

BUSINESS

Oppose Regional Development Agencies' abolition

Labour Commitment

- 'It is not too late to draw back from the hasty and ill thought-through decision to abolish RDAs. The east of England will certainly be less well placed to realise its potential without the RDA. This is a loss not only for the region but for UK plc' (Lord McKenzie, *Hansard HL*, 28 February 2011).

Cost

- Reversing decision to abolish Regional Development Agencies would involve administration costs of £0.2 billion (*BIS News Release*, 20 October 2010, [link](#)).

Other Opposition

- 'The Tory-led government has wrecked Regional Development Agencies' (John Denham, *Politics Home*, 5 March 2011, [link](#)).
- 'These were intended to be key parts of our regional economic growth and yet despite the taxpayer already paying for these we are asked again to find money for councils to buy them. It seems that for this Government its growth policy involves banning the word region and scrapping anything which would create jobs' (Chi Onwurah, *The Journal*, 18 February 2011).
- 'Where are councils even going to get the money from for this? If they had never abolished the development agencies they could have done this without wasting millions of pounds in public money' (Lord Beecham, *The Newcastle Journal*, 18 February 2011, [link](#)).
- 'I'm sorry to see the end of Advantage West Midlands and I worry too that the amount of funding that is available to support business...is being reduced' (Ian Austin, Patrick Burn's Blog, *BBC News*, 7 March 2011, [link](#)).
- 'The coalition's decisions to abolish Regional Development Agencies, the 27 per cent of cuts to local government services and cuts to higher education funding, leaves the arts at serious risk' (Gloria de Piero, *Total Politics*, 18 February 2011, [link](#)).

On 16 February, Ed Miliband and Ed Balls told all Labour frontbenchers they could not make unfunded spending commitments.

But in just four weeks since then, Labour have made **£12 billion** of unfunded spending commitments.

That's **£3 billion** of spending commitments a week.

£430 million a day.

£18 million an hour.

Or **£300,000** a minute.

And despite saying they would not oppose every cut, in the last four weeks they have opposed over **£50 billion** of savings proposed by the Coalition to clear up the mess they left.

Labour have not learned from their mistakes.

They have no control over their spending promises and would max out the nation's credit card all over again.

They can never be trusted with the public finances again.

Methodology

On 16 February 2011, Ed Miliband and Ed Balls circulated new controls on spending commitments to all Labour frontbench teams (The Waugh Room, *Politics Home*, 16 February 2011, [link](#)).

This letter warned Shadow frontbenchers that every policy announcement, press release, tweet, motion for debate or statement had to be cleared by the Leader's Office and Shadow Treasury team.

We have judged commitments against Labour's own rules:

- *Issues for clearance will include;*
 - *Any public statement by a frontbench spokesperson, whether in a speech or article or press statement.*
 - *Any contribution to Parliament, including any Opposition Day debate motions.*
 - *It should also include public campaigns that you intend to endorse...*

It goes without saying that this applies not just to statements made by the relevant Shadow Cabinet member but to the entire Shadow team' (ibid.).

The commitments detailed in this document have been made entirely by Labour's Shadow frontbench team – not backbenchers. The team members are listed here: <http://www.labour.org.uk/labours-new-front-bench-team,2010-10-11>

Only commitments to take action to reverse Coalition decisions, or commitments to implement new policies, have been costed as spending commitments.

The remainder are listed separately as savings Labour oppose. All costs are scored on an annual basis in 2014-15 using official estimates or Labour's own costings where appropriate.

This document sets out in detail every new spending commitment, and every opposition to a cut made by Labour since 16 February 2011.

excellently at the moment will have to be passed over to others... How can the Government deliver better woodland access and biodiversity when the Forestry Commission is cutting staff by a quarter over the next three months?' (Peter Soulsby, *Hansard*, 1 March 2011, Col. 18WH).

Cost

- This is included in the overall budget reduction above.

DEFRA

Opposing budget reduction

Labour Commitment

- ‘The Environment Secretary has already slashed her budget by 30 per cent, the largest cut of any spending department. Now we know that she may have more reckless cuts in store. She seems set on a collision course with anyone who cares about the English countryside’ (Mary Creagh, *Sunday Telegraph*, 20 February 2011).
- ‘By offering her 30% cut across DEFRA she has set herself on a collision course with anybody who loves the countryside-and if she will not stand up for the countryside, we on the Labour Benches most certainly will’ (Mary Creagh, *Hansard*, 17 February 2011, Col. 1157).

