

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.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

Firstly as a parent of a very confident happy 18 year old I do not see that reasonable loving chastisement of a child to prevent them from further actions to their harm or to divert them from actions that are wrong is assault. Assault is an action performed against a person to their harm, smacking a child (not carried out in anger or repeatedly) as a warning for that child for their good is not assault. A child needs to be brought up to be a good citizen of their country and community, to be responsible and teachable and to have respect for others, to know right and wrong. By not allowing reasonable chastisement, a child will easily grow up a tyrant wanting their own way and not coming under right authority. This Bill if it goes ahead would turn thousands of loving parents into criminals overnight and would also serve to divert resources away from those who are really assaulting and abusing children.

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

Children are already protected and rightly so from abuses and assaults from adults. More resources should be put to that use as already many are falling through the net from under resourcing. This Bill will not help in any way those genuine cases.

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 child should be assaulted ever, This proposal is skewed in its approach by leading the responder to think in this way. I have covered this previously. Abuse of children was not curbed when I was a child growing up in Manchester; that was where the true threat came from not corrective reasonable smacking from a parent.

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?

This questionnaire is by its very wording skewing whoever is answering the questions to think of loving corrective smacking of a child as assault. I have answered this in previous sections and yes every child should most definitely be protected from genuine assault, which this is not. By not allowing loving parents (IF it is required) to smack a child as part of bringing them up in a good safe and loving environment is to criminalise loving parents. Children are not adults and need to have good safe loving boundaries set. Children are dependent on their parents to teach them right from wrong and smacking is a loving way of doing so. This Bill if it goes ahead would be as intrusive, unwieldy as the now defunct Named person act was proved to have been and lead to thousands of trivial reports being made to social work so that real cases are missed (which they already are). This would lead to valuable resources being diverted from genuine cases, resources that are already in very short supply.

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

This is obvious in terms of legal (social work, health services, police etc).

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

All of these groups describe people and the effects of this Bill will criminalise all parts of this group where loving parents (whichever box they tick) will potentially be criminalised.

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

Yes by not putting this intrusive and potentially family destructive Bill through

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:

The costs to implement this with all of the extra resources, hearings, red tape etc and to ensure that genuine cases where children are being assaulted and abused would be prohibitive.

Page 15: General

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

As far as Polls are concerned, a 2014 ComRes poll found that 65% of adults said that it is sometimes necessary for a parent to smack a naughty child (only 22% disagreed with this). It is bad for children, families and society when children are not properly disciplined. In fact in the case of Sweden after

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

smacking was banned there in 1979, child abuse rates increased.

This proposal if it goes ahead will criminalise loving parents and serve to split up loving families, put a burden on social work and divert cases away from where help is really needed. This proposal will ultimately be bad for this country in future generations.