

## **Current sex discrimination by the Australian Federal Government and all State Government**

### **Sex / Gender discrimination**

The real joke (oxymoron) about gender / sex discrimination is that in order to prevent / enforce it, you have to apply it. This reform of legislature was being discussed on ABC national's Australia Talks show last week, and one man called in about a comedy show titled "stupid stupid man". It's a sad reflection on society and those making our laws when comedy is viewed as discrimination, yet you couldn't produce a comedy titled "stupid women" without risking persecution.

In the last couple of weeks, a web log (blog) called me a "men's rights campaigner" as though there was something wrong with expecting men to be treated as equally as women in all areas of society. Was that not what the suffragettes asked for in the early years of last century, that all women be treated as equally as men in all areas of society?

The problem is that somewhere between the suffragettes and now, radical feminism reared its ugly head. I don't have a problem with feminism, per se, women being treated equally, not being sexually harassed in the workplace, equal pay for equal work etc., however we still see groups like the National Council for Single Mothers and their Children (NCSMC) trying to portray that equal pay isn't happening, simply because on average a woman earns less, without looking at the reasons why.

Some radicals (feminist) like Andrea Dorkin, felt society would be better without men.

### **Legislation & office**

The Child Support (assessment) Act 1989 (fed) discriminates on a basis of marital status.  
The Child Support (registration and collection) Act 1988 (fed) discriminates on a basis of marital status.

The Sexual Discrimination Act 1984 (fed) implements items from the United Nations that are gender based

The Crimes Act 1900 (nsw) s 21, s22A

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PERSONS (CARE AND PROTECTION) ACT 1998 S  
229(2)(b)

The Office for the Status for Women is gender based discrimination practiced at both state and federal level.

### **Teoh and sex discrimination**

For ten years the Federal government attempted to over ride the decisions in Teoh, which highlighted that Australian citizens have a right to expect the legislature to uphold the obligations placed on them by the executive government signing international treaties.

Our government signs these international treaties and then give no credence to the obligations placed on them by that.

### **NSW EDU**

From my involvement in a fathers support group, we have had highlighted to us that NSW TAFE can advertise programs specifically for women but it is illegal for them to do the same with programs specifically for men.

### **Violence against Women, Australia Says No**

This campaign is based on flawed research. The 2005 Personal Safety Survey conducted by the ABS shows that violence against women is far less of an issue than violence against men. Simply put, the title of the campaign is gender based and therefore sexual discrimination. VicHealth claim that violence against women is the leading cause of female death and injury. The ABS mortality statistics regularly show that fewer women die from violent acts than in auto accidents. I don't know which data VicHealth is using, however that data obviously has not been investigated properly, similar to the "global warming" data.

### **Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women**

Once again a discriminatory title, yet our executive government saw fit to sign off on this without complaining that it is discrimination on a gender basis? I dissent from the opinion of the NCPP in their submission with regards to this document; this document should be viewed with contempt because it practices reverse discrimination.

The executive should seek sincere opinion from society before signing such a discriminatory document.

**CHILDREN AND YOUNG PERSONS (CARE AND PROTECTION) ACT 1998 -  
SECT 229**

**Unauthorised removal of children and young persons**

(2) A person who:

(b) permits a child who is not in the charge of the **child's mother** to be taken from the premises without first obtaining the consent of the Director-General, is guilty of an offence.

The above was enacted to prevent babies and very young children from being abducted from a hospital, and should read "child's parent". As the law stands, a father could be guilty of an offence and prosecuted.

There are so many cases similar in state and federal legislation that every act of every state and territory and federal acts also, will need to be reworded to remove the gender discrimination. We, as a nation would have to retract the executive's signature on international documents that discriminate as above.

**Patriae Mater**

The judiciary would have to cease using 800 year old recognised terms like "parens patriae", it would become "parens persona", the problem with this is that we live in a patriarchal society, matrimony would be a banned word, as would son, daughter, brother, sister, mother, father, aunty, uncle, man, women. You couldn't do a paternity test; there would be no maternity wards in hospitals. Now all this might sound ridiculous, it does to me however this is where we are heading in our delve to meet Orwell status.

Ross C Mitchell  
Newcastle NSW