Cost

- The Spending Review sets out cuts of £0.7 billion to the DEFRA budget in cash terms between 2010-11 and 2014-15 (HM Treasury, *Spending Review 2010*, p. 64).

Oppose National Park savings

Labour Commitment

- ‘After the forests debacle the Tory-led Government are imposing a 28 per cent cut on the national parks in yet another attack on the countryside. This is bad news for families and walkers’ (Mary Creagh, *Western Morning News*, 24 February 2011).
- ‘National Parks are a unique part of British life. The Tories are on a collision course with anyone who cares about the countryside’ (Mary Creagh, *The Mirror*, 7 March 2011).

Cost

- This is included in the overall budget reduction above.

Oppose Forestry Commission headcount reduction

Labour Commitment

- ‘Although it appears that there has been some pause in the Government's headlong rush to dismantle the public forest estate, they are pressing ahead with requiring the Forestry Commission to make substantial cuts in its staff. Some 400 jobs-about a quarter of the total-are at risk immediately. That will inevitably reduce its capacity to undertake the excellent stewardship achieved over recent years. Its ability to manage the deer and wildlife will be reduced, learning and educational programmes will be cut, and there will inevitably be extended charges for services or the shutting of facilities. Elements of what the Forestry Commission manages directly and

Labour's spending commitments

Since 16 February, Labour frontbenchers have made **£12 billion** of spending commitments.

Spending Commitments the Shadow frontbench have made since 16 February 2011

Labour Spending Commitment	Cost in 2014-15
Reverse CPI-RPI switch for benefits and pensions in 2014-15	£5.8bn
Abolish Tuition Fees and reverse higher education savings	£2.9bn
Reduce Universal Credit marginal deduction rates to 55%	£1.0bn
Reverse VAT increase on fuel	£700m
Cancel Labour's planned 1p Fuel Duty rise in 2011-12	£500m
Reverse Education Maintenance Allowance replacement	£500m
Reverse Future Jobs Fund abolition	£300m
Total	£12 billion

Cuts Labour have opposed

Ed Miliband has vowed that Labour would not oppose every cut – demonstrating Labour’s economic credibility.

- ‘I said very clearly when I became leader, we’re not going to oppose every cut’ (Ed Miliband, *The Andrew Marr Show*, 16 January 2011).

Yet in the four weeks since Ed Miliband and Ed Balls sent their new spending controls to the Shadow frontbench, Labour have opposed over **£50 billion** of spending cuts and tax rises.

In doing so, Labour have ruled out these tough measures from the cuts they would have to make under their plan to cut the deficit. They would have to find spending cuts and tax rises elsewhere. This is simply not credible. Either Labour are being opportunistic, or they plan a huge tax bombshell to reverse these decisions.

Ed Miliband and Ed Balls want to have it both ways. They oppose Coalition spending cuts, but do not commit to reversing them:

- ‘whilst we will continue rightly to oppose many of the decisions of the current Conservative-led Government, given the reckless gamble they are taking with the future of our economy, we cannot and should not at this stage make firm commitments to reverse each of those decisions unless and until we can say how those commitments will be paid for’ (The Waugh Room, *Politics Home*, 16 February 2011, [link](#)).

Deficit-cutting measures the Shadow frontbench have opposed since 16 February 2011

Coalition cuts opposed	Cost by 2014-15
Increase in VAT to 20 per cent	£13.5bn
Welfare savings	£11.9bn
In-year spending cuts in 2010-11	£6.2bn
Local Government cuts	£5.6bn
Capital spending on education cut	£4.2bn
Two year public sector pay freeze	£3.3bn
Cuts to capital and investment allowances	£2.8bn
Increasing public sector pension employee contributions	£1.8bn
Department of Justice cuts	£1.6bn
Police cuts	£1.2bn
DEFRA cuts	£700m
UK Border Agency cuts	£500m
Cuts to HMRC budget	£300m
Arts Council cuts	£100m
Reverse abolition of RDAs	£200m
Delay Type 22 frigate savings	£100m
Total	£54 billion

- A credible costing is not available.

Opposing RAF post reductions

Labour Commitment

- ‘He will understand the concern in the country and the armed forces that after he spoke about the no-fly zone, the Government issued redundancy notices to thousands of Royal Air Force personnel’ (Ed Miliband, *Hansard*, 2 March 2010, [link](#)).
- ‘I think those RAF trainee pilots will be angry and confused over why on Monday they can talk about establishing a no-fly zone over Libya and on Tuesday you are sacking the very people that, in the future, will be able to provide no-fly zones in the years to come. The government’s defence review of last year is sadly out of date already. It should be reopened’ (Jim Murphy, *Aberdeen Press and Journal*, 2 March 2011).

