



Commonwealth of Australia

Rhonda Sharp

Monica Costa

©2011

Contents

<i>1 Background</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>2 Gender responsive budgeting</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>References</i>	<i>11</i>

(This country profile is available online at www.unisa.edu.au/genderbudgets)

1 Socio-cultural, political and economic background

Socio-economic indicators	
Population 2008	21.3 million
Projected population change 2008–50	28.1 million
GDP per capita (PPP \$US) 2005	\$31,794
Proportion (percent) of population below the Poverty Line (\$1 PPP a day) 2005	Not available
Gender equality indicators	
Seats in parliament held by women (% of total) 2007	28.3%
Maternal mortality ratio (per 100,000 live births) 2005	8 per 100,000 births
Adult literacy rate, female (aged 15 and older) 2005	Not available
Adult literacy rate, male (aged 15 and older) 2005	Not available
Gross secondary enrolment: Ratio of female rate to male rate 2005	0.95
Gross secondary enrolment: Female ratio (% of the female secondary school aged population) 2005	144%
Share of women in wage employment in the non-agricultural sector (% of total employment in the sector) 2008	47.1%
Budgetary indicators	
General Government public expenditure on education (% of GDP) 2002–05	4.7%
General Government public expenditure on education (% of total expenditure) 2002-05	13.3%
General Government public expenditure on health (% of GDP) 2004	6.5%
General Government public expenditure on health (% of total government expenditure) 2005	33%
Central Government military expenditure (% of GDP) 2005	1.8%
Central Government public expenditure on defence (% of total outlays) 2007	6.7%
Open Budget Index: Overall Score	Not Available

Sources: UNDP (2007) *Human Development Report 2007/08*; Population Reference Bureau (2008) *World Population Data Sheet*; UN Statistics Division (2008) *Millennium Development Goal Indicators*; UNESCAP (2008) *Statistical Yearbook for Asia and the Pacific*; IMF (2007) *Government Finance Statistics*; International Budget Partnership (2009) *Open Budget initiative – Country Data* (See Explanatory Notes for details).

The Commonwealth of Australia (commonly known as Australia), located between the Indian and South Pacific Oceans, is a diverse society of 21 million (see table). About 90% of Australia's population is of European ancestry and around 3% descend from the indigenous Aboriginal population. Australia has a relatively high rate of immigration with more than six million migrants since the Second World War having re-settled from 200 countries of origin. Nearly one in four of its population was born overseas. While English is the official and dominant language, more than three million Australians speak other languages at home. Australia has the lowest population density in the world with only two people per square kilometre. However, Australia is a highly urbanised country with 87% of its population residing in urban centres mostly along the eastern coast. Almost two-thirds of the population nominate Christianity as their religion (US CIA 2011; BBC News 2010, Australia DFAT 2010, Australia DFAT 2008, UNDP 2007).

Australia is a constitutional monarchy and the British monarch remains Head of State, reflecting Australia's 18th and 19th century colonial ties with Great Britain. In 1901 Australia was established as a federation with powers shared between the national government (the Australian Government, sometimes called the Commonwealth Government) and six states. The states retained significant powers over education, health, police, judiciary and transport sectors. Under the Commonwealth government there are also two self-governing territories - the Australian

2 Commonwealth of Australia

Capital Territory and the Northern Territory. There are 600 local councils which deal with local community issues. In 2010 Ms Julia Gillard, of the Australian Labor Party, became Australia's first woman prime minister. She succeeded Mr Kevin Rudd, Australian Labor Party, who fell to a party coup in his first term as prime minister (December 2007 - July 2010). The national election in October 2010 resulted in a 'hung' parliament with no political party able to command a majority in its own right. Ultimately, however, PM Gillard retained office after gaining support from independent members of parliament, thus forming the first minority government for seventy years.

Australia is classified as a high-income economy by the World Bank (2009). It is also classified as a high human development country by the UNDP, ranked third best in the world with an index value of 0.962 (UNDP 2007). In 2005 GDP per capita was \$31,794 (see table). The federal government has highlighted that in 2007 Australia had the 14th largest economy in the world and the 9th biggest industrialised economy (Australia DFAT 2010). It has enjoyed over 16 years of continuous economic growth and the last decade has recorded annual average real GDP growth of 3.5% (Australia DFAT 2010). Some commentators have observed that Australia's economic performance has been linked to reforms starting in the mid-1980s, including floating the Australian dollar, abolishing foreign exchange controls and interest rate controls, trade liberalisation and deregulation of successive product markets and industries (Blöndal et al 2008). Broomhill (2009) notes also that this shift from the post-war Keynesian framework into a neo-liberal regime in the mid-1980s has resulted in increased integration with and dependence on the global economy as well as a rise in social and economic inequalities. Driving economic growth and investment has been a boom in commodity demand and prices since 2003 - including iron ore and metallurgical coal, bauxite, thermal coal, uranium, lead, zinc, gold, silver, copper, crude oil and gas. Commodities accounted for close to two-thirds of all exports, mostly to China and India (Blöndal et al 2008).

