

Good afternoon

I have read the discussion paper and have reservations about the proposal.

A strict adherence to the proposed wording could be interpreted as meaning that superannuation concessions would only apply up to the point that the superannuation investment would replace reliance on the Age Pension.

Given the clear benefits to individuals and the country of substantial superannuation savings, I think that approach is too simplistic and out of step with the aspirations of Australian workers.

I would prefer to see a definition which supported the aspiration for a better quality of life in retirement.

I do understand that superannuation may be exploited by the super rich, and agree there need to be limits to tax concessions. I'm worried that the proposed wording could be used by a future government to take away my plans for my future.

I would encourage you to ensure that any changes only affect future contributions, not retrospectively impacting the future of people who have limited or no capacity to adjust.

Regards

Andrew Bleeze