



Global Initiative to  
**End All Corporal Punishment  
of Children**

## **UNITED KINGDOM – COUNTRY REPORT**

### **Summary of necessary legal reform to achieve full prohibition**

#### ***Settings where explicit prohibition is necessary***

home, penal institutions, alternative care settings

#### ***Is there a legal defence for corporal punishment which must be repealed?***

Yes – Legal defences for the use of corporal punishment are found in section 58 of the Children Act in England and Wales, article 2 of the Law Reform (Miscellaneous Provisions) (Northern Ireland) Order (2006), and section 51 of the Criminal Justice (Scotland) Act (2003). These provisions must be explicitly repealed and explicit prohibition enacted of all corporal punishment and other cruel or degrading forms of punishment, in the home and all other settings where adults have authority over children.

#### ***Other legislative measures necessary***

*Penal institutions* – Explicit prohibition should be enacted of all corporal punishment in all institutions accommodating children in conflict with the law.

*Alternative care settings* – Explicit prohibition should also be enacted in legislation applicable to all alternative care settings, including public and private day care, residential institutions, foster care, etc.

# DETAILED COUNTRY REPORT

## Legality of corporal punishment

### Home

Corporal punishment is lawful in the home. In England and Wales, section 58 of the Children Act (2004) provides for “reasonable punishment” of children. In Northern Ireland, article 2 of the Law Reform (Miscellaneous Provisions) (Northern Ireland) Order (2006) provides for “reasonable punishment”. In Scotland, “justifiable assault” of children is lawful under section 51 of the Criminal Justice (Scotland) Act (2003), defining blows to the head, shaking and use of implements as unjustifiable. In rejecting the recommendations of the Universal Periodic Review (see below), the Government stated that it sees no need for law reform since it believes the current law is working well, parents should be allowed to discipline children and surveys show that the use of corporal punishment in childrearing has declined.<sup>1</sup>

### Schools

Corporal punishment was prohibited in all state-supported education in 1986. The prohibition was extended to cover private schools in England and Wales in 1998, in Scotland in 2000, and in Northern Ireland in 2003.

### Penal system

Corporal punishment is unlawful as a **sentence for crime**, abolished in England by the Criminal Justice Act (1967).

Corporal punishment is regarded as unlawful as a **disciplinary measure** in penal institutions, but there is no explicit prohibition. In secure training centres (privately run centres for young offenders), the Secure Training Centre Rules (1998, as amended in 2007) allow for the use of force (in the name of physical restraint) in maintaining order and discipline, including the infliction of physical pain (nose, rib and thumb “distractions”). The Rules were declared unlawful by the Court of Appeal in July 2008 but they have yet to be repealed.

### Alternative care

Corporal punishment is prohibited by regulation in residential care institutions throughout the UK (Children’s Homes Regulation Act, 2001; Residential Establishments Child Care (Scotland) Regulations, 1996). Residential care workers have been prohibited from smacking since 1991 (Children’s Homes Regulations 1991, SI 1991/1506, regulation 8). It is prohibited in foster care arranged by local authorities or voluntary organisations but is lawful in private foster care. In day care institutions and childminding, it is prohibited by regulations issued in 2002 for Wales and Scotland and in 2003 for England (Day Care and Child Minding (National Standards) (England) Regulations 2003, SI 2003/1996). Guidance states that physical punishment should not be used in day care institutions and childminding in Northern Ireland, but there is no explicit prohibition in law.

---

<sup>1</sup> 23 May 2008, A/HRC/8/25, *Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland*, para. 25

## Prevalence research

A survey of 55 health care workers working primarily with children (including paediatricians, clinical psychologists, psychiatrists, school nurses and health visitors) in Scotland found that 47% of them incorrectly believed that the law protected children from assault to a greater extent than adults, 40% correctly stated that this was not the case and 13% did not know.<sup>2</sup>

A retrospective survey of nearly 1,000 university students in China and England, carried out between 2001 and 2004, looked at their experiences of parental discipline and their attitudes towards it. Of the English students, 43% reported being hit by their parents as children; beating with a stick, rod or branch was reported by 11% of boys and 7% of girls. Of those who had been physically punished, 60% of boys and 47% of girls said they were punished for being “disobedient”, and 75% of boys and 64% of girls for being “naughty”.<sup>3</sup>

