



## International Snapshot: Australia 2007

By Aurelie Marfort

### IRV system was crucial to ensure democratic results for the last Australian federal legislative election.

**Introduction:** On November 24<sup>th</sup> 2007, Australia elected its House of Representatives with instant runoff voting (IRV), as it has for more than eight decades. After four straight election defeats, the Labor Party won a landslide majority of seats. Under IRV, Labor's initial 44% of first choices turned into a clear majority after considering the choices of supporters of third party candidates with too little support to win seats. The Green Party's 7.79% share of the national vote largely went to Labor in House races; that share earned several senate seats elected by proportional voting. Due in large part to compulsory voting, turnout was 94.77%; Australians rank near the top of national comparisons of voter satisfaction with their government.

**Background:** IRV or preferential voting was introduced in Australia in 1918 to deal with the "spoiler" problem created by the rise of the Country Party. Australia's democracy faced negative side effects with the increased voter choice, as the Country Party split the right-of-center vote in rural areas, thus allowing some left-of-center Labor Party candidates to win with a minority of votes. Prime Minister Bill Hughes' conservative government enacted IRV so as to allow competition and choice between parties but without putting seats in jeopardy. Since 1918, use of IRV has gradually been extended, and it is now applied to the House of Representatives of the Australian Parliament, in the federal, state and territory legislatures, to municipal elections, party primaries, and for some elections to corporate boards. It is widely seen as an effective way to prevent parties from being elected with a minority vote caused by vote-splitting.

**Analysis:** On Saturday, November 24, 2007, Australia held elections for its Federal Parliament, with 13.6 million Australians registered to vote. As usual, voter turnout was impressive, at 94.77%, due in part to the nation's compulsory voting law, but also to the competitive races in every district with candidates from across the political spectrum. Indeed, the *lowest* number of candidates being four, in some rural divisions, and the highest number of candidates being 13 in the division of Bennelong. The opposition center-left Labor Party, led by Kevin Rudd, ended more than a decade of conservative rule by winning 52.7% of the national vote against the 47.3% won by the ousted conservative Liberal Party at the end of the IRV tally. This Labor landslide can be attributed in part to the Green Party, which took 7.79% of the vote that mostly moved to Labor candidates and boosted them to 83 elected representatives. This had been possible only because Australia uses IRV for its House elections. If this election had been tallied using typical U.S.-style plurality rules, the Labor Party would have won only 44% of the vote, and the Greens, Labor and other smaller parties would have split their votes to allow the Liberal's to win a national victory without a majority of the votes. But, not only has the governing majority changed, but also the Australian Greens could make their case and win their votes, pushing the debate further than Labor might want to go on some issues such as the Iraq war and the environment, without splitting the vote. It is clear that in this election IRV generated issue-based campaigning, as well as true majority rule. As a result, the incoming Prime Minister, Kevin Rudd is pledging to push forward on a number of environmental policies, with former Midnight Oil lead singer Peter Garrett the likely new environment minister. As an example, a couple of hours after his election he ratified the Kyoto Protocol, the U.S remaining now as the only big country not to ratify it.

What would have happened if the 2007 federal legislative election ballots were tallied using simple plurality rules, where the candidate with the most votes wins, whether or not they have a majority? As explained in the introduction, the national results would have been sharply different insofar as the Labor Party would have won only 44% of the vote. An environmental organization, the Australian Conservation Foundation, as well as the Green Party, declared that 21 Labor Party pickups would have been lost without the Green vote, which was mostly redistributed to Labor. It is worth noting that in most divisions the distribution of preferences played a major role either between the center-left Greens and the Labor Party or between the center-right Liberals and the Family First Party (see examples in the appendix).

So what are the election problems that are avoided thanks to IRV? First of all, positive, issue-based campaigning is made possible as political parties have incentives to build strategic alliances with parties that are closest to them. Moreover, with IRV candidates need a majority of support to win, so vote splitting is no longer a problem, as voters can feel free to vote for the candidate they like rather than against the candidate they hate. The major parties can be closer on most issues because small parties can air the bigger differences, and the majority sentiment is more likely to find expression in government. Thus, small parties played and are still playing a major role in pushing forward people's interests. The majority views in Australia right now seem to be fiscal conservative. Thus, Labor adopted a lot of Liberal views on this and focused the campaign on greater protection of the environment and less pro-Iraq policies, which is where Labor stressed their differences. Not only these subjects were omnipresent during the campaign but also the people are now sure that Labor's new representatives as well as the new

government will keep their promises under pressure from the small parties, which play an important role on the political scene. IRV thus enabled a large part of the Australian electorate to have a voice that counts. Maybe this can explain the very low number of "informal" ballots (ballots which are blank, or do not rank the complete set of candidates running), which could have been expected to be quite high considering the compulsory voting system. Indeed, at the national scale the rate of informal votes was 3.95%. Unlike in the U.S or some European countries, voters do not turn their noses up at elections and do not cast spoiled ballots because they do not feel represented. For Australian voters, elections are not a way to show their discontent, but rather a way to make things change through an effective voting system.

