



**THE FEDERAL
REDISTRIBUTION
SOUTH AUSTRALIA**

Submission OB412

Moira Davidson-Copping

From: [REDACTED]
To: [FedRedistribution - SA](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Redistribution and name change for Grey
Date: Friday, 24 April 2026 4:07:50 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.

As Grey is currently one of the largest electorates in the world, I seriously question the logic or lack of it, in expanding the current area.

- The previous Federal member spent a considerable amount of time simply trying to access as many of his constituents as possible and deal with issues.
- The current Federal member is already facing the same logistical nightmare and doing an amazing job in reaching into the electorate far and wide.
- Current facilities such as medical support available in this electorate are stretched and need to be addressed before adding a further contingency of "voters" who are already able to rely on support, services and community involvement from Adelaide and surrounds .
- Rural areas have been substantially ignored by Federal and State governments over the years, and the opportunity exists for a commitment to address ongoing issues before "attaching" "provided for communities" to stretch the limited resources.
- We already have little support for domestic issues, mental health issues, recruitment of volunteers to "staff" ambulances, fire stations and continually raising funds to support exceptionally vital services such as RFDS
- We currently have inadequate hospital services and trained medical professionals to accommodate an aging population – surely a more important problem to be addressed than "needing more voters" in a particular constituency?
- The recent State election proved we have insufficient trained electoral personnel to cope with the size and number of voters as we are!
- Roads, transportation, outback services all need to be addressed before forcing the electorate and its overworked volunteer constituency to "assume" responsibility for a "town" population.

With regards to a name change FOR Grey, which will obviously involve millions of tax payer dollars to address signage, publicity, promotion of new name, replacement of all references to "Grey" in Federal, State and Local government offices – how does the "man on the street" actually benefit?

What advantage can we justify to the people living in cars, broken down housing or no housing at all, that the spending of this money is "relevant" to WHAT?

Maybe a "Committee" could do a review of the current rural electorate and clearly articulate what these changes mean to us, how do we benefit, and how at this time of increased petrol costs, electricity costs and general cost of living, can the Government seriously "hand on heart" state that these changes are necessary and beneficial to the people of Grey.

Maira Davidson-Copping