

BRIEFING FROM GLOBAL INITIATIVE TO END ALL CORPORAL PUNISHMENT OF CHILDREN

BRIEFING FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE RIGHTS OF THE CHILD PRE-SESSIONAL WORKING GROUP – September 2006

From Peter Newell, Coordinator, Global Initiative

info@endcorporalpunishment.org

CHILE (third periodic report – CRC/C/CHL/3)

Corporal punishment in the home

Corporal punishment is lawful in the home. According to the Civil Code (1994, amended 1998), children have an obligation to obey and respect their parents (articles 219 and 276). Parents may lawfully administer “moderate” punishment to their children (article 267), though this should not endanger the child’s health or include abuse (articles 234, 235, 238 and 239). Children have limited protection from violence and abuse under other provisions in the Civil Code, the Criminal Code and the Family Violence Act (amended 2000).

In 1994, a survey of 423 parents from two public schools and 104 parents from a private catholic school found that child battering was admitted by 80.4% in the public schools group and 57% in the private schools group.¹ This was confirmed by surveys of 192 students which revealed that 85% of children at one of the public schools and 54% at the private school reported having been physically punished. Striking with the hand was the most frequent form of corporal punishment, but 23.8% of the private school children questioned reported being beaten with a belt. In the World Studies of Abuse in the Family Environment (WorldSAFE) cross-national project, incidence rates for corporal punishment in Chile, as self-reported by mothers over a 6-month period, were: spanked buttocks with hand 51%, shook child 39%, twisted ear 27%, pulled hair 24%, hit with object on buttocks 18%, slapped face or head 13%, hit with knuckles 12%, pinched child 3%.²

Corporal punishment outside the home

Corporal punishment is lawful in **schools**. Children are protected from violence considered abuse under the Juvenile Act (amended 1994) which specifies penalties for child abuse outside the family, including abuse resulting from an act or omission damaging the physical or mental health of a minor (article 62). It also covers minor injuries.

In the **penal system**, corporal punishment is unlawful as a sentence for crime but there is no explicit prohibition in legislation of its use as a disciplinary measure in penal institutions. Children are protected from punishment which causes injury under article 62 of the Juvenile Act. In research reported in 2000 involving interviews with 160 young people in conflict with the law, 81% characterised their treatment by police as bad, 7% as average and 12% as good, contrasting with the situation once actually in custody where 11.3% said the treatment was bad, 27% average and 61.7% good.³ The most common forms of police abuse were repeated kicking, followed by drenching with hoses, suffocation, hanging naked from a tree, forcing the head into a bucket of water, and the use of electric prods.

¹ Vargas, N., et al., 1995, “Parental attitude and practice regarding physical punishment of school children in Santiago de Chile”, *Child Abuse & Neglect*, vol.19, no.9, pp.1077-1082

² Reported in Krug, E. G. et al. (eds) (2002), *World report on violence and health*, Geneva: World Health Organization

³ Jimenez, M. A., 2000, *Adolescent Detainees and Minor’s Justice*, UDP, cited in World Organisation Against Torture et al., 2004, *State violence in Chile: An alternative report to the UN Committee Against Torture*, OMCT

There is no explicit prohibition in legislation of corporal punishment in **alternative care settings**, though again children are protected from punishment which causes injury under article 62 of the Juvenile Act.

We have been unable to ascertain the legality of corporal punishment of children in the **workplace**.

In its concluding observations on the state party's second report in 2002, the Committee on the Rights of the Child expressed concern "that corporal punishment of children remains socially acceptable in Chile and it is still practised in families, schools and other institutions" and noted "that Chilean legislation does not expressly prohibit corporal punishment" (CRC/C/15/Add.173, para 31). The Committee encouraged the State party to "develop measures to raise awareness on the harmful effects of corporal punishment and engage in the promotion of alternative forms of discipline in families to be administered in a manner consistent with the child's dignity and in conformity with the Convention" and to "explicitly prohibit corporal punishment in the family, in schools and in other institutions" (para 32). We hope the Committee will question the State party in detail concerning the legal status of corporal punishment in the workplace. We hope the Committee will reiterate its recommendations of 2002 and urge the State party to explicitly prohibit in law corporal punishment of children in all settings, including the repeal of the provision in the Civil Code allowing "moderate" punishment by parents. We hope the Committee will also recommend public and professional awareness raising and the promotion of non-violent, positive, participatory methods of childrearing and education and of knowledge among children of their right to protection from all forms of corporal punishment, wherever they are.

