
1925



Fulham

Municipal Reform	33
Labour	3

Hammersmith

Constitutional Ratepayers	33
Labour	3

The West London Observer
Friday November 6, 1925

Hammersmith Council

Victory for Alliance candidates in six wards

There was very little excitement over the election. Fortunately the weather was fine, so that the excuse of bad climatic conditions could not be put forward by apathetic voters.

There was a steady flow of voters to the polling stations during the morning, but in the afternoon a certain amount of slackness prevailed. However, in the closing hours of the poll there was a continuous rush of electors.

Outside each polling station agents of the different candidates stood ready to thrust cards into the hands of electors with the names of candidates they wished them to vote for. Women voters left perambulators with children outside the polling booths in the care of the policemen on duty.

The most interesting contest in the six wards where polling took place was in the River ward, where Ratepayers Constitutional Alliance candidates, independents and Labour nominees - 18 in all - endeavoured to capture six seats.

The Alliance candidates were exhorted not to divide their votes whilst the independents announced that the pledge not to increase the assessments had been broken by ex-councillors sailing under the Alliance flag. A slogan of the Labour Party was "Vote for Labour today and keep reaction at bay".

A good deal of interest was also centred on Starch Green ward where Mr J.P. Gardner, prospective Labour candidate for North Hammersmith, and his wife, were amongst those seeking the suffrages of the electors.

Leaving out Brook Green ward, where there was no poll, the number of electors on the register was 47,185.

Counting of votes

On the close of the poll the ballot boxes were removed to the Town Hall where counting took place, both in the large hall and council chamber, under the direction of Mr Hugh Royle, the Town Clerk and Returning Officer, a start being made about nine o'clock.

There was a large attendance of the candidates and their friends interested in ascertaining the results. Amongst those who attended were the Mayor of Hammersmith (Alderman Marshall Hays). In making up totals an adding machine was used.

Red and white rosettes were worn by supporters of the Alliance candidates; and red and yellow by sympathisers with the Labour Party nominees.

Amongst those watching the counting were Captain Berry, Mr D. Cawdron (agents for Alliance candidates), Mr C.L.M. Thompson (agent for the independents) and Mr Hamilton Cardwell (agent for Labour candidates).

A crowd gathered outside the Town Hall, but after waiting some hours for the declaration of the poll, and a downfall of heavy rain coming on, people wended their way homewards.

After the result was made known in each ward there was loud cheering. When the result was declared in the Grove ward, members of the Junior Imperial League present gave a special cheer in honour of two of their members having been elected.

A cry of "Up with the Reds" was raised when the numbers in the College Park ward were read out.

Councillor C. Pascall, who headed the poll in the River ward, mounted a table and said it was with great pleasure that he proposed a vote of thanks to Mr Hugh Royle, the Returning Officer, and his staff.

They had won a notable victory and he was pleased to say that the election had been fought with fairness on both sides. Their victory voiced the opinion of Hammersmith. He begged to move a hearty vote of thanks to Mr Hugh Royle and his staff. [Applause]

In seconding, Councillor W.H. Church, who was at the top of the poll in College Park ward, said he wanted his tribute to the Town Clerk and his staff for their conduct of the election, quite an ordinary thing.

The mover of the resolution said they had won a magnificent victory. The Labour Party had also achieved a magnificent victory for Hammersmith. There was more interest taken in the municipal elections than ever before, because of the little pressure put on the other side.

Three years ago when he spoke some of his opponents told him that he ought to go up in Hyde Park. They were working for the welfare of the people equally with their opponents.

Three of his party had been returned for the College Park ward. In three years time they would find them again fighting for the Labour Party, and by that time he hoped they would reverse the decision announced that night.

He concluded by reciting lines from Rudyard Kipling's poem, "If":

"If you can meet with triumph and disaster and treat these two imposters just the same"

[Applause]

Mr Hugh Royle, in reply, said he wished to thank them very much for their vote of thanks for what little he had done in the election, and also for the vote of thanks to his staff.

It was very pleasing to know that they had given satisfaction. They might like to know how this election compared with the election in 1922, three years ago.

The number of voters then was 15,767; today 20,992 not including Brook Green ward, an increase of 30 per cent.

The averages in the wards were as follows: College Park 39.7; Wormholt 48.7; St Stephen's, 43.8; Grove, 40.9; River 40.4; Starch Green, 48.9, the highest average.

