

Individual Submission 031

10/02/2021

Contributory pension should be paid at 66.

How to pay for it

Ireland is a republic and the people voted for 66 and will they pay for it. People over average wage already more than paying for it with their 4% employee contribution and the 10.75% employer contribution and with no salary cap.

Run run social insurance fund as an insurance with reserves put aside. It had a surplus before Covid.

NTMA assumes governance to keep rogue ministers from stealing the reserves from the fund. [REDACTED] etc.

Up the employee PRSI to 6% plus and Employer to 13% plus. it's very low compared to other countries.

All employees earning over 200 euro pay into the fund. Remove USC off the low pay. Increase Family income supplement to compensate low wage families.

Remove PRSI credits for signing onto the Dole.

Off work to rear a family can only count up to a Max 50% of your contributions.

Pension should be based on lifetime absolute contributions. 40 years required for the full pension

Should not be means tested as the person on 100k pays 15k a year (Employee + employer) 600K plus in lifetime which pays for 5 people for ten years.

Option for a higher pension if you opt to delay the uptake of pension to 68.

Non contributory should be 68 to 70. 68 if you have over 2 years PRSI in your lifetime.

Make it mandatory for employers to offer reduced hours/job sharing for those over 60 with 5 plus years service to keep people working. This with the remote working option can keep people working.

Individual Submission 032

10/02/2021

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Date 10th February 2021

We write to the commission as 2 economic exiles living in France from a country where after a lifetime of study and work we were about have our home taken from us in Ireland in 2015. This was not due to any fault of our own making but due solely to the delinquent political mismanagement of Irelands economy by Fianna Fail.

My wife who suffers from [REDACTED] was denied her right to an invalidity pension in Ireland. Not the case in [REDACTED]

For both of us at 64 and 62 respectively we look forward to getting our contributory state old age pension at 66 after 2 productive working careers in Ireland paying an approximate combined total of 75 years of PRSI contributions.

If Ireland chooses to make the retirement age 67 for me, born in [REDACTED] 1956, it will be a travesty that will be out of step with the rest of the EU, and make Ireland complete outliers in the EU.

We do not ASK you to maintain the state pension age at 66, AS 2 IRISH AND EUROPEAN CITIZENS WE ABSOLUTELY DEMAND THAT YOU DO SO. DOING OTHERWISE WOULD BE ANOTHER SLAP IN THE FACE FROM A COUNTRY THAT HAS ALREADY DONE ENOUGH DAMAGE TO US.

WE WORKED ALL OUR LIVES IN IRELAND AND WE ARE ENTITLED TO OUR PENSION AND WE DEMAND IT.

Demographics aside, as far as we are concerned that's just political machinations. The Irish government had no problems screwing the Irish population over with a decade of enforced austerity, instead of "burning the bank bond holders", and bailing out banks who still hand out millions in bonuses to the executive white collar thieves who work for them.

Due to the 2008 recession caused by Irish Government economic mismanagement myself and my wife both lost our jobs, with the result that we had to sell our home

and emigrate before the vulture fund who bought our mortgage could put us in the street.

GIVE US OUR PENSION AT 66.



Individual Submission 033

10/02/2021

1. We pay PRSI to fund that state pension welfare and medical care we are not given any choice the government then takes that money and pays social welfare to lazy wasters that won't work so there is a large chunk of funds that is being waste. Welfare should not be for life unless you have a disability or medical condition that prevents you from working. Being a lazy areshole is neither a disability or a medical condition.
2. I have paid 22 years worth of prsi If I invested that money in my own pension plan and medical insurance cover I would have gotten a better return that letting some government clown handle my finances.
3. Stop taxing pensions you are taxing my private pensions and when I retire you will tax it again only a scum bag would tax and elderly persons pension.
4. Enda Kenny and the labour party cronies tool prsi funds and motor tax funds to pay for the creation of irish water. This should not happen ever there should be protection in place that prevent this kind of careless actions. There actually should be a law that prevents FG being in charge of the finance department.
5. I think people should be allowed to work longer in life if they feel able and are capable. Why should you retire and waste away.
6. Politicians / civil servant management we need to cut expenses wages and pensions we are paying for their pension and life style its not good value for money.
7. Governments constantly waste tax money there needs to be a proper oversite PAC are useless. Look at the amount of tax money has been wasted 3billion on the nation broadband scam, 24 million paid out to external companies for jop path, millions wasted on irish water. Million wasted on the national children's hospital we are not getting value for our tax money.

Individual Submission 034

10/02/2021

Thank you for the opportunity to contribute to the State Pension planning process.

I would like to highlight two aspects of the pension system that are not addressed in the document *Have your say on sustainable State Pensions into the future*.

First, approximately an eighth of the Irish population are immigrants. Ireland's rapidly internationalizing economy is likely to attract further immigration in the future. At present it is very difficult to manage cross-national retirement savings, especially when people relocate internationally beyond the EU. This affects Irish people working abroad for a portion of their career as well as non-Irish immigrants moving to Ireland. The current system lacks flexibility to move pension funding across international borders, especially outside the EU. A system that allows more flexible pension planning across international borders is urgently needed and will ultimately reduce the load on Irish taxpayers.

Second, changes introduced to the Public Service Pension Scheme following the 2008 crash have resulted in inequitable pension provision for those in the Public Service recruited after 2015. While pension reform is clearly necessary, it is important for pension arrangements to be equitable across staff in similar grades etc.

I hope these suggestions are useful.

Sincerely,

██████████

Individual Submission 035

11/02/2021

Dear Sirs / Madame,

The issue of pensions in Ireland is an area I have engaged with the State on over several years.

I would ask the commission to take account of the following points into consideration in it's current deliberations :

The State pension as currently established, is a foundation for most citizens basic retirement income plans and accordingly serves it's purpose very well.

The increased longevity of claimants living into the 85-95 age bracket will place more strain on what is an unfunded scheme.

Reducing birth rates across Europe are leaving the "pay-as-you go" funding model of all public pensions under greater pressure given the €150Bn PV liability that the State has presently ie double our official debt level on a GDP that is materially overstated by the effects of (mainly) US Multi-Nationals.

Ireland now needs a system of pension funding that works for all it's citizens.

One of the main drags on long-term savings value ie 50+ y's (25+ to retirement & 25+ yr's in retirement) is the cost of funds under management by an industry created on "easy to sell" tax relieved contributions.

The pensions industry's sale of tax based savings products cements a long-term high-cost model that destroys value for pension holders.

The State is a "big beast" in purchasing power terms that could achieve ultra low-cost fund management fees.

The State also has a massive long-term liability to manage on it's "Balance Sheet" being it's combined State & Public Pension obligations.