BRIEFING FROM GLOBAL INITIATIVE TO END ALL CORPORAL PUNISHMENT OF CHILDREN

BRIEFING FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE RIGHTS OF THE CHILD PRE-SESSIONAL WORKING GROUP – September 2006

*From Peter Newell, Coordinator, Global Initiative
info@endcorporalpunishment.org*

HONDURAS (third periodic report – CRC/C/HND/3)

Corporal punishment in the home

Corporal punishment is lawful in the home. The Civil Code (1906) states (article 231): “Parents are authorised to reprimand and adequately and moderately correct their children.” The Family Code (1984) states (article 191): “Parents have the authority to reprimand and adequately and moderately correct their children under their guardianship.”

Article 24 of the Code on Children and Adolescents (1996), the main child protection law, states: “Dignity is part of the child’s personality. It is everyone’s duty to safeguard this right and to protect children from all inhuman, violent, terrorizing, humiliating or destructive treatment, even when it is supposedly done for disciplinary or corrective measures, regardless of who commits it.” But article 57 states that paternal relationships are governed by the Family Code, which permits corporal punishment.

Corporal punishment outside the home

Corporal punishment was explicitly prohibited in **schools** by article 134 of the Public Education Code (1923) and the General Public Education Act, though these prohibitions are not reiterated in more recent laws. Article 24 of the Code on Children and Adolescents (see above) applies, and article 35 states that reciprocal respect and dignified treatment between educator and student must be ensured at every level of education. In the Statute of the Honduran Teacher (1997), educators’ obligations include respect for dignity, physical, psychological and moral integrity of the students (article 9).

In the **penal system**, corporal punishment is unlawful as a sentence for crime. There is no explicit prohibition of its use as a disciplinary measure in penal institutions, though a number of provisions offer protection from violence. For example, article 24 of the Code on Children and Adolescents (see above) applies; article 199 states that children in detention centres have the right to “receive an appropriate treatment on the part of authorities responsible for their custody, who will seek to avoid the use of force or any type of weapon in carrying out their responsibilities”; article 261 states that judges will punish public officials who violate the rights of juvenile offenders. According to legal opinion,⁴ these do not amount to an explicit prohibition of corporal punishment.

There is no explicit prohibition of corporal punishment in **alternative care settings**. Children are protected from abuse perpetrated by persons when under the care or protection of a public or private institution by article 173 of the Code on Children and Adolescents, and article 24 also applies (see above).

In the **workplace**, while there is no explicit prohibition of corporal punishment, legal opinion has stated that article 24 of the Code on Children and Adolescents (see above) “could be interpreted to mean that employers are not only required to protect children from corporal punishment, but are also prohibited from using it as a means of correction or discipline”.⁵

⁴ Andean Commission of Jurists, communication with Global Initiative, January 2005

⁵ Andean Commission of Jurists (2004), *Corporal punishment of children in Latin America: Juridical analysis of the legislation of Latin American countries*, ACJ-Save the Children Sweden, p.35

In its previous concluding observations on the state party's reports in 1994 and 1999 (CRC/C/15/Add.24 and CRC/C/15/Add.105), the Committee on the Rights of the Child did not make specific recommendations concerning corporal punishment. We hope the Committee will now urge the state party to explicitly prohibit corporal punishment in the home, including through the repeal of the provisions allowing "moderate correction" in the Civil Code and the Family Code. In light of the legal opinion on article 24 of the Code on Children and Adolescents, we hope the Committee will question the state party in detail on the legality of corporal punishment outside the home, and recommend the enactment and enforcement of clear legislative prohibition of corporal punishment in all settings, accompanied by awareness raising and education among professionals and the public, including children themselves, of the prohibition and of positive, non-violent, participatory approaches to childrearing and education.

