

Dear Director,

Thank you for the opportunity to submit a response to the consultation of the Treasury Laws Amendment (Off-Market Share Buy-Backs) Bill 2022.

We object to the proposed changes and believe the draft legislation is unfair to Australian companies and all shareholders.

Treasury Laws Amendment (Off-Market Share Buy-Backs) Bill 2022, if applied, will weaken the franking system.

Off-market share buy-backs and selective reductions of capital are important and established capital management tools for Australian companies and their boards. Any changes to these proven practices will negatively impact Australian companies' capital management choices and have unintended consequences.

Under the proposed amendments to off-market share buy-backs, companies would no longer be able to pay fully franked dividends to participating shareholders as part of the buy-back consideration paid. In addition, the government is also proposing to eliminate franking credits permanently to the extent it would have been paid out in a fully franked dividend to shareholders, should a company wish to conduct an off-market share buy-back in the future. So, not only is the government limiting a company's ability to distribute franking credits to shareholders, it is now proposing to permanently take those franking credits away from companies, in turn denying them the ability to distribute legitimate tax payments made on behalf of their shareholders. The above changes were added to the legislation and were not announced in the Federal Budget on 25 October 2022. It is a significant negative addition which looks to further disenfranchise Australian companies and investors.

We implore the government not to look at this proposal in isolation, but rather to view it in conjunction with the submission on Franked Distributions and Capital Raising (which closed for submission to your office on 5 October 2022). Together, these proposed changes undermine a system that has supported Australian companies and investors through more than three decades of economic stability and growth. During that time, the world has experienced a number of major macroeconomic events such as the global financial crisis and the current system has protected Australian companies, and in turn their shareholders, through these times of economic instability, reducing

companies need to take on unnecessary debt. It has encouraged Australian companies to invest in and pay corporate tax in Australia and emboldened Australians to invest locally. This, in turn, has created more jobs for Australians and provided the additional income tax revenue that Treasury and Government are currently seeking.

We believe that both the proposed changes fail to recognise the fundamental principle underlying the franking system and the reason for its creation, being the avoidance of double taxation on company earnings. If passed, the proposed changes will unfairly target retail investors, low-income investors and superannuation beneficiaries, while limiting companies' abilities to effectively manage their own capital.

We believe Treasury and Government are underestimating the long lasting and broad-reaching impact these changes will have on Australia and we ask you to re-consider making any changes.

Listed below are the personal reasons we have for objecting to the proposed changes:

1. Franking credits which include those from special dividends are an important part of our income as self-funded retirees. In fact, this was part of our retirement plan over 10 years ago and we specifically purchased shares returning fully franked dividends.
2. We specifically included small and medium Australian companies in our share portfolio to help foster their growth and now understand that it is just such companies that will be hurt most.
3. This proposal was not part of Labor's election platform last election - in fact they said the plan was dead when they lost the 2019 election.
4. How can anyone think it's fair to make the new rules retrospective to 2016? Does this mean we would have to pay back money we spent up to 6 years ago?
5. This looks very much like the thin edge of the wedge to bring in broader and more damaging changes, especially given the very short period allowed for submissions since the draft legislation was released.

Please contact me if you have any questions on the below submission.

Thank you again,
Frank Augustyn