26. The Results and the Pendulum

Malcolm Mackerras

The two most interesting features of the 2010 election were that it was close and it was an early election. Since early elections are two-a-penny in our system, I shall deal with the closeness of the election first. The early nature of the election does, however, deserve consideration because it was early on two counts. These are considered below. Of our 43 general elections so far, this was the only one both to be close and to be an early election.

Table 26.1 Months of General Elections for the Australian House of Representatives, 1901–2010

Month	Number	Years
March	5	1901, 1983, 1990, 1993, 1996
April	2	1910, 1951
May	4	1913, 1917, 1954, 1974
July	1	1987
August	2	1943, 2010
September	4	1914, 1934, 1940, 1946
October	6	1929, 1937, 1969, 1980, 1998, 2004
November	7	1925, 1928, 1958, 1963, 1966, 2001, 2007
December	12	1903, 1906, 1919, 1922, 1931, 1949, 1955, 1961, 1972, 1975, 1977, 1984
Total	43	

The Close Election

In the immediate aftermath of polling day, several commentators described this as the closest election in Australian federal history. While I can see why people would say that, I describe it differently. As far as I am concerned, there have been 43 general elections for our House of Representatives of which four can reasonably be described as having been close. They are the House of Representatives plus half-Senate elections held on 31 May 1913, 21 September 1940, 9 December 1961 and 21 August 2010. There has, in my analysis, never been a close double-dissolution election or one for the House of Representatives only.

The 1913 and 1961 elections did not produce a hung parliament. They were so close, however, as to result in the early dissolution of the 5th Parliament and the 24th Parliament respectively. The 1940 election did produce a hung parliament,

which ran its full term. (For a discussion of the expression 'full term', see below.) Eventually, we shall discover the history of the 43rd Parliament. My guess is that it will run to a full term, as did the 16th Parliament, elected in 1940.

Born in 1939, and professionally employed in politics since 1959, I have very good memories of December 1961 and August 2010. There are, in my opinion, two important differences. In 1961 two seats were very closely contested: Moreton, won by the Liberal Party, and Evans, won by Labor. In 2010 none was. For that reason, I consider 1961 to have been closer than 2010. More importantly, perhaps, the closeness of the 1961 election came as a complete shock. In contrast, in 2010 we had a predicted close election. I have been through the 2010 polling-day predictions of the experts. Every recognised analyst predicted a close result.

For 1913 and 1940, I must rely on the journalists of the day. For example, A. N. Smith wrote a magnificent book, *Thirty Years: The Commonwealth of Australia, 1901–1931*, which was published in Melbourne in 1933. Referring to the defeat of Andrew Fisher's Labor Government, he wrote, on pages 129 and 130:

The elections took place on 31st May and were singularly inconclusive. The early counting showed that the party numbers in the House of Representatives were likely to be almost equal. For several days the result depended upon the counting of votes from the outer districts of two widely scattered electorates of New South Wales. In the Riverina Division the retiring Labor member was fiercely assailed by a strong opponent. In the adjoining Hume Division the veteran Sir William Lyne, who had supported the Labor Government, was also on the defence. The final returns were against both and the seats went to the Opposition. Against these was to be set Ballarat, vacated by Mr. Deakin, where, after a similar close contest, the seat went to Labor by a small majority.

After ten or twelve days of doubt the Labor Party lost command of the House of Representatives by one member. Its losses included five seats in New South Wales and four in Victoria. But it won Bendigo from Sir John Quick, who had been a member of the Federal Convention, and to whom Federation owed so much, and also seats in Queensland, South Australia and Western Australia. The Liberals secured 38 seats against 37 gained by the Labor Party.

The records tell us that the second term of the Fisher Government ran from 29 April 1910 to 24 June 1913. More importantly, they tell us that in Hume the votes were 11 575 for Robert Patten (Liberal) and 11 236 for Sir William Lyne. In Riverina the votes were 11 674 for Franc Brereton Sadleir Falkiner (Liberal) and 11 208 for the sitting Labor Member, John Moore Chanter. These were close results but they were not nearly as close as Moreton in 1961. For that reason, I

consider the 1961 election to have been closer than in 1913. The 5th Parliament first met on 9 July 1913 and was dissolved on 30 July 1914, so its length was one year and 21 days. Thus, here was a case of an early dissolution: a double dissolution.

The circumstances of the 1940 election are best described by Don Whittington in his book *The House will Divide*, which was first published in Melbourne in 1954. In his Chapter 9, 'The Menzies governments: 1939–1940', he writes:

Just before the 1940 elections three senior ministers—the Army Minister, G. A., Street; the Vice President of the Executive Council, Sir Henry Gullett; and the Minister for Air, J. V. Fairbairn, were killed in an air crash near Canberra. It was alleged, but never proved, that Fairbairn was flying the machine, a service aircraft, as it approached Canberra airport to land. This was the worst misfortune the Government had experienced, for all three were capable ministers, and all were administering departments directly connected with the war effort.

Worse was to follow, from Menzies' point of view, because at the general election in September 1940 the Government lost its majority. Government and Labor parties were returned with 36 each, two Independents holding the balance of power. Thus was ushered in what was probably the most fantastic era in Australian politics, an era in which the Commonwealth had a Government depending for survival on the votes of two Independents, but with elements within its own ranks which were not prepared to subjugate personal ambitions and prejudices to the prosecution of the war. (Whittington 1954, 73)

On page 74, in Chapter 10, 'Twelve months' turmoil', Whittington writes:

As sometimes happens in politics, the minor issues of the 1940 election, which were virtually ignored, were more significant than the events which occupied the public eye.

Not until the election was over, for instance, was the full importance appreciated of the two men who held the balance of power in the new Parliament. One was A. W. Coles, one of two brothers who had created what was by then one of the biggest chain store organizations in Australia; the other was Alex Wilson, a Victorian wheat farmer of the post World War I era, who, like most of his fellows, had financial dealings with the private banks about which he retained a sense of grievance.

Coles entered the Parliament as the Independent member for the Victorian seat of Henty, but joined the U. A. P. [United Australia

Party] about eight months later. Wilson was elected as an Independent Country Party candidate, and announced that he would support the Government, though it was known his support would be conditional on the Government meeting his wishes on a number of matters, particularly financial policy.

Menzies lost the office of Prime Minister to Arthur Fadden on 29 August 1941. Then the Fadden Government was defeated in the House of Representatives on a vote described by Whittington in Chapter 10 (1954, 84–85) as follows:

Curtin moved: 'That while agreeing that the expenditure requisite for the maximum prosecution of the war should be provided by Parliament, the Committee is opposed to unjust methods prescribed by the Budget, declares that they are contrary to equality of sacrifice, and directs that the plan of the Budget should be recast to ensure a more equitable distribution of the national burden.'

