

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.

N. M. Ross

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 believe that this proposal, if implemented, will be detrimental to family life, to the well-being of children, and will effectively criminalise parents who may on occasions have to smack a naughty child in a fair and affectionate manner. Christian parents, like all parents, have no easy task in bringing up their children to know and do what is right and desist from wrongdoing, and to do so especially by instruction and example. But both Christian teaching and common sense also require that when necessary, physical discipline be administered in an equitable, loving way.

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

As a parent of five children and grandfather of several, I believe it would help parents in trying to maintain family morality and discipline (if necessary by an occasional fair and loving smack) if governments indicated their support for, or at least did not hinder, those endeavours. The praiseworthy aim of the well-being of children is already catered for by existing legislation and would be better delivered if there were not the unwarranted intrusion into family life which would undoubtedly be the result of the Bill.

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?

Children need the guidance and discipline which are unnecessary for grown-ups. Therefore, at some time or another, children may need just and affectionate physical punishment – which is not assault. It is so unfair, misleading and indeed wrong to describe physical discipline as assault. I find it shocking that a loving parent, administering justly deserved corporal chastisement, should be branded as a criminal, which would be the case if this proposal were implemented. It is also appalling that any government, by implementing such a proposal and equating physical discipline with assault, should unjustly encroach on family life, and curtail the freedom of parents to exercise fair and loving chastisement.

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

The implementing of this proposal will result in the investigating of parents (and I believe they will be

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

many) who will be reported for chastising their children even although the discipline was just and given out of love to the child. Therefore our already overstretched social services will have an extra and unnecessary burden imposed upon them.

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

With regard to "religion and belief", I fear that that Christian parents especially will fall foul of this proposed law, believing as they do that family discipline includes not only parental teaching and good example but also, if necessary, physical correction (all to be laced with tender love).

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

Please explain the reasons for your response:

There will have to be the the expanding of already scarce resources for the implementing of the Bill which, if I am not mistaken, will have significant disproportionate economic impact.

Page 15: General

red the opposite: that 65 per cent of parents agree "that it is sometimes necessary for a parent to smack a naughty child".

3rd_February_2014.pdf

Child abuse and assault are certainly criminal and to be soundly condemned and punished according to the law. But fair, affectionate, moderate physi

children but to their detriment; and to the undermining of family life. Sweden's 1979 ban on smacking appears to have done more harm than good.
[Differentiating Evidence from Advocacy in Evaluating Sweden's Spanking Ban A Response to Joan Durrant's Critique of my Booklet Sweden's](#)
