

Australian Electoral Commission

**SUPPLEMENTARY SUBMISSION TO THE JOINT STANDING
COMMITTEE ON ELECTORAL MATTERS**

AEC RESPONSES TO JSCEM HEARINGS OF 15 AUGUST 1996

Canberra

16 September 1996

CONTENTS

	Page
1. PREAMBLE.....	5
2. RESPONSES.....	5
2.1 AEC Ethnic Advertising.....	5
2.2 Roll Deletions in South Australia.....	6
2.3 New Enrolments and Transfers.....	6
2.4 Post Election Survey - Negative Results.....	6
2.5 Advocacy of Optional Preferential Voting.....	7
2.6 Survey of Informal and Exhausted Votes.....	7
2.7 Enrolment Facsimiles.....	7
2.8 Youth Enrolments.....	7
2.9 Norfolk Island and the Division of Canberra.....	7
2.10 External and Internal Territory Enrolments.....	10
2.11 Island Enrolment.....	10
2.12 Lord Howe Island.....	10
2.13 Australians Overseas.....	10
2.14 Eligible Overseas Electors.....	11
2.15 Subdivisions.....	11
2.16 Multiple Voting by State/Territory - 1980 to 1996.....	12
2.17 Multiple Voting by Division - 1996.....	13
2.18 Multiple Voting - Official Error.....	13
2.19 Multiple Voting - 1993 Jail Sentences.....	14
2.20 Multiple Voting - Wilfully.....	14

2.21	Last-minute Nominations.....	15
2.22	Western Sydney - political advertising.....	17
2.23	Pre-Poll and Postal Voting 1983 to 1996.....	18
2.24	Postal Vote Applications - Campaign Material.....	18
2.25	Multiple Postal Vote Applications.....	18
2.26	Electoral Fraud - Proof of Identity and Data-Matching.....	18
2.27	Enrolment - Citizenship.....	19
2.28	Prisoners - Mobile Polling.....	19
2.29	Absent Voting and Division-wide Ordinary Voting.....	19
2.30	Computerised Voting.....	19

APPENDIX

	Page
Table 1	AEC Ethnic Advertising - Languages and Media.....25
Table 2	Monthly Enrolments - all States/Territories except South Australia.....26
Table 3	Monthly Enrolments - South Australia.....27
Table 4	Incomplete Facsimile Enrolments by State/Territory.....28
Table 5	External and Internal Territory Enrolments.....28
Table 6	Multiple Voting by State/Territory - 1980 to 1996.....28
Table 7	Multiple Voting by Division - 1996.....29
Table 8	Nominations for the House of Representatives - Nomination Period - Divisional Offices31
Table 9	Nominations for House of Representatives - Last Day - Divisional Offices.....31
Table 10	Nominations for House of Representatives - Nomination Period - Head Offices - Bulk Nominations.....32
Table 11	Nominations for Ungrouped Candidates - Senate - Nomination Period.....32
Table 12	Nominations for Ungrouped Candidates - Senate - Last Day.....32
Table 13	Nominations for Groups - Senate - Nomination Period.....33
Table 14	Nominations for Groups - Senate - Last Day.....33
Table 15	Pre-Poll and Postal Voting 1983 to 1996.....34
Table 16	Postal Vote Applications - Campaign Material.....34
Table 17	Multiple Postal Vote Applications.....35
Table 18	Prisoner Mobile Polling by Division.....37
Table 19	Absent Voting from 1983 to 1996.....37

1. PREAMBLE

1.1 This supplementary submission by the Australian Electoral Commission (AEC) is presented to the Joint Standing Committee on Electoral Matters (JSCEM) in response to its "Inquiry into the 1996 Federal Election", as advertised on Saturday 22 June 1996 in all major national newspapers. The submission is supplementary to the major AEC submission, "The Conduct of the 1996 Federal Election" presented to the JSCEM on 29 July 1996 (submission No 30).

1.2 As part of the JSCEM inquiry, public hearings are in progress, and the first of these, on 15 August 1996, involved officers of the AEC. During the course of these hearings, members of the JSCEM raised a number of queries relating to the conduct of the 1996 federal election, and this submission provides the AEC responses to those queries, which were taken on notice.

2. RESPONSES

2.1 AEC Ethnic Advertising

On page EM 7 of the transcript, Mr Laurie Ferguson asked which languages were used at the 1996 federal election as part of the AEC advertising campaign, and how these languages were selected.

2.1.1 Different strategies have to be used for general elections and by-elections, but the underlying principle for the selection of languages for AEC advertising campaigns is that the AEC seeks advice from a range of authoritative sources. These sources include the Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs, the AEC's creative advertising agency, Box Emery & Partners, and the translation consultancy, Cultural Perspectives, who are subcontracted to the advertising agency to advise and translate. These agencies maintain up-to-date information relating to the speaking of community languages, levels of English competence amongst these groups, and the media best suited to reach these client groups. In addition, local knowledge from the AEC's Head Offices and Divisional Offices, especially in respect of by-elections where better targeting is possible, is sought.

2.1.2 The AEC considers whether speakers of particular languages can also speak English. For example, some well-represented groups, such as the Germans and the Dutch, have considerable fluency in English, so there is not as much need to translate for these groups. In addition to the translation of key messages, AEC advertising and public relations also draws attention to the Translating and Interpreting Service (TIS), from which electors can seek assistance at no cost to them.

2.1.3 The non-English languages and their media, which were used at the 1996 federal election, are detailed in Table 1 in the Appendix.

2.2 Roll Deletions in South Australia

On page EM 7 of the transcript, Mr Laurie Ferguson asked why the number of roll deletions were proportionately higher in South Australia.

2.2.1 As reported in the AEC submission No 30 at Appendix C, page S259, the total number of deletions for South Australia was 3,415. Whilst this figure appears to be proportionally higher than for the other States/Territories, it is primarily the result of the operational procedures required by the South Australian enrolment system, known as EAGLE, for the processing of interstate enrolment transfers. That is, to process a deletion from the South Australian EAGLE system, following the receipt of advice notifying an enrolment transfer to another State/Territory, a deletion transaction must be undertaken. This is not necessary for other States/Territories as the AEC Roll Management System (RMANS) enables enrolment transfer transactions to be processed automatically. See also AEC submission No 30, page S152.

2.3 New Enrolments and Transfers

On pages EM 9 and 28 of the transcript, Mr Laurie Ferguson asked for figures on new enrolments and transfers for the 12 months prior to the close of rolls for the election, and for six months after the close of rolls.

2.3.1 For all States except South Australia, the RMANS enrolment system has been retrospectively interrogated on a monthly basis from 6 January 1995 to 5 August 1996. The AEC is unable to provide information for South Australia in the required format as it is not possible to retrospectively interrogate the EAGLE system belonging to the South Australian Government. However, figures for South Australia have been provided from the monthly roll close. See Tables 2 and 3 in the Appendix, and AEC submission No 30, page S152.

2.4 Post Election Survey - Negative Results

On page EM 9, Mr Laurie Ferguson asked what were the “negative” results of the post-election survey

2.4.1 No details of the “negative” results of the post election survey are available. As part of the advertising tracking research, some questions were asked on the householder Voting Guide supplied by the AEC. Of those respondents who said that they had received and read the document, 80% said that they found it either somewhat or very useful. The market research company employed by the AEC did not probe this issue any further, but moved on to questions about the awareness of formal voting. See also AEC submission No 30, page S144.

2.5 Advocacy of Optional Preferential Voting

On page EM 9 of the transcript, Mr Griffin asked when the AEC would be able to provide a submission on the Langer cases.