Curtin knew—though few others did—that he would have the support of both Coles and Wilson. In a brief speech, Coles said: 'I regard the proposal of the Leader of the Opposition as a motion of want of confidence in the Government. [There is]...a loss of confidence in the Government's ability to carry on and to wage the maximum war effort. I told the Prime Minister I would vote against this Government today because he cannot give any assurance to the Parliament. He gave to the Governor-General an assurance he was not justified in giving because he had not consulted me. I told those Ministers who approached me when the ex-Prime Minister was being removed that I would not stand for it and that I would not support the Government.'

Wilson said he would support Labor also because he disapproved of the Government's financial policy.

Curtin's amendment was carried, and the Government resigned. Nairn, the U. A. P. Speaker, agreed to carry on under Labor, which gave it an extra vote in the House. The Curtin Cabinet was sworn in on October 7, 1941.

The truly interesting feature of the 16th Parliament is that it remained (until 2010) the sole hung parliament of the past 100 years. Yet it lasted for a full term of three years. Part of the reason for this stability was that there was a change of government during the term.

I remember the 1961 election very well indeed. From October 1959, I was a research officer with the Federal Secretariat of the Liberal Party and on polling night in 1961 I went into the tally room in Canberra with the same attitude as

everybody else: Menzies was going to win, probably with minimal losses of seats. Menzies was a political genius who had always won bigger than expected so the same would happen again. There was only one opinion poll at the time. Released on Thursday, 7 December, it showed 47 per cent intending to vote Liberal-Country Party, 47 per cent for Labor and 6 per cent for the anti-Labor Democratic Labor Party (DLP)—a result that, in two-party preferred terms, represented an electorate dividing nearly 53–47 per cent in favour of Menzies. In other words, the swing to Labor was predicted to be only a little more than 1 per cent.

The polls closed at 8 pm in those days, and I gathered in the small tally room with the then Federal Director, Bob Willoughby. We were a bit shocked that Wide Bay was early looking like a loss to Labor, but it was a Country Party seat! We could not believe the figures being posted for Cowper where Sir Earle Page looked to be in trouble. In our disbelief, we asked Frank Ley, the Chief Electoral Officer, to check the Cowper figures, which, we thought, could not possibly be correct. Ley assured us they were correct. Anyway Cowper, like Wide Bay, was also a Country Party seat!

Willoughby was a bit disappointed at the emerging picture but he displayed no sign of recognising the danger to the government. *The Sun-Herald* on 10 December ran the headline 'LIBS BACK, but with a reduced majority'. Arthur Calwell was reported to have conceded defeat to reporters at 11 pm on election night. Late on that Sunday, Willoughby and I did some figure work and concluded that the probable result was a 61–61 seat draw. The press did not, however, seem fully to understand. The Monday-morning headline in the *Sydney Morning Herald* was 'Swing against Menzies grows', but the paper believed the government had been returned. In *The Canberra Times*, the swing was noted but '[t]he government will, however, retain a working majority in the House of Representatives'.

In our belief that the result would be a 61–61 draw, we were convinced there would have to be another election. If the Liberal Party agreed to provide the speakership then it would give Labor a one-seat majority. Anyway, on 18 December the result became known. The seat of Moreton in Queensland was retained by Jim Killen and the result was 62–60 in favour of Menzies.

I consider 1961 to have been our closest election so I explain by comparing Moreton in 1961 with Corangamite in 2010. In the Moreton case the final win by Killen was with a majority of 130 votes: 26 239 for Killen (Liberal) and 26 109 for O'Donnell (Labor). In percentage terms that was 50.12 per cent for Killen and 49.88 per cent for O'Donnell. In the Corangamite case, the final win by Darren

Cheeseman was with a majority of 771 votes: 47 235 for Cheeseman (Labor) and 46 464 for Sarah Henderson (Liberal). In percentage terms that was 50.41 per cent for Cheeseman and 49.59 per cent for Henderson.

The close 1961 and 2010 elections make for an interesting comparative exercise, with party roles reversed. In both cases a Queensland anti-government landslide nearly brought the government down. In both cases, however, Victoria saved the government. In both cases, the system of compulsory preferences saved the party in power. In 1961 the 80–20 distribution of DLP preferences in favour of the Coalition saved the Liberal Party the seats of Bennelong (NSW), Bruce (Vic.), Maribyrnong (Vic.) and Moreton (Qld) where Labor candidates led on the primary vote. In 2010 the 80–20 distribution of the preferences of the Greens in favour of Labor saved them the seats of Banks, Reid and Robertson in New South Wales, Corangamite, Deakin and La Trobe in Victoria and Lilley and Moreton in Queensland where Liberal candidates led on the primary vote.

The contrasts between the cases are, first, between a long-term Liberal prime minister (Bob Menzies) saved by the system and a short-term Labor prime minister (Julia Gillard) equivalently saved. Second, the Menzies 62–60 win gave him majority government, but the Gillard 76–74 win gave her only minority government. Against that it should be noted (see Table 26.5) that the Menzies Government failed to win a majority of the two-party preferred vote in 1961 whereas the Gillard Government succeeded in that respect in 2010.

The 24th Parliament first met on 20 February 1962 and was dissolved on 1 November 1963, so its length was one year, eight months and 13 days. The November 1963 general election was for the House of Representatives only, accompanied by one Senate casual vacancy election in Queensland. The 43rd Parliament first met on 28 September 2010 and we shall find out its history soon enough. I feel sure it will run full term.

The Early Election

To the best of my knowledge, I am the only person who has ever defined the term ‘early election’ and I shall do that below. In the meantime, I want to say something about the date 21 August, the date sensibly chosen by Julia Gillard. During the 1940s there were four general elections for the House of Representatives accompanied by the normal periodical election for half the Senate. They were held on 21 September 1940, 21 August 1943, 28 September 1946 and 10 December 1949. So the calendars for 1943 and 2010 were identical. Both in 1943 and again in 2010, the elections were the earliest in terms of the time distance from the expiry of the terms of existing senators—namely, 30

June 1944 and 30 June 2011. In 1943 the Australian people replaced a hung parliament with a Labor-majority parliament. In 2010 they did the reverse of that.

It is worth noticing that the Curtin election of 21 August 1943 was a one-option vote. There were no double-dissolution ‘triggers’ in 1943 so Curtin had to make it for the House of Representatives and half the Senate. In contrast, Gillard had a choice not available to Curtin: with 14 ‘trigger’ bills on the list (11 of which related to the carbon pollution reduction scheme), there could have been a double dissolution. In the end, however, she made the same choice as Curtin. There have been three winter elections—all called by Labor prime ministers. The third was the double-dissolution election held on 11 July 1987, called by Bob Hawke. For a full list of the months of elections, see Table 26.1. That table leads me to predict that the next election will be in October 2013.

When I say I am the only person who has ever defined the term ‘early election’, I am referring to my article in *Politics* for May 1984 (Mackerras 1984, 73–84). In that article, I defined an early election as one that results from an early dissolution of the House of Representatives. I have kept that article up to date and the current version of it can be found on the web site of Old Parliament House where, now retired at the age of seventy-two, I am a volunteer guide.

