

A Bill to Abolish Parental Authority

Sue Bradford's Private Member's "Crimes (Abolition of Force as a Justification for Child Discipline) Amendment Bill" is due to come before Parliament soon. It purports to put in place an extra margin of safety for children whose parents might want to make the children an object of violent and abusive assault.

This Bill is badly misdirected and ill conceived. Even the title is nonsense, saying as it does that force justifies child discipline, a logical impossibility.

It is a very short Bill, fitting on one A4 page. It simply seeks to repeal Section 59 of the Crimes Act and make two consequential amendments to the Education Act. The downstream implications, however, will be gargantuan for all parents, home educators in particular.

Violent and abusive assault is already illegal, of course. In fact Section 59 actually helps to define violent and abusive assault against a child. Here is Section 59 itself as well as Section 2, the actual definition of "assault", both straight out of the Crimes Act 1961:

Section 59. Domestic discipline —
(1) Every parent of a child and, subject to subsection (3) of this section, 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.
(2) The reasonableness of the force used is a question of fact.
(3) Nothing in subsection (1) of this section justifies the use of force towards a child in contravention of

section 139A of the Education Act 1989.

Section 2. Interpretation —
"Assault" means the act of intentionally applying or attempting to apply force to the person of another, directly or indirectly, or threatening by any act or gesture to apply such force to the person of another, if the person making the threat has, or causes the other to believe on reasonable grounds that he has, present ability to effect his purpose.

Note in Section 2 that actual physical contact is not necessary to commit assault. Jim only needs to intimidate Fred into thinking Jim is going to make Fred do Jim's will. As soon as Fred believes Jim is serious and further believes that Jim can actually make Fred do it, Jim is guilty of assault against Fred.

Just think of the chaos that would descend on a household if junior got a snitch against mum and refused to do anything she said. Mum could not make junior do anything at all, for that would involve forcing her will on junior; she could not threaten him with any restriction of privileges, for that too would involve force.

We can all immediately see that parents use force with their children

Schools a "Major Site of Struggle"

At their graduation ceremony in May this year, Emeritus Professor Ivan Snook told the assembled Massey University teaching graduates in Palmerston North they were entering a "major site of struggle". He claimed that educational reforms over the past 18 years had failed. As a result, Professor Snook said, a litany of problems plagued teachers.

He had his own eclectic assortment of problems: teachers faced increased surveillance, were seen as skilled technicians rather than professionals and were prevented from promoting social justice under the guise of "political correctness".¹ I'm not sure how Prof Snook can complain about one Marxist practice (teachers promoting social justice) being done under the guise of another Marxist practice (political correctness), but Marxists have always been

good at creating smoke screens by playing one of their ideas off against another, never even giving non-Marxist ideas a mention.

He's right about schools being a site of struggle: there are the ideological as well as the physical battles.

We had all thought that the secular/sacred battle had been decided back in 1877 with the secular clause in the Education Act, that "the teaching shall be entirely of a secular character." However, it appears some schools want to ensure the free time is secular as well. Wellington's Seatoun School board of trustees told the school's Christian KidsKlub to close down their lunch time meetings. Unlike the secular worldview presented in the classes or the permissive sex education or the Halloween themes or the homosexual-friendly units from which the

(Continued on page 3: Struggle)

all the time! It is inseparable from their parental authority in directing the upbringing, training and behaviour of their children. Virtually every parent in the country, including Sue Bradford, would surely agree that this everyday use of force with our children is absolutely necessary, because without force to back up your authority, you have no authority.

This use of such everyday parental force is practised and understood by almost everyone. It is not of necessity violent or abusive, neither would any sane person define this kind of force as always being violent or abusive in nature. However, this kind of force is most definitely defined as **assault** according to Section 2 of the Crimes Act. According to the Act, criminal assault does not have to be either violent or abusive....it only requires that one person be convinced it **is about to happen** to him.

And right there is the problem: as soon as you repeal Section 59, all parents would be constantly open to charges of assault against their children for using force of **any** description, reasonable or unreasonable. Without Section 59 in place, **no**

force used toward a child is justified in law. Parental authority, like any other authority, must be backed up by force, or it is no authority at all. Repeal Section 59, and parental authority over their own children evaporates immediately.