The OECD (2010a: 2) observes that '[t]he Australian economy has been one of the most resilient in the OECD during the global economic and financial crisis'. To address the challenges of the Global Financial Crisis the government initiated a significant economic and financial intervention which included guaranteeing all bank deposits, a temporary ban on short selling, targeted job creation programs and the reform of services and infrastructure (Rudd 2009). Australia's strong performance during the global financial and economic crisis and subsequently was partly the result of growth in the Chinese and Indian economies with which it has growing trading relationships (OECD 2010a). Significantly, unemployment is expected to return to its 2008 low level of 5% in 2011 (OECD 2010b).

Not all Australians have shared equally in the sustained economic growth. Indeed economic growth has resulted in a two-speed economy with disparities in income across sectors, states, communities and in different income distribution groups (Access Economics 2008, Tanton 2010). The UNDP (2006) observed that inequality is prevalent with the poorest 10% of Australians owning 2% of the national income while the wealthiest 10% owning 25.4% in the 1990s. Single income women-headed families are the fastest growing household group. Indigenous people in Australia face lower life expectancy, poorer housing, and lower education, employment and incomes. Indigenous life expectancy at birth was estimated to be 17 years less than the life expectancy of the non-Indigenous. In 2006 a mere 47.4% of Indigenous young people had achieved Year 12 or equivalent (Commonwealth of Australia 2010).

Australia was a pioneer in developing women's policy national machinery in the 1970s, which was to inspire the United Nations approach to gender mainstreaming (Sawer 2007; Maddison and Partridge 2007). In the 1970s and 1980s the institutionalisation of feminism reached its pinnacle with whole programs and complex departments engaged in mainstreaming gender

into government policies (Sawer 2007; Maddison and Partridge 2007; Lake 1999). The Australian national women's machinery model at its most comprehensive stage included:

- The location of the chief women's policy unit in the main policy coordination department;
- Responsibility for the portfolio on gender equality was located in the Prime Minister's own department, supported by a woman cabinet minister;
- Focal points in government departments;
- A clear demarcation between the women's policy and equal employment opportunity functions;
- A focus on gender auditing undertaken by analyses of cabinet submissions and budget outlays;
- The strengthening of monitoring by a parliamentary party committee;
- Financial support provided to women's advocacy groups and services;
- Community representation on policy advisory bodies; and
- Engaging intergovernmental agencies to share best practices (Sawer 1999: 40 in Maddison and Partridge 2007: 37).

The work of the women's machinery is complemented by *Equal Opportunity Acts*, or anti-discrimination legislation, at the national, state and territory levels. At the federal level of government the Sex Discrimination Commissioner within the Australian Human Rights Commission has responsibility for the *Sex Discrimination Act* (1984). There is also a national statutory authority, the Equal Opportunity for Women in the Workplace Agency (previously called the Affirmative Action in the Workplace Agency), which administers the *Equal Opportunity for Women in the Workplace Act* (1999).

A leading scholar on women and public policy, Marian Sawer, (2007) argues that there was an unique conjuncture in Australia in the 1970s with (1) the combination of a visible and active women's movement looking to the government's machinery as an avenue to promote social justice and (2) the election of governments with a reform agenda. Significant for the development of this women's machinery was the engagement of feminist activists within the state-bureaucracy who became known as 'femocrats'. This positive context had dissipated by the mid-1990s when the Liberal Prime Minister Mr John Howard (representing the conservative side of politics in Australia), argued for 'governing for the mainstream' and began dismantling efforts to achieve equal opportunity by accommodating difference (Sawer 2007; Maddison and Partridge 2007).

During the 1990s and 2000s other factors contributed to the downturn of the feminist agenda, including the shift 'in the dominant discourse away from an equal opportunity discourse legitimising the welfare state towards (neoliberal) discourses of choice prioritising market freedoms' (Sawer 2007: 39). This neoliberal discourse framed feminists as a self-interested elite and delegitimised the advocacy work of public interest groups. Also, as the public sector adopted private sector models, policy expertise, including gender expertise, began to be contracted out. Within government, policy-making also became more centralised and less consultative with community based groups. In this context, the budget for the Office for Status Women was cut by around 40% and women's units across departments were abolished, as were inter-governmental bodies. Importantly, by 2004 the Office of the Status of Women (OSW), established in 1974, was demoted from the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet and relocated as 'the Office for Women' in the Department of Family and Community Services, thus re-positioning women's issues under family policy and programs (Sawer 2007; Maddison and Partridge 2007). In 2006, the CEDAW Committee in its concluding comments expressed its concern 'that there are inadequate structures and mechanisms to ensure effective coordination and consistent application of the Convention in all states and territories' (Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women 2006: 2).

