



**THE FEDERAL
REDISTRIBUTION
SOUTH AUSTRALIA**

Submission OB170

Peter Oswald

From: [REDACTED]
To: [FedRedistribution - SA](#)
Subject: [Redistribution SA - Submission] *WWW* [SEC=OFFICIAL]
Date: Wednesday, 8 April 2026 10:17:07 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Australian Federal Government. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Form submitted: 08/04/2026 10:16 PM

Oswald, Peter - Redistribution SA - Submission on the proposed South Australian redistribution

Personal details

First name: Peter
Surname: Oswald
Email: [REDACTED]

Submission on the proposed South Australian redistribution details

Category: Boundaries

Details: There must be a point when common sense prevails in terms of electoral boundaries when youre talking about the largest electorate in the state and one of the largest in the nation. It is unreasonable to include in Grey, outer suburbs of Adelaide even if that means Grey has significantly fewer electors on its roll. It is already extremely challenging logistically to represent a population spread over such a wide area. It would be more desirable to leave the member for Grey representing the rural and remote regions of the state than include outer Adelaide suburbs which would be better managed in a metropolitan seat. There is also the matter of electoral offices. Is it reasonable to expect northern Adelaide residents to drive 150km to Kadina to the nearest existing electoral office? Country people do that regularly but city folk would object. The alternative would be for the taxpayer to fund another office just for a couple of thousand electors in an outer suburb and expect the member for Grey to attend it. The ideal of roughly equivalent population numbers in each electorate is noble but like all plans it is imperfect in the case of Grey and I believe Grey warrants special treatment. This is no ones fault, just simple geographical facts that need to be addressed.