Section 59 Justifies Parents in Carrying Out Their Parental Responsibilities

However, with Section 59 in place as it is, parents are legally justified in using this kind of necessary force to correct their children. Section 59 protects us parents from malicious charges of assault from busybodies, trouble-makers and those who would victimise us because we irk them. Maybe our house is too nice. Maybe it is too messy for them. Perhaps we have too many children, or we home educate, or we have certain religious views. Or maybe we are Sue Bradford's idea of the worst parents of all: those who smack children when necessary. Section 59 says we parents are justified in **forcing** our children to get out of the busy road, to not touch that hot element, to get dressed, make their beds, finish their veggies, brush their teeth, do their lessons,

show proper respect to people and property, obey proper authorities, speak the truth, etc. These are all expressions of "correction", the one motivation for parental use of force which Section 59 justifies.

It was said earlier that Section 59 helps to define violent and abusive assault against a child. It does so by requiring two considerations to be present when parents use this force: 1) the force used must be reasonable in the circumstances, and 2) the force must be used by way of correction.

This is a beautiful piece of legislation. It recognises that parents have a unique responsibility

toward their children in correcting their actions, words, attitudes and behaviours; that is, in training them in the social graces. Force used against children for other reasons: to humiliate, to punish, to release anger and frustration, to save face and to get back at the child, are all clearly unjustifiable. A parent found to be using force against a child for any of these reasons is already in big trouble. Section 59 also recognises that the circumstances surrounding the use of the force – the family culture and ethnicity, their religious beliefs, the relative sizes and power and fitness of the child and of the parent, the attitudes displayed by both child and parent, the track records of both the child's behaviour and the parents' efforts at correction, the gravity of the event that triggered the use of force, the duration and intensity of the force used, where and how it was used, any previous involvement by state agencies, and even the downstream consequences for the relationship between the child and his parents, the implications for the parents' employment and overseas travel, the implications for the child's and the parents' social standing and living situations – all of these things are incredibly varied and can point to worse outcomes from a guilty verdict for the child than the original smack.

This Bill to repeal Section 59 assumes that judges and juries are too thick to weigh up all these circumstances properly and that they are unable to distinguish between "reasonable" force used "by way of correction" on the one hand and unacceptable violence against children on the other. It is Sue Bradford and other backers of the Bill saying the judges and the members of the juries, their peers, should not be trusted to tell the difference. This is how elitists show their arrogance.

Who Would You Rather Trust: A Jury of 12 with Time to Deliberate or a Single Policeman in the Heat of the Moment?

What they propose, if Section 59 were ever repealed, is that police officers would be able to make a right judgement on the spot. Some nosey neighbour or angry and irresponsible child, after being sent to

TEACH Bulletin

is a monthly publication of the Home Education Foundation and is concerned with those things which may impact on home educators. Articles will deal with political developments, statist and professional trends, correspondence with educationalists and other items of general interest to home educators. Information herein is not to be construed as legal advice. Opinions expressed in TEACH Bulletin are those of the writer and should not be assumed to reflect those of the Home Education Foundation Trustees or Board of Reference Members. TEACH Bulletin is available for a subscription of \$16 per year for 11 issues (none in December) or two years for \$30.

All correspondence to:

The Editor, Craig S. Smith
PO Box 9064
Palmerston North
New Zealand
Ph.: (06) 357-4399
Fax: (06) 357-4389
mail@hef.org.nz

www.hef.org.nz

Hear, my son, your father's instruction,
and reject not your mother's teaching.
— Proverbs 1:8

Trading Post



Wanted:

Unit Studies book wanted for beginner.

Contact:

Jane
Ph. (06) 878-8641

his room with a smack to the bottom, has rung the police, who now, in the heat of the moment, have to charge the parents or let them off. Since no force at all is justified legally if Section 59 is repealed, the conscientious cop will arrest the parent now and worry about it later.

Something else comes into focus when one looks more closely at the Crimes Act. Section 59 is separated along with Section 60 in their own little sub-category titled, "Powers of Discipline". Read Section 60:

60. Discipline on ship or aircraft—

(1) *The master or officer in command of a ship on a voyage or the pilot in command of an aircraft on a flight is justified in using and ordering the use of force for the purpose of maintaining good order and discipline on board his ship or aircraft if he believes on reasonable grounds that the use of force is necessary, and if the force used is reasonable in the circumstances.*

(2) *Every one acting in good faith is justified in using force in obedience to any order given by the master or officer or pilot in command for the purpose aforesaid, if the force used is reasonable in the circumstances.*

(3) *The reasonableness of the grounds of which the use of force was believed to be necessary, and the reasonableness of the force used, are questions of fact.*

One could be forgiven for thinking that those pushing for repeal of Section 59 are simply committed pacifists who abhor the use of any kind of **force**. In that case it would be this tiny minority trying to **force** their particular view of the matter onto the rest of us using the **force** of the Parliamentary process, which itself it backed up by the Police Force, the courts, prisons, etc.....an action which does seem somewhat at odds with itself. But since Sec-

tion 60 justifies the use of much greater force against adults by quite a wide range of other adults, i.e., "Every one acting in good faith, etc.," one wonders if there is a more sinister agenda attached to the repeal lobbyists.

