

Network news



THE NEWSLETTER OF THE EUROPEAN ANTI POVERTY NETWORK

N°107 | JULY-AUGUST | 2004

Editorial

Should the employment process still get our backing?

EAPN's Porto seminar on the European employment strategy started from the bitter conclusion that while the employment texts adopted by the Heads of State and Government now include the objectives of inclusion, the fact is that current employment policies are not only not working for inclusion, but are actually putting social cohesion at risk.

The approach adopted by the Council is doing little to stave off the flood of challenges to the European social model. The instruments of the Open Method of Coordination (OMC) are not working effectively because they are not underpinned by a real political will, genuine participation by all the actors concerned, or practical implementation by the Member States.

Does the employment strategy still deserve our backing? EAPN must keep demanding participation at all levels of the OMC on employment, not just because employment is fundamental to exclusion, but also because, as the debates in Porto showed, our members - drawing on their experience of on the ground work with people excluded from the labour market or in precarious employment - have vast expertise and a strong argument for the need and ways of making employment work for inclusion.

Meanwhile, the network has to move its own agenda away from the process to try and influence the debates that make up its ideological context. For that, poverty and social exclusion must come off the sidelines, onto the political agenda and into the public debate.

Claire Champeix

FOCUS ON EMPLOYMENT AND SOCIAL INCLUSION

CONTENTS

Employment

- The European employment strategy: a tool or a threat for social inclusion? 2
- The Joint Employment Report .. 2
- The role of the European Social Fund 3
- A trade-off between poverty and unemployment? 4
- "Making work pay" 4
- Undocumented migrant workers in Europe 5
- How many "working poor"? 5
- Interview with John Monks, Secretary-General of the European Trade Union Confederation (ETUC). 6
- EAPN publications 6

News from Austria

- Austrian Social State: an overview 7
- Profile of EAPN Austria 7
- Women and poverty in Austria: myths and reality 8

The European employment strategy: a tool or a threat for social inclusion?

EAPN gives its take on emerging employment policies that make not just the unemployed, but workers too, more vulnerable.

In the May 2003 issue of *Network News*, EAPN hailed the incorporation of the Nice objectives for social inclusion into the new employment guidelines. It is these that set the agenda for the national action plans on employment (NAP/Empl) drawn up by each Member State through the open method of coordination on employment (1).

A year on, EAPN's members are fearful that some employment policies are tending to undermine the unemployed and push up the numbers of "working poor" (see box page 5). That prompted EAPN's Employment Task Force to carry out an analysis of the NAP/Empl 2003 this year through the prism of the network's concerns (2). The conclusions of that analysis were debated at the seminar held on 29 and 30 April in Porto, which brought together EAPN members active in the Employment, Social Inclusion and Structural Funds Task Forces, many members of the Portuguese Network, and different representatives of the Portuguese authorities and European institutions.

Seven of EAPN's national networks put their country's NAPs/Empl under the microscope of a common framework for analysis. Their findings were disappointing and alarming, and were borne out by the seminar debates. The NAPs/Empl tend to focus on full employment and productivity rather than social cohesion, even though all three objectives were given equal weight when the strategy was revised. References to the Nice objectives are in short supply. The European Commission's representative, Robert Strauss, spoke of a "lack of interaction between the European inclusion and employment processes", and underlined the role of organisations like EAPN. Ilda Figueiredo, MEP, said that implementation of the strategy was shamefully under-resourced.

The strategy is still under-developed in the newly-joined EU member countries, and anti-poverty organisations have not been involved in writing the Joint Assessment Papers (3) from 1999: there needs to be a big commitment to make employment work for inclusion across the enlarged Union.

NGOs shut out of the process

Looking specifically at the different Nice objectives, it is clear that the NAPs/Empl have done little to further them. The specific training needs of people enduring poverty and social exclusion are largely disregarded, and there is more emphasis on private investment in the most profitable areas of training. The key role of the civil and solidarity-based economy, the non-commercial sector, is treated as a sideshow. In some countries, the future of the public employment services - a lifeline for people enduring poverty and social exclusion - is under threat. Whereas the Heads of State and Government pledged in Nice to act for the most vulnerable, the employment measures specifically for this group are

woefully inadequate.

