

*Department of the  
Parliamentary Library*



**INFORMATION AND RESEARCH SERVICES**

Research Paper  
No. 19 1999–2000

## Victorian Election 1999

ISSN 1328-7478

© Copyright Commonwealth of Australia 2010

Except to the extent of the uses permitted under the *Copyright Act 1968*, no part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means including information storage and retrieval systems, without the prior written consent of the Department of the Parliamentary Library, other than by Senators and Members of the Australian Parliament in the course of their official duties.

This paper has been prepared for general distribution to Senators and Members of the Australian Parliament. While great care is taken to ensure that the paper is accurate and balanced, the paper is written using information publicly available at the time of production. The views expressed are those of the author and should not be attributed to the Information and Research Services (IRS). Advice on legislation or legal policy issues contained in this paper is provided for use in parliamentary debate and for related parliamentary purposes. This paper is not professional legal opinion. Readers are reminded that the paper is not an official parliamentary or Australian government document. IRS staff are available to discuss the paper's contents with Senators and Members and their staff but not with members of the public.

Published by the Department of the Parliamentary Library, 2010

I N F O R M A T I O N   A N D   R E S E A R C H   S E R V I C E S

Research Paper  
No. 19 1999–2000

Victorian Election 1999

Scott Bennett, Politics and Public Administration Group  
Gerard Newman, Statistics Group  
11 April 2000

## Acknowledgments

The authors wish to thank Greg Baker, John Gardiner-Garden, Margaret Healy, Rob Lundie, Cathy Madden, Leanne Manthorpe, Deirdre McKeown, Adrienne Millbank, Derek Woolner, Rose Verspaandonk, Viv Wilson, Geoff Winter and the Victorian Electoral Commission for their assistance in writing this paper.

## Inquiries

Information and Research Services publications are available on the ParlInfo database.  
On the Internet the Department of the Parliamentary Library can be found at: <http://www.aph.gov.au/library/>

IRS Publications Office  
Telephone: (02) 6277 2760

# Contents

Symbols and Abbreviations . . . . .	1
Victoria—Some History . . . . .	2
Victoria Goes to the Polls, 1999 . . . . .	3
The Standing of the Kennett Government . . . . .	3
The Labor Challenge . . . . .	4
The Campaign Battle . . . . .	6
The Outcome—Legislative Assembly . . . . .	8
The Outcome—Legislative Council . . . . .	9
Electoralates of interest . . . . .	9
Brighton . . . . .	9
Frankston East . . . . .	10
Geelong . . . . .	10
Gippsland East . . . . .	10
Gippsland West . . . . .	11
Gisborne . . . . .	11
Mildura . . . . .	11
Mitcham . . . . .	12
Niddrie . . . . .	12
Swan Hill . . . . .	13
Warrnambool . . . . .	13
The Frankston East Supplementary Election . . . . .	13
A New Government . . . . .	14
The Verdict . . . . .	15
Government Performance . . . . .	15
A Radical Conservative Government . . . . .	15
The Premier and Governmental Style . . . . .	16
Services . . . . .	16
The Urban–Rural Divide . . . . .	17
The impact of preferential voting . . . . .	18
A Protest Vote? . . . . .	19
The Election that Would not Die . . . . .	20
End of the Coalition . . . . .	20
The Kennett Resignation and the Burwood By-election . . . . .	21
The Resignation of Pat McNamara . . . . .	22
The State of the Parties . . . . .	23

The Labor Party . . . . .	23
The Liberal Party . . . . .	24
The National Party . . . . .	24
Three-cornered Contests . . . . .	25
Conclusion . . . . .	26
A matter of timing? . . . . .	26
Implications? . . . . .	27
Endnotes . . . . .	28
Table 1 Legislative Assembly, State Summary . . . . .	31
Table 2a Legislative Assembly: District Summary . . . . .	32
Table 2b Legislative Assembly: District Summary . . . . .	34
Table 3 Legislative Assembly: District Details . . . . .	36
Table 4 Legislative Assembly: Two Party Preferred Vote . . . . .	48
Table 5 Legislative Assembly: Electoral Pendulum . . . . .	50
Table 6 Legislative Council, State Summary . . . . .	51
Table 7 Legislative Council, Composition After 1999 Election . . . . .	51
Table 8 Legislative Council: Province Summary . . . . .	52
Table 9 Legislative Council, Province Details . . . . .	53
Table 10 Legislative Council: Two Party Preferred Vote . . . . .	56
Table 11 Legislative Council: Electoral Pendulum . . . . .	57
Table 12 Legislative Assembly By-elections 1996 to 1999 . . . . .	58
Table 13 Legislative Council By-elections 1996 to 1999 . . . . .	59
Table 14 Legislative Assembly Elections 1950–1999 . . . . .	60

## Symbols and Abbreviations

ACS	Abolish Child Support
AD	Australian Democrats
AG	Australian Greens
ALP	Australian Labor Party
ARP	Australian Reform Party
CDP	Christian Democratic Party
DLP	Democratic Labor Party
HP	Hope Party
IND	Independent
LP	Liberal Party
NLP	Natural Law Party
NP	National Party
PHON	Pauline Hanson's One Nation
SP	Shooters Party
*	sitting member
#	party holding seat





## Introduction

The 1999 Victorian election was one of the most remarkable State elections of the last 50 years. It removed the apparently impregnable Liberal–National Coalition Government, it produced the retirement of two of the three party leaders, and it pitchforked into office a party that was remarkably unprepared—a number of its new ministers were sworn into executive office before being sworn in as parliamentarians. It was also an election that was unusually prolonged.

This paper gives a brief assessment of the major parties prior to polling day. It concludes that there were signs of the Kennett Government being in some danger but that these were largely ignored by the media. They, and many politicians, seemed to be influenced by particular opinion polls that suggested the Coalition Government was certain of victory. One intriguing aspect of the election result was the question of whether this was due to a protest vote against the Kennett team. The results of the election are described as are particular seats of more than usual interest. Major factors in the outcome are analysed, with the conclusion that it was a shift of votes in rural and regional electorates that was largely responsible for the narrow Labor victory. This was a reminder of the important impact that the rural–urban divide has long had upon our politics. Finally, the paper takes the story well past polling day to the Frankston supplementary election, the Burwood by-election, the end of the Coalition Government and the resignation of the National Party leader. Victorian election 1999 was later described as the election that would not end.

## Victoria—Some History

Prior to the mid-1950s Victorian politics was the most unsettled in the country. This was brought about largely by a distribution of electorates which heavily favoured rural areas but produced a party balance in Parliament that made it very difficult for any party to gain a parliamentary majority. A chronically unstable parliamentary situation was made more uncertain by the presence of a strong Country Party, which was able to govern as a minority government on occasion, sometimes with the support of the ALP. The Country Party had generally poor relations with the main non-Labor party, making coalitions generally unwelcome. Coalitions were in fact barred for a time by the Liberal Party.<sup>1</sup> All of this was combined with the presence of the electorally-weakest of all Labor branches. The first Labor Government to last more than four months did not emerge until May 1927 and the first majority Labor Government came to power only in December 1952.

In May 1955 Victorian politics stabilised with the election of a majority Liberal and Country Party<sup>2</sup> Government led by Henry Bolte. Aided by a redistribution that greatly benefited the Liberals while seriously weakening the Country Party, Bolte won six elections from 1955 to 1970. Apart from his final victory in 1970, when Labor won 4.7 per cent more of the vote than the Government, Sir Henry (he was knighted in 1966) was rarely put under any real pressure from the Labor Opposition which suffered a great deal of infighting and unrest.<sup>3</sup> The period of stable Liberal government continued under Dick Hamer, with victories in three elections during the 1970s. Hamer was replaced by Lindsay Thompson in 1981.

Government changed hands in 1982 when a reformed and newly-disciplined Labor Party took office from Thompson. John Cain led his party to its first majority victory since that of his father nearly thirty years before, forming only the second majority Labor Victorian government since the party's creation. The stability of the Liberals was now replaced by that of Labor which won elections in 1982, 1985 and 1988. Cain's successor, Joan Kirner, was defeated in the election of 1992, when 'the unprecedented sequence of financial crises sent the government's popular appeal into freefall'.<sup>4</sup>

By the time the Kennett Government came to power, the old animosities between the Liberal and National Parties had been put aside and a coalition formed, due largely to the fact that a one-vote-one-value redistribution appeared to make it difficult for the Liberal Party to win enough seats to govern on its own—something that was not borne out in the event. Winning office in 1992 with a very healthy combined first preference vote, the Kennett-McNamara team showed little sign of losing popular support in the following election. Polls suggested that the Government had maintained its support due to its strong leadership, its restoration of confidence in the Victorian economy and the continuing 'Guilty Party' stigma attached to the Labor Party. Indeed, the Coalition's 1996 election tactic was basically one of reinforcing in voters' minds the perception that Labor was responsible for any economic problems being suffered by the State. Kennett and his team therefore continued the stability that had been a mark of Victorian politics since the advent

of Henry Bolte's first government and which had seen just the two changes of government in over forty years.<sup>5</sup> Most observers expected this stability to be maintained whenever Premier Kennett chose to call the 1999 election.

## Victoria Goes to the Polls, 1999

On 24 August, Kennett announced that the 1999 Victorian election would be held on the 18 September. The election was for 88 Legislative Assembly seats and half (22) of the Legislative Council seats. There had been no redistribution since the previous election. Three Legislative Council by-elections, for the provinces of Ballarat, Melbourne and Melbourne North were to be held concurrently with the general election. Some observers wondered if the Premier had chosen the date so as to have the campaigning lost in Victoria's annual dose of football fever. It would be, said the *Herald Sun*, a '25-day footy finals campaign'.<sup>6</sup>

## The Standing of the Kennett Government

In its first term, the Kennett Government caught public attention with its radical approach to many aspects of government. Taking full advantage of its control of both houses of Parliament, the Government began a massive downsizing of the public sector, as well as an extensive privatising of government resources. It created controversy over the establishment of the Grand Prix track and its relationship with Crown Casino, and a lot of rural unrest was brought about by the suddenness and extent of local government changes. The important question in the 1996 Victorian election, therefore, was whether the Premier's preparedness to advance controversial policies was likely to see his government lose support at the ballot box. In the Commonwealth election of 2 March that saw the Howard Government come to power, the Liberal Party vote actually fell in Victoria, causing some observers to wonder if this were due to a backlash against the Kennett Government.<sup>7</sup>

If this was so, then there was no indication of this influencing voters in the Victorian State election held four weeks after the Commonwealth poll. In 1992 the Coalition first preference vote had been 52 per cent; four years later this had barely moved to 50.7 per cent. It was a quite remarkable stabilising of the vote, considering the many controversies surrounding the Government. This seemed to be recognised by the Premier, who described the 1996 victory as 'probably the most profound electoral result in any state or federally in this country in the last 50 years'.<sup>8</sup>

Dominating Victorian politics between 1992 and 1999, Premier Kennett was the latest in a long line of strong leaders to hold the top job at the State level. With his strong self-belief, his preparedness to ignore convention in his determination to push the State in a certain

direction, and his refusal to be deflected by criticism, Kennett not only dominated his State's politics, but he had the highest national profile of contemporary Premiers. He was very much in the mould of the strong, autocratic leader who has played such an important role in government and politics of the States in this country:

Premiers with powerful personalities exerting tight control over their state domains are ... a characteristic of state politics. ... They have not been content to be first among equals; they have developed a presidential-like status, with their cabinets and governments relegated to supporting roles. They bstride the politics of their states.<sup>9</sup>

According to Professor Brian Costar, this most recent of boss-Premiers had elevated the practice of executive dominance 'to an art form'.<sup>10</sup> With this type of Premier, there is always the chance that the very dominance of the leader may become an election issue, but it clearly had not done so to any great extent in 1996. Few expected 1999 to be any different.

The Kennett Government thus entered the campaign extremely confident of its chances, despite the loss of six Ministers who did not recontest their seats: Alan Stockdale (LP, Treasurer), Phil Gude (LP, Deputy Leader, Education), Marie Tehan (LP, Conservation), Jan Wade (LP, Attorney-General), Tom Reynolds (LP, Sport) and Bill McGrath (NP, Police). A sign of the Premier's confidence came at the opening of the campaign, when he ruled out a debate with the Leader of the Opposition describing such an event as 'irrelevant' to the final result.<sup>11</sup>

## The Labor Challenge

The 1996 election had re-confirmed the domination of the lower house by the Coalition, with the Liberals (49) and the Nationals (9) winning 58 of the 88 Assembly seats (65.9%). Labor, which had failed to win even 40 per cent of the vote when losing office in 1992, increased its vote by over 4 per cent to 43.1 per cent. This still left it well behind the Coalition, for it only managed to win back two seats, and the Labor total of 29 left it 16 short of control of the Legislative Assembly.

According to Graham Hudson of the University of Melbourne, Labor's performance since its 1992 defeat had done little to inspire confidence that it would be soon back on the government benches.<sup>12</sup> Its leaders were ineffectual in withstanding the Kennett onslaught, and none had produced electorally-popular policies. The Victorian branch of the ALP has had a long history of internal problems, which have tended to divert the leadership from either the job of government or opposition, and this tendency could be seen during 1992–99. This was particularly difficult for John Brumby, leader between 1993 and 1999, and played a part in his eventual departure from the leadership. Brumby had not helped his cause, however, by seeming to be unable to control the factional wars. Brumby had also frustrated some Labor members with his apparently defeatist approach to the party's 1996

chances. As he explained it, 'gaining six seats would be good, 12 would be fantastic, and 18 exceptional'. Such an attitude, however realistic, seemed to suggest the impossibility of denting the Coalition's position in the Parliament.<sup>13</sup>

Despite all of this, during 1996–99 there were some signs that Labor might enter the next election with rather more confidence than in 1996:

- As noted above, there had been an increase in its vote of 4.7 per cent at the 1996 election, and its first preference vote of 43.1 per cent placed it within reach of the Coalition.
- In addition, the largest swings to Labor in 1996 tended to be in safe Coalition seats making many of them marginal. The Coalition was therefore more vulnerable in 1999 than it had been in 1996.
- The Government had come under a lot of criticism from rural communities for what were described as its 'Melbourne-centric' policies.<sup>14</sup> As a measure of this, the independent candidate, Russell Savage, surprised by winning the safe Liberal rural seat of Mildura in 1996. Savage had gained barely one-third of the vote, but won with the help of ALP preferences.
- When former Liberal leader Alan Brown resigned his seat of Gippsland West to assume the position of Victorian Agent-General in London, the Liberals lost the seat to the independent, Susan Davies, in a by-election in February 1997. The Liberal first preference vote fell by 16.3 per cent.
- In December 1997 a by-election for the Melbourne seat of Mitcham was brought about by the resignation of Liberal sitting member Roger Pescott. In a rare example of dissension in Coalition ranks, Pescott's 'open letter' to the Premier accused Kennett of authoritarian leadership, and pointed to various examples of what Pescott called 'bad government', including Kennett's high-handed treatment of the Auditor-General's office.<sup>15</sup> The Mitcham by-election attracted 17 candidates, saw the Liberal vote fall by 23.5 per cent, Labor's first preference vote climb by 5.8 per cent, and a 16 per cent two-party-preferred swing against the Government, with loss of the seat. Observers wondered if this by-election signalled the end of the potency of the 'Guilty Party' slogan used to such great effect in the 1992 and 1996 general elections.<sup>16</sup>
- Peter McLellan, Liberal MLA for Frankston East, left the party in July 1998, also making a strong criticism of the leadership of Kennett as he did so. Unlike Pescott, however, on this occasion the dissident remained in Parliament, sitting on the cross-benches as an independent.<sup>17</sup>
- During 1998 opinion polls began to suggest that Labor might have a better chance in the next State election than most observers were prepared to concede. AgePolls for May–June and July–August, for instance, suggested that the ALP was actually ahead of the Government in two-party-preferred terms.<sup>18</sup>

- Labor's preselections had produced some younger, seemingly well-qualified candidates, including former ABC presenter, Mary Delahunty (who had won Northcote in a 1998 by-election), former mayor, Richard Wynne, the lawyers, Stuart Moss and Jenny Mikakos, Candy Broad, former ALP assistant national secretary, and Justin Madden, Australian Football League (AFL) footballer and former President of the AFL Players' Association.

There were signs, therefore, that the Government might be more vulnerable than many media observers believed, but within the Labor Party there developed a belief that any slip in the Kennett Government's standing had occurred in spite of Labor's efforts. There was a general disillusionment with Brumby's leadership, even within the leader's own faction, that produced a dangerous level of instability. Brumby finally conceded that a change was necessary, resigning in March 1999. He was replaced by Steve Bracks, MLA for Williamstown since 1994. It was a move that has been described as 'poll-driven'.<sup>19</sup>

Despite all of this, it was the common view of the media that the Government was certain of victory, probably by quite a wide margin. In fact, a February 1999 Newspoll that described the Coalition as 11 per cent ahead, had some observers wondering if the Labor Party might actually lose seats.<sup>20</sup> In addition, the polls showed a great deal of community ignorance of the Leader of the Opposition, though to one writer, 'the biggest problem for Labor was not so much their unknown leader, as the great popularity of the Premier'.<sup>21</sup> One journalist summed up the general media view that Bracks was:

Labor's sacrificial lamb, a good-looking guy in a suit who would inevitably be flattened by the Kennett steamroller.<sup>22</sup>

Such a view was echoed by former ALP federal secretary, Bob Hogg, who asserted in late August that it:

... stretches credibility too far for Bracks to look voters in the eye and say we can/will win this election.<sup>23</sup>

## The Campaign Battle

In many State elections, the standing of the Premier is often central to the result. As head of the State's administration, as effective leader of the State branch of the governing party, as the State's 'ambassador' in relations with the Commonwealth, and as its roving 'trade commissioner' in the endless quest to bring capital to the State, the Premier is often seen as crucial to his or her party's electoral chances. When a government is performing well, the importance of the Premier can occasionally be spelled out in a campaign slogan: 'Hamer Makes it Happen', 'Wran's Our Man', and 'Now, more than ever, Queensland needs Joh and the Nationals', were slogans of our recent past that thrust the Premier firmly before the voters.

Despite this historical tendency, the Victorian Government campaign in 1999 was probably unprecedented in the intensity of its focus on the political head of government. In a move reminiscent of Queensland's Joh Bjelke-Petersen (NP, 1968–87) at the height of his powers, Premier Kennett worked to ensure that he, and only he, was the spokesperson for the Government, when he issued a blanket ban on campaign comments by all Ministers bar himself. This was not achieved, largely due to the presence of the Nationals' Deputy Premier, Pat McNamara, who was certainly not silenced, but it effectively kept all of the Liberal Ministers out of the mainstream media. Not since the criticism of the Greiner 'one-man band' in the 1991 New South Wales election, has there been as much adverse comment about the domination of a campaign by a Premier.

The Liberals went further, however, when they attracted a great deal of attention by their creation of a Web-site geared entirely to the personality of the Premier. This was shown clearly in the fact that its internet address featured just the Premier's forename: [www.jeff.com.au](http://www.jeff.com.au). Apart from listing party policies, the site devoted much of its space to detailing the campaign activity of the Premier, and a sustained reading of the site would have suggested very much that the Victorian Government equalled Jeff Kennett. It even gave space to the Premier's dog. So unusual was the site as a campaigning tool, that it was seen as a probable pace-setter in campaigning throughout Australia. There was even a degree of adverse comment on the ordinariness of the Victorian Labor Party's site, which was concerned solely with policy matters, with no attention being paid to the leader.

Opinion polls showed Kennett so comfortably ahead of Bracks as 'preferred Premier', that the Labor leader and his advisers judged that there was no campaign mileage to be gained out of attacking the Premier. It was felt to be far more important to emphasise that Labor was now free of the baggage of the Cain–Kirner years.<sup>24</sup> The focus of Labor's campaign was therefore on policy questions and the promise of 'transparent' government. This featured three inter-related aspects:

- Labor spoke at length about what it described as its new and attractive policies.
- The Opposition did all it could to draw attention to weaknesses in the Government's administrative performance, with particular attention being paid to such matters as the Intergraph ambulance difficulties, school closures, hospital problems, police numbers, the reduction in the independence of the Auditor-General's office and the increased restrictions placed on freedom of information.
- Alert to the general unhappiness of many rural communities concerning their 'neglect' by the Government, Labor did all it could to remind voters of closed schools, diminished rail services, movement of local government councils to distant towns and other major regional complaints. To symbolise its concern it opened its campaign in Ballarat, and pledged a \$170 million infrastructure fund for regional Victoria.

Overriding this was Labor's promise of 'A new style of leadership', wherein Bracks promised to be both 'socially progressive' and 'financially conservative'. In an effort to

convince voters of this, Labor had the independent firm, Access Economics, 'sign off on the challenging party's election promises. Labor also was keen to emphasise that its leader was 'a nice bloke'.<sup>25</sup>

By polling day the general view of observers seemed to be that the Kennett Government was certain of being elected. More seemed to believe the final AC Neilson Agepoll, which had the Government ahead by ten percentage points 50–40 per cent, than the final Newspoll result which suggested the Government and Opposition were locked together on first preferences, with Labor ahead on a two-party-preferred basis.