The voting at the last election averaged 32.8 per cent, and at this election 43.9. The number of spoilt papers was 106, but one for want of the official mark. He thanked Mr Francis who had undertaken a large amount of detail work [applause].

The proceedings concluded at 2.15am and, on leaving the Town Hall, many had to walk to their homes in pouring rain.

Fulham: Labour gains in Margravine but position on council unaltered

Polling took place on Monday for the election of borough councillors.

During the day the various wards were very quiet, and it seemed likely that the final poll would be below the average. A last minute rush, in which there were as many women as men, changed the whole face of affairs, and the final voting figures were quite heavy for a municipal election.

The last votes were registered at eight o'clock and shortly after 8.30 the boxes were being opened in the big hall at the Baths, Walham Green, where count was to be held.

Mr J. Percy Shuter (the Returning Officer) and his staff lost no time in getting to work, although it was anticipated that the count would be a long business on account of cross-voting. That ratepayers had voted for "the man and not the party" as advocated by the West London Observer was perfectly obvious.

There was a slight delay owing to a hitch in Munster ward where, it was stated, the station officer's registration machine had refused to work properly.

The results and figures were finally announced by the Returning Officer shortly before 1pm. The M.R.s had retained all their seats with the exception of three out of the four in Margravine ward. A close fight in that ward had resulted in Mr A. Cook, who had long service on the council, being the only one to retain his seat.

The Labour representatives elected were Mr Banfield, who is a Fulham Guardian and served on the Borough Council until three years ago; Mr Chris Lancaster, also a member of the Guardians and who stood in the Labour interest at the L.C.C. election; and Mr Ballantyne.

Labour, on the last council, was represented by three Aldermen, whose term of office concluded this year. Mr Palmer, the only one of these standing, was 400 votes behind in Sands End ward, and the opposition to the M.R.s in the council chamber will thus be as it was before: three Labour members.

Progressives fared badly, Mr J.H. Palmer, who secured nearly 600 votes in Lillie ward, being at their head.

The only defeated members of the last council were Mr Palmer (Labour, Sands End) and Mr Todd (M.R., Margravine).

At the conclusion of the count a vote of thanks to Mr J.P. Shuter and his staff was proposed by Councillor Fowell and seconded by Councillor Banfield.

West London Observer
Friday November 6, 1925

editorial
A no-change election

The municipal contests for the election of the new Borough Councils on Monday contained few surprises when the verdict of the ballot boxes was revealed.

There was practically no change in the whole of West London, the Socialists being routed everywhere, with the exception of a few wards in each of the boroughs.

The verdict of the people is unmistakeable: they have no desire for revolutionary changes and came out en masse to vote against the extremists.

The Municipal Reformers swept the board in Kensington, Fulham, Paddington, Marylebone and Westminster, their opponents obtaining only a few seats.

In Hammersmith, where the Ratepayers' Alliance candidates are chosen on a non-political basis, the result was just as emphatic, they capturing every seat on the council, with the exception of three in the extreme north - a result which was an exact replica of 1922. Two seats gained by the Socialists at by-elections were recaptured by the Constitutional Ratepayers' Alliance.

Safety First!

This seems to have been the chief motive of the general body of electors. The recent exposure of Communist agitation, and the efforts which they have made to capture the Socialist movement, although without success, undoubtedly alarmed the public, with the result that they did not discriminate between the extremists and the saner elements in the Labour organisations.

Many of the latter would have been welcomed at the Town Hall, as representatives of the industrial section of the community, but even the most moderate of their candidates were overwhelmed in the great electoral tide which swept the constituencies, and they shared the same fate as their more extreme colleagues.

Will the moderates in the Labour movement take the lesson to heart and realise that if they wish to take part in municipal life, they must dissociate themselves from the extreme Socialist element, and stand as men and not politicians?

Businessmen chosen

The vast preponderance of the electorate comprises those who work for their livelihood either with brain or hands, or both. The workers in trade and industry command the situation, and can choose whom they will to represent them on the borough council.

On Monday they made their choice for the next three years and their choice fell upon the Constitutionalists, regardless of party politics.

Take a glance at the list of successful candidates in any of the West London boroughs and what do we find? They chiefly consist of men who have proved their capacity by business success and who, notwithstanding that they are busy men, are prepared to devote their abilities to the public service.

