

**Submission by Save the Children New Zealand
to the**

Justice and Electoral Select Committee on the

**Crimes (Abolition of Force as Justification for Child
Discipline) Amendment Bill**

Introduction

1. Save the Children New Zealand (SCNZ) is part of the International Save the Children Alliance, comprising 29 member countries working in more than 100 countries. Save the Children has been championing children's rights since 1919. Our founder, Eglantyne Jebb, drafted the first statement of children's rights, the Declaration of the Rights of the Child, which was adopted by the League of Nations in 1924 and formed the basis of the Declaration of the Rights of the Child as adopted by the United Nations in 1959. This went on to form the foundation for the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) as was adopted by the United Nations in 1988. The UNCRC came into force in 1990 and was ratified by New Zealand in 1993.
2. The International Save the Children Alliance works towards eliminating all forms of control and punishment of children, which breach their fundamental human rights. The Alliance (and therefore SCNZ) is committed to working towards eliminating, through education, legal reform and other measures, all forms of control and punishment of children, in the family, schools and all other settings, which breach children's fundamental rights to respect for their physical integrity and human dignity¹.
3. Save the Children New Zealand is a non-political, non-sectarian development agency that delivers immediate and lasting improvements to children's lives worldwide. Save the Children New Zealand has a membership of 4000 across 30 Branches and an annual supporter base of approximately 18,000. All of our work is underpinned by the principles laid out in the UNCRC.

¹ International Save the Children Alliance position and definition of Corporal/Physical Punishment and other forms of Humiliating or Degrading Punishment.

4. Here in New Zealand our work includes the lobbying of government and the wider community, providing information and education in child rights and development, and highlighting any deficiencies in public policy and practice which represent a failure to ensure children's rights are met. It is with this purpose we present our submission on the Crimes (Abolition of Force as Justification for Child Discipline) Amendment Bill.

Key points of the submission

5. Section 59 of the Crimes Act 1961² is a breach of children's rights. It is unacceptable to continue to justify a persisting breach of fundamental human rights. By repealing section 59 the government will remove a statutory defence that can and has been used as a legal defence in situations where assaults resulting in injury of a child have been excused as reasonable force.
6. Physical punishment is a risk factor for child abuse. Long term use of physical punishment impacts negatively on the development of children. The high rate of child deaths and apparent high level of social acceptance of physical punishment in New Zealand, (with the exception of schools where corporal punishment³ is prohibited), indicates the need for a change in social attitude towards how we care for and protect children. Legislative change needs to lead the way.
7. Repealing section 59 is not anti-discipline, it is anti-abuse. Adults have a responsibility to ensure that children receive the same protection from abuse and violence as adults. A repeal of section 59 needs to be accompanied with ongoing parent and public education, support and awareness raising.
8. Legislation to protect and care for children needs to be consistent. Section 59 of the Crimes Act is in conflict with the principles and intent of existing laws. Its repeal and associated amendments to sections 139A (1) & (2) of the Education Act (1989) will ensure that New Zealand law is more child focused and working in the best interest of children's care and protection.
9. Children are clear on their need for guidance, support and discipline from adults. They are also aware that physical punishment is a first resort, often used in anger and resulting in a confusing and conflicting message when violent behaviour is modelled as a response to violent actions (e.g. being hit for hitting). Children want to see the government put in place

² Section 59 of the Crimes Act (1961) "Every parent of a child and, subject to subsection (3), every person in the place of the parent of a child is justified in using force by way of correction towards the child, if the force used is reasonable in the circumstances."

³ Corporal punishment and physical punishment are used interchangeably internationally and define an action by a parent, caregiver or teacher that is intended to cause physical pain or discomfort to a child. In NZ corporal punishment is more often referred to in the context of institutions and educational facilities such as schools (and is against the law) and physical punishment is used in the context of home and family settings (and is currently allowed as long as the force is considered reasonable).

laws that protect them and for adults to be supported in their roles and responsibilities as parents and care givers.

Comment

Section 59 of the Crimes Act 1961 is a breach of children's rights.

