

**QUESTION TO BE ASKED OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE EMPLOYMENT AND SOCIAL SECURITY COMMITTEE ON TUESDAY 2004, BY DEPUTY T.J. LE MAIN OF ST. HELIER**

**Question**

- (a) Would the President inform the Assembly of the budget relating to eye, foot and dental care expenditure for the over 65s in 2001, 2002 and 2003 and will he inform members of the level of actual expenditure for these three years and the balance that remains ring-fenced for the elderly?
- (b) Would the President give a breakdown of the cost of the scheme, including the sum paid out to Westfield to administer the scheme?

**Answer**

- (a) A sum of £680,000 was inscribed in the 2001 budget to provide financial help for the Elderly. The Jersey 65+ Health Plan began as a two year pilot in September 2001, and for the four months remaining in 2001, actual expenditure was £52,865. In 2002 another sum of £680,000 was inscribed in the budget for the Jersey 65+ Plan and £164,782 was actually spent. In 2003 a figure of £500,000 was inscribed in the budget. The estimated actual cost for 2003 is approximately £443,000. Accounts are currently being finalised. For completeness the budget for 2004 is £479,700.

Members may recall that the Jersey 65+ Plan was started in September 2001 as a two year pilot scheme with a lump sum of £680,000 for two years and as such the Finance and Economics Committee allowed funds to be carried over during the period of the pilot, which covered three financial years. The accumulated underspend on the scheme at the end of 2003 is likely to be £1,199,353.

In November 2003, the States approved a proposition of the Employment and Social Security Committee to continue the Jersey 65+ Plan following a review of the pilot scheme which included very positive endorsements of the scheme from individuals and agencies such as Age Concern, the Citizens Advice Bureau and the Parishes. This Act of the States put the scheme on a firm financial footing, replacing the ring fenced lump sum arrangement equivalent to a couple of years expenditure with a long term commitment to future funding through the normal budgeting and cash limit process. Therefore, and in accordance with the Finance (Jersey) Law 1967, as amended, and associated Codes of Direction, all unspent monies as at the end of 2003 will be returned to the Treasury.

- (b) The cost of the scheme consists of premiums paid on behalf of individuals and administration costs incurred. The amounts paid to Westfield for administration were £9,777.43 in 2001, £21,421.61 in 2002 and an estimated £55,414.51 in 2003. The total cost of the scheme has been given in part (a) of the question but for completeness was £55,769, £164,782 and £443,000 for the years 2001, 2002 and 2003 respectively.