The term ‘early dissolution’ is defined by me to be any dissolution occurring other than in the last six months of the life of the parliament. By definition, therefore, every double-dissolution election is an early election. Consequently, 2010 was self-evidently early. We know that because we know the double-dissolution option was available. So the three winter elections give us two early cases (1987 and 2010) and one case when the election was not early: 1943.

This was our forty-third general election for the House of Representatives and our nineteenth early election. The early elections were held in December 1903, September 1914, May 1917, December 1919, October 1929, December 1931, September 1934, April 1951, December 1955, November 1963, May 1974, December 1975, December 1977, March 1983, December 1984, July 1987, March 1990, October 1998 and August 2010.

In my article referred to above, I have a table entitled ‘Early Dissolutions of the House of Representatives’ in which I give all the information one needs to know. For the purpose of this chapter, the critical information is the length of the term and the reason to dissolve early. Without going into too much needless detail, I notice that the length of the first Lyons Parliament was two years, five months and 22 days, the first (‘elected’) Menzies Parliament, one year and 25 days, the third Menzies Parliament, one year, three months and one day, the sixth Menzies Parliament, one year, eight months and 13 days, the first Whitlam

Parliament, one year, one month and 15 days, the second Whitlam Parliament, one year, four months and two days, the first Fraser Parliament, one year, eight months and 25 days, the third Fraser Parliament, two years, two months and 10 days, the first Hawke Parliament, one year, six months and five days, the second Hawke Parliament, two years, three months and 16 days, the third Hawke Parliament, two years, five months and five days, the first Howard Parliament, two years and four months, and the Rudd–Gillard Parliament, two years, five months and seven days. Notice the striking similarity between the first Lyons Parliament and the Rudd–Gillard Parliament.

More interesting than the above, however, is the reason given by each prime minister for the early dissolution. The reason ‘to preserve/restore simultaneous elections with the half-Senate’ accounts for six cases: 1903, 1917, 1955, 1977, 1984 and 1990. Section 57 dissolutions (double dissolutions) also account for six cases: 1914, 1951, 1974, 1975, 1983 and 1987. There are three cases of the need for a new mandate for policies—1919, 1934 and 1998—and three cases coming under the heading ‘instability in the House of Representatives’: 1929, 1931 and 1963.

That left just one case for which I needed a description: the dissolution occurring on 19 July 2010. Gillard did not give one so I entered this as the reason: ‘to enable Julia Gillard to become an elected prime minister.’ I placed the term ‘elected prime minister’ in inverted commas.

**Table 26.2 House of Representatives: Seats won, 24 November 2007
general election—actual**

State/Territory	Labor	Liberal	Nationals	Independent	Total
New South Wales	28	15	5	1	49
Victoria	21	14	2	-	37
Queensland	15	10	3	1	29
Western Australia	4	11	-	-	15
South Australia	6	5	-	-	11
Tasmania	5	-	-	-	5
Australian Capital Territory	2	-	-	-	2
Northern Territory	2	-	-	-	2
Total	83	55	10	2	150

**Table 26.3 House of Representatives: Seats won, 24 November 2007
general election – notional (including Lyne by-election)**

State/Territory	Labor	Liberal	Nationals	Independent	Total
New South Wales	30	12	4	2	48
Victoria	21	14	2	-	37
Queensland	17	9	3	1	30
Western Australia	5	10	-	-	15
South Australia	6	5	-	-	11
Tasmania	5	-	-	-	5
Australian Capital Territory	2	-	-	-	2
Northern Territory	2	-	-	-	2
Total	88	50	9	3	150

**Table 26.4 House of Representatives: Seats won, 21 August 2010 general
election – actual**

	Labor	Liberal	Nationals	Independent	Greens	Total
New South Wales	26	16	4	2	-	48
Victoria	22	12	2	-	1	37
Queensland	8	16	5	1	-	30
Western Australia	3	11	1	-	-	15
South Australia	6	5	-	-	-	11
Tasmania	4	-	-	1	-	5
Australian Capital Territory	2	-	-	-	-	2
Northern Territory	1	1	-	-	-	2
Total	72	61	12	4	1	150

Table 26.5 Aggregate Two-Party Preferred Percentages, 1940–2010

Election	Percentage Labor	Percentage UAP-Lib.-CP-Nats	Percentage swing
1940 ^a	50.3	49.7	0.9 to Labor
1943 ^a	58.2	41.8	7.9 to Labor
1946 ^a	54.1	45.9	4.1 to Lib.-CP
1949 ^a	49.0	51.0	5.1 to Lib.-CP
1951 ^a	49.3	50.7	0.3 to Labor
1954 ^a	50.7	49.3	1.4 to Labor
1955 ^a	45.7	54.3	5.0 to Lib.-CP
1958 ^a	45.9	54.1	0.2 to Labor
1961 ^a	50.5	49.5	4.6 to Labor
1963 ^a	47.4	52.6	3.1 to Lib.-CP
1966 ^a	43.1	56.9	4.3 to Lib.-CP
1969 ^a	50.2	49.8	7.1 to Labor
1972 ^a	52.7	47.3	2.5 to Labor

Election	Percentage Labor	Percentage UAP-Lib.-CP-Nats	Percentage swing
1974 ^a	51.7	48.3	1.0 to Lib.-CP
1975 ^a	44.3	55.7	7.4 to Lib.-CP
1977 ^a	45.4	54.6	1.1 to Labor
1980 ^a	49.6	50.4	4.2 to Labor
1983 ^b	53.2	46.8	3.6 to Labor
1984 ^b	51.8	48.2	1.4 to Lib.-Nats
1987 ^b	50.8	49.2	1.0 to Lib.-Nats
1990 ^b	49.9	50.1	0.9 to Lib.-Nats
1993 ^b	51.4	48.6	1.5 to Labor
1996 ^b	46.4	53.6	5.0 to Lib.-Nats
1998 ^b	51.0	49.0	4.6 to Labor
2001 ^b	49.1	50.9	1.9 to Lib.-Nats
2004 ^b	47.3	52.7	1.8 to Lib.-Nats
2007 ^b	52.7	47.3	5.4 to Labor
2010 ^b	50.1	49.9	2.6 to Lib.-Nats

Notes: ^a In respect of the 17 general elections from 1940 to 1980 (inclusive), the statistics are from *estimates* of the two-party preferred vote; ^b in respect of the 11 general elections from 1983 to 2010 (inclusive), the statistics are the percentages of the *actual* two-party preferred vote aggregates.

Table 26.6 Labor's Two-Party Preferred Percentages at Winning Elections

Election	Winner	Incumbent prime minister?	Percentage Labor
1943	Curtin	Yes	58.2
1946	Chifley	Yes	54.1
1983	Hawke	No	53.2
2007	Rudd	No	52.7
1972	Whitlam	No	52.7
1984	Hawke	Yes	51.8
1974	Whitlam	Yes	51.7
1993	Keating	Yes	51.4
1987	Hawke	Yes	50.8
2010	Gillard	Yes	50.1
1990	Hawke	Yes	49.9

House Seat Gains and Losses in 2010

In 1961, 1963, 1966 and 1969 seats in the House of Representatives changed hands only in one direction. In 1961 Labor gained 15 seats and lost none. In 1963 and 1966 Labor lost 10 and 11 seats, respectively, and made no gains. In 1969 Labor gained 20 seats and lost none.

