



**THE FEDERAL  
REDISTRIBUTION  
SOUTH AUSTRALIA**

# Submission CS6

Christopher Smith

# Feedback on Ideas for SA Federal Boundary Redistribution 2026

Submitted by Christopher Smith on 21<sup>st</sup> November 2025

## Disclosure

I am an active member and volunteer of the Greens SA, however this submission is made entirely from my own volition, maintaining objectivity as far as humanly reasonable, and does not necessarily represent the position or views of the Greens SA.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Redistribution Committee for the opportunity to provide feedback on the Ideas submitted for the 2026 Redistribution in SA.

## Feedback

I would like to submit feedback specifically on four suggestions as follows:

1. Suggestion 5- District Council of Streaky Bay

I am highly sympathetic to the difficulty faced by those in rural areas in regard to engaging actively in politics, and in accessing civic services, due to the vast distances encountered on our massive continent. However, I believe attempts to address this through division boundary redistribution is inappropriate, a threat to a fair and equitable democracy, and could be exploited through gerrymandering. Ultimately, reducing the geographic size of rural divisions would lead to inequity in population sizes between divisions and thus the vote of a rural elector being 'worth more' than that of an urban elector. This approach is comparable to the so-called "Playmandering" of the State Playford government in the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century. An alternative method to address this very real issue would be proper investment and resourcing of rural infrastructure, local governments and civic services by higher levels of government (particularly State), acknowledging that rural residents face numerous challenges not faced by those in urban areas

2. Suggestion 12- Anonymous

I would implore the Committee to strongly consider the suggestions raised by this Anonymous individual. I agree, in principal, with the renaming of electorates to honour great First Nations Australians, however also believe that this should be done with some degree of consultation with First Nations Australians themselves (for example, the SA Voice to Parliament).

I believe this suggestion should be considered in conjunction with Suggestion 6 (from Darren McSweeney) who lays out logical arguments and criteria behind the renaming of electorates carrying the names of colonial-era individuals, who would not even have considered themselves "Australian" (noting ultimately that Suggestion 6 does not, in conclusion, recommend the changing of any names)

3. Suggestion 14- Australian Labor Party

I do **not** agree that this Suggestion is the optimal way to correct the projected quota deviations, specifically of Mayo and Barker, for the following reasons

- a. Defining the boundary by the South-Eastern Freeway separates communities on the North and South of this boundary and does not acknowledge that towns and

localities share *more* commonality by being located near to this Freeway rather than by being on one side *or* the other

- b. The Suggestion does not make clear whether the township of Nairne would be included in Mayo or Barker. Including it in Mayo would still leave this division *over* projected quota. Including it in Barker would place it in a different division to Mt Barker and Littlehampton, areas with which Nairne is strongly linked economically and by transport routes, schooling and sports; a boundary which I feel is not necessary with other options available
- c. This Suggestion would separate Murray Bridge from nearly all of the rest of the 'Mallee' region and also from the numerous other locations which rely on the Murray River for economic, tourism and recreational reasons.

I would instead favour options offered by various other Suggestions, that being to move *either* the Northern Hills of Mayo (e.g. Kersbrook, Birdwood, Gumeracha) *or* the rest of the state division of Hammond (Strathalbyn, Langhorne Creek, Callington) from Mayo into Barker. This would not only minimise the disruption to voters of moving divisions, but also provide a more logical delineation of the boundary.

I believe it is no coincidence that a change in boundary as is suggested by the ALP would likely lead to a more favourable 2CP vote for the Labor party vs the incumbent Independent.

4. Suggestion 15- Rebekha Sharkie MP

I would compliment the Hon. MP for the thoroughness of her submission, and also her unquestionable familiarity with, commitment to, and concern for her electorate and constituents. Despite this, I do not believe her suggestion is a reasonable way to solve the quota discrepancy of Mayo. Although moving Aldinga/Sellicks Beach area into Kingston would bring Mayo within the 3.5% threshold, it would then leave Kingston more than 7% over quota. Although there are countless ways to resolve this by down-stream amendments, I believe the Committee should aim for an approach of minimal disruption- why move electors around unnecessarily when electors from Mayo could be moved into the neighbouring divisions requiring expansion, such as Barker or Makin.

Similar to above, I also believe it is no coincidence that this suggested change would likely improve Ms Sharkie's primary vote in a future election.