

Article: Lorna Vassallo

L-Orizzont daily, 21.6.18

Sabbatical for women in politics

I ask myself: what is the difference between men and women in today's society? The rule is: Men are first trusted with a position and then maybe they succeed, women must first succeed and then maybe they are trusted in a position.

When it comes to men, the assumption is that they are up to it. When it comes to women they are assumed not to be up to the job.

It is not uncommon for anyone to be amazed that a woman has made it! However, I've yet to come across someone who's so surprised a man has made it!

I believe that we haven't even started to incentivize women to run for general elections. To start with, in 99% of cases it is women who are responsible for child rearing and household cleanliness. I also believe that these two problems can be easily overcome if the woman has strong financial resources. This, in light of the fact that a few married men are willing to leave work to care for children and become full-time househusbands.

But, as everyone knows, women are paid less in society.

For a woman to opt not to take care of her children and the house herself on a full-time basis, she needs to pay others to do this job for her. To add insult to injury, her wages are, more often than not, not high enough to allow this.

So, the irony is, that well-paid men usually do not have to bother to pay for their children to be taken care of or for housework to be done. Women who are paid less need to pay for these services (alone or together with their spouse) to go on with their career. This, in itself, puts women at a disadvantage.

On the other hand, many men rightly argue that their wages are much more than that of their wife. So, as a couple, it wouldn't make sense for the man to quit the best-paid job in the family to take care of the children. So, this results in the women, finally quitting their job or working reduced hours, to catch up with all the work. This 'couple' argument makes sense. The only problem is that, again, it is the woman who ends without pay or reduced pay for long periods of her life. This creates a vicious social circle imposed by society itself from which a woman can hardly escape.

This also means that, at any given general election female candidates have less saved money (since their work-life has been interrupted by periods of no-pay or reduced pay), they actually earn no or less money (even if they work as they are paid less than men and have less paid positions anyway) and have less time (due to the fact that after a day's work they have to take care of the family and do the housework).

One easily understands why but a few women are running for politics.

But the beauty of all these problems is that all of them can be solved if money is thrown at

them! It is precisely for this reason that the model that has already been locally introduced in the educational sector should be also introduced to favour women in politics. I am here referring to introducing a 'sabbatical', that is, paid leave, for women in politics.

In education, the government introduced the 'sabbatical in order to incentivize teachers' career progression firmly believing that more specialized teachers are very helpful to society.

However, aren't women in politics not useful to society?

In the case of a 'sabbatical' for women in politics, husbands themselves will be glad that their wife is in politics. After all, no man would mind having a wife that earns more than him (although I stand to be corrected in this regard!). If so, the idea of 'we agreed that it is her to give up her job or work reduced hours because we couldn't give up the best-paid job in the family' might come to an end. Women's frequently asked question: 'but should I actually be running for election when my children are still young? If so, should I be doing my door-to-door campaign instead of washing my children and preparing their school lunch myself?' might be heard less.

It must be stated that, whoever runs for an election, under present rules, is only entitled to one month of unpaid leave. In my view, although money is not always a solution, in this case it might as well be one of the best solutions. Unless the government starts investing financially in female candidates, we won't be seeing many of them in our parliament.