2.5.1 On 30 August 1996, the AEC provided to the JSCEM the following two submissions: "Advocacy of Optional Preferential Voting" and "Advocacy of Optional Preferential Voting - Court Decisions".

2.6 Survey of Informal and Exhausted Votes

On page EM 10 of the transcript, Senator Minchin asked when the AEC would be able to provide a submission on informal and exhausted votes.

2.6.1 On 30 August 1996, the AEC provided to the JSCEM the following two submissions: "1996 House of Representatives Informal Ballot Paper Survey" and "1996 House of Representatives Exhausted Ballot Paper Survey".

2.7 Enrolment Facsimiles

On page EM 11 of the transcript, Mr Cobb asked how many enrolment claims were not processed because of incomplete faxes.

2.7.1 The numbers of enrolments which were not included in the close of rolls for the 1996 federal election because of incomplete enrolment forms received by facsimile are shown by State/Territory in Table 4 in the Appendix.

2.8 Youth Enrolments

On page EM 14 of the transcript, Mr Griffin asked for a comparison between all enrolment increases and those for 19 year olds.

2.8.1 During 1995/96 the AEC processed approximately 2.2 million electoral enrolment forms. This represented 642,968 transactions on the Commonwealth Electoral Roll, including new enrolments, re-enrolments and re-instatements. About 45% of all new enrolments were 18 year olds.

2.9 Norfolk Island and the Division of Canberra

On page EM 17 of the transcript, Senator Minchin asked the AEC to present again its views on incorporating Norfolk Island into the Division of Canberra for federal electoral purposes.

2.9.1 In the 1996 AEC submission No 30, at page S155, the AEC said that it remained of the view that Norfolk Islanders should be enrolled only for the Division of Canberra in order to maximise their voting power for the federal Parliament. Senator Minchin has suggested that Norfolk Islanders are already able to maximise their voting power if enough of them choose to enrol for the Division of Canberra, and asked that the AEC provide more detail to support its position.

2.9.2 On 21 December 1993 the AEC put a similar and lengthier submission on Norfolk Island enrolment to the previous JSCEM, and it is recommended that this 1993 AEC submission be re-examined in the light of the following further comments.

2.9.3 In its Report on the 1993 federal election, at page 145, the previous JSCEM recommended: “that section 95AA of the Electoral Act be amended so that Norfolk Islanders who choose to enrol may only enrol in the Division of Canberra” (recommendation No 69). In the Government Response of 21 September 1995 to the JSCEM Report, recommendation No 69 was deferred for further consideration. This was in order to allow the Department of Environment, Sport and Territories to conduct negotiations with Norfolk Island on the JSCEM proposal. The AEC recommendation No 4 in submission No 30 to this JSCEM suggests that the Department of Sport, Territories and Local Government be invited to put its views on the proposed amendments.

2.9.4 The proposition that Norfolk Islanders be enrolled in the Division of Canberra dates back as far as 1976, when the Nimmo Royal Commission recommended that Norfolk Islanders be enrolled in the Division of Canberra; to 1991, when a parliamentary committee recommended that the extension of the franchise to Norfolk Islanders be done on the advice of the AEC; and to the 1993 JSCEM Report recommendation No 69.

2.9.5 In the negotiations leading up to the 1992 legislation, which extended the franchise to eligible Norfolk Islanders, the Norfolk Island Government representatives put the view that they had no “community of interest” with the proposed Division of Canberra, and that enrolment should be possible anywhere in Australia, under provisions similar to those for itinerant electors, with the Division of Canberra as a “fall-back” Division, not to be named as such in the CEA. As indicated in the 1993 AEC submission to the JSCEM, it is unfortunate that a misapplication by consultants to the Norfolk Island Government of the phrase “community of interest” has been allowed to cloud the issue in recent years. (see for example, R Wettenhall and P Grundy, “Norfolk Island and the Electorate of Canberra: Community of Interest?” Report to the Norfolk Island Government, Canberra, March 1992.)

2.9.6 The phrase “community of interest” was borrowed from the provisions relating to redistributions, specifically sections 66(3)(b)(i) and 73(4)(b)(i) of the CEA. In the context of a redistribution that might involve, for the sake of argument, splitting one Division into two Divisions, one of the criteria under the CEA is that “community of interest” should be taken into account. This is taken by the AEC to mean that if a Division contains a well-defined community (based on economic, social and regional interests) then that community should not be broken up and split across two Divisions, but remain intact in one Division.

2.9.7 From this perspective, the Norfolk Islanders themselves form a “community of interest” which should not be broken up by splitting that community across Divisions in any redistribution involving, for example, the

Division of Canberra in the ACT. There has never been any suggestion that Norfolk Islanders have any economic, social or regional interests in common with any particular mainland Division, including the Division of Canberra.

2.9.8 The position of the AEC has been for many years that the community of Norfolk Islanders who choose to enrol for federal elections should enrol in one Division only, in order to maximise their representative power. To put this another way, every other community across Australia has a single Member of the House of Representatives who is responsible for their interests. The electors of the community of Norfolk Islanders should have the same right. By enrolling in many different Divisions, Norfolk Islanders are ensuring that no one voice speaks for their community interests in the Parliament, and as a consequence, they risk weakening their representative power (no matter what other benefits they may perceive).

2.9.9 On a final point, it is worth explaining why the Division of Canberra has been identified as the most appropriate Division for Norfolk Island electoral purposes. The Attorney-General's Department expressed the view early in the discussions on Norfolk Island enrolment, that it might be legally questionable for all the people of Norfolk Island to be classed as "people of a State" under the Constitution, which would be implied by any provision allowing Norfolk Islanders to enrol in a Division of a State. In the event, this doubt was addressed in the CEA by section 95AB, which, inter alia, obliges the Divisional Returning Officer (DRO) to accept that a Norfolk Islander seeking enrolment for a Division in a State is in fact one of the "people of a State" for the purposes of the Constitution. This "deeming" provision has not yet been judicially considered.

2.9.10 Given these early doubts about the constitutionality of enrolling Norfolk Islanders in a Division of a State, it seemed appropriate to look to inclusion in a Territory Division, which would not involve the same constitutional doubts. The Division of the Northern Territory already includes the external territories of Christmas Island and Cocos (Keeling) Islands, and the Division of Fraser in the ACT includes the internal territory of Jervis Bay. That left the Division of Canberra as the only other Territory Division which did not already include an external or internal territory, and so it became the only legal possibility for Norfolk Island.

2.9.11 With the recent redistribution of the ACT into three Divisions, there is of course no logical reason why the new Division of Namadgi should not be selected as the one Territory Division for Norfolk Island, except for the fact that there is some historical investment in the name of the Division of Canberra. That is, at any future ACT redistribution which might, for example, abolish one Division, it is likely that the Division of Canberra would stay as the name of one of the remaining Divisions. This means that if the Division of Canberra were to be named in the CEA as the Division for Norfolk Island enrolment, it is unlikely that it would require amendment to change the name following ACT redistributions in the future.

2.10 External and Internal Territory Enrolments

On page EM 18 of the transcript, Mr Cobb asked for current enrolment figures for all administered Territories and some islands.

2.10.1 Enrolment statistics by External and Internal Territories are provided in Table 5 in the Appendix.

2.11 Island Enrolment

On page EM 18 of the transcript, Mr Cobb asked for enrolment figures for some islands, which are part of the States, and not administered territories.