Despite participation by all the actors being a key element of the Open Method of Coordination, and the importance of the expert input of organisations that represent the interests of people enduring poverty and social exclusion, these NGOs are being shut out of the employment process. In addition, as the governador civil (prefect) of Porto Manual Maria Moreira points out, the strategy should "include more effective involvement by the local authorities, who have a better understanding of certain problems, and often considerable capabilities to deal with them".

Portugal typifies the limitations of the strategy. It is a country in the grip of sharply rising unemployment, low pay, and one of the lowest educational levels in the Union. According to Agostinho Cesário Jardim Moreira, President of EAPN Portugal, some people living in Porto inner city districts, for example, "are barely keeping body and soul together". But the writing of the Portuguese NAP/Empl was not taken as an

"The European social model needs protecting as part of humankind's world heritage"

The Joint Employment Report

Looking at the Joint Employment Report 2003-2004 (JER) adopted by the Commission on 21 January 2004 and approved at the Spring European Council, EAPN questions the overriding view that employment policies should work for economic growth rather than social cohesion, and that employment is the key to inclusion. EAPN also takes serious issue with the facts that NGOs that speak for the interests of people enduring exclusion were not involved, and that one of the main contributions was drawn up by the Wim Kok task force behind closed doors.

The JER does, though, contain some positive things in the following areas, which should be worked on:

- activation and prevention indicators;
- increased attention to the objective of inclusion;
- increased attention to the factors of gender gaps;
- the need to improve integration of vulnerable groups into the labour market;
- the importance of quality in work and job security;
- the issue of the "working poor";
- lifelong learning;
- improved governance of the European employment strategy.

The Joint Employment Report is available at:
http://europa.eu.int/comm/employment_social/employment_strategy/employ_en.htm

opportunity to consult all the actors concerned properly.

European social model under threat

It is not just the employment policies that are giving rise to concern, but, more generally, the prevailing reading of the Lisbon agenda, which favours competitiveness over social cohesion to the point where it is reasonable to wonder, as the Director of EAPN, Fintan Farrell asked, whether *"the European social model needs protecting as part of humankind's world heritage"*.

Employment policies as they stand, then, are being driven less by the Nice objectives than a determination to increase labour market participation at any price. The employment rate is being seen as an end in itself, an enabler of improved growth and, implicitly, social cohesion. In this context, many labour market reforms bear the hallmark of policies aimed at *"making work pay"*.

The backlash of this approach to social inclusion is plain to see. Apart from the rise in poverty caused by benefit restrictions, *"earn what you get"* approaches that trample on rights, these policies stigmatize people enduring poverty and social exclusion, and worsen their relations with the public employment services that are meant to help them. They are based on the misconception that people facing difficulties do the equation of earned income versus social security benefits, when in fact, most of them want a job and above all need real opportunities and support in order to return to and stay in the labour market.

Current policies focus on individual responsibility, adaptability and mobility, and demand that individuals adapt to the needs of the labour market. They have little or no thought for improving the scope for work-life balance. The Structural Funds may be a fundamental prop to employment policies, but as Maria Marinakou, President of EAPN and member of the Structural Funds Task Force, showed, they are clearly used in line with each Member State's priorities, and inclusion is not central to the choices in how they are implemented.

What this means for strategy

The social cohesion impact analysis of the employment policies as done by EAPN is a vital springboard for a forceful condemnation of the *"bad practices"* that lead to forced labour and an increased number of working poor, and to help set the public debate rolling. At the same time, the network will analyse and promote practices that put employment to work for social inclusion in practical ways. Training accessible to those distant from the labour market and employment within the solidarity-based economy are key elements here.

As well as analysing developments in European policies for inclusion and employment, EAPN will also be stepping firmly into the wider debates on the Union's economic guidelines and the future of the Lisbon agenda. This is an area in which EAPN must forge closer links with key actors like trade unions and employers' organisations, and build relevant alliances.

