

Children (Equal Protection from Assault) (Scotland) Bill

Page 2: About you

Are you responding as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?

an individual

Which of the following best describes you? (If you are a professional or academic, but not in a subject relevant to the consultation, please choose "Member of the public".)

Member of the public

Please select the category which best describes your organisation

No Response

Please choose one of the following; if you choose the first option, please provide your name or the name of your organisation as you wish it to be published.

I would like this response to be anonymous (the response may be published, but no name)

Please insert your name or the name of your organisation. If you choose the first option above, this should be the name as you wish it to be published. If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.

Please provide details of a way in which we can contact you if there are queries regarding your response. Email is preferred but you can also provide a postal address or phone number. We will not publish these details.

Page 7: Your views on the proposal

Q1. Which of the following best expresses your view of the proposal of giving children equal protection from assault by prohibiting all physical punishment of children?

Fully opposed

Q1. Which of the following best expresses your view of the proposal of giving children equal protection from assault by prohibiting all physical punishment of children?

Please explain the reasons for your response

I experienced mild physical punishment throughout my own childhood and employed it with those of my 4 children who required it when necessary. I believe that this is a parental responsibility where the State should only interfere when just discipline becomes abuse - I certainly do not consider a smack on the backside or hands to be abusive. Not all children require a smack, but the use of a smack is often the most effective course of action in my opinion. I'm glad my children are all older now as I'm not sure I'd like to raise children where I have no rights to exercise parental control (within limits...the limits we currently have) as I deem correct in good conscience.

Q2. Could the aims of the proposal be better delivered in another way (without a Bill in the Scottish Parliament)?

Yes (if so, please explain below)

Please explain the reasons for your response

Education, meaning that you should reason with parents rather than punish them....just as you wish parents to reason with children rather than punish them!

Q3. What do you think would be the main advantages, if any, of giving children equal protection from assault by prohibiting all physical punishment of children?

I look at the poor behaviour in schools since corporal punishment was banned and I can think of no advantage at all.

Q4. What do you think would be the main disadvantages, if any, of giving children equal protection from assault by prohibiting all physical punishment of children?

Poor behaviour where children grow up not recognising limits or understanding that breaching limits of acceptable behaviour in society has consequences. Smacking is a life-lesson in understanding cause and effect situations later in life.

Page 11: Financial implications

Q5. Taking account of both costs and potential savings, what financial impact would you expect the proposed Bill to have?

Significant increase in cost

Please explain the reasons for your response

Waste of police and judicial time pursuing every complaint about a parent mildly smacking their child.

Page 12: Equalities

Q6. What overall impact is the proposed Bill likely to have on the following protected groups (under the Equality Act 2010): race, disability, sex, gender re-assignment, age, religion and belief, sexual orientation, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity?

Neutral (neither positive nor negative)

Q7. Could any negative impact of the proposed Bill on any of these protected groups be minimised or avoided?

I can't see how such protected groups can be advantaged or disadvantaged by this Bill in any different way to all other people.

Page 14: Sustainability of the proposal

Q8. Do you consider that the proposed Bill can be delivered sustainably i.e. without having a disproportionate economic, social and/or environmental impact?

No

Please explain the reasons for your response:

I consider it unacceptable interference by the State - sufficient adequate remedies already exist therefore any additional remedies are unnecessarily costly.

Page 15: General

Q9. Do you have any other comments or suggestions on the proposal?

Scrap it!