, (35) Australian Family Alliance, (86) Labor Party, (93) Shooters Party, (104) Greens, (113) Australian Democrats, (137) Liberal/National Party, (151) Christian Democrats

#### Country Summit Alliance (Group BS, 0.89% vote, 9 candidates)

2708	8.52%	votes were cast below the line
1786	66.0%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group
16	0.6%	exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
508	18.8%	exhausted before reaching an effective preference

2692 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

- 331 12.3% Shooters Party
- 302 11.2% Christian Democrats (Group -1)
- 275 10.2% Australian Democrats

2200 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 420 19.1% Liberal/National Party
- 400 18.2% Shooters Party
- 386 17.5% Christian Democrats
- 343 15.6% Australian Democrats
- 250 11.4% One Nation

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: No Effective Preferences

#### Registered Clubs Party (Group F, 0.77% vote, 6 candidates)

2226	8.08%	votes were cast below the line
1425	64.0%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group

- 16 0.7% exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
- 443 19.9% exhausted before reaching an effective preference

2210 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

- 291 13.2% Liberal/National Party
- 262 11.9% Labor Party

1783 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 331 18.6% Liberal/National Party
- 269 15.1% One Nation
- 256 14.4% Australian Democrats
- 220 12.3% Labor Party
- 190 10.7% Greens

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (19) Shooters Party, (30) Christian Democrats, (39) Reform the Legal System, (46) Unity, (59) Greens, (68) Australian Democrats, (79) Australian Family Alliance

#### Gun Owners & Sporting Hunters Rights (Group J, 0.71% vote, 2 candidates)

1141	4.54%	votes were cast below the line
778	68.2%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group
9	0.8%	exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
210	18.4%	exhausted before reaching an effective preference

1132 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for 138 12.2% One Nation

931 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

185	19.9%	One Nation	
167	17.9%	Shooters Party	

- 153 16.4% Reform the Legal System
- 130 14.0% Greens

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (3) Outdoor Recreation

#### Country Party (Group S, 0.56% vote, 2 candidates)

	• • •	· · · · · ·
469	2.37%	votes were cast below the line
345	73.6%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group
1	0.2%	exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
81	17.3%	exhausted before reaching an effective preference

468 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

90	19.2%	Liberal/National Party
64	13.7%	Australian Democrats

388 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

24.0%	Australian Democrats
20.9%	Liberal/National Party
12.4%	Reform the Legal System
	24.0% 20.9% 12.4%

39 10.1% One Nation

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (5) Outdoor Recreation

#### What's Doing? Party (Group BW, 0.51% vote, 2 candidates)

20.62%	votes were cast below the line
51.3%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group
0.4%	exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
21.2%	exhausted before reaching an effective preference
	20.62% 51.3% 0.4% 21.2%

2978 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

381	12.8%	Shooters Party
379	12.7%	Outdoor Recreation
378	12.7%	Australians Against Further Immigration
347	11.7%	Labor Party

306 10.3% Liberal/National Party

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote

(Ticket 1 of 2) (11) Labor Party

(Ticket 2 of 2) (9) Liberal/National Party

#### A Better Future for Children (Group M, 0.44% vote, 2 candidates)

721	4.56%	votes were cast below the line

- 378 52.4% showed preferences for all candidates in this group
  - 2 0.3% exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
- 200 27.7% exhausted before reaching an effective preference

719 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for 104 14.5% Greens

521 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 193 37.0% Greens
- 85 16.3% Australian Democrats
- 83 15.9% Reform the Legal System

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote

(Ticket 1 of 2) (24) <u>Unity</u>, (31) Greens, (40) Australian Democrats, (71) Reform the Legal System, (79) Australian Family Alliance

(Ticket 2 of 2) (24) <u>Unity</u>, (31) Australian Democrats, (40) Greens, (71) Reform the Legal System, (79) Australian Family Alliance

#### Franca Arena Child Safety Alliance (Group AT, 0.39% vote, 3 candidates)

17.73%	votes were cast below the line
57.9%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group
0.2%	exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
7.5%	exhausted before reaching an effective preference
	17.73% 57.9% 0.2% 7.5%

2440 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

- 358 14.7% Christian Democrats
- 319 13.1% Labor Party
- 262 10.7% Liberal/National Party (Group +3)
- 260 10.7% One Nation

2261 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 497 22.0% Christian Democrats
- 364 16.1% Australian Democrats
- 294 13.0% Labor Party
- 254 11.2% Greens
- 248 11.0% Liberal/National Party
- 246 10.9% One Nation

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (20) Christian Democrats, (43) Australian Democrats

#### Three Day Weekend Party (Group AK, 0.34% vote, 2 candidates)

- 467 3.89% votes were cast below the line
- 307 65.7% showed preferences for all candidates in this group
- 0 0.0% exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
- 108 23.1% exhausted before reaching an effective preference

467 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

359 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 83 23.1% Outdoor Recreation
- 70 19.5% Greens
- 39 10.9% Australian Democrats

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (3) Outdoor Recreation

#### Australian Family Alliance (Group AD, 0.33% vote, 5 candidates)

167	9.87%	votes were cast below the line
901	77.2%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group
4	0.3%	exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
114	9.8%	exhausted before reaching an effective preference

1163 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

- 435 37.4% Christian Democrats
- 161 13.8% Liberal/National Party

1053 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

541	51.4%	Christian Democrats
157	1 1 00/	Liberal/National Darty

157 14.9% Liberal/National Party

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (9) <u>Reform the Legal System</u>, (21) Shooters Party, (22) Christian Democrats, (23) Outdoor Recreation