The expertise of organisations that represent the interests of people enduring poverty and social exclusion entitles them to a place in the process of the open method of coordination on employment, in drawing up both the NAPs/Empl at national level, as well as the Joint Employment Report, recommendations to the Member States and the peer review programmes at European level.

Claire Champeix

(1) For more information on the European employment strategy:

http://europa.eu.int/comm/employment_social/employment_strategy/index_en.htm

(2) *"EAPN national networks' evaluation of the national action plans for employment"*, Synthesis Report, EAPN April 2004 (available on www.eapn.org)

(3) *The JAPs are preparatory documents for integrating the new accession countries into the employment process.*

THE ROLE OF THE EUROPEAN SOCIAL FUND

The European Social Fund (ESF) is the financial tool by which the European employment strategy (EES) is translated into practice. Its budget for 2000-2006 is 62.5 billion euros. By the Commission's reckoning, 8% of spending on active labour market policies across the Union, which are central to the strategy, is financed by the ESF.

One particular Initiative financed by the ESF is Equal, which aims to test out new ways of tackling discrimination and inequalities affecting both those in and looking for work. EQUAL's activities centre around four strands: employability, entrepreneurship, adaptability, and equal opportunities between women and men.

Last year's mid-term review of the ESF aimed to strengthen the link between the revised EES for 2003-2006 and ESF interventions. In its report on the revision of the Structural Funds, EAPN stressed that however important ESF-funded labour market measures might be, they were not enough to deliver the objective of social inclusion: *"Marginalized groups require a broad range of measures to promote their integration and participation in society"*.

ESF website: http://europa.eu.int/comm/employment_social/esf2000/index-en.htm

EQUAL website: http://europa.eu.int/comm/employment_social/equal/index_en.html

EAPN policy position on the mid-term review of the Structural Funds: www.eapn.org or on request to: team@eapn.skynet.be

A trade-off between poverty and unemployment?

“Making work pay”

The Commission's position set out in its Communication of 31 December 2003 entitled “*Modernising Social Protection for More and Better Jobs - A comprehensive approach contributing to making work pay*” surveys the range of policies framed by Member States to get people back into work. Several Member States have tightened up their social security benefit eligibility criteria. Unemployment benefits are often seen as potentially creating disincentives to work if paid over too long a period.

According to EAPN, the “making work pay” approach subjugates employment policies to the needs of the economy, and is already behind benefit cuts and the spread of workfare. By failing to recognize the great desire that most people enduring unemployment and exclusion have to work, it stigmatizes those concerned and may underlie very poor relations between public services and people enduring poverty and social exclusion.

Commission Communication:
http://europa.eu.int/comm/employment_social/news/2004/jan/making_work_pay_en.html

In the debate between the European and American 'social models', many people have contrasted the high levels of social protection in Europe, and of employment in the United States. It is true that Europe has less poverty, and the US less unemployment, and this comparison has led many people to assume that there is a trade-off between poverty and unemployment.

In fact, this trade off is simply the result of comparing the United States on the one hand and the European

Union on the other. When the EU is broken down into its Member States the trade-off disappears, as revealed by a recent report (1) which compares the poverty and unemployment record of 15 OECD members. In the chart below, we divide the countries with higher employment rates from those with lower, and those with higher poverty rates from those with lower:



We can see that there are countries in each quarter:

- Some countries combine high poverty rates with high levels of employment,
- Others low poverty and high employment,
- Or high poverty combined low levels of employment,
- And low poverty and low employment.

A study of child poverty rates in industrialised countries (2) found that the proportion of poor children in these countries varied a great deal, probably for two reasons. Firstly, while employment is not the only factor, it is important. But the level of social protection in each country is vitally important. The report carries out another international comparison, and correlates the extent of child poverty in different countries, the result is striking. Countries either spend a lot and have low levels of poverty, or spend less and have

high poverty levels: “Clearly, income transfers and the other services of the welfare state are very important for the living standards of poor children, and these have been the focus of much previous research on child (and adult) poverty. Those countries which are ‘welfare leaders’ tend to have low poverty rates, while the ‘welfare laggards’ have much higher child poverty rates” (3).