**Green Issues in the Spotlight:** IRV is not a new phenomenon in Australia, and the former center-right government also benefited from the system during more than a decade in power -- but the 2007 elections witnessed the first time that the Green Party became electorally important on the political field. Perhaps more than ever, the brand new Labor government will have to address the parts of the Green Party's platform that are supported by a growing part of the electorate.

Indeed, the issue of global warming and environmental issues played a major role during the campaign, and two weeks before the Election Day 73% of the voters thought that environment would have an important impact on the results. Nevertheless, the issues were not seen as central to the Liberal platform and their Prime Minister John Howard, who was even considered a "climate skeptic." The day after Howard's defeat, Labor leader Kevin Rudd pledged to move quickly on campaign promises he made relating to climate change, promises that many view as critical to Labor's success. Thus, as the environment has become a major concern for Australian people over the last couple of years, the Green Party has been able to increase its share of the national vote using IRV, but without harming the electoral chances of the major party more sympathetic to its issues. The Greens are now the third most important party in Australia with 7.79% of the vote, and the preference distribution of the Green vote to Labor highlights Green voters' belief that Labor is the less "climate skeptic" major party. What matters at present is that the new Labor Prime Minister will be obliged to take the Green voters' will into account. Labor would not have been able to reach 50% of the national vote without Green voters. IRV enabled a real dialogue between the parties and allowed closer collaboration inside Green/Labor on major issues such as the environment as well as the Iraq war. So, what are the parallels we can draw between Australia's last elections and what American democracy should be?

First of all, the Green Party in the U.S., as of late 2007, claimed 234 office holders spread out in 29 states, though a number of these were elected in non-partisan races. But the problem for their supporters, as well as supporters of other third parties, is that the current U.S. political system breaks down when there are more than two choices. Due to the vote-splitting problem, supporters of third party issues or candidates must often choose between voting for the candidate they really want or voting for the lesser of two evils. This makes it difficult for parties to grow, or for more issues to be included in political debate, and for voters to have more choices. With IRV, the situation would be sharply different as hundreds of thousands people who would not necessarily have voted for (or against) one of the Democratic or Republican candidates could vote for the candidate they really want to elect. Voters across the United States are beginning to

see the benefits of IRV, as the system becomes approved for use in communities such as, Burlington (VT), Pierce County (WA), Cary (NC), Takoma Park (MD), Minneapolis (MN), Ferndale (MI), Berkeley (CA), Hendersonville (NC), and San Francisco (CA).

Moreover, those unfamiliar with IRV sometime assert that it seems too complicated. The fact is, where IRV is applied, it works. For example, in October, voters in Cary (NC), where IRV was used, “told an independent researcher that they found the process easy and satisfying” as reported by the Winston-Salem Journal. Cary was the first town in North Carolina to use IRV and it has been a huge success. According to the University News Release, reporting the results of an exit poll, “of those with a preference, 72 percent of Cary voters said they preferred IRV while just 28% said they preferred voting for a single candidate” and “almost everyone (96%) reported it was at least “somewhat easy to understand” the IRV ballot, with 82 percent agreeing that it was “very easy” to understand”. The ballot error rate in Australia’s 2007 elections was 3.85%, but note that this “informal vote” rate also includes voters who cast blank ballots – which are more likely to be found in Australia, given their compulsory voting system. Under the system, nevertheless, voter turnout was well over 80%, in comparison to American turnout for the 2004 federal election at a paltry 55.3% (its highest level since 1968).

For sure, IRV is an ingrained voting habit in Australia since it was first implemented in 1918 (as mentioned above) but what if it became an ingrained American voting habit? There is substantial evidence it could revitalize the American political life, especially at the local level, which tends to suffer from extremely low voter turnout.

## Appendix 1: 2007 Federal Election House of Representatives: Key Figures.

### Results

Labor	83 seats
Liberal	55 seats
Nationals	10 seats
Independents	2 seats

### Number of Candidates

Note: There are 150 divisions and 6 states.