The State could choose to selectively use it's Balance Sheet & purchasing powers to encourage more citizen pension savings by :

Capping all pensions at say 4 times the basic State Pension to say €48K per citizen (in today's money) on grounds of equity & fiscal prudence.

Adding a layer of increased State Pension to say 2 times basis State Pension in return for long-term additional contributions via the PRSI system.
Providing a flat-rated SSIA type assistance with long-term savings to eliminate the high/low tax rate disparity.
Provide the low-cost funds management model, enhanced basic & SSIA pension accounts via a State Pensions Agency (within say the NTMA).

I recognise that the capping of pensions is racial move and will require constitutional change aswell as bridging arrangement for the financial implications not to leave a cohort of people too badly affected by such changes, but no system designed in Bismark's era should be left unchanged indefinitely in the 21st Century in a Republic.

I would recommend that this topic be given to the People's Parliament ("PP") for consideration, as the issues under consideration are so long-term & multi-faceted between public & private spheres of our society that there is little likelihood of real reform being achieved without a mandate from the "people" in the way the State was finally enabled to change the constitution in the last referendum via the PP effectively, rather than the Dail.

Finally, it appears to me that all office holders (Judges, TD's etc) should have significantly higher pay, so they can fund their own pension arrangements just like other "normal" citizens removing the link to Civil Service pensions altogether, thus removing any real or apparent potential for bias by complete separation of the legislature & the judiciary from civil servants T's & C's of employment. After all how can anyone expect the T's & C's of any system to be reformed, if the very people carrying out the reforms are themselves insulated from the affects, by reason of being tied into the same T'S & C's !!!

Regards,

[Redacted signature]

For and on behalf of

[Redacted name]

[Redacted name]

[Redacted name]

[Redacted name]

[Redacted name]

[Redacted name]

[Redacted name]

[Redacted name]

[Redacted name]

[Redacted name]

[Redacted name]

Pensions Submission

I am a male aged 63.

I would like to submit the following ;

1. The averaging method of calculating pension entitlements should run parallel with any new system of calculating pension entitlement. This is to ensure fairness into the future and to ensure that no individual is discriminated against as a result of the timing of their reaching pension age, which is in effect an age discrimination.
2. Contributory pensions should never be subjected to any form of means testing. This should be written into legislation to guarantee that it can never be introduced into the future. This is very important in order to reassure persons making private pension contributions that they will never suffer losses from their future contributory pension as a result of their good financial planning throughout their lives.
3. Legislation should be passed to guarantee that no future government will levy or tax the funds in private pension funds into the future. This is very important as trust has been lost in the Irish government as a result of the removal of funds from private pension by finance minister Michael Noonan. Any person having deductions taken from their wages under the proposed Auto Enrolment system will be wary and concerned about any reintroduction of levies and taxes being taken from locked in private pension funds. This will act as a serious deterrent to the Auto Enrolment system which in itself is a very good idea.
4. The government should commit to the refund of all money and any investment gains on it, to be returned to the private pension funds raided by finance minister Michael Noonan. This is important to correct the injustice of this money raid and to show that the present government and any future governments agree that this was unjust and would never be tolerated again. If this money is returned it would be a step in the direction of regaining the trust of the Irish people that there is fairness in the Irish pension system. While this money is still held by the government any Auto Enrolment contributor will rightly worry about the safety of their pension funds.
5. Whatever criteria is selected to determine qualification for future pension entitlements it should remain stable for the entire working lives of the workers subjected to it. At present successive government have been tampering with the eligibility rules for pension qualification every few years. As pensions are a long term financial investment vehicle, contributors must have certainty that the terms and rules will not be changed to their detriment during their working lives. Uncertainty is the biggest enemy of long term investment and all possible uncertainty should be removed to preserve confidence in the pension systems.



[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Individual Submission 037

11/02/2021

Good morning,

I'll be brief...

I am 60 years of age, working full-time since I finished my Leaving Certificate in 1979, - but worked part-time/weekends since I completed my junior-certificate. By the time I retire, I'll have worked full-time for 47 years. Some say I'm lucky, and yes I have been to have work, but I ask for fairness.

As it stands I won't get the state pension until I am 68 years of age, so I will be getting 'dole' (€203) for three years.

I was paying into a defined benefit pension scheme (private sector) for most of my working life, until five years ago when my entitlements were 'stolen' from me, firstly in a Section 50, then three years ago the scheme was closed and I received a pittance to start a DC scheme.

Then the State brought in new rules which pushed the pension age out to 67 for some, and 68 for me. I miss out on the age 67 category by 30 days.

How do I feel? How would you feel?

Thank you for your work on The Pensions Commission.

All I ask is fairness - is/was my working life of less importance than those in State jobs?

That's a call the commission has to make.

God speed.

██████████

Individual Submission 038

11/02/2021

Hi,

I am going to retire this year after 35 years Service with a multinational company. I have contributed to the state during this timeframe with no issues. I will have 40yrs Prsi contributions and that's my side of the bargain.

However, I am 60 and could possibly have to wait until I'm 68 before I can access the above contributions..That's not fair bargaining.

I have paid into a private pension to support my early retirement and this should be mandatory as part of pension reform.

My early retirement will facilitate a new hire and new opportunity for someone else. I am aware that there are different rules for those in the public sector where access to pensions are sooner than those in the private sector.

I do not agree with the idea that We are living longer because a lot of people are going into nursing homes at a younger age now so that contradicts this theory.

We need fair opportunities to allow those who want to work beyond the retirement age but this could impact our younger recruits when they have studied and now can't get jobs because older people can work longer.

Quality of life after working almost 40years is highly dependent on one's health and the risk of retirement later in life will increase mortality unfortunately.

How can We standover paying people pensions starting at 68 when Politicians, Civil Servants and those who work in the public sector have access to pensions a lot earlier.

In summary, I don't agree that People are living longer but those who do in a lot of cases are a burden to the state where they are of poor health due to no fault of their own, can in lots of cases end up in nursing homes with access to Fair Deal policies or would need full time care which is a burden to families who cannot get state aid due to inadequacy in the Health Service.

Best Regards,

[REDACTED]

Individual Submission 039

11/02/2021

Good evening

I would like to make a short submission or recommendation.

I believe the state pension should be means tested from 2030 onwards.

For example any individual with an income in retirement or pension in excess of 100k (or married couple 200k) should not be entitled to claim the state pension.

Thank you

██████████

Submission 040

10/02/2021

To whom it Concerns,

New ledgetation to take power from politicians who ring fence there own big pensions. It's totally out of hand of what retired politicians are getting and than the rest of society are on crumbs.

We actually need new laws for everybody to pay into a proper framework and if y don't get ready to join the poverty que and get rid of the free bees.

You also need to separate sections in the pensions Authority.