The relationship here is every bit as clear as the lack of a relationship in the first chart.

European Governments have made employment the centrepiece of their anti-poverty strategy. This report provides powerful support for that strategic decision:

the goals of higher employment and lower poverty can not only be pursued at the same time, they can be mutually re-enforcing. However, the clear correla-

tion between a country's social protection spending and its poverty rate, and the lack of a correlation between poverty rates and employment rates indicates equally clearly that employment cannot be the whole answer to poverty.

As John Sweeney, of Ireland's Children's Rights Alliance, has commented: "The conclusion is not as crude as saying that 'a country gets as low a child poverty rate as it is willing to pay taxes to get'. It can be concluded, however, that the lowest child poverty rates are achieved by countries where an emphasis

on rising employment rates as the high road to lower welfare dependency has not been allowed to obscure the primordial task of the welfare state, viz, to protect living standards".

Richard Exell - Trade Union Congress, UK

(1) "Low Pay and Poverty in OECD Countries", I Marx, Employment Audit, Employment Policy Institute (UK), Winter 1999.

(2) "Child Poverty Across Industrialized Nations", B Bradbury & M Jantti, Innocenti Occasional Papers, Economic and Social Policy series no 71, September 1999.

(3) *Ibid*, p. 71

Undocumented migrant workers in Europe

The phenomena of globalization, human mobility and labour exploitation are all interlinked. Individuals pushed out of their countries by the effects of globalization seek ways to maintain their survival elsewhere. Yet due to the difficulties in legally entering the European Union, many migrants enter illegally, or enter legally and become "illegal" after their visa or residence permit expires. They do not hold the right to work due to their lack of an official work permit, and face difficulties in surviving in Europe, where they are often confronted with racism and xenophobia.

At the same time, various European economic sectors rely on undocumented workers to fulfil their needs for work. The percentage of work done by undocumented workers varies according to the country and sector, but it is observed that undocumented work is nonetheless a common element of European countries' economies. Undocumented workers are employed in the agricultural sector, in domestic work, in the construction sector, etc. Availability and flexibility are two important qualities in workers sought out by employers in these sectors. The aim is to make the workforce a variable that can be reduced in periods of economic downturn. Some employers seek out workers who should be available when needed, are flexible, and will accept poor working conditions. Undocumented migrants are the "perfect" workers to respond to this type of demand: they rarely assert their right to fair working conditions due to their dependence on their earnings and fear of other possible repercussions.

It should be noted that the risk inherent in tolerating a situation in which a certain group of workers is denied their rights, is a general downgrade of workers' rights. Migrants and undocumented migrants have often been the experimental ground for the profound restructuring of the economic fabric and work models. The new orientation of capital-work relations towards more and more flexibility and externalization has been and is being tested on foreign workers. "Have work but not the worker" risks to be the core of the whole future labour policy, if it is not stopped in its present stage.

Being undocumented is not synonymous to having no rights whatsoever; on the contrary, various international conventions set out rights for all persons and workers, regardless of their administrative status. National and international policy measures should be put into place based upon the existence of international instruments. An approach that is supporting undocumented workers will not necessarily increase the volume of the shadow economy. Unscrupulous employers will be deterred by the strengthening of legal certainty and by workers' abilities to deal with conflicts. In this view the supportive approach is an effective instrument to reduce incentives for exploitation and unfair competition and thus to protect the rights of all workers.

Nele Verbruggen - PICUM Coordinator

HOW MANY "WORKING POOR"?

Access to the labour market is often claimed to be a fast track out of poverty and social exclusion. Promoting participation in employment is after all the main objective of the European social inclusion strategy.