Smallest number of candidates	4
Highest number of candidates	13
Number of Candidates National Average	7.02
Number of Divisions with less than 5 candidates	7
Number of Divisions with more than 4 candidates	143
Number of Candidates New South Wales Average	7.3877551
Number of Candidates Queensland Average	6.5714285
Number of Candidates South Australia Average	6.368421
Number of Candidates Tasmania Average	7.4615384
Number of Candidates Victoria Average	7.060606
Number of Candidates Western Australia Average	7
Number of Seats with more than two candidates	150
Uncontested Races	0
Number of Seats with just two candidates	0

<b>Number of candidates who won without getting at least 50% of first choices</b>	76
---	----

### Number of Seats Where a Non Major Party Ran

#### PARTIES OF AVERAGE IMPORTANCE

Greens	150
Family First Party	129
Democrats	86
Citizens Electoral Council	81
Christian Democratic Party (including Fred Nile Group)	63
The Nationals	24

## MINOR PARTIES

Climate Change Coalition	7
Conservatives for Climate and Environment	4
Independent	102
L.D.P	47
Non-Custodian Parents Party (Equal Parenting)	2
One Nation	36
Socialist Alliance	17
Socialist Equality Party	9
The Fishing Party	2
What Women Want	4
Candidates without Party affiliation	4

<b>Number of seats where candidates won more than 60% of first choices</b>	14
--	----

## Details:

State	DivisionID	Division	CandidateID	Last Name	First	Party Ab	PartyNm	1st Round %	Final %
NSW	144	Reid	18448	FERGUSON	Laurie	ALP	Labor	60.1	66.8
VIC	203	Calwell	17557	VAMVAKINO	Maria	ALP	Australian Labor Party	60.22	69.33
VIC	212	Gellibrand	17333	ROXON	Nicola	ALP	Australian Labor Party	60.22	71.46
NSW	107	Blaxland	17809	CLARE	Jason	ALP	Labor	61.32	68.37
NSW	251	Watson	13321	BURKE	Tony	ALP	Labor	61.81	70.33
VIC	309	Gorton	18343	O'CONNOR	Brendan	ALP	Australian Labor Party	61.93	71.22
NSW	135	New England	17881	WINDSOR	Tony	IND	Independent	61.94	74.33
VIC	231	Murray	14201	STONE	Sharman	LP	Liberal	62.07	68.26
NSW	250	Riverina	17890	HULL	Kay	NP	Nationals	62.57	66.23
VIC	232	Scullin	17250	JENKINS	Harry	ALP	Australian Labor Party	63.32	70.85
VIC	224	Mallee	17665	FORREST	John	NP	The Nationals	63.94	71.27
NSW	111	Chifley	18269	PRICE	Roger	ALP	Labor	64.18	70.66
NSW	119	Fowler	17449	IRWIN	Julia	ALP	Labor	64.25	68.25
NSW	150	Throsby	17887	GEORGE	Jennie	ALP	Labor	64.98	73.46

## Greens Influence on the Results

**Projected Labor Seats:** Adelaide, Bass, Bendigo, Bennelong, Blair, Bonner, Bowman, Braddon, Brand, Brisbane, Chisholm, Corangamite, Corio, Dawson, Deakin, Denison, Dobell, Eden-Monaro, Flynn\*, Forde\*\*, Franklin, Fremantle, Hasluck, Hindmarsh, Isaacs, Jagajaga, Kingston, Leichhardt, Longman, Lowe, Lyons, Macquarie, Melbourne Port, Moreton, Page\*\*\*, Perth, Petrie, Richmond, Robertson, Solomon, Sydney, Wakefield.

**Projected Liberal Seats:** Bass, Bennelong, Blair, Bonner, Braddon, Corangamite, Dawson, Deakin, Dobell, Eden-Monaro, Flynn, Forde, Hasluck, Kingston, Leichhardt, Longman, Moreton, Page, Petrie, Roberston, Solomon, Wakefield.

**Current Number of Seats where Greens currently reverse defeat for Labor:** Bass, Bennelong, Bowman, Braddon, Corangamite, Deakin, Hasluck, Page<sup>\*\*\*</sup>, Robertson, Solomon.

**Current Number of Seats where Greens/third parties currently bring Labor above 50%:** Bass, Bennelong, Braddon, Corangamite, Deakin, Hasluck, Page, Robertson, Solomon.