### The Outcome—Legislative Assembly

The Opposition (30 seats) entered the election needing 15 seats to gain control of the Legislative Assembly. The Coalition (Liberal 46 seats, National 9) seemed impregnable, despite the Liberal loss of Mildura, West Gippsland, and Mitcham since 1996. Even Malcolm Mackerras, almost the only commentator prepared to tip an increase in Labor seats—he spoke of seven being picked up—still asserted that no one expected Labor to be in government after the election.<sup>26</sup>

The seats that changed hands were as follows:

Liberal losses to Labor	Ballarat East, Ballarat West, Bendigo East, Carrum, Geelong, Gisborne, Narracan, Oakleigh, Ripon, Seymour, Tullamarine
Independent loss to Labor	Frankston East
National loss to Liberal	Warrnambool
National loss to independent	Gippsland East

The Labor Party contested all 88 seats, with its vote of 45.5% being 2.4 per cent higher than in 1996. It gained 11 seats (excluding Frankston East), its total of 41 being four short of an absolute majority.

The Liberal Party won 36 of the 81 seats it contested. It lost 11 to Labor and won a seat from the National Party. Its first preference vote of 42.2 per cent was a fall of just 1.8 per cent, though it did contest three fewer seats than in 1996.

The National Party contested 12 seats, winning seven, a nett loss of two seats, one to the Liberal Party and one to an independent. Its share of the vote fell 1.8 per cent to 4.9 per cent, despite its contesting two more seats in 1999.

Independent candidates won three seats. (For more details see Table 1)



Of the other parties and groups, the Australian Democrats won fewer votes in 6 electorates than Pauline Hanson's One Nation Party (PHON) did in 4. The average PHON vote was 6.9 per cent, a reminder of the party's potential to cause trouble to the big three when it has a higher electoral profile than on this occasion. In the rural seat of Rodney, Dorothy Hutton, a PHON candidate for an outer-Sydney seat in the March 1999 New South Wales election, managed 10.8 per cent.

## **The Outcome—Legislative Council**

There are 44 Members of the Victorian Legislative Council. The Members represent 22 electoral provinces with two Legislative Councillors representing each province. Each province is made up of four Legislative Assembly electorates. Legislative Councillors serve for two terms of the Legislative Assembly. At any general election half of the Legislative Council provinces fall vacant; the other half falling vacant at the next general election. The voting method is preferential voting.

The normal half-Council election saw Labor (42.2%) win eight of the 20 provinces it contested. The party won three Liberal seats: Ballarat, Chelsea and Geelong. The Liberal Party (39.7%) won 11 of 19 provinces it contested, and the National Party (7.3%) won the three provinces it contested. The Labor and Liberal vote was lower than in the Assembly election. Many of these lost votes may well have been gathered by the Australian Democrats, whose Statewide vote of 6.8 per cent indicated that the party seems to be seen by voters primarily as an upper house player, even in an election where preferential voting is used.

In the three by-elections, Labor won Ballarat from the Liberal Party and retained Melbourne and Melbourne North.

The party balance after the election was, therefore, Liberal 24 seats (a loss of four seats on 1996), Labor 14 seats (+4) and the National Party 6 seats (no change).

### **Electorates of interest**

#### **Brighton**

Brighton had been held by the retiring Treasurer, Alan Stockdale. With such a safe Liberal seat becoming vacant, the party's preselection was likely to determine who would be the next MLA. Brighton quickly became the battleground for a struggle between forces led by the Premier and others supportive of the Commonwealth Treasurer, Peter Costello. In the event, Kennett's support for the Small Business Minister, Louise Asher, an MLC seeking

to move to the lower house, proved decisive, though not before a very public struggle was conducted. As expected, Asher won the seat comfortably in the general election, but the fall in the Liberal first preference vote of 8.8 per cent was one of the largest shifts of Liberal votes in the metropolitan area.<sup>27</sup>

### Frankston East

This was the seat held by the rebel Liberal, Peter McLellan, who had left the party in the previous year to sit as an Independent. McLellan had won the seat for the Liberals in 1992, but resigned after clashes with the Premier over various issues including WorkCover, privatisation and the effort to reduce the importance of the Auditor-General. In a re-run of the aborted Commonwealth election for Newcastle in 1998, McLellan's death on the morning of the election meant that Frankston East voters would have to wait for a supplementary election, on 16 October (see below, p. 13–14).

### Geelong

If Labor was to do well, it needed to win back seats in areas it once held. Geelong was just such an area, and the Opposition nominated Ian Trezise, son of Neil, Geelong football legend, MLA for Geelong West (1964–91) and Minister in the Cain Government. Geelong was held by Ann Henderson, Minister for Housing and Minister responsible for Aboriginal Affairs. She had increased the Liberal vote by over six per cent in the previous election, winning the seat on first preferences (52.6%) and seeming to make it much more likely to be retained. Despite this, Geelong turned out to be the ultimate cliff-hanger. Henderson's vote fell by 5.1 per cent, the Labor vote barely moved (+0.1%), but the seat went to preferences, where Trezise eked out a win by just 16 of the 30 984 formal votes that had been cast. If just nine of Labor's Geelong voters had shifted to the Government, the Coalition would probably have retained office.

### Gippsland East

One difficulty in analysing State elections is that the most easily found information tends to relate to general State-wide issues. In focussing on the broad picture, however, commentators can sometimes fail to notice the existence of local issues that are important enough to turn many voters away from the major parties. Occasionally a sitting member can be defeated by a spectacular movement of such votes—in 1988 the Labor Party lost the safe Labor seat of Swansea in New South Wales over the controversial issue of the Swansea Bridge. In Gippsland East an issue that had caused much local unhappiness was the virtual disappearance of water running in the Snowy River. Craig Ingram, a concerned local resident, decided to stand in an effort to draw attention to the Snowy issue. As in the

Swansea case, the single issue campaigner did much better than he expected. The National sitting member's vote fell by 16.9 per cent, with Ingram's vote of 24.8 per cent leaving him in third position. Preferences from three other candidates pushed him into second place, and Labor's second preferences produced a massive 15.4 per cent two-candidate-preferred margin for the political novice. The National Party and its predecessors had held the seat since 1920.<sup>28</sup>

### **Gippsland West**

In the 1996 State election, the endorsed Labor candidate, Susan Davies, managed just one-third of the first preferences votes, finishing a distant runner-up to former Liberal leader Alan Brown (57.7%). When running as an independent in the 1997 by-election, Davies' percentage of the vote actually declined by 0.6 per cent, but aided by the preferences of the four other candidates, who stripped 16.3 per cent off the Liberal vote, she squeaked into the seat by 159 votes. In 1999 Davies was only able to increase her first preference vote by 3.1 per cent despite being the sitting MLA. She was helped greatly by the Liberal vote falling a further 3.4 per cent from the by-election figure and won the seat on preferences by an eventual margin of eight per cent.<sup>29</sup>

### **Gisborne**

Tom Reynolds, the Member for Gisborne, and Minister for Sport and Rural Development, retired at this election. Premier Kennett participated in the resulting preselection, making it clear that he wished it to be won by Rob Knowles, Minister for Health and Aged Care. Knowles, fifth in the Ministerial list, was spoken of as Kennett's preferred successor as party leader, but had the disqualification of having a seat in the Legislative Council. After much intra-party argument, Knowles gained preselection for a seat that Reynolds had retained in 1996 with a first preference vote of 55.7 per cent (itself a drop of 7.2 per cent). In 1999, the Liberal vote dropped a further 13.8 per cent and although Labor's vote also fell (0.4%), its candidate Joanne Duncan managed to win on preferences—the Liberals thus lost a seat held since 1967. Apart from its vote suffering because of the general drop in regional areas, the Liberal Party was reported to have suffered from voter resentment at the government's inattention to concerns over a noisome waste treatment plant, as well as resentment at Knowles being brought in as a headquarters-anointed candidate.<sup>30</sup>

### **Mildura**

In 1996 the loss of Mildura by the Liberals to an independent was seen by the party as a one-off, fluke result. As is typical in the occasional independent victory, Russell Savage had gained only a modest first preference vote (35.7%), but picked up the lion's share of

preferences to win the seat by just 1.8 per cent. During his term in Parliament, Savage was portrayed as standing up for his rural constituents, while also managing to anger the Premier on a number of well-publicised occasions. Although the Liberal Party had expected to win back the seat, Savage's first preference vote increased by 8.7 per cent in the general election, and he secured over 56 per cent of the two-candidate-preferred vote. The Liberal vote fell by 19 per cent, most of which probably went to the National Party (19.7%) which nominated a candidate, unlike 1996.<sup>31</sup>

### **Mitcham**

As already noted, Mitcham was the scene of a remarkable by-election in December 1997 when an enormous swing saw Labor's Tony Robinson win the seat narrowly from Andrew Munroe (LP) and 15 other candidates. In the 1982 State election it was the movement of eastern suburb electorates, such as Mitcham, to Labor, that was considered to have been crucial in returning Labor to office. In 1999, observers believed that if Labor could not win a parcel of such seats, then its chances would be slim. It was therefore important for Robinson to hold the seat in another contest with Munroe. In the event, Labor did not recover ground in this part of Melbourne, though Mitcham was held by just 343 votes after preferences. The seat may well have been decided on the votes of an independent who campaigned against Government proposals for the Eastern Freeway extension. He won 4.8 per cent of the vote and directed his second preferences to Labor.<sup>32</sup>

### **Niddrie**

In normal circumstances the electorate of Niddrie, held by Rob Hulls for the ALP by a margin of 8.8 per cent, would not feature in a listing of electorates of interest. On this occasion, however, the electorate was in the news because of the origins of the Liberal candidate, Susannah Kruger. Hulls, former MHR for Kennedy (Qld, 1990–93), and one of the more colourful of Labor's Assembly members, had been forced to apologise to two young women, one of whom had been Kruger, after he had a verbal altercation with them earlier in the year. At the time of the announcement of the election, Kruger received publicity by approaching the Liberal Party and offering herself as a candidate, despite her apparent lack of any political experience. How would she fare against a no-holds-barred politician like Hulls? The answer was quite clear, due to the fact that each of the 1996 and 1999 contests had only two candidates. Kruger's vote of 43.2 per cent was a fall of 2.4 per cent, giving Hulls a 13.6 per cent margin.<sup>33</sup>

## Swan Hill

In 1996 Swan Hill was one of the safest Coalition seats, having been retained by Barry Steggall (NP) with a first preference vote of 59 per cent. Three years later, local schoolteacher and former St Kilda football star, Carl Ditterich, stood as an independent, apparently at the urging of Russell Savage in neighbouring Mildura. The picture was made more interesting by the decision of Bill Croft of PHON to stand. Croft had won 12 per cent of the vote in Mallee in the 1998 Commonwealth election. Like Savage, Ditterich and Croft both emphasised government neglect of the bush. Although Ditterich won only 22.6 per cent of the vote, he forced the sitting member to preferences as a consequence of his vote falling by 13.8 per cent, and briefly seemed to have a chance of winning the seat. Eventually, Steggall won with a 52.8 per cent two-candidate-preferred vote. Croft had managed only 5.1 per cent of first preferences.

## Warrnambool

Water was also a problem for the Government in Warrnambool, the seat of retiring Police Minister, Bill McGrath (NP). A rise in water charges for local farmers had become a controversial issue. With the retirement of the Minister, the Liberal Party nominated John Vogels, to the Nationals' chagrin (see below p. 25). Despite this competition the National Party expressed its confidence of retaining the seat. In the event its vote fell by an extraordinary 40.3 per cent to just 17.5 per cent. The Liberal candidate topped the poll with 40.2 per cent and won easily on preferences.<sup>34</sup>

## The Frankston East Supplementary Election

After the counting of all seats except Frankston East, the Government held 43 seats, Labor held 41 and independents held 3 (Gippsland East, Gippsland West, Mildura). The Frankston East supplementary election, to be held on 16 October, therefore assumed great importance. If the seat was retained by the Liberal Party, the Government would have half the lower house numbers, and would need only the support of one of the independents to control the Assembly—Craig Ingram seemed the least hostile to Premier Kennett. If Labor could win the seat, it would then be in a position of being able to govern with the support of the three independents, but a loss by Labor would have meant that it could not form a government that had any realistic chance of survival. In addition, the supplementary election was likely to be seen as an opinion poll upon the standing of the Government and might therefore play a part in influencing the independents when considering their future actions in the Parliament. During the election, they had, in fact, made it clear that the result in the supplementary election would do just that.

The major parties therefore put all of their resources into winning the seat, for it was eminently winnable for both sides—in 1996 McLellan's first preference vote had been 4.6 per cent ahead of his Labor opponent, though later preferences had pushed that out to a margin in excess of 6 per cent. In addition, the presence of 14 non-major party candidates on the ballot paper seemed to make it more of a lottery than would usually be the case. Leader of the Opposition Bracks made little alteration to his election pitch, but Premier Kennett caught the headlines by a sudden announcement of more money to be given to the local hospital. He attracted some criticism by the apparent ease with which he expressed his preparedness to modify some of his Government's policies despite his strong defence of them in the general election. He also made an unprecedented apology for his political style which, he acknowledged, may have antagonised some people.

The result was quite convincing, for Labor's Matt Viney won the seat on first preferences, a rise of 7.1 per cent to 51.4 per cent. The Liberal vote fell substantially by 7.3 per cent, to 41.6 per cent. Labor now held 42 of the 88 Legislative Assembly seats, three short of an absolute majority.

## A New Government

On 27 September shortly before the Frankston East election the three independent MLAs released their 'Independents' Charter Victoria 1999', stating they wanted written responses to the Charter from the party leaders by the Tuesday prior to polling day for the supplementary election. Stating their determination to remain independent and outside any 'formal part of any government', the independents expressed their willingness to support a government which publicly undertook to:

- Promote 'open and accountable government'
- Improve 'the democratic operation of Parliament'
- Establish 'clear plans, strategies and targets to address the urgent needs of Rural Victoria'
- Offer assurances of increased levels of cooperation with Independent Members, and improved codes of conduct between government and other Members of Parliament
- Permit no more privatisation of public assets 'at least until after a full independent inquiry has reported to Parliament on the social and economic costs and benefits of planned and existing privatisations'.

The independents also expressed their willingness to provide political stability by voting with the government on appropriation and supply bills and all motions of no confidence, 'unless there is evidence of fraud, misappropriation or illegal activities'.<sup>35</sup>

After negotiations with both sides, on 18 October the independents announced their support for Labor,<sup>36</sup> and two days later the Bracks Labor Government was sworn in by Governor Gobbo. There were 18 ministers, none with prior ministerial experience and eight of whom were women—a record proportion for any State or Commonwealth government. Four of the new Ministers, Candy Broad, Justin Madden, Bronwyn Pike and Marsha Thomson accepted office prior to their taking their Parliamentary seats for the first time. Only two, Peter Batchelor and Sherryl Garbutt, had been in Parliament at the time of the defeat of the previous Labor Government in 1992.

## The Verdict

### Government Performance

Three factors seem to affected voters' perceptions of the Kennett Government's performance.

### A Radical Conservative Government

In many ways the Kennett Government was ground-breaking. The extent of innovation was great, and the preparedness to tread where others had refused to go marked it out as a ministry prepared to test public patience. The Kennett Government has, in fact, been described as 'a genuine revolution in the relationship between the public and private sectors and between society and the State'.<sup>37</sup> Its radical reorganisation of local government, for instance, dealt with a political issue that had seen its predecessor unwilling to take on vested regional interests, while its embrace of the Crown Casino was in stark contrast to the timidity of the Liberal Government of Dick Hamer. The swathe cut through the public service, which included the closure of schools and hospitals, was very controversial, and the pushing of outsourcing eclipsed any other Australian government's efforts. Such a record may well have been a double-edged sword, for although it would have pleased many in the community, it probably antagonised many more. Woodward and Costar have noted that State governments 'cannot ... assume that having good credentials as economic managers will suffice [to ensure their re-election]'. In saying this they drew a parallel between the governments of Jeff Kennett and Wayne Goss.<sup>38</sup>

Here also it would not have taken very many votes to be loosened for the Government's position to become uncertain.

## The Premier and Governmental Style

Although the opinion polls consistently gave Premier Kennett a very favourable rating, there seems to have been no doubt that his political style was controversial. His crash-through approach to government, his unpreparedness to tolerate criticism and his muzzling of ministers during the campaign, were all well-publicised examples of his leadership style. Woodward and Costar have stated that this became a 'major' issue after the *Herald Sun* ran a front page story on the Premier's gagging of his team.<sup>39</sup> Prior to the election, Gary Morgan stated that his research suggested that many voters saw the Premier's confidence as arrogance. He cited Kennett's decision to ignore Bracks as a 'crucial mistake', suggesting that, '[w]hen you ignore the opposition they have a field day'.<sup>40</sup> It seems quite likely, therefore, that some votes shifted because of an unhappiness with Kennett's mode of operation.

On the other hand, it was claimed that the Premier's brash style won him many supporters among young males aged 18–25 years.<sup>41</sup> The use, and the style of, the 'jeff' website was seen as a means of attracting this part of the electorate. Kennett was often heard on various Melbourne rock radio stations, where his 'Jeff f..... rules, OK!' adverts were also to be heard. In hindsight, the danger may have been that in pitching so public a message to this demographic segment, he may have alienated support from others. There was some evidence of middle-aged voters being less keen on the Premier than younger voters.<sup>42</sup> The hostile journalist, Pamela Bone, claimed in the *Age* before the election that '[Liberal] party strategists knew many traditional Liberal voters would be shocked, not only by the language [of the adverts] but the sentiment behind them'. Dame Beryl Beaurepaire, Liberal *grande dame*, was said to have described them as 'a pity'.<sup>43</sup>

## Services

It is a truism of State and Territory elections that the performance of the government in the provision of services plays a very important part in explaining election results. Poll evidence suggests that service delivery was a significant issue in this election. When surveying voters' views prior to the election the *Herald Sun* claimed that nearly eight voters in 10 were unhappy at the state of hospitals, nearly two-thirds unhappy at changes in schools, and over three-quarters dissatisfied at the central place that gambling had assumed in Victoria.<sup>44</sup> A Morgan poll, published in the final weeks of the campaign, suggested that whilst voters preferred the Government as the manager of the economy (58% favoured the Government and 14% favoured the Opposition), by contrast Labor was preferred in the areas of health (55–15), education (51–18) and law and order (53–18).<sup>45</sup> As we have seen the Government did not lose many votes overall, but a few disgruntled voters unhappy with particular services and prepared to shift their vote because of this, may well have made the difference between a narrow defeat and a comfortable parliamentary majority for the Coalition.



The fact that during the campaign the Premier announced a number of significant initiatives relating to government services suggests that he may have realised the potential for the loss of votes in this area. In his policy speech much was made of the provision of more teachers and nurses, as well as a promise for faster hospital treatment—perhaps these promises were seen as an implicit recognition that there were some serious weaknesses in the provision of these services or that the changes had gone further than voters were prepared to accept.

A potential problem for a State government that cuts back the provision of services by its own agencies is that it runs the risk of suffering an electoral backlash if the new providers are not up to the mark. For the Kennett Government this may have been symbolised by three aspects of outsourcing that gained it unwelcome publicity. First, there were a number of stories of ambulances failing to answer calls quickly, some of which produced claims of patients dying because of these delays. The second matter involved the creation of private gaols, where claims were made of inefficiency, and of inmates being able to abscond easily. Finally, there was the pending introduction of high tolls to be paid on new privately-run motorways, and the conversion of older public roads into the motorway system.

### The Urban–Rural Divide

The Government seemed well aware that the question of services seemed particularly to affect rural and regional residents. The Premier had reportedly made 27 visits to country areas during January–August 1999 for a significant number of the Government's marginal seats were outside of Melbourne.<sup>46</sup> Coalition relationships had become strained over policies that appeared to be uncaring of the position of rural people, while being very much capital city-centred. Some policies, in particular, earned unwelcome criticism. The massive reshaping of local government, which removed many government offices from country towns and was said to have reduced the quality of service, and the plans to privatise the State Electricity Commission, for example, both put strains upon the Coalition, for the National Party was uncomfortable with such changes.<sup>47</sup> Some cases, such as the closure of the Mortlake hospital in 1994, took on a symbolic importance, as they seemed to illustrate how the Government did not understand the needs of country people. As the editor of a country newspaper put it: 'you tear the heart out of any community when a hospital shuts'.<sup>48</sup>

The division between town and country has been a key part of Australian electoral politics since the advent of elected legislatures in the nineteenth century. The importance of this division has been seen most obviously in the continuing electoral health and political significance of the (Country) National Party that emerged during the second decade of this century. Generally, this has worked to the disadvantage of the Labor Party. In the 1999 Victorian election, however, the belief that the Kennett Coalition Government had

neglected rural areas seems to have been crucial in accounting for the marked success of the ALP in rural electorates. A paper by two Victorian academics states that 'The backlash against the government in rural and regional Victoria was decisive'.<sup>49</sup> In Melbourne the Government lost just three seats, on a vote fall of 2.3 per cent, but in the thirty-two non-metropolitan seats the combined Liberal–National vote fell by 6.1 per cent, with nine seats lost by the Coalition—eight to the ALP and one to the successful independent in Gippsland East. There was a 4.7 per cent swing to Labor in provincial city electorates.<sup>50</sup> Surprisingly, National leader McNamara put this down to an inability to counter the 'folksy' and 'country boy' image of Bracks, who had been raised in Ballarat.<sup>51</sup> Despite this unusual claim of a Labor politician apparently sounding more sympathetic to the bush than were the Nationals, the loss of rural votes and seats was presumably much more to do with a longer-term rural unhappiness with the Government. In two general elections the Government parties had in fact lost 12 of the 26 regional seats that they gained in 1992. At the same time, just six of the 35 Melbourne seats were lost to Labor. This suggests that Bracks' election as party leader had little to do with the final result, and that regional Victorian voters had begun to resent what they saw as 'big-city' neglect some years before.<sup>52</sup>

### The impact of preferential voting

This election is a reminder that occasionally the preferential voting method can have an impact upon the result of an election.

