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### 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)

1. If something is “reasonable” why ban it? There is an illogicality to the bill.

2. The law already bans abusive and excessive physical punishment, so there is no need for this bill. It is wasting valuable assembly time.

3. The Assembly government has already indicated the possible cost implication to enforcing such a bill if passed. This represents unwarranted extra burden on the time and financial resources of agencies such as the police, social services and courts.

4. Such a law could criminalise otherwise good, caring and loving parents and create an unnecessary rift between parents and children.

5. Parents have primary responsibility for their children, not the state. The importance of the family as the basic building block in society has already been under attack from a number of angles. This bill represents yet another assault on the special status of the family.

#### 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. The law already protects children from unreasonable chastisement. The bill represents yet another political correctness attack on family life.

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)

Obtaining objective evidence for any prosecution could be difficult. If there were no physical signs deemed unreasonable by medical practitioners, any case would rely on the varying opinions of the child, the parent or how a bystander viewed what had happened.

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)

-

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)

Yes. Reasonable, caring and loving parents could be demonised and even lose access to their children because of such unnecessary state interference in their child-rearing role. Although hinted at, enforcement of such a bill once law could be burdensome to those agencies involved.

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)

Yes. As already said, there are costs in time and money for the Assembly to debate such an unnecessary bill. Also, implementation and enforcement would have serious implications. Interestingly, it would appear that police in Scotland have recognised this with a similar bill being proposed there.
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)