#### Young Australians Caring for our (Group D, 0.31% vote, 2 candidates)

	<b>J</b>
6.91%	votes were cast below the line
40.3%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group
0.5%	exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
34.3%	exhausted before reaching an effective preference
	6.91% 40.3% 0.5% 34.3%

762 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

	•	•
93	12.2%	NSW Ratepayers Party (Group +1)
79	10.4%	Registered Clubs Party (Group +2)

503 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

173	34.4%	Greens

107 21.3% Reform the Legal System

90 17.9% Australian Democrats

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (3) <u>Greens</u>, (9) Australian Democrats, (10) Shooters Party, (14) Reform the Legal System

#### Australians Against Further Immigration (Group BN, 0.31% vote, 2 candidates)

706	6.49%	votes were cast below the line
565	80.0%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group
1	0.1%	exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
00	40.00/	and an attack of the fame was a bin an antiferation was fame as a s

92 13.0% exhausted before reaching an effective preference

705 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

194 27.5% One Nation

614 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

258 42.0% One Nation 62 10.1% Greens

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (9) Outdoor Recreation, (42) Shooters Party, (44) Christian Democrats

#### Gay and Lesbian Party (Group C, 0.29% vote, 2 candidates)

250	11 070/	votos woro cast holow the line
200	11.97 /0	votes were cast below the line
961	76.9%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group
7	0.6%	exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
242	19.4%	exhausted before reaching an effective preference

#### 1243 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

209 10	6.8% A	ustralian	Democrats
--------	--------	-----------	-----------

- 175 14.1% Greens
- 141 11.3% Marijuana Smokers Rights Party (Group -1)

1008 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

335 33.2% Greens	335	33.2%	Greens	
------------------	-----	-------	--------	--

290 28.8% Australian Democrats

125 12.4% Labor Party

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (6) Outdoor Recreation, (16) Unity

# Australians Against the Promotion of Homosexuality (Group AF, 0.26% vote, 2 candidates)

335	3.67%	votes were cast below the line
242	72.2%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group
2	0.6%	exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
53	15.8%	exhausted before reaching an effective preference

333 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for42 12.6% One Nation

282 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 61 21.6% Christian Democrats
- 50 17.7% One Nation
- 48 17.0% Australians Against Further Immigration

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (5) Australian Family Alliance, (14) <u>Christian</u> <u>Democrats</u>

#### Small Business Party (Group BE, 0.25% vote, 2 candidates)

2.66%	votes were cast below the line
65.7%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group
0.8%	exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
19.2%	exhausted before reaching an effective preference
	2.66% 65.7% 0.8% 19.2%

193 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 28 14.5% Australian Democrats
- 23 11.9% One Nation
- 22 11.4% Liberal/National Party
- 21 10.9% Australians Against Further Immigration
- 20 10.4% Outdoor Recreation

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (4) <u>Reform the Legal System</u>, (27) Australian Democrats, (32) Unity, (36) Greens, (52) Australian Family Alliance

#### Animal Liberation (Group BM, 0.22% vote, 2 candidates)

4.40%	votes were cast below the line
77.4%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group
0.0%	exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
15.7%	exhausted before reaching an effective preference
	4.40% 77.4% 0.0% 15.7%

345 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

54	15.7%	Wilderness Party
----	-------	------------------

42 12.2% Greens

291 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

129 44.3% Greens

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (11) Outdoor Recreation, (18) Greens

#### Democratic Socialists (Group BG, 0.21% vote, 2 candidates)

- 379 4.96% votes were cast below the line
- 319 84.2% showed preferences for all candidates in this group
  - 2 0.5% exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
- 32 8.4% exhausted before reaching an effective preference

377 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

- 96 25.5% Greens
- 50 13.3% Communist Party
- 42 11.1% Labor Party

347 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

171	49.3%	Green

67 19.3% Australian Democrats

55 15.9% Labor Party

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (5) <u>Greens</u>, (32) Labor Party, (40) Unity, (47) Australian Democrats, (72) Liberal/National Party, (101) Reform the Legal System, (128) Outdoor Recreation, (194) Australian Family Alliance, (238) Christian Democrats, (243) Shooters Party, (254) Australians Against Further Immigration

#### Speranza: Hope for Better Health NSW (Group AB, 0.21% vote, 3 candidates)

264	3.46%	votes were cast below the line
106	40.2%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group
8	3.0%	exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
57	21.6%	exhausted before reaching an effective preference

256 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

79 30.9% Kevin Ryan - Drug Reform (Group +1)

207 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 68 32.9% Australian Family Alliance
- 21 10.1% Greens

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (5) Australian Family Alliance, (10) <u>Reform the Legal System</u>, (17) Unity, (34) Australians Against Further Immigration, (46) Greens, (47) Australian Democrats, (48) Christian Democrats

#### Four Wheel Drive Party (Group AV, 0.21% vote, 2 candidates)

194	2.57%	votes were cast below the line
140	72.2%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group
0	0.0%	exhausted showing no preferences outside of group

22 11.3% exhausted before reaching an effective preference

194 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for 36 18.6% Outdoor Recreation

172 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 68 39.5% Outdoor Recreation
- 24 14.0% Shooters Party

