

STATES OF JERSEY



DRAFT ANNUAL BUSINESS PLAN 2011 (P.99/2010): FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT

**Lodged au Greffe on 31st August 2010
by the Deputy of St. Mary**

STATES GREFFE

1 PAGE 2, PARAGRAPH (a) –

After the words “withdrawn from the consolidated fund in 2011” insert the words –

“except that the net revenue expenditure of the Health and Social Services Department shall be increased by –

- (a) £51,000 in order to maintain the department’s work in Health Protection and not proceed with the Comprehensive Spending Review proposal on page 62 of the Plan HSS-S1 “Restructure Environmental Health/Health Protection Dept.”;
- (b) £45,000 in order to maintain the department’s work in Occupational Therapy and not proceed with the Comprehensive Spending Review proposal on page 62 of the Plan HSS-S10 “Redesign OT services”,

and the net revenue expenditure of the Treasury and Resources Department shall be decreased by the same amount by reducing the allocation for Restructuring Costs.”.

2 PAGE 2, PARAGRAPH (a) –

After the words “withdrawn from the consolidated fund in 2011” insert the words –

“except that the net revenue expenditure of the Planning and Environment Department shall be increased by £54,000 in order to maintain the existing programme of grants for energy efficiency measures for low income families and charities, and not proceed with the Comprehensive Spending Review proposal on page 63 of the Plan PE-S4 “5% reduction in energy efficiency grants” and the net revenue expenditure of the Treasury and Resources Department shall be decreased by the same amount by reducing the allocation for Restructuring Costs.”.

DEPUTY OF ST. MARY

REPORT

Amendment 1(a) – Restructure Environmental Health/Health Protection Dept (HSS)

This is listed in the reply of the Minister for Treasury and Resources to my Written Question of 19th July 2010 as an “efficiency saving” as opposed to a “service cut”.

However, there are 2 points to be made. Firstly, this reduction involves the loss of 2 posts. Secondly, it is unlikely that these posts are administrative posts, since the very next saving is HSS-S2 “Reduce public health admin staff costs”.

Health Protection and Health Improvement are part of the effort to avoid expensive secondary care by preserving and improving the health of our residents. This effort should be receiving priority and not be being sacrificed.

If this is a cut, then it should be rejected.

Amendment 1(b) – Redesign OT services (HSS)

This is listed in the reply of the Minister for Treasury and Resources to my Written Question of 19th July 2010 as a “service cut” and indeed there is the loss of half a post involved.

The Minister can try to justify this cut to members. What is its effect on the quality of life of those who will be denied the OT service or who will have to wait? If they will have to wait, how long for, and what will be the knock-on effects for them? What are the consequences going beyond the effects on individuals, for example on the costs of people not being able to go back to work or needing other kinds of assistance, etc.?

It may be that this really is a “redesign” and does not affect services to the public. Maybe it is an example of the fat that departments have to carry against the day that the mad axe-man cometh demanding instant cuts. I would attach no blame to the department if that were so. Departments are operating in a highly politicised environment where the public good does not always take precedence over political ideology.

Amendment 1(a) and 1(b) – Financial and manpower implications

The amendment is cost-neutral for the States as the increases are offset with an identical reduction from the £6 million Treasury and Resources Department’s central allocation for Restructuring Costs. The 2.5 posts that are shown in the CSR savings as being lost could be retained.

Amendment 2 – Grants for Energy Efficiency (Planning and Environment)

We should be putting money into this area, not taking it away.

The eventual aim should be for the department to enable all Islanders and businesses to insulate their homes and premises in a way that is cost-neutral for the department. Payment for the work done, and also for the department’s role in setting up the scheme, can be financed out of the savings which are made in energy costs, as already happens in areas of the UK.

We should be supporting Planning and Environment in enabling Islanders to save money, to bear down on inflation through cost reductions throughout the economy, and reducing our dependence on fossil fuels as well as reducing our carbon footprint.

Work done for those with very low incomes will not ever be recoverable in cost, so let us get on with this excellent success story.

This cut takes us into exactly the wrong direction.

Amendment 2 – Financial and manpower implications

The amendment is cost-neutral for the States as the increase is offset with an identical reduction from the £6 million Treasury and Resources Department's central allocation for Restructuring Costs. There are no manpower implications.