We are glad that such men possess sufficient public spirit to come forward and brave the throes of a contested election and, having won the fight, they are entitled to our hearty congratulations, which we extend unreservedly on behalf of our readers.

Increased polls

The confidence of the people, as expressed in the ballot box, should inspire our new councillors to renewed effort in the public service.

They know they represent the declared will of the electorate; the figures are indisputable.

The poll in all the West London boroughs was over ten per cent, better than three years ago, we are glad to note, and some of the credit for that is due to the persistence of the West London Observer in endeavouring to rouse the ratepayers during the last few months to take an increasing interest in their own municipal government.

Our methods have not always received the approbation of some of our old friends, because of our insistence on a non-party appeal, but the big increase in the number of electors who have been induced to record their votes is proof positive of the success of our efforts to induce the ratepayers to go to the poll and vote for men of sound business acumen and high personal character, regardless of their views on imperial politics.

That our new council will regard themselves as the representatives of the whole of the community, and not merely a party or section, we have every confidence.

The ratepayers' affairs are entrusted to them for another three years, and they will administer them in as efficient and economical manner as possible, without fear or favour. Good luck to the people's chosen representatives! May they all experience much joy in the public service!

Fulham Borough

Baron's Court

1925 electorate %turnout		5,781	49.9	+ 8.1
***Frank Holmes**	**MR**	**2,459**	**91.1**	**- 3.2**
***Frederick R. Flew**	**MR**	**2,441**	**90.4**	**- 3.4**
Hubert M. Bowden	**MR**	**2,405**	**89.1**	**- 3.8**
***Frederick J. Bellenger**	**MR**	**2,402**	**89.0**	**- 3.5**
***George L. Hodge**	**MR**	**2,400**	**88.9**	**- 3.1**
Harriet A. Packer	**MR**	**2,356**	**85.3**	**- 6.5**
Edgar H. Fraser	Lab	313	11.6	+ 3.6
George A. Adamson	Lab	299	11.1	+ 4.0
Lily Dickinson	Lab	292	10.8	+ 4.5
George I. Light	Lab	285	10.6	
Owen G. Edwards	Lab	278	10.3	
Maud Sweet	Lab	271	10.0	
3.6% swing MR to Lab	Maj	2,146	79.5	
		2,128	78.8	
		2,092	77.5	
		2,089	77.4	
		2,087	77.3	
		2,043	73.7	

Hurlingham

1925 electorate %turnout		4,432	54.3	+ 8.2
***Edward H. Pritchard**	**MR**	**1,702**	**74.5**	**- 0.4**
Herbert Dodimead	**MR**	**1,678**	**73.4**	**+ 0.1**
John C. Faulkner	**MR**	**1,666**	**72.9**	**- 0.3**
William H. Cooper	Lab	621	27.2	+ 0.3
William A. Parfitt	Lab	600	26.2	- 0.6
Charles O. Hufflett	Lab	591	25.9	+ 1.1
0.2% swing MR to Lab	Maj	1,081	47.3	
		1,057	46.2	
		1,045	45.7	

GAIN 3

Margravine

1925 electorate %turnout		7,540	42.5	+12.0
WIlliam J. Banfield	**Lab**	**1,616**	**53.6**	**+ 7.5**
Christopher Lancaster	**Lab**	**1,610**	**53.4**	**+ 8.1**
***Arthur Cook**	**MR**	**1,540**	**51.1**	**+ 5.6**
Sydney F.J. Ballantyne	**Lab**	**1,521**	**50.5**	**+ 7.4**
Charles T. Hobley	Lab	1,469	48.8	
Daniel A. Hart	MR	1,437	47.7	- 7.8
*Henry J. Todd	MR	1,431	47.5	- 4.4
James A. Scott	MR	1,429	47.4	
6.8% swing MR to Lab	Maj	179	5.9	
		173	5.7	
		84	2.8	
		71	2.3	