Otago University lecturer in law Rex Ahdar and colleague James Allan, in a 2001 article in the *New Zealand Law Review* titled, "Taking Smacking Seriously", make much of the heavy paternalism among the repeal lobby, saying this lobby group certainly cannot justify acting as if they know what is best for everyone else's children and attempting to use the force of law to impose their narrow view on everybody else. They also indicate that ideology directs the repeal lobby's thinking. Others have said the same. American researcher Dr Robert Larzelere said of Canadian researcher Dr Joan Durrant, "Durrant and I used the identical data source to arrive at nearly opposite conclusions."¹

Repeal Is Ideologically Driven

It is the unique position of parents having the responsibility to train, discipline and correct their children over many years and the authority to back up their efforts with reasonable force that is under attack, not the use of force itself. The repeal lobby never mention Section 60, even though the force being justified there is arguably a lot greater. Section 60 also justifies total strangers using such force against others who have no relation to them at all, as long as they act "in good faith". The repeal lobby, those who would ban smacking by parents, Sue Bradford and her supporters, are totally illogical and inconsistent about this....unless they don't trust parents the way they don't trust judges or juries. Perhaps they also consider parents to be incapable of determining reasonable force with their own children. Perhaps their aim is to remove any real authority from parents by removing their legal right to back up their authority with reasonable force.

Imagine the police or the city council or the IRD being unable to

back up their authority, that is, enforce their statements, with the use of force. They would have no real authority at all, for without the power to force compliance, people would only consider their statements as optional suggestions. If parents have no justification in law to back up their authority with the use of any force at all (which would be the case if Section 59 were repealed), children would soon learn that they could ignore whatever their parents said. They would also soon learn – from schoolmates and teachers and Politically Correct units in the state school curriculum – that they could get the police to descend on their parents should they ever make – or even try to make – the children do anything against their wills.

Parenting and the role of parents in training and correcting and disciplining their children would be eliminated from New Zealand if Section 59 were repealed. Parents would be reduced to baby-sitters, manipulated by their undisciplined children, frozen into impotency by the very real fear of an assault charge.

Oppose all measures to repeal Section 59. The future of our families depends upon it.

Note:

1. Larzelere, Robert E., Child Abuse in Sweden, <http://people.biola.edu/faculty/paulp/sweden2.html>

(Continued from page 1: **Struggle**)

children may occasionally be given the opportunity to opt out of, children had to opt in to the once-a-week Christian club with permission slips from parents. Mike McKee, KidsKlub coordinator, said he asked the board how they'd feel if a Hindu group set up at the school. They apparently replied it would be a good way to celebrate diversity....but Christian things had to stay out.²

MP Brian Donnelly heated up the situation even more by saying the secular clause was "necessarily" breached to satisfy Treaty of Waitangi requirements! Apparently curriculum documents require a development of spirituality among students.³ It is widely recognised that education is inherently and ines-

capably a religious task. The only question is: which religion is going to be the favoured and recognised religion of the state classroom?

Then there is the social struggle. According to New Zealand Principals' Federation President Pat Newman, principals and teachers have become de facto social workers in their own schools. (One could argue that this has been the social engineering objective from the first day the state usurped the teaching responsibility from the parents back in 1877. You do reap what you sow. — Ed.) "We're not talking about kids just being naughty, we're talking about severely disturbed children from severely dysfunctional families...When you're dealing with children who do everything from verbal abuse to assault on other children and teachers, you're spending a lot of time insuring the safety of the children and yourself even before you begin teaching."

