

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.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

Putting a loving smack in the same category as an assault is ludicrous ... the current law already protects children from unreasonable assault. If this bill is passed, it will actually INCREASE abuse of children in two ways 1. it will divert scarce resources away from real cases of abuse and 2. if one child is separated from his/her parent(s) because of a loving/concerned smack then that separation would be infinitely more abusive to the child than the smack would have been.

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

Government should focus on addressing the pressures and reasons that lead to parents breaking up which cause deep and long-term trauma for children and this is infinitely worse than a loving smack.

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?

No Response

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?

Social work and other resources taken away from real cases of abuse, increased bureaucracy and potential for serious abuse of the law and children through interference and further pressure on ordinary family lives.

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

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

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

Yes, by not passing the Bill.

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

Page 15: General

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

This Proposed Bill is couched in 'politically correct' jargon but would result in exactly the opposite of its declared objective ... behind it appears to be an increasing intolerance towards ordinary families ... there are far more important issues for Government to be addressing than trying to criminalise a loving/concerned smack.