Cost

- A credible costing is not available.

DEFENCE

Opposing Ark Royal savings

Labour Commitment

- ‘Ark Royal has been decommissioned and Illustrious is in for major refit’ (Jim Murphy, *Labour Party Press Release*, 10 March 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘If the Government do not honour that covenant given on the Ark Royal, what will they do?’ (Huw Irranca-Davies, *Hansard*, 16 February 2011, Col. 1060-1061).

Cost

- The decommissioning of the HMS Ark Royal and HMS Illustrious will save £0.035 billion and £0.03 billion respectively in 2014-15 (*Hansard*, 7 March 2011 804WA).

Delay Type 22 Frigate Savings

Labour Commitment

- ‘I would delay the scrapping of these ships [Devonport’s fleet of Type 22 frigates is being scrapped to save money] to give us some breathing space...I appreciate there is a cost but we need to make sure we have things available’ (Alison Seabeck, *The Plymouth Herald*, 25 February 2011, [link](#)).

Cost

- Delaying the Type 22 frigate savings would cost £0.1 billion in 2014-15. This assumes the savings across the Spending Review period are split evenly (*Hansard*, 3 March 2011, Col. 563).

Other opposition

- ‘At the same time, Ministers are flogging off Navy ships and can’t secure contracts for the new frigates they promised’ (Jim Murphy, *Labour Party Press Release*, 10 March 2011, [link](#)).

Opposing helicopter fleet savings

Labour Commitment

- ‘The country wants to know what the impact of government cuts will be on our defence capabilities, in particular whether the decade long carrier strike capability gap, cuts to maritime capability and scaling back plans to increase the helicopter fleet limit our ability to respond to crises’ (Jim Murphy, *Labour Party Press release*, 3 March 2011).

Cost

Note – being fair on the Eds

Case Study: Labour’s plans for a £21 billion National Care Service

We have given Labour the benefit of the doubt.

We have only included clear commitments where Labour unambiguously promise to spend the money or cut the tax.

So for example we have not included a Labour frontbencher’s clear commitment to implement their *Manifesto 2010* plans for a National Care Service – costing **£20.7 billion** annually by 2014-15.

Nevertheless, since 16 February, Labour Shadow Ministers have intentionally given the clear impression that they are promising this money.

If you think we are being unduly fair to Labour, then add this £20.7 billion commitment to Labour’s **£12 billion** of other spending commitments detailed in this document.

Commitment

- ‘The previous Labour Government planned to introduce a National Care Service which would have given individuals a high quality service and more control over their care with the choice to stay in their own home if they decided to. The Tory led Government has scrapped this plan which would have given people peace of mind and help protect their savings and homes’ (Gordon Marsden, *Gordon Marsden Press Release*, 3 March 2011, [link](#)).

Cost

- The previous government’s ‘comprehensive’ option (i.e. the one that would involve a levy on all estates) is expected to cost £20.7 billion in 2014-15 (DH, *Shaping the Future of Care Together – Impact Assessment*, 14 July 2009).

Previous commitments from John Healey and Ed Miliband

- **John Healey.** Shadow Health John Healey ‘praised Mr Burnham’s plan for a levy on estates – dubbed a “death tax” by the Tories – to fund a national care service, saying it was “a good starting point” for Labour, but adding that how to fund social care was “a big open question for us all”’ (*Independent*, 11 October 2010, [link](#)).
- **Ed Miliband.** ‘We need a properly funded National Care Service, as we set out in our manifesto’ (Ed Miliband, *Socialist Health Association*, 13 July 2010 - [link](#)).

Unfunded spending commitments

CULTURE, MEDIA AND SPORT

Reverse CPI-RPI switch in benefit and pension uprating in 2014-15

Labour Commitment

- 'In welfare the Government is making some changes, some of them we agree with. So we've said, for example, that we wouldn't uprate benefits at such a high level for three years, for a temporary period' (Ed Miliband, *BBC Breakfast*, 28 February 2011).
- 'I do not agree that that should be a permanent change. That aspect of the Government's proposal is very damaging' (Stephen Timms, *Hansard*, 17 February 2011, Col. 1185).
- 'The Government are signalling today that they intend a permanent shift from RPI to CPI as the inflation measure for uprating benefits and pensions. The Opposition do not support that' (Stephen Timms, *Hansard*, 17 February 2011, Col. 1188).