**Divisions Where Labor was under 50% in round one and won with Greens/other support:** 42

**Number of these seats that represent Labor pickups (23 total pickups):** 22

**Divisions where Labor was losing in round one and won with Greens:** 10

**Number of these seats that represent pickups (23 total pickups):** 9

*In Flynn, in the first round of counting, Labor had 45.34%, Nationals 33.98%, Liberals 14.05%, Greens 1.86%. Labor ultimately won with 50.44% to Nationals 49.56%.
**In Forde, the Green plus Labor first choices add to 49.06%, but other transfers brought Labor to 52.74%.
***In Page, the Green plus Labor first choices add to 49.99%, but other transfer brought Labor to 52.62%

## Voter Turnout and Level of Spoiled Ballots ( Informal Votes)

<b>Formal Votes</b>	12,419,863
<b>Informal Votes</b>	510,951
<b>% of Informal Votes</b>	3.95
<b>Voter Enrollment</b>	13,645,073
<b>Voter Turnout</b>	12,930,814
<b>% Voter Turnout</b>	94.77

**Appendix 2: 2007 Federal Election House of Representatives: First Preferences by Party and Two Parties Preferred.**

First Preferences			
Enrolment: 13,645,073 Turnout: 94.77%			
Party	Votes	Percentage %	Swing %
Liberal	4,506,236	36.28	-4.19
Australian Labor Party	5,388,147	43.38	5.74
The Greens	967,781	7.79	0.6
The Nationals	682,424	5.49	-0.4
Family First	246,792	1.99	-0.02
Democrats	89,810	0.72	-0.52
One Nation	32,650	0.26	-0.93
CDP Christian Party	104,705	0.84	0.22
Citizens Electoral Council	27,879	0.22	-0.14
CLP - The Territory Party	40,298	0.32	-0.02
Socialist Alliance	9,973	0.08	-0.04
The Fishing Party	2,083	0.02	0
DLP - Democratic Labor Party	6,018	0.05	0.04
Climate Change Coalition	9,470	0.08	0.08
Conservatives for Climate and Environment Incorporated	3,239	0.03	0.03
Liberty and Democracy Party	17,041	0.14	0.14
Non-Custodial Parents Party	795	0.01	0
Socialist Equality Party	4,283	0.03	0.03
What Women Want (Australia)	3,870	0.03	0.03
Independent	275,135	2.22	-0.24
Non Affiliated	1,234	0.01	-0.02
....	0	0	-0.4
FORMAL	12,419,863	96.05	1.23
INFORMAL	510,951	3.95	-1.23
TOTAL	12,930,814	94.77	0.45

Two Party Preferred			
Enrolment: 13,645,073 Turnout: 94.77%			
Coalition	Votes	Percentage %	Swing %
Liberal/National Coalition	5,874,104	47.3	-5.44
Australian Labor Party	6,545,759	52.7	5.44



**Appendix 3: 2007 Federal Election House of Representatives: Party Representation by State.**

PartyAb	Party	NSW	VIC	QLD	WA	SA	TAS	ACT	NT	Total	LastElectionTotal
LP	Liberal	15	14	10	11	5	0	0	0	55	74
ALP	Australian Labor Party	28	21	15	4	6	5	2	2	83	60
GRN	The Greens	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NP	The Nationals	5	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	12
FFP	Family First	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DEM	Democrats	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ON	One Nation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CDP	CDP Christian Party	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CEC	Citizens Electoral Council	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CLP	CLP - The Territory Party	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
SAL	Socialist Alliance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FPY	The Fishing Party	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DLP	DLP - Democratic Labor Party	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CCC	Climate Change Coalition	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CCE	Conservatives for Climate and Environment Incorporated	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LDP	Liberty and Democracy Party	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NCP	Non-Custodial Parents Party	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SEP	Socialist Equality Party	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
WWW	What Women Want (Australia)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
IND	Independent	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	3
NAFD	Non Affiliated	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Appendix 4: 2007 Federal Election House of Representatives: Seats decided on Preferences.**

