

# **Gender Budgeting Statement**

## **Misleading and Patriarchal Assumptions**

Subrat Das and Yamini Mishra\*

*Gender budgeting statement presented in Union Budget 2006-07, for the second time after its initiation last year, covers a significant number of Ministries/Departments of the Union Government and hence is a welcome step. However, many of the figures given in the concerned statement in the Budget indicate highly questionable assumptions, which on the one hand are unjustifiable and on the other quite patriarchal.*

In Union Budget 2005-06, the Government for the first time included a statement on Gender Budgeting, which presented the magnitude of allocations for various programmes/ schemes under ten demands for grants of the Union Government that were expected to benefit women substantially (and hence eligible to be a part of the Gender Budget). The total allocations included in the Gender Budgeting Statement in 2005-06 Union Budget (Statement No. 19, Expenditure Budget Vol. I, Union Budget 2005-06) constituted about 2.8 % of the Total Union Government Expenditure as per the Budget Estimates for 2005-06. With Union Budget 2006-07, this Gender Budgeting exercise has been expanded to cover 24 demands for grants under 18 Ministries/Departments of the Union Government and five Union Territories. The total magnitude of Gender Budget (i.e. women-specific allocations) has now gone up to 4.67 % of total Union Budget in the 2005-06 BE (as a much higher number of Departments and their schemes have been included under the Gender Budgeting exercise presented this year) and the total magnitude of Gender Budget shows a rise to 5.1 % of total Union Budget in the Budget Estimates for 2006-07. While this step from the Government to expand the scope of Gender Budgeting is indeed welcome, there are some serious drawbacks in this exercise presented in Union Budget 2006-07 (Statement No. 20, Expenditure Budget Vol. I, Union Budget 2006-07)<sup>1</sup>, which must be rectified by the Government.

The inclusion of Gender Budget in the Union Budget in India is a rather nascent and welcome development and women's activism needs to be given a lot of credit for it. The demand for Gender Budget is not a demand for a separate budget for women, rather, an attempt at dissecting the budget for its gender specific impact since gender based differences and discrimination are built into the entire social-economic-political fabric of almost all societies. A gender neutral or gender blind national budget ignores the different, socially determined roles and responsibilities of men and women and is bound to reach and benefit the men more than the women unless concerted efforts are made to correct gender based discrimination. The relevance of gender budgets can be summarized in the adage – if it is unfair to have differential treatment for same people, it is also unfair to have same treatment for different people.

---

\* This article was originally published in Economic and Political Weekly, Vol. XLI, No. 30, July 29, 2006.

The **Gender Budgeting statement** presented in Union Budget 2006-07 indicates, in two parts (Part A and Part B), the budget provisions for **programmes/ schemes that are substantially meant for the benefit of women**. **Part A** presents women-specific budget provisions under schemes in which 100% provisions (or allocations) are meant for women. **Part B** presents women-specific budget provisions under schemes where such allocations constitute at least 30% of the total provisions. The Gender Budget allocations by the Union Government, as presented in Part A and Part B of the said statement, add up to Rs. 28,736.53 Crore for the Budget Estimates of 2006-07, which as we mentioned above constitutes 5.1 % of the total Union Government Expenditure of Rs. 5,63,991 Crore in 2006-07 BE.

However, the point being made here is that this Gender Budgeting exercise is based on **numerous assumptions** relating to the proportion of allocations under a scheme that directly benefits women. Several of these assumptions seem unrealistic and such unacceptable assumptions weaken the relevance of this particular Gender Budgeting exercise.

Table 1 below presents some of the schemes included in Part A of the Gender Budgeting Statement (i.e., schemes in which 100% allocations are meant for women), highlighting the key objectives of these schemes as mentioned in the Budget (in Notes on Demands for Grants [Expenditure Budget Vol. II] of Union Budget), and tries to identify the actual section of beneficiaries of these schemes on the basis of these stated objectives.

**Table 1: Some of the Schemes (or Items of Expenditure) included in Part A of Gender Budgeting Exercise\* in Union Budget 2006-07**

Scheme	Allocations in 2006-07 BE (in Rs. Crore)	Nature/Objective of the Scheme (as stated in Expenditure Budget Vol. II) **	Targeted Section of Beneficiary
Free Distribution of Contraceptives (Demand No. 46, Dept. of Health & family welfare)	100	As terminal methods of Family Planning can't be advocated to the young couples, to respond to the needs of them, various contraceptives under spacing methods of Family Planning are offered under the Programme.	Young Couples
Social marketing of Contraceptives (Demand No. 46, Dept. of Health & family welfare)	49.50	This scheme is mainly for control of HIV infection through usage of condoms as one of the option for safe sex.	Both males and females
ICDS Scheme (Demand No. 57, Dept. of Women & Child Development)	4087.54	Seeks to provide an integrated package of health, nutrition and educational services to children up to six years of age, pregnant women and nursing mothers. The package includes supplementary nutrition, immunization, health check-up, referral services, nutrition and health education and non-formal pre-school education.	Children up to six years of age, pregnant women and nursing mothers.