Beginning in 1972, however, the normal pattern has been for seats to change hands in both directions. The exceptional cases were 1975 (Labor lost 28 seats and gained none), 1983 (Labor gained 22 seats and lost none), 1984 (Labor lost eight seats and gained none) and 1996 when Labor lost 33 seats and gained none. For all the 1998, 2001, 2004, 2007 and 2010 elections, seats have changed hands in both directions. The unusual nature of 2010 is the big difference with the result in 2007 when one compares the actual result (Table 26.2) with the notional result on the new boundaries in New South Wales, Queensland and Western Australia (Table 26.3). Consequently, I shall give the seat gains and losses in each of these States.

In New South Wales, Labor won 28 seats in 2007 and 26 in 2010. On an actual basis that is two losses, and one would identify the two as Bennelong and Macquarie. Only in Bennelong was a sitting Labor member defeated: Maxine McKew. If one takes the base as 30 seats, however, there were four losses: Gilmore and Macarthur, notional, and Bennelong and Macquarie, actual.

In Queensland, Labor won 15 seats in 2007 and eight in 2010. Actual losses were Bonner, Brisbane, Dawson, Flynn, Forde, Leichhardt and Longman. Additional notional losses were Dickson and Herbert. Of the new members, those in Dawson and Flynn joined the caucus of The Nationals, increasing the number of Queensland Nationals from three in 2007 to five in 2010: Dawson, Flynn, Hinkler, Maranoa and Wide Bay.

In Western Australia, the redistribution caused the Liberal seat of Swan to become notionally Labor; however, the sitting Liberal, Steve Irons, retained it. Labor lost Hasluck to the Liberal Party but Liberal Wilson Tuckey was defeated in O'Connor by Tony Crook of The Nationals.

There were no changes in party numbers in South Australia or the Australian Capital Territory. In Tasmania, Labor lost Denison to the Independent Andrew Wilkie. In the Northern Territory, Labor lost Solomon to the Country Liberals—the new member being Natasha Griggs who joined the party room of the Liberal Party. In Victoria (where there was no redistribution of seats), Labor gained La Trobe and McEwen from the Liberal Party.

American analysts of congressional elections have a term, 'retirement slump', which refers to the average fall-off in the party's vote when the incumbent retires. I think, in addition to that, the term 'retirement loss' is appropriate for Australia. The following members of our House of Representatives retired—and saw their seat lost to another party or to an Independent: Fran Bailey in McEwen, James Bidgood in Dawson, Bob Debus in Macquarie, Duncan Kerr in Denison and Lindsay Tanner in Melbourne.

Table 26.4 shows the current state of parties of the House of Representatives. As can be seen there are five 'others': the Greens Member for Melbourne and four Independents. When their intentions were finally revealed on the afternoon of Tuesday, 7 September, it was seen that only Bob Katter in Kennedy intended to support the Coalition, the others supporting Labor. This enables me to divide Table 26.4 into two: the mining States of Queensland, Western Australia and the Northern Territory, and the non-mining States of New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, Tasmania and the Australian Capital Territory.

The 47 seats in the mining States divide 34 for the Coalition, one for the Independent (Katter) supporting the Coalition and a miserable 12 for Labor. The 103 seats in the non-mining States divide 60 for Labor, 39 for the Coalition and the four Labor-supporting 'others'. It is clear from where the Gillard Government and the Abbott opposition get their support.

My friend Martin Gordon points out that there is an alternative way to describe the above. If the outback SA seat of Grey is excluded from 'non-mining Australia' then that populous part of the country (New South Wales, Australian Capital Territory, Victoria, Tasmania and non-outback South Australia) accounts for 102 seats, of which Labor and its supporters have 64 and the Coalition thirty-eight.

Then 'mining Australia' would be Queensland, Western Australia, Northern Territory—and Grey. So the Coalition would have 36 seats in 'mining Australia' and Labor only twelve. In Grey itself, according to Gordon (in email correspondence in 2010):

The striking thing is the swings to Liberal in Whyalla, 7.5 per cent, Port Pirie 10 per cent, Roxby Downs, 8.9 per cent, and also Andamooka and Coober Pedy. Whyalla has produced probably the best Liberal TPP vote (5,005 versus 6,461) for a long time. In fact the state seat of Giles would only have a Labor lead of 7,858 to 8,172...The Liberal TPP vote in Stuart and Frome is very impressive also.

Analysis of House Swings

Tables 26.7, 26.8, 26.9 and 26.10 set out the important information. Combining my look at these tables, I think the following observations can be made.

Table 26.7 The 10 Biggest Swings to Labor

Rank	Seat*	AEC demographic rating	% swing to Labor
1. (SS)	Kingston (Labor, SA)	Outer metropolitan	9.5
2. (SS)	Franklin (Labor, Tas.)	Outer metropolitan	6.8
3.	Lalor (Labor, Vic.)	Outer metropolitan	6.6
4.	Bass (Labor, Tas.)	Provincial	5.7
5. (SS)	Wakefield (Labor, SA)	Outer metropolitan	5.4
6. (RS)	McEwen (Liberal, Vic.)	Rural	5.3
7. (SS)	Corio (Labor, Vic.)	Provincial	5.3
8. (SS)	Braddon (Labor, Tas.)	Rural	5.2
9. (SS)	Makin (Labor, SA)	Outer metropolitan	4.5
10.	Lyons (Labor, Tas.)	Rural	4.0

SS = 'sophomore surge'

RS = 'retirement slump'

* The party shown is the one holding the seat before the 2010 election

Table 26.8 The 10 Biggest Swings to the Liberal-Nationals

Rank	Seat*	AEC demographic rating	% swing to Liberal-Nationals
1. (RS)	Fowler (Labor, NSW)	Outer metropolitan	13.8
2.	Wentworth (Liberal, NSW)	Inner metropolitan	11.0
3.	Bowman (Liberal, Qld)	Outer metropolitan	10.4
4.	Groom (Liberal, Qld)	Provincial	10.3
5.	O'Connor (Liberal, WA)	Rural	10.2
6.	Watson (Labor, NSW)	Inner metropolitan	9.1
7.	Banks (Labor, NSW)	Inner metropolitan	8.9
8.	Hinkler (Nationals, Qld)	Rural	8.9
9.	Maranoa (Nationals, Qld)	Rural	8.8
10.	Leichhardt (Labor, Qld)	Rural	8.6

RS = 'retirement slump'

* The party shown is the one holding the seat before the 2010 election

First, the Liberal National Party (LNP) performed very well in Queensland and the Liberal Party performed very well in those parts of the Sydney metropolitan area with a substantial Asian population. I argue that the sacking of Kevin Rudd was the main reason for these big swings.