"There's got to be some other ways to discipline rather than hitting kids. You never forget what happened when you were younger." (14 year-old girl)

10. The United Nations, the UNCRC, the UN Committee Against Torture, the New Zealand Human Rights Commission and the Tasmanian Law Reform Institute all support the view that section 59 of the Crimes Act is a breach of children's rights.
11. The three articles of the UNCRC which are of direct relevance to this submission are articles 3, 19 & 37 (see Appendix 1 for the full text of these articles). Article 3 states that all actions that involve children should consider their best interest and that the Government should look after children when their parents, or anyone else responsible for looking after them does not. Article 19 ensures children are protected from abuse and neglect by making sure that the Government takes all legislative, administrative, social and educative measures to protect children. Article 37 makes sure that Government protects children from torture, inhumane, cruel or degrading treatment or punishment.
12. Section 59 of the Crimes Act permits parents and caregivers to use force as a means of correction, as long as that force is reasonable in the circumstances. This anomaly effectively excuses and thereby endorses the use of physical force against children and has, in some cases, been used as a legal defence in the abuse of children. This is in direct conflict with the articles of the UNCRC outlined above.
13. Following the New Zealand Government's report to the UNCRC Committee in 2003 the Committee expressed deep concern that there had still not been amendment to section 59 of the Crimes Act and they recommended that there be an amendment to the legislation to prohibit corporal punishment in the home. The Committee also recommended that public education campaigns and activities, promoting non-violent forms of discipline and raising awareness of the negative consequences of corporal punishment, be undertaken (see the Appendix 2 for the full wording and recommendations). The implementation of these recommendations was also endorsed by the United Nations Committee Against Torture in 2004.
14. Save the Children New Zealand acknowledges that the Government has begun to address the Committee's recommendations through the implementation of an effective education initiative Strategies with Kids: Information for Parents (SKIP). However a child's right to protection from abuse, violence, inhumane and degrading punishment is not sufficiently

addressed through educative programmes alone, no matter how successful they are. Overseas experience shows that a change in social attitude follows more quickly if legislative change leads the way.⁴

15. The New Zealand Human Rights Commission's Action Plan for Human Rights⁵ also prioritises the repeal of section 59 as a means of ensuring every child and young person in New Zealand is safe and violence is not tolerated.
16. The Tasmania Law Reform Institute's report⁶ on Physical Punishment of Children states that, allowing the physical punishment of children means that they do not enjoy the same right to physical integrity as adults and that this implies that children are not entitled to the same dignity and respect as adults, effectively treating them as lesser human beings.
17. Any amendment to section 59 in an attempt to determine what is safe or reasonable force is unacceptable. Amendment perpetuates the view that violence is acceptable. It does not address the breach of children's rights as any use of force is not in the best interest of a child's fundamental right to protection. Repealing section 59 ensures children's rights and their best interests are fully protected by the law and makes certain that children receive the same protection from abuse and neglect as adults.

Save the Children New Zealand recommends that:

- ?? **Section 59 of the Crimes Act 1961 be repealed.**
- ?? **Repeal of section 59 be accompanied with ongoing funding and resourcing of educative and skill building programmes such as SKIP.**

New Zealand's social tolerance to child abuse and the use of force in disciplining children has a negative impact on children's development. This is not effective discipline.

"You feel upset because they are hurting you and you love them so much and then all of a sudden they hit and hurt you and you feel like as though they don't care about you because they are hurting you." (13 year-old girl)

18. The UNICEF League Table of Child Maltreatment Deaths in Rich Nations⁷ puts New Zealand as having the fifth highest rate of deaths from child homicide and child maltreatment out of the 27 OECD countries

⁴ *Ending Corporal Punishment of Children: Making it happen.* (2001). Save the Children, London.

⁵ <http://www.hrc.co.nz/report/actionplan/0foreword.html>

⁶ Tasmania Law Reform Institute. (2003). *Physical Punishment of Children*, 4:October 2003.

⁷ UNICEF. (September 2003). *A League Table of Child Maltreatment Deaths in Rich Nations* Innocenti Report Card: Issue No. 5, September 2003. UNICEF.

studied⁸. Recent national survey's and public polls have indicated that physical punishment of children has a high level of social acceptance within New Zealand society. This along with a recent study of children's views on family discipline⁹, which showed a concerning number of children being smacked or hit around the face and/or head and with implements, raises some very real concerns about the level of social tolerance of physical punishment when disciplining children.