Silverdale Normal principal Russ Young said he would spend half the week working with children with problems. Frankton principal Judy Dixon said, "There seems to have been a whole generation who have lost parenting skills. Whether it's because they're too busy I don't know, but the issue of where the responsibility lies needs to be addressed."⁵

Ms Dixon has raised a very important issue: whose responsibility are the children? They are compelled by law to attend school, but if they leave at 16 totally illiterate, you cannot sue the teachers, the schools or the MoE. It is the parents' fault. Same for when a child is "socialised" into anti-social and incompetent behaviour: it is still the parents who will get the blame. This writer knows a teenager who has picked up on all the positive messages about homosexuality. But once he started propositioning other kids at school this year, he got expelled. Like the illiterates and incompetents, this perverted kid has been dumped by the very institution which helped form him. These kids become the parents' problem until they are institutionalised and/or let loose on society...then they are *our* problem, even though they've never been our responsibility.

Compulsory state schooling takes many of the jobs of parenting away from parents but refuses to take the responsibility. This will eventually destroy society. The teachers are seeing it happen before their very eyes: since parents think many of their parenting chores have been taken over by the schools, they stop trying. They lose; their children lose; and a nasty cycle develops.

Another struggle is with the pupils becoming more creative at baiting the teachers with all the advances in technology. One of the latest is enraging teachers and recording their responses on cellphones. And of course they bully and intimidate one another via text messages, spreading rumours on chat rooms and taking cellphone photos in the changing rooms. This kind of thing mostly goes unreported since the children don't want their cellphones taken from them. We're talking children as young as five with cellphones here. Technology safety group NetSafe school education manager Claire Balfour says parents sometimes haven't got a clue how their children use cellphones, especially the one who received a \$1000 bill after unwittingly buying her 11-year-old a phone with internet access.⁴

Of course we home educators do not need to give our five-year-olds cellphones to keep up with the peer pressure or to learn from their classmates how to mis-use them. It is so good to be out of that whole wretched scene. If only our friends, neighbours and relations could see past their mortgages and second jobs and other establishment trappings to the welfare and happiness of their own children, they'd be home educating as well.

Notes:

1. *NZ Herald*, 16 May 2005, http://www.nzherald.co.nz/index.cfm?c_id=1&ObjectID=10125709
2. *Newstalk ZB News*, 10 June 2005, Parents vow to reinstate club.
3. *Stuff.co.nz*, 22 June 2005, Debate over school bible studies reaches parliament, <http://www.stuff.co.nz/stuff/0,2106,3321012a7694,00.html>

4. *Sunday Star-Times*, 15 May 2005, Phone-bully pupils targeting teachers, <http://www.stuff.co.nz/stuff/0,2106,3280838a7694,00.html>
5. *Hamilton Press*, 8 June 2005, Schools cry out for help.

Blame the Genes

Principal Youth Court Judge Andrew Becroft is so alarmed at youth offending, he believes intervention should start at age three, since that's when you can see the signs, he reckons. This came out at a Youth Horizons conference in Wellington in June, where the topic was "severe conduct disorder", sometimes called "juvenile psychopathy" or "human time bombs" to use Judge Becroft's turn of phrase.

Not to be outdone, child development researcher Richie Poulton said the disorder was caused by a combination of genes and upbringing. Professor Poulton stood before the entire conference and declared, "Genes don't operate in isolation. It is childhood maltreatment that turns the gene on and off."¹ Now this kind of creative biology is very, very worrying. It is saying badly behaved children probably cannot help themselves. If that is so, how can we possibly blame them for their bad behaviour? We'll either have to simply put up with it or perhaps drug them to the eyeballs or maybe just institutionalise them. In the old days we used to discipline them. Some of us still do.

This "blame it on the genes" tack is really interesting. It appears to be a secular version of the Christian doctrine which states that all people are inherently bent toward rebellion and bad behaviour. But where the gene theory will only treat the symptoms, the Bible says this rebellious tendency can be driven out of the child's personality to a large extent, providing a near-cure, by consistent training and discipline. "Foolishness is bound up in the heart of a child, but the rod of correction will drive it far from him" says Proverbs 22:15.

However, the gene theory puts the problem beyond the reach of the layman (you and me); only the medical and scientific and pharmaceutical community can propose any solutions; that is, once they've

exhausted years of research grants to investigate and more fully understand this ludicrous idea. And in the meantime, since the out-of-control child cannot help himself, neither can his parents. And so intervention by professionally trained agents of the state is called for: social welfare officers, police officers, psychologists, teachers, prison guards, etc. Plenty of us parents know that loving and consistent discipline, including a spanking when necessary, rather than putting up with a child's naughtiness, deals with this "conduct disorder" very well indeed: preventing it from ever developing in the first place. But not only is there a push to get this problem into the hands of highly paid professionals, there are also moves afoot to ban parents from utilising this marvellous tool of training and discipline because it involves the use of force and the ancient art of smacking. If we parents don't take a stand against the "professionals" coming to claim our own children, it is not likely that anyone else will.