2.11.1 Kangaroo Island is part of the Division of Barker and contains 2,943 electors, and Lord Howe Island is part of the Division of Sydney and contains 247 electors.

2.12 Lord Howe Island

On page EM 18 of the transcript, Mr Laurie Ferguson asked for an electoral history of Lord Howe Island.

2.12.1 Lord Howe Island was included in the Division of East Sydney in 1903 by the Commissioner appointed to distribute the State of New South Wales into Divisions for federal electoral purposes. The 1903 Distribution Report does not provide any specific explanation for the inclusion of Lord Howe Island in East Sydney. Lord Howe Island remained in the Division of East Sydney until 1948. Between 1949 and 1967 Lord Howe Island was included in the Division of West Sydney, and from 1968 in the Division of Sydney

2.13 Australians Overseas

At page EM 19 of the transcript, Mr Cobb asked for an estimate of the number of Australian electors overseas at election time, to compare with the number who voted within Australia.

2.13.1 The AEC has not been able to obtain figures on the number of Australian electors who were overseas at the time of the 1996 federal election. The Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs can only provide yearly figures on the total number of Australians who are overseas. The Australian Bureau of Statistics provides monthly figures of Australian residents who have left and returned to the country, but these figures are not matched to give a balance of the number of Australian residents who are overseas at any given time. For example, not all of those returning are included in the figure for those that have left, as they may have been overseas for some years and just returned. In addition, the numbers of people leaving from and returning to Australia include those under 18 years old and therefore not eligible to vote.

2.13.2 The number of Australian electors who voted overseas is 46,307. Details of where these electors voted are provided in Appendix D of the AEC submission No 30.

2.14 Eligible Overseas Electors

On page EM 20 of the transcript, Mr Cobb asked whether the period of application for Eligible Overseas Elector status is appropriate, or whether it needs extension.

2.14.1 The AEC considers that the recent amendments to the CEA that provided for an extension for application for Eligible Overseas Elector status to one year after departure from Australia is appropriate, but see also AEC submission No 30, page S156.

2.15 Subdivisions

On page EM 32 of the transcript, Senator Minchin asked for a specific AEC response to the allegations made by Dr Amy McGrath on the issue of subdivisions.

2.15.1 Dr McGrath alleges in her submission No 29 to the JSCEM that the AEC has adopted an “unauthorised and illegal policy” in relation to subdivisions. This claim is false. Prior to the amendments made to the CEA by the Commonwealth Electoral Legislation Amendment Act 1983 subsection 26(1) of the CEA did provide that:

Each Division shall be divided into Subdivisions and the boundaries of each Subdivision shall be as specified by proclamation.

2.15.2 However, subsection 26(1) was repealed by the 1983 Act and replaced with a provision (now section 79) that read as follows:

The Electoral Commission may, by notice published in the Gazette -

(a) divide a Division into such Subdivisions (if any) as are specified and set out the boundaries of each Subdivision so specified; and

(b) divide the Northern Territory into such Districts as are specified and set out the boundaries of each District so specified.”

2.15.3 The words “if any” in paragraph (a) make it clear beyond any doubt that the 1983 amendments, except in relation to the Northern Territory, removed any general legal obligation for Division to be subdivided. In addition, the 1983 amendments inserted in the CEA a new subsection 4(4) which provides that:

Where a Division is not divided into Subdivisions, a reference in this Act to a Subdivision shall, in relation to that Division, be read as a reference to that Division.

2.15.4 Subsection 82(2) of the CEA, as quoted in this submission, does not require the continued existence of subdivisions. Its effect is only to require that there be subdivisional rolls for those Divisions that are subdivided.

2.15.5 It should be emphasised that all steps taken by the AEC with regard to the creation or abolition of subdivisions since the enactment of the 1983 amendments have been in the public domain, by virtue of the fact that they have to be gazetted. Those steps were neither illegal nor unauthorised: they were in fact authorised and made legal by Parliament. Neither subsection 26(1) (which is now subsection 79(1)) nor subsection 4(4) has been amended in any material way since 1983.

2.15.6 The assertion is also made that the 1983 amendments “still limited ordinary voting cast in a division to ‘the Subdivision of enrolment’”, that at the 1984 election “Subdivisions simply no longer existed” despite the fact that “the Act still required Subdivisional Rolls”, and that as a consequence “the three electoral Commissioners of the new Electoral Commission were henceforth in breach of the Parliamentary Act.”

2.15.7 The assertions are again false. The relevant amendment enabling Division-wide ordinary voting was made by paragraph 88(b) of the Commonwealth Electoral Legislation Amendment Act 1983 and the Explanatory Memorandum provided to the Parliament when the relevant Bill was being debated noted that that paragraph “amends sub-section 113(1) to provide for ordinary voting to be possible within the division, rather than the subdivision, of the elector’s enrolment”. Numerous subdivisions still existed at the time of the 1984 election, and official rolls for subdivided Divisions continued to be maintained on a subdivisional basis while subdivisions were maintained.

2.16 Multiple Voting by State/Territory - 1980 to 1996

On page EM 43 of the transcript, Mr Laurie Ferguson asked whether the introduction of Division-wide ordinary voting has had an effect of the levels of multiple voting.

2.16.1 Table 6 in the Appendix details the number of recorded instances since the 1980 federal election of electors who have admitted to voting more than once at an election. It is reasonable to conclude on these figures that the introduction of Division-wide voting has had a minimal effect, in percentage terms, on the levels of multiple voting.

2.16.2 The increase in multiple voting in 1987 is directly attributable to the introduction of optical scanning of the Certified Lists of Voters, which has resulted in a greater degree of accuracy in the identification of apparent multiple voters.

2.16.3 Whilst the figures indicate a minor increase in multiple voting from 0.0027% of votes cast in 1987 to 0.0085% of votes cast in 1996,

investigations show that this is the direct result of voter confusion, in the majority of cases. For example, there is a disproportionate number of cases recorded in Tasmania in 1996, attributable to the overlap of the Tasmanian State election with the federal election.

2.17 Multiple Voting by Division - 1996

On page EM 43 of the transcript, Mr Laurie Ferguson asked for multiple voting figures by Division.

2.17.1 Table 7 in the Appendix details the number of electors in each Division who admitted to voting more than once at the 1996 federal election, as at 30 August 1996.

2.17.2 Following the optical scanning of the Certified Lists of Voters after polling day, the Divisional Returning Officers write to those electors whose names show up as being marked off more than once on the Lists, seeking a reason for the apparent multiple vote. Replies from apparent multiple voters often reveal official error, such as occurs, for example, when an apparent non-voter can be matched with an apparent multiple voter. This is the most frequent form of official error, when the polling official marks off a name and address record on the Certified List which is one record above or below the correct record.

2.17.3 If an elector replies that he or she only voted once then this must be accepted in the absence of other conclusive evidence to the contrary. If the elector does not reply, or letters are returned unclaimed, then no further investigation is possible. Replies may contain an admission of multiple voting - see Table 7. Where the elector admits to voting more than once, it may be that no prosecution is warranted, because the elector was, for example, elderly or had literacy problems, and there was clearly no intent to defraud the system. In other cases, prosecution may follow.

2.17.4 Note that there is a disproportionate number of multiple voters in Tasmania at the 1996 federal election, because of the overlap with the Tasmanian State election.

2.18 Multiple Voting - Official Error

On page EM 43 of the transcript, Mr Laurie Ferguson asked for the meaning of the term "official error" in relation to multiple voting

2.18.1 An "official error" in the context of multiple voting is an error by an electoral official in marking off the Certified Lists of Voters. These generally occur in the polling place when polling staff are marking off the names of ordinary voters on the Certified Lists. Similarly, some official errors are made by Divisional staff and casuals in marking off the Certified Lists for voters who made postal, pre-poll, absent, provisional or other declaration votes.