Lillie

1925 electorate %turnout		10,802	45.1	+14.4
***Fred H. Barber**	**MR**	**2,581**	**57.8**	**- 4.9**
William J. Morgan	**MR**	**2,520**	**56.4**	**- 4.3**
Walter L. Leonard	**MR**	**2,476**	**55.4**	**- 3.9**
Emanuel Gompers	**MR**	**2,405**	**53.8**	**- 5.3**
Victor L. Franzini	**MR**	**2,374**	**53.1**	**- 3.3**
Charles W. Lombard	**MR**	**2,354**	**52.7**	**- 3.6**
James H. Forey	Lab	1,676	37.5	- 5.4
Violet E. Turner	Lab	1,629	36.5	- 4.7
William Hurst	Lab	1,627	36.4	- 4.5
William T. James	Lab	1,586	35.5	- 5.2
Robert C. Wadman	Lab	1,576	35.3	- 4.8
Arthur G. Sutton	Lab	1,556	34.8	- 4.8
John H. Palmer	Prog	586	13.1	
Walter Colbert	Prog	425	9.5	
Gavin Melville	Prog	363	8.1	
William N. Moon	Prog	362	8.1	
George W. Jones	Prog	358	8.0	
Herbert H. Nightingale	Prog	354	7.9	
0.35% swing Lab to MR	Maj	905	20.3	
		844	18.9	
		800	17.9	
		729	16.3	
		698	15.6	
		678	15.2	

GAIN 3

Munster

1925 electorate %turnout		16,847	41.3	+ 6.0
***William Fowell**	**MR**	**3,623**	**56.5**	**- 5.4**
Arthur W. Ford	**MR**	**3,555**	**55.4**	**- 5.0**
***William A. White**	**MR**	**3,555**	**55.4**	**- 3.8**
William Purves	**MR**	**3,553**	**55.4**	**- 3.8**
Helen L. Cummins	**MR**	**3,546**	**55.3**	**- 3.3**
George Solley	**MR**	**3,525**	**55.0**	**- 3.4**
***William Wilcox**	**MR**	**3,514**	**54.8**	
George W. Redway	**MR**	**3,485**	**54.3**	
Jeremiah O'Brien	Lab	3,039	47.4	+ 6.0
George A. Lineham	Lab	2,961	46.2	+ 5.1
LIly M. Lineham	Lab	2,921	45.5	+ 4.7
James Prouse	Lab	2,850	44.4	+ 4.1
Mary Sheppard	Lab	2,850	44.4	+ 5.1
George Patterson	Lab	2,802	43.7	+ 4.5
John H. Muir	Lab	2,797	43.6	
Alfred Walton	Lab	2,739	42.7	
4.4% swing MR to Lab	Maj	584	9.1	
		516	8.0	
		516	8.0	
		514	8.0	
		507	7.9	
		486	7.6	
		475	7.4	
		446	6.9	

Sands End

1925 electorate %turnout		11,431	50.4	+ 3.3
***Donald S. Van Den Bergh**	**MR**	**3,148**	**58.7**	**+15.5**
***Albert Baggs**	**MR**	**3,044**	**56.8**	**+15.9**
Arthur W. Driver	**MR**	**3,017**	**56.3**	**+15.8**
Charles R. Fryer	**MR**	**2,951**	**55.0**	**+15.2**
Ernest M. Pratt	**MR**	**2,943**	**54.9**	**+15.7**
Arthur Minute	**MR**	**2,930**	**54.7**	**+16.1**
John Palmer	Lab	2,564	47.8	+11.9
Thomas M. Cox	Lab	2,394	44.7	+ 9.1
Joseph C. Dickinson	Lab	2,354	43.9	+ 8.9
Louis A. Hill	Lab	2,327	43.4	+ 9.4
Ward Teague	Lab	2,253	42.0	+ 9.1
William T. Westfallen	Lab	2,240	41.8	+ 9.6
3.1% swing Lab to MR	Maj	584	10.9	
		480	9.0	
		453	8.5	
		387	7.2	
		379	7.1	
		366	6.9	

Town

1925 electorate %turnout		6,856	51.6	+ 8.9
***George F. Clark**	**MR**	**2,687**	**79.7**	**- 2.0**
Sydney G. Carnt	**MR**	**2,630**	**78.0**	**- 0.3**
***William R. Corbin**	**MR**	**2,585**	**76.7**	**- 1.1**
William L. Upham	**MR**	**2,505**	**74.3**	
Mark Burke	Lab	826	24.5	+ 2.1
Caroline C. Townsend	Lab	761	22.6	+ 1.6
Sydney Farrall	Lab	746	22.1	+ 1.2
Frederick W.M. Lane	Lab	746	22.1	
1.3% swing MR to Lab	Maj	1,861	55.2	
		1,804	53.5	
		1,759	52.2	
		1,679	49.8	