1. *Dominion Post*, 29 June 2005, How to pick a crim at age 3, <http://www.stuff.co.nz/stuff/0,2106,3328736a10,00.html>

Update from Sheila in Germany

We received some very interesting and very positive news since the elections in May with regards to the legal situation of homeschooling in our state of North Rhine Westphalia. Perhaps the winds are changing.

First, the letter we received at the end of March demanding that our daughter be in school or we would be fined EUR 500, was dictated by the state ministry of education and sent to all 26 (known) homeschooling families in the state.

Second, a judge has ruled the ministry of education had no right to send such a letter. Eleven families have received notice that the fines have been withdrawn "due to the unclear legal situation", and in several pending court cases the judges have offered settlement proceedings.

Third, the most influential civil servant within the ministry of educa-

tion, who had told several families before (including us) that there is "no basis to even discuss the legality of homeschooling," has now invited one of the most politically active families in our state to discuss their ideas on ways to regulate homeschooling. This is obviously quite a breakthrough.

Fourth, this same family had sent a petition to the state parliament in February, to which they had received no feedback until this week (mid-May 2005), when a member of the parliament promised them a hearing.

Home Educators Save the State Millions\$

Driven by parents' beliefs that homeschool learning environments can be superior to those of public or private schools, as well as a desire by parents to spend more time together as a family, Nevada homeschooling has undergone remarkable growth during the past decade.

Homeschool children in the state now make up about one percent of all school-age children. Public school advocates have argued that homeschooling "costs" the school system money through lost per-pupil taxpayer funding whenever a child is homeschooled rather than public schooled. In fact, home school students benefit school districts in the long run by relieving them of the far greater total costs of educating them. In Nevada these cost savings are well in excess of the "lost" state aid.

By not being educated in public schools, homeschool children either save taxpayers money or make additional tax money available for other uses, including bolstering the educational opportunities for children who remain in public schools. Similar savings result from private school students. The present analysis measures the extent of this saving by estimating the additional costs that Nevada's public schools would incur if home- and private school students were placed in public schools.

Based on 2003 data, the analysis shows an annual potential cost savings to Nevada taxpayers ranging from \$24.3 million to \$34.6 million attributable to homeschool students, and another \$101.9 to \$147 million attributable to private school students, for a combined total of \$126.2 million to \$181.7 million. This total amounts to an annual potential cost savings ranging from \$327 to \$471 per Nevada public school student.

Local educators should look at home and private school students as assets, not as liabilities. Because of them, Nevada public schools' expenses decrease by a greater amount than their revenues decrease, producing a net gain. We calculate the net gain to local school districts to be between \$25.9 million and \$42.7 million.

Moreover, if taxpayers' cost savings are used to enhance the educational opportunities of those students who attend public schools, the benefit to public schools would be even greater.

(Executive Summary of *Homeschooling in Nevada: The Budgetary Impact*, by John T. Wenders, Ph.D. and Andrea D. Clements, Ph.D., Nevada Policy Research Institute Analysis (based on 2003 data, <http://www.npri.org/mgraphs/NvHomeschooling.pdf>.)

After School Porn

I'm not exactly a card-carrying member of the Moral Majority. In fact, to read my hate mail, one might think I'm some menopausal version of the Anti-Christ. But putting stereotypes aside, I would like to sound an alarm around the country. Get those chastity belts out Dorothy - we're not in Kansas anymore.

I was an adolescent in the '60s and '70s, so I didn't exactly fall off the turnip truck yesterday. My formative years were laced with numerous opportunities for sex and drugs, but neither was "on demand" nor pumped into my living room or on my desktop after school. The other day I was at the gym at 4:30 p.m. mindlessly ticking off those calories one by painful one when I read the VH1 trailer, "Coming up next: Ce-

Coming Events

Fri-Sun, 29-31 July 2005

Fifth Annual H.E.A.R.T. Retreat

Where: Totara Springs Christian Centre, Matamata, Taihoa North Road

Contact: Sue, (07) 886-0402
Email: absclan@xtra.co.nz

Sat, 6 August 2005

Whangarei Home Educators Workshop

Venue: St Andrews Uniting Church, Cnr Bank and Hunt Sts, Whangarei.