Cost

- Reversing the RPI-CPI switch in 2014-15 would cost £5.8 billion (HM Treasury, *June Budget 2010*, Table 2.1, p. 40).

Abolish tuition fees/reverse higher education funding saving

Labour Commitment

- 'He is trebling tuition fees... Why does he not change course and help those young people who need help up and down this country?' (Ed Miliband, *Hansard*, 16 February 2011, Col. 950).
- 'On tuition fees... day in, day out you are showing there is an alternative' (Ed Miliband, *Speech to the Welsh Labour Conference*, 19 February 2011).

Cost

- Reversing the saving made to higher education funding would cost £2.9 billion by 2014-15 (*BIS News Release*, 20 October 2010, [link](#)).

Other opposition

- 'The existing system is being continued, but the difference is that this Government are tripling the debt that students will take on, with which I profoundly disagree... I disagreed with the concept of fees' (Ian Lucas, *Hansard*, 4 March 2011, Col. 592, [link](#)).

Opposing cuts to the Arts Council

Labour Commitment

- 'Cuts to the arts are savage. They are deep and they are disproportionate. The Arts Council will lose 29.6 per cent of its budget in the course of the next four years - a total of £457.4m. While the Conservatives and the Liberal Democrats claim that none of the organisations regularly funded by the Arts Council will be hit by cuts of more than 15 per cent, this is simply not the case. All organisations will have to reapply for their funding and many are at risk of losing all their funding or, if not, then significantly more than the 15 per cent' (Gloria de Piero, *Total Politics*, 18 February 2011, [link](#)).

Cost

- The Arts Council budget is being cut by £0.1 billion by 2014-15 (*DCMS Press Release*, 20 October 2010, [link](#), *BBC News*, 20 October 2010, [link](#)).

JUSTICE

Opposing budget reduction including reductions to Legal Aid and the Courts Service

Labour Commitment

- ‘Slashing the justice budget by almost one quarter must not be at the expense of victims of crime and their families’ (Sadiq Khan, *Politics Home*, 21 February 2011, [link](#)).

Cost

- The Spending Review sets out cuts of £1.6 billion to the MoJ budget in cash terms between 2010-11 and 2014-15 (HM Treasury, *Spending Review 2010*, p. 55).

Other Opposition

- ‘There are also sweeping cuts in Legal Aid’ (Nia Griffith, *Nia Griffith Press Release*, 16 February 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘The Secretary of State will be well aware of the devastating impact that the cuts to legal aid will have on citizens advice bureaux across the country, leaving many people without the advice they desperately need’ (Nia Griffith, *Hansard*, 17 February 2011, Col. 1125, [link](#)).
- ‘The voluntary sector overall is facing huge pressures and advice services are certainly in the same position. There is a big increase for this, it is only going to get worse when the Government changes legal aid and I think the council should be doing all it can to help out’ (Lord Beecham, *Newcastle Evening Chronicle*, 25 February 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘The proposals [saving £350 million] would lead to a huge increase in unrepresented litigants, with serious implications... at a time when courts are having to cope in any event with closures, budgetary cutbacks and reductions in staff numbers’ (Andy Slaughter, *Guardian*, 25 February 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘These plans [to close Pontefract Court] are madness. It’s bad for local justice and local communities. But it’s also hopelessly impractical too. Wakefield simply doesn’t have the space to cope with the extra work from Pontefract. Victims of crime in our area will end up facing long delays as well as long journeys to get justice done. And if justice is delayed it will make it harder to clamp down on crime round here too’ (Yvette Cooper, *Yvette Cooper’s Website*, [link](#)).
- ‘This is an irresponsible time to be leaving the most vulnerable in society without advice or legal help’ (Andy Slaughter, *Sunday Mirror*, 27 February 2011, [link](#)).

- ‘The Government are tripling student debt in the years ahead, but that is profoundly wrong’ (Ian Lucas, *Hansard*, 4 March 2011, Col. 592, [link](#)).
- ‘It is particularly important now to help the Assembly in its efforts to moderate the devastating effects of the Conservative-led government in Westminster – a couple of examples being protecting students from massive hikes in student fees’ (Nia Griffith, *Llanelli Star*, 2 March 2011).