The figures supplied by Eurostat, the European statistical office, seem to show that the poverty rate among the unemployed population in the Europe of Fifteen was 38% in 2001! Among the employed population, it was claimed to have plummeted to 7%. But taking the actual numbers affected, we find that there are 5 million unemployed people living in poverty, but more than double that - 11.4 million - people in work but still living below the poverty line!

While these statistics must be approached with the usual caution, they nevertheless suggest that what is needed is not just more new jobs, but more and better quality ones.

PICUM, the Platform for International Cooperation on Undocumented Migrants, is a network of organisations providing assistance to undocumented migrants residing in Europe. The aim of PICUM is to promote the access to basic social rights of these migrants, such as the right to health care, the right to education, the right to housing, and the right to fair working conditions for undocumented migrants. The article is based on the report 'Undocumented Migrant Workers in Europe', published by PICUM in January 2004. More info: www.picum.org



John Monks, Secretary-General of the European Trade Union Confederation

EAPN publications

- Review of the financial perspective 2007-2013 and its implications for European action against poverty (May 2004)
- EAPN national networks' evaluation of the National Action Plans for Employment: Synthesis Report (April 2004)
- EAPN reaction regarding the Joint Employment Report 2003-2004 (April 2004)
- EAPN position on streamlining open coordination in the field of social protection (September 2003)
- EAPN response to the Social Protection Committee document "Key issues on social protection and employment" (April 2003)
- EAPN Response to the Commission's Communication on the future of the European Employment Strategy (EES) "A strategy for full employment and better jobs for all" (March 2003)
- Making the Employment Strategy work for Social Inclusion (September 2002)
- A submission from EAPN on the review of the European Employment Strategy (June 2002)
- How are the Employment guidelines addressing long-term unemployment? (January 2001)
- The Employment Guidelines: Are they working? (February 2000)

Publications available at www.eapn.org or on simple request: team@eapn.skynet.be

"The European social model must be recognised as a productive factor"

Interview with John Monks, Secretary-General of the European Trade Union Confederation (ETUC).

EAPN: Do you consider that the European Employment Strategy (EES) is contributing to social cohesion?

John Monks: *The implementation of the revised EES will contribute to improving the overall labour market situation as well as promoting equal opportunities between women and men. Re-integrating into the labour market those who have been excluded – not by choice or due to over generous social welfare systems but because insufficient jobs have been created – will help us to reach the Lisbon targets. But in order to ensure that we create more quality jobs, issues such as reconciling work and family life, reducing the gender pay gap, guaranteeing social security rights for atypical workers, providing quality jobs for women and promoting lifelong learning for all must also remain priorities.*

What are the potential risks and advantages of the "activation" approach?

Clearly there is an important role for active labour market policies to help those who do not have the skills to secure and retain jobs, especially the long-term unemployed, people with disabilities and careers with heavy domestic responsibilities. However, there is a real danger in concentrating too much on trying to lever the unemployed into work. There is an underlying assumption that they are reluctant to work and that ways must be found through the social security systems to put pressure on them to take any available jobs. In fact, research in Europe shows that the majority of unemployed people, including those who are socially excluded, regard finding work as the first priority and the best way to improve their living conditions. There is a risk of moving towards an American-style "workfare" approach in some activation policies.

Does the EES have a real impact since it is subordinated to the Broad Economic Policy Guidelines?

In the current European climate of disappointing growth there is a tendency to prioritise economic targets above all others considerations, social policies

among them. The ETUC believes this is profoundly misguided. The European social model must be recognised as a productive factor, with employment, quality of work and human investment as key ingredients of economic recovery.

For this reason, the ETUC opposes the subordination of the European Employment Strategy to the Broad Economic Policy Guidelines. The Employment Guidelines should play the leading role in employment policy coordination.

What do you think about "corporate social responsibility"? Could we expect from employers more 'inclusive jobs'?

The ETUC regards corporate social responsibility initiatives (CSR) as voluntary measures that companies choose to take – often to boost their commercial image or appeal for investors. But there is no binding requirement within CSR programmes for input from workers or trade unions. The ETUC is not against CSR, and is willing to play an active role so long as it is an 'extra' and does not seek to replace provisions agreed between the social partners.