DivisionID	DivisionNm	StateAb	PartyAb	PartyNm
179	Adelaide	SA	ALP	Australian Labor Party
180	Barker	SA	LP	Liberal
192	Bass	TAS	ALP	Australian Labor Party
200	Bendigo	VIC	ALP	Australian Labor Party
105	Bennelong	NSW	ALP	Australian Labor Party
304	Blair	QLD	ALP	Australian Labor Party
310	Bonner	QLD	ALP	Australian Labor Party
182	Boothby	SA	LP	Liberal
155	Bowman	QLD	LP	Liberal
193	Braddon	TAS	ALP	Australian Labor Party
235	Brand	WA	ALP	Australian Labor Party
156	Brisbane	QLD	ALP	Australian Labor Party
109	Calare	NSW	NP	The Nationals
236	Canning	WA	LP	Liberal
205	Chisholm	VIC	ALP	Australian Labor Party
207	Corangamite	VIC	ALP	Australian Labor Party
208	Corio	VIC	ALP	Australian Labor Party
237	Cowan	WA	LP	Liberal
113	Cowper	NSW	NP	The Nationals
158	Dawson	QLD	ALP	Australian Labor Party
209	Deakin	VIC	ALP	Australian Labor Party
194	Denison	TAS	ALP	Australian Labor Party
252	Dickson	QLD	LP	Liberal
115	Dobell	NSW	ALP	Australian Labor Party
210	Dunkley	VIC	LP	Liberal
117	Eden-Monaro	NSW	ALP	Australian Labor Party
159	Fadden	QLD	LP	Liberal
160	Fairfax	QLD	LP	Liberal
161	Fisher	QLD	LP	Liberal
311	Flynn	QLD	ALP	Australian Labor Party
162	Forde	QLD	ALP	Australian Labor Party
239	Forrest	WA	LP	Liberal
195	Franklin	TAS	ALP	Australian Labor Party
240	Fremantle	WA	ALP	Australian Labor Party
213	Gippsland	VIC	NP	The Nationals
183	Grey	SA	LP	Liberal
305	Hasluck	WA	ALP	Australian Labor Party
165	Herbert	QLD	LP	Liberal
185	Hindmarsh	SA	ALP	Australian Labor Party
166	Hinkler	QLD	NP	The Nationals
124	Hughes	NSW	LP	Liberal
125	Hume	NSW	LP	Liberal
219	Isaacs	VIC	ALP	Australian Labor Party
220	Jagajaga	VIC	ALP	Australian Labor Party
241	Kalgoorlie	WA	LP	Liberal
167	Kennedy	QLD	IND	Independent

186	Kingston	SA	ALP	Australian Labor Party
223	La Trobe	VIC	LP	Liberal
168	Leichhardt	QLD	ALP	Australian Labor Party
302	Longman	QLD	ALP	Australian Labor Party
129	Lowe	NSW	ALP	Australian Labor Party
196	Lyons	TAS	ALP	Australian Labor Party
131	Macarthur	NSW	LP	Liberal
133	Macquarie	NSW	ALP	Australian Labor Party
226	McEwen	VIC	LP	Liberal
227	McMillan	VIC	LP	Liberal
228	Melbourne	VIC	ALP	Australian Labor Party
230	Melbourne Ports	VIC	ALP	Australian Labor Party
173	Moreton	QLD	ALP	Australian Labor Party
243	O'Connor	WA	LP	Liberal
138	Page	NSW	ALP	Australian Labor Party
139	Parkes	NSW	NP	The Nationals
249	Paterson	NSW	LP	Liberal
245	Perth	WA	ALP	Australian Labor Party
175	Petrie	QLD	ALP	Australian Labor Party
145	Richmond	NSW	ALP	Australian Labor Party
146	Robertson	NSW	ALP	Australian Labor Party
177	Ryan	QLD	LP	Liberal
307	Solomon	NT	ALP	Australian Labor Party
246	Stirling	WA	LP	Liberal
190	Sturt	SA	LP	Liberal
247	Swan	WA	LP	Liberal
149	Sydney	NSW	ALP	Australian Labor Party
191	Wakefield	SA	ALP	Australian Labor Party
178	Wide Bay	QLD	NP	The Nationals

**Appendix 5: 2007 Federal Election House of Representatives:  
Examples of divisions where Labor would have lost without the  
Greens preference distribution.**

**BASS DIVISION**

First Preferences Enrolment: 68,967 Turnout: 95.66%				
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing (%)
WIENER, Sven	Independent	1,123	1.76	+1.76
WATTS, Adrian Ronald	Citizens Electoral Council	219	0.34	-1.02
CAMPBELL, Jodie <input type="checkbox" value="ELECTED"/>	Australian Labor Party	23,764	37.23	-1.99
MILLEN, Tom	The Greens	9,745	15.27	+7.17
de HAAN, Ixa	Family First	930	1.46	-0.37
BENNETT, Shem	LDP	285	0.45	+0.45
FERGUSON, Michael	Liberal	27,769	43.50	-5.63
.....	Socialist Alliance	0	0.00	-0.35
FORMAL		63,835	96.75	+0.65
INFORMAL		2,142	3.25	-0.65
TOTAL		65,977	95.66	+0.03

