About you
Individual

1 The Bill’s general principles

1.1 Do you support the principles of the Children (Abolition of Defence of Reasonable Punishment) (Wales) Bill?
— No

1.2 Please outline your reasons for your answer to question 1.1

(we would be grateful if you could keep your answer to around 1000 words)

To teach a child consequence by only verbally challenging does not demonstrate the physical consequence of danger e.g a child attempts to place their hand near a fire stepping out into a road without looking. A mild smack would be appropriate in that it would demonstrate that if that was a shock then the shock of them placing their hand in a fire or stepping out into a road with oncoming traffic, would be much worse. Merely verbally gesticulating that these kind of actions are dangerous has no tangible value to a child who’s reasoning skills are still being developed. removing the ability to physically chastise further removes the comprehension of tangible consequence. in the presence of danger as a result of their own actions.

1.3 Do you think there is a need for legislation to deliver what this Bill is trying to achieve?

(we would be grateful if you could keep your answer to around 1000 words)

no as there are already many legislative laws in place to protect children otherwise the likes of social services would never exist.
2 The Bill’s implementation

2.1 Do you have any comments about any potential barriers to implementing the Bill? If no, go to question 3.1

(we would be grateful if you could keep your answer to around 1000 words)

The European court of human rights as agreed in principle reasonable chastisement. implementation of the bill would undermine the parental role and the bill of human rights thus polarising Wales against the wider world giving the view of a nanny state.

2.2 Do you think the Bill takes account of these potential barriers?

(we would be grateful if you could keep your answer to around 1000 words)

no as quite a large number polls have stated three quarters of all those interviewed are opposed to the legislation.

3 Unintended consequences

3.1 Do you think there are any unintended consequences arising from the Bill? If no, go to question 4.1

(we would be grateful if you could keep your answer to around 1000 words)

The burden on the already over stretched resources of social services will be increased to the point that they will be inundated with 'reasonable chastisement' cases when they could be looking at genuine cases of child endangerment and in some cases may very well overlook such cases with fatal detriment to those children who need protection as opposed to criminalising parents for parenting with common sense.

Criminalising parents in such a way for practising common sense parenting would marginalise a large majority of loving parents and as such they would be classed as abusers potentially losing their jobs as a result of criminal records.

There would be a grey area confusion in what is considered abuse making what is currently considered genuine child abuse a further extreme on the definition scale.

4 Financial implications

4.1 Do you have any comments on the financial implications of the Bill (as set out in Part 2 of the Explanatory Memorandum)? If no, go to question 5.1

(we would be grateful if you could keep your answer to around 1000 words)

again its an unnecessary expenditure at the cost of the tax payer to provide a service the removes parental rights to parent with common sense a mild smack does not denote
physical abuse it is a tool to condition a response to common dangers that cannot be made tangible through verbal gesticulation (do not put your hand in the fire do not step into oncoming traffic do not touch a boiling kettle do not drink/eat poisonous items etc etc)

the expenditure in implementing the legislation would be better utilised enforcing current law and protecting genuinely endangered children reducing the strain on an already over stretched social services

5 Other considerations

5.1 Do you have any other points you wish to raise about this Bill?

(we would be grateful if you could keep your answer to around 1000 words)

Please use common sense and not middle class social media commercialised views in order to portray a world of no consequence to actions. reasonable chastisement is a fundamental right as agreed by the EU court of human rights. It feels an attempt to enforce legislation as a step to differentiate us from the EU as a result of Brexit.