The whole thing is very complex and more workshops for people to inform people that index related research in 20 years time y need x y and z. People are poorly informed and I know that from my Dad who will only receive 34 euros a week with his old age after 30 years working from 5 in the morning there is no repect for the working class this is shocking unfair for my dad but who cares the fat cats in Dublin are misleading people and thrown there dignity down the drain.

Regards

██████████

Second email: 11/02/2021

Subject: We need to remodel our out of touch pension system that is fairer to working class people and all society and proper costings and pension fund for the state that cannot be touched like the last recession raid.

To whom it concerns,

Our pension system is a disgrace for working people who only get 30 or 40 euros more than people on the old age who never contributed to the Irish state. Its time for government to wakening up and design and regulation for pensions for working class. Allot of people cannot afford private pensions and then there is no guarantee at the end.

Government needs to take stakes in toll roads and build up funds in different ways that will fund a healthy agening population.

Companies need to contribute to a secure government department of pensions and y get what y put in.

The Irish way of no accountability or vision to correct systems is no longer viable.

Off course Irelands selling policy to people by government does not wash anymore.

Pension system needs to keep avc schemes and let people in society work if they want to including Gardaí prison service Teachers Nurses defence forces.

We need a 100 year plan and maths of excellent economics to build a super fund that is managed and funded guaranteed returns and the thing of having pension system running on overdraft from week to week is unfair on the taxpayers we need to passport pension funds in gold electricity wind energy we need to borrow 10 billion and with the banks funds from AIB and Bank of Ireland a new superfund could be invested for 10 years to properly fund pensions and the exchequer less exposed to funding the monster in the room.

Let's face it we are not at the races with pensions for retired people there is a huge inequality to ordinary working people.

Regards

████████████████████

Individual Submission 041

12/02/2021

Considering ways of having a sustainable State Pension arrangements into the future. Please consider the following question:

Question.

Are there ways and means within the Irish economic system that we retirees could make funding available for young first time home buyers who themselves are funding our pensions, from pension savings we may not need for ten or twenty years - then later have the funds returned to us for use when we would need them?

If not, can sure a system be set up?

To explain: I am coming up to retirement. I planned diligently for retirement and had no terrible 'rainy day' situations befall me. It all worked out well for me so I am 'comfortable' now. Part of my retirement plan includes my Irish contributory pension which is being supported by younger Irish tax paying workers.

I suspect there are many retirees or soon to be retirees in my fortunate position. - Are the billions in deposit accounts in Ireland not in part funded by Irish pension savings?

While God may have other plans for me (which is really not my problem!), my plan is to live healthily until I am 95 give or take. That being the case I don't plan to draw on a lot of my own funds for some twenty or thirty years.

So I repeat, my question: Could an economic system be developed whereby we retirees could make capital available for younger first time home buyers from the savings we don't need to draw on for ten or twenty years? And then have the funds returned back for use for our needs at a later time?

Yours etc

Signing as :

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Pensions Submission

To whom it may concern,

I would like to submit the following;

1. The averaging method of calculating pension entitlements should run parallel with any new system of calculating pension entitlement. This is to ensure fairness into the future and to ensure that no individual is discriminated against as a result of the timing of their reaching pension age, which is in effect an age discrimination.
2. Contributory pensions should never be subjected to any form of means testing. This should be written into legislation to guarantee that it can never be introduced into the future. This is very important in order to reassure persons making private pension contributions that they will never suffer losses from their future contributory pension as a result of their good financial planning throughout their lives.
3. Legislation should be passed to guarantee that no future government will levy or tax the funds in private pension funds into the future. This is very important as trust has been lost in the Irish government as a result of the removal of funds from private pension by finance minister Michael Noonan. Any person having deductions taken from their wages under the proposed Auto Enrolment system will be wary and concerned about any reintroduction of levies and taxes being taken from locked in private pension funds. This will act as a serious deterrent to the Auto Enrolment system which in itself is a very good idea.
4. The government should commit to the refund of all money and any investment gains on it, to be returned to the private pension funds raided by finance minister Michael Noonan. This is important to correct the injustice of this money raid and to show that the present government and any future governments agree that this was unjust and would never be tolerated again. If this money is returned it would be a step in the direction of regaining the trust of the Irish people that there is fairness in the Irish pension system. While this money is still held by the government any Auto Enrolment contributor will rightly worry about the safety of their pension funds.
5. Whatever criteria is selected to determine qualification for future pension entitlements it should remain stable for the entire working lives of the workers subjected to it. At present successive government have been tampering with the eligibility rules for pension qualification every few years. As pensions are a long term financial investment vehicle, contributors must have certainty that the terms and rules will not be changed to their detriment during their working lives.

Uncertainty is the biggest enemy of long term investment and all possible uncertainty should be removed to preserve confidence in the pension systems.

6. The proposed new rules for pensions that require individuals to pay 40 years of PRSI contributions is too long; many individuals who spend time in university, work abroad, or work part-time will be disadvantaged by this system. This should be brought down to 20 years to avoid disadvantaging these individuals and to provide a fairer system.
7. The qualifying age for contributory pension payments should remain at 66 years.

Yours sincerely,

[Redacted signature block]

12th February 2021

Individual Submission 043
1302/2021

Hi Josephine,

My Name is [REDACTED]. I am 65 years old(since [REDACTED]).
I live at home with my wife and son (who is Down Syndrome)
I worked for 44 years in the workforce(All in Multinational Companies),and was made redundant in April 2019. at age 63
I became a Carer for my Son([REDACTED]) who is Down Syndrome([REDACTED] years old).I have been in receipt of the Carer's Benefit(€220) since April 2019
This Benefit is for 24 months so next Month March,will be my last payment.
So I will now be transitioning to the Interim payment € 203 from April 2021
Then unless the commission decides otherwise I will receive my State Pension entitlement on [REDACTED] 2021 (€248)

I had contributed to a private pension,but after being made redundant in 1994,had to cash this in,as unemployment was a factor and I had a large Mortgage.Obviously this pension made a small but necessary impact on my mortgage at the time.
When I commenced my final employment, I started another Private Pension in 2000.
A few things happened to this pension,in the meantime,The 2008 Crash,had a big effect on my pension.
The Government also raided this Pension. So overall when I Was made redundant I will be taking home €90 per week,from next year onwards

I completed the Survey 2 days ago. There were a lot points which need to be challenged

In this I mentioned the words **Fairness and Equality**

Government needs to understand that most retirement ages in Multinational companies are age 65(no choice,have to leave)

I am sure this is the same for most SME companies as well.

Of Course Flexibility of being able to work longer should be introduced. How can this be done with individual Contracts.