Second, in the Northern Territory the Country Liberal Party (CLP) candidate for the substantially Aboriginal division of Lingiari secured a big swing. The candidate, Leo Abbott, was Aboriginal. I have not yet been able to examine the detail of swings within this division. My friend Martin Gordon has, however, done a thorough analysis and he assures me the swing was entirely due to the Aboriginal polling places. In the predominantly white polling places, there was no swing at all. In addition to this good performance in Lingiari, the CLP gained Darwin-based Solomon on a much lower swing.

Third, Julia Gillard in her western suburbs of Melbourne division of Lalor and Malcolm Turnbull in his eastern suburbs of Sydney division of Wentworth gained high levels of personal voting.

Fourth, Labor performed very well in Victoria and Tasmania.

Fifth, high levels of ‘sophomore surge’ were recorded. These deserve a special mention. According to Wikipedia, a sophomore surge is

a term used in the political science of the US Congress that refers to an increase in votes that congressional candidates [candidates for the House of Representatives] usually receive when running for their first re-election. The phrase has been adopted in Australia by psephologist Malcolm Mackerras who is well-known for his electoral pendulums.

Under the heading ‘etymology’, it says the word ‘sophomore’ is commonly used to refer to someone in their second year of high school or college. Under the heading ‘history’, it says the phenomenon of sophomore surge was first noticed by political scientists in the 1960s.

The two biggest individual seat swings to Labor are both cases of sophomore surge. Otherwise, the two cases are rather different. Whereas Kingston is a case of South Australia as ‘the State of sophomore surge’, Franklin illustrates both retirement slump and sophomore surge. In 2007, Harry Quick retired from Franklin. The new Labor candidate, Julie Collins, was able to retain the seat. The swing to Liberal in Franklin in 2007 was, however, 3.1 per cent—the biggest swing to Liberal in Australia. So Franklin is the Australian equivalent of an American congressional district. First, there was retirement slump—but it was followed by sophomore surge. That is the typical American pattern.

South Australia is described above as ‘the State of sophomore surge’. What is interesting about South Australia is that no division changed its member at

this election. Grey, Kingston, Makin, Port Adelaide and Wakefield, however, changed their members in 2007, with Kingston, Makin and Wakefield Labor gains. In September 2008, Mayo changed its member at a by-election. In all of these six divisions, there was a swing in favour of the sitting member—the most notable cases being Kingston, Wakefield, Makin and Grey.

Table 26.9 Two-Party Preferred Votes and Swings in Each Division, 2010

Division	Votes preferring Labor		Votes preferring Lib-Nats		% swing to Lib-Nats
	Votes	%	Votes	%	
NEW SOUTH WALES					
Banks	43 150	51.4	40 719	48.6	8.9
Barton	44 742	56.9	33 941	43.1	8.1
Bennelong	40 166	46.9	45 518	53.1	4.5
Berowra	28 972	33.8	56 752	66.2	6.2
Blaxland	45 948	62.2	27 882	37.8	4.4
Bradfield	27 719	31.8	59 397	68.2	4.3
Calare (n)	35 033	39.3	54 209	60.7	7.3
Charlton	52 064	62.7	31 016	37.3	0.2
Chifley	50 103	62.3	30 268	37.7	7.3
Cook	33 450	37.3	56 138	62.7	6.3
Cowper (n)	34 691	40.7	50 477	59.3	8.0
Cunningham	56 234	63.2	32 780	36.8	3.7
Dobell	45 551	55.1	37 163	44.9	−1.1
Eden-Monaro	46 300	54.2	39 063	45.8	−1.9
Farrer	29 434	35.5	53 513	64.5	3.3
Fowler	45 178	58.8	31 704	41.2	13.8
Gilmore	38 649	44.7	47 850	55.3	5.7
Grayndler	58 789	70.6	24 450	29.4	4.2
Greenway	40 355	50.9	38 953	49.1	4.8
Hughes	38 688	44.8	47 619	55.2	4.6
Hume	36 337	41.3	51 679	58.7	3.4
Hunter (n)	50 803	62.5	30 511	37.5	3.2
Kingsford Smith	45 249	55.2	36 780	44.8	8.1
Lindsay	42 546	51.1	40 681	48.9	5.2
Lyne (n)	31 902	37.6	53 065	62.4	3.6
Macarthur	36 741	47.0	41 462	53.0	3.5
Mackellar	29 855	34.3	57 245	65.7	3.3
Macquarie	42 604	48.7	44 801	51.3	1.5
McMahon	46 170	57.8	33 690	42.2	6.0
Mitchell	27 500	32.8	56 229	67.2	7.5
Newcastle	51 220	62.5	30 744	37.5	3.4

Division	Votes preferring Labor		Votes preferring Lib-Nats		% swing to Lib-Nats
	Votes	%	Votes	%	
New England (n)	30 265	33.2	60 907	66.8	2.0
North Sydney	30 808	35.9	54 901	64.1	8.5
Page (n)	46 273	54.2	39 111	45.8	-1.8
Parkes (n)	27 946	31.1	61 789	68.9	5.2
Parramatta	42 583	54.4	35 734	45.6	5.5
Paterson	36 804	44.7	45 582	55.3	4.7
Reid	41 949	52.7	37 679	47.3	8.2
Richmond (n)	46 071	57.0	34 764	43.0	1.9
Riverina (n)	28 009	31.8	59 980	68.2	3.6
Robertson	43 520	51.0	41 821	49.0	-0.9
Shortland	52 612	62.8	31 101	37.2	1.9
Sydney	53 235	67.1	26 142	32.9	2.3
Throsby	51 909	62.1	31 662	37.9	4.7
Warringah	31 360	36.9	53 612	63.1	4.3
Watson	45 393	59.1	31 364	40.9	9.1
Wentworth	30 457	35.1	56 219	64.9	11.0
Werrriwa	42 740	56.7	32 574	43.3	8.3
Total NSW	1 958 077	48.8	2 051 241	51.2	4.8
VICTORIA					
Aston	40 916	48.2	43 901	51.8	-3.3
Ballarat	55 188	61.7	34 251	38.3	-3.6
Batman	58 028	74.9	19 435	25.1	1.0
Bendigo	54 928	59.5	37 337	40.5	-3.4
Bruce	44 603	58.1	32 144	41.9	0.2
Calwell	61 045	69.7	26 509	30.3	-0.4
Casey	38 439	45.8	45 458	54.2	-1.7
Chisholm	43 459	56.1	33 991	43.9	1.3
Corangamite	47 235	50.4	46 464	49.6	0.4
Corio	53 083	64.2	29 578	35.8	-5.3
Deakin	41 927	52.4	38 073	47.6	-1.0
Dunkley	42 023	49.0	43 777	51.0	-3.0
Flinders	37 002	40.9	53 499	59.1	0.9
Gellibrand	61 531	73.9	21 732	26.1	-2.4
Gippsland (n)	34 199	38.5	54 513	61.5	5.5
Goldstein	36 811	43.5	47 747	56.5	0.4
Gorton	70 705	72.2	27 280	27.8	-0.9
Higgins	35 180	43.3	46 167	56.7	-0.3
Holt	60 412	63.2	35 133	36.8	-1.6
Hotham	50 394	63.5	28 966	36.5	-0.5