19. Studies have shown that those children exposed to harsh physical punishment at a young age suffer not only physical injury but also experience a long-lasting impact on their developing sense of self^{10 11}. A summary of international research on the discipline and guidance of children undertaken by the Children's Issues Centre and the Office of the Children's Commissioner¹² reports that there is an overwhelming consistency in findings of studies that indicate the long-term parental use of physical punishment is associated with negative outcomes for children's behaviour. There is strong evidence that physical punishment is a risk factor in the development of problem behaviour in children. Some of the negative developmental outcomes associated with physical punishment include:
- the development of antisocial behaviour
 - poorer performance on intellectual tasks
 - poorer quality of parent child relationships and attachments
 - the development of mental health problems
 - lower chances that children will internalise parental rules and values.
20. Children are at their most vulnerable in their early years, yet this is most often the time in which parents use physical punishment as a means of family discipline¹³. Parents often justify this behaviour through a child's inability to understand reasoning and explanation - 'a smack is the only thing that works'. While the fear, threat or action of physical punishment may bring an immediate reaction that appears to stop the negative

⁸ Of the 27 OECD countries in the report who have explicit laws protecting children from all forms of corporal punishment only Hungary rates worse than New Zealand. Hungary's legislation amendment took place in 2004 and was put into force in 2005, the UNICEF report relates to data collected prior to the legislative change.

⁹ Dobbs, T. (2005). *INSIGHTS: Children and young people speak out about family discipline*. Save the Children New Zealand, Wellington..

¹⁰ Durrant, J.E. (2005). Corporal Punishment: Prevalence, Predictors and Implications for Child Behaviour and Development in *Eliminating Corporal Punishment: the way forward to constructive child discipline*. UNESCO

¹¹ See Tasmania Law Reform, note 6.

¹² Smith, A.B., Gollop, M.M., Taylor, N.J. & Marshall, K.A. (2004). *The Discipline and Guidance of Children: A summary of Research*. Children's Issues Centre, University of Otago and the Office of the Children's Commissioner.

¹³ *Joint Statement on Physical Punishment of Children and Youth*. Coalition on the Physical Punishment of Children and Youth, April 2003. <http://www.cheo.on.ca/english/1120.html>

behaviour, research shows that physical punishment does little to assist with long term changes in behaviour^{14 15}. Physical punishment often results in resentment and subsequent further negative behaviour¹⁶ which can in itself cause the use of force to escalate over time with the intent to punish resulting in serious injury¹⁷.

21. The public messages are currently confusing when it comes to guidance on disciplining children. The very useful and constructive SKIP educational material¹⁸ notes that “ Guidance, or discipline, is most effective in a warm and loving relationship, where your child feels supported and secure.” It also goes on to say that “Smacking or hitting doesn’t teach your child what they did wrong. It teaches then that hitting other people is okay.” These positive discipline statements are directly in conflict with the existing legislation of section 59 which states that force is acceptable when disciplining children as long as it is reasonable.
22. Repealing section 59 will set a clear standard that no force is reasonable and reinforce the current education messages promoted by SKIP and other NGO parent education programmes. The concerning high level of public acceptance of physical punishment also presents a strong case for leading the way with legislative directive. As the Hon Steve Maharey states¹⁹

There is no doubt that any changes to laws concerning the physical discipline of children will be controversial. That is good. It is time for New Zealanders to think long and hard about the amount of violence that is aimed at children. The horror stories we read about in the newspaper are just the tip of a very large iceberg which sees far too many children hurt by the very people who are supposed to be caring for them. Changing the way adults think about children and what is an appropriate way to discipline them is central to lowering the number of children who are scarred for life by violence.

23. The publicised apparent lack of public support for repeal of section 59 is not an unusual climate for legislative change. As the Tasmanian Law Reform Institute Report ²⁰states “ None of the countries that have banned physical punishment to date had prior support in opinion polls”. In fact, it is not until after legislative change that change in social attitude

¹⁴ See Joint Statement, note 13.

¹⁵ See Smith, A.B., et al., note 12.

¹⁶ See Dobbs. T., note 9.

¹⁷ See Tasmania Law Reform, note 6.

¹⁸ SKIP (2004). *Managing behaviour for under fives*. Ministry of Social Development.

¹⁹ News and happenings from the Office of Hon Steve Maharey Volume 3, Issue Number 78, 2 December 2002
(http://www.labour.org.nz/Our_mps_top/steve_maharey/Newsletters/news10/index.html#5)

²⁰ See Tasmania Law Reform, note 6.

really begins to be apparent. Mike Roguski²¹ from the Ministry of Social Development also notes that “Following legislative changes in Sweden, public support for physical punishment has steadily declined”.

Save the Children New Zealand recommends that:

- ?? **A standard of zero tolerance towards violence and abuse to children be adopted and a clear message made by repealing section 59.**
- ?? **That the public be made more aware of the negative impacts of physical punishment and steps be taken to address the high levels of social tolerance of violence towards children.**

Repealing section 59 is not anti-discipline.