Two Candidates Preferred					
Candidate	Party	Votes	This Election (%)	Last Election (%)	Swing (%)
CAMPBELL, Jodie <input type="checkbox" value="ELECTED"/>	Australian Labor Party	32,553	51.00	47.37	+3.63
FERGUSON, Michael	Liberal	31,282	49.00	52.63	-3.63

**DEAKIN DIVISION**

First Preferences Enrolment: 87,711 Turnout: 95.84%				
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing (%)
STEVENSON, Nick	LDP	586	0.71	+0.71
BRONTE, Fiona	Family First	2,589	3.15	+0.81
SYMON, Mike <input type="checkbox" value="ELECTED"/>	Australian Labor Party	34,451	41.86	+5.71
BARRESI, Phil	Liberal	36,501	44.35	-6.24
NICHOLSON, Paula	Australian Democrats	1,205	1.46	-0.51
PEMBERTON, Bill	Australian Greens	6,978	8.48	+0.62

.....	Citizens Electoral Council of Australia	0	0.00	-0.17
.....	Other	0	0.00	-0.91
<b>FORMAL</b>		<b>82,310</b>	<b>97.91</b>	<b>+0.97</b>
<b>INFORMAL</b>		<b>1,756</b>	<b>2.09</b>	<b>-0.97</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>84,066</b>	<b>95.84</b>	<b>+0.41</b>

Two Candidates Preferred					
Candidate	Party	Votes	This Election (%)	Last Election (%)	Swing (%)
SYMON, Mike <span style="border: 1px solid green; padding: 2px;">ELECTED</span>	Australian Labor Party	42,319	51.41	45.03	+6.38
BARRESI, Phil	Liberal	39,991	48.59	54.97	-6.38

## PAGE DIVISION

First Preferences Enrolment: 93,426 Turnout: 95.64%					
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing (%)	
BEHN, Doug	Independent	1,525	1.78	+0.40	
VEGA, Mirian	Family First	784	0.92	+0.76	
CULVERWELL, John	Citizens Electoral Council	143	0.17	-0.78	
MELLAND, Julia	Democrats	910	1.06	+0.79	
JONGEN, Theo	The Greens	6,930	8.10	-1.46	
SAFFIN, Janelle <span style="border: 1px solid green; padding: 2px;">ELECTED</span>	Labor	35,636	41.67	+8.60	
KANE, Tony	Independent	877	1.03	+1.03	
AVASALU, Rhonda Joy	Christian Democratic Party (Fred Nile Group)	1,430	1.67	+1.67	
BEATTY, Ben	LDP	462	0.54	+0.54	
GULAPTIS, Chris	Nationals	36,813	43.05	-6.68	
.....	Pauline Hanson's One Nation	0	0.00	-0.19	
.....	Nuclear Disarmament Party	0	0.00	-0.02	
.....	liberals for forests	0	0.00	-2.56	
.....	Lower Excise Fuel and Beer Party	0	0.00	-0.13	
.....	Outdoor Recreation Party	0	0.00	-1.39	
.....	Socialist Alliance	0	0.00	-0.49	
.....	Ex-Service, Service & Veterans Party	0	0.00	-0.11	
<b>FORMAL</b>		<b>85,510</b>	<b>95.70</b>	<b>-0.22</b>	
<b>INFORMAL</b>		<b>3,842</b>	<b>4.30</b>	<b>+0.22</b>	

TOTAL		89,352	95.64	-0.29
-------	--	--------	-------	-------

Two Candidates Preferred					
Candidate	Party	Votes	This Election (%)	Last Election (%)	Swing (%)
SAFFIN, Janelle <span style="border: 1px solid green; padding: 2px;">ELECTED</span>	Labor	44,770	52.36	44.53	+7.83
GULAPTIS, Chris	Nationals	40,740	47.64	55.47	-7.83



FairVote  
6930 Carroll Avenue  
Suite 610  
Takoma Park, MD 20912

FairVote is a non-partisan electoral reform organization seeking fair elections with meaningful choices. Our vision of “the way democracy will be” includes an equally protected right to vote, instant runoff voting for executive elections and proportional voting for legislative elections.

FairVote’s **Research Report** series analyzes American and international elections and election practices, studying the effect on voter participation, fairness in representation and competitive choice.

FairVote | [www.fairvote.org](http://www.fairvote.org) | 301-270-4616