BRIEFING FROM GLOBAL INITIATIVE TO END ALL CORPORAL PUNISHMENT OF CHILDREN

BRIEFING FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE RIGHTS OF THE CHILD **PRE-SESSIONAL WORKING GROUP – September 2006**

From Peter Newell, Coordinator, Global Initiative
info@endcorporalpunishment.org

KENYA (second periodic report – CRC/C/KEN/2)

Corporal punishment in the home

Corporal punishment is lawful in the home. The Children and Young Persons Act allowed persons having care or control of a child to administer reasonable punishment. This has been replaced by the Children Act (2001, in force 2002), which makes no mention of “reasonable chastisement” but does not explicitly prohibit corporal punishment by parents and it is presumed that reasonable chastisement is acceptable. In 2006, the Government announced it was set to review the Children Act 2001 to strengthen children’s protection from violence.

Children are protected from “excessive” use of force by article 241 of the Penal Code and from grievous bodily harm by article 234. The Draft Constitution (2004) prohibits corporal punishment in article 45 of the Bill of Rights.

In a survey of 500 women aged 18-24 concerning their childhood experiences of violence, published in 2006, 99% reported experiencing physical violence.⁶ Beating with an object was the most prevalent form of physical violence (80.8%), followed by punching (59.5%), hard work (43.8%), kicking (39.6%), being denied food (35%), being choked/burned/stabbed (20.5%), being locked or tied up (14.3%), and having spicy/bitter substances put in mouth (12.3%). Girls were found to be most vulnerable when aged 10-13 years, and more than half the cases of hitting/punching and beating with an object resulted in “bruises or scratches, broken bones or teeth, or bleeding”. In 2005, a survey of 267 adults and children and interviews with parents, teachers and children found that the most frequent forms of physical discipline used on children were smacking (78.8%), pulling ears (68.8%) and cuffing (61.5%).⁷ Other corporal punishments included forcing a child to kneel on a hard floor (45.9%), tapping (43.3%), forcing a child to stand in the sun (33.2%) and burning fingers (19.7%). And a 2004 survey by Population Communication Africa reported that over 60% of children believed that they had been or were being physically abused at school, including being slapped in the face, being hit on the body with a cane or stick, and being beaten, kicked or punched or otherwise physically bullied.⁸

Corporal punishment outside the home

Corporal punishment was prohibited in **schools** by Ministry of Education legal notice No. 56 pursuant to the Children Act in 2001. Guidelines on alternative forms of punishment were launched in March 2005. The Draft Constitution prohibits corporal punishment in schools and institutions (article 41).

In the **penal system**, corporal punishment is unlawful as a sentence for crime and as a disciplinary measure in juvenile detention centres. However, as at 2005 provisions allowing for corporal punishment in the Prisons Act, the Prisons Rules, the Borstal Institutions Act, and the Borstal Institutions Rules had yet to be repealed. In May 2006, proposed amendments to the Prison Act seeking to eliminate corporal punishment from the prison and penal system were under discussion.

⁶ Stavropoulos, J., 2006, *Violence Against Girls in Africa: A Retrospective Survey in Ethiopia, Kenya and Uganda*, Addis Ababa, The African Child Policy Forum

⁷ ANPPCAN Kenya Chapter, 2005, *From Physical Punishment to Positive Discipline: Alternatives to Physical/Corporal Punishment in Kenya*, second draft

⁸ Johnston, T., 2004, *Gender Series: The Abuse of Nairobi School Children*, Population Communication Africa: Nairobi. Cited in O’Sullivan, M., 2005, “Corporal Punishment in Kenya”, *Juvenile Justice Quarterly*, vol.2, no.1

Corporal punishment is prohibited in institutions under the Children Act, but there is no explicit prohibition relating to other **alternative care settings**. Regulation 6 of the Children's Department internal rules and regulations for the administration of children's institutions, which allows corporal punishment, has been repealed. The prohibition of corporal punishment in the Draft Constitution (see above) would apply.

