

Children (Equal Protection from Assault) (Scotland) Bill

Page 2: About you

Are you responding as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?

on behalf of an organisation

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".)

No Response

Please select the category which best describes your organisation

Third sector (charitable, campaigning, social enterprise, voluntary, non-profit)

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.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

The state should not interfere in family life to this extent. Children are already protected in law from harm and from cruel parenting. Loving Christian parents will be criminalised overnight by the introduction of the proposed legislation. The Bible has much to say about responsibilities of parents and children. It permits the use of smacking as a means of loving discipline. It requires parents to use physical discipline when necessary.

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

Unsure

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 advantage. This is not a matter of equality.

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 be criminalised.

The teachings of Christianity would be criminalised.

Legitimate debate about parenting methods would be stifled.

Parenting will be made much more complicated, perhaps even impossible, for many parents who are currently doing a good job but use a smack as a means of discipline when appropriate.

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

Please explain the reasons for your response

Christian parents would be unable to fulfil the teachings of the Bible without coming into conflict with the civil law. This Bill would represent the imposition of a secular humanistic framework on society and would discriminate against legitimate Christian practice and belief.

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

No. The Bill should be passed.

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:

It will involve costs.

Page 15: General

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

The nations of the world that still permit the use of legitimate physical chastisement of children include UK, USA, Canada, and Australia. These are countries with strong heritage of free Christian thought and practice. It has undoubtedly enabled them to have stable politics and healthy economies. It is a significant fact that most people in these countries practice smacking of their children as a means of discipline and oppose a smacking ban.

These nations prove that it is good for society when children are properly disciplined.

It is inappropriate for the state to use criminal law to interfere in normal family life. It would cause untold social harm.