Walham

1925 electorate %turnout		6,426	43.8	+ 9.3
***Edward R. Armfield**	**MR**	**1,375**	**48.9**	**+ 2.5**
Alfred Davis	**MR**	**1,292**	**46.0**	**+ 2.0**
Charles Harwood	**MR**	**1,223**	**43.5**	**+ 2.4**
John M. Browning	Lab	1,125	40.0	+ 9.3
Joseph H. Richardson	Lab	990	35.2	+ 5.2
John S.E. Marsh	Lab	968	34.5	+ 4.6
James Turney	Prog	485	17.3	
2.05% swing MR to Lab	Maj	250	8.9	
		167	6.0	
		98	3.5	

Hammersmith Borough

Brook Green and St Matthew's

1925 electorate %turnout		10,938	-	-
Richard Bevan	**C Rate**	**Unop**		
Patrick J. Grey	**C Rate**	**Unop**		
Thomas Irons	**C Rate**	**Unop**		
Frederick A. Ratcliffe	**C Rate**	**Unop**		
Edwin J.B. Spearing	**C Rate**	**Unop**		
Joseph Woolerton	**C Rate**	**Unop**		
Swing incalculable	Maj	-		

College Park and Latimer

1925 electorate %turnout		4,970	39.6	+ 9.7
***William H. Church**	**Lab**	**1,252**	**66.5**	**+21.1**
Walter G. Parish	**Lab**	**1,191**	**63.3**	**+18.2**
***Edward E. Woods**	**Lab**	**1,162**	**61.7**	**+16.9**
T. Courtney	C Rate	717	38.1	- 1.9
L. Stevens	C Rate	681	36.2	+ 2.4
M. Tasch	C Rate	646	34.3	+ 3.2
8.7% swing C Rate to Lab	Maj	535	28.4	
		474	25.2	
		445	23.6	

River

1925 electorate %turnout		6,921	42.0	+15.7
***Charles Pascall**	**C Rate**	**1,507**	**56.3**	**- 20.5**
Bertie Samels	**C Rate**	**1,417**	**52.9**	**- 20.1**
Arthur Atkinson	**C Rate**	**1,416**	**52.9**	**- 17.8**
John R. Bedford	**C Rate**	**1,333**	**49.8**	**- 19.8**
William South	**C Rate**	**1,321**	**49.3**	**- 18.7**
Horace F. Joyce	**C Rate**	**1,285**	**48.0**	**- 18.1**
A. Batstone	Lab	938	35.0	+ 2.7
John T. Westcott	Lab	932	34.8	+ 3.2
A. Bannerman	Lab	928	34.6	+ 6.2
M. Davis	Lab	875	32.7	+ 4.7
C. Turner	Lab	865	32.3	+ 4.4
A. Evans	Lab	824	30.8	+ 3.2
H. Johnson	Ind	558	20.8	
A. Meeks	Ind	460	17.2	
J. Wilson	Ind	396	14.8	
J. May	Ind	348	13.0	
I. Bren	Ind	343	12.8	
G. Millett	Ind	326	12.2	
11.65% swing C Rate to Lab	Maj	569	21.3	
		479	17.9	
		478	17.9	
		395	14.8	
		383	14.3	
		347	13.0	

St Stephen's

1925 electorate %turnout		4,149	43.7	+17.5
Arthur Cracknell	**C Rate**	**1,263**	**69.9**	**- 19.4**
***Elizabeth M. Davies**	**C Rate**	**1,200**	**66.4**	**- 22.0**
Horace W. Durrant	**C Rate**	**1,174**	**65.0**	**- 19.6**
E. Syrett	Lab	623	34.5	
E. Lewington	Lab	583	32.3	
A. Ellis	Lab	578	32.0	
Swing incalculable	Maj	640	35.4	
		577	31.9	
		551	30.5	