2.18.2 The simplest way of making such an error is to mark the name and address record above or below the correct record on the Certified List. Generally these errors can be easily identified because there are obvious complementary apparent non-voters, and electors with dual markings, on the Certified List. Even though such errors may appear obvious, AEC officers draw no conclusions until the apparent non-voters and apparent multiple voters have been given the opportunity to respond to a letter or other form of inquiry from the DRO.

2.18.3 With respect to the “deletions” Certified List, it is possible that an elector who has been marked off as a death may have in fact voted before dying, by, for example, casting a pre-poll or postal vote.

2.19 Multiple Voting - 1993 Jail Sentences

On page EM 44 of the transcript, Mr Cobb asked how many people were jailed for multiple voting at the 1993 federal election.

2.19.1 Only one person was prosecuted for multiple voting at the 1993 federal election. An elector in the Division of Braddon in Tasmania admitted to voting four times. The elector was found guilty but discharged without proceeding to conviction, upon entering into a recognisance in the sum of \$500 to be of good behaviour for three years.

2.20 Multiple Voting - Wilfully

On page EM 44 of the transcript, Senator Minchin asked for the AEC to present its views on the possible removal of the word “wilfully” from the offence of multiple voting.

2.20.1 From 1902 to 1983 the offence of multiple (or dual) voting under the CEA read: “voting more than once at the same election.” In 1983 the Joint Select Committee on Electoral Reform recommended that the relevant provision be amended to read: “wilfully voting more than once at the same election.” The recommended amendment was passed without debate by the Parliament and was apparently intended to prevent proceedings being initiated against those who might vote more than once without a clear and deliberate intention to defraud the electoral system.

2.20.2 However, it is now clear that prosecution of the offence under section 339(1)(j) of the CEA can provide difficulties because, barring an admission from the voter that he or she deliberately (or wilfully) voted more than once, it is impossible to prove intent.

2.20.3 The DPP advised the AEC on 22 July 1992 that there will be continuing problems in prosecuting multiple voters unless the provision is amended. The DPP advised that it should be up to the defendant, rather than the prosecution, to raise a defence of honest and reasonable mistake. The Criminal Law Branch of the Attorney-General’s Department advised on 10 August 1992 that the word “wilfully” is a word of ambiguous meaning and

should be avoided, and that the courts should be relied upon to decide whether the offence was committed intentionally or otherwise.

2.20.4 In summary, at present it is not possible to prosecute the offence of multiple voting in the majority of likely cases. Legal advice from both the DPP and the Attorney-General's Department confirms that the word "wilfully" could be deleted from section 339(1)(j) of the CEA without any great injustice occurring. Its deletion might be expected to result in an increased number of prosecutions, which together with a possible increase in the penalty, might contribute to a substantial deterrent effect on multiple voting. See also AEC submission No 30, page S213.

2.21 Last-minute Nominations

On page EM 51 of the transcript, Mr Cobb asked for the numbers of nominations in the last day and the last hour, and what percentage increase this represents over the whole nomination period. There was also some discussion about providing for a 24 hour breathing space between the close of nominations and the declaration of the nominations.

2.21.1 The comparative figures are at Tables 8 to 14 in the Appendix.

2.21.2 Section 172 of the CEA provides that no nomination shall be rejected by reason of a formal defect or error in the nomination, if the officer to whom the nomination is made is satisfied that the provisions of section 166, 167, 170 and 171 of the CEA have been substantially complied with. That is, rejection of a nomination will only occur where the nomination has not been received by the relevant DRO or AEO before the hour of nomination, or the nomination does not provide the following formal details:

- (a) the name, address (unless the candidate provides an address for correspondence to the DRO) and occupation (although if no occupation is shown the nomination would be accepted) of the candidate;
- (b) the signatures of the correct number of qualified nominators;
- (c) the correct deposit in cash or banker's cheque to the relevant DRO or AEC;
- (d) the signed declaration of and consent to act by the candidate;

2.21.3 All of these formal requirements are basic to the making of a valid nomination. However, if any one of these requirements is not satisfied at the time of lodgement with the DRO or AEO, it can be rectified, provided this is done before the close of nominations. It is therefore in the candidate's interest to lodge the nomination well before the closing time in case any of these requirements are incomplete. Effectively, the nomination is not formally made until such time as all these requirements are complete. Therefore, to

accept a nomination before the close of nominations, subject to correction of defects later, is not an acceptable alternative. It would also be open to abuse.

2.21.4 By contrast, many industrial ballots do allow for the correction of defects in nominations after the close of nominations. The general rule applying in industrial ballots is that candidates may rectify a defect within seven days from the date of notification, not from the date of close of nominations. However, the correction of formal defects does not extend to the qualifications of candidates or their nominators. On a practical level, to allow normal practice at industrial elections to prevail at federal elections would inevitably lead to the kind of difficulties which the AEC's proposal for a delay in the declaration of nominations was meant to address. It is highly likely that candidates who are difficult to locate, or leave the correction to the last minute, would end up causing the same problems as last minute nominations.

2.21.5 The AEC is strongly of the view that nominations for federal elections must close at 12 noon on the day of the close of nominations. However, the provision of a 24 hour period before the declaration of nominations would allow the AEC to check those few last minute nominations, and especially those fewer nominations which may require some legal advice, without the pressure of needing to make hasty decisions. This period is not intended to allow for corrections to be made to the nominations by candidates.

2.21.6 The AEC has suggested the 24 hour period not only in the interests of relieving the pressure on AEC officers, but also to be able to provide to candidates and party workers, the media and others, a definite time for the declaration and draw to take place. It is appreciated that the candidates, the parties and the media are under critical time constraints during the election campaign, and the AEC sees it as unreasonable that they are asked to wait for an unspecified time while Divisional staff check through all the last minute nominations. It is not uncommon, for example, for the declaration of Senate nominations to be delayed for some hours for the final checks to take place. Under the AEC proposal the declaration of nominations and the draw for positions on the ballot papers would commence exactly at 12 noon on the day after the close of nominations.

2.22 Western Sydney - political advertising

On page EM 59 of the transcript, Mr Laurie Ferguson asked for a report from the Division of Reid and other western Sydney Divisions about complaints of unauthorised signs and posters on polling day, and for advice on what actions were taken in respect of these complaint.

2.22.1 There were four complaints lodged about signs and posters in the western Sydney Divisions of Bennelong and Grayndler.

2.22.2 In the Division of Bennelong, Mr Johnston, party worker, phoned the AEC Head Office in Sydney to advise that political advertising was being displayed within 6 metres of the West Ryde Public School and mentioned that

this was also the case at the Ryde Court House. The complaint was referred to the DRO for Bennelong who immediately conducted an on-site inspection at the polling places concerned.

2.22.3 At the West Ryde Public School, the building itself was the polling place and this area did not include the school grounds. The DRO determined that any advertising displayed by political parties was more than 6 metres from the building, and therefore the polling place perimeter. During the DRO's inspection he briefly discussed with the party workers the locations used for advertising, and there were no further complaints made concerning this polling place.

2.22.4 The frontage of Ryde Court House is in close proximity to the footpath on Victoria Road, Ryde. The DRO ensured that political advertising was displayed as far as possible from the building, which was the designated polling place. The restricted display area was understood and accepted by all party workers on site at the time.