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (3) Outdoor Recreation

#### Outdoor Recreation Party (Group BK, 0.20% vote, 3 candidates)

- 530 7.30% votes were cast below the line
- 430 81.1% showed preferences for all candidates in this group
- 2 0.4% exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
- 87 16.4% exhausted before reaching an effective preference

528 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

- 100 18.9% Four Wheel Drive Party
- 64 12.1% Liberal/National Party
- 54 10.2% Shooters Party

443 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

113 25.5% Shooters Pa	113	25.5%	Shooters Part
-----------------------	-----	-------	---------------

- 87 19.6% Liberal/National Party
- 56 12.6% One Nation
- 50 11.3% Australian Democrats

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (6) Australians Against Further Immigration, (9) Australian Family Alliance, (14) Reform the Legal System, (19) Christian Democrats

#### Rider's and Motorist's Party (Group P, 0.20% vote, 2 candidates)

650	9.25%	votes were cast below the line
540	83.1%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group
1	0.2%	exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
108	16.6%	exhausted before reaching an effective preference

542 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 101 18.6% Australian Democrats
- 87 16.1% Greens
- 78 14.4% One Nation

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (7) <u>Outdoor Recreation</u>, (14) Australian Family Alliance, (27) Reform the Legal System

#### Kevin Ryan - Drug Reform (Group AC, 0.19% vote, 2 candidates)

741	10.83%	votes were cast below the line
431	58.2%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group
5	0.7%	exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
110	14.8%	exhausted before reaching an effective preference

736 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for 137 18.6% Labor Party (Group +2)

631 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 100 15.8% Liberal/National Party
- 89 14.1% Labor Party
- 82 13.0% Christian Democrats
- 81 12.8% Australian Democrats
- 70 11.1% Greens

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (3) Australian Family Alliance, (6) <u>Reform the Legal System</u>, (16) Outdoor Recreation, (23) Australians Against Further Immigration

#### The Seniors Party (Group AL, 0.18% vote, 2 candidates)

241	3.67%	votes were cast below the line
170	74 20/	abound proferences for all condidate

179 74.3% showed preferences for all candidates in this group

2 0.8% exhausted showing no preferences outside of group

34 14.1% exhausted before reaching an effective preference

239 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for 47 19.7% One Nation (Group +1)

207 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 42 20.3% One Nation
- 26 12.6% Australian Democrats
- 24 11.6% Christian Democrats
- 22 10.6% Greens
- 21 10.1% Australians Against Further Immigration

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (6) <u>Outdoor Recreation</u>, (18) Australian Family Alliance, (19) Christian Democrats, (23) Shooters Party

#### Jobs for Everyone, Futures for All (Group R, 0.18% vote, 2 candidates)

- 225 3.45% votes were cast below the line
- 85 37.8% showed preferences for all candidates in this group
- 0 0.0% exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
- 61 27.1% exhausted before reaching an effective preference

225 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

- 23 10.2% Country Party (Group +1)
- 23 10.2% A Better Future for Children

164 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 53 32.3% Reform the Legal System
- 32 19.5% Greens
- 27 16.5% Australian Democrats

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (11) Australians Against Further Immigration, (15) <u>Australian Democrats</u>

#### Marine Environment Conservation Party (Group K, 0.17% vote, 2 candidates)

584	9.44%	votes were cast below the line
380	65.1%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group
2	0.3%	exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
	<b>a a a a i</b>	

122 20.9% exhausted before reaching an effective preference

582 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for 167 28.7% Greens

462 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

272	58.9%	Greens
-----	-------	--------

52 11.5% Australian Democrats	52	11.3%	Australian Democrats
-------------------------------	----	-------	----------------------

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (8) Outdoor Recreation

#### Wilderness Party (Group BH, 0.17% vote, 2 candidates)

		-	
258	4.23%	votes were ca	ast below the line

88	72.9%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group
~~		

		•			-	
0	0.0%	exhausted showing no	preferences	outside o	f gro	u

45 17.4% exhausted before reaching an effective preference

258 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

38 14.7% Greens

1

- 30 11.6% Women's Party / Save the Forests (Group -2)
- 26 10.1% Marine Environment Conservation Party

213 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

09 51.2% Gree	ens
---------------	-----

- 27 12.7% Australian Democrats
- 25 11.7% Australians Against Further Immigration

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (5) Outdoor Recreation

#### Stop Banks from Exploiting Australians Group (Group H, 0.17% vote, 2 candidates)

678	11.43%	votes were cast below the line
0.0	11110/0	

- 366 54.0% showed preferences for all candidates in this group
  - 4 0.6% exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
- 172 25.4% exhausted before reaching an effective preference

506 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 129 25.5% Greens
- 94 18.6% Reform the Legal System
- 77 15.2% Australian Democrats

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (5) <u>Australian Democrats</u>, (6) Greens, (7) Reform the Legal System, (9) Australian Family Alliance, (11) Shooters Party

# Australian Independents Coalition for Political Integrity (Group BL, 0.16% vote, 2 candidates)

- 85 1.50% votes were cast below the line
- 54 63.5% showed preferences for all candidates in this group 0 0.0% exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
- 0 0.0% exhausted showing no preferences outside of group 11 12.9% exhausted before reaching an effective preference

85 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

10 11.8% Christian Democrats

74 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 16 21.6% Christian Democrats
- 12 16.2% Greens
- 10 13.5% Australian Democrats
- 9 12.2% Australians Against Further Immigration