We have been unable to ascertain the legality of corporal punishment of children in the **workplace**. The provisions in the Draft Constitution (see above) would apply.

Following its examination of the state party's initial report in 2001, the Committee on the Rights of the Child expressed deep concern at the continued use of corporal punishment in schools, the juvenile justice system, the family and in care institutions (CRC/C/15/Add.160, para 33). The Committee recommended that the state party "take legislative measures to prohibit all forms of physical and mental violence, including corporal punishment, in the juvenile justice system, in schools and care institutions, and in the family", "monitor the ban on corporal punishment in schools" and "reinforce its public awareness campaigns to promote positive, participatory, non-violent forms of discipline as an alternative to corporal punishment at all levels of society" (para 34). In 2005, the Human Rights Committee "welcome[d] the information that Kenya has now prohibited all forms of corporal punishment of children" (CCPR/CO/83/KEN, para 6), though we understand this refers only to settings outside the home/family. We hope the Committee on the Rights of the Child will now urge the state party to pursue its progress in prohibiting corporal punishment of children by introducing legislation which prohibits its use within the home, for example through the proposed review of the Children Act 2001, by completing the repeal of legislation providing for corporal punishment in the penal system, and by ensuring corporal punishment is also prohibited in employment settings.

BRIEFING FROM GLOBAL INITIATIVE TO END ALL CORPORAL PUNISHMENT OF CHILDREN

BRIEFING FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE RIGHTS OF THE CHILD PRE-SESSIONAL WORKING GROUP – September 2006

*From Peter Newell, Coordinator, Global Initiative
info@endcorporalpunishment.org*

MALAYSIA (as at 23-8-06 report not yet submitted)

Corporal punishment in the home

Corporal punishment is lawful in the home. Children are protected from some violence and abuse under the Child Act (2001, in force 2002). A comparative study of 10,073 children aged 9-17 years across East Asia and the Pacific by UNICEF and Research International Asia (Thailand) in 2001 found that 25% of those surveyed in Malaysia reported having been beaten by their parents.⁹

Corporal punishment outside the home

Corporal punishment of boys is lawful in secondary **schools** under the Education Ordinance (1957, amended 1959) and Education Rules (School Discipline) (1959). Education Ministry guidelines advise on the number of strokes that should be given for different categories of “offence”. In 2004, the Ministry expanded the power of caning students to teachers other than headmasters, principals and those involved in disciplining students. In “vernacular schools” (Chinese-medium schools funded by government allocations), caning has long been used in primary and secondary schools by teachers as well as heads and on girls as well as boys.

In 2005, the Human Rights Commission of Malaysia conducted an online poll on school corporal punishment. Of the 64 respondents to the question “Is caning students in schools a violation of human rights?” 31.3% agreed, 57.8% disagreed, and 10.9% were unsure.¹⁰ In 2003, a survey of 5,754 students, by researchers from local universities assigned by the Human Rights Commission of Malaysia (Suhakam) found that 52% agreed that caning commonly happened in their schools, more often in rural schools than urban schools; around 80% of cases occurred at technical schools; 79.5% of teachers and 71.8% of administrators agreed that persistent offenders should be caned.¹¹

In the **penal system**, corporal punishment is lawful as a sentence for crime (mandatory for some, discretionary for others) and as a disciplinary measure in penal institutions. Article 91 of the Child Act, applicable to children aged between 10 and 18 years, states that the Court for Children may “order the child, if a male, to be whipped with not more than ten strokes of a light cane – (i) within the Court premises; and (ii) in the presence, if he desires to be present, of the parent or guardian of the child”. Whipping is the prescribed punishment under the Penal Code and other laws for an increasingly wide range of crimes. Both the lower courts and the high court may order caning of juveniles, who must be certified medically fit. The Syariah Criminal Offences (*Hudud* and *Qisas*) Enactment provides for corporal punishment including whipping, stoning and amputation for *hudud* offences.

Corporal punishment is lawful in **alternative care settings**.