Division	Votes preferring Labor		Votes preferring Lib-Nats		% swing to Lib-Nats
	Votes	%	Votes	%	
Indi	33 916	40.1	50 755	59.9	0.7
Isaacs	55 721	61.0	35 594	39.0	-3.3
Jagajaga	52 868	61.5	33 075	38.5	-2.5
Kooyong	34 508	42.5	46 779	57.5	-2.0
La Trobe	45 308	50.9	43 689	49.1	-1.4
Lalor	74 452	72.1	28 736	27.9	-6.6
Mallee (n)	20 842	25.6	60 611	74.4	3.1
Maribyrnong	51 193	66.9	25 379	33.1	-1.5
McEwen	58 144	55.3	46 963	44.7	-5.3
McMillan	38 731	45.6	46 229	54.4	-0.4
Melbourne	65 473	73.3	23 854	26.7	-1.0
Melbourne Ports	48 819	57.6	36 002	42.4	-0.4
Menzies	33 811	41.3	48 102	58.7	2.7
Murray	23 882	29.7	56 666	70.3	2.1
Scullin	57 355	72.2	22 025	27.8	-1.4
Wannon	35 554	42.7	47 697	57.3	-0.2
Wills	61 297	72.6	23 091	27.4	-0.2
Total Victoria	1 758 982	55.3	1 421 202	44.7	-1.0
QUEENSLAND					
Blair	39 814	54.2	33 595	45.8	2.7
Bonner	38 765	47.2	43 400	52.8	7.4
Bowman	32 455	39.6	49 490	60.4	10.4
Brisbane	39 609	48.9	41 440	51.1	5.7
Capricornia (n)	43 150	53.7	37 230	46.3	8.4
Dawson (n)	39 455	47.6	43 494	52.4	5.0
Dickson	36 549	44.9	44 902	55.1	5.9
Fadden	26 356	35.8	47 236	64.2	3.8
Fairfax	34 034	43.1	45 032	56.9	4.0
Fisher	33 784	45.9	39 868	54.1	0.6
Flynn (n)	37 086	46.4	42 806	53.6	5.8
Forde	33 987	48.4	36 271	51.6	5.0
Griffith	47 007	58.5	33 405	41.5	3.9
Groom	26 589	31.5	57 912	68.5	10.3
Herbert	37 797	47.8	41 221	52.2	2.2
Hinkler (n)	31 993	39.6	48 770	60.4	8.9
Kennedy (n)	31 106	38.1	50 616	61.9	4.7
Leichhardt	36 273	45.5	43 539	54.5	8.6
Lilley	46 234	53.2	40 711	46.8	4.8
Longman	36 277	48.1	39 173	51.9	3.8

Division	Votes preferring Labor		Votes preferring Lib-Nats		% swing to Lib-Nats
	Votes	%	Votes	%	
McPherson	31 004	39.7	47 044	60.3	1.6
Maranoa (n)	23 625	27.1	63 520	72.9	8.8
Moncrieff	24 612	32.5	51 103	67.5	3.7
Moreton	41 447	51.1	39 612	48.9	4.9
Oxley	39 894	55.8	31 640	44.2	5.6
Petrie	40 097	52.5	36 267	47.5	1.7
Rankin	44 289	55.4	35 640	44.6	6.3
Ryan	38 138	42.8	50 896	57.2	6.0
Wide Bay (n)	28 029	34.4	53 484	65.6	7.2
Wright	30 049	39.9	45 358	60.1	6.4
Total Queensland	1 069 504	44.9	1 314 675	55.1	5.6
WESTERN AUSTRALIA					
Brand	41 610	53.3	36 418	46.7	2.7
Canning	38 303	47.8	41 818	52.2	-2.2
Cowan	34 992	43.7	45 062	56.3	5.0
Curtin	27 669	33.8	54 158	66.2	2.9
Durack	26 155	36.3	45 843	63.7	6.0
Forrest	33 257	41.3	47 343	58.7	3.3
Fremantle	45 858	55.7	36 478	44.3	3.4
Hasluck	40 774	49.4	41 722	50.6	1.4
Moore	31 901	38.8	50 302	61.2	2.3
O'Connor	22 029	27.0	59 555	73.0	10.2
Pearce	32 349	41.1	46 292	58.9	1.2
Perth	44 815	55.9	35 379	44.1	2.1
Stirling	35 832	44.4	44 775	55.6	4.3
Swan	37 710	47.5	41 729	52.5	2.8
Tangney	31 607	37.7	52 266	62.3	2.5
Total WA	524 861	43.6	679 140	56.4	3.1
SOUTH AUSTRALIA					
Adelaide	50 164	57.7	36 793	42.3	0.8
Barker	34 992	37.1	59 278	62.9	3.4
Boothby	42 042	49.3	43 317	50.7	-2.2
Grey	34 373	38.8	54 119	61.2	6.7
Hindmarsh	49 698	55.7	39 526	44.3	-0.7
Kingston	58 695	63.9	33 139	36.1	-9.5
Makin	53 014	62.2	32 219	37.8	-4.5
Mayo	39 201	42.7	52 702	57.3	0.3
Port Adelaide	63 295	70.0	27 084	30.0	-0.3
Sturt	41 113	46.6	47 172	53.4	2.5
Wakefield	54 528	61.9	33 485	38.1	-5.4
Total SA	521 115	53.2	458 834	46.8	-0.8

Division	Votes preferring Labor		Votes preferring Lib-Nats		% swing to Lib-Nats
	Votes	%	Votes	%	
TASMANIA					
Bass	37 165	56.7	28 337	43.3	−5.7
Braddon	37 650	57.5	27 855	42.5	−5.2
Denison	42 692	65.8	22 167	34.2	−0.5
Franklin	39 856	60.8	25 675	39.2	−6.8
Lyons	40 959	62.3	24 796	37.7	−4.0
Total Tasmania	198 322	60.6	128 830	39.4	−4.4
ACT					
Canberra	66 335	59.1	45 821	40.9	2.7
Fraser	71 613	64.2	39 928	35.8	0.9
Total ACT	137 948	61.7	85 749	38.3	1.7
NORTHERN TERRITORY					
Lingiari	23 051	53.7	19 876	46.3	7.5
Solomon	24 585	48.3	26 371	51.7	1.9
Total Northern Territory	47 636	50.7	46 247	49.3	4.7
Total Australia	6 216 445	50.1	6 185 918	49.9	2.6

Fairness of Our Electoral Boundaries

It is clear that Labor performed very well in Victoria and Tasmania and quite well in South Australia and the Australian Capital Territory. It is equally clear that the Coalition performed very well in the mining jurisdictions of Queensland, Western Australia and the Northern Territory. That leaves our most populous State of which the question must now be asked: who won in New South Wales?