How can the Pension age be pushed out,unless this flexibility is put in place

Assumption that people are living longer,this needs to be recognised as a **positive.**

Assumption Fewer Children being born

(1) How can you predict this with certainty going Forward

(2) if this is True,then you will have less Children's Allowance claimants and other associated benefits

(3)You would also have less People reaching the Pension Age.

Growing demands on Government Spending **I think it is a mistake to look at the State Pension separately to all Pensions provided by the State**
All of these Pensions should be taken into consideration,such as All TD's Minister's Taoiseach, Judges,Senior Civil Servants etc
At the end of the day,these Pensions are contributed to by Taxpayers

One other point that needs to be challenged is that younger People are contributing for my pension.

So the Narrative says When I was contributing,I was paying for Pensioners throughout the last 44 years.

The point cannot be losted That I have contributed for 44 years,and I deserve to benefit now from these contributions.

The Suggestion is that the younger people are paying for my pension. This is Untrue.

Finally, I don't see the need for this Commission,the Government only decided to go this Route after the Program for Government was agreed last July

Nobody is fooled here,the majority of people(at Election Time) wanted a restoration to age 65 or 66 NOT an Increase beyond this age.

rgds

[REDACTED]

Individual Submission 044

13/02/2021

To Whom it may concern,

---STOP 67 ---

I would like the state retirement pension to remain at age 66 with an interim payment from age 65 to 66.

I am 62 yo and still working with a contractual retirement age of 65.

People my age entered the work force at a much younger age than today. I am now working 44 years. In many jobs today there is a bias against the older employees.

There is a lot of bullying, intimidation, stress caused from both the employer and fellow employees . This is very common and has a huge detrimental effect on one's health.

I personally will not be able to work in my present workplace under the present conditions until age 67. I am struggling with health issues as it is and am trying my best to make it in work to age 65.

I feel that if the pension age has to increase it shouldn't affect people who are :

- 1) Rapidly approaching pension age
- 2) People who have a work contract with retirement age at 65

Maybe if increased pension age is introduced for people who are now in their 40s it would give them time to plan and prepare for retirement.

The reality is some people going forward will be paying a mortgage till aged 70.

Also I do think one should not get the state pension and be allowed to continue working: It should be either get your pension and retire or suspend your pension and continue working.

There are many people who are in good health and working in a fair and equitable environment who would like the option

either/ or. I think its very unfair for anyone to get a pension and work as well. Its occupying a job that somebody on the live register and who is struggling to find work could have.

Thank You,

Yours Sincerely,

██████████

Individual Submission 045

13/02/2021

Those who provide long-term care for most of their working age lives

Dear Sir/Madam

I wish to make a submission regarding the future of state pensions for carers, especially of people with disabilities. This submission will refer specifically to persons who were on Class B PRSI, such as civil servants recruited before 1995. A large cohort of civil servants are coming to pension age over the next couple of years. Many of these may have taken time out to care for their loved ones through a variety of options, such as:

Carer's Leave

Term Time

Shorter Working Year

Career Breaks

Reduced Work Patterns

When they now approach pension age they realise that they are well short of years for both their defined civil service pension and lump sum and will have no entitlement to the state contributory pension. This, coupled with the loss of income as a result of taking these forms of unpaid leave, put this cohort of people at a serious disadvantage to others. They have saved the state significant sums of money over the years, as if they remained at work, the state would have had to spend vast amounts of money on service provision for the people they have cared for.

This cohort of civil servants have given their all to Government departments while they were able to hold down employment and deserve more from the state consequently. While paying Class B contributions, they are not allowed to pay any other type of contribution or gain credits for their home-making years. In fact the guidelines actually prohibit this.

At the very least, when a civil servant is left with very little option other than to stay at home to care for people with disabilities, they should receive some state assistance. Options such as availing of Carer's Leave are short term (two year limit) and do not account for long term disabilities such as caring for people with Autism. Also they should be entitled to pension-entitling credits for the time spent caring. Class B PRSI contributions should be amended to include this.

I appreciate that the situation has been amended for those recruited to the Civil Service post 1995 paying Class A PRSI contributions and this will hopefully address

anomalies in the future, as future pensioners will be allowed to avail of credits for certain specified forms of caring leave.

My submission is that Civil Servants recruited before 1995 and who paid Class B PRSI contributions should have been allowed to pay Class S contributions for the years spent on the various forms of leave to care for their loved ones with disabilities, as they were effectively self-employed caring for these people. This could also be taken into consideration in the Total Contributions scenario. Civil servants who retired early to do similar caring duties should also be allowed to pay Class S contributions also. Class S credits should now be given retrospectively to these people at this stage.

While this might mean a small increase in the overall pension budget, it would mean a huge amount of recognition and self-worth to the small cohort of people who have served both state and loved ones well over many years.

I hope you will look favourably on my suggestion.

Kind regards

██████████

Former Civil Servant and Carer for two young adults with disabilities

Individual Submission 046

13/02/2021

To whom it concerns

I saw an advertisement on Facebook about me (not just me) having a say in this commission

I recently saw a YouTube video by an economist from Australia. He stated that if every baby born in Ireland was given €6750 by the government and left in an account to grow on compound interest for 65 years, that €6,750 would grow to a couple of million.

And as this is a 1 time payment by the government, it works out cheaper in the long run.

And of course, if/when someone does die within the 65 years, that fund which grew now becomes part of Government Capital to spend as they see fit.

Of course this is long term planning, but if it's short term you are looking for, I have no suggestions.

Sincerely

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Individual Submission 047

13/02/2021

The issues could hardly be better set out than in M Clifford's 'Examiner' piece below. [The Irish Examiner, "Michael Clifford: Age-old issue of pensions hasn't gone away", 14 February 2021] The obvious solutions should emerge directly from his analysis – it simply requires a Government that has the courage to put the unarguable rationale for change, squarely and forcefully to the electorate.

I was part of a generation that was fortunate to be working while defined benefit schemes and age-65 retirements were still possible- due to a combination of post-war demographic and financial circumstances that will never be repeatable. Forward-looking, prudent firms began closing their DB schemes to new entrants in the early 90's. This is what enabled them to continue to have solid well-funded DC schemes today. If Bismark were to pioneer a first-ever pension scheme today, he would probably base it on a retirement age over 70 as a minimum.

Government should bite several bullets at once by initially setting incremental age rises over next 20 years- in the national interest – justifying it by taking into account the massive debt repayments required for years to come.

██████████

██████████████████

Please acknowledge receipt.

Individual Submission 048

13/02/2012

To who it may concern,

I would like to contribute my views on the issue of pension affordability and extending the old age pension age.