In a survey of 1,000 parents of children aged 0-10 in Northern Ireland, 47% said they had physically punished their children at some point and 45% had done so in the last year. On average, those who had used physical punishment during the last year had done so 8 times. The most common form of physical punishment used was a smack on the bottom with a bare hand, used by 33% of parents, on average 5.3 times in the past year. A quarter of parents (26%) had slapped their child on the hand, arm or leg, on average 5.6 times in the past year; 2.2% had hit their child on the bottom with a belt, a hairbrush, a stick or some other hard object, on average 4.5 times in the past year. Children aged 3-6 were more likely to have been physically punished in the past year (53%) than children aged 7-10 (43%) or 0-2 (33%). Two thirds of parents thought that physical punishment never or infrequently led to the child having increased respect for parents, and 60% that it never or infrequently led to the child learning acceptable behaviour. Forty per cent thought that physical punishment always or frequently made the child more aggressive, 36% that it always or frequently led to long-term emotional upset for the child, and 60% that it always or frequently made the parent feel regret or guilt.<sup>4</sup>

Surveys by the National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children (NSPCC) in 2008 found that about 7% of teenagers aged 15-17 had been hit by a parent in the previous six months, with one in eight children of all ages smacked during that time.<sup>5</sup>

Of nearly 14,000 mothers interviewed as part of the third survey of the Millennium Cohort Study, which tracks the development of more than 15,000 UK children, 45% said that they never smacked their five year old child. Half of the mothers in Wales (49%) said they never smacked their child, compared with 35% in Northern Ireland, 45% in England and 43% in Scotland.<sup>6</sup>

In 2008, a report for the Growing up in Scotland (GUS) study focussed on parenting styles. Interviews were carried out with over 4,500 parents of children aged on average 22.5 months and 2,500 parents of children aged on average 46.5 months. A third of the parents of 3 year olds (34%) and 16% of the parents of younger children reported that they had smacked their children. Less than one in five of the parents of 3 year olds said they believed that smacking was useful, and fewer still of the parents of younger children.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Rae, H., McKenzie, K. & Murray, G. (2010), “Health Care Workers’ Knowledge of Current Child Protection Legislation and Child Discipline Practices”, *Child Abuse Review*, vol. 19, pp. 259-272

<sup>3</sup> Hester, M. et al. (2009), “Girls” and boys” experiences and perceptions of parental discipline and punishment while growing up in China and England”, *Child Abuse Review*, vol. 18, pp. 401-413

<sup>4</sup> Bunting, L., Webb, M. A. & Healy, J. (2008), *The ‘smacking debate’ in Northern Ireland: messages from research*, Barnardo’s Northern Ireland, NICCY and NSPCC Northern Ireland

<sup>5</sup> NSPCC survey, reported in *The Guardian*, 8 October 2008

<sup>6</sup> Hansen, K. & Joshi, H. (2008), *Millennium Cohort Study: Third Survey: A User’s Guide to Initial Findings*, London: Institute of Education

<sup>7</sup> Bradshaw, P. et al. (2008), *Growing up in Scotland: Sweep 2 Overview Report*, Edinburgh: The Scottish Government

A poll for the organisation Parenting Across Scotland revealed that 5% of the 1,000 parents surveyed had smacked their child “fairly often” or “sometimes” in the previous year, 15% had smacked their child one or twice during that time, and around 20% had threatened to smack their child. Only 1% said they believe that smacking is an effective way of changing a child’s behaviour, and 3% that threatening to smack is effective. A majority of parents (71%) had shouted or yelled at their child, though only 7% considered this to be effective.<sup>8</sup>

As part of its 2007 review into Section 58 of the Children Act 2004, the Department of Children, Schools and Families commissioned studies into the views of parents and children in England and Wales on “smacking”. The parental survey involved 1,822 parents, of whom 1,204 had children aged under 18 and 618 had children aged 18 and over. Of the parents with children under 18, 29% said they had smacked their child at some point in the past year, 8% in the past month and 5% in the past week; 38% said they had never smacked their child. Children aged 2-5 were most likely to have been smacked in the past year, with 37% of parents of this age group saying they had done this, compared with 32% of parents of 6-10 year olds, 18% of parents of 11-15 year olds, 10% of parents of 16-17 year olds, and 9% of parents of 0-1 year olds.<sup>9</sup> The study into children’s views involved 64 children aged 4-16 in group and pair discussions. The majority of the children had been smacked at some point in their lives, mostly but not exclusively when they were under 10. Boys and girls from all social classes were smacked.<sup>10</sup>