It must be clear that CSR is not an alternative to social dialogue and collective bargaining. The CSR debate must be developed in the framework of the European social model, and based on the common values of the EU Member States, especially in the context of enlargement, globalisation and sustainable development.

What's your position as far as the draft Directive on services in the internal market (to be adopted in 2005) is concerned?

The ETUC is gravely concerned about some of the provisions in this draft Directive. They could speed up deregulation, seriously erode workers' rights and protection, and damage the supply of essential services to European citizens.

The draft as it stands is seriously flawed, and threatens to undermine existing collective agreements, national labour codes, and the success of the whole European social model. For these reasons, the ETUC cannot support it, and has called for an urgent meeting with the European Council working group on competitiveness and growth to discuss its concerns.

Interview: V. Forest

Overview of the Austrian welfare state

Judged purely on volume of spending (29.1% of GDP, or 57,785 million euros in 2002) or range of benefits, Austria comes over as a highly developed welfare state. But

with the widening gap between theory and fact, and the policies pursued especially since the mid-1990s, come rising vulnerability to poverty.

No minimum resources guarantee

Austria is a welfare state: over 80% of social expenditure goes on national insurance for pensions, sickness, accident and unemployment. Entitlements are tied to previous contributory employment and, because of the "primary (male) earner" principle, also partly cover family members. Growth in different forms of non-marital union, rising divorce rates, and changes in traditional gender relations are throwing this model increasingly into crisis: women's once "invisible" dependency is now clear to be seen in the poverty figures.

Since the mid-1990s, the entitlement criteria in different branches of social security have been steadily tightened up, and net benefit payment rates have been cut. Apart from the pension insurance scheme, the Austrian social security system has no minimum resources guarantee. It is an insecure system in that there is no assurance of decent benefits unless the claimant's working life fits the "standard" mould (permanent, unbroken, full-time, etc.).

Non-employment-related universal benefits exist for people with care needs and families (one of the best-funded systems in Europe). The fundamental principle is that "all children have the same value to the State" and the needs criteria are highly restrictive. The system ensures a high level of take-up, but produces disproportionate poverty rates among lone mothers and fathers, and large families with three children and over. Entitlement to universal benefits is limited to Austrian citizens. There is no level playing-field for immigrants, who only qualify for these rights after an unbroken period of five years' residence.

A flawed safety net on the bottom rungs

There are also benefits that come into play only when the potential "mutual contributions" of income, personal assets and regular employment are exhausted and family reciprocity cannot be called on. The two main social assistance benefits are crisis assistance and follow-up benefit. The former is intended to be a bridging benefit for those claiming unemployment benefit (in theory, it is not time-limited); while the latter is the minimum level of state social protection. The lack of minimum protection components in above-minimum social welfare provision combined with growing vulnerability to poverty have increased the importance of follow-up benefit to the point where it is now effectively one of the main forms of support although still failing to stave off income poverty. Only one in two of those entitled actually claims follow-up benefit...

There is an increasing reliance on non-cash state benefits. Austria has - but for how long? - highly developed public goods and services provision, although there is obviously always room for improvement. To call attention to their key role in the welfare state and demand improvements, the Austrian anti-poverty network mounted a Stop-GATS campaign last year (*).

Martina Kargl

(* GATS is the World Trade Organisation's General Agreement on Trade in Services.

PROFILE OF EAPN AUSTRIA

EAPN Austria (Armutskonferenz) is a network of 24 national organizations and three regional networks (Salzburg, Carinthia and Upper Austria). Member organization and regional network representatives meet as a General Assembly twice a year. A six-person coordination team looks after day-to-day business, assisted by a coordination bureau of three part-timers. The Armutskonferenz's substantive work is supported by a thirty-strong scientific board.