When the Labor government lodged the next CEDAW report in 2008, 7 months into its first term of office, it reported on a number of measures that it argued demonstrated its commitment to the 'principles of equality and non-discrimination and to improving the lives of Australian women' (Australian Government 2008:1). These included the appointment of a Minister with full ministerial responsibilities for women issues (the Minister for the Status of Women), ratification of the Optional Protocol to CEDAW, the undertaking of a review of the effectiveness of the Commonwealth Sex Discrimination Act (1984) and policies to address the concerns of the CEDAW Committee in its 2006 report. However, the Labor government did not re-establish the Office for Women in the policy coordination Department of the Prime Minister and the Cabinet.

Australia ranks 2nd in the world on the Gender Development Index with a value of 0.960 (UNDP 2007). In the early 2000s the national Office of the Status of Women (2003: 14) reported to CEDAW significant progress for women and girls' 'participation in education, training and employment and in decision-making and leadership'. Progress included a significant presence in tertiary education where women comprised 56% of students commencing an undergraduate degree and 48.6% of postgraduate students (Commonwealth Office of the Status of Women 2003). In its 2010 appearance before the CEDAW committee, the Australian government stressed the range of life choices enjoyed by Australian Women with women comprising 30% of all Australian Parliamentarians and holding the highest offices as Governor General and Prime Minister. Some 58% of the Australian public service are women and in the past decade there has been a three-fold increase in women occupying the senior executive ranks of the Australian public service. Further, three of the seven High Court justices are now women (Australian Government 2010). In the international arena, Australia's development aid agency, known as AusAID, reinstated gender equality as one of its core principle in mid-2000s (Sawer 2007). After 30 years of campaigning by the trade union and women's movement and allies for a national paid parental leave scheme, the Gillard Labor government introduced the first national Paid Parental Leave in 2010. This provides eligible working parents with 18 weeks of Parental Leave Pay at the rate of the national minimum wage (Australia Government FAHCSIA 2010, Sawer 2009). There is also a nationally coordinated plan to reduce violence against women and children.

Yet many challenges to gender equality remain. The 2009 Australian NGO CEDAW Shadow Report nominated a number of problematic areas hampering progress in gender equality. These included slow progress in expanding childcare, violence against women and children, discrimination and disadvantage experienced by indigenous women, aggravated by inadequate and inappropriate responses from responsible services, women's under-representation in the political arena and senior management and women's marginalisation in access to services, including health (YWCA and Women's Legal Services Australia 2009). Women now comprised 46% of all employed persons but continue to provide the majority of unpaid care and household work. In addition, employment remains heavily gender segregated by industry and occupation with men more likely to have better working conditions and incomes (*Year Book Australia*, 2009–10, Cat No 1301.0) Over 70% of part-time employees are women and in 2010 nearly a third of women workers, mainly in casual employment, did not have paid leave entitlements of any kind (Australian Government 2010:7). On average, women who are engaged in full-time work earn 17% less than men and over a lifetime the gender divide in pay packets has been estimated at 26%, resulting in women being more prone to economic dependency and poverty (Castells et al 2011). The federal government's 2010-11 Women's Budget Statement identifies challenges to gender equality including women being stretched between paid work and caring obligations, less secure retirement, the overrepresentation of single women-headed families among jobless families with children and men being locked out of caring roles because of the emphasis on the male breadwinner role (Australian Government 2010:7).

Significant to Australian' successful women's policy machinery was the role of the women's movement (Maddison and Partridge 2007, Sawer 2007, Lake 1999). Some commentators have argued that the history of the Australian women's movements can be seen in four phases: the 1969-1972 formative years emerging from the anti-war and student movements, the 1972-1975 honeymoon years with collaboration between the women's movement and the government, the 1975 to late 1980s years of diffusion; and finally, the defensive years from 1996 to the present with the government changing its views on the role played by NGOs and the women's movement (Maddison and Partridge 2007, Sawer 2008). Observers have noted that Australia has a tradition of non-party women's political advocacy directed primarily towards the state. The Women's Electoral Lobby (WLE), for example, played a leading role in the development and dissemination of Australia's gender mainstreaming model by both pressuring the government from outside and providing staff for the bureaucracy's new policy co-ordination agencies inside.