Starch Green

1925 electorate %turnout		10,064	48.9	+14.4
George Vine	**C Rate**	**2,577**	**56.2**	**- 13.5**
***John Morton**	**C Rate**	**2,556**	**55.8**	**- 12.3**
***Harry J. May**	**C Rate**	**2,543**	**55.5**	**- 12.4**
***Robert W. Twitchett**	**C Rate**	**2,539**	**55.4**	**- 10.6**
Thomas J. Brunsden	**C Rate**	**2,478**	**54.1**	**- 11.8**
John H. Perry	**C Rate**	**2,432**	**53.1**	**- 11.1**
J. Gardner	Lab	2,227	48.6	+14.0
M. Gardner	Lab	2,152	47.0	+12.6
F. West	Lab	2,127	46.4	+13.2
W. Adams	Lab	1,987	43.4	+11.3
L. Orchard	Lab	1,943	42.4	+10.4
W. Hearn	Lab	1,936	42.2	+10.4
12.0% swing C Rate to Lab	Maj	350	7.6	
		329	7.2	
		316	6.9	
		312	6.8	
		251	5.5	
		205	4.5	

Wormholt

1925 electorate %turnout		10,787	48.4	+ 8.4
***John N. Claydon**	**C Rate**	**2,886**	**55.7**	**- 3.0**
***Edwin C. Jarvis**	**C Rate**	**2,730**	**52.7**	**- 3.7**
Nathaniel E. Davis	**C Rate**	**2,698**	**52.1**	**- 3.0**
***John Rooke**	**C Rate**	**2,637**	**50.9**	**- 4.2**
Lavinia M. Evison	**C Rate**	**2,592**	**50.0**	**- 2.1**
***Alfred Gillham**	**C Rate**	**2,464**	**47.6**	**- 4.1**
W. Barnett	Lab	2,225	42.9	+ 5.7
J. Colerick	Lab	2,173	41.9	+ 4.8
Wilfred Turney	Lab	2,155	41.6	+ 4.5
E. Goldsmith	Lab	2,131	41.1	+ 5.5
E. Hobden	Lab	2,109	40.7	+ 5.3
A. McLellan	Lab	2,109	40.7	+ 5.4
F. Everard	Ind	363	7.0	- 2.3
3.0% swing C Rate to Lab	Maj	661	12.8	
		505	9.8	
		473	9.2	
		412	8.0	
		367	7.1	
		239	4.7	

Summary of election results

Fulham	Year	Elec	%Poll	Mun Ref	Lab	Prog	Ind	Ind Prog
Baron's Court	1925	5,781	49.9	89.3	10.7			
	1922	5,385	41.8	92.9	7.1			
Hurlingham	1925	4,432	54.3	73.6	26.4			
	1922	4,329	46.1	73.8	26.2			
Lillie	1925	10,802	45.1	54.9	36.0	9.1		
	1922	10,404	30.7	59.1	40.9			
Margravine	1925	7,540	42.5	48.4	51.6			
	1922	7,445	30.5	55.2	44.8			
Munster	1925	16,847	41.3	55.3	44.7			
	1922	16,479	35.3	59.7	40.3			
Sands End	1925	11,431	50.4	56.1	43.9			
	1922	11,049	47.1	40.3	34.3	13.2	12.2	
Town	1925	6,856	51.6	77.2	22.8			
	1922	6,508	42.7	78.5	21.5			
Walham	1925	6,426	43.8	46.1	36.6	17.3		
	1922	5,455	34.5	43.8	30.2		25.9	

Hammersmith	Year	Elec	%Poll	C Rate	Lab	Prog	Ind	NFDS
Brook Green and St Matthew's	1925	10,938	-	Unop				
	1922	10,062	-	Unop				
College Park and Latimer	1925	4,970	39.6	36.2	63.8			
	1922	4,600	29.9	34.9	45.1		20.0	
River	1925	6,921	42.0	51.5	33.4		15.1	
	1922	8,707	26.3	70.7	29.3			
St Stephen's	1925	4,149	43.7	67.1	32.9			
	1922	4,086	28.2	81.4			18.6	
Starch Green	1925	10,064	48.9	55.0	45.0			
	1922	9,495	34.5	67.0	33.0			
The Grove and Ravenscourt	1925	10,474	40.9	64.4	35.6			
	1922	9,744	33.6	68.7	31.3			
Wormholt	1925	10,787	48.4	51.5	48.5			
	1922	9,235	40.0	54.5	45.5			