We have been unable to ascertain the legality of corporal punishment of children in the **workplace**.

Malaysia has not yet (August 2006) submitted an initial report under the Convention on the Rights of the Child. We hope the Committee will question the delegation in detail on the

⁹ UNICEF, 2001, *Speaking Out! Voices of Children and Adolescents in East Asia and the Pacific*

¹⁰ Human Rights Commission of Malaysia, online poll (www.suhakam.org.my/en/)

¹¹ Reported in “Spare the rod?”, *New Straits Times*, Kuala Lumpur, 21 March 2004

continuing legality of corporal punishment of children in all settings and recommend that the state party as a matter of urgency prohibit corporal punishment in the home, schools, alternative care settings, the workplace and the juvenile justice system, including as a sentence for offences under “Syariah” law. We hope the Committee will encourage the state party to undertake a study into the nature, prevalence and negative effects of corporal punishment of children, as a basis for changing public opinion.

BRIEFING FROM GLOBAL INITIATIVE TO END ALL CORPORAL PUNISHMENT OF CHILDREN

BRIEFING FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE RIGHTS OF THE CHILD PRE-SESSIONAL WORKING GROUP – September 2006

*From Peter Newell, Coordinator, Global Initiative
info@endcorporalpunishment.org*

MALDIVES (second and third periodic report – CRC/C/MDV/2)

Corporal punishment in the home

Corporal punishment is lawful in the home. Children have limited protection from violence and abuse under the Law on the Protection of the Rights of the Child (1991), and the Family Law (2000, in force 2001) protects children from some corporal punishment, stating in article 18: “No child shall, even as a measure of discipline, be subjected to punishment which may cause physical injury or which may be detrimental to the health of the child.” But there is no explicit prohibition of all forms of corporal punishment.

Corporal punishment outside the home

Corporal punishment is prohibited in **schools** under article 10 of the Law on the Protection of the Rights of the Child, which states: “Punishment in school should be appropriate to the child’s age and should not affect them physically or psychologically.” This is reiterated in the Ministry of Education *Handbook for Teachers* (updated 2002), which confirms (in section 2.7): “Maldavian Law does not allow teachers to inflict corporal punishment on students.”

In the **penal system**, corporal punishment is lawful as a sentence for crime. The Law on the Protection of the Rights of the Child prohibits imposing cruel and degrading punishment on children, and the Penal Code (amended 2002) does not include corporal punishment among permitted sentence for crimes that fall outside of *Shari’a* law. However, under the Penal Code, the Sentencing Guidelines 298 (“Rules on Investigation Adjudication and Sentencing in Respect of Offences Committed by Minors”) and the Rules for Sentencing No. 6 (2003), the *Hadd* punishments of Islamic law, including corporal punishment, are applicable to any person who has reached puberty. There is no explicit prohibition of corporal punishment as a disciplinary measure in penal institutions.

There is no explicit prohibition of corporal punishment in **alternative care settings**. The Education and Training Centre for Children operates under the Ministry of Education and so corporal punishment is prohibited in that institution under article 10 of the Law on the Protection of the Rights of the Child and the *Handbook for Teachers* (see above).

We have been unable to ascertain the legality of corporal punishment in the **workplace**.

In its concluding observations on the state party’s initial report in 1998 (CRC/C/15/Add.91), the Committee on the Rights of the Child made no specific recommendation concerning corporal punishment. We understand from the follow-up process to the South Asia Regional Consultation for the UNSG’s Study on violence against children that the Maldives is committed to law reform to prohibit corporal punishment: we hope the Committee will now question the state party in detail on the issue of corporal punishment and urge the state party as a matter of priority to introduce legislation to prohibit corporal punishment in the home, alternative care contexts, workplace settings, and the juvenile justice system, including as a sentence for offences under *Shari’a* law. We hope the Committee will recommend this be accompanied by a study of the nature, prevalence and negative effects of corporal punishment of children as a basis for public and professional awareness raising of children’s rights to protection from all corporal punishment and the promotion of positive, non-violent and participatory approaches to childrearing and education.