The women's movement also became active in providing services delivery including women's information services, women's refuges, and rape crisis, women's health and women's legal centres. However, by the mid-1990s, the women's movement was also becoming less visible and less effective as a political base for feminist initiatives in government (Sawer 2007). For over a decade, women's organisations have been excluded from the policy-making arena. Maddison and Partridge (2007: 80) argue that the persisting negative view over the role of women's organisations draws on the 'tenants of public choice theory and appears to now be almost hegemonic among politicians and bureaucrats who determine the nature of government-NGO relations'. The CEDAW Committee called in its concluding comments for 'increased attention in existing consultative forums and other mechanisms of control and partnership to the consistent implementation of the Convention in all states and territories' (Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women 2006: 2). Under the new Labor government a review of the National Women's Secretariats representing the views of selective NGOs and their renaming to National Women's Alliances. This step signaled a new direction in forming collaborative relationships between women's organisations and the government with an emphasis on information sharing, advocacy, and policy advice and analysis on women's issues. In 2010 after an extensive consultation the Australian government funded 6 national National Women's Alliances at \$2000,000 for 3 years. This included, for the first time Indigenous women being represented under their own national Women's Alliance (Australian Government (FaHCSIA) 2011).

2 Gender responsive budgeting

Gender responsive budgeting has a long history in Australia at the national, state and territory levels of government and it has influenced similar projects elsewhere. Termed 'women's budgets' in Australia, a central feature of these initiatives has been the publication of a 'Women's Budget Statement' by governments. It was identified as best practice in 1998 by a UN expert group meeting on national machineries for gender equality (Sawer 2002). However, the processes by which the assessments of the gender impact of the budget are undertaken for the Women's Budget Statement, along with the status and lines of accountability of these documents, has changed significantly over time. Two broad phases can be identified in the evolution of the Women's Budget Statement in the Australian context.

The world's first gender responsive budgeting initiative was introduced at the national level in Australia in mid-1980s. The newly elected Hawke Labor government undertook a pilot involving thirteen departments which resulted in a Women's Budget Statement (initially called a women's budget program) as part of the 1983-84 budget documents. Subsequently, initiatives were introduced by the 6 Australian States and two Territory governments for varying periods of time. These 'women's budget' exercises sought to increase understanding of the budget's

impact on women and girls and provide a process for making budgetary changes that enhanced women's economic and social status and promoted gender equality. As expressed in the forward of the second South Australian Women's Budget, such initiatives were designed:

..to obtain information about what is being done for women, to raise the profile of women's programs in bids for funding, but also to build into each department a clear awareness that everything they do, every dollar they spend, has an impact on women- and that impact is very often different for women than for men. (South Australia 1987:1 quoted in Sharp and Broomhill 2002: 30)

In the case of South Australia, the 3 categories of expenditure framework was developed to distinguish the broad ways in which program design and funding can have gender impacts (and gender neutrality could not be assumed), a framework adopted by several of the state governments (Sharp and Broomhill 1990).

The Australian national, state and territory gender responsive budgeting initiatives were located 'inside government' and led by the women's policy machinery. Sawer (1990) reports that the concept of developing a budget that was responsive to the needs of women and girls emerged in a regular quarterly meeting between Federal, State and Territory senior 'femocrats' and generated a discussion on how to influence non-gender specific budget expenditures. It was these expenditures that the senior feminist bureaucrats believed were significantly shaping the social and economic status of women. This idea was developed at the national level by the head of Office of the Status of Women in the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet, Dr Anne Summers, and gained approval by the high-level coordination gathering of federal government departmental heads - the Secretaries' Taskforce on the Status of Women. It built on the requirement established in the 1983 Cabinet Handbook of the new government that all Cabinet submissions include a statement discussing its impact on women (Sawer 2002, 1990). The process required federal government departments, using standardised formats, to detail the impact of their activities on women and men. This information was to be included in a document circulated on budget night by the Prime Minister. To complement the analysis of the impact of existing programs and policies, government departments were to identify objectives and avenues to improve performance in addressing the needs and concerns of women (Sawer 2002, 1990). Sharp and Broomhill (2002) argue that broadly the national initiative, along with most of the state and territory women's budget exercises, were focused on three goals, and achieved some measure of success in each. These were:

- raising awareness of the disparate impacts of the budget on men and women, boys and girls;
- strengthening governments' accountability for their gender equality commitments; and
- fostering policies and budgets changes that advance the status of women and promote gender equality.

