

One rule for MPs and another for general public

Published: 24 October 2003

A revealing Internet survey - unveiled by leading mature workers' campaigning group Wiseowls - indicates wide-ranging discontent with the Government's on-going decision to increase MPs' personal pensions levels in face of the crisis affecting many working and retired members of the British public.

Wiseowls' online readers, who responded to the interactive online survey, condemned the recent decision by Government to increase MPs' final salary pension schemes - worth an additional several thousand pounds a year. A backbench MP currently receives a salary in the region of £50-55,000.

Asked if MPs should award themselves pensions increases "partially at the expense of the taxpayer, when other people are seeing their pension schemes closed or eroded?" 99% of online readers voted against the idea.

In a further development Wiseowls asked its significant mature worker readership: "Do you think MPs should vote themselves an increase in pensions and pension contributions when so many others are seeing theirs eroded?" Again a staggering 92% voted against the proposal.

Wiseowls - a key Non Government Organisation pushing for greater recognition of mature workers' rights and needs - condemned the recent decisions taken by Government to increase the personal wealth of MPs when the UK's working population is facing a pensions crisis.

Chris Walsh, a campaigner for leading anti-ageism group Wiseowls, said: "Millions of people in the UK have lost, or are facing the loss of, final salary pension schemes which are by far the best financial packages for retired workers. We have been told by politicians - time and time again - that stock market losses are to blame for the demise of effective pension schemes. Yet, MPs have awarded themselves a generous retirement nest egg at the expense of the tax-payer - it is total hypocrisy. Baby-boomers are more likely to have savings and have significant investments, by undermining their financial stability in this way the Government is sending out a message that it is not interested in the financial well-being of both older and younger generations of workers".