Councillors' majorities

Fulham

1.	Arthur Cook	Margravine	71	2.3
2.	Sydney Ballantyne	Margravine	84	3.4
3.	Charles Harwood	Walham	98	3.5
4.	Chris Lancaster	Margravine	173	5.7
5.	William Banfield	Margravine	179	5.9
6.	Alfred Davis	Walham	167	6.0
7.	Arthur Minute	Sands End	366	6.9
8.	George Redway	Munster	446	6.9
9.	Ernest Pratt	Sands End	379	7.1
10.	Charles Fryer	Sands End	387	7.2
11.	William Wilcox	Munster	475	7.4
12.	George Solley	Munster	486	7.6
13.	Helen Cummins	Munster	507	7.9
14.	William Purves	Munster	514	8.0
15.	William White	Munster	516	8.0
16.	Arthur Ford	Munster	516	8.0
17.	Arthur Driver	Sands End	453	8.5
18.	Edward Armfield	Walham	250	8.9
19.	Albert Baggs	Sands End	480	9.0
20.	William Fowell	Munster	584	9.1
21.	D. Van Den Bergh	Sands End	584	10.9
22.	Charles Lombard	Lillie	678	15.2
23.	Victor Franzini	Lillie	698	15.6
24.	Emanuel Gompers	Lillie	729	16.3
25.	Walter Leonard	Lillie	800	17.9
26.	William Morgan	Lillie	844	18.9
27.	Fred Barber	Lillie	905	20.3
28.	JohnFaulkner	Hurlingham	1,045	45.7
29.	Herbert Dodimead	Hurlingham	1,057	46.2
30.	Edward Pritchard	Hurlingham	1,081	47.3
31.	William Upham	Town	1,679	49.8
32.	William Corbin	Town	1,759	52.2
33.	Sydney Carnt	Town	1,804	53.5
34.	George Clark	Town	1,861	55.2
35.	Harriet Packer	Baron's Court	2,043	73.7
36.	George Hodge	Baron's Court	2,087	77.3
37.	Frederick Bellenger	Baron's Court	2,089	77.4
38.	Hubert Bowden	Baron's Court	2,092	77.5
39.	Frederick Flew	Baron's Court	2,128	78.8
40.	Frank Holmes	Baron's Court	2,146	79.5

Hammersmith

1.	John Perry	Starch Green	205	4.5
2.	Alfred Gillham	Wormholt	239	4.7
3.	Thomas Brunsden	Starch Green	251	5.5
4.	Robert Twitchett	Starch Green	312	6.8
5.	Harry May	Starch Green	316	6.9
6.	Lavinia Evison	Wormholt	367	7.1
7.	John Morton	Starch Green	329	7.2
8.	George Vine	Starch Green	350	7.6
9.	John Rooke	Wormholt	412	8.0
10.	Nathaniel Davis	Wormholt	473	9.2
11.	Edwin Jarvis	Wormholt	505	9.8
12.	John Claydon	Wormholt	661	12.8
13.	Horace Joyce	River	347	13.0
14.	William South	River	383	14.3
15.	John Bedford	River	395	14.8
16.	Arthur Atkinson	River	478	17.9
17.	Bertie Samels	River	479	17.9
18.	Charles Pascall	River	569	21.3
19.	Edward Woods	CP & Latimer	445	23.6
20.	Walter Parish	CP & Latimer	474	25.2
21.	Sidney Raynor	The Grove	1,035	25.9
22.	Henry Wright	The Grove	1,064	26.6
23.	Victor Dean	The Grove	1,121	28.1
24.	William Church	CP & Latimer	535	28.4
25.	Henry Ainsworth	The Grove	1,144	28.6
26.	Charles Johnson	The Grove	1,168	29.2
27.	James Chamberlen	The Grove	1,185	29.4
28.	Horace Durrant	St Stephen's	551	30.5
29.	Elizabeth Davies	St Stephen's	577	31.9
30.	Arthur Cracknell	St Stephen's	640	35.4
31.	Richard Bevan	Brook Green	Unopposed	
32.	Patrick Grey	Brook Green	Unopposed	
33.	Thomas Irons	Brook Green	Unopposed	
34.	Frederick Ratcliffe	Brook Green	Unopposed	
35.	Edward Spearing	Brook Green	Unopposed	
36.	Joseph Woolerton	Brook Green	Unopposed	