National Institute of Public Cooperation & Child Development (Demand No. 57, Dept. of Women & Child Development)	11.80	The aim of the Institute is to develop and promote voluntary action for social development, comprehensive view of child development and promotion of programmes in pursuance of the National Policy for Children.	Children of both sexes
Other Schemes of Child welfare (Demand No. 57, Dept. of Women & Child Development)	22.45	These include, provision for the Commission for Protection of Child Rights proposed to be set up in 2006-07, National Children's Board, National Awards for Child Welfare, Universal Children's Day, Indo-Foreign Exchange Programme, UN Contribution, Research Publications, Assistance to voluntary organizations for providing Social Defence and Information, Media and Publication.	Children of both sexes
Rural Housing- Indira Awaas Yojana (Demand No. 78, Dept. of Rural Development)	2920	The objective of Indira Awaas Yojana (IAY) is primarily to provide assistance for construction of dwelling units and upgradation of existing unserviceable 'kutcha' houses for Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes and non-SC/ST rural families living below the poverty line	Rural families living below the poverty line.
Health Care Center (Demand No.52, Police, Ministry of Home Affairs)	0.21	No information in Notes on Demands for Grants	
Improvised Service (Demand No.52, Police, Ministry of Home Affairs)	0.14	No information in Notes on Demands for Grants	
Nutritional care Centre (Demand No.52, Police, Ministry of Home Affairs)	0.21	No information in Notes on Demands for Grants	

\* Part A: where 100 % allocations for the Scheme have been taken as women-specific, or, as substantially meant for the benefit of women.

\*\* Expenditure Budget Vol. II (Notes on Demands for Grants), Union Budget 2006-07

It can thus be seen that, in case of schemes like 'Free Distribution of Contraceptives' and 'Social marketing of Contraceptives' under the Department of Health and Family Welfare, which are currently under Part A, the beneficiaries are not only women but also men. Including the entire allocations (i.e. 100 % allocations) under such schemes as women-specific is highly questionable.

Likewise, the 'Integrated Child Development Services' (ICDS) Scheme (under Demand No. 57) is targeted at all children up to six years of age and also includes pregnant women and nursing mothers, as beneficiaries. Hence, inclusion of 100 %

allocations under ICDS as women-specific is not justifiable, although a lesser proportion would have been. Likewise, many of the schemes for children are meant both for boys and girls; including 100 % allocations under these child-specific schemes as women-specific is problematic.

The entire allocations for 'Indira Awaas Yojana' (IAY) have also been included as women-specific, apparently because the houses built are registered in the name of women members. However, the houses built benefit men and women equally and hence should not be seen as solely for the benefit of women. Moreover, the guidelines provided in the Indira Awaas Yojana also have provision for allotting houses in the name of both husband and wife, and in cases where there is no eligible female member in the family available/alive, IAY houses can also be allotted to male members. Beyond this registration clause, there is nothing else in the IAY to assume that the beneficiaries will be only women (there is no earmarking of provisions of physical targets set out to benefit women). As a consequence, significant numbers of houses are also registered in the names of both husband/wife, and houses allotted exclusively for women, although high, are not the only category<sup>2</sup>. Thus, including 100 % allocations under 'Indira Awaas Yojana' as women-specific is questionable.

Entire allocations for the purpose of Health Care Center, Improvised Service, and Nutritional Care Centre under Demand No.52 (Police, Ministry of Home Affairs) have been included as women-specific. But no information is available about the targeted beneficiaries of these schemes in the Expenditure Budget Vol. II (Notes on Demands for Grants) and inclusion of 100 % allocations under these in the Gender Budget certainly demands an explanation from the Government.

In the following section, we look at the percent share of women specific allocations in the entire allocations of the Ministries/Departments in the Union Budget 2006-07 (Table 2). The share of women specific allocations has been arrived at by summing allocations under Part A (100% for women) and Part B (at least 30% for women) of relevant departments and dividing these by the total allocations of the department.