Contact: Sharyne (09) 437-2725
sjfamily@maxnet.co.nz or Sio-bhan ph (09) 437-2250.

Cost: \$15 single, \$25 couple, or \$5 per session.

lebrity Sex.” The program proceeded to show various ill-gotten photos and videos of celebrities gearing up for, having or having just engaged in sexual activity. VH1 then showed the audience of little monsters how to search for and click onto these videos and photos from their own computers.

VH1 is not exactly a porn channel, but they must understand that pornography is big business. There are more porn Web pages than there are people in this country. Yet we have hardly heard a peep out of the usual self-anointed moral guardians: Tom DeLay, Jerry Falwell, Bill Frist, Rick Santorum, James Dobson - to name a few - are so focused elsewhere that they are getting crushed by an avalanche of what my mother used to call, “debauchery.”

I spoke with some teachers who said that there is an “oral sex epidemic in the middle schools these days.”

What about Internet filters? Most kids I have interviewed say the only thing those filters do is keep their parents from looking at porn. Kids hide from parents the notes sent home from school on this subject. Those who do see the notes say,

Programme

8:30-8:55am Registration and inspect resources for sale.

9:00-10:00am Keynote Address: Getting things into Perspective - Craig Smith

10:00-10:45am Morning Tea

10:50-12:05 Four Electives

A. Teaching the Reluctant Learner - Laughton King

B. Books, Great Books and More Books + the Vital Nature of Reading Aloud - Craig & Barbara Smith

C. Career Analysis and Planning - Ray Green

D. Keeping Going - Carol Munroe

12:05-1:05pm Lunch and Resource Viewing

1:10-2:10pm Four Electives

A. The Several Intelligences - Robyn Williams

B. Home Educating Through Secondary - Craig Smith

C. Starting Out in Home Education - Sharyne Jaunay

D. Music in the Home - Dale Nelson

2:15-2:45pm 5 Mini Workshops

A. Science - Kathy Derrick

B. Holistic History - Rose Tattersal and Karen Sawford

C. Temperaments - Robyn Williams

D. An Effective Approach to Early Literacy - Sarah Reynolds

E. CVs - Jannette Coleman

2:45-3:00pm Afternoon Tea

3:00-4:00pm Four Electives

A. Dad's Essential Role - Craig Smith

B. Training Our Children's Minds: the Tools of Learning and Motivation - Barbara Smith

C. Getting Crafty - Wendy Hamilton

D. ERO Reviews - Rob Williamson

“My Johnny is a good boy.”

Denial is not just a river in Egypt. It exists in the homes of many parents.

(After-School entertainment, 18 April 2005, by Ellen Ratner, news analyst at the Fox News Channel. http://wnd.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=43855)

4:05-4:35pm Question & Answer session with panel of experienced home educators.

(For more information on Coming Events throughout the month, see www.hef.org.nz and click on Coming Events)

Lower North Island Consultations with MoE

Jeanette Voyce and Peter Norton of the Lower Hutt Management Office of the Ministry of Education have organised the following itinerary to give home educators an opportunity to ask questions and hear the latest developments. All Home Educators are invited to attend. Meetings are arranged for the rest of NZ, but details are incomplete at present.

Mon, 15 August 2005

10am - Reformed Church, 541 Ruahine St., **Palmerston North**

2pm - Thompson House, 4 Kent St., **Levin**

Wed, 17 August 2005

10am - Dannevirke Services and Citizens Club, 1 Princess St., **Dannevirke**

2pm - REAP House, 340 Queen St., **Masterton**

Fri, 19 August 2005

1pm - GSE Level 4, Westfield Tower, 45 Knights Rd., **Lower Hutt**

Wed, 24 August 2005

9am - The Life Advance Community Centre, 150 Ngamotu Rd., **New Plymouth**

2pm - Wanganui East Baptist Church, cnr Nixon & Moana Sts, **Wanganui**

Thur, 25 August 2005

9am - Council Chambers, Hautapu St., **Taihape**

Mon, 29 August 2005

2pm - Johnsonville Community Centre, 3 Frankmoore Ave., **Johnsonville**

Tue 30 August 2005

10am - Kapiti C.C. Library, 179 Rimu Rd., **Paraparaumu**

2pm - Pataka Porirua Museum of Arts and Cultures, cnr Norrie & Parumoana Rds, **Porirua**

Wed 31 August 2005

2pm - “The Stables” Lane Park Hall, 16-22 Lane St., **Upper Hutt**