BRIEFING FROM GLOBAL INITIATIVE TO END ALL CORPORAL PUNISHMENT OF CHILDREN

BRIEFING FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE RIGHTS OF THE CHILD PRE-SESSIONAL WORKING GROUP – September 2006

*From Peter Newell, Coordinator, Global Initiative
info@endcorporalpunishment.org*

MALI (second periodic report – CRC/C/MLI/2)

Corporal punishment in the home

Corporal punishment is lawful in the home. The Family Relations Code (1973) states that “the authority of the father comprises a right to custody, of management, surveillance and correction” (article 82). Children are given limited protection from violence by the Code on the Protection of the Child (2002), which includes provisions against repeated violations of their integrity and all acts of brutality likely to harm their emotional, psychological or physical balance (article 56). Other protection is given by the Criminal Code.

Corporal punishment outside the home

Corporal punishment is prohibited in **schools**, under internal regulations No. 94-4856/MEB-CAB of 8 April 1994 (fundamental schools), No. 94-4999/MEB/CAB (special education institutions) and No. 94-5000 of 15 April 1994 (kindergartens). It is reportedly practised in coranic schools and in the “medersas” (Moslem Theology Schools).

In the **penal system**, corporal punishment is unlawful as a sentence for crime. It is considered unlawful as a disciplinary measure in penal institutions, although there is no explicit prohibition. The penitentiary system is governed by Decree No. 88-002 (1988), article 105 of which forbids staff from using acts of violence on convicts. Punishments for disciplinary offences, listed in article 112, do not include corporal punishment. Article 14 of the Code on the Protection of the Child states that a child placed in a protective educational or rehabilitative institution, or in a place of detention, has the right to physical and moral protection.

Corporal punishment is prohibited in some **alternative care contexts**, including the Bollé Observation and Rehabilitation Centre and the SOS Children’s Villages, but there is no explicit prohibition in legislation. Article 14 of the Code on Child Protection (see above) applies to institutions, and the provisions against violence in article 56 (see above) apply to all settings.

We have been unable to ascertain the legality of corporal punishment in the **workplace**.

In its concluding observations on the state party’s initial report in 1999, the Committee on the Rights of the Child expressed concern “that traditional societal attitudes continue to encourage the use of such punishment within families and generally within society” and recommended that the state party “take appropriate measures to prohibit by law corporal punishment in care institutions” and “reinforce measures to raise awareness of the negative effects of corporal punishment and change cultural attitudes to ensure that discipline is administered in a manner consistent with the child’s dignity and in conformity with the Convention” (CRC/C/15/Add.113, para 25). We hope the Committee will now urge the state party to prohibit corporal punishment within the home, in all alternative care settings, and in the workplace, and accompany this with public and professional awareness raising on children’s right to protection from all forms of corporal punishment and the negative effects of such punishment, and the promotion of positive, non-violent, participatory forms of childrearing and education.

BRIEFING FROM GLOBAL INITIATIVE TO END ALL CORPORAL PUNISHMENT OF CHILDREN

BRIEFING FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE RIGHTS OF THE CHILD PRE-SESSIONAL WORKING GROUP – September 2006

*From Peter Newell, Coordinator, Global Initiative
info@endcorporalpunishment.org*

MARSHALL ISLANDS (second periodic report – CRC/C/93/Add.8)

Corporal punishment in the home

Corporal punishment is lawful in the home. Under the Juvenile Procedure Code, “[a] parent or guardian having custody of a child is charged with the control of such child and shall have the power to exercise parental control and authority over such child” (article 8). Children are protected from some violence and abuse under the Child Abuse and Neglect Act (Public Law 1991-207) (1991), the Domestic Relations Act and the Criminal Code.

Corporal punishment outside the home

Corporal punishment is prohibited in **schools** by the Rules and Regulations of the Ministry of Education (1992), which define corporal punishment as “hitting, kicking, slapping or any other means of brutal punishment”.