Labor won the election despite being behind the Coalition on first preferences. Sometimes such a result can be an indication that many votes have been wasted—large majorities built up in safe seats can be a problem for a party. This occurred to Labor in the 1954 Commonwealth election when it failed to win government despite topping 50 per cent on first preferences. A variant of this occurs then a party can win a significant number of seats by securing enough second or later preferences from other candidates although its opponents win a greater number of first preferences. This second example was said to have been crucial to Labor's 1990 Commonwealth election victory.

It also seems to have been very important in Victoria in 1999. In five seats (Carrum, Geelong, Gisborne, Mitcham, Seymour) Labor trailed its major opponent on first preferences. The average margin was 1.7 per cent. In all cases Labor won the seat on preferences, despite their opponent's first preference figure averaging 47.7 per cent in four of the seats. Only in Gisborne, where the Liberal first preference vote was 41.9 per cent, was the Government candidate some distance from the figure needed for victory. This suggests that although quite a number of voters shifted from the Coalition parties many of these voters did not find the Labor Party attractive enough to receive their first preference. Instead, they voted for a third candidate but put Labor ahead of the Coalition on their later preferences. It was hardly a ringing endorsement of the Labor Party.

The importance of preferences was also evident in Gippsland East and Gippsland West, both won by independents. In Gippsland East the first preference count had the National candidate (35.9%) 11.1 per cent ahead of Craig Ingram—who in fact was third after the first preference count. Despite this the National was defeated comfortably on preferences. In Gippsland West the gap was narrower, but again the Liberal candidate (38%) lost a lead, and Susan Davies won comfortably on preferences.

It is therefore clear that if a different voting method had been in use, the result would have been different. First-past-the-post, for instance, would have produced a comfortable majority for the Kennett Government.

### A Protest Vote?

It has been noted that if a State administration continues to deliver benefits to the electorate then it is likely to remain in office. It does seem that, generally, a State government's administrative performance has to be very bad for it to be voted out by the voters.<sup>53</sup> The 1999 Victorian election must make analysts think again about some of the 'truths' of State-level electoral politics, for on the eve of the election it appeared that the Kennett Government was in much better electoral standing than the challenging Labor party. It had experienced some community unrest over aspects of its administration of the State's services, but polls seemed to be saying it was still held in high regard.

Was this result, then, simply a 'protest' vote against the Kennett Government? In this context, 'protest' is meant to suggest that some voters, resentful about some aspect of the Government's performance, but not wanting its actual defeat, voted against it to give it and its leader (in the words of an unnamed senior Liberal), 'a bit of a kick up the arse on a few things'.<sup>54</sup> Was it, in the words of Denis Naphine, successor to Kennett as leader of the Liberal Party, 'a protest vote gone wrong'?<sup>55</sup> Such a view is well summed up by the Liberal MLA for Mordialloc, Geoff Leigh, who described the election result as 'one of the great accidents of history'.<sup>56</sup> The journalist Mike Steketee has even used such a view to wonder if the publication of opinion polls ought to be controlled close to an election, as is done in some European countries.<sup>57</sup>

Despite the fact that such views have been heard on similar occasions—after the near-defeat of the Greiner (NSW, L-NP, 1991) and Goss (Qld, ALP, 1995) Governments for example—such views are essentially unprovable. It is impossible to know when a vote against a government is 'genuine' and when it is 'not-genuine', that is, a 'protest' vote. All that electoral analysts can do is ascertain just how many votes shifted in an election—the reasons for each shift are impossible to establish with any accuracy. One possible test of the 'protest vote' view might be the Frankston East and Burwood by-elections. If voters in these electorates were concerned that a 'protest vote' had gone too far, they could at least have shown their support for the Liberal Party. In both cases, however, there was a further movement of voters away from the Liberals.

To a marked degree, elections deal with expectations. If enough people are certain of a particular result—in this case the comfortable return of a government—then there is a need to explain away a different outcome. Despite the impossibility of really knowing what motivates the individual voter, journalists and politicians together can find comfort in the notion of the 'protest' vote: in the words of one journalist, 'Saturday's poll may well go down as the election that defied all predictions, producing the mother of all protest votes'.<sup>58</sup> To state such a conclusion, however, is not to prove it.

## The Election that Would not Die

Apart from having to wait for four weeks after polling day to learn the Frankston East result, three other important post-polling day events formed part of the story of the 1999 Victorian election.

### End of the Coalition

Mention has already been made of the long history of poor relations between the two major non-Labor parties, typified by the words of long-time Liberal Premier, Sir Henry Bolte, who once described the Country Party as 'a mob of political prostitutes who will go to bed with anybody'.<sup>59</sup> Despite the fact that the 1992–99 Kennett Government was the longest surviving coalition in Victorian history, relations between the long-time antagonists was at times very strained. This was partly due to the inevitable tensions that exist in Liberal–National coalitions wherever they are established, but it was given particular feeling because of the relative strengths of the parties. The Liberal Party actually won a majority of seats in the 1992 and 1996 elections, and the Coalition was formed by the grace of the Premier—himself a determined opponent of coalition in the 1980s. Not all Liberals were pleased with this.<sup>60</sup>

The relationship was also strained by many of the policies followed by the Kennett Government that appeared to be unsympathetic to the needs of rural people (see above, pp. 17–18). In the aftermath of the unexpected defeat, it therefore seemed inevitable that the formal coalition would crumble. On 22 October, a meeting between National MPs and the party's State Council duly reported that henceforth there was 'no coalition agreement between the Liberal and National Parties in Opposition'.<sup>61</sup>

Such a decision was in part a recognition that tensions existed in both camps. For the Nationals there was also the feeling that they were fighting for their very existence. In 2000, the National Party holds just seven Legislative Assembly seats and six in the Legislative Council—nine per cent of the Parliament. Fifty years ago the respective figures were 20 and 13 in a smaller Parliament, for 32 per cent of the total membership. For the Liberals there were the continuing resentments felt in that party over the very

notion of coalition. In an echo of Henry Bolte's words, one unnamed Liberal MLA claimed after the election that, 'The Nationals like to stay for the night but don't like to get married'.<sup>62</sup>

Eventually a memorandum of understanding was signed. It was designed to satisfy disgruntled National supporters, while apparently accepting the probable need to work together in the future:

- Although the formal coalition is at an end for the time being, there will be a combined Opposition front bench.
- There will be an Opposition front bench team of 22 (out of a total Assembly representation of 43).
- Five of these 22 will be from the National Party.
- The parties will remain 'separate and distinct'.
- The party leadership will meet weekly, and shadow Cabinet will meet regularly.
- Backbench members will sit in separate party blocs. The Liberal party will be the official Opposition, and the National Party 'the Third Party'.
- The National Party Leader will have a place at the Legislative Assembly table with the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party.<sup>63</sup>

### The Kennett Resignation and the Burwood By-election

Jeff Kennett submitted his resignation from Parliament on 2 November, thus precipitating the by-election for his seat of Burwood that was held on 11 December. Both the Labor and Liberal Parties put a great deal of effort into winning a seat that had been held by the Liberals since its re-creation in 1976. Labor's candidate was Bob Stensholt, the defeated candidate in the general election, while the Liberals surprised by their by-passing of prominent party member, Helen Kroger, for Lana McLean.

The Liberal Party seemed to be on the back foot throughout the campaign. McLean proved unexpectedly controversial. Among other matters, she had been involved in a local planning dispute and she was apparently involved in a legal dispute with the Commonwealth Bank. She even earned notice during the campaign for her criticism of a junior basketball referee. The party also earned media criticism for some of its claims, such as the prediction that a Labor victory would encourage the government to set up a chain of heroin injecting rooms across all suburbs of Melbourne. At the same time, Labor seemed to concentrate its efforts on the discrediting of McLean rather than discussing policy. When the fact of Stensholt having not mentioned his brief career as a seminarian

was noted by the Liberal Party, an *Age* journalist criticised the 'grubby' campaigning efforts of both sides, 'Why such crowded gutters in Burwood?', he asked.<sup>64</sup> The picture in the by-election was made more uncertain by the nominations of a Green candidate and of Stephen Mayne, former Kennett media adviser, who had earlier had a well-publicised falling-out with his employer.

The Labor Party won Burwood comfortably after preferences, though the result was probably brought about more by voter disillusionment with their opponents than enthusiasm for a party which had never held the seat. Even in a climate of support and interest for a new government, Labor's first preference vote of 45.1 per cent was only 3.6 per cent higher than in the general election. As in the case of the general election itself, it was a reminder of the relatively small increase in the Labor vote over the State as a whole (see below, p. 22). By contrast, the Liberal vote fell to its lowest in over twenty years, with its 40.5 per cent being ten per cent lower than in September. Mayne pointed to a probable disillusionment with both major parties: in the general election the combined Labor–Liberal vote was 97 per cent, but in the by-election this fell by 11.4 per cent.<sup>65</sup>

### The Resignation of Pat McNamara

Soon after the election, the National Party leader, Pat McNamara, announced that he would soon leave the leadership, and would probably leave the Parliament by Christmas. It seemed likely that there would be a by-election for his seat of Benalla in the new year, possibly February. The 1999 Victorian election therefore seemed still to have some life, particularly as a swing of 7.5 per cent would see the National Party lose a seat that it has held since 1943.

In due course McNamara handed over the reins to Peter Ryan in November, but did not say anything about his resignation from the Parliament. However, in the immediate aftermath of the Burwood by-election, reports began to be heard of McNamara coming under pressure to remain in the seat, at least for a few more months.<sup>66</sup> Were the seat to be won by the Government, this would be the first time Labor has held a seat whose history can be dated back to the first decade of this century. Such a result would give Labor half of the Legislative Assembly, a significantly stronger position than before the resignation of Kennett. Loss of Benalla would also further weaken the Nationals' parlous parliamentary position. McNamara remains in Parliament at the time of writing.

## The State of the Parties

### The Labor Party

Labor is fortunate to be occupying the government benches in the Legislative Assembly. Its vote of 45.5 per cent, which was a modest increase of only 2.4 per cent on the 1996 figure, was actually 1.6 per cent behind its Coalition opponents. Labor's total of first preferences is the lowest by a winning party since the final Hamer victory in 1979. The election result might actually tell us more about the disillusionment of voters with the Coalition Government, than their support for their challengers. Many voters abandoned the Coalition, but a significant number chose to give Labor their second preference, rather than their first. In the seat of Seymour, for example, Labor trailed the Liberal sitting member on first preferences, but won the seat by just 462 votes after the distribution of Australian Green preferences.

On a more positive note, Labor's vote of 45.5 per cent was its second increase in successive elections, and was a healthy 7.1 per cent above its dark days of 1992—which had been its worst vote for 25 years. The ALP needs to use the advantages of office to prepare the ground to win majority government in its own right and gain a safer parliamentary position—as did the New South Wales party between the elections of 1995 and 1999. It has to work to win more seats east and south of the Yarra, for history suggests that its hold on its regional gains will be harder to maintain than its hold over its metropolitan seats. The increase in its Melbourne vote was only 2.6 per cent, and its total metropolitan vote of 49.6 per cent gives significant room for improvement—in 1982 John Cain's Labor Party won 54.7 per cent of the Melbourne vote. There is room for growth outside of the capital as well. Despite Labor picking up so many regional seats, its overall vote was only 38.1 per cent, 4.8 per cent lower than in 1982. It must ensure that its policies are seen as 'bush-friendly', if it is to retain these seats.

Of course, the length of time that Labor has in office may be insufficient to build up any degree of extra support, for its biggest problem will be ensuring that it retains the government reins. A minority government, propped up with some reluctance by independents, which has to face a Legislative Council controlled by the Opposition, is likely to see an early election as a strong possibility. Whether it could win majority control of the Assembly may well depend on a great many variables that are out of its control.<sup>67</sup> Not the least of its problems is the great difficulty it will have in gaining control of the Legislative Council while the two-member province electoral system is retained.

## The Liberal Party

The Liberal Party's new leader, Denis Napthine, has moved to indicate a new style of leadership: 'I can't imagine a denis.com'. He quickly signalled this in symbolic fashion. The Victorian Liberals under the successive leadership of Henry Bolte, Dick Hamer, Lindsay Thompson and, initially, Jeff Kennett, had always had caucus election for most of their front bench. In 1988 this had been scrapped by Kennett, who took over the responsibility himself—as is done in other divisions of the party. In turn, Napthine has reinstated caucus election with a few positions chosen by the party leader.<sup>68</sup>

Like the ALP, the Liberals can face the next few years with some optimism. With a new leadership team, and presumably a forthcoming review of its policies, it should be encouraged by the fact that its 1999 State-wide vote fell by only 1.8 per cent. In fact, its first preference vote was higher than any vote managed by Sir Henry Bolte from 1955 to 1970, when the party was reliant on Democratic Labor Party preferences in a great many seats. The party is very strong in Melbourne, so that its main aim must be to regain the seats it held in regional Victoria—for instance, it lost both Ballarat East and Ballarat West, as well as the two Legislative Council Ballarat contests.

Overall, the Liberal Party is well-placed to launch a bid to regain office at the next election, providing the early, emotional views of some members ('the worst ever loss in the history of the Victorian section'<sup>69</sup>) do not lead to any widespread party blood-letting with resulting poor publicity. If such blood-letting does occur, past history suggests that the earlier it is done before the next election, the better.

## The National Party

The National Party's position is far less healthy. Despite its running of two more candidates than in 1996 its vote fell. Its State total of 4.9 per cent was the party's lowest on record—50 years ago its vote was exactly 10 percentage points higher. It currently holds just seven of the 88 seats; fifty years ago it held 20 of 75 seats. Its chances of growth appear to be non-existent. A steady decline in regional seats presents it with a dilemma familiar to branches in New South Wales and Queensland. One chance of growth is to contest near-metropolitan seats, but its abject failure when it attempted to do so in Victoria in the mid-1980s does not bode well for such a tactic if it were to be tried again.<sup>70</sup>

In the immediate future, the party must work to regain Gippsland East. The task of pushing the Liberals out of Warrnambool might be rather more difficult. Elsewhere, it possibly needs to reconsider its opposition to three-cornered contests, for to do so would enable it to mount a serious challenge in the Liberal-held regional seats, as well as in the regional seats its coalition partner has just lost.



The Nationals must hope that the Bracks push to introduce proportional representation for Legislative Council elections can be stopped. On its current vote, it would be hard-pressed to retain its six seats, assuming that the upper house remained the same size. Were it to be reduced, as has been flagged by Labor, and as occurred in Tasmania in 1998, the task of gaining any upper house representation would be very much harder than it is at present.

The Nationals also have a dilemma over the matter of coalition with the Liberal Party. Despite the view of Pat McNamara that the advantages in being involved in government decision-making justified joining a coalition, others have suggested that 'the experience of power in the Kennett years can be said to have been at best a mixed blessing'.<sup>71</sup> The party presumably suffered by being part of the 'Melbourne-centric' Kennett Government, and a return to a coalition government would leave it open to a similar problem in the future. Ryan has pledged to visit rural Victoria to listen to its concerns, but it has been argued that this may be too late: 'The time to communicate with rural communities and then deliver meaningful, effective policies was between 1992 and the 1999 election'.<sup>72</sup>

### Three-cornered Contests

Three-cornered contests used to be an important component of Coalition electoral contests. In recent years, however, the National Party, ever-mindful of its declining number of seats, has criticised the Liberal Party for its continued enthusiasm for them—as was heard after the 1999 New South Wales election.<sup>73</sup> In a similar fashion, McNamara expressed his annoyance at the number of 'pointless' three-cornered contests in Victoria in 1999. A journalist summed up what he called 'one of the many lessons' learned from the campaign, namely that the partners had spent 'too much energy and resources' fighting such three-cornered battles.<sup>74</sup> The evidence does not seem to bear out such a view.

There were five such contests in this Legislative Assembly election, three in Liberal (or former Liberal) seats, and two in National seats. None of these seats had three-cornered contests in 1996. There were none in the Legislative Council contests.

In *Gippsland West* and *Mildura* the three-cornered contests in former Liberal seats were actually caused by the nomination of National Party candidates. In both, the combined Liberal–National vote topped the first preference vote of the winning independent, suggesting that the theory that three-cornered contests maximise the combined Coalition vote, was borne out. In neither case, however, did the Coalition vote top 50 per cent, and this no doubt was of vital importance in aiding the independent victories. In both cases, however, the three-cornered contest tactic appears to have been justified.

In *Polwarth*, a Liberal seat that runs west from the electorates of Geelong North and Geelong, the Liberal candidate (41%) saw 10 percentage points stripped from the party's 1996 vote. As the National candidate (16.6%), was a prominent ex-Geelong AFL player, it is quite likely that it was his nomination that forced the Liberal sitting member to

preferences. The margin between the two Coalition partners was so great—and the National vote so low—that it can be argued that if there was a 'pointless' three-cornered contest, this was it. It was forced, though, by the National Party.

As we have seen the Coalition lost a larger proportion of votes in rural Victoria than in metropolitan electorates. In *Wimmera*, however, the Coalition figure jumped from 56.9 per cent in 1996 (National only) to a combined Liberal and National vote of 63.5 per cent. Assuming that a National candidate standing alone would have had a reduced vote, the three-cornered contest quite clearly maximised the Coalition vote, as the theory suggests it should. The impact upon the ALP was such that it received less than one-quarter of the vote and was excluded from the contest at the penultimate count. The final count was therefore between National and Liberal, with the National candidate retaining the seat by a 15 per cent margin.

We have seen earlier that the National Party had come under criticism in *Warrnambool* over water charges. Despite this, the 'intrusion' of a Liberal Party candidate presumably helped the Coalition vote to top 57 per cent—though the National's 17.5 per cent was a drop of 40.3 per cent on the previous result. The question here is whether the National standing alone could have won this seat that is normally not friendly to the ALP. Labor's candidate received just 31.5 per cent, so it is unlikely that enough of the vote that went to the Liberals would have shifted to Labor if a Liberal candidate had not been on the ballot paper. As no other candidate topped 6 per cent, it is in regard to this seat, alone, that McNamara's complaint—as a National spokesperson—has some justification. From the Liberal perspective, however, the fact that the Liberal Party was able to nominate an attractive candidate for the seat meant that *Warrnambool* did not slip out of Coalition hands as might have happened.

## Conclusion

### A matter of timing?

The Victorian Liberal Party, the most successful division of the party that Robert Menzies created over 50 years ago, will probably mull over two tantalising questions for some time to come:

- Should Kennett have gone earlier? A combination of good polls, plus Labor's leadership tensions, suggests that the Premier should probably have gone to the people earlier, possibly as early as May or June. The delay meant that the new leadership was able to stake out a position as a reasonable, 'new' face of Labor that could increasingly claim to have put the party's internal problems behind it.<sup>75</sup>

- It seems clear that if Kennett had timed his departure from the Liberal leadership—and hence the Premiership—as soon as it was clear that he had lost his parliamentary majority, then at least Russell Savage, and possibly Craig Ingram, would have supported a minority Liberal–National Government. Indeed, as late as the Monday after the Frankston East by-election, Savage suggested that an earlier Kennett resignation would have swung independent support behind the Coalition: 'They had a great chance to do it but they didn't'.<sup>76</sup>

## Implications?

There are several implications that can be drawn from the Victorian election.

- The urban-rural divide remains an important part of Australian politics. Given the right circumstances, as in Victoria in 1999, even if few votes move in metropolitan electorates a significant movement of votes in the bush can decide an election result. This recent Victorian election is a reminder of New South Wales 1976. In that election Labor's ability to retain the seats it held outside of the cities, and to pick up the rural seat that gave it a one-seat parliamentary majority, brought Neville Wran to power.
- It is clear that the growing volatility of the Australian electorate means that no government, whether at Commonwealth or State level, can be seen as impregnable. The past decade has seen governments defeated in New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, South Australia, Tasmania and the ACT as well as in the Commonwealth election of 1996.
- A related point is that even governments with very large majorities can see these quickly disappear. This occurred to Premiers Greiner, Goss and Kennett, with Greiner resigning before the end of his term, Goss losing power after a by-election defeat and Kennett's recent loss of power.
- Governments that undertake a large-scale reform program run the risk of bringing about a voter backlash, no matter how much the economic circumstances of the time suggest the need for such reform.
- Victoria 1999 reminds us that the use of preferential voting can sometimes have an important impact upon the result of an Australian election.