I certainly agree that sustainability of the old age pension is a huge issue and one that needs to be addressed now for future generations. However I think just reducing the issue to one of age is missing a big part of the picture. In my own case I did my leaving certificate at 17 and joined the workforce before my 18th birthday like many of my contemporaries at the time (1980). Relatively few of my school mates went to third level and indeed a significant number started working after their Inter Cert at 16. We are now approaching our 60s and in recent years have watched the pension age moving further away from us. It meant that in my case I would have been working for more than 50 years before I could qualify for an old age pension and some of my friends would be working for almost 53 years. Throughout this time we have been paying PRSI contributions. Like most non public sector employees I do not have a defined benefit pension and so I have been making substantial contributions to my PRSA pension for some time but this will still only give me a very modest private pension. This leaves me very dependent on the social welfare old age pension when I retire forcing me to work until 68 years of age under the current planned arrangements.

I strongly feel this is very unfair. Firstly in comparison with public servants who will be able to retire at 65, with far superior defined benefit and index linked pensions, along with lump sums which we will not have. In addition compared to those who have attended college with the result that they have not commenced their working life until their early to mid twenties. As a consequence their working lives are significantly shorter than those of us who did not have that opportunity if they retire at the same age as we do. Their PRSI contributions will also be lower as a result.

My view is that length of working life, and consequent PRSI contributions, should be a factor in determining age for qualification for old age pension. I believe that those of us who have worked for 45 years or more by the time we are 65 should then be able to retire on a full old age pension. In short everyone should qualify for the old age social welfare pension if they are 65 and have worked for 45 years. The addition of a 45 year qualification would mean that someone leaving college at 23 who works 45 years would then qualify for the old age pension at 68.

By the way, for the life of me I do not understand the point of a transition payment between 65 and 66. This simply moves the same cost from one place to another, the State still has to fund that transition year.

Finally I absolutely agree that contribution to a pension should be compulsory for all employees and that employers should also be compelled to contribute a min % of salary. However I think the resulting pension fund should not just be left to the mercies of the private funds market. It should be State backed and invested by the National Treasury Agency. This pension should be integrated with the social welfare old age pension when people complete 45 years of working life and are at least 65.

Those employees who can afford it should be able to take our separate PRSAs with private pension providers to fund an additional pension if they wish to top up their State pension but tax relief should be at the standard rate.

I hope you take account of the situation of people like me and our views and that age is not the only criteria.

Many thanks,

Kind regards,



Individual Submission 049

13/02/2021

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

10.02.2021

Ms. Josephine Feehily,
The Chair,
Pensions Commission,
Department of Social Protection,
Floor 1, Áras Mhic Dhiarmada,
Store Street,
Dublin 1, D01 WY03
consultpc@pensionscommission.gov.ie

Dear Ms. Feehily,

I found your comments on Drivetime 09.02.2021 most interesting.

I wish to state some HISTORICAL FACTS regarding the coming Pensions' Crisis. When I state these facts I am NOT, repeat NOT making any type of misogynistic statements regarding of appearances.

1, There is NO CASE known to History of any Society that was NOT organized along patriarchal lines OR 'love honour & obey your husband' to the verbally challenged in Society, Ladies.

2. There is NO CASE known to History of any Society that SURVIVED the introduction of Artificial Contraception. This is a four to five generation (100 - 125 years) point.

3. There is NO CASE known to History of any Society that has given women as a GROUP (and I stress the word "group" here as OPPOSED to individuals) any type of GROUP-influence or GROUP-power over public policy that did NOT sooner or later, collapse, the FORMER USSR being a good example in our own times.

You MAY find the following demographic FACTS of some interest.

A. In the South of Spain THREE people DIE for every person born.

B. In Greece, there is 42 (YES 42) grandchildren per 100 Grandparents.

In Germany you can see old men collecting empty beer cans in the wee hours before the City Council street cleaning crews start work. These old men are not motivated by civic duty or pride. They can exchange the empty cans for food in the discount store so they can eat for the last few days before their pensions are paid.

C. In South Korea women in the 65+ age bracket can be found working as prostitutes (I have no intention to be offensive or sleazy) so that they can eat.

D. In Germany 25% of people over 70 receive ONE visitor per month and 10% receive LESS than one visitor per month.

E. In Japan 4,000 old people (YES 4,000) a week are found DEAD in their flats. These people GENERALLY speaking are found when the neighbours get the smell.

F. In Japan, South Korea and Taiwan there are MORE old folks nappies than baby nappies sold.

The above countries did NOT set out to witness this Social Disaster as they endorsed the "Progressive" Society at different times since WW2. If we think that we will be IN ANY WAY different, Good Luck folks!!!

Again let us return to FACTS as opposed to opinions.

1. A Society with 2 children per couple experiences a 50% population decline every 65 years.

2. A Society with 1.5 children per couple experiences a 50% population decline every 45 years.

3. A Society with 1 child per couple experiences a 50% population decline every 25 years.

4. With a birth rate of 1.8 WE will ONLY have 50% of today's population by 2100 and quite possibly some decades sooner.

5. By 2050 according to the UN, there will be a 20% decline in Spain's population if present demographic trends continue.

6. By 2050 according to the UN, 60% of Italians will have NO brothers, NO sisters, NO uncles NO aunts, NO nieces, NO nephews or NO first cousins if present demographic trends continue.

7. By 2050 according to the UN, the German population will fall by 17 millions, the population of the former Communist East if present demographic trends continue

8. By 2050 according to the UN, there will be a decline of 74% in Greece's population, a decline of 83% in Germany's population, a decline of 85% in Spain's population and a decline of 86% in Italy's population, if present demographic trends continue.

As you know the Black Death devastated Europe from 1346 - 49 killing, 40 - 55% of the people according to MOST accounts. (Now that we are in COVID lockdown we should know that the children's rhyme "Ring a ring a Rosie, we all fall down" dates from the Black Death as the people reckoned (as did MOST doctors) that sweet-smelling flowers would confer immunity from the Black Death. In addition the word "quarantine" dates from the Black Death. The city-state of Venice forced ships to wait in the sea for 'quaranta giorni' meaning "40 days" to check if the ship was carrying the Black Death.) After the Black Death, spouse abandoned spouse, child abandoned parent, parent abandoned child and sibling abandoned sibling. The Economic consequences of the Black Death was a 100 (YES 100) year depression. It might sound great that you have inherited your cousin's farm in Tipperary and your sister's shop in Sligo, but the farm and the shop become liabilities when you have nobody who will lease them. According to the UN, Europe is heading for a 40% population crash within 50 years.

What can be done? The answer to this question does NOT depend on opinions or Referenda results. We can pass a Referendum by a BILLION percent that Tipperary is in Ulster and that Tyrone is in Munster, without changing the FACT that Tipperary is in Munster and Tyrone is in Ulster.

The solution to the mess WILL BE as follows, whether we do it NOW or in 30 years time.