“Mums and Dads should talk nicely, would be better than angry stuff.” (5 year-old boy)

24. Public misconception is that by repealing section 59 the government is telling parents how to parent and removing a parent’s right to parent. This is not the case, repealing section 59 simply removes a law which has been used to defend the abuse of children.
25. The UNCRC clearly affirms the role of the parent and family. The Preamble states that ‘the family, as the fundamental group of society and the natural environment for the growth and well-being of all its members and particularly children, should be afforded the necessary protection and assistance and that the child, for the full and harmonious development of his or her personality should grow up in a family environment, in an atmosphere of happiness, love and understanding.’²² Article 5 of the UNCRC clearly affirms the rights and responsibilities of parents and caregivers (see Appendix 3 for full text). These parental rights and responsibilities however are conditional to their being actioned in a way that is consistent with the evolving capacities of the child and which recognises the rights of the child as set out by the UNCRC.
26. Section 59 breaches both the intent of the UNCRC and the primary responsibility of the parent or caregiver to ensure that the rights of their child(ren) are met, in that section 59 protects parents and caregivers before it protects children. The UNCRC, whilst recognising the importance of family and parental guidance, is clearly intent on ensuring the best interests of children are paramount. Repealing section 59 sets a standard that puts the protection of children first and ensures that the discipline of children by parents and caregivers is in the best interest of children and is without abuse and violence.

²¹ Roguski, M. (2004). *Discipline or Punishment: a conference review*. Social Policy Journal of New Zealand, Issue 23. Ministry of Social Development. <http://www.msd.govt.nz/publications/journal/23-december-2004/23-pages195-199.html>

²² Ennew, J. & Stephenson, P. (2004). *Questioning the basis of our work: Christianity, children’s rights and development*. Tearfund.

27. An area of public concern about repealing section 59 is that parents and caregivers will be labelled as criminals for giving their children light smacks. While technically a repeal of section 59 will mean that any physical force used to punish children could be termed assault, it is expected that minor assaults would not be prosecuted, in the same way that trivial assaults between adults are currently not prosecuted. Other countries who have changed their law in a similar way have not experienced an increase in prosecutions. Increases in the reporting of assaults have been recorded²³, this is to be expected due to increased public awareness of the issues resulting from changing in the law.
28. The first aim of repeal, linked to awareness-raising and public education, is to raise awareness of the right of the child to equal protection. Changing the law and linking this to awareness-raising seeks to change attitudes and reduce violence towards children. Adult awareness of the issues is likely to increase and result in more reporting. It should be emphasised that currently minor assaults while clearly unlawful seldom get to court.

Save the Children New Zealand recommends that

- ?? **Children’s best interests be put first by repealing section 59.**
- ?? **Repeal of section 59 be closely linked to public education and awareness raising initiatives.**
- ?? **Information and guidelines be developed to alleviate any public concerns about risks of prosecution.**

Section 59 is in conflict with existing laws.

*“They [parents] do act differently sometimes, don’t know why, it’s confusing.”
(7 year-old boy)*

29. When asked the question ‘When children do things they shouldn’t, do parents always act the same way?’ a 7 year-old boy answered with the quote above²⁴. New Zealand legislation setting out to protect children receives a similar response, it acts differently, it is not always clear why and it can be confusing.
30. Section 59 of the Crimes Act (1961) and its permissible use of force, conflicts with the principles of existing New Zealand legislation such as the Children and Young Persons Act (1989), the Domestic Violence Act (1995), the Care of Children Act (2004) the Guardianship Act (1967), the

²³ See Tasmania Law Reform, note 6.

²⁴ See Dobbs. T., note 9.

New Zealand Bill of Rights Act (1990), the Human Rights Act (1993), and the Crimes of Torture Act (1989)^{25 26}.

31. To ensure consistency across legislation, section 59 of the Crimes Act needs to be repealed and sections 139A (1) & (2) of the Education Act (1989) need to be amended by omitting the words 'unless that person is a guardian of the student or child'. This amendment to the Education Act will ensure that the physical punishment of children is not permitted in any place of care.
32. Legislation needs to be consistent in how it protects children and their best interests. A repeal of section 59 and the associated amendments to the Education Act will remove the conflict with existing laws and enable New Zealand to join the 15 other countries who already have legislation that fully protects children from all forms of corporal and physical punishment (see appendix 4 for a list of these).