Before I come to New South Wales, I want to give a brief consideration to the Australian Capital Territory. I argue that the swings to Liberal in both divisions were not real swings at all. They were cases of retirement slump, since both seats changed their Labor members through retirement. My basis for this assertion lies in the Senate vote. In 2007 Gary Humphries (Liberal) was elected to the second Senate seat with a quota in his own right. No distribution of preferences was necessary. In 2010, in contrast, he did not receive a quota on the first count. Before he could be elected, the surplus of Kate Lundy (Labor) needed to be distributed, then two other candidates (there were nine in all) needed to be excluded before Humphries was elected.

In New South Wales, Labor won in terms of seats but the Coalition won the two-party preferred vote (see Tables 26.4 and 26.9). That raises this question: can it be argued that the electoral boundaries in New South Wales were gerrymandered in favour of Labor? To so argue would go wholly against everything I have

asserted about our federal redistributions since the electoral reforms of 1983 and 1984. I have asserted that the traditional pattern of boundaries being drawn in favour of the party in power would not happen again after those reforms.

In the case of this election, I point out that Labor won 50.1 per cent of the Australia-wide two-party preferred vote and the Coalition 49.9 per cent. The consequence in seats was that 76 recorded two-party preferred majorities in favour of the Coalition and 74 for Labor. Therefore, it is absurd to suggest that the boundaries were, in any way, loaded in favour of Labor. Quite the reverse! It is true that on my new pendulum the 76–74 distribution goes the other way; that is explained by Lyne and New England. As can be clearly seen from Table 26.9, Lyne and New England were easily won by The Nationals in terms of the two-party preferred vote. Their Independent members, however, decided to keep Labor in office.

Table 26.10 Median Seats on Mackerras Pendulum and Overall Labor Percentages Required for Government

Election year	Median seat	% swing needed	Seat held?	Coalition two-party preferred vote % at previous election	Labor % required on uniform swing
1961	Bowman (Liberal, Qld)	6.2	No	54.1	52.1
1963	Maribyrnong (Liberal, Vic.)	0.9	Yes	49.5	51.4
1966	Robertson (Liberal, NSW)	3.9	Yes	52.6	51.3
1969	Forrest (Liberal, WA)	7.8	No	56.9	50.9
1972	Griffith (Liberal, Qld)	1.6	Yes	49.8	51.8
1974	Mitchell (Labor, NSW)	1.3	No	47.3	51.4
1975	Isaacs (Labor, Vic.)	0.5	No	48.3	51.2
1977	Kingston (Liberal, SA)	6.6	Yes	55.7	50.9
1980	Fadden (Liberal, Qld)	6.1	Yes	54.6	51.5
1983	Bendigo (Liberal, Vic.)	1.4	No	50.4	51.0
1984	Dunkley (Labor, Vic.)	3.1	Yes	46.8	50.1
1987	Lowe (Labor, NSW)	2.3	No	48.2	49.5
1990	Aston (Labor, Vic.)	2.6	No	49.2	48.2
1993	Cowan (Labor, WA)	0.9	No	50.1	49.0
1996	Gilmore (Labor, NSW)	0.5	No	48.6	50.9
1998	Parramatta (Liberal, NSW)	3.9	Yes	53.6	50.3
2001	Moreton (Liberal, Qld)	0.6	Yes	49.0	51.6
2004	Eden-Monaro (Liberal, NSW)	1.7	Yes	50.9	50.8
2007	Bennelong (Liberal, NSW)	4.0	No	52.7	51.3
2010	Longman (Labor, Qld)	1.7	No	47.3	51.0
2013	Greenway (Labor, NSW)	0.9	?	49.9	49.2

Table 26.10 is entitled 'Median Seats on Mackerras Pendulum and Overall Labor Percentages Required for Government'; however, I faced a dilemma here. On the pendulum as actually published, the median seat is Greenway (Labor, NSW) where the Liberal Party needs a swing of 0.9 per cent to regain the seat. That means the overall share for Labor to govern is shown as 49.2 per cent. Those statistics only apply, however, because Lyne and New England have changed sides on the pendulum without having changed their voting patterns. If The Nationals had won both these seats then the Coalition number would have been 76 and the median seat would have been shown as Boothby (Liberal, SA), needing a swing of 0.8 per cent for Labor to win. That being so, the overall share needed for Labor to govern on the uniform-swing model would have been shown as 50.7 per cent—very close to the figure shown in the row above: the even 51 per cent.

Coming back to New South Wales, the argument to suppose a Labor gerrymander would lie in the very economical margins secured by Labor in Greenway, Robertson, Lindsay, Banks and Reid. Here I would say that good old-fashioned luck had a lot to do with those wins. I estimate the 'donkey vote' at this election in those seats to have been worth 1.2 per cent of the formal vote. It happens that Labor had the benefit of the ballot-paper draw in all five seats. If the draw had gone the other way, I think Labor would still have retained Reid but it would have lost Greenway, Robertson, Lindsay and Banks.

When I write of a 'donkey vote' in those seats to have been worth 1.2 per cent, I should mention the basis of that estimate. I went through all the preference distributions in seats in the Newcastle–Sydney–Wollongong conurbation and came up with that estimate. The single most interesting case is Reid where Christian Democratic Party (CDP) voters broke the 'how-to-vote' card that preferenced the Liberal Party. There were five candidates in Reid with the CDP first, Labor second, Greens third, Liberal fourth and Carolyn Kennett of the Socialist Equity Party bottom on the ballot paper. Kennett was first eliminated and CDP second. The CDP candidate, Bill Shailer, had 2445 primary votes and gained 167 from the Kennett distribution. His 2612 votes were distributed 1197 to Labor, 974 to Liberal and 441 to the Greens. My claim that Labor's Banks win was based on the 'donkey vote' is based on my analysis of the Greens distribution in that seat where they were on the top of the ballot paper and Labor was higher than Liberal. In Greenway and Lindsay the Labor candidate was actually on the top of the ballot paper.

Reference was made above to South Australia as 'the State of sophomore surge'. It is worth considering New South Wales in that context. Here I see a contrast between metropolitan Sydney and the country. In the north-western inner-metropolitan seat of Bennelong, Maxine McKew conspicuously failed to get any sophomore surge. I attribute that to her loss of Asian support—

a consequence of the dumping of Kevin Rudd. Also the unpopularity of the State Labor Government had the effect that she gained nothing from Julia Gillard's promise to build the Parramatta–Epping railway. McKew's fate contrasts greatly with that of Janelle Saffin in Page and Mike Kelly in Eden-Monaro. Both these country Labor members gained the benefit of sophomore surge.

The Senate Election

Given that the Australian Senate electoral system is semi-proportional rather than one of proportional representation, it is not surprising that one needs to go back to 1993 to find a truly proportional result. Indeed, depending on how one reads the Gallagher least-squares indexes of disproportionality, it can be argued that one needs to go back to 1987 to find a truly proportional result—and 1987 was a double-dissolution election in which one would expect the level of proportionality to be higher.

