Senate Finance and Public Administration Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Finance and Administration Portfolio

Australian Electoral Commission

Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearings 2005-06 – 01 November 2005

Question: F18

Outcome: Australian Electoral Commission

Topic: Multiple voting

Hansard Page: F&PA 77

Senator Carr asked:

You mentioned the question of multiple voting in Richmond. How do they compare with other electorates?

Answer:

In all divisions, most of the cases of apparent multiple voting at the 2004 federal election initially identified by the AEC involved two marks on the Certified Lists. As discussed at the hearing, multiple voting is defined as more than two marks. In the administration of apparent multiple voting, a range of electors were excluded where investigation or feedback determined that they were not multiple voters. Often this is because of polling official error or the elector has denied voting more than once and the evidence is inconclusive. The final step in the process is the referral of appropriate cases to the Australian Federal Police (AFP) for investigation. The AEC referred a total of 64 cases of alleged multiple voting to the AFP at the 2004 federal election. The following table provides a breakdown of those cases by division:

New South Wales	**Number referred to AFP**
Banks	1
Bennelong	2
Calare	1
Cowper	1
Eden-Monaro	2
Lindsay	5
Lyne	1
Macarthur	1
Newcastle	1
Reid	2
Richmond	1
Robertson	1
Shortland	1
Sydney	1
Werriwa	1
Total	**22**
Victoria	
Ballarat	1

Casey	1
Corangamite	1
Deakin	4
Gellibrand	1
Gorton	2
Higgins	1
Hotham	3
Jagajaga	1
Malley	1
McEwen	4
Melbourne	1
Scullin	1
Total	**22**
Queensland	
Brisbane	1
Fairfax	2
Griffith	3
Leichhardt	1
Maranoa	2
McPherson	1
Moncrieff	4
Rankin	1
Ryan	1
Total	**16**
Tasmania	
Denison	1
Franklin	1
Total	**2**
South Australia	
Kingston	**1**
Western Australia	
Tangney	**1**
Northern Territory	**0**
Australian Capital Territory	**0**
TOTAL	**64**