Save the Children New Zealand recommends that

?? Stated amendments be made to sections 139A (1) & (2) of the Education Act (1989).

Children's voices should be listened to.

"Most kids get smacked for hurting someone like kicking your brother or sister." (9 year-old boy)

33. As article 12 of the UNCRC states, children have the right to express their opinion freely and to have their opinion considered in things that affect them. As Robert Ludbrook notes²⁷ "Parents are a much more powerful and articulate lobby group than children and the emphasis on parental rights ignores that children are the group most affected by physical punishment and that their views should be given no less weight than those of groups arguing for the rights of parents."
34. A recent study by Terry Dobbs²⁸, *Insights: Children and young people speak out about family discipline*, was undertaken so that children's voices could help inform the public's understanding and the development of appropriate discipline approaches. While this study focused more widely than physical punishment the findings are significant in the consideration of what is in the best interest of children.

²⁵ *Discipline and punishment of children: a rights-based review of laws, attitudes and practices in East Asia and the Pacific: Save the Children Sweden Southeast Asia and the Pacific, regional submission on the UN Secretary General's Global Study on Violence Against Children.* (2005). Save the Children Sweden.

²⁶ *Ending legalised violence against children: Report for East Asia & Pacific Regional Consultation.* (2005). Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children. London.

²⁷ See Tasmania Law Reform, note 6.

²⁸ See Dobbs. T., note 9.

35. The findings of the research support the fact that there needs to be greater awareness, information and support for non-physical forms of discipline. Removal of the legal defence for physical punishment (section 59) is an important component of changing attitudes about the use of physical punishment by parents and caregivers.
36. The findings from Dobbs' study relevant in this context are:
- Children understand why they should behave well
 - Parents are not always clear about why they are disciplining children
 - Children can identify effective parental styles
 - Children report heavy use and dangerous levels of physical punishment as a primary means of discipline
 - Children report physical punishment as a negative experience
 - Children associate physical punishment with anger
 - Violent behaviour is modelled as a response to violent behaviour (children are hit for hitting)
 - Children have clear advice about effective parenting techniques
37. During the United Nations General Assembly's Special Session on Children in 2002 four hundred children from around the world created a statement entitled 'A World Fit for Us'.²⁹ As part of this statement children wanted to see "An end to exploitation, abuse and violence. Laws that protect children from exploitation and abuse being implemented and respected by all."
38. At the Children's Forum for the East Asia and Pacific Regional Consultation for the United Nations Study on Violence Against Children³⁰ representatives from 13 different countries in the region made the following recommendations in relation to violence against children in the home and family:
- ?? Governments should give training to the parents on how to communicate with children in a nice way. Parents should not say bad words that cause children to lose confidence. Governments should educate parents and others on the roles and responsibilities they have to children. Children should not be called bad names.
 - ?? Organisations should be set up that protect children from physical abuse and educate parents and others who have responsibilities to children to prevent violence in families. Governments should put into practice harsh penalties for people who use corporal punishment in the family.
39. Children understand that they need guidance and support to behave well. They are also clear that physical punishment is not an effective way to do this. Children have clearly made recommendations asking for

²⁹ *A world Fit for Us*. (2002). Save the Children New Zealand.

³⁰ *Recommendations from children on Violence Against Children*. (2005). UNICEF.
http://www.crin.org/docs/eac_vac_childfriendly.pdf

governments and adults to take responsibility to ensure that they are protected from abuse and violence. It is our responsibility to ensure that children receive such protection.

Save the Children New Zealand recommends that

?? Children's voices be heard and that the repeal of section 59 be accompanied with ongoing public education on positive non-violent discipline.

Summary of Recommendations

- 1. Section 59 of the Crimes Act 1961 be repealed.**
- 2. Repeal of section 59 be accompanied with ongoing funding and resourcing of educative and skill building programmes such as SKIP.**
- 3. A standard of zero tolerance towards violence and abuse to children be adopted and a clear message made by repealing section 59.**
- 4. That the public be made more aware of the negative impacts of physical punishment and steps be taken to address the high levels of social tolerance of violence towards children.**
- 5. Children's best interests be put first by repealing section 59.**
- 6. Repeal of section 59 be closely linked to public education and awareness raising initiatives.**
- 7. Information and guidelines be developed to alleviate any public concerns about risks of prosecution.**
- 8. Stated amendments be made to sections 139A (1) & (2) of the Education Act (1989).**
- 9. Children's voices be heard and that the repeal of section 59 be accompanied with ongoing public education on positive non-violent discipline.**

Sonya Hogan
New Zealand Programme Coordinator
Save the Children New Zealand

John Bowis
Executive Director
Save the Children New Zealand

Acknowledgement

All the quotes from children and young people in this submission are from the research undertaken by Terry Dobbs (INSIGHTS: Children and young people speak out on family discipline).

