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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)

Loving parents should not be criminalised. A smacking ban would turn thousands of parents into potential criminals overnight while doing little to stop bad parents abusing children.

It should be the role of a parent to decide whether to smack their child, not the Government. The state should not use the criminal law to regulate parenting. Banning smacking could overwhelm police and social workers with trivial reports so that real cases of child abuse are missed.

Smacking is not child abuse. There is a clear difference between child abuse and loving parental discipline.

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)

Not at all. The law already protects children from violence. It is completely misleading to describe a loving smack as violence.
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)

A 2017 ComRes poll found that 76% of Welsh adults were against criminalising smacking, while only 11% were in favour. It’s bad for children, families and society when children are not properly disciplined.

Most adults were smacked when they were children – polls routinely show over 80% – but do not think their parents were child abusers. Smacking is used to warn children of dangers before they are old enough to understand a verbal warning. Criminalising it will actually jeopardise children’s safety.

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.

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)

Indeed yes. Child-on-child violence in Sweden increased after smacking was banned in 1979. Criminalising it will actually jeopardise children’s safety. It will criminalize loving parents, undermining their healthy education.

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)

It will have huge financial implications; The government will have to create budgets to be given to a wide variety of people involved in this new bill.

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)
No, what I said is well enough.

This is a bill which is going to undermine parental authority and as such, it further helps to create a communist society where everyone is controlled, even at thought level, where intrusive agents will maintain surveillance in schools and homes, etc.