

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.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

A loving smack is NOT abuse and will only be of benefit to the child who will learn from the discipline of the parents the difference between right and wrong. Parents who administer a smack because they love their children would become "criminals" if what is being proposed would become law! The resources needed for dealing with cases of genuine abuse of children would sadly be diverted with the focus being on parents who have the best interests of their children at heart.

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**

The Bill is not concentrating on genuine child abuse but including ALL parents which is interfering with those who genuinely do love their children when they administer a 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?

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?

Loving parents would become "criminals" which seriously undermines family life. Social workers would be inundated with trivialities and many cases of real child abuse would be missed.

## 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**

Parents who are administering discipline in love would be needlessly chased up and Social Workers would be inundated with needless reports etc. The law already protects children and it is very misleading when the government describes a smack given to a child out of love as "an assault". Children are dependent on their parents to guide them as to what is right and what is wrong so a loving smack will not harm the child. It is not child 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?

*No Response*

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

*No Response*

## 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 Response*

## Page 15: General

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

The public have already strongly opposed a ban on smacking. Only 22% disagreed. It is a bad reflection on our society when children are not taught right from wrong at an early age. They need to be properly disciplined in the home first and the state should not interfere with loving parental discipline in normal family life and neither should it use criminal law to threaten such caring parents. It is now known that child abuse rates and child-on-child violence in Sweden increased after smacking was banned there in 1979. Our country should learn lessons from such statistics. We used to be "The Land of The Book" which states "spare the rod and spoil the child" and also advises "train up a child in the way he should go and when he is old he will not depart from it". We do not wish to see more overcrowded prisons in our country as a result of our children being neglected as far as discipline is concerned.