At this 2010 election, the Coalition won 18 seats, Labor 15, the Greens six and the Democratic Labor Party one seat—in Victoria. Table 26.12 sets out how these numbers affect the distribution of the seats in the whole Senate from July 2011. Converting percentages of votes into percentages of seats, I find that the Coalition's 38.6 per cent of votes becomes 45 per cent of seats, Labor's 35.1 per cent of votes becomes 37.5 per cent of seats and 13.1 per cent of votes for the Greens becomes 15 per cent of seats. So the big three parties are over-represented. In contrast, the category 'other' secured 13.2 per cent of the votes and only 2.5 per cent of the seats.

The senators elected in August 2010 have, from July 2011, replaced the senators elected in October 2004. For that reason it is sensible to compare the votes of 2004 and 2010. Whereas one speaks of a 'swing to the right' in the House of Representatives election (comparing 2010 with 2007), one speaks of a 'swing to the left' in the Senate election by comparing 2010 with 2004. That there was a swing to the left is made clear from Tables 26.13 and 26.14.

The seats followed the votes. In all of Queensland, Victoria and Tasmania, the left gained a seat from the right in 2010. In Queensland and Victoria that meant converting a four–two right–left distribution in 2004 into a three–three distribution in 2010, with the Greens gaining a seat in each State. In Tasmania it meant the Labor Party gaining a seat from the Liberal Party.

Can we, however, compare 2007 and 2010 and assert that the swing was to the left? Can we assert the swing was to the right? The answer is in the negative for both questions. All we can say is that the result in Tasmania was the same on each occasion: three Labor, two Liberal and one for the Greens. In the five

mainland States, the distribution between left and right was three–three, both in 2007 and in 2010. The difference is simply that Labor performed better in 2007 and the Greens in 2010.

At the 2013 election can the Greens increase their Senate numbers yet again? Probably—but there is no certainty. If that election follows a double dissolution, the Greens would surely lose a seat in South Australia—and possibly in Western Australia also. If there is a premature House-only election then the half-Senate election might be deferred to May 2014. My prediction, however, is that we shall have a House of Representatives plus half-Senate election in October 2013. The Greens would have only three senators coming up for re-election—one each in Tasmania, Western Australia and South Australia. In that case it would be likely they could increase their numbers yet again.

Table 26.11 State of Parties in the Senate from 1 July 2008

Party	NSW	Vic.	Qld	WA	SA	Tas.	ACT	NT	Total
Labor	6	5	5	4	5	5	1	1	32
Liberal	4	6	5	6	5	5	1	-	32
Nationals	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	5
Greens	-	-	-	2	1	2	-	-	5
Independent	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
Family First	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Total	12	12	12	12	12	12	2	2	76

Table 26.12 State of Parties in the Senate from 1 July 2011

Party	NSW	Vic.	Qld	WA	SA	Tas.	ACT	NT	Total
Labor	5	5	5	4	4	6	1	1	31
Liberal	4	4	4	6	5	4	1	-	28
Nationals	2	1	2	-	-	-	-	1	6
Greens	1	1	1	2	2	2	-	-	9
Independent	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
Democratic Labor Party	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Total	12	12	12	12	12	12	2	2	76

Table 26.13 Labor and Liberal–Country Party–Nationals Senate Percentages

Election	Labor	Lib.–CP–Nats	Excess Lib.–CP–Nats over Labor
1949	44.9	50.4	5.5
1951	45.9	49.7	3.8
1953	50.6	44.4	–6.2
1955	40.6	48.7	8.1
1958	42.8	45.2	2.4
1961	44.7	42.1	–2.6
1964	44.7	45.7	1.0
1967	45.0	42.8	–2.2
1970	42.2	38.2	–4.0
1974	47.3	43.9	–3.4
1975	40.9	51.7	10.8
1977	36.8	45.6	8.8
1980	42.3	43.5	1.2
1983	45.5	39.9	–5.6
1984	42.2	39.5	–2.7
1987	42.8	42.0	–0.8
1990	38.4	41.9	3.5
1993	43.5	43.0	–0.5
1996	36.2	44.0	7.8
1998	37.3	37.7	0.4
2001	34.3	41.8	7.5
2004	35.0	45.1	10.1
2007	40.3	39.9	–0.4
2010	35.1	38.6	3.5
Average	41.6	43.6	2.0

Note: Cases where excess is 10 per cent or more are shown in bold.

Table 26.14 Greens Performances, 2007 and 2010

Jurisdiction	Senators	Half-Senate election 2007			Half-Senate election 2010		
		Votes	%	Total formal	Votes	%	Total formal
Australian Capital Territory	2	48 384	21.5	225 321	52 546	22.9	229 272
Tasmania	6	59 254*	18.1	326 846	67 016*	20.3	330 691
Victoria	6	320 759	10.1	3 182 369	471 317*	14.6	3 218 751
Western Australia	6	111 813*	9.3	1 202 750	172 327*	14.0	1 234 219
Northern Territory	2	8870	8.8	100 569	13 105	13.6	96 687
South Australia	6	65 322*	6.5	1 006 809	134 287*	13.3	1 009 578
Queensland	6	177 063	7.3	2 418 907	312 804*	12.8	2 450 511
New South Wales	6	353 286	8.4	4 193 234	443 913*	10.7	4 152 524
Total	40	1 144 751	9.0	12 656 805	1 667 315	13.1	12 722 233

* A senator was elected on this vote. In all there were three in 2007 and six in 2010, for a total of nine from 1 July 2011

Table 26.15 Winners and Losers for Last Senate Places, 2010

State	Quota	Last winners		Best losers	
		Fifth	Sixth	Best	Second best
NSW	593 123	Fiona Nash (Nationals)	Lee Rhiannon (Greens)	Steve Hutchins (Labor)	Glenn Druery (Liberal Democrats)
Vic.	459 822	Bridget McKenzie (Nationals)	John Madigan (DLP)	Antony Thow (Labor)	Julian McGauran (Liberal)
Qld	350 074	Larissa Waters (Greens)	Brett Mason (Liberal)	Keith Douglas (Aust. Fishing & Lifestyle Party)	Desiree Gibson (Aust. Sex Party)
WA	176 318	Judith Adams (Liberal)	Rachel Siewert (Greens)	John McCourt (Nationals)	Wendy Perdon (Labor)
SA	144 226	Penny Wright (Greens)	David Fawcett (Liberal)	Dana Wortley (Labor)	Bob Day (Family First)
Tas.	47 242	Stephen Parry (Liberal)	Lisa Singh (Labor)	Guy Barnett (Liberal)	Peter Whish-Wilson (Greens)

References

- Mackerras, Malcolm. 1984. 'The Early Dissolution of the House of Representatives'. *Politics* 19(1): 73–84.
- Smith, Arthur Norman. 1933. *Thirty Years: The Commonwealth of Australia, 1901–1931*. Melbourne: Brown, Prior.
- Whittington, Don. 1954. *The House will Divide*. Melbourne: Lansdowne Press.