Breakdown of results

Shepherds Bush				C Rate	Lab	Ind	Total
1925	Electorate	29,970	Votes	7,443	6,327	0	13,770
	%Turnout	45.2	Votes%	54.1	45.9	0.0	100.0
	%Swing	6.95	Councillors	15	3	0	18
	C Rate to Lab		Candidates	18	18	0	36
1922	Electorate	27,416	Votes	5,650	2,926	3,723	12,299
	%Turnout	33.2	Votes%	45.9	23.8	30.3	100.0
			Councillors	15	3	0	18
			Candidates	18	15	5	38
			Change	+ 8.2	+22.1	-	

College Park and Latimer, St Stephen's, Starch Green, Wormholt

Hammersmith				C Rate	Lab	Ind	Total
1925	Electorate	28,333	Votes	4,143	2,389	558	7,090
	%Turnout	41.5	Votes%	58.4	33.7	7.9	100.0
	%Swing	5.65	Councillors	18	0	0	18
	Lab to C Rate		Candidates	18	12	6	36
1922	Electorate	28,513	Votes	3,866	1,702	0	5,568
	%Turnout	30.0	Votes%	49.0	35.6	0.0	100.0
			Councillors	17	4	0	21
			Candidates	21	21	0	49
			Change	+ 9.4	- 1.9	-	

Brook Green and St Matthew's, River, The Grove and Ravenscourt

North Fulham				Mun Ref	Lab	Prog	Ind	Total
1925	Electorate	40,970	Votes	10,100	6,644	586	0	17,330
	%Turnout	44.7	Votes%	58.3	38.3	3.4	0.0	100.0
	%Swing	11.25	Councillors	21	3	0	0	24
	Lab to MR		Candidates	24	24	6	0	54
1922	Electorate	39,713	Votes	2,469	2,630	863	438	6,400
	%Turnout	34.6	Votes%	38.6	41.1	13.5	6.8	100.0
			Councillors	8	11	2	0	21
			Candidates	21	18	9	6	54
			Change	+ 19.7	- 2.8	- 10.1	-	

Baron's Court, Lillie, Margravine, Munster

South Fulham				Mun Ref	Lab	Prog	Ind	Ind Prog	Total
1925	Electorate	29,145	Votes	8,912	5,136	0	0	0	14,048
	%Turnout	50.0	Votes%	63.4	36.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
	%Swing	8.05	Councillors	16	0	0	0	0	16
	Lab to MR		Candidates	16	16	0	0	0	32
1922	Electorate	27,341	Votes	6,858	3,650	836	1,182	0	12,526
	%Turnout	42.6	Votes%	54.8	29.1	6.7	9.4	0.0	100.0
			Councillors	15	0	0	0	0	15
			Candidates	15	15	6	3	0	39
			Change	+ 8.6	+ 7.5	-	-	-	

Hurlingham, Sands End, Town, Walham

By-elections: 1925-1928

Fulham Borough

Town

Saturday 28 November 1925

No change

Stanley T. Cave	**MR**	**Unopposed**		

Walham

Saturday 28 November 1925

No change

1925 electorate %turnout				
Winifred Brooks	**MR**	**611**	**50.7**	**+ 4.6**
John M. Browning	Lab	593	49.3	+12.7
4.05% swing MR to Lab	Maj	18	1.4	

Sands End

Saturday 25 June 1927

resignation of Cllr Ernest Pratt, Municipal Reform

No change

1927 electorate %turnout				
George R. Renton	**MR**	**1,781**	**50.5**	**- 5.6**
Louis A. Hill	Lab	1,747	49.5	+ 5.6
5.6% swing MR to Lab	Maj	34	1.0	

Baron's Court

Saturday 17 December 1927

No change

1927 electorate %turnout				
Thomas J. Bokenham	**MR**	**958**	**86.0**	**- 3.3**
Solomon Vanderhook	Lab	156	14.0	+ 3.3
3.3% swing MR to Lab	Maj	802	72.0	

Hammersmith Borough

River

Thursday 10th December 1925

Elevation to Aldermen of Cllrs Arthur Atkinson and Charles Pascall, Rate

No change

1925 electorate %turnout		6,000	17.4	
Elizabeth S. Hodgson	**C Rate**	**628**	**63.0**	**+11.5**
Richard B. Mumford	**C Rate**	**579**	**58.0**	**+ 6.5**
John T. Westcott	Lab	399	40.0	+ 6.6
Arthur Batstone	Lab	389	39.0	+ 5.6
2.0% swing Lab to C Rate	Maj	229	23.0	
		180	18.0	