## Endnotes

---

1. Peter Aimer, *Politics, Power and Persuasion. The Liberals in Victoria*, James Bennett, Sydney, 1974, pp. 150–4.
2. At this time, a symbol of the less-than-friendly relations between the non-Labor parties was the decision of the Liberal Party in 1949 to call itself the Liberal and Country Party. The party only dropped the word 'Country' in 1965.
3. James Jupp, 'Victoria: Left, Right and Centre', in Andrew Parkin and John Warhurst, ed., *Machine Politics in the Australian Labor Party*, George Allen and Unwin, Sydney, 1983, pp. 69–72.
4. Brian Costar and Nicholas Economou, 'Elections and Electoral Change 1982–92', in Mark Considine and Brian Costar, ed., *Trials in Power. Cain, Kirner and Victoria 1982–1992*, Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1992, p. 261.
5. Leanne White, 'The Fourth Estate and the Kennett Government', in Brian Costar and Nicholas Economou, eds, *The Kennett Revolution. Victorian Politics in the 1990s*, University of New South Wales Press, Sydney, 1999, p. 33.
6. *Herald Sun*, 25 August 1999.
7. Ardel Shamsullah, "'The Policy of Confidence": Politics in Victoria 1992–98', in Costar and Economou, *The Kennett Revolution*, p. 6.
8. *Australian*, 1 April 1996.
9. Ernie Chaples, Helen Nelson and Ken Turner, 'The Wran model in perspective', in Ernie Chaples, Helen Nelson and Ken Turner, eds, *The Wran Model. Electoral politics in New South Wales 1981 and 1984*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1985, p. 245.
10. Brian Costar, 'Laboring against the Jeff factor', *Sunday Age*, 29 August 1999.
11. *Age*, 25 August 1999.
12. Graham Hudson, 'The ALP: Labouring in Opposition', in Costar and Economou, *The Kennett Revolution*, p. 99.
13. Brumby quoted in Hudson, op. cit., p. 100.
14. Nicholas Economou and Brian Costar, 'The Electoral Contest and Coalition Dominance 1992–98', in Costar and Economou, *The Kennett Revolution*, p. 131.
15. Shamsullah, op. cit., p. 13.
16. Economou and Costar, 'The Electoral Contest...', p. 130; *Age*, 12 November 1997.
17. *Age*, 27 July 1998.
18. *Australian*, 25 February 1999.
19. Shamsullah, op. cit., p. 11; Hudson, op. cit., p. 109.
20. For speculation that Labor could lose seats, see *Australian*, 25 February 1999, *Age*, 25 August 1999.
21. *Age*, 25 August 1999.
22. Allan Attwood, 'A true believer takes his chance while cameras roll', *Age*, 20 September 1999.

23. *Age*, 26 August 1999.
24. *Age*, 25 August 1999.
25. *Age*, 28 August 1999.
26. *Australian*, 25 August 1999.
27. *Age*, 17, 18 July 1999, *Weekend Australian*, 3–4 July 1999.
28. *Sunday Age*, 24 October 1999.
29. *Age*, 9 September 1999.
30. *Herald Sun*, 6 September 1999; *Age*, 20 September 1999.
31. *Sunday Herald Sun*, 5 September 1999; *Age*, 10 September 1999.
32. *Weekend Australian*, 28–29 August 1999; *Sunday Age*, 5 September 1999; *Herald Sun*, 8 September 1999; *Age*, 20 September 1999.
33. *Herald Sun*, 25 August 1999; *Australian*, 26 August 1999.
34. *Age*, 25 August 1999.
35. Independents' Charter Victoria 1999, <http://home.vicnet.au/~susandavies/Charterfinal.htm>
36. *Age*, 18 October 1999.
37. Robert Manne, *Sydney Morning Herald*, 13 September 1999.
38. Woodward and Costar, op. cit., p. 15.
39. Dennis Woodward and Brian Costar, 'Another Case of Electoral Volatility? The 1999 Victorian Election', unpublished paper, 1999, p. 3.
40. *Bulletin*, 7 September 1999.
41. *Financial Review*, 17 September 1999, *Courier Mail*, 18 September 1999.
42. *Age*, 28 August 1999.
43. Pamela Bone, 'Why some Liberals can't abide Kennett', *Age*, 16 September 1999; Anne Henderson, 'Rewards go to grassroots polities', *Australian*, 30 September 1999.
44. *Herald Sun*, 27 August 1999.
45. *Herald Sun*, 10 September 1999.
46. *Age*, 25 August 1999.
47. Anne Vince, 'Amalgamations', in Brian Dollery and Neil Marshall ed., *Australian Local Government. Reform and Renewal*, Macmillan, Melbourne, 1997, p. 160; Brian Costar, 'Coalition Government: An Unequal Partnership', in Costar and Economou, *The Kennett Revolution*, pp. 93–4; Bill Russell, 'Rebuilding Victoria after Kennett', *Dissent*, Summer 1999/2000, p. 56.
48. Editor, *St Arnaud North Central News*, quoted Costar, 'Coalition Government...', p. 92.
49. Woodward and Costar, op. cit., p. 9.
50. *ibid*, p.16.
51. *Age*, 20 September 1999.
52. See Tim Colebatch, 'Behind the rural revolt', *Age*, 18 October 1999; for other articles on the rural view of the Kennett Government, see *Weekend Australian*, 28–29 August 1999, *Bulletin*, 5 October 1999.

53. Scott Bennett, *Affairs of State: politics in the Australian States and Territories*, Allen and Unwin, Sydney, 1992, p. 187.
54. *Australian*, 2–8 December 1999.
55. *Age*, 18 December 1999.
56. *Age*, 25 October 1999.
57. Mike Steketee, 'Felled by the polls', *Australian*, 2–8 December 1999.
58. Tony Parkinson, 'Can-do Premier undone', *Age*, 20 September 1999.
59. Quoted in Brian Costar, 'The National Party Campaign', in Brian J. Costar and Colin A. Hughes ed., *Labor to Office. The Victorian State Election 1982*, Drummond, Blackburn, p. 70.
60. Bennett, op. cit., p. 7.
61. *Financial Review*, 23 October 1999.
62. *Age*, 27 October 1999.
63. *Age*, 29 October 1999.
64. *Age*, 9 December 1999.
65. *Age*, 16 December 1999.
66. See, for example, *Australian*, 12 January 2000.
67. Virginia Trioli, 'End of the line', *Bulletin*, 26 October 1999, pp. 42–3.
68. *Age*, *Australian*, 27 October 1999.
69. Bernie Finn, former MLA for Tullamarine, *Age*, 22 December 1999.
70. Ardel Shamsullah, 'Politics in Victoria: Parliament, Cabinet and the Political Parties', in Considine and Costar, op. cit., pp. 16–17.
71. *Age*, 21 December 1999.
72. *ibid.*
73. For the New South Wales National Party's complaints, see Scott Bennett and Gerard Newman, 'New South Wales Election 1999', *Research Paper No. 22*, Department of the Parliamentary Library, Canberra, 1999, pp. 14–15. See also Scott Bennett, *Winning and Losing. Australia's National Elections*, Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1996, pp. 52–3.
74. Ewin Hannan, 'Running on empty in Liberal country', *Age*, 18 December 1999.
75. Adam Kilgour, Executive Director of CPR Communications & Public Relations Pty Ltd, who worked on the Labor campaign, was one observer who believed the delay was a 'major' mistake by the Premier, see 'How Bracks won it', *Age*, 22 October 1999.
76. *Bulletin*, 26 October 1999.

Table 1 Legislative Assembly, State Summary

Enrolled 3 130 338						
Candidates	Seats		First Preference Votes		Change from 1996	
	Won (a)	Number	Per cent	Seats(b)	Votes	
Australian Labor Party (ALP)	88	42	1 289 696	45.57	+13(+12)	+2.44
Liberal Party (LP)	81	36	1 194 998	42.22	-13(-10)	-1.77
National Party (NP)	12	7	135 930	4.80	-2(-2)	-1.89
Australian Greens (AG)	21		32 570	1.15		+1.15
Hope Party (HP)	10		10 894	0.38		+0.38
One Nation (PHON)	4		8 181	0.29		+0.29
Australian Democrats (AD)	6		7 972	0.28		+0.28
Democratic Labor Party (DLP)	8		6 183	0.22		+0.22
Natural Law Party (NLP)	15		6 044	0.21		-1.65
Shooters Party (SP)	2		2 011	0.07		+0.03
Australian Reform Party (ARP)	3		1 483	0.05		+0.05
Christian Democratic Party (CDP)	1		414	0.01		-0.22
Abolish Child Support (ACS)	1		194	0.01		+0.01
Independents (IND)	67	3	133 701	4.72	+2(0)	+0.65
Formal Votes			2 830 271	96.98		-0.72
Informal Votes			88 275	3.02		+0.72
Totals/Turnout	319	88	2 918 546	93.23		-0.85

(a) After the Burwood by-election, ALP 43 and LP 35.

(b) Figures in brackets represent change from position prior to 1999 election.

Table 2a Legislative Assembly: District Summary  
Number

Electoral District	First Preference Votes				Formal Votes	Informal Votes	Total Votes	Electors Enrolled
	ALP	LP	NP	Others				
Albert Park	<b>18 997</b>	14 671			33 668	989	34 657	39 365
Altona	<b>21 545</b>	11 774			33 319	1 303	34 622	36 589
Ballarat East	<b>16 100</b>	13 886			29 986	706	30 692	32 526
Ballarat West	<b>15 527</b>	14 910			30 437	744	31 181	32 893
Bayswater	13 732	<b>17 165</b>		1 380	32 277	786	33 063	35 427
Bellarine	14 289	<b>15 875</b>		1 930	32 094	599	32 693	34 423
Benalla	13 013		<b>17 543</b>		30 556	1 128	31 684	34 087
Benambra	13 561	<b>18 016</b>			31 577	931	32 508	35 378
Bendigo East	<b>15 478</b>	14 123		2 380	31 981	567	32 548	34 094
Bendigo West	<b>18 315</b>	11 679		2 483	32 477	638	33 115	34 932
Bennettswood	13 103	<b>16 715</b>			29 818	733	30 551	32 822
Bentleigh	13 831	<b>15 679</b>		1 927	31 437	865	32 302	34 492
Berwick	17 248	<b>21 958</b>		1 519	40 725	1 241	41 966	44 452
Box Hill	12 166	<b>17 299</b>		1 356	30 821	671	31 492	34 099
Brighton	6 973	<b>17 701</b>		5 920	30 594	664	31 258	34 221
Broadmeadows	<b>22 718</b>	6 889		2 080	31 687	1 898	33 585	36 559
Bulleen	9 810	<b>17 843</b>		2 722	30 375	982	31 357	33 760
Bundoora	<b>18 375</b>	14 612		807	33 794	973	34 767	36 747
Burwood	13 062	<b>17 455</b>		928	31 445	789	32 234	34 668
Carrum	<b>16 099</b>	16 770		1 896	34 765	899	35 664	38 150
Caulfield	13 460	<b>18 947</b>			32 407	1 024	33 431	37 601
Clayton	<b>20 037</b>	12 441			32 478	1 503	33 981	36 653
Coburg	<b>18 877</b>	7 765		2 547	29 189	1 248	30 437	35 338
Cranbourne	14 892	<b>20 444</b>		2 379	37 715	997	38 712	41 084
Dandenong	<b>23 129</b>	18 297			41 426	1 733	43 159	46 056
Dandenong North	<b>16 406</b>	11 908		2 096	30 410	1 302	31 712	33 802
Doncaster	10 579	<b>19 707</b>		2 126	32 412	915	33 327	35 902
Dromana	13 542	<b>17 900</b>		1 441	32 883	799	33 682	36 014
Eltham	14 325	<b>18 696</b>		4 157	37 178	907	38 085	40 355
Essendon	<b>18 489</b>	13 135			31 624	839	32 463	34 636
Evelyn	11 480	<b>18 367</b>		3 686	33 533	1 042	34 575	36 733
Footscray	<b>19 916</b>	9 533			29 449	1 503	30 952	34 174
Forest Hill	12 895	<b>17 583</b>		1 000	31 478	816	32 294	34 556
Frankston	10 083	<b>17 778</b>		2 476	30 337	635	30 972	33 431
Frankston East	<b>13 127</b>	10 632		1 803	25 562	1 280	26 842	28 877
Geelong	<b>14 001</b>	14 719		2 264	30 984	802	31 786	33 830
Geelong North	<b>19 000</b>	12 176			31 176	1 158	32 334	34 379
Gippsland East	8 177		10 776	<b>11 054</b>	30 007	812	30 819	33 075
Gippsland South	9 955		<b>15 130</b>	4 867	29 952	800	30 752	32 761
Gippsland West	5 487	11 502	1 973	<b>11 332</b>	30 294	821	31 115	32 796
Gisborne	<b>13 589</b>	14 084		5 975	33 648	981	34 629	36 390
Glen Waverley	10 738	<b>18 410</b>			29 148	714	29 862	31 984
Hawthorn	10 635	<b>20 548</b>		1 650	32 833	792	33 625	36 943
Ivanhoe	<b>15 079</b>	12 788		2 227	30 094	858	30 952	33 205
Keilor	<b>22 338</b>	12 851		2 875	38 064	1 967	40 031	42 091
Kew	10 751	<b>19 594</b>		1 380	31 725	795	32 520	35 644
Knox	14 684	<b>20 481</b>		1 408	36 573	943	37 516	39 768
Malvern	10 583	<b>21 129</b>			31 712	697	32 409	35 940
Melbourne	<b>20 572</b>	12 122		1 986	34 680	1 334	36 014	41 000
Melton	<b>24 237</b>	15 294			39 531	1 862	41 393	44 047



Table 2a Legislative Assembly: District Summary  
Number continued

Electoral District	First Preference Votes				Formal Votes	Informal Votes	Total Votes	Electors Enrolled
	ALP	LP	NP	Others				
Mildura	2 572	7 998	6 015	<b>13 942</b>	30 527	763	31 290	33 191
Mill Park	<b>24 307</b>	12 405		924	37 636	1 541	39 177	41 456
Mitcham	<b>14 411</b>	15 043		2 423	31 877	729	32 606	34 479
Monbulk	12 266	<b>15 206</b>		3 043	30 515	870	31 385	33 627
Mooroolbark	12 549	<b>19 509</b>			32 058	896	32 954	34 835
Mordialloc	14 200	<b>15 515</b>			29 715	955	30 670	32 829
Mornington	12 198	<b>17 821</b>		3 599	33 618	813	34 431	36 840
Morwell	<b>17 366</b>	11 040		2 912	31 318	700	32 018	33 737
Murray Valley	10 811		<b>20 899</b>		31 710	990	32 700	34 790
Narracan	<b>13 074</b>	11 925		3 685	28 684	939	29 623	31 688
Niddrie	<b>17 761</b>	13 525			31 286	1 252	32 538	33 802
Northcote	<b>20 681</b>	8 124		2 480	31 285	1 306	32 591	35 695
Oakleigh	<b>15 060</b>	13 558		1 975	30 593	1 118	31 711	34 347
Pakenham	11 949	<b>17 202</b>		3 208	32 359	802	33 161	35 194
Pascoe Vale	<b>17 725</b>	9 569			27 294	1 098	28 392	31 045
Polwarth	7 393	<b>12 668</b>	5 116	5 735	30 912	686	31 598	33 217
Portland	8 016	<b>12 093</b>		7 153	27 262	515	27 777	29 156
Prahran	13 056	<b>16 789</b>		3 055	32 900	904	33 804	39 089
Preston	<b>20 087</b>	8 769		1 052	29 908	1 339	31 247	33 794
Richmond	<b>20 121</b>	10 716		4 213	35 050	1 348	36 398	41 466
Ripon	<b>15 579</b>	14 045			29 624	668	30 292	31 732
Rodney	8 565		<b>18 329</b>	3 257	30 151	692	30 843	32 526
Sandringham	11 693	<b>19 478</b>			31 171	828	31 999	34 629
Seymour	<b>15 410</b>	15 675		1 797	32 882	879	33 761	35 717
Shepparton	7 616		<b>12 355</b>	10 965	30 936	865	31 801	33 823
South Barwon	12 468	<b>16 892</b>		3 937	33 297	761	34 058	36 107
Springvale	<b>18 230</b>	11 152		2 078	31 460	1 476	32 936	35 438
Sunshine	<b>19 826</b>	9 100		4 780	33 706	1 987	35 693	38 506
Swan Hill	5 511		<b>12 378</b>	9 486	27 375	1 066	28 441	30 088
Thomastown	<b>23 305</b>	8 212			31 517	1 479	32 996	35 416
Tullamarine	<b>18 346</b>	15 561		2 383	36 290	1 210	37 500	39 652
Wantirna	13 301	<b>21 579</b>			34 880	931	35 811	37 964
Warrandyte	10 630	<b>19 395</b>		1 645	31 670	620	32 290	34 386
Warrnambool	9 993	<b>12 739</b>	5 550	3 418	31 700	962	32 662	34 226
Werribee	<b>22 652</b>	14 120		1 524	38 296	1 221	39 517	41 644
Williamstown	<b>20 468</b>	8 877		1 341	30 686	1 155	31 841	34 501
Wimmera	7 230	9 450	<b>9 866</b>	3 868	30 414	878	31 292	32 652
Yan Yean	<b>18 265</b>	15 397		1 712	35 374	1 048	36 422	38 305
Total	1 289 696	1 194 998	135 930	209 647	2 830 271	88 275	2 918 546	3 130 338
Regions								
Metropolitan	907 539	837 769	0	82 894	1 828 202	61 771	1 889 973	2 040 259
Non-Metropolitan	382 157	357 229	135 930	126 753	1 002 069	26 504	1 028 573	1 090 079

Note: Party winning seat shown in bold.