At the national level, the document assessing the impact of the budget on women averaged around 300 pages in its early years. While the document provided the reader with detailed information on existing and new policies and budgets, it was often uncritical about their weaknesses, including failing to discuss what programs and funding were being cut. For example, there was no record in the 1986-87 federal government document of the cuts to the budget of the Human Rights Commission which held a central refereeing role in the Commonwealth Sex Discrimination Act (Budlender 2002). In 1987, the federal initiative, renamed the Women's Budget Statement, also published a summary version of 32 pages (Sawer 2002, 1990). A 1993 review recommended that the national exercise should be replaced by two accountability mechanisms: (1) target data published in an annual women's statistical yearbook was to substitute the gender equality indicators published in the Women's Budget Statement; and (2) gender reporting was to be integrated into the program statements provided every year

to parliamentary committees. Short versions of the Women's Budget Statement were published in 1994 and 1995 (Sawer 2002).

The first phase of gender budgeting in Australia survived until the mid 1990s. At the federal level it was sustained for twelve years (1984 – 1996). However, by the 1990s a range of factors had come into play that contributed to the phasing out of the women's budget statements and processes at all levels of government. Prominent forces for change were the election of conservative governments, the downsizing of the women's machinery of government, the increasing dominance of neo-liberal policy discourses and reduced engagement around the budget by the women's movement (Sharp and Broomhill 2002, Sharp 2003b, Maddison and Partridge 2007, Sharp 2007).

In 1996, the election of an Australian Liberal-National government led by Mr John Howard resulted in a major unravelling of the Women's Budget Statement at the federal level. The new government, via the Office of the Status of Women, was quick to marginalise the centrality of the Women's Budget Statement as an avenue for gender mainstreaming announcing:

..while the innovative women's budget statement has been a valuable formal reporting mechanism, its purpose has been principally one of communication, with little impact on policy formulation. The strategic policy development and advising role, though a less public function of OSW, is a far more effective channel for the integration of gender issues into specific policies. (OSW 1996: 1 quoted in Sawer 2002: 61).

This second phase of the gender responsive budgeting experience in Australia emerged with the introduction of neoliberal policy approaches in the context of the restructuring of the Australian economy (Sharp 2007). The focus on individual 'choice', which characterises the neoliberal policy approach, is set out by the Minister Assisting the Prime Minister for the Status of Women in the 1997-1998 budget under her ministerial statement:

Government's commitment to women has been reflected in its first year through policies which allow women to make real choices at different stages of their lives. (Australian Government 1997)

In this new national context, a short Ministerial Statement of the Budget's Impact on Women was released by the Minister for the Status of Women, with the budget papers. This Ministerial Statement listed the government's achievements included in the budget with regards to women. It was compiled by the women's policy office without departments being required to provide an assessment of the policy and budget's impact on men and women (Sharp 2007, Budlender 2007). Since 2004 these Ministerial Statements of the Budget's Impact on Women have been developed as a practical resource for a wider audience. It was supported by additional publications on the budget's impact on women on the Office of Status of Women's website, including in the 2007-8 budget a 'Women's Budget Kit'. Sharp (2007: 4) describes this as an 'interesting return to the earlier term of women's budgets' but with little analysis'. Many commentators have observed that with time the 'Federal government document became increasingly less critical and more an exercise in departmental self-justification (Sawer 2002: 51).

At the state and territory government level, there also was a significant scaling back or elimination of the phase 1 initiatives but with some remnants of them being maintained into the early 2000s. In the case of South Australia, a 'residual' form of a Women's Budget Statement was published in the form of an appendix to the budget papers for a period during the early 2000s. In contrast, the Australian Capital Territory Labor government under John Stanhope introduced a Women's Budget Statement in 2004 that consisted of 5-10 pages of the Budget Overview (Budget Paper No 3). The ACT Women's Budget Statement was similar to the phase 1 initiatives. This ACT Women's Budget Statement, the last of the state initiatives, ceased in 2008.

In 2008, the newly elected federal Labor Government's first budget distributed 'Budget 2008-09 Women'. In its Foreword, the Prime Minister and Minister for the Status of Women acknowledged women's contribution to the economy:

The 2008-09 Budget will secure Australia's future and build a strong economy to deliver for working families. The Government values the contribution Australian women make in our workplaces, homes and communities across the country. With this Budget women will share more equally in Australia's prosperity. (Rudd and Plibersek 2008)

... The 2008-09 Women's Budget Statement highlights measures in the Budget that will assist women and their families.