A. The Eighth goes back into the Constitution with a [REDACTED] Clause included. This will mean that those participating in Abortion will face the MURDER law, just as we see people TODAY in the 90+ age bracket in Germany who were cleaners, telephonists and typists in the Nazi Death Camps facing complicity charges.

B. Marriage MUST be made an ENFORCABLE legal contract, a unique & unbreakable union of ONE man & ONE woman until one of them dies. The HARSH historical fact is that ANY Society that has abandoned this concept, regardless of people's bona fides has failed. This will mean that it must be a CRIME to abandon an innocent spouse.

C. The "Children's" Referendum must be scraped as it is a hallmark of ALL tyrannical regimes (Stalin's USSR, Hitler's Germany & Saddam's Iraq) is that they ALL use children to spy on and control parents.

D. The ENTIRE system (Adoption/Fostering, Pensions, Taxation etc) must operate for the Mr. & Mrs Murphy Family with Mr. Murphy working 25/8, NOT 24/7 to pay the bills while Mrs Murphy works at home with the children.

E. Contraception must be BANNED like Cocaine. The ONLY difference in terms of Catastrophic Disastrous consequences between Cocaine & Contraception is that Cocaine acts FAR, FAR faster.

I STRESS that when I state these facts I am NOT, repeat NOT making any type of misogynistic statements regarding of appearances.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

P.S. Sorry for the long email, but I reckoned that I would say everything 'in one fell swoop' to repeat our Macbeth.

Second email: 13/02/2021

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

13.02.2021

Ms. Josephine Feehily,
The Chair,
Pensions Commission,
Department of Social Protection,
Floor 1, Áras Mhic Dhiarmada,
Store Street,
Dublin 1, D01 WY03

consultpc@pensionscommission.gov.ie

Dear Ms. Feehily,

I found your comments on Drivetime 09.02.2021 most interesting.

I wish to state some HISTORICAL FACTS regarding the coming Pensions' Crisis. When I state these facts I am NOT, repeat NOT making any type of misogynistic statements regarding of appearances.

1, There is NO CASE known to History of any SUCCESSFUL & SUSTAINABLE Society since people lived in caves and hunted wooly mammoths that was NOT organized along patriarchal lines OR 'love honour & obey your husband' to the verbally challenged in Society, Ladies.

2. There is NO CASE known to History of any Society since people lived in caves and hunted wooly mammoths that SURVIVED the introduction of Artificial Contraception. This is a four to five generation (100 - 125 years) point.

3. There is NO CASE known to History of any Society since people lived in caves and hunted wooly mammoths that has given women as a GROUP (and I stress the word "group" here as OPPOSED to individuals) any type of GROUP-influence or GROUP-power over public policy that did NOT sooner or later, collapse, the FORMER USSR being a good example in our own times.

You MAY find the following demographic FACTS of some interest.

A. In the South of Spain THREE people DIE for every person born.

B. In Greece, there is 42 (YES 42) grandchildren per 100 Grandparents.

C. In Greece you can see old people rumaging through BINS for food.

D. In Germany you can see old men collecting empty beer cans in the wee hours before the City Council street cleaning crews start work. These old men are not motivated by civic duty or pride. They can exchange the empty cans for food in the discount store so they can eat for the last few days before their pensions are paid.

E. In South Korea women in the 65+ age bracket can be found working as prostitutes (I have no intention to be offensive or sleazy) so that they can eat.

F. In Germany 25% of people over 70 receive ONE visitor per month and 10% receive LESS than one visitor per month.

G. In Japan 4,000 old people (YES 4,000) a week are found DEAD in their flats. These people GENERALLY speaking are found when the neighbours get the smell. Apartment owners can get SPECIAL insurance against an 'lonely' as the phrase goes being found in a property. There are specialist cleaning firms to clean up the 'lonely' death apartments.

H. In Japan, South Korea and Taiwan there are MORE old folks nappies than baby nappies sold.

The above countries did NOT set out to witness this Social Disaster that they are now witnessing as they endorsed the "Progressive" Society at different times since WW2. If we think that we will be IN ANY WAY different, Good Luck folks!!!

Again let us return to FACTS as opposed to opinions.

1. A Society with 2 children per couple experiences a 50% population decline every 65 years.
2. A Society with 1.5 children per couple experiences a 50% population decline every 45 years.
3. A Society with 1 child per couple experiences a 50% population decline every 25 years.
4. With a birth rate of 1.8 WE will ONLY have 50% of today's population by 2100 and quite possibly some decades sooner.
5. By 2050 according to the UN, there will be a 20% decline in Spain's population if present demographic trends continue.
6. By 2050 according to the UN ,60% of Italians will have NO brothers, NO sisters, NO uncles NO aunts , NO nieces, NO nephews or NO first cousins if present demographic trends continue.
7. By 2050 according to the UN, the German population will fall by 17 millions, the population of the former Communist East if present demographic trends continue
8. By 2050 according to the UN, there will be a decline of 74% in Greece's population, a decline of 83% in Germany's population, a decline of 85% in Spain's population and a decline of 86% in Italy's population, if present demographic trends continue.

Those who ignore the lessons of History are DOOMED to repeat the mistakes of History. As you know the Black Death devastated Europe from 1346- 49 killing, 40 -

55% of the people according to MOST accounts. (Now that we are in COVID lockdown we should know that the children's rhyme "Ring a ring a Rosie, we all fall down" dates from the Black Death as the people reckoned (as did MOST doctors) that sweet-smelling flowers would confer immunity from the Black Death. In addition the word "quarantine" dates from the Black Death. The city-state of Venice forced ships to wait in the sea for 'quaranta giorni' meaning "40 days" to check if the ship was carrying the Black Death.) After the Black Death, spouse abandoned spouse, child abandoned parent, parent abandoned child and sibling abandoned sibling. The Economic consequences of the Black Death was a 100 (YES 100) year depression. It might sound great that you have inherited your cousin's farm in Tipperary and your sister's shop in Sligo, but the farm and the shop become liabilities when you have nobody who will lease them. According to the UN, Europe is heading for a 40% population crash within 50 years.

Those who ignore the lessons of History are DOOMED to repeat the mistakes of History, Just before he invaded Russia Napoleon said "Après trois mois, la Russie me demendera la paix/Tar éis trí mhí iarrfaidh an Rúis síocháin orm" to one of his generals. In June 1941 German officers on the ground, as opposed to the Nazi leaders, told the troops NOT to worry. The SERIOUS fighting would last 6 weeks, they would be at the Urals in 14 and that they would all be home for Christmas. As a matter of FACT, the Germans destroyed 40% of the Soviet Air Force in the first 24 hours and the ENTIRE Soviet Air Force in a week. Indeed during the Autumn of 1941 some German units were practising THEIR OPERAS as they raced to Moscow.