Table 2b Legislative Assembly: District Summary  
Per cent

Electoral District	First Preference Votes				Formal Votes	Informal Votes	Turnout
	ALP	LP	NP	Others			
Albert Park	<b>56.4</b>	43.6			97.1	2.9	88.0
Altona	<b>64.7</b>	35.3			96.2	3.8	94.6
Ballarat East	<b>53.7</b>	46.3			97.7	2.3	94.4
Ballarat West	<b>51.0</b>	49.0			97.6	2.4	94.8
Bayswater	42.5	<b>53.2</b>		4.3	97.6	2.4	93.3
Bellarine	44.5	<b>49.5</b>		6.0	98.2	1.8	95.0
Benalla	42.6		<b>57.4</b>		96.4	3.6	93.0
Benambra	42.9	<b>57.1</b>			97.1	2.9	91.9
Bendigo East	<b>48.4</b>	44.2		7.4	98.3	1.7	95.5
Bendigo West	<b>56.4</b>	36.0		7.6	98.1	1.9	94.8
Bennettswood	43.9	<b>56.1</b>			97.6	2.4	93.1
Bentleigh	44.0	<b>49.9</b>		6.1	97.3	2.7	93.7
Berwick	42.4	<b>53.9</b>		3.7	97.0	3.0	94.4
Box Hill	39.5	<b>56.1</b>		4.4	97.9	2.1	92.4
Brighton	22.8	<b>57.9</b>		19.4	97.9	2.1	91.3
Broadmeadows	<b>71.7</b>	21.7		6.6	94.3	5.7	91.9
Bulleen	32.3	<b>58.7</b>		9.0	96.9	3.1	92.9
Bundoora	<b>54.4</b>	43.2		2.4	97.2	2.8	94.6
Burwood	41.5	<b>55.5</b>		3.0	97.6	2.4	93.0
Carrum	<b>46.3</b>	48.2		5.5	97.5	2.5	93.5
Caulfield	41.5	<b>58.5</b>			96.9	3.1	88.9
Clayton	<b>61.7</b>	38.3			95.6	4.4	92.7
Coburg	<b>64.7</b>	26.6		8.7	95.9	4.1	86.1
Cranbourne	39.5	<b>54.2</b>		6.3	97.4	2.6	94.2
Dandenong	<b>55.8</b>	44.2			96.0	4.0	93.7
Dandenong North	<b>53.9</b>	39.2		6.9	95.9	4.1	93.8
Doncaster	32.6	<b>60.8</b>		6.6	97.3	2.7	92.8
Dromana	41.2	<b>54.4</b>		4.4	97.6	2.4	93.5
Eltham	38.5	<b>50.3</b>		11.2	97.6	2.4	94.4
Essendon	<b>58.5</b>	41.5			97.4	2.6	93.7
Evelyn	34.2	<b>54.8</b>		11.0	97.0	3.0	94.1
Footscray	<b>67.6</b>	32.4			95.1	4.9	90.6
Forest Hill	41.0	<b>55.9</b>		3.2	97.5	2.5	93.5
Frankston	33.2	<b>58.6</b>		8.2	97.9	2.1	92.6
Frankston East	<b>51.4</b>	41.6		7.1	95.2	4.8	93.0
Geelong	<b>45.2</b>	47.5		7.3	97.5	2.5	94.0
Geelong North	<b>60.9</b>	39.1			96.4	3.6	94.1
Gippsland East	27.3		35.9	<b>36.8</b>	97.4	2.6	93.2
Gippsland South	33.2		<b>50.5</b>	16.2	97.4	2.6	93.9
Gippsland West	18.1	38.0	6.5	<b>37.4</b>	97.4	2.6	94.9
Gisborne	<b>40.4</b>	41.9		17.8	97.2	2.8	95.2
Glen Waverley	36.8	<b>63.2</b>			97.6	2.4	93.4
Hawthorn	32.4	<b>62.6</b>		5.0	97.6	2.4	91.0
Ivanhoe	<b>50.1</b>	42.5		7.4	97.2	2.8	93.2
Keilor	<b>58.7</b>	33.8		7.6	95.1	4.9	95.1
Kew	33.9	<b>61.8</b>		4.3	97.6	2.4	91.2
Knox	40.1	<b>56.0</b>		3.8	97.5	2.5	94.3
Malvern	33.4	<b>66.6</b>			97.8	2.2	90.2
Melbourne	<b>59.3</b>	35.0		5.7	96.3	3.7	87.8
Melton	<b>61.3</b>	38.7			95.5	4.5	94.0

Table 2b Legislative Assembly: District Summary  
Per cent continued

Electoral District	First Preference Votes				Formal Votes	Informal Votes	Turnout
	ALP	LP	NP	Others			
Mildura	8.4	26.2	19.7	<b>45.7</b>	97.6	2.4	94.3
Mill Park	<b>64.6</b>	33.0		2.5	96.1	3.9	94.5
Mitcham	<b>45.2</b>	47.2		7.6	97.8	2.2	94.6
Monbulk	40.2	<b>49.8</b>		10.0	97.2	2.8	93.3
Mooroolbark	39.1	<b>60.9</b>			97.3	2.7	94.6
Mordialloc	47.8	<b>52.2</b>			96.9	3.1	93.4
Mornington	36.3	<b>53.0</b>		10.7	97.6	2.4	93.5
Morwell	<b>55.5</b>	35.3		9.3	97.8	2.2	94.9
Murray Valley	34.1		<b>65.9</b>		97.0	3.0	94.0
Narracan	<b>45.6</b>	41.6		12.8	96.8	3.2	93.5
Niddrie	<b>56.8</b>	43.2			96.2	3.8	96.3
Northcote	<b>66.1</b>	26.0		7.9	96.0	4.0	91.3
Oakleigh	<b>49.2</b>	44.3		6.5	96.5	3.5	92.3
Pakenham	36.9	<b>53.2</b>		9.9	97.6	2.4	94.2
Pascoe Vale	<b>64.9</b>	35.1			96.1	3.9	91.5
Polwarth	23.9	<b>41.0</b>	16.6	18.6	97.8	2.2	95.1
Portland	29.4	<b>44.4</b>		26.2	98.1	1.9	95.3
Prahran	39.7	<b>51.0</b>		9.3	97.3	2.7	86.5
Preston	<b>67.2</b>	29.3		3.5	95.7	4.3	92.5
Richmond	<b>57.4</b>	30.6		12.0	96.3	3.7	87.8
Ripon	<b>52.6</b>	47.4			97.8	2.2	95.5
Rodney	28.4		<b>60.8</b>	10.8	97.8	2.2	94.8
Sandringham	37.5	<b>62.5</b>			97.4	2.6	92.4
Seymour	<b>46.9</b>	47.7		5.5	97.4	2.6	94.5
Shepparton	24.6		<b>39.9</b>	35.4	97.3	2.7	94.0
South Barwon	37.4	<b>50.7</b>		11.8	97.8	2.2	94.3
Springvale	<b>57.9</b>	35.4		6.6	95.5	4.5	92.9
Sunshine	<b>58.8</b>	27.0		14.2	94.4	5.6	92.7
Swan Hill	20.1		<b>45.2</b>	34.7	96.3	3.7	94.5
Thomastown	<b>73.9</b>	26.1			95.5	4.5	93.2
Tullamarine	<b>50.6</b>	42.9		6.6	96.8	3.2	94.6
Wantirna	38.1	<b>61.9</b>			97.4	2.6	94.3
Warrandyte	33.6	<b>61.2</b>		5.2	98.1	1.9	93.9
Warrnambool	31.5	<b>40.2</b>	17.5	10.8	97.1	2.9	95.4
Werribee	<b>59.1</b>	36.9		4.0	96.9	3.1	94.9
Williamstown	<b>66.7</b>	28.9		4.4	96.4	3.6	92.3
Wimmera	23.8	31.1	<b>32.4</b>	12.7	97.2	2.8	95.8
Yan Yean	<b>51.6</b>	43.5		4.8	97.1	2.9	95.1
Total	45.6	42.2	4.8	7.4	97.0	3.0	93.2
Regions							
Metropolitan	49.6	45.8	0.0	4.5	96.7	3.3	92.6
Non-Metropolitan	38.1	35.6	13.6	12.6	97.4	2.6	94.4

Note: Party winning seat shown in bold.

Table 3 Legislative Assembly: District Details

<b>Albert Park</b>					Enrolled 39 365				
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing					
<i>First Preference Votes</i>									
Thwaites J *	ALP	18 997	56.4	-0.6					
Rushford R	LP	14 671	43.6	+4.1					
Formal		33 668	97.1	-0.7					
Informal		989	2.9	+0.7					
Turnout		34 657	88.0	-1.8					
<b>Altona</b>					Enrolled 36 589				
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing					
<i>First Preference Votes</i>									
Kosky L *	ALP	21 545	64.7	+7.9					
Lambrinakos S	LP	11 774	35.3	-1.4					
Formal		33 319	96.2	-0.9					
Informal		1 303	3.8	+0.9					
Turnout		34 622	94.6	+0.1					
<b>Ballarat East</b>					Enrolled 32 526				
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing					
<i>First Preference Votes</i>									
Traynor B *	LP	13 886	46.3	-2.0					
Howard G	ALP	16 100	53.7	+5.8					
Formal		29 986	97.7	-0.7					
Informal		706	2.3	+0.7					
Turnout		30 692	94.4	-0.5					
<b>Ballarat West</b>					Enrolled 32 893				
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing					
<i>First Preference Votes</i>									
Verlin J #	LP	14 910	49.0	-0.5					
Overington K	ALP	15 527	51.0	+5.2					
Formal		30 437	97.6	-0.6					
Informal		744	2.4	+0.6					
Turnout		31 181	94.8	-0.1					
<b>Bayswater</b>					Enrolled 35 427				
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing					
<i>First Preference Votes</i>									
Bristow J	HP	1 380	4.3	+4.3					
Craven S	ALP	13 732	42.5	+1.4					
Ashley G *	LP	17 165	53.2	-2.8					
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>									
Craven S	ALP	14 623	45.3	+2.8					
Ashley G *	LP	17 654	54.7	-2.8					
Formal		32 277	97.6	-0.5					
Informal		786	2.4	+0.5					
Turnout		33 063	93.3	-1.0					
<b>Bellarine</b>					Enrolled 34 423				
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing					
<i>First Preference Votes</i>									
Erlor K	ALP	14 289	44.5	+0.1					
Menheere-Thompson E	AD	1 930	6.0	+6.0					
Spry G *	LP	15 875	49.5	-6.1					
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>									
Erlor K	ALP	15 495	48.3	+3.8					
Spry G *	LP	16 599	51.7	-3.8					
Formal		32 094	98.2	-0.1					
Informal		599	1.8	+0.1					
Turnout		32 693	95.0	-0.8					
<b>Benalla</b>					Enrolled 34 087				
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing					
<i>First Preference Votes</i>									
Allen D	ALP	13 013	42.6	+19.0					
McNamara P *	NP	17 543	57.4	-1.5					
Formal		30 556	96.4	-1.6					
Informal		1 128	3.6	+1.6					
Turnout		31 684	93.0	-1.9					
<b>Benambra</b>					Enrolled 35 378				
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing					
<i>First Preference Votes</i>									
Plowman T *	LP	18 016	57.1	-5.8					
Murdoch B	ALP	13 561	42.9	+9.9					
Formal		31 577	97.1	-0.9					
Informal		931	2.9	+0.9					
Turnout		32 508	91.9	-1.4					
<b>Bendigo East</b>					Enrolled 34 094				
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing					
<i>First Preference Votes</i>									
Rivendell B	AG	1 552	4.9	+4.9					
John M *	LP	14 123	44.2	-8.1					
Thorpe A	ARP	828	2.6	+2.6					
Allan J	ALP	15 478	48.4	+6.6					
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>									
John M *	LP	15 004	46.9	-8.1					
Allan J	ALP	16 977	53.1	+8.1					
Formal		31 981	98.3	-0.4					
Informal		567	1.7	+0.4					
Turnout		32 548	95.5	+0.7					

<b>Bendigo West</b>		Enrolled 34 932			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Cameron B *	ALP	18 315	56.4	+12.7	
Howard A	IND	1 092	3.4	+3.4	
Hall A	AG	1 391	4.3	+4.3	
Cappy F	LP	11 679	36.0	-7.0	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Cameron B *	ALP	19 893	61.3	+9.6	
Cappy F	LP	12 582	38.7	-9.6	
Formal		32 477	98.1	-0.4	
Informal		638	1.9	+0.4	
Turnout		33 115	94.8	-0.1	

<b>Bennettswood</b>		Enrolled 32 822			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Wilson R #	LP	16 715	56.1	-2.0	
Andrews M	ALP	13 103	43.9	+4.4	
Formal		29 818	97.6	-0.5	
Informal		733	2.4	+0.5	
Turnout		30 551	93.1	-1.4	

<b>Bentleigh</b>		Enrolled 34 492			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Maloney C	ALP	13 831	44.0	+0.1	
Brunton N	AG	1 139	3.6	+3.6	
King G	DLP	492	1.6	+1.6	
Barber M	IND	296	0.9	+0.9	
Peulich I *	LP	15 679	49.9	-3.9	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Maloney C	ALP	15 090	48.1	+2.8	
Peulich I *	LP	16 300	51.9	-2.8	
Formal		31 437	97.3	-0.7	
Informal		865	2.7	+0.7	
Turnout		32 302	93.7	-1.4	

<b>Berwick</b>		Enrolled 44 452			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Dean R *	LP	21 958	53.9	+0.8	
Reed P	ALP	17 248	42.4	-0.3	
Rowe M	DLP	1 519	3.7	+3.7	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Dean R *	LP	22 376	54.9	-0.4	
Reed P	ALP	18 348	45.1	+0.4	
Formal		40 725	97.0	-0.4	
Informal		1 241	3.0	+0.4	
Turnout		41 966	94.4	-0.6	

<b>Box Hill</b>		Enrolled 34 099			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Waters J	HP	1 356	4.4	+4.4	
Thorn C	ALP	12 166	39.5	+1.2	
Clark R *	LP	17 299	56.1	-3.0	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Thorn C	ALP	13 067	42.4	+2.7	
Clark R *	LP	17 754	57.6	-2.7	
Formal		30 821	97.9	-0.4	
Informal		671	2.1	+0.4	
Turnout		31 492	92.4	-1.4	

<b>Brighton</b>		Enrolled 34 221			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Del Porto A	IND	5 920	19.4	+19.4	
Dunsmuir I	ALP	6 973	22.8	-7.3	
Asher L #	LP	17 701	57.9	-8.8	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Dunsmuir I	ALP	10 529	34.4	+2.5	
Asher L #	LP	20 061	65.6	-2.5	
Formal		30 594	97.9	-0.4	
Informal		664	2.1	+0.4	
Turnout		31 258	91.3	-1.5	

<b>Broadmeadows</b>		Enrolled 36 559			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Marr G	IND	1 022	3.2	+3.2	
Tay P	LP	6 889	21.7	-1.7	
Brumby J *	ALP	22 718	71.7	0.0	
Haidar A	IND	789	2.5	+2.5	
Kaliniy J	IND	269	0.8	+0.8	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Tay P	LP	8 019	25.3	+0.4	
Brumby J *	ALP	23 651	74.7	-0.4	
Formal		31 687	94.3	-2.7	
Informal		1 898	5.7	+2.7	
Turnout		33 585	91.9	-0.8	

<b>Bulleen</b>		Enrolled 33 760			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Manassa D	HP	890	2.9	+2.9	
Miras C	ALP	9 810	32.3	-1.1	
Trafficante R	AG	1 832	6.0	+6.0	
Kotsiras N #	LP	17 843	58.7	-4.7	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Miras C	ALP	11 662	38.4	+3.0	
Kotsiras N #	LP	18 709	61.6	-3.0	
Formal		30 375	96.9	-0.5	
Informal		982	3.1	+0.5	
Turnout		31 357	92.9	-2.0	

Victorian Election 1999

<b>Bundoora</b>		Enrolled 36 747			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Mason N	NLP	807	2.4	-0.5	
Garbutt S *	ALP	18 375	54.4	+3.9	
McCabe C	LP	14 612	43.2	-3.3	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Garbutt S *	ALP	18 942	56.1	+3.5	
McCabe C	LP	14 852	43.9	-3.5	
Formal		33 794	97.2	-0.8	
Informal		973	2.8	+0.8	
Turnout		34 767	94.6	-0.6	

<b>Burwood</b>		Enrolled 34 668			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Bunn M	NLP	734	2.3	-0.9	
Kennett J *	LP	17 455	55.5	-1.7	
Stensholt B	ALP	13 062	41.5	+2.0	
Abolish Child Support	ACS	194	0.6	+0.6	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Kennett J *	LP	17 858	56.8	-1.8	
Stensholt B	ALP	13 585	43.2	+1.8	
Formal		31 445	97.6	-0.7	
Informal		789	2.4	+0.7	
Turnout		32 234	93.0	-1.0	

<b>Carrum</b>		Enrolled 38 150			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Bray D	AG	1 896	5.5	+5.5	
Lindell J	ALP	16 099	46.3	+0.4	
Lean D *	LP	16 770	48.2	-1.1	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Lindell J	ALP	17 444	50.2	+1.0	
Lean D *	LP	17 321	49.8	-1.0	
Formal		34 765	97.5	-0.5	
Informal		899	2.5	+0.5	
Turnout		35 664	93.5	-0.7	

<b>Caulfield</b>		Enrolled 37 601			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Shardey H *	LP	18 947	58.5	+0.2	
Simon H	ALP	13 460	41.5	+3.0	
Formal		32 407	96.9	-0.7	
Informal		1 024	3.1	+0.7	
Turnout		33 431	88.9	-2.7	

<b>Clayton</b>		Enrolled 36 653			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Lok C	LP	12 441	38.3	0.0	
Lim H *	ALP	20 037	61.7	+6.2	
Formal		32 478	95.6	-1.3	
Informal		1 503	4.4	+1.3	
Turnout		33 981	92.7	-0.9	

<b>Coburg</b>		Enrolled 35 338			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Carli C *	ALP	18 877	64.7	-1.5	
Rush E	AG	2 547	8.7	+8.7	
Hrycek M	LP	7 765	26.6	-4.8	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Carli C *	ALP	20 951	71.8	+4.9	
Hrycek M	LP	8 232	28.2	-4.9	
Formal		29 189	95.9	-1.0	
Informal		1 248	4.1	+1.0	
Turnout		30 437	86.1	-5.9	

<b>Cranbourne</b>		Enrolled 41 084			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
McCormack C	IND	2 379	6.3	+6.3	
Perera J	ALP	14 892	39.5	-1.5	
Rowe G *	LP	20 444	54.2	-4.8	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Perera J	ALP	16 708	44.3	+3.3	
Rowe G *	LP	21 002	55.7	-3.3	
Formal		37 715	97.4	+0.1	
Informal		997	2.6	-0.1	
Turnout		38 712	94.2	-1.4	

<b>Dandenong</b>		Enrolled 46 056			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Miller A	LP	18 297	44.2	+0.1	
Pandazopoulos J *	ALP	23 129	55.8	+6.2	
Formal		41 426	96.0	-0.4	
Informal		1 733	4.0	+0.4	
Turnout		43 159	93.7	-0.6	

<b>Dandenong North</b>		Enrolled 33 802		
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing
<i>First Preference Votes</i>				
Lenders J #	ALP	16 406	53.9	+3.3
Harris G	IND	1 820	6.0	+6.0
Emmanouil G	LP	11 908	39.2	-6.8
Klimek F	ARP	276	0.9	+0.9
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>				
Lenders J #	ALP	17 634	58.0	+5.8
Emmanouil G	LP	12 775	42.0	-5.8
Formal		30 410	95.9	-1.1
Informal		1 302	4.1	+1.1
Turnout		31 712	93.8	-0.5

<b>Doncaster</b>		Enrolled 35 902		
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing
<i>First Preference Votes</i>				
Fyfield S	AG	1 497	4.6	+4.6
Perton V *	LP	19 707	60.8	-3.1
McCallum J	ALP	10 579	32.6	-0.3
Dawe G	HP	629	1.9	+1.9
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>				
Perton V *	LP	20 518	63.3	-1.6
McCallum J	ALP	11 892	36.7	+1.6
Formal		32 412	97.3	-0.3
Informal		915	2.7	+0.3
Turnout		33 327	92.8	-1.8

<b>Dromana</b>		Enrolled 36 014		
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing
<i>First Preference Votes</i>				
Dixon M *	LP	17 900	54.4	+3.5
Thompson D	ALP	13 542	41.2	+7.0
Crea P	DLP	951	2.9	+2.9
Charlwood J	NLP	490	1.5	+0.6
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>				
Dixon M *	LP	18 480	56.2	-1.9
Thompson D	ALP	14 403	43.8	+1.9
Formal		32 883	97.6	-0.8
Informal		799	2.4	+0.8
Turnout		33 682	93.5	-0.7

<b>Eltham</b>		Enrolled 40 355		
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing
<i>First Preference Votes</i>				
Engish J	IND	546	1.5	+1.5
Jennings M	IND	1 310	3.5	+3.5
Hanney P	ALP	14 325	38.5	+0.2
Rosenfeldt W	NLP	98	0.3	-0.8
Whitehead J	AG	1 237	3.3	+3.3
Phillips W *	LP	18 696	50.3	-4.4
Carter S	AD	966	2.6	+2.6
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>				
Hanney P	ALP	17 315	46.4	+3.2
Phillips W *	LP	19 960	53.6	-3.2
Formal		37 178	97.6	-0.9
Informal		907	2.4	+0.9
Turnout		38 085	94.4	-1.0

<b>Essendon</b>		Enrolled 34 636		
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing
<i>First Preference Votes</i>				
Maddigan J *	ALP	18 489	58.5	+7.6
Saunders K	LP	13 135	41.5	-1.7
Formal		31 624	97.4	-0.3
Informal		839	2.6	+0.3
Turnout		32 463	93.7	+0.4

<b>Evelyn</b>		Enrolled 36 733		
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing
<i>First Preference Votes</i>				
Gillam C	IND	1 824	5.4	+5.4
Fyffe C #	LP	18 367	54.8	-5.1
Marquez-Bridger N	ALP	11 480	34.2	+0.8
Houlihan R	IND	1 862	5.6	+5.6
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>				
Fyffe C #	LP	19 957	59.5	-3.2
Marquez-Bridger N	ALP	13 571	40.5	+3.2
Formal		33 533	97.0	-0.6
Informal		1 042	3.0	+0.6
Turnout		34 575	94.1	0.0

<b>Footscray</b>		Enrolled 34 174		
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing
<i>First Preference Votes</i>				
Lynch D	LP	9 533	32.4	+2.6
Mildenhall B *	ALP	19 916	67.6	-0.4
Formal		29 449	95.1	-0.7
Informal		1 503	4.9	+0.7
Turnout		30 952	90.6	-0.5

Victorian Election 1999

<b>Forest Hill</b>		Enrolled 34 556			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Richardson J *	LP	17 583	55.9	-3.8	
Buxton J	ALP	12 895	41.0	+3.3	
Hardiman S	HP	1 000	3.2	+3.2	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Richardson J *	LP	17 974	57.1	-3.2	
Buxton J	ALP	13 503	42.9	+3.4	
Formal		31 478	97.5	-0.6	
Informal		816	2.5	+0.6	
Turnout		32 294	93.5	-1.4	

<b>Frankston</b>		Enrolled 33 431			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Borg F	IND	626	2.1	+2.1	
Koch D	ALP	10 083	33.2	-0.4	
Kelsall H	AG	1 850	6.1	+6.1	
McCall A *	LP	17 778	58.6	-5.7	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Koch D	ALP	11 891	39.3	+4.7	
McCall A *	LP	18 399	60.7	-4.7	
Formal		30 337	97.9	-0.3	
Informal		635	2.1	+0.3	
Turnout		30 972	92.6	-1.0	