Such a document has been published each year since 2008 and it provides a informative discussion of the policies funded by the government in each budget that are significant for women and gender equality. The budgetary measures discussed refer to the gender gap that needs addressing and the policy and funding that seeks to address it. There are discussions about the revenue side of the budget and there is recognition to the significance of unpaid care work for policy. The 2010-11 Statement identifies gender equality and women's social inclusion as important goals for the government budget. Labor's Women's Budget Statement is an improvement on the previous ministerial statements for its policy detail and there is a gradual improvement on funding specifics. However, as with all government publications, there is a bias towards making the government look good and significant policy and budget downsides are omitted. For example, the document highlighted new budget measures in 2010-11 to improve superannuation (pension) savings for retirement costing \$2.4 billion over 4 years, 'which will benefit women who are overrepresented among lower income earner and who have significantly low superannuation balances' (Australian Government, FaHCSIA 2010;2). However, the fact that the government foregoes \$20 billion a year in tax concessions for retirement savings (a measure that primarily benefits men, particularly high income men), was not mentioned as part of the discussion.

While there is marked a return to the terminology of the 'Women's Budget Statement' under Labor the processes involved in producing this 'Women's Budget Statement' and its relationship with the budget processes and documents are different to that of the first phase. In 'Budget 2009-10 Women', the then Minister for the Status of Women, Ms Tanya Plibersek, observed that the 2009-2010 Women's Budget Statement emerged out of a more careful process: it 'reflects a more rigorous and informative women's budget process' (Plibersek 2009). However, little detail is provided on the process that underpinned the statement. The document is prepared by the Office for Women and the accountability of other ministers and their departments is not obvious. Moreover, the document is not listed on the Department of Treasury's website as one of the official budget papers. Under the first phase, an important element of strengthening the government's accountability was the publishing of the Women's Budget Statements as government budget papers, which aimed to bring the Treasury department to the process as a partner. In its current phase, it is not clear how the Women's Budget Statement engaged with budgetary decision making processes to produce improved policies and funding for women and gender equality.

Some observers have argued that the Women's Budget Statement led the national women's machinery to focus on building trust within the public sector and with its minister and led to its invisibility to its wider constituency. Without significant pressure from outside government there was little challenge to the policy framework (Sharp 2007). However, publishing of the gender analysis as part of the budget papers made it unattractive for women in civil society to read and as a result women were less engaged in making the government accountable for their gender commitments. As noted by Sharp and Broomhill (2002: 38) this was not unexpected:

Realistically, the budget and budgetary processes, in their conventional forms, offer only a limited framework for monitoring progress toward gender equality. They allocate resources on short-term criteria and often on the basis of narrow financial parameters.

Labor's recent Women's Budget Statements do provide some evaluation as to whether policies and resource allocations were achieving longer-term goals of raising women's status and gender equality and this fits uneasily with the traditional budget process. The unanswered question is whether the current form of Women's Budget Statements will become a key tool that civil society embraces.

References

- Australian Bureau of Statistics (2010) *Year Book Australia, 2009–10, Cat No.1301.0*.
www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/Latestproducts/1301.0Main%20Features12009-10?opendocument&tabname=Summary&prodno=1301.0&issue=2009-10&num=&view (accessed 5/5/11).
- Australia Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) (2010) *Australia in brief Australia — an overview* (online). Australia Government: Canberra.
<http://www.dfat.gov.au/aib/overview.html> (accessed 30/01/2011).
- Australia Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) (2008) *Australia in brief - A diverse people* (online). Australia Government: Canberra.
<http://www.dfat.gov.au/aib/society.html> (accessed 30/01/2011).
- Australian Government, Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs (FaHCSIA 2011) 'Engaging with Women's Organisations'.
http://www.fahcsia.gov.au/sa/women/progserv/equal/Pages/engaging_womens_org.aspx (accessed 12/05/11).
- Australian Government, Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs (FaHCSIA 2010) 'Committee on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women: Statement by Australia' July 20, 2010.
http://www.fahcsia.gov.au/about/news/2010/Pages/UN_cedaw.aspx (accessed 12/05/2011).
- Australian Government (1997) 'Overview'. *Budget 1997 – 1998* (online).
<http://www.budget.gov.au/1997-98/oswourco.asp#OSW-OVERVIEW> (accessed 30/01/2011).
- Australia Government (date unspecified) 'About Australia'. *australia.gov.au Your Connection with Government* (online).
<http://australia.gov.au/about-australia/our-country/our-people#AustralianPeople> (accessed 30/01/2011).
- Access Economics (2008) *The impact of the global financial crisis on social services in Australia - An Issues paper prepared by Access Economics for Anglicare Australia, Catholic Social Services Australia, The Salvation Army and Uniting Care Australia* (November 2008).
www.aifs.gov.au/afrc/pubs/newsletter/n13pdf/n13c.pdf (accessed 30/01/2011).
- BBC News (2010) 'Australia country profile'. BBC News (08 September 2010) (online).
http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/country_profiles/1250188.stm (accessed 30/01/2010).
- Blöndal, J.R., Bergvall D., Hawkesworth, I. and Deighton-Smith, R. (2008) Budgeting in Australia *OECD Journal on Budgeting* 8(2): 1 – 64.
- Budlender, Debbie in collaboration with the Commonwealth Secretariat (2007) *Gender Responsive Budgets in the Commonwealth Progress Report 2005 – 2007 Commonwealth Finance Minister's Meeting (Georgetown Guyana 15th -17th October 2007)*. London: Commonwealth Secretariat (FMM(07)17).
<http://www.gender-budgets.org/content/view/472/153/> (accessed 02/06/2009).
- Budlender, Debbie (2002) 'A Profile of Country Activities'. Budlender, D., Elson, D., Hewitt, G. and Mukhopadhyay, T. *Gender Budgets Make Cents Understanding gender responsive budgets*. Commonwealth Secretariat: London.
- Budlender, Debbie and Sharp, Rhonda (1998) *How to do a gender-sensitive budget analysis: Contemporary research and practice*. Commonwealth Secretariat and AusAID: Adelaide.
<http://www.idrc.ca/uploads/user-S/11000392461AusAIDTrainingManual.pdf> (accessed 06/03/2010).
- Broomhill, Ray (2009) '14 May 1986 Paul Keating's 'Banana Republic' Statement and the end of the 'Golden age''. Crotty, M. nd Roberts, D. (Eds.) *Turning Points in Australian History*. UNSW Press: Sydney: 224 -238.