**Table 2: Women-specific Shares (or Gender Budget component) in Total Allocations Under Various Departments of Union Government**

Demand No.	Ministry/ Department	Total Allocations for the Department (As per the Expenditure Budget Vol. II 2006-07)			Women-specific Allocations (As per the Gender Budgeting Statement 2006-07) <b>[% Share in Total Allocations]</b>		
		2005-06 BE	2005-06 RE	2006-07 BE	2005-06 BE	2005-06 RE	2006-07 BE
1	Department of Agriculture & Cooperation	4589.83	4300.51	5219.16	1.00 (0.02)	3.75 (0.09)	1.50 (0.03)
12	Department of Industrial Policy & Promotion	640.27	490.6	600.32	5.00 (0.78)	5.00 (1.02)	5.50 (0.92)
15	Department of Information Technology	965.3	916	1126	5.70 (0.59)	5.70 (0.62)	9.30 (0.83)

46	Department of Health & Family Welfare	10281.13	9675.83	12545.88	6631.53 <b>(64.50)</b>	6368.66 <b>(65.82)</b>	8118.2 <b>(64.71)</b>
47	Department of AYUSH	405.98	364	447.98	38.24 (9.41)	36.95 (10.15)	43.22 (9.65)
52	Police	14772	14945	16033.82	11.04 <b>(0.07)</b>	6.71 <b>(0.04)</b>	4.59 <b>(0.03)</b>
54	Ministry of Home Affairs, Transfer to UT Government	838.05	946.71	1195.37	2.03 (0.24)	1.71 (0.18)	2.03 (0.17)
55	Department of Elementary Education & Literacy	12536.53	12536.33	17132.71	5949.37 <b>(47.46)</b>	5946.50 <b>(47.43)</b>	7631.00 <b>(44.54)</b>
56	Department of Secondary Education & Higher Education	5800.5	5800	6982.28	1277.94 <b>(22.03)</b>	1349.55 <b>(23.27)</b>	1641.62 <b>(23.51)</b>
57	Department of Women & Child Development	3931.11	3931.34	4852.94	3922.49 <b>(99.78)</b>	3922.47 <b>(99.77)</b>	4842.68 <b>(99.78)</b>
59	Ministry of Labour & Employment	1192.09	1265	1481.36	125.05 (10.49)	115.76 (9.15)	127.46 (8.60)
64	Ministry of Non Conventional Energy Sources	605.38	356.43	603.64	5.00 (0.83)	0.01 (0.002)	0.10 (0.02)
76	Department of Rural Development	18353.87	21354.27	24047.56	4359.00 <b>(23.75)</b>	4800.00 <b>(22.48)</b>	4300.00 <b>(17.88)</b>
81	Demand No.81 Department of Science & Technology	1636	1446	1746	4.00 ( 0.24)	4.00 ( 0.28)	30.00 ( 1.72)
83	Department of Bio-Technology	458.6	402.6	534.6	5.00 (1.09)	5.00 (1.24)	5.00 (0.94)
86	Ministry of Small Scale Industries	460.3	470.62	524.24	0.40 ( 0.09)	0.40 ( 0.08)	1.00 ( 0.19)
87	Ministry of Social Justice & Empowerment	1599.7	1599.7	1817.6	1550.03 <b>(96.90)</b>	1510.35 <b>(94.41)</b>	1743.15 <b>(95.90)</b>

94	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	1672.69	1617.31	3629.96	0.45 (0.03)	0.45 (0.03)	0.50 (0.01)
95	Chandigarh	990.96	971.84	1030.66	0.73 (0.07)	0.73 (0.08)	0.80 (0.08)
96	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	113.01	114.63	120.42	0.47 (0.42)	0.47 (0.41)	0.52 (0.43)
97	Demand No.97, Daman & Diu	114.3	114.8	121.12	0.29 (0.25)	0.29 (0.25)	0.32 (0.26)
98	Demand No.98, Lakshadweep	240.95	250.95	381.69	0.06 (0.02)	0.06 (0.02)	0.06 (0.016)
102	Ministry of Urban Employment & Poverty	512.03	409	413.67	-	29.00 (7.09)	75.00 (18.13)
104	Ministry of Youth Affairs & Sports	506.99	478.01	669	139.18 (27.45)	128.99 (26.98)	155.18 (23.20)

Note: Figures in the parentheses indicate the percentage share of women-specific allocations within total allocations for respective Ministry/Department.