In April 2007, the NSPCC published the results of a survey of 1,000 adults in which 77% believed smacking is becoming less acceptable. The survey was part of the NSPCC’s campaign to stop children being smacked in shops. It revealed that a child being smacked in public had been witnessed by 41% of respondents within the previous six months. The majority of adults (86%) would be happy to shop in a smack-free shop, while 40% would actively prefer to shop where smacking was prohibited; almost all (93%) said they would like shops to take action to help parents losing their tempers with their children. When asked how they felt on seeing a child being smacked, 65% of respondents said they felt concerned for the child; 51% felt upset; 51% said they would like to stop the child being smacked, with 42% of those wanting to comfort the child and 47% wanting to help the parent.<sup>11</sup>

In a survey of 1,250 people by the organisation Parenting Across Scotland, 90% of respondents said they choose to discuss problems. While 7% said it was acceptable to smack a child, 20% admitted having done so in the last year, with a further 36% saying they had threatened physical punishment.<sup>12</sup>

Between November 2005 and October 2006, there were a total of 3,036 incidents of restraint in the four secure training centres (STCs); 41% of these (1,245 incidents) were perpetrated on girls who represent 34% of the STC population.<sup>13</sup>

In a 2004 poll of 2,004 adults in England and Wales, 56% agreed that “it is wrong for someone to hit a child in their family”, compared with 31% who disagreed. Over half of the respondents (57%) thought that children and adults should have the same protection in law from being hit while nearly a third (29%) thought children should have more protection; only 7% thought that adults should have greater

---

<sup>8</sup> Ipsos MORI (2008), *What Scottish Parents Tell Us*, Edinburgh: Parenting Across Scotland

<sup>9</sup> IPSOS Mori (2007), *A study into the views of parents on the physical punishment of children for the Department for Children, Schools and Families*, Department for Children, Schools and Families

<sup>10</sup> Sherbert Research (2007), *A Study into Children’s Views on Physical Discipline and Punishment*, Department for Children, School and Families & Central Office of Information

<sup>11</sup> Reported by the NSPCC, 10 April 2007

<sup>12</sup> Reported in *BBC News*, 27 February 2007

<sup>13</sup> Reply to Parliamentary question, reported in The Howard League for Penal Reform (2007), *Briefing for House of Lords Debate on the use of restraint in secure training centres*

protection from assault. Nearly three quarters (71%) said they would support changing the law to give children the same protection from being hit as adult family members.<sup>14</sup>

A nationally representative survey of parents, children and discipline across Britain, for the Economic and Social Research Council, revealed in 2003 that 9% of parents reported using “severe” physical punishment.<sup>15</sup>

Research by Save the Children in Northern Ireland, published in 2002, involved questionnaires and interviews with 189 children aged 4-11 years. Two thirds believed that children were hit because they are “bad, bold, cheeky, doing things wrong or doing wrong things”; one in four believed that children are hit because of how the adult is feeling. More than 80% of children used words like “hurt, sad, sore, upset, unhappy, unloved, heartbroken, awful” to describe how they felt when they were hit. 94% said they would not smack their children when they themselves became parents. Fewer than three in 20 thought it was acceptable for an adult to hit a child.<sup>16</sup>

Research by Save the Children in Scotland looked at the opinions of 1,319 children and young people aged 6-18 years, using focus groups and questionnaires. Of the 1,249 children who completed the questionnaires, 93% said there were other ways that parents could discipline their children, without hitting them. 76% believed that it is wrong for a parent or other adult to hit a child. Most believed that hitting was the result of a parent’s feelings of anger, stress and frustration, rather than a reasonable act, and most described feeling distressed when they were hit.<sup>17</sup>

## **Recommendations by human rights treaty bodies**

### *Committee on the Rights of the Child*

(20 October 2008, CRC/C/GBR/CO/4, Concluding observations on third/fourth report, paras. 6, 7, 38, 39, 40, 41 and 42)

“The Committee, while welcoming the State party’s efforts to implement the concluding observations on previous State party’s reports, notes with regret that some of the recommendations contained therein have not been fully implemented, in particular:

- a) with respect to the concluding observations on the second periodic report of the United Kingdom (CRC/C/15/Add.188), those recommendations related, inter alia, to ... corporal punishment (paras. 35-38)...
- c) with respect to the initial report of the United Kingdom - Isle of Man (CRC/C/15/Add.134) those regarding, inter alia, corporal punishment (paras. 26-27)....