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (7) <u>Reform the Legal System</u>, (19) Australian Family Alliance, (22) Australian Democrats, (23) Unity, (24) Greens, (27) Christian Democrats

#### Fair Tax Party (Group BQ, 0.15% vote, 4 candidates)

409	7.85%	votes were cast below the line
269	65.8%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group
1	0.2%	exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
44	10.8%	exhausted before reaching an effective preference

408 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for 132 32.4% Liberal/National Party

365 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

137 37.5% Liberal/National Party

52 14.2% Christian Democrats

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (11) Australian Family Alliance, (18) <u>Outdoor</u> <u>Recreation</u>

#### Help Disabled People (Group AA, 0.14% vote, 2 candidates)

354	7.00%	votes were cast below the line
238	67.2%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group
5	1.4%	exhausted showing no preferences outside of group

5 1.4% exhausted showing no preferences outside of group 79 22.3% exhausted before reaching an effective preference

275 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 68 24.7% Greens
- 56 20.4% Australian Democrats
- 31 11.3% Reform the Legal System

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (7) <u>Reform the Legal System</u>, (9) Australian Family Alliance, (12) Outdoor Recreation, (28) Christian Democrats

#### No GST / Mick Gallagher for Australia (Group X, 0.14% vote, 2 candidates)

504	10.06%	votes were cast below the line

- 256 50.8% showed preferences for all candidates in this group
  - 4 0.8% exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
- 106 21.0% exhausted before reaching an effective preference

500 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for 73 14.6% Australian Democrats (Group +1)

398 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 107 26.9% Australian Democrats
- 69 17.3% Greens
- 53 13.3% Reform the Legal System

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (4) Australian Family Alliance, (5) <u>Outdoor</u> <u>Recreation</u>, (24) Australians Against Further Immigration, (36) Reform the Legal System, (53) Australian Democrats, (54) One Nation, (56) Unity, (57) Greens, (67) Shooters Party, (79) Christian Democrats

#### NSW Ratepayers Party (Group E, 0.14% vote, 2 candidates)

- 294 5.90% votes were cast below the line
- 112 38.1% showed preferences for all candidates in this group
  - 2 0.7% exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
- 97 33.0% exhausted before reaching an effective preference

292 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

- 67 22.9% Registered Clubs Party (Group +1)
- 37 12.7% Stop Banks from Exploiting Australians Group (Group +3)

197 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 40 20.3% Greens
- 39 19.8% Australian Democrats
- 28 14.2% Reform the Legal System
- 24 12.2% Christian Democrats
- 21 10.7% One Nation

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (4) Australian Family Alliance, (10) <u>Reform the Legal System</u>, (18) Australians Against Further Immigration, (21) Outdoor Recreation

#### Women's Party / Save the Forests (Group BF, 0.13% vote, 4 candidates)

- 308 6.50% votes were cast below the line
- 146 47.4% showed preferences for all candidates in this group
  - 1 0.3% exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
- 73 23.7% exhausted before reaching an effective preference

307 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

- 60 19.5% Wilderness Party (Group +2)
- 31 10.1% Greens

235 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 112 47.7% Greens
- 28 11.9% Australian Democrats

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (7) <u>Outdoor Recreation</u>, (21) Australians Against Further Immigration

1

#### Australia First (Group AN, 0.13% vote, 2 candidates)

15	2.44%	votes were cast below the line
77	67.0%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group
1	0.9%	exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
10	8.7%	exhausted before reaching an effective preference

114 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

- 33 28.9% One Nation (Group -1)
- 12 10.5% Australians Against Further Immigration

105 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 34 32.4% One Nation
- 23 21.9% Australians Against Further Immigration
- 13 12.4% Christian Democrats

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (10) Outdoor Recreation, (13) Australian Family Alliance, (16) Australians Against Further Immigration, (27) One Nation, (29) Reform the Legal System, (36) Shooters Party, (40) Christian Democrats, (58) Unity

#### Make Billionaires Pay More Tax (Group AU, 0.13% vote, 2 candidates)

	-			-		
254 5.44%		votes were	cast	below	the	line

- 166 65.4% showed preferences for all candidates in this group
- 0 0.0% exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
- 52 20.5% exhausted before reaching an effective preference

202 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 48 23.8% Greens
- 35 17.3% Australian Democrats

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (19) <u>Greens</u>, (39) Unity, (43) Reform the Legal System, (72) Australian Democrats

#### Euthanasia Referendum Party (Group BO, 0.13% vote, 2 candidates)

470	10.32%	votes were cast below the line
370	78.7%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group
4	0.9%	exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
67	14.3%	exhausted before reaching an effective preference

403 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 81 20.1% Australian Democrats
- 63 15.6% Greens
- 44 10.9% Australians Against Further Immigration
- 42 10.4% Liberal/National Party
- 42 10.4% Labor Party

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (10) Australians Against Further Immigration, (12) <u>Greens</u>

#### Care For Us Party (Group L, 0.13% vote, 2 candidates)

- 88 1.97% votes were cast below the line
- 44 50.0% showed preferences for all candidates in this group
- 1 1.1% exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
- 23 26.1% exhausted before reaching an effective preference

87 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

19 21.8% A Better Future for Children (Group +1)

65 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 24 36.9% Greens
- 10 15.4% One Nation
- 10 15.4% Reform the Legal System

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (5) <u>Greens</u>, (6) Australian Democrats, (9) Shooters Party, (11) Christian Democrats