Reduce Universal Credit marginal deduction rates to 55 per cent

Labour Commitment

- ‘We think that detail is wrong. In fact the Centre for Social Justice argue that the taper should be not 65 per cent but 55 per cent and the Government has tweaked it in a damaging way’ (Stephen Timms, *Daily Politics*, 17 February 2011).

Cost

Reducing marginal deduction rates from 100% to 65% costs £2.6bn. Reducing the rate to 55% costs £3.6bn according to the CSJ. So reducing from 65% to 55% costs at least an extra £1bn.

- **CSJ proposed reducing marginal rates to 55 per cent.** ‘We propose a single universal benefit withdrawal rate of 55% on post-tax earnings above the earnings disregards’ (Centre for Social Justice, *Dynamic Benefits*, p. 26).
- **CSJ said their 55 per cent proposal would cost £3.6 billion** ‘The change in benefit withdrawal rates, earnings, and employment resulting from these proposals would increase the total annual benefits bill by £3.6 billion’ (ibid., p. 30).
- **Universal Credit’s reduction of marginal rates to 65 per cent costs £2.6 billion**
 - **£2.6 billion cost.** ‘Overall, it is estimated that benefit expenditure will be around £2.6bn higher once Universal Credit is fully implemented. This will be a cost to the Exchequer and the taxpayer’ (DWP, *Universal Credit Impact Assessment*, 16 February 2011, p. 2, [link](#)).
 - **Marginal rates reduced from 100 per cent to 65 per cent.** ‘Universal Credit replaces the multiplicity of tapers for in-work support with a consistent taper of around 65 per cent, and removes the 100 per cent taper for out of work benefits; as a result Universal Credit will reduce the highest MDRs’ [Marginal Deduction Rates] (ibid., p. 20).
- **So reducing the marginal deduction rate from 65 per cent to 55 per cent could cost at least £1.0 billion**

TRANSPORT

Reverse VAT increase to 20 per cent on fuel

Labour Commitment

- ‘World oil prices are already very high, and the Chancellor has chosen, at this very moment, to raise fuel prices further, by pushing up VAT. I am urging him to reverse that increase’ (Ed Balls, *Press Association*, 27 February 2011).
- ‘The VAT rise he could reverse immediately and I think he should’ (Ed Balls, *BBC News*, 11 March 2011, [link](#)).

Cost

- Reversing the VAT increase to 20 per cent on fuel would cost £0.7 billion per year (House of Commons Library, reported in the *Sunday Times*, 27 February 2011).

Other Opposition

- ‘Reverse the Tory VAT rise on fuel, sign our petition at: <http://www.reversevatonfuel.com/>’ (Angela Eagle, *Twitter*, 4 March 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘He should help hard-pressed motorists this week by listening to Labour and immediately reversing the Tory VAT rise on fuel’ (Kerry McCarthy, *Labour Party Press Release*, 9 March 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘George Osborne should admit he got it wrong and reverse the VAT rise on petrol now’ (John Denham, *News from John Denham*, March 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘He should immediately reverse the VAT rise on fuel, which has added nearly 3p to the price of a litre of petrol, using the extra £800m the Treasury will be getting from the bank levy’ (David Hamilton, *David Hamilton’s website*, 4 March 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘He should immediately reverse the VAT rise on fuel, which has added nearly 3p to the price of a litre of petrol, using the extra £800m the Treasury will be getting from the bank levy’ (Helen Jones, *Warrington Guardian*, 7 March 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘He should immediately reverse the VAT rise on fuel, which has added nearly 3p to the price of a litre of petrol, using the extra £800m the Treasury will be getting from the bank levy’ (Ann McKechin, *Ann McKechin website*, 4 March 2011, [link](#)).
- **Labour’s say their commitment would be paid for by the Government’s increase in the Bank Levy in 2010.** ‘Independent calculations by House of Commons officials suggest the Treasury would lose around £700m a year by dropping VAT on fuel from the 20% rate, introduced last month, to 17.5%. However, the Treasury is expected to gain around £800m from Osborne’s new bank levy. Balls argues that this would pay for the VAT cut on fuel’ (*Sunday Times*, 27 February 2011).
- **But the £800 million extra revenue from the Bank Levy is a one-off.**

Opposing higher rail fares over Spending Review period

Labour Commitment

- ‘After rail fares increased last month by RPI plus 1 per cent, as we have already heard, it is disappointing for commuters that the Secretary of State keeps claiming that fare increases across the CSR period will be only 10 per cent... The Minister’s Department confirmed to me... that it expects the effect of those rises to be rail passengers opting for other forms of transport. There is a concern, which the Minister used to share, that higher fares will price people off trains’ (Andrew Gwynne, *Hansard*, 17 February 2011, Col. 380WA).