“The Committee urges the State party to take all necessary measures to address those recommendations from the concluding observations of the previous reports that have not yet - or not sufficiently - been implemented as well as those contained in the present concluding observations. In this context, the Committee draws the attention of the State party to its general comment No. 5 (2003) on general measures of implementation of the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

---

<sup>14</sup> MORI (2004), *Attitudes to hitting family members: Research study conducted for the Children Are Unbeatable! Alliance*

<sup>15</sup> Economic and Social Research Council, Ghate, Hazel and Creighton (2003) *National Study of Parents, Children and Discipline in Britain*, ESRC

<sup>16</sup> Horgan, G. (2002), *It’s a hit, not a “smack”*: A booklet about what children think about being hit or smacked by adults, Belfast: Save the Children. Comparable findings were revealed in similar research by Save the Children in England and in Wales (Crowley, A. & Vulliamy, C., *Listen Up! Children Talk: About Smacking*, Cardiff: Save the Children; Willow, C. & Hyder, T., 1998, *It hurts you inside – children talking about smacking*, National Children’s Bureau and Save the Children)

<sup>17</sup> Cutting, E. (2001), *“It doesn’t sort anything”*: A report on the views of children and young people about the use of physical punishment, Edinburgh: Save the Children

“The Committee notes that the State party has reviewed the use of physical restraint and solitary confinement to ensure that these measures are not used unless absolutely necessary and as a measure of last resort. However, the Committee remains concerned at the fact that, in practice, physical restraint on children is still used in places of deprivation of liberty.

“The Committee urges the State party to ensure that restraint against children is used only as a last resort and exclusively to prevent harm to the child or others and that all methods of physical restraint for disciplinary purposes be abolished.

“The Committee, while noting amendments to legislation in England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland which restrict the application of the defence of ‘reasonable chastisement’, is concerned that this defence has not been removed. The Committee welcomes the commitment of the National Assembly in Wales to prohibiting all corporal punishment in the home, but notes that under the terms of devolution it is not possible for the Assembly to enact the necessary legislation. The Committee is concerned at the failure of State party to explicitly prohibit all corporal punishment in the home and emphasizes its view that the existence of any defence in cases of corporal punishment of children does not comply with the principles and provisions of the Convention, since it would suggest that some forms of corporal punishment are acceptable.

“The Committee is further concerned that corporal punishment is lawful in the home, schools and alternative care settings in virtually all overseas territories and crown dependencies.

“The Committee, reiterating its previous recommendations (CRC/C/15/Add.188, para. 35), in the light of its general comment No. 8 on ‘the right of the child to protection from corporal punishment and other cruel or degrading forms of punishment’, as well as noting similar recommendations made by the Human Rights Committee; the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women; and the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, recommends that the State party:

- a) prohibit as a matter of priority all corporal punishment in the family, including through the repeal of all legal defences, in England and Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland, and in all Overseas Territories and Crown Dependencies;
- b) ensure that corporal punishment is explicitly prohibited in schools and all other institutions and forms of alternative care throughout the United Kingdom and in the overseas territories and crown dependencies;
- c) actively promote positive and non-violent forms of discipline and respect for children’s equal right to human dignity and physical integrity, with a view to raising public awareness of children’s right to protection from all corporal punishment and to decreasing public acceptance of its use in childrearing;
- d) provide parental education and professional training in positive child-rearing.”

*Committee on the Rights of the Child*

(9 October 2002, CRC/C/15/Add.188, Concluding observations on second report, paras. 8, 9, 35, 36, 37 and 38)

“While noting the entry into force of the Human Rights Act 1998, which incorporates the rights enshrined in the European Convention on Human Rights into domestic law, the Committee is concerned that the provisions and principles of the Convention on the Rights of the Child - which are much broader than those contained in the European Convention - have not yet been incorporated into domestic law, nor is there any formal process to ensure that new legislation fully complies with the Convention. The Committee notes that the devolved administrations have introduced some legal reforms to ensure compatibility with the Convention such as ensuring that the education system in Scotland complies with article 12 and that corporal punishment in the day-care system in Wales is prohibited, but remains concerned that the State party does not ensure that its legislation is compatible with the Convention throughout its territory.