2.22.5 In the Division of Grayndler, Mr Kevin Butler, No Aircraft Noise (NAN) Party, wrote to the Australian Electoral Officer for New South Wales (AEO NSW) on 29 February 1996. He complained that rival candidates in the Division of Grayndler could use the distinctive colours of the NAN Party on their political advertising, in an attempt to mislead voters. Mr Butler was also of the opinion that many of these voters could rely on use of non-written cues to identify particular parties. The Deputy AEO NSW contacted Mr Butler and advised him to seek his own legal advice in relation to sections 383(1) and 329(1) of the CEA.

2.22.6 In a third complaint, Mr Douglas Howard wrote to complain about unfair advertising tactics used by political parties displaying numerous posters advocating the virtues of one candidate over another. He expressed the view that this volume of unsubstantiated advertising could have undesirable effects on the electoral process. The AEO NSW advised Mr Howard that there are no provisions in the CEA restricting the size or number of political posters displayed outside polling places, but that the CEA does require electoral advertisements to be authorised, and not exhibited within 6 metres of the entrance to a polling place.

2.22.7 In a fourth complaint, Mr Tony Nutt, Liberal Party, informed the AEO on polling day that the ALP had affixed large quantities of plastic wrap near polling booths across New South Wales. The plastic wrap displayed the TELSTRA trademark and the words "Save TELSTRA - Vote Labor". Mr Nutt requested that the ALP be restrained from such conduct. The Deputy AEO NSW advised Mr Nutt that this did not constitute an offence under section 329(1) of the CEA.

2.23 Pre-Poll and Postal Voting 1983 to 1996

On page EM 68 of the transcript, Mr Laurie Ferguson asked for figures on postal and pre-poll voting since the introduction of pre-poll voting in 1984.

2.23.1 Figures for postal and pre-poll voting are provided at Table 16 in the Appendix. The CEA was amended prior to the 1990 federal election to provide a clear operational distinction between postal and pre-poll votes, which were known previously as “oral” postal votes. The election statistics did not distinguish between postal and pre-poll votes until the 1993 federal election.

2.24 Postal Vote Applications - Campaign Material

On page EM 74 of the transcript, Mr Griffin asked for statistics on complaints of political party material being included with postal vote applications.

2.24.1 The numbers of complaints received by the AEC with regard to party campaign material being included with postal vote applications are in Table 16 in the Appendix.

2.25 Multiple Postal Vote Applications

On page EM 72 of the transcript, Senator Minchin asked how many multiple postal vote applications were received by the AEC.

2.25.1 The figures are supplied at Table 17 in the Appendix.

2.26 Electoral Fraud - Proof of Identity and Data-Matching

On page EM 83 of the transcript, Mr Laurie Ferguson asked for a separate submission on proof of identity in the context of electoral fraud. What has been the experience of other jurisdictions that have moved to a POI system in the last decade? Has it had any deterrent effect on fraudulent enrolment and voting. The AEC submission on POI is to include comment on options for checking the validity of enrolments by data-matching with agencies such as Immigration and Registrars.

2.26.1 The AEC submission is in preparation.

2.27 Enrolment - Citizenship

On page EM 81 of the transcript, Senator Minchin asked what the procedures are when citizenship details are not provided on the enrolment form.

2.27.1 Applications for enrolment are only rejected where it would appear that the elector has no entitlement to enrolment under the provisions of section 93 of the CEA. In relation to citizenship claims, there are three separate areas on an enrolment form which are used to determine eligibility. A Divisional Returning Officer can contact persons in writing or by telephone if any of these three areas are incomplete. Failure by the person applying to provide adequate clarification or the additional necessary information would result in the enrolment form not being processed.

2.27.2 Since Australia Day 1996 all new citizens are enrolled following their citizenship ceremonies where they complete a pre-printed personalised enrolment form. The form contains data produced by the Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs, including a Citizenship Identification Number. Prior to the introduction of these new enrolment procedures the AEC would receive advice from the then Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs on a new citizen's identification number. This particular procedure proved less than satisfactory as up to five months could elapse before such notification was provided and the elector became entitled to exercise the franchise.

2.28 Prisoners - Mobile Polling

On page EM 83 of the transcript, Mr Cobb asked for the number of votes taken by mobile polling teams in prisons.

2.28.1 There were 730 votes issued by mobile polling teams visiting prisons, as detailed by State/Territory in Table 18 in the Appendix.

2.29 Absent Voting and Division-wide Ordinary Voting

On page EM 85 of the transcript, Mr McDougall asked for the number of absent votes for the 1983 and 1984 elections, pre and post the introduction of Division-wide ordinary voting.

2.29.1 The figures are provided in Table 19 in the Appendix.

2.30 Computerised Voting

On page EM 87 of the transcript, Mr McDougall asked for information on the latest trends in electronic voting.

2.30.1 The possibility of mechanised voting at federal elections has been of periodic interest since the beginning of federation. In 1904 the Minister for Home Affairs commissioned an inquiry into voting machines for federal elections. The Committee invited inventors to submit voting machines for testing and examination, in the following terms:

In order to obviate informal voting, errors in counting, and delay in Parliamentary Elections, an inquiry has been instituted by the Department of Home Affairs, and exhaustive tests will be made of such Voting Machines as may be submitted to the Department, with a view to the adoption of one of them, if found effective.

(a) that an elector can in one visit to the machine vote preferentially or otherwise with security and perfect secrecy for a Senate or House of Representatives Election, or both, and at least one referendum;

(b) that all possibility of disorganisation, breakdown, fraud, or confusion under the most exacting conditions is eliminated.

2.30.2 The inquiry was advertised nationally and in the USA, where voting machines were already in use. There were sixteen machines submitted from Australian inventors for examination. In explaining the possible reasons why no American inventors submitted, the Committee said the following:

The entirely different electoral conditions obtaining in the United States of America, and the evident difficulty in adjusting the machines in use in that country to meet the novel features connected with the application of the principle of Proportional Representation, may, to some extent, account for the non-submission of American machines.

2.30.3 After examining the machines the Committee concluded that none could provide adequately for preferential voting, or guarantee security.

2.30.4 With the advent of computers, it was thought that perhaps these early problems with mechanised voting might be overcome. However, the First Report of the Joint Select Committee on Electoral Reform in September 1983 concluded that the application of computer technology to federal elections was not appropriate at that time. The AEC Research Report Number 1 of 1986 entitled "Informal Voting 1984 - Senate" also concluded that computerised voting was not feasible at that time. A decade later, the AEC remains unconvinced that computerised voting at Australian federal elections is a feasible proposition. However, the AEC is convinced that a computerised Senate scrutiny is a real possibility, and the Electoral and Referendum Bill Amendment 1995, which was not passed by the last Parliament, included a proposal to computerise the Senate scrutiny.

2.30.5 The proposal involves voters casting their preferences on the traditional ballot papers, and the AEC entering the details into a computer after the event. This would be done by manual data entry or by optical scanning, and can be undertaken during the 13 day waiting period after polling day for the receipt of postal votes. During this period, the AEC would commence the keying and verification of the Senate ballot papers, and then perform the formality check, and the actual automated scrutiny. A computerised Senate scrutiny would leave a paper trail for audit and other purposes, as well as eliminating the need for recounts and printed records, and providing minimal disruption to voters. The computer program, already developed by the AEC, is based on one used for many years for union ballots and is therefore well tested.

