

71936967

Proposed Protection of Workers (Retail and Age-Restricted Sales etc.) (Scotland) Bill

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

-

Please choose one of the following:

I would like this response to be anonymous (the response may be published, but no name)

Q1. Which of the following expresses your view of creating a new offence of assault against a worker in the retail sector?

Fully opposed

Please explain the reasons for your response

The law already provides a range of offences that can be prosecuted for the offences you identify. perhaps the system should advice shop keepers an owners how to gather evidence better to use the existing laws. the problems identified are rooted in other factors that shop owners and keepers are unable to affect. the crimes, as identified, are social problems and the crimes committed in shops are only a symptom and not in themselves a cause. that is to say that someone who is already prepared to break the laws as they stand will be no more deterred than the currently are. i.e. it wont make a difference in deterring crime, nor will it make a victim any less fearful of the crimes being committed.

Q2. Which of the following would you support as a way to respond to assaults on workers upholding statutory age-restrictions?

Neither

Please explain the reasons for your response

its hard to further explain what neither means, the problem is further up the chain of those prepared to commit these sort of offences. again it is a symptom and not a cause.

Q3. Which of the following would you support as a way to respond to abuse, harassment, threatening or obstruction of workers upholding statutory age-restrictions?

Neither

Please explain the reasons for your response

Again its hard to further explain neither. there are already laws in place to cover 'abuse, harassment, threatening or obstruction' behaviour. the last thing that is needed is to add a law that could be as inconvenienced as these questions. the problem is much more a social issue and punitive punishment hardly makes a dent into those. Investment in these times of harsh 'tory' austerity is sadly a pipe dream but would go much further to solving or reducing these sort of problems.

Q4. Do you think that there are other steps which could be taken (either instead of, or in addition to, legislation) to achieve the aims of the proposal?

Yes

Please explain the reasons for your response.

my previous answers say that treating the symptom not the cause is, in my view, not actually dealing with the problem. laws already exist to cover the offences detailed, any new law would not stop those prepared to commit them. it might make some feel good that they have identified a problem and proposed a solution, sadly that solution wont change anything for the actual workers you propose to help. the crime will still happen , then, and only then will a new law come into effect. if you are serious on the idea of protecting workers then prevention is key, criminal justice is always (necessarily) retrospective. it prevents nothing.

Q5. Taking account of both costs and potential savings, what financial impact would you expect the proposed Bill to have on:

Q5.1. (a) Government and the public sector - Significant increase in cost

Q5.2. (b) Businesses - Significant increase in cost

Q5.3. (c) Individuals - Significant increase in cost

Please explain the reasons for your responses.

It will be another law that will miss the point, it will increase costs across the board while missing the root causes. A lot of these sort of cases fail due to lack of evidence, this law will not make evidence any easier to collect. the crimes will still happen, the businesses will still suffer losses and the collection of evidence will still be what the cases hinge on. the root cause will still exist. no change and waste of time and effort for all involved.

Q6. Are there ways in which the Bill could achieve its aim more cost-effectively (e.g. by reducing costs or increasing savings)?

Yes

Please explain the reasons for your responses.

not be brought forward.

Q7. What overall impact is the proposed Bill likely to have on equality, taking account of 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 responses.

if you propose to protect one person or group more than (any) another I am unsure how 'equality' can come into it. in fact it is the exact opposite if equality

Q8. In what ways could any negative impact of the proposed Bill on equality be minimised or avoided?

not being brought forward! as you seem to aim to protect specific people in specific places and try and call it equal. this is in itself confusing.

Q9. Do you consider that the proposed Bill can be delivered sustainably i.e. without having likely future disproportionate economic, social and/or environmental impacts?

No

Please explain the reasons for your responses.

as already said a change for changes sake is an unneeded cost. therefore it will in effect be a new cost with no savings available

Q10. Do you have any other comments or suggestions on the proposal, for example, other trigger points for violence and abuse, and other workers who should be covered?

All people, working or not, of all ages creeds, colours, religions, sexual orientation and sexes should be treated equally, The police already devote extra time to the drinks industry by way of increased and enhanced patrols around the 'night time economy' of many towns and cities of which the producers pay little to fund. the bars, pubs and clubs may well share some of the cost but the vast majority of the funding comes from general taxation. i.e. from the normal public.

A shop selling restricted products already gets protection, they are not forced to sell restricted products, they do so to make money, they can and often do take extra security steps to protect themselves and their products, it is a straight cost v's benefit calculation in their business plan. they are already required to provide a 'safe working environment' as are all employers, including your own. yet many shops do not take steps and leave themselves as some risk. that is not something these proposals would cover or even seems to consider.

The larger problem appears to be societal, deprivation and poverty also play a large part in crimes such as these. these proposals appear to be a sticking plaster on a broken leg. entirely missing the point.

Q11. Which of the following describes your retail-sector experience (please tick all that apply)?

Working in premises selling alcohol for consumption on the premises (e.g. pub)	No
Working in premises selling alcohol for consumption off the premises (e.g. shop)	No
Working in premises selling other age-restricted products (e.g. tobacco, knives etc.)	No
Working in other retail premises	Yes
None of the above	No

Q12. Which of the following describes your experience of violence or verbal abuse in the retail sector (please tick all that apply)?

I have been the victim of physical violence	Yes
I have been the victim of verbal abuse	Yes
I have witnessed colleagues being subjected to physical violence	Yes
I have witnessed colleagues being subjected to verbal abuse	Yes
None of the above	No

Q13. Please give details of any personal experience that you would wish to share. (Please avoid naming any other person or giving information that would allow another person to be identified)

Only last night I was in my local off sales / corner shop when a young under-age lad came in and spouted the, sadly, all to common racial and verbal abuse to the shop keeper, he proclaimed boldly that he was 'just nicking this' and picked up two half bottles of 'tonic wine' threatened the shop keeper with them and made to leave.

when I say 'came in' the shop keeper had shut and locked the door behind me in an attempt to keep him out, the young lad had apparently already taken drink from the shop earlier in the day. he proceeded to kick the door in having already vandalised the shop keepers car. when the shop keeper sought to retrieve his stock a scuffle ensued and I was forced to assist the shop keeper in the attempt to limit any more physical violence, myself, the shop keeper and another customer then restrained the lad until the police arrived.

At only 15 years of age this clearly troubled young lad already had no respect for anyone, and especially not the shop keeper or even the police, He had not right to even consider buying alcohol far less nick it. I seriously doubt that the proposals you have presented would have one iota of affect on this young lads actions, he doesn't even have the beginnings of a clue which laws he was in violation of, especially as he assaulted the police whilst they arrested him, his troubles and this crime would not have been any different for any of us if the proposals presented here where in place. of course he might well be punished more but I fail to see how that would help anyone, least of all the young lad. who I can only think has already been failed by the system he has been in for the previous 10 years of his life.

Specificity his situation and in general the wider problems need more that some fancy words on paper, there is actually a problem that clearly effects many but is not limited to those that sell restricted items. solve that problem first and these sorts of problems will reduce in concert.

invest, train and educate wider society as a whole, but that's far to hard for you to consider so you propose a pointless 'new' law in what appears a rehash of the old adage of 'something must be done so I will do something'. knee jerk reaction at best and simple political point scoring at worst, 0/10 you must do better.

