

# 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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.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 Supportive

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**

No one requires physical assault visited upon them. Adults can object and be heard, or have redress in law. Children can't, although, since the Salamanca agreement, they should have.

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

No

**Please explain the reasons for your response**

Voluntary action does not protect the most vulnerable children, viz, those who are assaulted. The adults with them clearly think THEY have the rights, not the child.

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?

Growing up without that fear, hopefully growing into adults who wouldn't think to hit a child. Sadly though, it's power, so I think this bill will only be a part of the protection necessary for the vulnerable in the face of today's violent, power mad society. It's a good move.

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?

Can't think of any.

## Page 11: Financial implications

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

Unsure

**Please explain the reasons for your response**

I don't have any expertise in costings for implementing and enforcing law, so I can't comment if this is relating to financial costs. In societal costs, I can only imagine it to be a substantial saving in attitudes to the vulnerable.

## 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?

Positive

**Please explain the reasons for your response**

I imagine that once the "right" to hit someone is removed in relation to one vulnerable group, it should be easier to implement for all groups.

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

We need to balance human rights better. I'm not for a moment suggesting suspending anyone's human rights, and I believe they are rights, not privileges, but when a perpetrator's rights are equal to their victims rights, that seems to me to give the advantage to the perpetrator. If that could be managed better, it would be beneficial to all. As, in my opinion, would the current practice in law of "winning". Justice and mercy are more beneficial to society than "winning". The vast cost of going to law must also be sorted in a fair Scotland.

## 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?

Yes

**Please explain the reasons for your response:**

Any bill can be delivered sustainably, it takes the will and imagination of the legislating body to do it.

## Page 15: General

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

Go for it. Make Scotland a more fair and just land for everyone in it. Ignore might, money and power.