

STATES OF JERSEY



NURSERY FUNDING: IMPLEMENTATION OF PROPOSED CHANGES (P.39/2016) – SECOND AMENDMENT

**Lodged au Greffe on 7th June 2016
by Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade**

STATES GREFFE

NURSERY FUNDING: IMPLEMENTATION OF PROPOSED CHANGES
(P.39/2016) – SECOND AMENDMENT

PAGE 2 –

- (1) For the words “until such time as –” substitute the words “to cut the provision of free nursery hours to those earning a combined income of over £75,000 a year.”.
- (2) Delete paragraphs (a) and (b).

DEPUTY M. TADIER OF ST. BRELADE

REPORT

The reason for this amendment is to allow the States to have a standalone and informed debate on the merits or otherwise of the Minister's proposed changes to Nursery funding from a universal free system to a means-tested system, rather than for the changes to be debated as part of a line of figures in the Medium Term Financial Plan. In fact, this was always the intention of part (b) of the original proposition. Once this debate has taken place, the Minister will have a clear decision from the States Assembly as to whether he has the backing for his proposed savings to be included in the MTFP, or whether he should look for alternative savings or income.

The underlying driver for the amended proposition remains the same: we, in Reform Jersey, do not believe that the change from the universal provision of 20 hours' nursery care to a means-tested system is the right course of action, and the arguments are laid out in the substantive proposition.

Financial and manpower implications

A decision not to pursue means-testing for Nursery provision would leave us with the status quo; and it would mean that the Minister would need to make alternative provisions: either to apply for an extra growth bid, source equivalent income, or to seek to make alternative savings, which might be more acceptable to the Assembly.