What can be done? The answer to this question does NOT depend on opinions or Referenda results. We can pass a Referendum by a BILLION percent that Tipperary is in Ulster and that Tyrone is in Munster, without changing the FACT that Tipperary is in Munster and Tyrone is in Ulster.

The solution to the mess WILL BE as follows, whether we do it NOW or in 30 years time.

A. The Eighth goes back into the Constitution with a [REDACTED] Clause included. This will mean that those participating in Abortion will face the MURDER law, just as we see people TODAY in the 90+ age bracket in Germany who were cleaners, telephonists and typists in the Nazi Death Camps facing complicity charges.

B. Marriage MUST be made an ENFORCABLE legal contract, a unique & unbreakable union of ONE man & ONE woman until one of them dies. The HARSH historical fact is that ANY Society that has abandoned this concept, regardless of people's bona fides has failed. This will mean that it must be a CRIME to abandon an innocent spouse.

C. The "Children's" Referendum must be scraped as it is a hallmark of ALL tyrannical regimes (Stalin's USSR, Hitler's Germany & Saddam's Iraq) is that they ALL use children to spy on and control parents.

D. The ENTIRE system (Adoption/Fostering, Pensions, Taxation etc) must operate for the Mr. & Mrs Murphy Family with Mr. Murphy working 25/8, NOT 24/7 to pay the bills while Mrs Murphy works at home with the children. Regarding Pensions this MUST mean that the Old Age Pension is tied to the number of children you have WITHIN Marriage.

E. Contraception must be BANNED like Cocaine. The ONLY difference in terms of Catastrophic Disastrous consequences between Cocaine & Contraception is that Cocaine acts FAR, FAR faster.

I STRESS that when I state these facts I am NOT, repeat NOT making any type of misogynistic statements regarding of appearances.

Yours sincerely,

████████████████████

P.S. Sorry for the long & corrected email, but I reckoned that I would say everything 'in one fell swoop' to repeat our Macbeth.

Individual Submission 050

13/02/2021

The State's pensions liability is projected to rise rapidly in the foreseeable future due to Ireland's aging population

PENSION AGE

I do not think the pension age should be raised – at least for those entering the work force with an expectation of the existing pension age . Such a proposal has proved to be politically unpopular and unacceptable

Raising the pension age would cut the bill in 2 ways.

First, it will raise the age at which a person becomes entitled to the pension.

Secondly, it will cut the duration of the payment of the pension as I understand that life expectancy falls the older the age of actual retirement. This has social implications.

END MIXED PUBLIC /PRIVATE PENSION MODEL

At present, people are encouraged to take out private pension insurance to "top up" the modest State pension.

It has been proposed that participation in private pension schemes be made compulsory. I would object to such a proposal on the following grounds:

The contribution is immediately subject to a commission so that the full contribution paid is not available for investment. Any statutory scheme should abolish or set a limit on commission;

The investment fund is subject to an annual management fee of say 3%-5% per annum as a first charge- which can wholly or partly offset the annual return on the funds invested. In any statutory scheme the annual management fee should be subject to a limit.

The return on funds invested depends on the competence (or incompetence) of the fund managers. As a result, there may be no real actual return on pension contributions when retirement age is reached (especially during an era of low interest rates). In any statutory scheme, the State should guarantee and underwrite a minimum real return of say 1% per annum; and impose an annual levy on pension insurers/insurance funds to cover this underwriting liability .

NEW ZEALAND MODEL

I understand that in New Zealand everyone pays a hefty contribution based on earnings to the State pension fund and gets a pension related to their lifetime earnings.

This should substantially eliminate the need for the “topping up” State pension contributions with contributions to private pension funds, the returns from which are uncertain.

I recommend that the New Zealand or similar generous State pension models (Sweden?) be examined as a radical alternative to the existing mixed public/private pension model.

The State could contribute to the new pension fund either directly from tax revenue or by way of tax relief (flat rate) on pension contributions. The cost to the State should be partly offset by not having to fund the existing pension model going forward

[REDACTED]

Individual Submission 051

13/02/2021

Pension should be payed on Thursday, should be increased prorata every year
telephone allowance increased

Individual Submission 052**14/02/2021**

Regarding pensions I have worked for the last 40 years and aged 59 years When I started working 40 years ago I was told if I worked for 10 years I would get a contributory pension when I was 65 I cannot understand how anyone can think that it is safe and just to have a 65 or 66 year old person working possible on a roof and at the same time have a fine healthy 23 year old person getting social welfare I agree with the latest proposal to let 65 year old get social welfare if they are unable to work or not want to work This should be reduced to 60 and give the younger people have an opportunity to get good solid experience If we ever get to full employment then and only then rise the pension age Let people my age get out of the work force and give younger people have an opportunity Also everyone should get a pension based on a percentage of years worked over 40 years with possible credit for time unemployed and definitely credit for stay at home mothers I would love to be able to to continue with lessor work for the next few years but on a 2 day week

Individual Submission 053

14/02/2021

I heard the tail-end of a report on the Pensions Commission work on Drive Time on Radio 1 one evening recently. I would like to put my point of view.

I am totally opposed to the retirement age being increased. It should never have been increased to 66. I am 65 in March and have been working full-time since I was 16. Years ago (in the UK at any rate) the retirement age for men was 65 and for women it was 60. I'm not quite sure what's happened to make everything go so pear-shaped that we are now talking about raising the retirement age to 67. I have worked for 49 years, that's enough for anyone. I realise here in Ireland there is a rising elderly population but why should someone who has worked all their lives be penalised? If pension pots need to be cut look to the Dail - look at the huge allowances, perks and pensions TDs are given, not to mention subsidised bars and restaurants (I don't know of any workplace that actively allows drinking, let alone subsidises it). Also, cut down the vast perks previous Taoisigh receive for the rest of their lives. Also, millions of Euro could be saved each year if the government didn't prop up the ailing and extremely cruel greyhound racing industry.

It's very unfair that it's the average working man and woman who always bear the brunt of government cuts. After the financial crash, as a public sector worker, I had imposed on my salary a "pension levy" (which is nothing to do with my pension) and of course, the Universal Social Charge. We were told these were brought in as a temporary emergency measure. A decade on, we're still paying them. The average working (wo)man did not cause the financial crash but we're still paying for it.

I believe I deserve a chance to retire while I'm still fit and healthy. I do not want to be told I have to endure another two years of the alarm going off at 6 a.m., in the winter months driving to and from work in the dark and arriving home worn out.

I hope you take my views into account.

Thank you.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Individual Submission 054

14/02/2021

Hi

I have two questions I would like to ask regarding the state contributory pension.