2.30.6 Overseas experience with computerised scrutines is limited but promising. In the 1993 election in Norway, which has a proportional representation voting system, optical scanning was used in the single constituency of Oslo, which elects 16 members of Parliament. Norwegians have voter cards and direct computerised voting was feasible, but the Norwegian Government was reluctant to do away with the paper ballot entirely. In Great Britain general elections are still paper-based, but optical scanning of ballot papers is used in union and private elections.

2.30.7 Computerised voting, on the other hand, would require voters to cast their preferences into a computer, either directly into a terminal, or indirectly by a punch card or other machine readable medium. If used in conjunction with some type of security device such as a Personal Identification Number (PIN), a record could also be made that that person had voted.

2.30.8 For comparative purposes it is worth noting that the United States of America uses an array of direct voter input methods, including mechanical and computerised voting. At the 1992 Presidential election, which was conducted by the various State and local authorities, rather than by a single federal agency, 39.3% of voters used manual or voice activated punch cards, 28.4% used mechanical levers, 15.6% used optical scanners, 3.4% used direct electronic voting methods. A further 9.5% used mixed voting methods, while 3.4% used paper ballots. However, a critical distinction is that the USA (and the United Kingdom) has a first-past-the-post electoral system, where voters need only make one preference mark on the ballot paper, and the candidate who obtains the most number of those marks, or preferences, wins.

2.30.9 By contrast, the full preferential voting system used for federal elections in Australia, where voters are required to place numbers on the ballot paper to indicate a descending order of preferences for all candidates listed on the ballot paper, would require much more complex ballot paper presentation than is required for the casting of a single preference vote. (It would not be possible, for example, to use the simple mechanical lever system used in some States of the USA to record a single preference).

2.30.10 With current levels of technology and a full preferential voting system in Australia, computerised voting is less practical than paper-based methods. To devise a computerised voting system which could accommodate full preferential voting would require sophisticated and totally reliable computing facilities. In addition, voters would have to handle the equipment, which, even in its simplest forms, would be difficult for a great many voters, especially the elderly and those with poor literacy and numeracy skills.

2.30.11 Computerised voting would require computing facilities in every polling booth. The cost, not to mention logistical difficulty, of installing computing facilities in all polling booths across the nation for a single day, would be prohibitive. A rough estimate of the cost of using personal computers for such a system is \$112 million (32,000 PCs at 8,000 polling places). And with continuous and rapid advances in technology, the investment in PCs may be wasted as they quickly became obsolete.

2.30.12 Another obstacle to computerised voting is the reliability of the actual computer. Experience in the USA has uncovered examples of computer software used for election purposes containing errors sufficient to bring the legitimacy some election results into question. In addition to programming problems, hardware “crashes” could wreak havoc on polling day if an on-line computer network was employed. Australian experience has

seen computer crashes on the TAB network, Brisbane's Gold Lotto computer system, and the Australian Stock Exchange computer system.

2.30.13 Perhaps the most serious obstacle to computerised voting is the matter of security. In the USA security has emerged as a serious problem, as computer voting software (ie the programs that count the vote) is produced in secret by commercial companies. Computer experts have claimed that it is impossible to guarantee the security of such commercially-produced systems no matter what audit trails are built in. If the software were to be kept secret, as in the USA, it is extremely unlikely subtle vote rigging would ever be detected. Making software publicly available, to ensure integrity and accountability, carries with it its own drawbacks.

2.30.14 The opportunity to corrupt software would also arise with national networking. Such a network would require stringent security measures to ensure any attempted "hacking" was easily detected. To check the integrity of the software and to guard against fraudulent programming, the only reliable accounting method would be to check the election result against machine-readable cards or ballot papers and manually count them back. To go to such lengths to ensure integrity and accountability would defeat the purpose of computerised voting.

2.30.15 There have been developments in direct voting by telephone, but this has been restricted to smaller and simpler business applications such as shareholder voting. Voter-friendly systems would need to be specifically developed for use in federal elections. The necessary dialogue between the voter and the telephonic system, which would be required for the provision of the detail of a full set of preferences, is not yet available.

2.30.16 Even were such a system to be developed, the operational problems are not trivial. It must be borne in mind that 5.47% of the total 11,258 million voters nationally cast a "below the line" vote for the Senate in the 1996 federal election. In New South Wales and Victoria this meant the expression of full preferences for 63 and 44 Senate candidates respectively. Many voters, particularly the aged, the infirm, the disabled, and non-English speakers would experience considerable difficulty in accurately providing the necessary information in dialogue with an automated telephone system.

2.30.17 Further, the time taken to complete individual transactions would impact on the capacity of the system to avoid queuing. To date there has been no investigation undertaken on the additional telephone infrastructure required to handle close to 11 million extended calls in the course of a single day, in addition to the normal load. Nor has there been any study of the average length of calls which may be required, although estimates of 15 to 20 minutes have been made. A dedicated telephone centre in each of the 148 federal Divisions, would average 80,000 extended calls per centre on polling day.

2.30.18 Telephonic voting would require each elector to be issued with a phone card or unique pin number. The possibility of issuing a voter card for

the identification of voters on polling day was examined by the 1993 JSCEM, and it was noted that it could cost \$2 per elector or some \$22 million to produce and distribute such a card to the 11 million electors nationally. The AEC is preparing a submission to this JSCEM on enrolment and voter ID.

2.30.19 Though still in comparative infancy, developments in Integrated Circuit (IC) chip technology are being monitored by the AEC. For example, visitors to the National Gallery can now use computer handpieces on audio tours and, instead of following a pre-set tour route, can select any picture description. The use of similar handpieces at polling places may be less expensive than computer terminals, and in overseas developments on this front, the Indian Government has developed handpieces that would allow a voter to select up to 64 candidates. However, this technology has not yet been used at an election, and again, the Indian electoral system is first-past-the-post.

2.30.20 The AEC is vigilant in monitoring technological advances and active in applying any new technology that might improve the administration of federal elections. For example, the AEC has adopted the RMANS roll management system and an Election Management System which gave very prompt results on election night. The newly-developed computerised Senate scrutiny system is ready for use pending passage of relevant legislation.

2.30.21 It is of course possible that at some time in the future, some or all of the above problems with computerised voting may be overcome. But given current technology, a full preferential voting system, and substantial security concerns, the AEC believes that computerised voting is not feasible at present.

APPENDIX

	Page
Table 1	AEC Ethnic Advertising - Languages and Media.....25
Table 2	Monthly Enrolments - all States/Territories except South Australia.....26
Table 3	Monthly Enrolments - South Australia.....27
Table 4	Incomplete Facsimile Enrolments by State/Territory.....28
..	
Table 5	External and Internal Territory Enrolments.....28
Table 6	Multiple Voting by State/Territory - 1980 to 1996.....28
Table 7	Multiple Voting by Division - 1996.....29
Table 8	Nominations for the House of Representatives - Nomination Period - Divisional Offices.....31
Table 9	Nominations for House of Representatives - Last Day - Divisional Offices.....31
Table 10	Nominations for House of Representatives - Nomination Period - Head Offices - Bulk Nominations.....32
Table 11	Nominations for Ungrouped Candidates - Senate - Nomination Period.....32
Table 12	Nominations for Ungrouped Candidates - Senate - Last Day.....32
Table 13	Nominations for Groups - Senate - Nomination Period.....33
Table 14	Nominations for Groups - Senate - Last Day.....33
Table 15	Pre-Poll and Postal Voting 1983 to 1996.....34
Table 16	Postal Vote Applications - Campaign Material.....34
Table 17	Multiple Postal Vote Applications.....35
Table 18	Prisoner Mobile Polling by Division.....37
Table 19	Absent Voting from 1983 to 1996.....37