Cost

- A credible costing is not available.

fraud or domestic violence may not have the expert dedicated police teams that are needed to secure successful convictions. This government is in such a rush to cut spending that it has forgotten its basic duty of keeping people safe' (Fiona MacTaggart, *Fiona MacTaggart's website*, 24 February 2011, [link](#)).

- 'The Tory-led Government's cuts will mean 1,600 fewer police officers and staff in the coming years, making Wales a less safe place. The Assembly elections in May are a chance to send David Cameron a real message. Labour in Wales is showing there is an alternative' (Peter Hain, *Daily Post*, 19 February 2011).

Opposing UK Border Agency savings

Labour Commitment

- 'At the same time as retreating over the immigration cap, the Government is cutting 5,200 jobs at the UK Border Agency at the very time we need to improve enforcement and tackle illegal immigration. As the independent chief inspector's report today makes clear, UKBA faces a resources challenge and the Government is intent on making it worse' (Gerry Sutcliffe, *Press Association*, 16 February 2011).

Cost

- The Spending Review sets out savings to the UK Border Agency of £0.5 billion (HM Treasury, *Spending Review 2010*, p. 55).

Other Opposition

- 'Any action to control illegal immigration depends upon a properly staffed and effective border agency which can both detect and remove illegal immigrants. With cuts of 20% and job losses of 5,200 for the UK Border Agency, detection and enforcement officers are already warning that their work is being undermined. The Government are talking tough on illegal immigration. Is the Minister sure that the Home Secretary has given him the resources to deliver?' (Shabana Mahmood, *Hansard*, 7 March 2011, Col. 626).

o The Government originally planned to introduce the bank levy at a lower rate in 2011 before rising to a higher rate in 2012. Revenue from the bank levy would therefore be £1.7 billion in 2011 rising to £2.5 billion in 2012 (*HMT Press Release*, 8 February 2011, [link](#)).

o On 8 February, the Chancellor announced that, since the near-term outlook and resilience of the UK banking sector had improved since the bank levy was first announced, the higher rate of the bank levy would be introduced earlier than planned. As a result, revenue from the bank levy will be £2.5 billion in 2011 and £2.5 billion in 2012 (*HMT Press Release*, 8 February 2011, [link](#)).

- **So there will be an additional £200 million revenue from the bank levy in 2010-11, £600 million in 2011-12, but no additional revenue in 2012-13.** Labour would therefore have to reverse his reduction in VAT on fuel in 2012-13 or find £700 million in extra taxes or spending cuts to pay for it.

Cancel Labour's planned 1p Fuel Duty rise in 2011-12

Labour Commitment

- 'In the Budget next month he should look again at the annual fuel duty rise due in April. The last Labour government often postponed planned duty increases when world oil prices were on the up – as they are now' (Ed Balls, *The Sun*, 28 February 2011, [link](#)).
- 'In past times when we as Labour in government saw the world oil price go up we didn't raise the fuel duty; we cancelled it or we postponed it. That's a George Osborne decision for the Budget' (Ed Balls, *BBC News*, 11 March 2011, [link](#)).

Cost

- A 1p reduction in Fuel Duty costs £0.5 billion per year (*Hansard*, 7 February 2011, Col. 55).

Other Opposition

- 'And in the Budget he should look again at the annual duty rise due in April' (Kerry McCarthy, *Labour Party Press Release*, 9 March 2011, [link](#)).
- 'I am calling on George Osborne to look again, in the Budget, at the annual fuel duty rise due in April' (Anne McGuire, *Press Release*, 1 March 2011, [link](#)).
- 'Mark is backing Fair Fuel UK' (*Mark Hendrick's website*, 17 February 2011, [link](#)).
- 'And in the Budget later this month George Osborne should look again at the annual fuel duty rise due in April. The last Labour government often postponed planned duty increases when world oil prices were on the up – as they are now.' (David Hamilton, *David Hamilton's website*, 4 March 2011, [link](#)).

- ‘There is a planned further increase in fuel duty in April, which I hope the Chancellor, currently preparing his Budget for a month’s time, will put off, or even reverse.’ (Iain Wright, *Iain Wright’s website*, *Mail Column*, 24 February 2011, [link](#)).

