

22nd July 2012

The Hon Tanya Plibersek MP
150 Broadway
Broadway. 2077

Good morning Ms Plibersek,

On the 18th of May I wrote to you regarding infant male circumcision and, in particular, the fact that my son was circumcised without my parental consent.

I asked that you review a previous letter that I had sent to the Prime Minister, Julia Gillard and a subsequent reply from the then Minister for Health and Ageing, Nicola Roxon. I requested that you then offer your thoughts, policy and position.

These and other letters may be found at www.MyCircumcisionDisgrace.org

It is now over two months since I sent my letter to you. Regrettably, my request that I be provided with a timely reply appears not to have been possible.

My site has generated a multitude of responses from all over the world. One was from a human rights proponent in China. As with all but a very few respondents she is aghast that my son could possibly have been subjected to circumcision without the informed written consent of both parents. She also suggested that my letters posed too many complex arguments to politicians, bureaucrats and regulators. Upon reflection, I agree with her.

Against the backdrop of my letter to the Prime Minister and Ms Roxon's reply to it, could I ask you two very direct and, I hope, simple questions:

1. Ms Roxon's reply stated Commonwealth Health Department recognition (recognition which could easily be construed as support) of the notion that infant male circumcision is countenanced for a number of non-medical reasons. **Do you or your department countenance infant male circumcision for ANY reason other than demonstrable, scientifically justifiable medical imperative or therapeutic benefit?**
2. Ms Cathy Rainsford from the Attorney Generals Department assures me that the Family Law Act supports the proposition that the circumcision of my little boy was simply none of my business. **Ms Plibersek, even if non-medically indicated infant male circumcision is to somehow be allowed and justified, do you or your department support the view that it should be performed with the consent of only one parent, in potential deference to the views of the other parent?**

As I have previously noted, the journey to both cause change to the way that this 'procedure' is viewed generally and the consent regime that legitimises it is taking far longer than it should.

I have now posed two very simple questions which I feel should reasonably be able to be answered in a time frame of weeks rather than months.

Yours sincerely,