#### Godfrey Bigot People Before Politics (Group AO, 0.13% vote, 2 candidates)

850	19.05%	votes were cast below the line
426	50.1%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group
3	0.4%	exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
92	10.8%	exhausted before reaching an effective preference

847 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

- 115 13.6% Australian Democrats
- 93 11.0% Labor Party
- 89 10.5% Greens

758 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 200 26.4% Greens
  - 179 23.6% Australian Democrats
- 98 12.9% Labor Party

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (17) Australian Family Alliance, (26) <u>Reform the Legal System</u>, (30) Greens, (32) Australian Democrats, (39) Unity

#### Hospitals Education Law Privacy (Group AS, 0.12% vote, 2 candidates)

156	3.53%	votes were cast below the line
86	55.1%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group
2	1.3%	exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
39	25.0%	exhausted before reaching an effective preference

154 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

10.4% Franca Arena Child Safety Alliance (Group +1)

117 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 24 20.5% Australian Democrats
- 14 12.0% Christian Democrats
- 14 12.0% Greens

16

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (9) Reform the Legal System, (22) Australians Against Further Immigration, (30) Liberal/National Party

#### Earthsave (Group AY, 0.11% vote, 2 candidates)

	•	· · · ·
444	10.91%	votes were cast below the line
341	76.8%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group
1	0.2%	exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
67	15.1%	exhausted before reaching an effective preference

443 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for 138 31.2% Greens

377 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

217 57.6% Greens

48 12.7% Australian Democrats

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote

(Ticket 1 of 2) (9) <u>Reform the Legal System</u>, (12) Australian Family Alliance, (26) Outdoor Recreation, (42) Unity, (43) Australians Against Further Immigration, (46) Australian Democrats, (48) Christian Democrats, (138) Labor Party

(Ticket 2 of 2) (10) <u>Reform the Legal System</u>, (11) Australian Family Alliance, (22) Outdoor Recreation

#### People Against Paedophiles (Group CB, 0.11% vote, 2 candidates)

- 163 4.14% votes were cast below the line
- 96 58.9% showed preferences for all candidates in this group
- 0 0.0% exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
- 45 27.6% exhausted before reaching an effective preference

118 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 25 21.2% Australians Against Further Immigration
- 18 15.3% Greens
- 14 11.9% Labor Party
- 14 11.9% Reform the Legal System
- 12 10.2% Shooters Party

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (25) Labor Party, (32) Liberal/National Party

#### Independent Community Network (Group BP, 0.11% vote, 4 candidates)

•		
308	7.92%	votes were cast below the line
199	64.6%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group
1	0.3%	exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
16	5.2%	exhausted before reaching an effective preference

307 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

- 60 19.5% Australian Democrats
- 53 17.3% Greens
- 45 14.7% Labor Party

292 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 91 31.2% Australian Democrats
- 88 30.1% Greens
- 42 14.4% Labor Party

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote

(Ticket 1 of 2) (12) <u>Reform the Legal System</u>, (54) Greens, (63) Australian Democrats, (97) Unity, (128) Liberal/National Party, (131) Labor Party, (160) Christian Democrats, (165) Shooters Party

(Ticket 2 of 2) (12) <u>Reform the Legal System</u>, (54) Australian Democrats, (62) Greens, (97) Unity, (128) Liberal/National Party, (131) Labor Party, (160) Christian Democrats, (165) Shooters Party

#### Abolish State Government (Group U, 0.11% vote, 3 candidates)

- 709 18.40% votes were cast below the line
- 558 78.7% showed preferences for all candidates in this group

- 4 0.6% exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
- 121 17.1% exhausted before reaching an effective preference
- 705 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for 96 13.6% Australian Democrats
- 588 continuing votes showed effective next preference for
  - 147 25.0% Australian Democrats
  - 119 20.2% Greens
  - 70 11.9% Reform the Legal System
  - 69 11.7% Liberal/National Party

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (4) Greens, (13) Reform the Legal System

#### A Fair Go For Families (Group BV, 0.10% vote, 2 candidates)

- 79 2.16% votes were cast below the line
- 52 65.8% showed preferences for all candidates in this group
- 0 0.0% exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
- 24 30.4% exhausted before reaching an effective preference
- 79 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for
  - 10 12.7% People Against Paedophiles

55 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 8 14.5% Australians Against Further Immigration
- 7 12.7% One Nation
- 7 12.7% Australian Democrats
- 6 10.9% Christian Democrats
- 6 10.9% Australian Family Alliance

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote

(Ticket 1 of 2) (20) <u>Reform the Legal System</u>, (43) Australian Democrats, (52) Greens, (63) Unity, (84) Labor Party, (97) Liberal/National Party, (112) Australian Family Alliance, (117) Christian Democrats

(Ticket 2 of 2) (20) <u>Reform the Legal System</u>, (45) Greens, (54) Australian Democrats, (65) Unity, (84) Labor Party, (97) Liberal/National Party, (112) Australian Family Alliance, (117) Christian Democrats

#### Communist Party (Group V, 0.10% vote, 2 candidates)

513	15.13%	votes were cast below the line
438	85.4%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group
0	0.0%	exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
39	7.6%	exhausted before reaching an effective preference

513 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

- 107 20.9% Greens
- 79 15.4% Democratic Socialists
- 71 13.8% Labor Party

474 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 227 47.9% Greens
- 96 20.3% Labor Party
- 81 17.1% Australian Democrats