Reverse Education Maintenance Allowance replacement

Labour Commitment

- ‘On educational maintenance allowances... day in, day out you are showing there is an alternative’ (Ed Miliband, *Speech to the Welsh Labour Conference*, 19 February 2011).
- ‘He is... abolishing the education maintenance allowance... Why does he not change course and help those young people who need help up and down this country?’ (Ed Miliband, *Hansard*, Col. 950).

Cost

- Replacing Education Maintenance Allowance will save £0.5 billion by 2014-15 (HM Treasury, *Spending Review 2010*, p.42).

Other Opposition

- ‘I would urge you to back this campaign, and let’s Save EMA’ (Ed Balls, *Save EMA website*, 16 February 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘These plans are deeply unfair on students round here who will be more heavily hit. I don’t want to see young people in our area put off going to the very best universities, or not staying on after 16 because of changes in support. People recognise it is fair for graduates to pay something back when they earn more, but the sheer scale of these increases in fees especially for some universities will cause serious problems for young people round here. I’m worried these young people are being hit hardest by the government’s unfair plans’ (Yvette Cooper, *Yvette Cooper’s Website*, [link](#)).
- ‘For young people from less well-off backgrounds, EMA provides a helping hand to succeed - and these figures show how important it is... The risk is a lost generation of students, who have the talent but not the financial means to stay in post-16 education.’ (Andy Burnham, *Times Educational Supplement*, 4 March 2011).
- ‘Surely time for a rethink on EMA and Future Jobs Fund?’ (Chuka Umunna, *Twitter*, 24 February 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘Our suspicion is that the Government may well trigger the provisions in the Bill that provide that fiscal circumstances mean that they cannot meet those targets as they pile on the VAT, cut tax credits and education maintenance allowances and so on and so forth’ (Chris Leslie, *Hansard*, 1 March 2011, [link](#)).

be lost because of the Tory-led Government’s front-loaded 20 per cent cuts to police budgets’ (Yvette Cooper, *Press Association*, 23 February 2011).

- ‘Theresa May needs to face up to the fact that 20 per cent budget cuts and the loss of over 10,000 police officers is causing immense strain. The Home Secretary needs to urgently think again on the pace and scale of their cuts to the police’ (Yvette Cooper, *Press Association*, 21 February 2011).
- ‘The police station in Sherwood has played a crucial role in making the area a safer place to live, work and shop. Before it opened, Sherwood suffered from quite serious levels of anti-social behaviour and to see the facility close would be a major setback for the local community and local business’ (Chris Leslie, *Nottingham Evening Post*, 26 February 2011).
- ‘new information indicating an overall loss of 28,000 staff from the police service could mean throwing everything back in the air’ (Karen Buck, *Karen Buck website*, 3 March 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘Can the Minister confirm that more than 10,000 police officers, many of whom are in neighbourhood teams tackling antisocial behaviour, will be cut over the next two years?... So with cuts to front-line policing and youth services across the country, how exactly does the Minister expect his rebranded, weaker version of the ASBO to maintain progress in combating antisocial behaviour?’ (Vernon Coaker, *Hansard*, 7 March 2011, Col. 624).
- ‘Humberside Police Authority have officially confirmed that 142 police jobs are being cut in the coming year. Combined with the officers that have already gone since March 2010, it means that by March 2012 Humberside would have lost over 200 police in two years. More cuts are due to come in the three years after that in Humberside Police’s Four Year Plan... Just like VAT and student tuition fees, police cuts are another Lib Dem broken promise’ (Diana Johnson, *Diana Johnson’s Website*, [link](#)).
- ‘School based police officers are crucial and make a huge difference that is noted by parents, teachers and local residents and, in particular, by students themselves. I was lobbied last week by year 7 and 9 pupils from Small Heath school in my constituency- incidentally, it is my former school. They were lamenting the loss of their local police constable, PC Ingles, who had been based at their school for a number of years and had made such an impact on the students and on antisocial behaviour, the rates of which had declined significantly’ (Shabana Mahmood, *Shabana Mahmood’s Website*, 25 February 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘I am concerned that these cuts to police numbers will put at risk the safety of our communities. I am glad that the pressure I have consistently put on the police to protect neighbourhood policing has born some fruit but I will be watching very closely in conjunction with local residents to make sure we continue to have neighbourhood patrols in Slough. I am already conducting a local survey of residents about their experience of crime and policing so I can use their views to press the government. I am very anxious that our Chief Constable has already told me that specialist units are at risk which means that local people who have been victims of

HOME OFFICE

Opposing cuts to the police

Labour Commitment

- ‘He went too far and too fast, and insisted on 20% cuts in policing’ (Ed Miliband, *Hansard*, 9 March 2011, Col. 901).