- Cassells, Rebecca Abello, Annie, Vidyattama Yogi and Linc Thurecht (2011) *Viewpoint : The Economic Vitality Report, Issue 3 - A focus on the financial gender divide and its economic impact*, Commonwealth Bank: Sydney
www.canberra.edu.au/centres/natsem/publications (accessed 5/5/11).
- Commonwealth of Australia (2010) *Closing the Gap - Prime Minister's Report*. Australia Government: Canberra.
http://www.fahcsia.gov.au/sa/indigenous/pubs/general/Pages/closing_the_gap_2010.aspx (accessed 30/01/2011).
- Commonwealth Office of the Status of Women (2003) *Australia's Combined Fourth and Fifth Reports to the United Nations on the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women*. Australian Government: Canberra.
<http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/cedaw/34sess.htm> (accessed 16/04/2009).
- Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) (2006) *Concluding comments of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women: Australia Thirty-fourth session (16 January - 3 February 2006)* (CEDAW/C/AUL/CO/5).
<http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/cedaw/34sess.htm> (accessed 30/01/2011).
- Commission on the Status of Women (2007) *Australia's Country statement delivered at the 51st session of the Commission on the Status of Women (26 February – 9 March 2007)*.
http://www.ofw.fahcsia.gov.au/international_engagement/united_nations_csw51.htm (accessed 16/04/2009).
- Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs (Australia Government FaHCSIA) (2010) 'Paid Parental Leave'. *Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs* (FaHCSIA) (online). Australia Government: Canberra.
http://www.fahcsia.gov.au/sa/families/proserv/paid_parental/Pages/default.aspx (accessed 30/01/2011).
- Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs (Australia Government FaHCSIA) (2009) 'The Place of Women in The Economy'. *2009 Women's Budget Statement* (online). Australia Government: Canberra.
http://www.fahcsia.gov.au/about/publicationsarticles/corp/BudgetPAES/budget09_10/women/Documents/p1.htm (accessed 30/01/2011).
- Lake, Marilyn (1999) *Getting Equal – The history of Australian Feminism*. Allen and Unwin: St. Leonards.
- Maddison, Sarah and Partridge, Emma (2007) 'How well does Australian democracy serve Australian Women?'. *Democratic Audit of Australia Report 8*. School of Social Sciences – Australian National University: Canberra.
- OECD (2010a) 'Overview'. *OECD Economic Survey of Australia* (November 2010). OECD.
http://www.oecd.org/document/37/0,3746,en_33873108_33873229_46255013_1_1_1_1,00.html (accessed 30/01/2011).
- OECD (2010b) *Australia - Economic Outlook 88 Country Summary* (online). OECD.
http://www.oecd.org/document/15/0,3746,en_33873108_33873229_45268687_1_1_1_1,00.html (accessed 30/01/2011).
- Plibersek, Tanya - Minister for the Status of Women (2009) 'A message from the Minister for the Status of Women'. *Women's Budget Statement*. Australia Government: Canberra.
http://www.fahcsia.gov.au/about/publicationsarticles/corp/BudgetPAES/budget09_10/women/Documents/default.htm (accessed 30/01/2011).
- Rudd, Kevin (2009) 'The Global Financial Crisis'. *The Monthly - Essays* (02/2009).
<http://www.themonthly.com.au/monthly-essays> (accessed 30/01/2011).

