

European Union Public Policy

Professor John Wilton

Lecture 6a

A case study: E.U. Welfare policy

Lecture 6a

1957 Treaty of Rome – no Member State should be at a competitive economic advantage or disadvantage in ‘common market’ because of its social provisions (social protection and welfare systems)

Article 117 introduced principle of *harmonisation* of social protection and welfare systems – but only an ‘aim’, no laws or regulations

Lecture 6a

1957 Treaty of Rome put social protection and welfare provision on E.E.C. agenda (***AGENDA-SETTING***)

After 1985 – Delors ‘*spillover*’ neo-functional strategy – develops ‘*Coherence*’ approach – enables him to get ‘*Social Dimension*’ on to E.C. policy agenda (***AGENDA-SETTING***)

1985 Single European Act confirmed move away from *harmonisation* towards *mutual recognition* of national social protection and welfare systems

Lecture 6a

1985 Single European Act referred to “the harmonisation of conditions”, BUT stressed that directives should be adopted setting out “minimum requirements for gradual implementation having regard to the conditions and technical rules obtaining in each of the Member States” (on social protection and welfare) ***(POLICY IMPLEMENTATION based on MUTUAL RECOGNITION)***

Lecture 6a

1989 Charter of the Fundamental Social Rights of Workers – encouraged *convergence* of national social protection and welfare policies on common objectives

- *harmonisation* retained in context of freedom of movement - harmonisation of:
 - conditions of residence;
 - conditions on duration of paid leave;
 - of health and safety conditions at workplace

Lecture 6a

BUT Charter ‘recognised national differences in social protection and welfare systems – referred to “ need to act in accordance with national practices and arrangements applying in each Member State

(POLICY FORMULATION based on
COHESION (of principles)

(MUTUAL RECOGNITION of diversity in
POLICY IMPLEMENTATION)

Lecture 6a

Charter of Fundamental Social Rights of Workers
appended to 1992 Maastricht Treaty as the
Agreement on Social Policy

- EU Commission's role limited to encouraging co-operation between Member States and facilitating co-ordination of action of Member States in all public policy/welfare policy covered by Agreement on Social Policy

Lecture 6a

July 1992 E.U. Council of Ministers issued recommendation on ‘convergence of social protection objectives and policies’

- was concerned that differences in social security cover might impede free movement of labour and increase regional imbalances, particularly between north and south of E.U.

- proposed a *convergence* strategy that was flexible, progressive, but non-binding

Lecture 6a

Common objectives of convergence strategy based on:

- equal treatment and fairness;
- avoidance of discrimination and disadvantage.

(POLICY FORMULATION)

BUT only broad aims and principles – no clarification of how principles should be operationalised

(POLICY IMPLEMENTATION based on harmonisation of principles rather than clear measures)

Lecture 6a

1997 E.U. Commission described highly developed social protection (and welfare) systems as a ‘fundamental component and distinguishing feature of the European Model of Society’

BUT welfare and social protection *policy formulation* only subjected to limited *harmonisation* (of objectives, aims and principles) AND greater *mutual recognition* of diversity in *policy implementation*

Lecture 6a

Reasons for limited harmonisation (of principles and aims) and greater mutual recognition (in implementation):

1. Enlargements (and introductions into membership of states with differing welfare and social protection systems);
2. Differing stages of social and economic development of Member States (economic costs)
3. Differing societal cultural traditions

Lecture 6a

Implementation of Welfare policy across EU

Member States last 25 years strongly influenced by:

1. Shifts towards market principles in provision of welfare – and introduction some privatisation of services;
2. Economic pressures and political ideological choices by governments;
3. Introduction of managerial reforms;
4. Increased selectivity of citizens entitled to welfare