

B.S.L. Bill (Scotland) - Public Consultation Questionnaire Response

1. Is it possible the B.S.L. Bill is an attempt to side-track potential claims against discrimination under the Equality Act (2010)?
2. The aim to increase the use of B.S.L. amongst Public authorities is ambitious, optimistic and honourable.
3. Of course there may be consequences for users of Deaf Blind Manual; readers of Braille, etc.
For instance, official documents often contain statements offering information provided in different formats, e.g. in Braille, yet these addendums are rarely printed in Braille.
4. Will the Minister with lead responsibility for B.S.L. be an indigenous sign language user?
5. That seems to depend on the willingness of the authorities concerned, not on the legislative powers of the Bill. So will there be any real change?
7. The two-track time-scale for the B.S.L. and Scottish Government makes no sense to me at all. Perhaps a B.S.L. explanation would make sense to me, because the English table makes no sense, and is probably not produced by a Sign Language user.
Is this an attempt by the Scottish Government to distance itself from its responsibilities under the Equalities Act (2010), by putting a time-lag in place over the B.S.L. Bill?
17. Typical of Government/Council projects, the Financial Memorandum cites costs relevant to its own procedures and programmes that it normally indulges in. The money (costs) assigned to 'establish' the Bill appears to be programmed to be directed not to the production and enhancement of the use of B.S.L., but on production of plans and procedures in the English language. Thus indulging in existing language use and further excluding

B.S.L. users from financial resources.

Furthermore, the Financial Memorandum fails to recognise the potential financial gain from implementing full equality to B.S.L. users, which would enable B.S.L. users to achieve their full potential in the work place and Scottish economy as a whole. There is a vast wealth of knowledge and expertise in the Sign Language community hoping to contribute to the wealth of the nation. Should the FM not evaluate the potential gains in revenue from promoting B.S.L. use and access, not just the costs of paperwork/red-tape in the English language?

S Daniel C Hignett

31st January 2015