

15<sup>th</sup> July 2011

NSW Commission for Children and Young People  
Ms Megan Mitchell - Commissioner  
Level 3, 407 Elizabeth Street  
Surry Hills. 2010

cc: Ms Lou-Anne Lind

Good morning Ms Mitchell,

I refer to correspondence from Lou-Ann Lind dated the 13<sup>th</sup> October and from you dated the 22<sup>nd</sup> December 2010.

You may recall my writing to you regarding the circumcision of my son, Connor.

It has been almost a year now since he was circumcised without my consent.

I continue to fight an uphill battle to have anyone simply tell me plainly that I should finally accept that, in the view of the many Commissions, Departments, Councils and other bodies that have overlapping jurisdictions in this area, the circumcision of my son was essentially none of my business and that the morality of performing non-medically indicated surgery on infants should continue to be seen as de rigueur.

On the 29<sup>th</sup> of December last I wrote to you enclosing the two responses I had received from the NSW government on this issue. I'm hoping that your lack of response to these letters was out of embarrassment at even receiving your pay from the same source as the authors.

On reviewing my bulging portfolio of largely useless replies only one thing is certain. Namely, that the pro-circumcision lobby elicits knee-trembling fear amongst politicians, bureaucrats and regulators. Generally, even the most general question regarding the morality of routine infant circumcision has them scurrying under their desks like scared rabbits.

Then again, perhaps I always underestimated the simple mathematics of the situation. Parents who demand the right to mutilate their little boys have a vote. The infants at the receiving end of the scalpel do not.

I do, however, have a question for you Ms Mitchell. In Ms Lind's letter to me of the 13 October last, she said that "The Tasmanian Commissioner for Children assumed the lead role for this issue within the ACCG". Now that the bloodied axe of the pro-circumcision lobby is metaphorically sitting beside the body of Paul Mason, who will now assume that 'lead role'?

Or will Paul Mason's demise ensure, as intended, that anyone who had started to act on this issue will return to a state of silent and compliant ambivalence?

As a footnote, one of Ms Lind's suggestions in the same letter was that I approach the Australian Human Rights Commission. You'll no doubt be enthralled by the intellectual analysis that I received. My response to that letter, as is so often the case with the Australian bureaucracy I'm afraid, has simply been ignored, despite two subsequent requests.

Yours sincerely,