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (5) <u>Greens</u>, (36) Australian Democrats, (53) Labor Party, (62) <u>Reform the Legal System</u>, (100) Australian Family Alliance, (134) Unity, (161) Outdoor Recreation, (168) Australians Against Further Immigration, (229) Christian Democrats, (234) Shooters Party, (251) Liberal/National Party, (261) One Nation

#### Voice of the People Party (Group BJ, 0.09% vote, 4 candidates)

71 2.18% votes were cast below the line

38 53.5% showed preferences for all candidates in this group

- 2 2.8% exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
- 11 15.5% exhausted before reaching an effective preference

69 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

- 17 24.6% Unity
- 9 13.0% Labor Party
- 7 10.1% Liberal/National Party

60 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 25 41.7% Unity
- 7 11.7% Liberal/National Party

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote

(Ticket 1 of 2) (13) Outdoor Recreation, (17) <u>Australian Democrats</u>, (22) <u>Christian Democrats</u>, (24) Australian Family Alliance, (28) Unity, (29) Reform the Legal System

(Ticket 2 of 2) (17) Australian Democrats

#### Citizens Electoral Council (Group I, 0.09% vote, 2 candidates)

- 176 5.45% votes were cast below the line
- 82 46.6% showed preferences for all candidates in this group
  - 2 1.1% exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
- 60 34.1% exhausted before reaching an effective preference

#### 174 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

- 41 23.6% Gun Owners & Sporting Hunters Rights (Group +1)
- 26 14.9% One Nation
- 22 12.6% Marine Environment Conservation Party (Group +2)

116 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 30 25.9% One Nation
- 22 19.0% Reform the Legal System
- 20 17.2% Greens

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (3) Australian Family Alliance, (31) <u>Reform the</u> <u>Legal System</u>, (53) Australians Against Further Immigration, (66) Outdoor Recreation, (84) One Nation

#### Natural Law Party (Group O, 0.09% vote, 2 candidates)

328	10.21%	votes were cast below the line
183	55.8%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group

- 1 0.3% exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
- 84 25.6% exhausted before reaching an effective preference

327 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for 80 24.5% Greens (Group +2)

244 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

09	44.7%	Greens

1

50 20.5% Australian Democrats

33 13.5% Reform the Legal System

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote

(Ticket 1 of 2) (12) <u>Reform the Legal System</u>, (35) Greens, (44) Unity, (49) Australian Democrats, (66) Labor Party

(Ticket 2 of 2) (12) <u>Reform the Legal System</u>, (35) Greens, (44) Unity, (49) Australian Democrats, (64) Liberal/National Party

#### Give Criminals Longer Sentences (Group BA, 0.09% vote, 2 candidates)

- 137 4.36% votes were cast below the line
- 88 64.2% showed preferences for all candidates in this group
- 1 0.7% exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
- 30 21.9% exhausted before reaching an effective preference
- 136 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for 15 11.0% People Against Paedophiles

107 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 22 20.6% Reform the Legal System
- 20 18.7% Australians Against Further Immigration
- 18 16.8% One Nation

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (3) Australian Family Alliance, (16) Australians Against Further Immigration, (33) One Nation, (43) Unity

#### Responsible Drug Reform for Australia (Group AH, 0.09% vote, 2 candidates)

- 96 3.06% votes were cast below the line
- 57 59.4% showed preferences for all candidates in this group
- 0 0.0% exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
- 20 20.8% exhausted before reaching an effective preference

96 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

- 17 17.7% Kevin Ryan Drug Reform
- 12 12.5% Marijuana Smokers Rights Party

76 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 18 23.7% Greens
- 13 17.1% Reform the Legal System
- 10 13.2% Australian Democrats
- 8 10.5% Labor Party

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (16) <u>Greens</u>, (17) Unity, (23) Australian Democrats, (32) Reform the Legal System

#### Republic 2001 / People First (Group AI, 0.09% vote, 15 candidates)

- 335 10.89% votes were cast below the line
- 158 47.2% showed preferences for all candidates in this group
- 152 45.4% exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
- 198 59.1% exhausted before reaching an effective preference

183 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

27	14.8%	Labor Party

23 12.6% Liberal/National Party

137 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 24 17.5% Greens
- 23 16.8% Liberal/National Party
- 17 12.4% Australian Democrats
- 15 10.9% One Nation

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (16) <u>Outdoor Recreation</u>, (26) Australian Family Alliance, (29) Reform the Legal System, (39) Australians Against Further Immigration

#### outside Newcastle Sydney Wollongong Party (Group W, 0.08% vote, 2 candidates)

- 152 5.19% votes were cast below the line
- 117 77.0% showed preferences for all candidates in this group
  - 0 0.0% exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
- 28 18.4% exhausted before reaching an effective preference

152 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

24 15.8% Australian Democrats (Group +2)

124 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 33 26.6% Australian Democrats
- 16 12.9% Liberal/National Party
- 13 10.5% Greens

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (9) <u>Outdoor Recreation</u>, (16) Reform the Legal System, (18) Australian Democrats, (36) Greens, (43) Australian Family Alliance

#### Responsible Gambling Party (Group G, 0.08% vote, 2 candidates)

- 237 8.16% votes were cast below the line
- 113 47.7% showed preferences for all candidates in this group
  - 0.4% exhausted showing no preferences outside of group 1
- 75 exhausted before reaching an effective preference 31.6%