<b>Frankston East</b>		Enrolled 28 877			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Vogt M	AG	486	1.9	+1.9	
Bunyan I	IND	72	0.3	+0.3	
McClure M	IND	77	0.3	+0.3	
McLean C #	LP	10 632	41.6	-7.3	
Rankin S	IND	131	0.5	+0.5	
Anderson R	IND	95	0.4	+0.4	
Pavlekovich-Smith I	IND	13	0.1	+0.1	
Viney M	ALP	13 127	51.4	+7.1	
Clark G	IND	21	0.1	+0.1	
Hoser R	IND	11	0.0	+0.0	
Burleigh G	IND	140	0.5	+0.5	
Crea P	DLP	93	0.4	+0.4	
Clarke L	NLP	24	0.1	-1.0	
Eames L	IND	319	1.2	+1.2	
Dawn D	IND	58	0.2	+0.2	
Coppard J	IND	263	1.0	+1.0	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
McLean C #	LP	11 603	45.4	-7.7	
Viney M	ALP	13 953	54.6	+7.7	
Formal		25 562	95.2	-2.6	
Informal		1 280	4.8	+2.6	
Turnout		26 842	93.0	-1.3	

<b>Geelong</b>		Enrolled 33 830			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Faris R	IND	1 292	4.2	+4.2	
Grose L	IND	641	2.1	+2.1	
O'Dea J	IND	331	1.1	+1.1	
Henderson A *	LP	14 719	47.5	-5.1	
Treize I	ALP	14 001	45.2	+0.1	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Henderson A *	LP	15 484	50.0	-3.5	
Treize I	ALP	15 500	50.0	+3.5	
Formal		30 984	97.5	-0.3	
Informal		802	2.5	+0.3	
Turnout		31 786	94.0	-0.3	

<b>Geelong North</b>		Enrolled 34 379			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Kennett B	LP	12 176	39.1	-2.9	
Loney P *	ALP	19 000	60.9	+2.9	
Formal		31 176	96.4	-0.6	
Informal		1 158	3.6	+0.6	
Turnout		32 334	94.1	-1.4	

<b>Gippsland East</b>		Enrolled 33 075			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Buckley B	IND	1 704	5.7	+5.7	
Ingram C	IND	7 439	24.8	+24.8	
Bolitho B	ALP	8 177	27.3	-1.3	
Treasure D *	NP	10 776	35.9	-16.9	
Freshwater M	PHON	1 911	6.4	+6.4	
<i>Two Candidate Preferred</i>					
Ingram C	IND	17 317	57.7		
Treasure D *	NP	12 690	42.3		
Formal		30 007	97.4	-0.9	
Informal		812	2.6	+0.9	
Turnout		30 819	93.2	-1.0	

<b>Gippsland South</b>		Enrolled 32 761			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Sayers M	IND	4 411	14.7	+14.7	
Ryan P *	NP	15 130	50.5	-17.2	
Emanuel H	ALP	9 955	33.2	+4.7	
Clarke R	NLP	456	1.5	-2.3	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Ryan P *	NP	17 238	57.5	-11.9	
Emanuel H	ALP	12 740	42.5	+11.9	
Formal		29 952	97.4	-0.9	
Informal		800	2.6	+0.9	
Turnout		30 752	93.9	-0.7	



<b>Gippsland West</b>		Enrolled 32 796			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Taylor P	ALP	5 487	18.1	-15.1	
Head W	NP	1 973	6.5	+6.5	
Richardson M	NLP	128	0.4	+0.4	
McRae G	LP	11 502	38.0	-19.8	
Lowry M	IND	385	1.3	-7.7	
Davies S *	IND	10 819	35.7	+35.7	
<i>Two Candidate Preferred</i>					
McCrae G	LP	13 934	46.0		
Davies S *	IND	16 360	54.0		
Formal		30 294	97.4	-0.9	
Informal		821	2.6	+0.9	
Turnout		31 115	94.9	-0.4	

<b>Gisborne</b>		Enrolled 36 390			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Mowatt R	AD	1 260	3.7	+3.7	
Reynolds G	IND	643	1.9	+1.9	
Duncan J	ALP	13 589	40.4	-0.4	
Dunn D	IND	3 394	10.1	+10.1	
Knowles R #	LP	14 084	41.9	-13.8	
Hall L	AG	678	2.0	+2.0	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Duncan J	ALP	17 371	51.6	+9.4	
Knowles R #	LP	16 277	48.4	-9.4	
Formal		33 648	97.2	-0.9	
Informal		981	2.8	+0.9	
Turnout		34 629	95.2	-0.4	

<b>Glen Waverley</b>		Enrolled 31 984			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Smith R *	LP	18 410	63.2	-1.6	
Dalby R	ALP	10 738	36.8	+4.0	
Formal		29 148	97.6	-0.6	
Informal		714	2.4	+0.6	
Turnout		29 862	93.4	-1.4	

<b>Hawthorn</b>		Enrolled 36 943			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Baillieu T #	LP	20 548	62.6	+1.7	
Wickiramasingham N	ALP	10 635	32.4	+3.3	
Dawborn K	HP	1 650	5.0	+5.0	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Baillieu T #	LP	21 042	64.1	+0.5	
Wickiramasingham N	ALP	11 791	35.9	-0.5	
Formal		32 833	97.6	-1.1	
Informal		792	2.4	+1.1	
Turnout		33 625	91.0	-3.4	

<b>Ivanhoe</b>		Enrolled 33 205			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Poynton L	HP	358	1.2	+1.2	
McLean D	LP	12 788	42.5	-5.0	
Langdon C *	ALP	15 079	50.1	+0.8	
Clarke L	NLP	132	0.4	-2.8	
Roberts R	AG	1 737	5.8	+5.8	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
McLean D	LP	13 413	44.6	-3.8	
Langdon C *	ALP	16 679	55.4	+3.8	
Formal		30 094	97.2	-0.7	
Informal		858	2.8	+0.7	
Turnout		30 952	93.2	-1.0	

<b>Keilor</b>		Enrolled 42 091			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Seitz G *	ALP	22 338	58.7	-0.3	
Burns H	IND	2 875	7.6	+7.6	
Fenech J	LP	12 851	33.8	-3.5	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Seitz G *	ALP	23 529	61.9	+0.3	
Fenech J	LP	14 481	38.1	-0.3	
Formal		38 064	95.1	-0.7	
Informal		1 967	4.9	+0.7	
Turnout		40 031	95.1	+0.9	

<b>Kew</b>		Enrolled 35 644			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Hale P	HP	1 380	4.3	+4.3	
McIntosh A #	LP	19 594	61.8	-1.9	
Lewes J	ALP	10 751	33.9	+1.1	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
McIntosh A #	LP	20 247	63.8	-1.2	
Lewes J	ALP	11 478	36.2	+1.2	
Formal		31 725	97.6	-0.6	
Informal		795	2.4	+0.6	
Turnout		32 520	91.2	-2.0	

<b>Knox</b>		Enrolled 39 768			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Wells K	DLP	1 408	3.8	+3.8	
Smith C	ALP	14 684	40.1	-0.1	
Lupton H *	LP	20 481	56.0	-0.9	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Smith C	ALP	15 611	42.7	+0.6	
Lupton H *	LP	20 962	57.3	-0.6	
Formal		36 573	97.5	-0.5	
Informal		943	2.5	+0.5	
Turnout		37 516	94.3	-0.5	

Victorian Election 1999

<b>Malvern</b>		Enrolled 35 940			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Doyle R *	LP	21 129	66.6	+0.2	
Wallace J	ALP	10 583	33.4	+2.8	
Formal		31 712	97.8	-0.3	
Informal		697	2.2	+0.3	
Turnout		32 409	90.2	-2.1	

<b>Melbourne</b>		Enrolled 41 000			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Pike B #	ALP	20 572	59.3	+5.7	
McLean L	LP	12 122	35.0	+4.2	
Jorquera J	IND	1 986	5.7	+5.7	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Pike B #	ALP	22 112	63.8	-2.1	
McLean L	LP	12 568	36.2	+2.1	
Formal		34 680	96.3	-0.7	
Informal		1 334	3.7	+0.7	
Turnout		36 014	87.8	-0.6	

<b>Melton</b>		Enrolled 44 047			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
McGeary J	LP	15 294	38.7	+0.8	
Nardella D #	ALP	24 237	61.3	-0.8	
Formal		39 531	95.5	-1.2	
Informal		1 862	4.5	+1.2	
Turnout		41 393	94.0	+0.3	

<b>Mildura</b>		Enrolled 33 191			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Mansell A	NP	6 015	19.7	+19.7	
Danson P	LP	7 998	26.2	-19.0	
Savage R *	IND	13 551	44.4	+8.7	
Zigouras J	ALP	2 572	8.4	-9.5	
Joyce T	AD	391	1.3	+1.3	
<i>Two Candidate Preferred</i>					
Mansell A	NP	11 039	43.9		
Savage R *	IND	14 110	56.1		
Formal		30 527	97.6	-0.7	
Informal		763	2.4	+0.7	
Turnout		31 290	94.3	+0.1	

<b>Mill Park</b>		Enrolled 41 456			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Davenport A	LP	12 405	33.0	+1.0	
D'Angelo R	NLP	924	2.5	+1.0	
Andrianopoulos A *	ALP	24 307	64.6	+4.5	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Davenport A	LP	12 864	34.2	-1.8	
Andrianopoulos A *	ALP	24 772	65.8	+1.8	
Formal		37 636	96.1	-0.4	
Informal		1 541	3.9	+0.4	
Turnout		39 177	94.5	-0.5	

<b>Mitcham</b>		Enrolled 34 479			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Robinson T *	ALP	14 411	45.2	+4.7	
Petherbridge T	HP	894	2.8	+2.8	
Munroe A	LP	15 043	47.2	-6.4	
Aubrey C	IND	1 529	4.8	+4.8	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Robinson T *	ALP	16 110	50.5	+5.8	
Munroe A	LP	15 767	49.5	-5.8	
Formal		31 877	97.8	-0.3	
Informal		729	2.2	+0.3	
Turnout		32 606	94.6	-0.6	

<b>Monbulk</b>		Enrolled 33 627			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Scurfield L	NLP	258	0.8	-0.5	
Voigt W	CDP	414	1.4	+1.4	
McArthur S *	LP	15 206	49.8	-2.7	
Wood L	ALP	12 266	40.2	+2.0	
Holtham R	AG	1 928	6.3	+6.3	
Feltham F	DLP	443	1.5	+1.5	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
McArthur S *	LP	16 241	53.2	-2.0	
Wood L	ALP	14 306	46.8	+2.0	
Formal		30 515	97.2	-0.8	
Informal		870	2.8	+0.8	
Turnout		31 385	93.3	-1.1	

<b>Mooroolbark</b>		Enrolled 34 835			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Elliott L *	LP	19 509	60.9	0.0	
McCrorey D	ALP	12 549	39.1	+2.7	
Formal		32 058	97.3	-0.6	
Informal		896	2.7	+0.6	
Turnout		32 954	94.6	-0.3	

<b>Mordialloc</b>		Enrolled 32 829		
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing
<i>First Preference Votes</i>				
McLeod R	ALP	14 200	47.8	+5.8
Leigh G *	LP	15 515	52.2	-1.2
Formal		29 715	96.9	-1.2
Informal		955	3.1	+1.2
Turnout		30 670	93.4	-1.1

<b>Mornington</b>		Enrolled 36 840		
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing
<i>First Preference Votes</i>				
Nicholson V	IND	2 816	8.4	+8.4
Cornelius G	ALP	12 198	36.3	-0.8
Plunkett S	IND	783	2.3	+2.3
Cooper R *	LP	17 821	53.0	-6.2
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>				
Cornelius G	ALP	14 880	44.3	+5.6
Cooper R *	LP	18 733	55.7	-5.6
Formal		33 618	97.6	-0.4
Informal		813	2.4	+0.4
Turnout		34 431	93.5	-0.5

<b>Morwell</b>		Enrolled 33 737		
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing
<i>First Preference Votes</i>				
Tyler P	LP	11 040	35.3	+35.3
Hamilton K *	ALP	17 366	55.4	+4.0
Hoppner H	IND	2 912	9.3	+9.3
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>				
Tyler P	LP	12 856	41.1	-6.2
Hamilton K *	ALP	18 457	58.9	+6.2
Formal		31 318	97.8	-0.1
Informal		700	2.2	+0.1
Turnout		32 018	94.9	-0.2

<b>Murray Valley</b>		Enrolled 34 790		
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing
<i>First Preference Votes</i>				
Jasper K *	NP	20 899	65.9	-5.3
Leschen Z	ALP	10 811	34.1	+8.4
Formal		31 710	97.0	-1.4
Informal		990	3.3	+1.4
Turnout		32 700	94.0	-0.5

<b>Narracan</b>		Enrolled 31 688		
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing
<i>First Preference Votes</i>				
Fozard M	AD	1 534	5.3	+5.3
Mathieson R	IND	504	1.8	+1.8
Maxfield I	ALP	13 074	45.6	+3.7
Dowling C	SP	1 292	4.5	+4.5
Andrighetto F *	LP	11 925	41.6	-5.8
Robinson H	IND	355	1.2	+1.2

<i>Two Party Preferred</i>				
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing
Maxfield I	ALP	15 063	52.5	+4.1
Andrighetto F *	LP	13 261	47.5	-4.1
Formal		28 684	96.8	-1.3
Informal		939	3.2	+1.3
Turnout		29 623	93.5	-1.8

<b>Niddrie</b>		Enrolled 33 802		
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing
<i>First Preference Votes</i>				
Kruger S	LP	13 525	43.2	-2.4
Hulls R *	ALP	17 761	56.8	+2.4
Formal		31 286	96.2	-0.7
Informal		1 252	3.8	+0.7
Turnout		32 538	96.3	+1.0

<b>Northcote</b>		Enrolled 35 695		
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing
<i>First Preference Votes</i>				
Richardson E	LP	8 124	26.0	-2.2
Duffy S	IND	2 480	7.9	+7.9
Delahunty M *	ALP	20 681	66.1	+6.5
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>				
Richardson E	LP	8 552	27.3	-2.8
Delahunty M *	ALP	22 733	72.7	+2.8
Formal		31 285	96.0	-0.2
Informal		1 306	4.0	+0.2
Turnout		32 591	91.3	-1.5

<b>Oakleigh</b>		Enrolled 34 347		
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing
<i>First Preference Votes</i>				
Barker A	ALP	15 060	49.2	+3.4
McGregor S	IND	452	1.5	+1.5
Eboli L	IND	268	0.9	+0.9
Walters S	AG	1 107	3.6	+3.6
McGill D *	LP	13 558	44.3	-3.1
Schlager R	NLP	148	0.5	-0.5
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>				
Barker A	ALP	16 286	53.3	+4.1
McGill D *	LP	14 262	46.7	-4.1
Formal		30 593	96.5	-1.1
Informal		1 118	3.5	+1.1
Turnout		31 711	92.3	-0.8

Victorian Election 1999

<b>Pakenham</b>		Enrolled 35 194			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Scoullar D	AG	2 571	7.9	+7.9	
Maclellan R *	LP	17 202	53.2	-5.0	
Dean F	IND	637	2.0	+0.3	
Anderson J	ALP	11 949	36.9	+0.8	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Maclellan R *	LP	18 284	56.5	-4.6	
Anderson J	ALP	14 059	43.5	+4.6	
Formal		32 359	97.6	-0.4	
Informal		802	2.4	+0.4	
Turnout		33 161	94.2	-0.5	

<b>Pascoe Vale</b>		Enrolled 31 045			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Aghajani V	LP	9 569	35.1	-2.9	
Campbell C *	ALP	17 725	64.9	+4.9	
Formal		27 294	96.1	-0.9	
Informal		1 098	3.9	+0.9	
Turnout		28 392	91.5	-1.4	

<b>Polwarth</b>		Enrolled 33 217			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Crook B	IND	4 574	14.8	-3.8	
Brown S	AG	1 161	3.8	+3.8	
Couch P	NP	5 116	16.6	+16.6	
Garland S	ALP	7 393	23.9	-4.5	
Mulder T #	LP	12 668	41.0	-10.0	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Garland S	ALP	12 237	39.6	-2.3	
Mulder T #	LP	18 675	60.4	+2.3	
Formal		30 912	97.8	-0.3	
Informal		686	2.2	+0.3	
Turnout		31 598	95.1	-0.3	

<b>Portland</b>		Enrolled 29 156			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Jackson L	ALP	8 016	29.4	-5.1	
Kempton P	IND	7 153	26.2	+26.2	
Napthine D *	LP	12 093	44.4	-11.3	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Jackson L	ALP	12 394	45.5	+5.9	
Napthine D *	LP	14 868	54.5	-5.9	
Formal		27 262	98.1	-0.2	
Informal		515	1.9	+0.2	
Turnout		27 777	95.3	-0.2	

<b>Prahran</b>		Enrolled 39 089			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Salter W	AG	2 282	6.9	+6.9	
Burke L *	LP	16 789	51.0	-1.8	
O'Reilly J	ALP	13 056	39.7	-3.9	
Dawson M	NLP	164	0.5	-3.1	
Murphy F	DLP	609	1.9	+1.9	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Burke L *	LP	17 785	54.0	-0.6	
O'Reilly J	ALP	15 126	46.0	+0.6	
Formal		32 900	97.3	-0.4	
Informal		904	2.7	+0.4	
Turnout		33 804	86.5	-1.1	

<b>Preston</b>		Enrolled 33 794			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Dickins M	NLP	1 052	3.5	+1.2	
Padgett R	LP	8 769	29.3	-4.6	
Leighton M *	ALP	20 087	67.2	+3.3	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Padgett R	LP	9 384	31.4	-3.3	
Leighton M *	ALP	20 522	68.6	+3.3	
Formal		29 908	95.7	-0.1	
Informal		1 339	4.3	+0.1	
Turnout		31 247	92.5	-0.8	

<b>Richmond</b>		Enrolled 41 466			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Jolly S	IND	4 213	12.0	+12.0	
Tran D	LP	10 716	30.6	+0.6	
Wynne R #	ALP	20 121	57.4	-4.8	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Tran D	LP	11 837	33.8	+1.2	
Wynne R #	ALP	23 204	66.2	-1.2	
Formal		35 050	96.3	-0.9	
Informal		1 348	3.7	+0.9	
Turnout		36 398	87.8	-1.4	

<b>Ripon</b>		Enrolled 31 732			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Helper J	ALP	15 579	52.6	+8.8	
Elder S *	LP	14 045	47.4	-5.0	
Formal		29 624	97.8	-0.5	
Informal		668	2.2	+0.5	
Turnout		30 292	95.5	-0.1	

<b>Rodney</b>		Enrolled 32 526			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
McCulloch M	ALP	8 565	28.4	+8.7	
Maughan N *	NP	18 329	60.8	-2.8	
Hutton D	PHON	3 257	10.8	+10.8	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
McCulloch M	ALP	10 358	34.4	+10.5	
Maughan N *	NP	19 793	65.6	-10.5	
Formal		30 151	97.8	-0.6	
Informal		692	2.2	+0.6	
Turnout		30 843	94.8	-1.1	

<b>Sandringham</b>		Enrolled 34 629			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Thompson M *	LP	19 478	62.5	-0.3	
Munt J	ALP	11 693	37.5	+3.2	
Formal		31 171	97.4	-0.9	
Informal		828	2.6	+0.9	
Turnout		31 999	92.4	-1.2	

<b>Seymour</b>		Enrolled 35 717			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Hardman B	ALP	15 410	46.9	+2.9	
Rule D #	LP	15 675	47.7	-4.8	
Romagnesi J	AG	1 797	5.5	+5.5	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Hardman B	ALP	16 672	50.7	+4.9	
Rule D #	LP	16 210	49.3	-4.9	
Formal		32 882	97.4	-0.7	
Informal		879	2.6	+0.7	
Turnout		33 761	94.5	-0.4	

<b>Shepparton</b>		Enrolled 33 823			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Boyle W	ALP	7 616	24.6	-3.2	
Kilgour D *	NP	12 355	39.0	-26.0	
Hazelman C	IND	10 965	35.4	+35.4	
<i>Two Candidate Preferred</i>					
Kilgour D *	NP	16 724	54.1		
Hazelman C	IND	14 212	45.9		
Formal		30 936	97.3	-0.3	
Informal		865	2.7	+0.3	
Turnout		31 801	94.0	-0.2	

<b>South Barwon</b>		Enrolled 36 107			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Paterson A *	LP	16 892	50.7	-8.4	
Crutchfield M	ALP	12 468	37.4	-0.6	
Paull J	AD	1 891	5.7	+5.7	
Lauren T	IND	598	1.8	+1.8	
Gannon M	IND	215	0.6	+0.6	
Chenery S	AG	1 233	3.7	+3.7	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Paterson A *	LP	18 222	54.7	-5.5	
Crutchfield M	ALP	15 076	45.3	+5.5	
Formal		33 297	97.8	-0.4	
Informal		761	2.2	+0.4	
Turnout		34 058	94.3	-1.0	