Source: Compiled from Expenditure Budget Vol. I & II, Union Budget 2006-07

This table reveals the following:

- According to the Gender Budget statement, almost 65 % of total budget provisions under **Department of Health and Family Welfare** of the Union Government are meant substantially for the benefit of women. This seems unrealistic and needs to be looked at carefully. It is quite disturbing to note that, in the Budget Estimates for 2006-07, the entire (i.e. 100 %) allocations for *Safdarjung Hospital, Vardhaman Mahavir Medical College* and *AIIMS* (all three in New Delhi), under Department of Health and Family Welfare, have been included as women-specific allocations in the Gender Budget. It must be noted here that it might have been the intention of the Government to include in the Gender Budget Statement only the allocations for Gynaecology and Obstetrics out of the total allocations for these institutions, but if that is the case the total allocations for these institutions as mentioned in the Expenditure Budget Vol. II- Demand No. 46 (Dept. of Health and Family Welfare) are incorrect figures which must be rectified by the Government.
- Out of the total allocations for **Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment** (Demand No. 87) in 2006-07 BE, which is Rs. 1817.6 crore, 96 % allocations (i.e., Rs. 1743.15 crore) have been included in the Gender Budget for 2006-07 BE, which is simply unacceptable. Does the Government intend to say that almost entire outlays of this Ministry are going towards the benefit of women? We must note here that according to **Statement 21** of Expenditure Budget Vol. I (2006-07), which presents the budget provisions under programmes/ schemes that are **meant substantially for the benefit of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes**, as much as 73 % of allocations under the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment are SC/ST-specific. Thus, the Government needs to address the explicit contradiction between these two claims made separately in Statements 20 and 21 of its Expenditure Budget Vol. I.

- Entire (100 %) allocations for 'Nehru Yuva Kendra' and 'Promotion of National Integration' under Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports (Demand No. 104) have been included in the Gender Budget, which is quite unjustifiable.
- Likewise, almost 100 % allocations under **Department of Women and Child Development** have been included as women-specific, which could imply an assumption that welfare of children is the sole responsibility of women. The Government must explain on what basis they have included almost the entire allocations under Department of Women and Child Development as women-specific.

The table (Table 2) also highlights serious concerns about the priority accorded to women in several departments. According to the Gender Budgeting Statement, out of the entire allocations of Union Government for Police (under Ministry of Home Affairs, GoI), only 0.03 % is women-specific, which indicates that allocation of meager resources for women-specific programmes/ schemes could be one of the major reasons for prevalence of high levels of crimes against women. The Government must substantially improve the priorities for women within allocation of financial resources for Police.

While around 45 % of allocations under **Department of Elementary Education and Literacy** are shown to be women-specific, only 23 % of allocations under **Department of Secondary and Higher Education** have been regarded by the Government as women-specific. Given the poor educational attainments of women and very high levels of drop out rates of girls in secondary education, the Government needs to provide much greater resources towards women's education both at the elementary level and secondary and higher education levels.

In the Budget Estimates for 2006-07, less than 18 % of allocations under **Department of Rural Development** have been shown to be women-specific, which includes the debatable inclusion of 100 % allocations for 'Indira Awaas Yojana'. This certainly needs to be stepped up significantly.

The gender budget exercise in the Union Budget 2006-07 thus presents problems at several levels. First and foremost, the total magnitude of gender budget of 5.1% is low in itself. The Budget 2006-07 reveals that women are low in priority in the allocation of resources by the Union Government in many crucial sectors, like, rural development, secondary and higher education and police, etc. which need to be stepped up significantly. Moreover, the assumptions that have been made in arriving even at this meager figure are highly problematic and need to be challenged. On one hand, some of these assumptions are clearly wrong, for instance, putting 100 % allocations for 'Nehru Yuva Kendra' and 'Promotion of National Integration' under Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports in the Gender Budget. On the other hand, other assumptions are deeply patriarchal, for instance, the assumption that anything that has to do with children, anything that has to do with contraception and family planning is for the exclusive benefit of women. The eternal clubbing of women and children as one category by policymakers in India should end, and the specific needs of these two disadvantaged sections of population must be addressed distinctly. And, unless the misleading assumptions are rectified, the relevance of Gender Budgeting attempted by the Government will be diluted.

Brinda Karat, Member of Parliament, raised this issue in the Parliament during the Budget Session on 9<sup>th</sup> of March this year, but disturbingly, the Finance Minister didn't even respond to her questions in his reply to the House<sup>3</sup>. We think the Finance Minister owes us an explanation.

For Correspondence:  
subrat2005@gmail.com, yamini.mishra@gmail.com

(The authors are thankful to colleagues at Centre for Budget and Governance Accountability, New Delhi for their valuable help, and deeply grateful to Com. Brinda Karat of CPI (M) for drawing attention to the possible lacunae in the Gender Budgeting exercise presented in Union Budget 2006-07).

#### End Notes

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.indiabudget.nic.in/ub2006-07/eb/stat20.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> <http://pib.nic.in/archieve/others/2005/nedocuments2005dec/ruraldevdec2005/Chapter4.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> Information based on communications with Brinda Karat.