#### 236 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

16.9% Stop Banks from Exploiting Australians Group (Group +1) 40

162 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 24.1% Greens 39
- 14.8% Reform the Legal System 24
- 22 13.6% Australian Democrats
- Liberal/National Party 10.5% 17

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: No Effective Preferences

#### No Nuclear Waste Dumps Party (Group AP, 0.07% vote, 2 candidates)

158	6.19%	votes were cast below the line
100	63.3%	showed preferences for all candidates

- showed preferences for all candidates in this group 63.3% 1
  - 0.6% exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
- 35 22.2% exhausted before reaching an effective preference

123 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 35.0% Greens 43
- 17 13.8% Australian Democrats

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (6) Reform the Legal System, (11) Australian Family Alliance, (23) Outdoor Recreation

#### Motor Vehicle Consumer Protection Party (Group BI, 0.06% vote, 2 candidates)

- 2.04% votes were cast below the line 45
- 30 66.7% showed preferences for all candidates in this group
- exhausted showing no preferences outside of group 0 0.0%
- 9 exhausted before reaching an effective preference 20.0%

45 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

11.1% Small Business Party 5

#### 36 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- Australians Against Further Immigration 9 25.0%
- 5 13.9% Christian Democrats
- 5 13.9% One Nation

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (15) Australians Against Further Immigration, (20) Unity, (21) Outdoor Recreation, (25) Shooters Party, (27) Christian Democrats, (28) Australian Democrats, (29) Greens

#### No Privatisation People's Party (Group BB, 0.06% vote, 2 candidates)

250 12.00% votes were cast below the	line
--------------------------------------	------

- 173 69.2% showed preferences for all candidates in this group
  - 3 1.2% exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
- 46 18.4% exhausted before reaching an effective preference

247 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

- 59 23.9% Labor Party
- 33 13.4% Give Criminals Longer Sentences (Group -1)

204 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 60 29.4% Labor Party
- 49 24.0% Unity

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote

(Ticket 1 of 2) (9) Outdoor Recreation, (33) Australian Family Alliance

(Ticket 2 of 2) (9) <u>Outdoor Recreation</u>, (19) Australian Family Alliance, (20) Reform the Legal System

#### No Badgerys Creek Airport Party (Group AZ, 0.06% vote, 2 candidates)

- 163 8.14% votes were cast below the line
- 134 82.2% showed preferences for all candidates in this group
- 2 1.2% exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
- 19 11.7% exhausted before reaching an effective preference

161 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

21 13.0% Australian Democrats

144 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 32 22.2% Australian Democrats
- 23 16.0% Greens
- 16 11.1% Labor Party

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (5) <u>Outdoor Recreation</u>, (10) Reform the Legal System

#### Esposito/Hutton Independent (Group AG, 0.06% vote, 2 candidates)

133	6.70%	votes were cast below the line
104	78.2%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group
0	0.0%	exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
21	15.8%	exhausted before reaching an effective preference

133 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for 26 19.5% Labor Party (Group -2)

112 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 25 22.3% Labor Party
- 16 14.3% Liberal/National Party
- 15 13.4% One Nation
- 12 10.7% Reform the Legal System

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote

(Ticket 1 of 3) (13) Labor Party

(Ticket 2 of 3) (11) Labor Party

(Ticket 3 of 3) (11) Liberal/National Party

#### Anti-Corruption Party (Insurers, Lawyers, Politicians) (Group Z, 0.05% vote, 2 candidates)

- 106 5.68% votes were cast below the line
- 57 53.8% showed preferences for all candidates in this group
- 0 0.0% exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
- 16 15.1% exhausted before reaching an effective preference

106 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

- 13 12.3% Help Disabled People (Group +1)
  - 12 11.3% No GST / Mick Gallagher for Australia (Group -2)

90 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 40 44.4% Reform the Legal System
- 14 15.6% Greens

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (4) <u>Reform the Legal System</u>, (22) Australian Democrats, (23) Christian Democrats, (24) Greens, (25) Shooters Party, (26) Unity, (29) Australians Against Further Immigration, (30) Outdoor Recreation

#### Non-Custodial Parents Party (Group BY, 0.05% vote, 2 candidates)

202 11.07% votes were cast below the line

- 167 82.7% showed preferences for all candidates in this group
- 0 0.0% exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
- 21 10.4% exhausted before reaching an effective preference

202 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

22 10.9% Liberal/National Party

#### 181 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 28 15.5% Reform the Legal System
- 23 12.7% Liberal/National Party
- 22 12.2% Greens
- 21 11.6% Shooters Party

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (5) <u>Reform the Legal System</u>, (8) Outdoor Recreation, (12) Australians Against Further Immigration, (16) Australian Family Alliance

#### Elect the President (Group T, 0.05% vote, 2 candidates)

120	6.98%	votes were cast below the line
72	60.0%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group
1	0.8%	exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
22	18.3%	exhausted before reaching an effective preference

119 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

18 15.1% Abolish State Government (Group +1)

98 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 21 21.4% Australian Democrats
- 15 15.3% Greens
- 14 14.3% Reform the Legal System

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (23) Outdoor Recreation

#### Australians for a Better Community (Group BX, 0.05% vote, 2 candidates)

- 36 2.14% votes were cast below the line
- 25 69.4% showed preferences for all candidates in this group
- 0 0.0% exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
- 9 25.0% exhausted before reaching an effective preference

36 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for 4 11.1% Christian Democrats