Table 1: AEC Ethnic Advertising - Languages and Media

Press	Radio	Television	Voting Guide
Italian	Italian	Arabic	Chinese
German	Arabic	Greek	Greek
Macedonian	Macedonian	Polish	Macedonian
Indonesian/Malay	Bahasa (Indones)	Chinese (Canton)	Arabic
Filipino (Tagalog)	Thai	Italian	Serbian
Greek	Greek	Russian	Polish
Vietnamese	Vietnamese	French	Italian
Maltese	Croatian	Japanese	Vietnamese
Portugese	Portugese	Spanish	Turkish
Croatian	Khmer	German	Croatian
Chinese	Chinese (Mandar)	Mandarin	Spanish
Spanish	Spanish	Vietnamese	
French	Filipino (Tagalog)		
Serbian	Serbian		
Arabic	Farsi		
Polish	Chinese (Canton)		
Turkish	Polish		
Korean	Turkish		
	Korean		
	Laotian		
18 Languages	20 Languages	12 Languages	11 Languages

Table 2: Monthly Enrolments - all States/Territories except South Australia

From	To	New enrolments	Transfers *
06/01/95	05/02/95	21 393	42 360
06/02/96	05/03/95	38 972	80 099
06/03/95	05/04/95	46 287	78 368
06/04/95	05/05/95	37 530	72 524
06/05/95	05/06/95	43 496	85 828
06/06/95	05/07/95	40 357	85 112
06/07/95	05/07/95	35 548	78 797
06/08/95	05/09/95	23 163	45 430
06/09/95	05/10/95	31 492	69 623
06/10/95	05/11/95	35 998	69 464
06/11/95	05/12/95	31 558	58 301
06/12/95	06/01/96	20 842	37 896
06/01/96	05/02/96	94 205	207 544
06/02/96	05/03/96	33 701	62 943
06/03/96	05/04/96	34 307	113 608
06/04/96	05/05/96	14 605	32 295
06/06/96	05/06/96	14 902	35 288
06/06/96	05/07/96	12 155	23 192
06/07/96	05/08/96	13 925	23 244

*Transfers: transfers within Divisions, between Divisions, and between States. For transfers between Divisions and States only transfers in are counted, as every transfer in has a corresponding transfer out, and to include both would be double counting. The figures do not include re-enrolments, reinstatements and no-change enrolments.

Table 3: Monthly Enrolments - South Australia

From	To	Adds *1	Amendments *2
09/02/95	28/02/95	3 099	1 174
29/02/95	03/03/95	7	34
02/03/95	03/04/95	5 929	2 782
04/04/95	28/04/95	13 464	8 199
29/04/95	31/05/95	18 249	19 668
01/06/95	30/06/95	9 752	18 220
01/07/95	21/07/95	10 690	9 644
22/07/96	10/08/95	9 658	9 315
11/08/95	31/08/95	8 306	6 194
01/09/95	29/09/95	11 538	10 409
30/09/95	31/10/95	7 939	7 363
01/11/95	30/11/95	7 146	4 032
01/12/95	21/12/95	3 546	4 708
22/12/95	05/02/96	36 346	11 116
06/02/96	29/02/96	7 918	4 089
01/03/96	29/03/96	17 648	5 636
30/03/96	30/04/96	13 278	5 512
01/05/96	31/05/96	5 815	3 432
01/06/96	28/06/96	3 491	1 878
29/06/96	08/08/96	5 931	3 179

*1 Adds includes reinstatements, re-enrolments, interstate transfers in and intrastate transfers in.

*2 Amendments = transfers within Divisions.

Table 4: Incomplete Facsimile Enrolments by State/Territory

State/Territory	Incomplete Faxes
New South Wales	18
Victoria	138
Queensland	13
South Australia	62
Western Australia	12
Tasmania	0
Northern Territory	5
TOTAL	248

Table 5: External and Internal Territory Enrolments

External Territory	Enrolment
Norfolk Island	129
Cocos (Keeling) Islands	398
Christmas Island	672
Australian Antarctic Territory (including Macquarie Island)	no permanent residents
Territory of Heard Island and McDonald Island	no permanent residents
Coral Sea Islands	no permanent residents
Territory of Ashmore and Cartier Islands	no permanent residents

Internal Territory	Enrolment
Australian Capital Territory	205 369
Northern Territory	102 993
Jervis Bay Territory	274

Table 6: Multiple Voting by State/Territory - 1980 to 1996

	1980	1983	1984	1987	1990	1993	1996
NSW	14	3	16	130	131	166	238
Vic	0	7	13	61	109	200	245
Qld	7	14	21	37	28	62	89
SA	1	3	3	8	22	30	51
WA	1	3	4	14	25	49	44
TAS	1	0	1	9	17	13	278
NT	0	0	0	3	0	6	4
ACT	0	1	0	1	6	9	13
TOTAL	24	31	58	263	338	535	962
% Votes	0.0003	0.0003	0.0006	0.0027	0.0033	0.0049	0.0085

Table 7: Multiple Voting by Division - 1996

New South Wales	
Banks	7
Barton	10
Bennelong	3
Berowra	6
Blaxland	41
Bradfield	4
Calare	1
Charlton	0
Chifley	9
Cook	1
Cowper	2
Cunningham	3
Dobell	0
Eden-Monaro	0
Farrer	0
Fowler	16
Gilmore	1
Grayndler	8
Greenaway	2
Gwydir	0
Hughes	5
Hume	4
Hunter	0
Kingsford Smith	0
Lindsay	3
Lowe	6
Lyne	3
MacArthur	3
Mackellar	6
Macquarie	0
Mitchell	4
Newcastle	0
New England	1
North Sydney	10
Page	0
Parkes	2
Parramatta	7
Paterson	4
Prospect	9
Reid	6
Richmond	6
Riverina	3
Robertson	3
Shortland	2
Sydney	2
Throsby	3
Warringah	7
Queensland	

Watson	12
Wentworth	7
Werriwa	6
TOTAL	238

Victoria	
Aston	8
Ballarat	5
Batman	12
Bendigo	5
Bruce	13
Burke	0
Calwell	2
Casey	12
Chisholm	10
Corangamite	1
Corio	8
Deakin	14
Dunkley	2
Flinders	0
Gellibrand	23
Gippsland	2
Goldstein	4
Higgins	13
Holt	5
Hotham	17
Indi	2
Isaacs	6
Jagajaga	1
Kooyong	8
Lalor	3
Latrobe	4
McEwan	3
McMillan	5
Mallee	8
Maribyrnong	8
Melbourne	6
Melbourne Ports	6
Menzies	3
Murray	7
Scullin	6
Wannon	1
Wills	12
TOTAL	245

Western Australia	
--------------------------	--

Bowman	4
Brisbane	6
Capricornia	2
Dawson	1
Dickson	3
Fadden	4
Fairfax	2
Fisher	6
Forde	9
Griffith	1
Groom	1
Herbert	2
Hinkler	5
Kennedy	2
Leichhardt	4
Lilley	9
Longman	0
McPherson	6
Maranoa	3
Moncrief	0
Moreton	2
Oxley	2
Petrie	2
Rankin	5
Ryan	1
Wide Bay	7
TOTAL	89

NT	4
-----------	----------

ACT	
Canberra	4
Fraser	5
Namadgi	4
TOTAL	13

Brand	1
Canning	0
Cowan	4
Curtin	9
Forrest	1
Fremantle	13
Kalgoorlie	1
Karratha	0
Moore	0
O'Connor	0
Pearce	1
Perth	6
Stirling	3
Swan	0
Tangney	5
TOTAL	44

