

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 am content for this response to be attributed to me or my organisation

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.

Stephen Carter

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

1. I do not believe at all that children should be routinely beaten or that smacking should be a first resort but I do believe it is appropriate where the safety of the child is at stake or in cases of willful disobedience where other measures have failed. For instance harming another child. 2. I believe statistical evidence does not support banning reasonable chastisement. For instance in Sweden child abuse and child-on-child violence increased after a ban was enforced in 1979. 3. I believe that giving the state such draconian powers is open to abuse and incompetence. The handling of the Bodnariu family in Norway is internationally believed to have been disproportionate and ultimately extremely damaging to the children. 4. Considering that the state is struggling to deal with real abusers, giving it such wide powers is going to further diminish resources in areas where intervention would be almost universally agreed to be necessary.

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

Just enforce the existing legislation against assault which is quite adequate where real abuse is occurring.

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?

None

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?

Undue interference in the functioning of loving well ordered families.

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

All functions of the state cost money. This is likely to increase the number of legal actions. By increasing the functions and precipitating legal challenges it is inevitable that costs would escalate. Since there is unlikely to be significantly more money it is likely to negatively impinge on appropriate state action in the event of genuine abuse.

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?

Negative

Please explain the reasons for your response

There is one pot of money. By spending it unnecessarily in this area it is inevitable that other areas will be affected

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

No

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:

Already stated

Page 15: General

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

Allow decent families to function in peace