

To whom it may concern,

I am a late career person contemplating retirement from the very fortunate situation of a good super balance spread across several super funds reflecting the course of my employment. These include an industry fund, a government defined benefit fund, and an SMSF that I personally manage and administrate. I wish all Australians can have the benefit of what has proved an excellent policy over the last several decades - provided one has been continuously employed in high-income jobs with the security of properly managed employer affairs. My partner, a woman, is not so fortunate, having been unemployed while prioritising children and the victim of very poor employer practise in small business including misappropriated super contributions.

I therefore strongly commend the Government for this opportunity to contribute to the debate about the proposed legislated definition of super.

I support the wording proposed, and am not fussed about the precise order of words (something a competent legal drafter should handle.)

I strongly support elimination of the word "cohesive": this is a weasle word that could mean almost anything.

I am a little concerned about the word "sustainable", in particular the way the explanatory notes cover "equitable and sustainable" in the same paragraph. I would greatly prefer these two ewords to be separated so that their individual meanings are clear: In fact, the explanation provided - "signifies ... similar outcomes ... simimilar circumstances ... targeted government support" - is excellent, but it really only applies to "equitable". The second sentence "super also needs to fit within the broader fiscal strategy" is pure waffle worthy of Sir Humphrey. I submit that the explanatory notes to resulting legislation should separately discuss "Sustainable", and make it clear that this this means sustainable to the public finances of Australia within the context of a fair and progressive tax system. It is outrageous that tax concessions currently apply to super balances vastly in excess of those needed for a dignified retirement by any reasonable "pub test".

Gareth Moorhead