Cost

- The Spending Review sets out cuts of £1.2 billion to the central government contribution to the police in cash terms between 2010-11 and 2014-15. This includes contributions from Home Office, CLG and Welsh Assembly Government funding (HM Treasury, *Spending Review 2010*, p. 54).

Other Opposition

- ‘At a packed public meeting this evening to discuss police cuts in Robin Hood, Lofthouse’ (Ed Balls, *Ed Balls’ Twitter*, 18 February 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘What the Government is doing is introducing 20% cuts with the steepest cuts in the first two years so they’re making more cuts in the first few years than the Labour Party would have made over an entire Parliament. That’s what means we’re seeing 28,000 jobs going’ (Yvette Cooper, *BBC News*, 8 March 2011).
- ‘Police are being hit more heavily than other services, which is a problem if you care about the fight against crime and what the public think. Yes, we do need to make efficiency savings, but we need to do so in a sensible way’ (Yvette Cooper, *Sky News*, 8 March 2011).
- ‘The Government is cutting too far and too fast with 20 per cent frontloaded cuts’ (Yvette Cooper, *Labour Press Release*, 08 March 2011).
- ‘The Home Secretary needs to urgently think again on the pace and scale of their cuts to the police. Chief Constables across the country are being put in an impossible position and the safety of our communities is being put at risk’ (Yvette Cooper, *Labour Press Release*, 18 February 2011).
- ‘The Home Secretary should be working with the police on reforms and efficiencies rather than attacking them in the newspapers and trying to make them the scapegoats for the job losses as a result of the scale and pace of these cuts. This speech is not about saving jobs it is about diverting attention from the fact that she has put Chief Constables in an impossible position with a 20% front loaded cut to their budgets’ (Yvette Cooper, *Independent*, 3 March 2011).
- ‘This is yet more evidence that the Tory-led Government needs to think again on its deeply destructive cuts to the police. Over 10,000 police officers are already going to

- ‘They are hitting young people with a triple whammy: scrapping the Future Jobs Fund, cutting EMA and a tripling of tuition fees. Without work and study, what are they supposed to do?’ (Kerry McCarthy, *Kerry McCarthy website*, 16 February 2011, [link](#)).

Reverse Future Jobs Fund abolition

Labour Commitment

- ‘We developed the Future Jobs Fund, which we would keep and which the Conservative-led gov’t has scrapped’ (Ed Miliband, *Ed Miliband Twitter*, 25 February 2011, [link](#)).

Cost

- Restoring the Future Jobs Fund and replacing it with a similar scheme in future years would cost £0.3 billion in steady state (*HMT Press Release*, 24 May 2010, [link](#)).

Other Opposition

- ‘He is... abolishing the future jobs fund. Why does he not change course and help those young people who need help up and down this country?’ (Ed Miliband, *Hansard*, Col. 950).
- ‘The problem of youth unemployment is particularly serious at present because there is such a large cohort of young people. The size of that cohort will decrease over the next few years, so there is a strong case for the future jobs fund or something very like it’ (Stephen Timms, *Hansard*, 16 February 2011, Col. 1016).
- ‘I’m really worried about the future of our young people in this country so I’ve said we should take action on youth unemployment’ (Ed Miliband, *BBC Breakfast*, 28 February 2011).
- ‘The decision to cancel the Future Jobs Fund was the wrong one... and urgent action is now required to stop a generation of young people being lost to worklessness’ (David Hanson, *David Hanson website*, 21 February 2011, [link](#)).

Spending commitments too vague to cost

Tax breaks to firms offering the minimum wage

- ‘I have proposed we look at the potential for tax incentives to reward the adoption of the living wage’ (Ed Miliband, *Resolution Foundation speech*, 28 February 2011).

Rail electrification of the Wrexham to Bidston line

- ‘And while the Secretary of State for Transport tried to soften the blow with promises of further schemes at some point in the future, he said nothing at all about North Wales. Yet there has been a long running campaign here which has received support from all sides of the political spectrum to electrify the Wrexham to Bidston line’ (Ian Lucas, *Ian Lucas Press Release*, 2 March 2011, [link](#)).

Introduce one-to-one tuition for 16-18 year olds in English and Maths

- ