

**Cooley, Dorota (REPS)**

---

**From:** Murphy, Julanne M [Julanne.M.Murphy@team.telstra.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, 18 September 2008 4:23 PM  
**To:** Committee, Treaties (REPS)  
**Subject:** FW: CEDAW

**SUBMISSION NO. 15**

**TT on 26 August 2008**

To the Committee Secretary, Joint Standing Committee on Treaties, House of Representatives<

The UN Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) Committee has made some ideologically specific calls to date reflected in the line of questioning that the CEDAW committee pursues when examining country reports.

For example, in the 1997 examination of Australia's report, the Committee experts took their line of questioning from the Shadow Report put in by a small, self-selected group of rather narrowly-focused Australian NGO's.

Amongst the questions Australia had to take on notice from the Committee, were:

- \* Are textbooks in Australia being changed so as to arrive at gender-equal education?
- \* (re medically assisted reproduction) Are unmarried women entitled to access to treatment? Who covers cost?
- \* Why under Tasmanian law are single women allowed to adopt children solely in exceptional circumstances?
- \* What proposals does the federal government have with regard to abortion?

This is not a trustworthy Committee. The lesson to be drawn here is that it is unwise to entrust serious issues where there is deep dissent on religious, cultural and ethical grounds to ideologically driven 'experts' such as the majority of CEDAW Committee members.

Australia should not ratify the CEDAW protocol.

Julanne Murphy