In the **penal system**, corporal punishment is unlawful as a sentence for crime. However, article 181 of the Criminal Code states that customs should be taken into account in sentencing and we have been unable to ascertain whether this would allow for corporal punishment of young offenders. Corporal punishment is unlawful as a disciplinary measure in penal institutions. There is no provision for its use in the Criminal Procedure Code or the Juvenile Procedure Code, though there is no explicit prohibition.

There is no explicit prohibition of corporal punishment in **alternative care settings**. The provisions against violence and abuse in the Child Abuse and Neglect Act and the Criminal Code apply.

We have been unable to ascertain the legality of corporal punishment in the **workplace**.

In its concluding observations on the state party’s initial report in 2000, the Committee on the Rights of the Child expressed concern “that the use of corporal punishment within the family, schools, other institutions, and generally within society is not expressly prohibited by law” (CRC/C/15/Add.139, para 36). The Committee recommended that the state party “adopt appropriate legislative measures to prohibit the use of any form of corporal punishment within the family, schools and other institutions” and encouraged the state party “to develop measures to raise awareness about the negative effects of corporal punishment and ensure that alternative forms of discipline are administered in families, schools and other institutions in a manner consistent with the child’s dignity and in conformity with the Convention” (para 37). We hope the Committee will question the state party in detail about the legality of corporal punishment, including as a customary sentence for crime. We hope the Committee will recommend that the state party introduce legislation to prohibit corporal punishment in all settings, including within the home, and accompany this with public and professional awareness raising and education about the negative effects of corporal punishment and children’s right to protection from all forms of corporal punishment, and the promotion of positive, non-violent, participatory approaches to childrearing and education.

BRIEFING FROM GLOBAL INITIATIVE TO END ALL CORPORAL PUNISHMENT OF CHILDREN

BRIEFING FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE RIGHTS OF THE CHILD PRE-SESSIONAL WORKING GROUP – September 2006

*From Peter Newell, Coordinator, Global Initiative
info@endcorporalpunishment.org*

SURINAME (second periodic report – CRC/C/SUR/2)

Corporal punishment in the home

Corporal punishment is lawful in the home. There is no defence for its use enshrined in law, but it is not explicitly prohibited. Under the Civil Code, parents have an obligation to maintain and educate their children (articles 157 and 351). Protection from violence and abuse is given by the Code of Criminal Law and the Constitution (1987, amended 1992). In a survey in 1999, 12.9% of parents reported that they used corporal punishment on their children; 50% supported the use of corporal punishment in schools.¹²

Corporal punishment outside the home

Corporal punishment is prohibited in **schools** under directives issued by the Ministry of Education and Community Development, though it continues to be used and the prohibition has not been confirmed in legislation.

In the **penal system**, corporal punishment is unlawful as a sentence for crime. It is not listed as a permitted measure in the internal regulations governing the penal institution, but there is no explicit prohibition in law and there have been reports of ill-treatment of children in detention.

There is no explicit prohibition of corporal punishment in **alternative care contexts**. A Children's Home Bill which prohibits corporal punishment in both private and state institutions for children was due to be discussed by the Board of Ministries in early 2005. The Constitutional provisions and protections in the Criminal Code (see above) apply.

We have been unable to ascertain the legality of corporal punishment in the **workplace**.

In its concluding observations on the state party's initial report in 2000, the Committee on the Rights of the Child expressed concern at the continued use of corporal punishment in schools, families and care institutions (CRC/C/15/Add.130, para 41). The Committee recommended that the State party "take legislative measures to prohibit all forms of physical and mental violence, including corporal punishment, within the family, schools and care institutions" and encouraged the state party "to intensify its public-awareness campaigns to promote positive, non-violent forms of discipline as an alternative to corporal punishment at all levels of society" (para 42).

We hope the Committee will recommend that the state party introduce with urgency legislation to prohibit corporal punishment in all settings, including within the home, and accompany this with public and professional awareness raising and education about the negative effects of corporal punishment and children's right to protection from all forms of corporal punishment, and the promotion of positive, non-violent, participatory approaches to childrearing and education.

¹² Reported in second state party report to the Committee on the Rights of the Child (2005), CRC/C/SUR/2, para. 59