South Australia	
Adelaide	7
Barker	2
Bonython	1
Boothby	1
Grey	11
Hindmarsh	0
Kingston	0
Makin	2
Mayo	4
Port Adelaide	12
Sturt	6
Wakefield	5
TOTAL	51

Tasmania	
Bass	32
Braddon	59
Denison	69
Franklin	65
Lyon	53
TOTAL	278

National Total	962
-----------------------	------------

**Table 8: Nominations for the House of Representatives -
Nomination Period - Divisional Offices**

	30/1	31/1	1/2	2/2	3/2	5/2	6/2	7/2	8/2	9/2
NSW	4	8	8	12		23	26	44	45	33
Qld		2		4		2	4	9	25	19
SA		1		1		2	3	4	11	10
Tas						1		6	6	1
Vic	1		1	7	1	10	61	72	32	29
WA	1	1	4	3	1	3	6	18	15	14
ACT				1						3
NT				1					1	1
TOTAL	6	12	13	29	2	41	100	153	135	110

**Table 9: Nominations for House of Representatives -
Last Day - Divisional Offices**

	8.30-9.00	9 -10	10-11	11-11.30	11.30-12
NSW		4	9	4	16
Qld	1	3	6	3	6
SA		3	3		4
Tas			1		
Vic	1	8	7	2	11
WA		4	5	1	4
ACT			1	1	1
NT				1	
TOTAL	2	22	32	12	42

**Table 10: Nominations for House of Representatives -
Nomination Period - Head Offices - Bulk Nominations**

	30/1	31/1	1/2	2/2	3/2	5/2	6/2	7/2
NSW				1			2	2
Qld						1	2	4
SA				1			1	2
Tas							3	
Vic						1	2	3 ¹
WA							1	
ACT							1	2
NT							1	1
TOTAL				2		2	13	12

Table 11: Nominations for Ungrouped Candidates - Senate - Nomination Period

State	30/1	31/1	1/2	2/2	3/2	5/2	6/2	7/2	8/2	9/2
NSW			1	1		2	1	1	3	2
QLD				1		1			2	
SA										1
TAS										
VIC		2		1		1		1	1 ²	1
WA								1	2	1
ACT				1			1			2
NT										1
TOTAL		2	1	4		4	2	3	8	8

Table 12: Nominations for Ungrouped Candidates - Senate - Last Day

	8.30-9.00	9 -10	10-11	11-11.30	11.30-12
NSW		1	1		
Qld					
SA				1	2
Tas					
Vic				1	
WA					1
ACT		1			1
NT			1		
TOTAL		2	2	2	2

¹ One of these bulk nominations was the second part of a nomination lodged on 6 February.

² Nomination withdrawn 9 February

Table 13: Nominations for Groups - Senate - Nomination Period

		30/ 1	31/ 1	1/2	2/2	3/2	5/2	6/2	7/2	8/2	9/2
											1
NSW		1		1			2	6	5	2	
Qld					1		1	1	3	5	7
SA			1		1	1	1	2	4	1	2
Tas								2	3	2	1
Vic							8	3	11	12	4
WA		1		1			2	1	1	2	1
ACT								1	1	3	
NT								1	2		
TOTAL		2	1	2	2	1	14	17	30	27	16

Table 14: Nominations for Groups - Senate - Last Day

	8.30-9	9 -10	10-11	11- 11.30	11.30- 12
NSW			1		
Qld		1	3	2	1
SA			1		1
Tas					1
Vic			4		
WA				1	
ACT					
NT					
TOTAL		1	9	3	3

Table 15: Pre-Poll and Postal Voting 1983 to 1996

	1983	1984	1987	1990	1993	1996
NSW	111 181	117 408	194 329	168 810	212 983	256 100
ACT	15 142	16 473	24 525	20 699	32 785	30 771
Vic	95 449	107 160	181 939	142 228	170 679	192 662
Qld	67 430	71 024	91 165	103 246	129 699	157 265
SA	32 138	30 096	61 552	46 195	51 375	56 601
WA	23 684	25 559	41 376	37 469	45 529	65 788
Tas	16 407	12 267	16 532	15 331	17 589	26 239
NT	4 982	4 817	7 652	6 309	7 241	9 019
TOTAL	366 413	384 804	619 070	540 287	667 880	794 445
% Total	3.91	3.9	5.98	5.26	6.1	7.03

Table 16: Postal Vote Applications - Campaign Material

State/Territory	Number
New South Wales	1
Victoria	33
Queensland	0
South Australia	41
Western Australia	4
Tasmania	20
Northern Territory	0
TOTAL	79

Applications

Warringah	2
Watson	8
Wentworth	24
Werriwa	27
TOTAL	750

Victoria	
Aston	16
Ballarat	104
Batman	10
Bendigo	106
Bruce	86
Burke	0
Calwell	1
Casey	8
Chisholm	18
Corangamite	2
Corio	10
Deakin	59
Dunkley	180
Flinders	45
Gellibrand	10
Gippsland	0
Goldstein	45
Higgins	51
Holt	7
Hotham	6
Indi	8
Isaacs	3
Jagajaga	25
Kooyong	47
Lalor	0
	5

Queensland	
Bowman	14
Brisbane	17
Capricornia	17
Dawson	1
Dickson	25
Fadden	6
Fairfax	5
Fisher	47
Forde	6
Griffith	68
Groom	9
Herbert	22
Hinkler	28
Kennedy	58
Leichhardt	15
Lilley	76
Longman	8
McPherson	9
Maranoa	2
Moncrief	66
Moreton	118
Oxley	6
Petrie	73
Rankin	3
Ryan	7
Wide Bay	13
TOTAL	719

NT	7
-----------	----------

ACT	
Canberra	4
Fraser	0
Namadgi	0
TOTAL	4

Western Australia	
Brand	7
Canning	35
Cowan	48
Curtin	42
Forrest	2
Fremantle	10
Kalgoorlie	115
Karratha	0
Moore	41
O'Connor	8
Pearce	2
Perth	18
Stirling	3
Swan	48
Tangney	3
TOTAL	382

South Australia	
Adelaide	40
Barker	1
Bonython	3
Boothby	10
Grey	20
Hindmarsh	27
Kingston	14
Makin	18
Mayo	15
Port Adelaide	3
Sturt	7
Wakefield	5
TOTAL	163

National Total	3 027
-----------------------	--------------

Table 18: Prisoner Mobile Polling by Division

Division	Prisoner Voting
Calare	28
Canning	102
Capricornia	8
Grey	44
Groom	9
Herbert	28
Hume	2
Kalgoorlie	99
Kingsford-Smith	24
Melbourne	42
Northern Territory	188
Page	40
Parramatta	89
Paterson	17
Reid	10
Total	730

Table 19: Absent Voting from 1983 to 1996

	1983	1984	1987	1990	1993	1996
NSW	283 754	221 284	247 913	241 668	216 929	211 290
Vic	132 438	121 381	129 566	151 534	152 497	143 464
Qld	113 269	89 297	105 807	110 972	113 892	126 677
WA	77 190	51 998	75 290	68 588	70 746	77 469
SA	50 880	41 348	51 200	54 418	53 946	52 628
Tas	28 403	13 497	12 199	16 281	16027	21 277
ACT	3 178	2 474	2 718	3 015	3 739	5 184
Total	689 112	541 279	624 693	646 476	627 776	637 989