<b>Springvale</b>		Enrolled 35 438			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Liu-Hyland B	IND	1 680	5.3	+5.3	
Campbell J	LP	11 152	35.4	-2.7	
Bisset R	IND	398	1.3	+1.3	
Holding T #	ALP	18 230	57.9	+2.9	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Campbell J	LP	12 322	39.2	-2.9	
Holding T #	ALP	19 114	60.8	+2.9	
Formal		31 460	95.5	-1.2	
Informal		1 476	4.5	+1.2	
Turnout		32 936	92.9	-1.1	

<b>Sunshine</b>		Enrolled 38 506			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Morgan S	LP	9 100	27.0	-2.7	
Languiller T	ALP	19 826	58.8	-8.8	
Barker I *	IND	4 780	14.2	+14.2	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Morgan S	LP	10 062	29.9	-1.0	
Languiller T	ALP	23 643	70.1	+1.0	
Formal		33 706	94.4	-0.8	
Informal		1 987	5.6	+0.8	
Turnout		35 693	92.7	-0.2	

Victorian Election 1999

<b>Swan Hill</b>		Enrolled 30 088			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Schorel G	IND	257	0.9	+0.9	
Ditterich C	IND	6 192	22.6	+22.6	
Williams D	ALP	5 511	20.1	+2.7	
Maher B	IND	1 435	5.2	+5.2	
Croft B	PHON	1 383	5.1	+5.1	
Steggall B *	NP	12 378	45.2	-13.8	
Bonney L	IND	219	0.8	+0.8	
<i>Two Candidate Preferred</i>					
Ditterich C	IND	12 925	47.2		
Steggall B *	NP	14 450	52.8		
Formal		27 375	96.3	-2.0	
Informal		1 066	3.7	+2.0	
Turnout		28 441	94.5	-0.7	

<b>Thomastown</b>		Enrolled 35 416			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Gidley M	LP	8 212	26.1	-1.3	
Batchelor P	ALP	23 305	73.9	+3.0	
Formal		31 517	95.5	-1.0	
Informal		1 479	4.5	+1.0	
Turnout		32 996	93.2	-1.4	

<b>Tullamarine</b>		Enrolled 39 652			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Beattie L	ALP	18 346	50.6	+6.5	
Fraser P	AG	996	2.7	+2.7	
Grenfell R	SP	719	2.0	+2.0	
Finn B *	LP	15 561	42.9	-5.4	
Mulholland J	DLP	668	1.8	+1.8	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Beattie L	ALP	19 502	53.8	+6.9	
Finn B *	LP	16 751	46.2	-6.9	
Formal		36 290	96.8	-1.0	
Informal		1 210	3.2	+1.0	
Turnout		37 500	94.6	-0.5	

<b>Wantirna</b>		Enrolled 37 964			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Abraham C	ALP	13 301	38.1	+2.3	
Wells K *	LP	21 579	61.9	-0.3	
Formal		34 880	97.4	-0.6	
Informal		931	2.6	+0.6	
Turnout		35 811	94.3	+1.0	

<b>Warrandyte</b>		Enrolled 34 386			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Orr D	ALP	10 630	33.6	+3.2	
Honeywood P *	LP	19 395	61.2	-0.2	
Roberts P	NLP	288	0.9	-0.3	
Stockdale K	HP	1 357	4.3	+4.3	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Orr D	ALP	11 571	36.5	+0.4	
Honeywood P *	LP	20 096	63.5	-0.4	
Formal		31 670	98.1	-0.4	
Informal		620	1.9	+0.4	
Turnout		32 290	93.9	-1.9	

<b>Warrnambool</b>		Enrolled 34 226			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Blair G	AG	740	2.3	+2.3	
Walsh G #	NP	5 550	17.5	-40.3	
O'Brien R	IND	435	1.4	+1.4	
Vogels J	LP	12 739	40.2	+40.2	
Lindop M	IND	1 864	5.9	-6.7	
Reekie R	ALP	9 993	31.5	+2.9	
Wilson B	ARP	379	1.2	+1.2	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Vogels J	LP	18 682	58.9	-4.9	
Reekie R	ALP	13 018	41.1	+4.9	
Formal		31 700	97.1	-1.1	
Informal		962	2.9	+1.1	
Turnout		32 662	95.4	-0.5	

<b>Werribee</b>		Enrolled 41 644			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Gillett M *	ALP	22 652	59.1	+12.8	
Manson C	AG	913	2.4	+2.4	
Impson G	IND	353	0.9	+0.9	
McLaren D	LP	14 120	36.9	-6.7	
Backhouse W	IND	258	0.7	+0.7	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Gillett M *	ALP	23 540	61.5	+10.8	
McLaren D	LP	14 754	38.5	-10.8	
Formal		38 296	96.9	-0.6	
Informal		1 221	3.1	+0.6	
Turnout		39 517	94.9	-0.2	

<b>Williamstown</b>		Enrolled 34 501			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Dyson N	IND	1 341	4.4	+4.4	
Evers-Buckland A	LP	8 877	28.9	-4.3	
Bracks S *	ALP	20 468	66.7	+2.8	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Evers-Buckland A	LP	9 671	31.5	-2.9	
Bracks S *	ALP	21 011	68.5	+2.9	
Formal		30 686	96.4	-0.2	
Informal		1 155	3.6	+0.2	
Turnout		31 841	92.3	-0.4	

<b>Wimmera</b>		Enrolled 32 652			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Hallam D	IND	1 446	4.8	+4.8	
Cross G	LP	9 450	31.1	+31.1	
Mackley B	PHON	1 630	5.4	+5.4	
Liston L	IND	792	2.6	+2.6	
Power L	ALP	7 230	23.8	+3.0	
Delahunty H #	NP	9 866	32.4	-24.5	
<i>Two Candidate Preferred</i>					
Cross G	LP	12 904	42.4		
Delahunty H #	NP	17 510	57.6		
Formal		30 414	97.2	-1.4	
Informal		878	2.8	+1.4	
Turnout		31 292	95.8	-0.1	

<b>Yan Yean</b>		Enrolled 38 305			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Smith L	IND	1 371	3.9	+3.9	
Rigby B	NLP	341	1.0	-1.5	
Tivendale H	LP	15 397	43.5	-3.7	
Haermeyer A *	ALP	18 265	51.6	+1.4	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Tivendale H	LP	16 204	45.8	-2.6	
Haermeyer A *	ALP	19 170	54.2	+2.6	
Formal		35 374	97.1	-0.6	
Informal		1 048	2.9	+0.6	
Turnout		36 422	95.1	-0.4	

Table 4 Legislative Assembly: Two Party Preferred Vote

Electoral District	Number		Per cent		% Swing to ALP
	ALP	LP/NP	ALP	LP/NP	
Albert Park	18 997	14 671	56.4	43.6	-2.4
Altona	21 545	11 774	64.7	35.3	+6.5
Ballarat East	16 100	13 886	53.7	46.3	+3.7
Ballarat West	15 527	14 910	51.0	49.0	+2.4
Bayswater	14 623	17 654	45.3	54.7	+2.8
Bellarine	15 495	16 599	48.3	51.7	+3.8
Benalla	13 013	17 543	42.6	57.4	+7.9
Benambra	13 561	18 016	42.9	57.1	+7.9
Bendigo East	16 977	15 004	53.1	46.9	+8.1
Bendigo West	19 893	12 582	61.3	38.7	+9.5
Bennettswood	13 103	16 715	43.9	56.1	+3.2
Bentleigh	15 090	16 300	48.1	51.9	+2.8
Berwick	18 348	22 376	45.1	54.9	+0.3
Box Hill	13 067	17 754	42.4	57.6	+2.7
Brighton	10 529	20 061	34.4	65.6	+2.5
Broadmeadows	23 651	8 019	74.7	25.3	-0.4
Bulleen	11 662	18 709	38.4	61.6	+3.0
Bundoora	18 942	14 852	56.1	43.9	+3.5
Burwood	13 585	17 858	43.2	56.8	+1.8
Carrum	17 444	17 321	50.2	49.8	+1.0
Caulfield	13 460	18 947	41.5	58.5	+0.8
Clayton	20 037	12 441	61.7	38.3	+2.1
Coburg	20 951	8 232	71.8	28.2	+4.9
Cranbourne	16 708	21 002	44.3	55.7	+3.4
Dandenong	23 129	18 297	55.8	44.2	+2.5
Dandenong North	17 634	12 775	58.0	42.0	+5.8
Doncaster	11 892	20 518	36.7	63.3	+1.6
Dromana	14 403	18 480	43.8	56.2	+1.9
Eltham	17 315	19 960	46.5	53.5	+3.2
Essendon	18 489	13 135	58.5	41.5	+5.1
Evelyn	13 571	19 957	40.5	59.5	+3.2
Footscray	19 916	9 533	67.6	32.4	-1.7
Forest Hill	13 503	17 974	42.9	57.1	+3.4
Frankston	11 891	18 399	39.3	60.7	+4.7
Frankston East	13 953	11 603	54.6	45.4	+7.7
Geelong	15 500	15 484	50.0	50.0	+3.5
Geelong North	19 000	12 176	60.9	39.1	+2.9
Gippsland East	14 222	15 782	47.4	52.6	+12.6
Gippsland South	12 740	17 238	42.5	57.5	+11.9
Gippsland West	13 199	17 095	43.6	56.4	+6.2
Gisborne	17 371	16 277	51.6	48.4	+9.5
Glen Waverley	10 738	18 410	36.8	63.2	+2.5
Hawthorn	11 791	21 042	35.9	64.1	-0.5
Ivanhoe	16 679	13 413	55.4	44.6	+3.8
Keilor	23 529	14 481	61.9	38.1	+0.3
Kew	11 478	20 247	36.2	63.8	+1.2
Knox	15 611	20 962	42.7	57.3	+0.6
Malvern	10 583	21 129	33.4	66.6	+1.0
Melbourne	22 112	12 568	63.8	36.2	-2.1
Melton	24 237	15 294	61.3	38.7	-0.9



Table 4 Legislative Assembly: Two Party Preferred Vote continued

Electoral District	Number		Per cent		% Swing to ALP
	ALP	LP/NP	ALP	LP/NP	
Mildura	11 223	19 304	36.8	63.2	+1.4
Mill Park	24 772	12 864	65.8	34.2	+1.9
Mitcham	16 110	15 767	50.5	49.5	+5.9
Monbulk	14 306	16 241	46.8	53.2	+2.1
Mooroolbark	12 549	19 509	39.1	60.9	+1.4
Mordialloc	14 200	15 515	47.8	52.2	+2.5
Mornington	14 880	18 733	44.3	55.7	+5.5
Morwell	18 457	12 856	58.9	41.1	+6.2
Murray Valley	10 811	20 899	34.1	65.9	+6.5
Narracan	15 063	13 621	52.5	47.5	+4.1
Niddrie	17 761	13 525	56.8	43.2	+2.4
Northcote	22 733	8 552	72.7	27.3	+2.8
Oakleigh	16 286	14 262	53.3	46.7	+4.1
Pakenham	14 059	18 284	43.5	56.5	+5.6
Pascoe Vale	17 725	9 569	64.9	35.1	+3.9
Polwarth	12 237	18 675	39.6	60.4	-2.3
Portland	12 394	14 868	45.5	54.5	+5.9
Prahran	15 126	17 785	46.0	54.0	+0.6
Preston	20 522	9 384	68.6	31.4	+3.3
Richmond	23 204	11 837	66.2	33.8	-1.1
Ripon	15 579	14 045	52.6	47.4	+7.2
Rodney	10 358	19 793	34.4	65.6	+10.5
Sandringham	11 693	19 478	37.5	62.5	+1.8
Seymour	16 672	16 210	50.7	49.3	+4.9
Shepparton	11 743	19 267	37.9	62.1	+7.4
South Barwon	15 076	18 222	45.3	54.7	+5.5
Springvale	19 114	12 322	60.8	39.2	+2.9
Sunshine	23 643	10 062	70.1	29.9	+1.1
Swan Hill	10 619	16 864	38.6	61.4	+7.6
Thomastown	23 305	8 212	73.9	26.1	+1.9
Tullamarine	19 502	16 751	53.8	46.2	+6.8
Wantirna	13 301	21 579	38.1	61.9	+1.3
Warrandyte	11 571	20 096	36.5	63.5	+0.5
Warrnambool	13 018	18 682	41.1	58.9	+4.9
Werribee	23 540	14 754	61.5	38.5	+10.7
Williamstown	21 011	9 671	68.5	31.5	+2.9
Wimmera	10 648	19 850	34.9	65.1	+6.1
Yan Yean	19 170	16 204	54.2	45.8	+2.5
Total	1 420 775	1 409 567	50.2	49.8	+3.7
Region					
Metropolitan	960 658	867 363	52.6	47.4	+2.5
Non-Metropolitan	460 117	542 204	45.9	54.1	+6.1

Table 5 Legislative Assembly: Electoral Pendulum

District	Swing to Lose %	District	Swing to Lose %
<b>ALP/Ind Seats</b>		<b>LP/NP Seats</b>	
Broadmeadows	24.7	Malvern	16.6
Thomastown	23.9	Murray Valley	15.9
Northcote	22.7	Rodney	15.6
Coburg	21.8	Brighton	15.6
Sunshine	20.1	Wimmera	15.1
Preston	18.6	Hawthorn	14.1
Williamstown	18.5	Kew	13.8
Footscray	17.6	Warrandyte	13.5
Richmond	16.2	Doncaster	13.3
Mill Park	15.8	Glen Waverley	13.2
Pascoe Vale	14.9	Sandringham	12.5
Altona	14.7	Shepparton	12.1
Melbourne	13.8	Wantirna	11.9
Keilor	11.9	Bulleen	11.6
Clayton	11.7	Swan Hill	11.4
Werribee	11.5	Mooroolbark	10.9
Melton	11.3	Frankston	10.7
Bendigo West	11.3	Polwarth	10.4
Geelong North	10.9	Evelyn	9.5
Springvale	10.8	Warmambool	8.9
Morwell	8.9	Caulfield	8.5
Essendon	8.5	Box Hill	7.6
Dandenong North	8.0	Gippsland South	7.5
Gippsland East (Ind)	7.7	Benalla	7.4
Niddrie	6.8	Knox	7.3
Albert Park	6.4	Forest Hill	7.1
Mildura (Ind)	6.1	Benambra	7.1
Bundoora	6.1	Burwood	6.8
Dandenong	5.8	Pakenham	6.5
Ivanhoe	5.4	Dromana	6.2
Frankston East	4.6	Bennettswood	6.1
Yan Yean	4.2	Mornington	5.7
Gippsland West (Ind)	4.0	Cranbourne	5.7
Tullamarine	3.8	Berwick	4.9
Ballarat East	3.7	South Barwon	4.7
Oakleigh	3.3	Bayswater	4.7
Bendigo East	3.1	Portland	4.5
Ripon	2.6	Prahran	4.0
Narracan	2.5	Eltham	3.5
Gisborne	1.6	Monbulk	3.2
Ballarat West	1.0	Mordialloc	2.2
Seymour	0.7	Bentleigh	1.9
Mitcham	0.5	Bellarine	1.7
Carrum	0.2		
Geelong	0.0		

Note: Swing to lose for Independent held seats based on two candidate preferred vote.

Table 6 Legislative Council, State Summary

	Candidates	Seats Won	First Preference Votes		Swing Per cent
			Number	Per cent	
Australian Labor Party (ALP)	20	8	1 187 484	42.23	+1.72
Liberal Party (LP)	19	11	1 116 347	39.70	-4.20
National Party (NP)	3	3	204 587	7.28	+0.65
Australian Democrats (AD)	17		190 940	6.79	+1.06
Australian Greens (AG)	4		62 796	2.23	+2.23
Christian Democratic Party (CDP)	2		6 608	0.24	+0.04
Australian Reform Party (ARP)	1		6 617	0.23	+0.23
Independents (IND)	8		36 399	1.29	-1.74
Formal Votes			2 811 778	96.63	-0.79
Informal Votes			97 949	3.37	+0.79
Turnout/Total Votes	74	22	2 909 727	92.95	-1.13

Table 7 Legislative Council, Composition After 1999 Election

	Elected 1996(a)	Elected 1999	Total
Liberal Party	13	11	24
National Party	3	3	6
Australian Labor Party	6	8	14
Total	22	22	44

(a) Adjusted for 1999 By-election results. Ballarat Province changed from LP to ALP.

Table 8 Legislative Council: Province Summary

Electoral Province	First Preference Votes					Formal Votes	Informal Votes	Total Votes	Electors Enrolled
	ALP	LP	NP	AD	Others				
	<b>Number</b>								
Ballarat	<b>57 655</b>	55 834		6 853		120 342	3 383	123 725	133 541
Central Highlands	61 686	<b>70 353</b>				132 039	4 368	136 407	144 842
Chelsea	<b>57 949</b>	56 642		5 250	2 185	122 026	4 621	126 647	135 896
Doutta Galla	<b>93 833</b>	49 202				143 035	7 441	150 476	158 446
East Yarra	41 644	<b>72 041</b>		13 236		126 921	3 308	130 229	141 354
Eumemmerring	64 024	<b>65 426</b>		5 161	9 509	144 120	6 243	150 363	159 504
Geelong	<b>57 389</b>	58 390		6 540	5 568	127 887	3 350	131 237	138 739
Gippsland	47 503	<b>46 447</b>		6 802	18 652	119 404	4 330	123 734	131 261
Higinbotham		<b>69 024</b>		53 414		122 438	3 892	126 330	136 171
Jika Jika	<b>87 169</b>	45 415				132 584	5 390	137 974	147 692
Koonung	51 052	<b>71 158</b>		6 908	4 480	133 598	3 915	137 513	146 767
Melbourne	<b>73 484</b>	44 220		13 517		131 221	5 460	136 681	152 440
Melbourne North	<b>78 663</b>	42 115			4 909	125 687	6 777	132 464	142 672
Melbourne West	<b>79 460</b>	43 561		7 682		130 703	5 801	136 504	146 908
Monash	45 926	<b>62 295</b>		9 211	4 165	121 597	4 009	125 606	151 995
North Eastern	43 958		<b>70 020</b>	10 148		124 126	3 889	128 015	136 517
North Western	49 952		<b>62 789</b>	8 855		121 596	2 913	124 509	132 305
Silvan	48 266	<b>66 992</b>		7 375	3 587	126 220	3 685	129 905	138 275
South Eastern	51 147	<b>70 597</b>		6 551	5 972	134 267	3 807	138 074	146 734
Templestowe		<b>69 383</b>		13 568	46 776	129 727	3 944	133 671	143 222
Waverley	54 573	<b>57 252</b>		9 869		121 694	4 686	126 380	135 806
Western	42 151		<b>71 778</b>		6 617	120 546	2 737	123 283	129 251
Total	1 187 484	1 116 347	204 587	190 940	112 420	2 811 778	97 949	2 909 727	3 130 338
	<b>Per cent</b>								
Ballarat	<b>47.9</b>	46.4		5.7		97.3	2.7	92.6	
Central Highlands	46.7	<b>53.3</b>				96.8	3.2	94.2	
Chelsea	<b>47.5</b>	46.4		4.3	1.8	96.4	3.6	93.2	
Doutta Galla	<b>65.6</b>	34.4				95.1	4.9	95.0	
East Yarra	32.8	<b>56.8</b>		10.4		97.5	2.5	92.1	
Eumemmerring	44.4	<b>45.4</b>		3.6	6.6	95.8	4.2	94.3	
Geelong	<b>44.9</b>	45.7		5.1	4.4	97.4	2.6	94.6	
Gippsland	39.8	<b>38.9</b>		5.7	15.6	96.5	3.5	94.3	
Higinbotham		<b>56.4</b>		43.6		96.9	3.1	92.8	
Jika Jika	<b>65.7</b>	34.3				96.1	3.9	93.4	
Koonung	38.2	<b>53.3</b>		5.2	3.4	97.2	2.8	93.7	
Melbourne	<b>56.0</b>	33.7		10.3		96.0	4.0	89.7	
Melbourne North	<b>62.6</b>	33.5			3.9	94.9	5.1	92.8	
Melbourne West	<b>60.8</b>	33.3		5.9		95.8	4.2	92.9	
Monash	37.8	<b>51.2</b>		7.6	3.4	96.8	3.2	82.6	
North Eastern	35.4		<b>56.4</b>	8.2		97.0	3.0	93.8	
North Western	41.1		<b>51.6</b>	7.3		97.7	2.3	94.1	
Silvan	38.2	<b>53.1</b>		5.8	2.8	97.2	2.8	93.9	
South Eastern	38.1	<b>52.6</b>		4.9	4.4	97.2	2.8	94.1	
Templestowe		<b>53.5</b>		10.5	36.1	97.0	3.0	93.3	
Waverley	44.8	<b>47.0</b>		8.1		96.3	3.7	93.1	
Western	35.0		<b>59.5</b>		5.5	97.8	2.2	95.4	
Total	42.2	39.7	7.3	6.8	4.0	96.6	3.4	93.0	