- Rudd, Kevin and Plibersek, Tanya - Prime Minister and Minister for the Status of Women (2008) 'A message from the Prime Minister and the Minister for the Status of Women'. *Women's Budget Statement 2008-09*. Australia Government: Canberra.
<http://www.fahcsia.gov.au/about/publicationsarticles/corp/BudgetPAES/budget2008-09/WomensBudget/Pages/PMMinisterMessage.aspx> (accessed 30/01/2011).
- Sawer, Marian (2009) 'Equity: Blind to gender'. *Australia Policy* (online).
http://www.apo.org.au/webboard/comment_results.html?filename_num=266750 (accessed 23/03/2009).
- Sawer, Marian (2008) *Making women Count – A history of the Women's electoral lobby in Australia*. UNSW Press: Sydney.
- Sawer, Marian (2007) 'Australia: the Fall of the Femocrat'. Outshoorn, J. and Kantola, J. (Eds.) *Changing State Feminism*. Palgrave Macmillan: Hampshire: 20 -40.
- Sawer, Marian (2002) 'Australia: The Mandarin Approach to Gender Budgets', in Debbie Budlender & Guy Hewitt (Eds.) *Gender Budget Make More Cents*, Commonwealth Secretariat: London: 43-64.
- Sawer, Marian (1990) *Sisters in suits – Women and public policy in Australia*. Allen & Unwin: Sydney.
- Sharp, Rhonda and Elson, Diane (2008) 'Improving budgets: a framework for assessing gender-responsive budget initiatives', Mastuti, S. et al, *Audit Gender Terhadap Anggaran*. CiBa: Jakarta.
www.unisanet.unisa.edu.au/genderbudgets (accessed 05/02/2010).
- Sharp, Rhonda (2007) 'Gender Responsive Budgets Have a place in financing Gender Equality and women's Empowerment'. United Nations Division for the Advancement of Women Expert Group Meeting on financing for gender equality and the empowerment of women - Oslo 4-7/09/ 2007 (EGM/FFGE/2007/EP.4)
www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/egm/financing_gender_equality/ExpertPapers/EP.4%2520Sharp.pdf (accessed 30/01/2011).
- Sharp, Rhonda (2003a) *Budgeting for equity: Gender budget initiatives within a framework of performance oriented budgeting*, United Nations Development Fund for Women UNIFEM, New York.
- Sharp, Rhonda (2003b) 'Government budgets: Integrating a gender perspective'. Argyrous, G. and Stilwell, F. (editors) *Economics as a Social Science*, second edition. Pluto: Annadale: 243-246.
- Sharp, Rhonda (2002) 'Moving forward: Multiple strategies and guiding goals'. Judd, K. *Gender budget initiatives: Strategies, concepts and experiences*. UNIFEM: New York: 86-98.
- Sharp, Rhonda (2000) 'Gender responsive budgets: The Australian Experience'. Paper prepared for the International Workshop on Gender Auditing of Government Budgets, Rome, 15th -16th September.
- Sharp, Rhonda and Broomhill, Ray (2002) 'Budgeting for equality: The Australian experience'. *Feminist Economics* 8(1): 25 – 47.
- Sharp, Rhonda and Broomhill, Ray (1990) 'Women and Government Budgets'. *Australian Journal of Social Issues* 25(1): 1-14.
- Tanton, Robert (2010) 'The city, the country, the rich bush and the poor bush'. *Australian Policy Online* (online) (19/10/2010). Institute of Social Research: Hawthorn.
<http://www.apo.org.au/commentary/city-country-rich-bush-and-poor-bush> (accessed 30/01/2011).
- UNDP (2007) *Fighting Climate Change: Human Solidarity in a Divided World*. UNDP: New York.
<http://hdr.undp.org/en/reports/global/hdr2007-2008/> (accessed 12/10/2009).
- UNDP (2006) *Human Development Report: Beyond scarcity: Power, poverty and the global water crisis*. United Nations Development Programme: New York.
www.hdr.undp.org/hdr2006/ (accessed 30/01/2011).
- United States Government Central Intelligence Unite (US CIA) (2011) 'Australia- Oceania: Australia'. *The World Factbook* (12/01/2011) (online). US Government.
<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/as.html> (accessed 30/01/2011).

Women's Rights Action Network (2005) *Australian NGO Shadow Report on the Implementation of the Convention on the Elimination of All forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW)*. Women's Rights Action Network Australia
www.pwd.org.au/documents/pubs/SB09-CEDAW-NGO.doc (accessed 30/01/2011).

YWCA Australia and Women's Legal Services Australia (2009) *NGO Report on the Implementation of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) in Australia*.
www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cedaw/docs/ngos/YWCA_Australia46.pdf (accessed 31/01/2011).