(1) why is the state contributory pension referred to as a social welfare payment when in fact it is money contributed by the recipient over the course of their working life for the provision of their older years ?

The fact that it is referred to as a social welfare payment gives the impression it is a government hand out when in fact it is the recipients own money.

(2) why are the rules different for politicians regarding pension entitlement ?

I have been told by the dept that a person cannot receive any more then 1 social welfare payment,yet it seems politicians can receive MULTIPLE pensions in respect of every portfolio they have held.

If someone is a TD they receive a pension upon retirement in respect of that position,if that same person is appointed minister ,they receive a further pension in respect of that position also,if they eventually go on to become teaseach they receive yet a FURTHER pension in respect of that position,yet I.told by the dept I cannot receive any more then 1 social welfare payment

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Individual Submission 055

14/02/2021

I don't care what it takes, everyone should be entitled to a pension at 65. God knows, its hard earned coming through an economic incident every decade at this stage. If you are looking to save money, you need to look at the TD's salaries and pensions!

Individual Submission 056

14/02/2021

Hi,

A few thoughts on this issue

I think in looking at this topic the following needs to be consider

- + The contributory pension should be funded from richer individual's late life wealth
- + If you pay a contributory pension then you are entitled to the pension irrespective of whether you need the income, the tax system should claw excess income back
- + If you claim tax relief on pension contributions (contributory or individual) your pension pot should not be tax free for inheritance purposes
- + There should be no such thing as a non-contributory pension, a welfare scheme should cater for people who currently depend on the non-contributory pension
- + If the retirement age is 6x, anyone who does not want to retire at this age should be allowed 'accumulate' their pension until they decide to retire. This fund should be taxed at Standard Rate, it would allow people without an AVC fund to get a cash lump sum, and as they are working and paying tax and also paying tax on the lump sum it should be self-funding



Individual Submission 057

15/02/2021

In the interest of fairness implementation of any changes to the pension regime should have a notice period of at least five years maybe up to ten years.

kind regards

██████████

Individual Submission 058

15/02/2021

Hi,

I have one frustration every time I read about the proposed move from a requirement of 520 full-rate PRSI contributions to 2,080 or more PRSI contributions.

There is never any mention of tapering.

It is one thing to inform a 20 year old that 40 years of contributions are going to be required. It is another thing to inform a 50 or 60 year old of that.

For many people close to the retirement age, this change results in a large step change downwards in what they could have expected before.

In my own case, it almost halves what I would get.

The change should be tapered so that for people closer to retirement, there is a smaller adjustment.

Regards,

██████████

Individual Submission 059

15/02/2021

15th February 2021

Post & Email

Secretariat, Pension Commission
Department of Social Protection
First Floor
Aras Mhic Dhiarmada
Store Street
Dublin 1

Pension Submission

Dear Sir or Madam,

I write to you with some viewpoints and concerns regarding proposed changes to the State Contributory Pension. My particular interest is in the self-employment area including farmers. These individuals have been permitted to pay PRSI only since 1988. Therefore the earliest that such individuals could have accumulated 40 years of credits (as might be required under the Total Contributions Model) would be 2028. Furthermore not all such individuals would have come into the system in 1988 as it was necessary to have an income of £2500 (Irish Pounds) to qualify and therefore many farmers were not able to begin paying PRSI until some years later.

The self-employed person who reaches 66 in 2022 will have a maximum of 34 years PRSI credits (and as I've said many will have less). Consequently, any system that is based on a person requiring 40 years of credits is inherently unfair on these individuals. Below I have outlined some options for dealing with this situation:

- The simple and targeted solution is to give the new self-employed pensioners of 2022 six years of added credits, those of 2023 five years of added credits, and so on until in 2028 it will be possible for a self-employed individual to achieve 40 years of paid credits.

- The baseline requirement is set initially at 34 years for all in 2022 and is increased each year up to 2028 when the 40 years paid contributions is possible.
- Yearly credits or 'disregards' could be awarded (similar to the Homemaker's Scheme) for those involved in farming during years when farmers were not eligible for PRSI payments.
- Yearly credits could be made available for purchase by affected individuals. These could be purchased at the rate of minimum PRSI contribution per year or an agreed sum.

As to the retirement age I am of the opinion that it should for the moment remain at 66. We all realise that demographic change is happening however Ireland has one of the youngest populations in Europe and it is not appropriate that we would have one of the highest retirement ages. The changes that were proposed in 2011 were as a result of the economic crash and were imposed by the Troika. Since then our economy (COVID aside) has been performing strongly and the country has been well able to afford its Social Welfare obligations. As job growth continues we can look forward to new workers, young people from around the world as well as our own returning emigrants, coming to our country and contributing to our economy.

Most people of my acquaintance regard the Contributory State Pension as sacrosanct. Knowing that there is a guaranteed state pension available on retirement is a huge comfort throughout life for the ordinary person in the street (or even the farm). In my opinion any increased funding required should come from an increase in the PRSI rate and indeed the minimum PRSI payment. An increase in PRSI, if required, would be acceptable to most people so long as their State Contributory Pension was assured.

So to sum up, a significant cohort of people who retire from 2022 onwards will not have had time to build up 40 years of contributions. In the interest of fairness transitional measures will have to be put in place for self-employed people who qualify for the State Pension for the period 2022 to 2028.

Wishing the Commission the best of luck with its assignment and I look forward to your recommendations.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Email [REDACTED]

Individual Submission 060
15/02/2021

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

15/02/21.

Submission to Pensions Commission

Dear Sir/Madam,

My submission regarding this issue is quite short but nonetheless relevant to the matter at hand. It is this:

Due to demographic changes and the reality that the average lifespan has increased, I would agree that the standard age for being in receipt of the State Pension needs to increase. However, for those who wish to be in receipt of the State Pension at an earlier age, this should be facilitated by introducing a tiered system of increased PRSI contributions which people who wish to receive the State Pension earlier can voluntarily make. Those who continue to pay the standard PRSI contribution would be entitled to receive the State Pension at the statutory age as defined by an Act of the Oireachtas.

To take account of those who through no fault of their own are unable to work due to disability or illness and those genuinely unable to find employment, an enhanced PRSI credit could be made available to those who wish to receive the State Pension at an earlier age. This enhanced credit would be automatically applied to those who are unable to work due to disability or illness. For those who are unemployed, this enhanced credit could be offset by a reduced rate of Social Welfare payment to those who wish to voluntarily avail of this option. Otherwise, a standard PRSI credit would apply for unemployed people who wish to receive the State Pension at the statutory age.

I believe that the above is a fair, socially just and equitable way to deal with this issue and would provide the necessary extra revenue to accommodate those who wish to receive the State Pension at an earlier age than that defined by Statute.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]