27 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 5 18.5% Australian Democrats
- 4 14.8% Christian Democrats
- 4 14.8% Greens
- 3 11.1% Shooters Party
- 3 11.1% Labor Party

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (7) Unity, (22) Australian Family Alliance

#### Reclaim Australia (Group AJ, 0.04% vote, 2 candidates)

- 35 2.32% votes were cast below the line
- 16 45.7% showed preferences for all candidates in this group
- 0 0.0% exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
- 9 25.7% exhausted before reaching an effective preference

35 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

- 9 25.7% Australia First
- 4 11.4% Australians Against Further Immigration
- 4 11.4% One Nation (Group +3)
- 4 11.4% The Seniors Party (Group +2)

26 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 10 38.5% Australians Against Further Immigration
- 4 15.4% One Nation
- 3 11.5% Christian Democrats
- 3 11.5% Australian Family Alliance

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (3) Australians Against Further Immigration, (9) <u>Outdoor Recreation</u>, (42) Shooters Party, (44) Christian Democrats

#### Our Common Future Party (Group BD, 0.04% vote, 3 candidates)

- 441 30.10% votes were cast below the line
- 255 57.8% showed preferences for all candidates in this group
  - 0 0.0% exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
- 32 7.3% exhausted before reaching an effective preference

441 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

- 114 25.9% Greens
- 63 14.3% Australian Democrats
- 52 11.8% Labor Party

409 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 210 51.3% Greens
  - 92 22.5% Australian Democrats
  - 50 12.2% Labor Party

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (26) <u>Reform the Legal System</u>, (36) Greens, (45) Unity, (76) Australian Democrats, (101) Labor Party, (117) Liberal/National Party

#### Kanan/Shen Independents (Group BC, 0.03% vote, 2 candidates)

- 46 3.72% votes were cast below the line
- 19 41.3% showed preferences for all candidates in this group
- 1 2.2% exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
- 10 21.7% exhausted before reaching an effective preference

45 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

- 18 40.0% Our Common Future Party (Group +1)
- 13 28.9% Labor Party

36 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 11 30.6% Outdoor Recreation
- 10 27.8% Labor Party
- 6 16.7% Unity

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (13) Outdoor Recreation, (17) One Nation, (18) <u>Christian Democrats</u>

#### Hotel Patrons Party (Group CA, 0.03% vote, 2 candidates)

- 52 4.38% votes were cast below the line
- 33 63.5% showed preferences for all candidates in this group
- 0 0.0% exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
- 16 30.8% exhausted before reaching an effective preference

52 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

8 15.4% What's Doing? Party

36 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 7 19.4% Liberal/National Party
- 5 13.9% Australians Against Further Immigration
- 5 13.9% Reform the Legal System
- 4 11.1% Australian Democrats

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (5) One Nation, (16) Outdoor Recreation, (17) Australians Against Further Immigration

#### Reform Parliamentary Super Party (Group AR, 0.03% vote, 2 candidates)

7.22%	votes were cast below the line
70.0%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group
0.0%	exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
	7.22% 70.0% 0.0%

17 21.3% exhausted before reaching an effective preference

63 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 15 23.8% Australian Democrats
  - 9 14.3% Greens

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (17) Unity

#### Community First Party (Group AQ, 0.03% vote, 2 candidates)

- 30 2.92% votes were cast below the line
- 14 46.7% showed preferences for all candidates in this group
- 1 3.3% exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
- 5 16.7% exhausted before reaching an effective preference
- 29 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for 3 10.3% Christian Democrats

25 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 6 24.0% Christian Democrats
- 6 24.0% Greens

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (10) <u>Unity</u>, (14) Greens, (17) Reform the Legal System

#### Timbarra Clean Water Party (Group BT, 0.02% vote, 2 candidates)

132	15.15%	votes	were	cast	below	the line	
				-			

- 98 74.2% showed preferences for all candidates in this group
- 0 0.0% exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
- 19 14.4% exhausted before reaching an effective preference

132 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for 39 29.5% Greens

113 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 77 68.1% Greens
- 13 11.5% Australian Democrats

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (15) <u>Australian Democrats</u>, (16) Unity, (27) Labor Party, (31) Outdoor Recreation

#### Tenants Have Rights Party (Group BU, 0.02% vote, 2 candidates)

77 9.58% Votes were cast below the line	77	9.58%	votes were cast below the line
---	----	-------	--------------------------------

55 71.4% showed preferences for all candidates in this group

- 0 0.0% exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
- 12 15.6% exhausted before reaching an effective preference

77 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for

- 14 18.2% Greens
- 9 11.7% Labor Party

65 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 30 46.2% Greens
- 10 15.4% Labor Party
- 7 10.8% Australian Democrats

Effective Preferences on Group Ticket Vote: (3) <u>Greens</u>, (6) Reform the Legal System, (9) Unity, (14) Australian Democrats

#### Ungrouped Candidates (Group CC, 0.02% vote, 6 candidates)

801	100.00%	votes were cast below the line
180	22.5%	showed preferences for all candidates in this group
1	0.1%	exhausted showing no preferences outside of group
129	16.1%	exhausted before reaching an effective preference

800 continuing votes showed immediate next preference for 116 14.5% Labor Party

672 continuing votes showed effective next preference for

- 117 17.4% Labor Party
  - 92 13.7% Australian Democrats
  - 85 12.6% Christian Democrats
  - 84 12.5% Greens
  - 75 11.2% Liberal/National Party