Note: Party winning seat shown in bold

Table 9 Legislative Council, Province Details

<b>Ballarat</b>					Enrolled 133 541				
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing					
<i>First Preference Votes</i>									
Clark D #	LP	55 834	46.4	-5.3					
Lutz G	AD	6 853	5.7	+1.8					
Hadden-Tregear D	ALP	57 655	47.9	+6.4					
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>									
Clark D #	LP	58 568	48.7	-5.7					
Hadden-Tregear D	ALP	61 774	51.3	+5.7					
Formal		120 342	97.3	-0.9					
Informal		3 383	2.7	+0.9					
Turnout		123 725	92.6	-2.3					

  

<b>Central Highlands</b>					Enrolled 144 842				
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing					
<i>First Preference Votes</i>									
Stoney G *	LP	70 353	53.3	-0.8					
Mitchell R	ALP	61 686	46.7	+8.9					
Formal		132 039	96.8	-0.9					
Informal		4 368	3.2	+0.9					
Turnout		136 407	94.2	-0.8					

  

<b>Chelsea</b>					Enrolled 135 896				
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing					
<i>First Preference Votes</i>									
Smith B	ALP	57 949	47.5	+5.3					
Good M	IND	2 185	1.8	+1.8					
Bennett J	AD	5 250	4.3	-0.4					
Wilding S *	LP	56 642	46.4	-4.3					
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>									
Smith B	ALP	62 501	51.2	+4.5					
Wilding S *	LP	59 525	48.8	-4.5					
Formal		122 026	96.4	-1.1					
Informal		4 621	3.6	+1.1					
Turnout		126 647	93.2	-1.1					

  

<b>Doutta Galla</b>					Enrolled 158 446				
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing					
<i>First Preference Votes</i>									
Madden J #	ALP	93 833	65.6	+7.8					
Daw P	LP	49 202	34.4	-1.8					
Formal		143 035	95.1	-0.6					
Informal		7 441	4.9	+0.6					
Turnout		150 476	95.0	+0.9					

  

<b>East Yarra</b>					Enrolled 141 354				
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing					
<i>First Preference Votes</i>									
Birrell M *	LP	72 041	56.8	-0.5					
Harcourt P	AD	13 236	10.4	+1.5					
Walpole D	ALP	41 644	32.8	+2.6					
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>									
Birrell M *	LP	76 560	60.3	-1.8					
Walpole D	ALP	50 356	39.7	+1.8					
Formal		126 921	97.5	-0.8					
Informal		3 308	2.5	+0.8					
Turnout		130 229	92.1	-1.8					

  

<b>Eumemmerring</b>					Enrolled 159 504				
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing					
<i>First Preference Votes</i>									
Dickson L	CDP	4 492	3.1	+0.5					
Blades R	IND	5 017	3.5	+3.5					
Berk D	AD	5 161	3.6	-0.5					
Rich-Phillips G #	LP	65 426	45.4	-3.4					
Baldovino C	ALP	64 024	44.4	+1.4					
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>									
Rich-Phillips G #	LP	72 518	50.3	-2.5					
Baldovino C	ALP	71 602	49.7	+2.5					
Formal		144 120	95.8	-1.0					
Informal		6 243	4.2	+1.0					
Turnout		150 363	94.3	-0.7					

  

<b>Geelong</b>					Enrolled 138 739				
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing					
<i>First Preference Votes</i>									
Whitehead A	AG	5 568	4.4	+4.4					
Hodge R	AD	6 540	5.1	+0.6					
Carbines E	ALP	57 389	44.9	+1.6					
Hartigan B *	LP	58 390	45.7	-5.5					
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>									
Carbines E	ALP	65 790	51.4	+4.7					
Hartigan B *	LP	62 097	48.6	-4.7					
Formal		127 887	97.4	-0.3					
Informal		3 350	2.6	+0.3					
Turnout		131 237	94.6	-1.0					

Victorian Election 1999

<b>Gippsland</b>		Enrolled 131 261			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Treasure D	IND	11 179	9.4	+9.4	
Seabrook P	IND	3 957	3.3	+3.3	
McCubbin J	AD	6 802	5.7	+1.0	
Davis P *	LP	46 447	38.9	+38.9	
Wishart D	ALP	47 503	39.8	+6.2	
O'Brien J	IND	3 516	2.9	+2.9	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Davis P *	LP	60 046	50.3	-10.7	
Wishart D	ALP	59 358	49.7	+10.7	
Formal		119 404	96.5	-1.4	
Informal		4 330	3.5	+1.4	
Turnout		123 734	94.3	-0.7	

<b>Higinbotham</b>		Enrolled 136 171			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Strong C *	LP	69 024	56.4	-0.4	
Tucker C	AD	53 414	43.6	+35.8	
Formal		122 438	96.9	-1.0	
Informal		3 892	3.1	+1.0	
Turnout		126 330	92.8	-1.4	

<b>Jika Jika</b>		Enrolled 147 692			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Mikakos J #	ALP	87 169	65.7	+10.4	
Dunn A	LP	45 415	34.3	+0.4	
Formal		132 584	96.1	-0.3	
Informal		5 390	3.9	+0.3	
Turnout		137 974	93.4	-0.8	

<b>Koonung</b>		Enrolled 146 767			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Kir M	AG	4 480	3.4	+3.4	
Legg K	ALP	51 052	38.2	+2.7	
Atkinson B *	LP	71 158	53.3	-3.2	
Alesich S	AD	6 908	5.2	-0.4	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Legg K	ALP	58 137	43.6	+3.2	
Atkinson B *	LP	75 248	56.4	-3.2	
Formal		133 598	97.2	-0.7	
Informal		3 915	2.8	+0.7	
Turnout		137 513	93.7	-0.6	

<b>Melbourne</b>		Enrolled 152 440			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Handsaker S	AD	13 517	10.3	+1.9	
Romanes G #	ALP	73 484	56.0	+1.1	
McGraith S	LP	44 220	33.7	+0.2	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Romanes G #	ALP	83 865	63.9	+0.1	
McGraith S	LP	47 313	36.1	-0.1	
Formal		131 221	96.0	-0.9	
Informal		5 460	4.0	+0.9	
Turnout		136 681	89.7	-1.3	

<b>Melbourne North</b>		Enrolled 142 672			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
De Bono G	LP	42 115	33.5	-2.5	
McClure M	IND	4 909	3.9	+3.9	
Thomson M #	ALP	78 663	62.6	+4.9	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
De Bono G	LP	44 484	35.4	-2.9	
Thomson M #	ALP	81 196	64.6	+2.9	
Formal		125 687	94.9	-1.4	
Informal		6 777	5.1	+1.4	
Turnout		132 464	92.8	-1.2	

<b>Melbourne West</b>		Enrolled 146 908			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Darveniza K #	ALP	79 460	60.8	+13.2	
Barnes D	AD	7 682	5.9	+2.8	
Borg A	LP	43 561	33.3	-0.2	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Darveniza K #	ALP	84 297	64.5	+3.3	
Borg A	LP	46 404	35.5	-3.3	
Formal		130 703	95.8	-0.4	
Informal		5 801	4.2	+0.4	
Turnout		136 504	92.9	-0.8	

<b>Monash</b>		Enrolled 151 995			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
D'Andrea R	IND	4 165	3.4	+3.4	
Coote A #	LP	62 295	51.2	-0.5	
Willox J	ALP	45 926	37.8	-0.7	
Peters J	AD	9 211	7.6	+1.0	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Coote A #	LP	67 158	55.3	+0.5	
Willox J	ALP	54 246	44.7	-0.5	
Formal		121 597	96.8	-0.8	
Informal		4 009	3.2	+0.8	
Turnout		125 606	82.6	-7.8	

<b>North Eastern</b>		Enrolled 136 517			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Davis L	ALP	43 958	35.4	+9.8	
Lee B	AD	10 148	8.2	+4.2	
Baxter B *	NP	70 020	56.4	+19.4	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Davis L	ALP	49 395	39.8	+9.1	
Baxter B *	NP	74 727	60.2	-9.1	
Formal		124 126	97.0	-0.8	
Informal		3 889	3.0	+0.8	
Turnout		128 015	93.8	-0.8	

<b>North Western</b>		Enrolled 132 305			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Kidd J	ALP	49 952	41.1	+7.3	
Bishop B *	NP	62 789	51.6	-5.6	
Van Diesen A	AD	8 855	7.3	+1.6	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Kidd J	ALP	54 332	44.7	+6.3	
Bishop B *	NP	67 257	55.3	-6.3	
Formal		121 596	97.7	-0.4	
Informal		2 913	2.3	+0.4	
Turnout		124 509	94.1	-0.8	

<b>Silvan</b>		Enrolled 138 275			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Tunstall M	ALP	48 266	38.2	+3.5	
Raskovy S	IND	1 471	1.2	+1.2	
Leeper A	AD	7 375	5.8	-0.1	
Olexander A #	LP	66 992	53.1	-2.9	
Levick R	CDP	2 116	1.7	+1.7	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Tunstall M	ALP	54 475	43.2	+3.6	
Olexander A #	LP	71 662	56.8	-3.6	
Formal		126 220	97.2	-0.6	
Informal		3 685	2.8	+0.6	
Turnout		129 905	93.9	-1.1	

<b>South Eastern</b>		Enrolled 146 734			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Kingsford S	AG	5 972	4.4	+4.4	
Bowden R *	LP	70 597	52.6	-4.0	
Armstrong R	AD	6 551	4.9	0.0	
Binney M	ALP	51 147	38.1	-2.7	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Bowden R *	LP	76 088	56.7	-3.4	
Binney M	ALP	58 148	43.3	+3.4	
Formal		134 267	97.2	-0.6	
Informal		3 807	2.8	+0.6	
Turnout		138 074	94.1	-0.8	

<b>Templestowe</b>		Enrolled 143 222			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Evans R	AG	46 776	36.1	+36.1	
Forwood B *	LP	69 383	53.5	-1.3	
Millane B	AD	13 568	10.5	+1.8	
<i>Two Candidate Preferred</i>					
Evans R	AG	57 426	44.3		
Forwood B *	LP	72 294	55.7		
Formal		129 727	97.0	-0.7	
Informal		3 944	3.0	+0.7	
Turnout		133 671	93.3	-1.5	

<b>Waverley</b>		Enrolled 135 806			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Morgan P	AD	9 869	8.1	+1.2	
Brideston A *	LP	57 252	47.0	-3.9	
Morris S	ALP	54 573	44.8	+4.3	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Brideston A *	LP	61 735	50.7	-4.1	
Morris S	ALP	59 959	49.3	+4.1	
Formal		121 694	96.3	-1.1	
Informal		4 686	3.7	+1.1	
Turnout		126 380	93.1	-1.0	

<b>Western</b>		Enrolled 129 251			
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					
Hallam R *	NP	71 778	59.5	+59.5	
Mitchell P	ALP	42 151	35.0	+1.8	
McDonald L	ARP	6 617	5.5	+5.5	
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>					
Hallam R *	NP	74 660	61.9	-2.8	
Mitchell P	ALP	45 884	38.1	+2.8	
Formal		120 546	97.8	-0.4	
Informal		2 737	2.2	+0.4	
Turnout		123 283	95.4	-0.4	

Table 10 Legislative Council: Two Party Preferred Vote

Electoral Province	Number		Per cent		% Swing to ALP
	ALP	LP/NP	ALP	LP/NP	
Ballarat	61 774	58 568	51.3	48.7	+5.7
Central Highlands	61 686	70 353	46.7	53.3	+4.3
Chelsea	62 501	59 525	51.2	48.8	+4.5
Doutta Galla	93 833	49 202	65.6	34.4	+4.4
East Yarra	50 356	76 560	39.7	60.3	+1.9
Eumemmerring	71 602	72 518	49.7	50.3	+2.5
Geelong	65 790	62 097	51.4	48.6	+4.7
Gippsland	59 358	60 046	49.7	50.3	+10.7
Higinbotham (a)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Jika Jika	87 169	45 415	65.7	34.3	+2.9
Koonung	58 137	75 248	43.6	56.4	+3.2
Melbourne	83 865	47 313	63.9	36.1	+0.1
Melbourne North	81 196	44 484	64.6	35.4	+2.9
Melbourne West	84 297	46 404	64.5	35.5	+3.3
Monash	54 246	67 158	44.7	55.3	-0.5
North Eastern	49 395	74 727	39.8	60.2	+9.1
North Western	54 332	67 257	44.7	55.3	+6.3
Silvan	54 475	71 662	43.2	56.8	+3.6
South Eastern	58 148	76 088	43.3	56.7	+3.4
Templestowe (a)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Waverley	59 959	61 735	49.3	50.7	+4.1
Western	45 884	74 660	38.1	61.9	+2.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>1 298 003</b>	<b>1 261 020</b>	<b>50.7</b>	<b>49.3</b>	<b>+4.7</b>

(a) *Two Party Preferred* votes not available due to absence of ALP candidate.



Table 11 Legislative Council: Electoral Pendulum

Province	Swing to Lose %	Province	Swing to Lose %
	<b>LP/NP Seats</b>		<b>ALP Seats</b>
Western (NP)	11.9	Jika Jika	15.7
East Yarra	10.3	Doutta Galla	15.6
North Eastern (NP)	10.2	Melbourne North	14.6
Silvan	6.8	Melbourne West	14.5
South Eastern	6.7	Melbourne	13.9
Higinbotham (a)	6.4	Geelong	1.4
Koonung	6.4	Ballarat	1.3
Templestowe (a)	5.7	Chelsea	1.2
North Western (NP)	5.3		
Monash	5.3		
Central Highlands	3.3		
Waverley	0.7		
Gippsland	0.3		
Eumemmerring	0.3		

(a) No ALP candidate. For Higinbotham, swing to lose against AD; for Templestowe, swing to lose against AG.

Table 12 Legislative Assembly By-elections 1996 to 1999

<b>Gippsland West (1/2/97)</b>					<b>Northcote (15/8/98)</b>				
Enrolled 31 375					Enrolled 34 787				
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					<i>First Preference Votes</i>				
Davies S	IND	8 844	32.6	+32.6	Kavalenka N	PHON	1 690	6.0	+6.0
Sayers N	SP	1 275	4.7	+4.7	Saunders K	AD	7 439	26.3	+26.3
Turnbull D	IND	1 361	5.0	+5.0	Evans D	IND	555	2.0	+2.0
Mathieson R	ARP	2 555	9.4	+9.4	Sekhon G	AG	1 081	3.8	+3.8
Lowry M	IND	1 867	6.9	-2.1	Haidar A	ACS	75	0.3	+0.3
Coleman M #	LP	11 214	41.4	-16.3	Delahunty M #	ALP	16 954	60.0	+0.4
					Sibelle M	IND	472	1.7	+1.7
<i>Two Candidate Preferred</i>					<i>Two Candidate Preferred</i>				
Davies S	IND	13 606	50.3		Saunders K	AD	9 891	35.0	
Coleman M #	LP	13 447	49.7		Delahunty M #	ALP	18 351	65.0	
Formal		27 116	97.5	-0.8	Formal		28 266	95.4	-0.8
Informal		708	2.5	+0.8	Informal		1 373	4.6	+0.8
Turnout		27 824	88.7	-6.5	Turnout		29 639	85.2	-7.6

  

<b>Mitcham (13/12/97)</b>					<b>Burwood (11/12/99)</b>				
Enrolled 33 919					Enrolled 34 964				
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing	Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing
<i>First Preference Votes</i>					<i>First Preference Votes</i>				
Stokes P	IND	1 356	4.7	+4.7	Stensholt B	ALP	13 410	45.0	+3.5
Munroe A #	LP	8 764	30.7	-22.9	McLean L #	LP	12 054	40.5	-15.0
Dunn M	ARP	204	0.7	+0.7	Crohn P	AG	1 875	6.3	+6.3
Wootton R	IND	498	1.7	+1.7	Ferwerda P	DLP	453	1.5	+1.5
Kliska A	IND	257	0.9	+0.9	Mayne S	IND	1 975	6.6	+6.6
Ford N	IND	42	0.1	+0.1					
Smith B	IND	48	0.2	+0.2	<i>Two Party Preferred</i>				
McDermott D	SP	245	0.9	+0.9	Stensholt B	ALP	15 963	53.6	+10.4
Petherbridge T	IND	551	1.9	+1.9	McLean L #	LP	13 804	46.4	-10.4
Kalinkara S	IND	42	0.1	+0.1	Formal		29 767	97.6	0.0
Scotte D	IND	246	0.9	+0.9	Informal		741	2.4	0.0
Raskovy S	IND	88	0.3	+0.3	Turnout		30 508	87.3	-5.7
Abolish Child Support	ACS	69	0.2	+0.2					
McLaren J	AD	1 857	6.5	+6.5					
Evans R	AG	1 021	3.6	+3.6					
Stagg A	IND	55	0.2	+0.2					
Robinson T	ALP	13 206	46.3	+5.8					
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>									
Munroe A #	LP	11 247	39.5	-15.8					
Robinson T	ALP	17 214	60.5	+15.8					
Formal		28 549	96.5	-1.6					
Informal		1 040	3.5	+1.6					
Turnout		29 589	87.2	-8.0					

Table 13 Legislative Council By-elections 1996 to 1999

<b>Ballarat (18/9/99)</b>		Enrolled 133 541		
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing
First PreferenceVotes				
McQuilten J	ALP	58 904	48.4	+6.9
Clarke C	AG	5 233	4.3	+4.3
Bath H #	LP	55 191	45.3	-6.4
Patterson J	IND	2 423	2.0	+2.0
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>				
McQuilten J	ALP	63 589	52.2	+6.6
Bath H #	LP	58 162	47.8	-6.6
Formal		121 751	97.1	-1.1
Informal		3 631	2.9	+1.1
Turnout		125 382	93.9	-1.0

<b>Melbourne (18/9/99)</b>		Enrolled 152 440		
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing
First PreferenceVotes				
Sekhon G	AG	11 126	8.5	+8.5
Sharp B	AD	8 437	6.4	-2.0
Nguyen K	LP	41 634	31.8	-1.7
Jennings G #	ALP	69 811	53.3	-1.6
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>				
Nguyen K	LP	48 336	36.9	+0.7
Jennings G #	ALP	82 617	63.1	-0.7
Formal		131 008	95.9	-1.0
Informal		5 555	4.1	+1.0
Turnout		136 563	89.6	-1.3

<b>Melbourne North (18/9/99)</b>		Enrolled 142 672		
Candidate	Party	Votes	%	Swing
First PreferenceVotes				
Broad C #	ALP	79 955	63.6	+5.9
Bradshaw C	IND	5 255	4.2	+4.2
Kraskov M	LP	40 444	32.2	-3.6
<i>Two Party Preferred</i>				
Broad C #	ALP	83 034	66.1	+4.4
Kraskov M	LP	42 607	33.9	-4.4
Formal		125 654	94.9	-1.4
Informal		6 789	5.1	+1.4
Turnout		132 452	92.8	-1.2

Table 14 Legislative Assembly Elections 1950–1999

Election	ALP	LP	NP	AD	DLP	Oth	Total	ALP	LP/NP	
			<i>First Preference Votes</i>						<i>Two Party Votes</i>	
1950	45.3	40.7	10.6			3.4	100.0	50.4	49.6	
1952	49.1	24.9	8.3			17.7	100.0	56.7	43.3	
1955	32.6	37.8	9.5		12.6	7.5	100.0	42.1	57.9	
1958	37.7	37.2	9.3		14.4	1.4	100.0	42.2	57.8	
1961	38.6	36.4	7.1		17.0	0.9	100.0	42.1	57.9	
1964	36.2	39.6	8.8		15.0	0.4	100.0	41.0	59.0	
1967	37.9	37.5	8.6		14.3	1.7	100.0	41.6	58.4	
1970	41.4	36.7	6.4		13.3	2.2	100.0	45.8	54.2	
1973	41.6	42.3	6.0		7.8	2.3	100.0	44.8	55.2	
1976	42.4	45.9	7.1		2.6	2.1	100.0	44.2	55.8	
1979	45.2	41.4	5.6	5.4	0.5	1.8	100.0	49.5	50.5	
1982	50.0	38.3	5.0	5.3	0.3	1.0	100.0	53.8	46.2	
1985	50.0	41.9	7.3			0.8	100.0	50.7	49.3	
1988	46.5	40.6	7.8	1.1	0.2	3.8	100.0	49.5	50.5	
1992	38.4	44.2	7.8	0.2		9.4	100.0	43.7	56.3	
1996	43.1	44.0	6.7			6.2	100.0	46.5	53.5	
1999	45.6	42.2	4.8	0.3	0.2	6.9	100.0	50.2	49.8	
			<i>Seats Won</i>							
1950	24	27	13			1	65			
1952	37	11	12			5	65			
1955	20	33	11		1	1	66			
1958	18	39	9				66			
1961	17	39	9			1	66			
1964	18	38	10				66			
1967	16	44	12			1	73			
1970	22	42	8			1	73			
1973	18	46	8			1	73			
1976	21	52	7			1	81			
1979	32	41	8				81			
1982	49	24	8				81			
1985	47	31	10				88			
1988	46	33	9				88			
1992	27	52	9				88			
1996	29	49	9			1	88			
1999	42	36	7			3	88			