“The Committee encourages the State party to incorporate into domestic law the rights, principles and provisions of the Convention in order to ensure that all legislation complies with the Convention and that the provisions and principles of the Convention are widely applied in legal and administrative proceedings. The State party is also encouraged to provide training in the provisions of the Convention and to disseminate the Convention more widely.

“The Committee welcomes the abolition of corporal punishment in all schools in England, Wales and Scotland following its 1995 recommendations (*ibid.*, para. 32) but is concerned that this abolition has not yet been extended to cover all private schools in Northern Ireland. It welcomes the adoption by the National Assembly for Wales of regulations prohibiting corporal punishment in all forms of day care, including childminding, but is very concerned that legislation prohibiting all corporal punishment in this context is not yet in place in England, Scotland or Northern Ireland.

“In light of its previous recommendation (*ibid.*, para. 31), the Committee deeply regrets that the State party persists in retaining the defence of ‘reasonable chastisement’ and has taken no significant action towards prohibiting all corporal punishment of children in the family.

“The Committee is of the opinion that the Government’s proposals to limit rather than to remove the ‘reasonable chastisement’ defence do not comply with the principles and provisions of the Convention and the aforementioned recommendations, particularly since they constitute a serious violation of the dignity of the child (see similar observations of the of the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, E/C.12/1/Add.79, para. 36). Moreover, they suggest that some forms of corporal punishment are acceptable, thereby undermining educational measures to promote positive and non-violent discipline.

“The Committee recommends that the State party:

- a) with urgency adopt legislation throughout the State party to remove the ‘reasonable chastisement’ defence and prohibit all corporal punishment in the family and in any other contexts not covered by existing legislation;
- b) promote positive, participatory and non-violent forms of discipline and respect for children’s equal right to human dignity and physical integrity, involving children and parents and all those who work with and for them, and carry out public education programmes on the negative consequences of corporal punishment.”

### *Committee on the Rights of the Child*

(15 February 1995, CRC/C/15/Add.34, Concluding observations on initial report, paras. 16, 31 and 32)

“The Committee is disturbed about the reports it has received on the physical and sexual abuse of children. In this connection, the Committee is worried about the national legal provisions dealing with reasonable chastisement within the family. The imprecise nature of the expression of reasonable chastisement as contained in these legal provisions may pave the way for it to be interpreted in a subjective and arbitrary manner. Thus, the Committee is concerned that legislative and other measures relating to the physical integrity of children do not appear to be compatible with the provisions and principles of the Convention, including those of its articles 3, 19 and 37. The Committee is equally concerned that privately funded and managed schools are still permitted to administer corporal punishment to children in attendance there which does not appear to be compatible with the provisions of the Convention, including those of its article 28, paragraph 2....

“The Committee is also of the opinion that additional efforts are required to overcome the problem of violence in society. The Committee recommends that physical punishment of children in families be prohibited in the light of the provisions set out in articles 3 and 19 of the Convention. In connection with the child’s right to physical integrity, as recognized by the Convention, namely in its articles 19, 28, 29 and 37, and in the light of the best interests of the child, the Committee suggests that the State party consider the possibility of undertaking additional education campaigns. Such measures would

help to change societal attitudes towards the use of physical punishment in the family and foster the acceptance of the legal prohibition of the physical punishment of children.

“... Legislative measures are recommended to prohibit the use of corporal punishment in privately funded and managed schools.”

*Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women*

(18 July 2008, Part of A/63/38, Concluding observations on fifth/sixth report, paras. 280 and 281)

“... The Committee also notes with concern that corporal punishment is lawful in the home and constitutes a form of violence against children, including the girl child.

“The Committee urges the State party to accord priority attention to the adoption of comprehensive measures to address violence against women in accordance with its general recommendation No. 19 on violence against women.... The Committee further recommends that the State party include in its legislation the prohibition of corporal punishment of children in the home.”

*Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights*

(12 June 2009, E/C.12/GBR/CO/5, Concluding observations on fourth/fifth report, para. 24)

“The Committee ... also remains concerned that corporal punishment of children in the home is not yet prohibited by law.

The Committee ... reiterates its recommendation that physical punishment of children in the home be prohibited by law.”

*Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights*

(5 June 2002, E/C.12/1/Add.79, Concluding observations on fourth report, para. 36)

“Given the principle of the dignity of the individual, which provides the foundation for international human rights law (see paragraph 41 of the Committee's General Comment No. 13) and in the light of article 10.1 and 10.3 of the Covenant, the Committee recommends that the physical punishment of children in families be prohibited, in line with the recommendation of the Committee on the Rights of the Child (see paragraph 31 of the 1995 concluding observations of that Committee (CRC/C/15/Add.34)).”

*Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights*

(4 December 1997, CESCR/E/C.12/1/Add.19, Concluding observations on third report, paras. 16 and 28)

“The Committee is alarmed by the fact that corporal punishment continues to be practised in schools which are privately financed, and at the statement by the delegation that the Government does not intend to eliminate this practice.

“The Committee recommends that the State party take appropriate measures to eliminate corporal punishment in those schools in which this practice is still permitted, i.e. privately financed schools.”

*Human Rights Committee*

(30 July 2008, CCPR/C/GBR/CO/6, Concluding observations on sixth report, para. 27)

“The Committee notes with concern that corporal punishment of children is not prohibited in schools in Bermuda, the British Virgin Islands, Gibraltar, Montserrat and the Crown Dependencies. (arts. 7 and 24)

The State party should expressly prohibit corporal punishment of children in all schools in all British Overseas Territories and Crown Dependencies.”

*Human Rights Committee*

(27 July 1995, CCPR/C/79/Add.55, Concluding observations on fourth report, para. 8)

“The Committee recommends that corporal punishment administered to privately funded pupils in independent schools be abolished.”

*European Committee of Social Rights*

(July 2005, Conclusions XVII-2)

“The Committee recalls that Article 17 of the Charter requires a prohibition in legislation against any form of violence against children, whether at school, in other institutions, in their home or elsewhere. It furthermore considers that this prohibition must be combined with adequate sanctions in penal or civil law.

“The Committee notes that information from the report on the Regulations on Children’s Homes which do not allow corporal punishment as a disciplinary measure in children’s homes, in England, Wales and Scotland. It asks whether such a regulation exists for Northern Ireland.

“It notes from another source that legislation prohibiting corporal punishment in all forms of day care, including child minding, has not yet been put in place in England, Scotland or Northern Ireland. Since the precise situation is not clear, the Committee asks that the next report contain detailed information on the prohibition of corporal punishment in all child-care settings, including private ones.

“The Committee further notes from the same source that the abolition of corporal punishment in all schools in England, Wales and Scotland, has not yet been extended to cover all private schools in Northern Ireland. It asks that the next report provide more information on this.

“The Committee notes that corporal punishment within the family is not prohibited. It further notes from the abovementioned source that the defence of ‘reasonable chastisement’ still exists and the State has taken no significant action towards prohibiting all corporal punishment of children in the family. Therefore, it considers that since there is no prohibition in legislation of all corporal punishment in the home, the situation is not in conformity with Article 17 of the Charter.

...

“The Committee concludes that the situation in the United Kingdom is not in conformity with Article 17 of the Charter on the grounds that:

- corporal punishment in the home is not prohibited....”

*European Committee of Social Rights*

(1 January 2001, Conclusions XV-2 vol. 2, pages 612-617)

“As regards corporal punishment, the Committee notes that it was prohibited in private schools by the School Standards and Framework Act 1998, with the result that corporal punishment is now prohibited

in all schools. The Committee wishes to be informed whether legislation prohibits corporal punishment in other institutions caring for children. It notes that not all forms of corporal punishment are prohibited within the family. The Committee refers to its general observations on Article 17 in the General introduction and decides to defer its conclusion on this point pending more information from the British Government on the situation and on its intentions in this regard. It also wishes to receive information on the situation in Northern Ireland and Scotland....

...

“Pending the information requested ... on corporal punishment, the Committee defers its conclusion.”

## **Universal Periodic Review**

The UK was examined under the Universal Periodic Review process in 2008. The Government rejected the recommendations to prohibit all corporal punishment of children.

*Report prepared by the Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children*  
[www.endcorporalpunishment.org](http://www.endcorporalpunishment.org); [info@endcorporalpunishment.org](mailto:info@endcorporalpunishment.org)  
*January 2011*