Appendix 1

Articles 3, 19 and 37 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child

Article 3

1. In all actions concerning children, whether undertaken by public or private social welfare institutions, courts of law, administrative authorities or legislative bodies, the best interests of the child shall be a primary consideration.
2. States Parties undertake to ensure the child such protection and care as is necessary for his or her well-being, taking into account the rights and duties of his or her parents, legal guardians, or other individuals legally responsible for him or her, and, to this end, shall take all appropriate legislative and administrative measures.
3. States Parties shall ensure that the institutions, services and facilities responsible for the care or protection of children shall conform with the standards established by competent authorities, particularly in the areas of safety, health, in the number and suitability of their staff, as well as competent supervision.

Article 19

1. States Parties shall take all appropriate legislative, administrative, social and educational measures to protect the child from all forms of physical or mental violence, injury or abuse, neglect or negligent treatment, maltreatment or exploitation, including sexual abuse, while in the care of parent(s), legal guardian(s) or any other person who has the care of the child.
2. Such protective measures should, as appropriate, include effective procedures for the establishment of social programmes to provide necessary support for the child and for those who have the care of the child, as well as for other forms of prevention and for identification, reporting, referral, investigation, treatment and follow-up of instances of child maltreatment described heretofore, and, as appropriate, for judicial involvement.

Article 37

- States Parties shall ensure that:
- (a) No child shall be subjected to torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. Neither capital punishment nor life imprisonment without possibility of release shall be imposed for offences committed by persons below eighteen years of age;
 - (b) No child shall be deprived of his or her liberty unlawfully or arbitrarily. The arrest, detention or imprisonment of a child shall be in conformity with the law and shall be used only as a measure of last resort and for the shortest appropriate period of time;

(c) Every child deprived of liberty shall be treated with humanity and respect for the inherent dignity of the human person, and in a manner which takes into account the needs of persons of his or her age. In particular, every child deprived of liberty shall be separated from adults unless it is considered in the child's best interest not to do so and shall have the right to maintain contact with his or her family through correspondence and visits, save in exceptional circumstances;

(d) Every child deprived of his or her liberty shall have the right to prompt access to legal and other appropriate assistance, as well as the right to challenge the legality of the deprivation of his or her liberty before a court or other competent, independent and impartial authority, and to a prompt decision on any such action.

Appendix 2

United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child Committee recommendations para 29 & 30 (CRC/C/15/Add.216 October 2003)

The Committee is deeply concerned that despite a review of legislation, the State Party has still not amended section 59 of the Crimes Act 1961, which allows parents to use reasonable force to discipline their children. While welcoming the Government's public education campaign to promote positive, non-violent forms of discipline within the home, the Committee emphasizes that the Convention requires the protection of children from all forms of violence, which includes corporal punishment in the family, and which should be accompanied by awareness-raising campaigns on the law and on children's rights to protection.

The Committee recommends that the State party:

- a) Amend legislation to prohibit corporal punishment in the home;**
- b) Strengthen public education campaigns and activities aimed at promoting positive, non-violent forms of discipline and respect for children's right to human dignity and physical integrity, while raising awareness about the negative consequences of corporal punishment.**

Appendix 3

Article 5 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child

Article 5

States Parties shall respect the responsibilities, rights and duties of parents or, where applicable, the members of the extended family or community as provided for by local custom, legal guardians or other persons legally responsible for the child, to provide, in a manner consistent with the evolving capacities of the child, appropriate direction and guidance in the exercise by the child of the rights recognized in the present Convention.

Appendix 4

Countries who fully protect children by law from corporal punishment

Austria	(1989)
Bulgaria	(2000)
Croatia	(1999)
Cyprus	(1994)
Denmark	(1997)
Finland	(1983)
Germany	(2000)
Hungry	(2005)
Israel	(2000)
Iceland	(2003)
Latvia	(1998)
Norway	(1987)
Romania	(2004)
Sweden	(1979)
Ukraine	(2004)

<http://www.endcorporalpunishment.org/index.html>