

# 78440779 - Stuart Tooley

## 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 am content for this response to be attributed to me or my organisation

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.

Stuart Tooley

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

Fully supportive

**Please explain the reasons for your response**

- A new law would provide a strong message that violence and abuse are unacceptable.

- For too many workers, abuse and violence have become 'just part of the job'.
- In order to change that, a new law would do three positive things:
  - o Ensure that victims and potential perpetrators are aware that abuse and violence are illegal, and carry significant consequences
  - o It will help to break the cycle of under-reporting, where victims feel it is just part of the job.

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

Either

**Please explain the reasons for your response**

- Both a statutory offence and statutory aggravation would help to increase the awareness of the issue, thus hopefully preventing abuse and violence.
- A statutory aggravation could have the benefit of increasing the severity of the punishment for existing crimes, while a new statutory offence could capture new offences, for example obstruction. This may help to prevent issues escalating.

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?

Either

**Please explain the reasons for your response**

- Both a statutory offence and statutory aggravation would help to increase the awareness of the issue, thus hopefully preventing abuse and violence.
- A statutory aggravation could have the benefit of increasing the severity of the punishment for existi

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?

No

**Please explain the reasons for your response.**

-

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** - Some increase in cost

**Q5.2. (b) Businesses** - Some reduction in cost

**Q5.3. (c) Individuals** - Broadly cost neutral

**Please explain the reasons for your responses.**

There may be some increase in costs to government due to increase work by police or courts.

Businesses may save money due to fewer staff absences and less staff turnover.

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

No

**Please explain the reasons for your responses.**

-

**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?**

Slightly positive

**Please explain the reasons for your responses.**

There is some evidence to suggest that the victims of the behaviour that this bill is trying to prevent would be more likely to be female, as more women than men work in the retail sector.

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

-

**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?**

Yes

**Please explain the reasons for your responses.**

Reducing staff absence and turnover due to abuse and violence could have positive impact on both businesses' sustainability, and positive wellbeing of their staff.

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?

*I feel it is important that pharmacy is included, if not implicitly covered through retail.*

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	No
None of the above	Yes

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

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)

-