Key aims and activities

- Public information on poverty and social exclusion: media relations, public events;
- Lobbying and follow-up on Austrian and EU social policy;
- Networking civil society actors involved in the fight against poverty and social exclusion;
- Staging poverty conferences (five to date, each attended by 400-odd participants: social workers, NGO workers, people directly affected, scientists, concerned groups);
- Follow-up on the national action plans against poverty and social exclusion, drafting an NGO shadow report;
- Publications on poverty, wealth and social exclusion;
- Writing and regularly publishing a newsletter;
- Development and permanent updating of the website www.armutskonferenz.at;
- Involvement in development of the website www.sozial-wirtschaft.at (e.g., production of a social policy database).

Women and poverty in Austria: myths and reality

Status report by EAPN Austria's Women in Poverty Task Force.

Myth	Reality
There is no poverty in Austria	Austria is one of the world's ten wealthiest countries. But many women are financially hard-pressed. 4.9% of Austrian women - 200,000 people - live in severe poverty, and about 600,000 are on the brink of poverty (male poverty rate: 2.9%)
We all have to tighten our belts! Spending restraints in Austria affect everyone - women and men, rich and poor - alike.	Because of their low incomes, women are much harder hit than men by tax increases , self-pay elements, and pensions reform; higher-earning women lose a much bigger share of their income to these. By contrast, the well-off pay little tax in Austria; Austria has the lowest wealth tax of all EU States.
Tax reforms benefit everyone	Tax reform is no help to 2.1 million workers - mostly women - because they are too low-paid. But they are obviously affected by higher taxes. The reform also does nothing for families where both parents work. Instead, it promotes an out-moded family model where the woman can only earn pin money.
The welfare state looks after all children equally; lone parents get a state maintenance advance where the child's father makes no maintenance payment.	17% of single mothers (one in six) get neither maintenance payments nor the state advance! No advance is paid if the child's father cannot repay (e.g., because of incapacity for work or sickness, for example). Nor does the welfare state take care of many immigrant children who rarely receive either child benefit or child care allowance.
Child care allowance gives women a choice between unwaged work at home and paid employment.	The 14.53 euro a day child care allowance is not enough to live on without an extra income. Also, "real choice" means having more, good quality and affordable child care provision .
There is at least no female homelessness.	Very many women are "hidden" homeless or vulnerable to homelessness. Women may get involved in temporary relationships and put up with abuse and sexual exploitation just to have somewhere to live. But they do not talk about it for fear of being subjected to stigma.
No woman any longer has to stay with a violent man!	The big problems for women escaping a violent relationship include: debt problems from guarantees required; losing their job from being stalked by their violent former partner; vulnerability to poverty ; and for immigrant women, forfeiting the right to stay which was granted to the couple on a family visa.
Foreigners do best out of our social welfare system.	Foreign nationals pay in more than they get back. They have the same obligations , but not the same access to social security benefits (child benefits, child care allowance, social assistance, social housing, labour market).
Women now earn the same as men.	Women earn on average about 40% less than men. This gap is due to lower starting pay, career breaks for family care, the disadvantages inherent in part-time work, and the high job mismatch rates among women.
Anyone who wants a job can find one!	At present, there are 11 applicants for every job vacancy, and 2.5 trainees for every work training place. Adding to that the "hidden unemployed" - like the approximately 10,000 women who do not qualify for crisis assistance because of their partner's income - increases the jobless total by 50%.

What we need is social justice, not fallacies that harm everyone!

More details of the activities and positions of the Women in Poverty Task Force from: www.frauenarmut.at

EAPN works for a better sharing of wealth, opportunities and resources

N°107
July-August 2004

published
in English, French,
German, Spanish and Italian

Editor
F. Farrell

Responsible for publication
V. Forest

Rue du Congrès 37-41 Box 2
B-1000 Brussels
tel. 32 2 230 44 55
fax 32 2 230 97 33
E-mail: team@eapn.skynet.be
Internet: <http://www.eapn.org>

Contributors
P. Brandellero
C. Champeix
C. Nolmans
C. Fonseca

Bureau de dépôt
1600 Sint Pieters Leeuw 1



With the support
of the European Commission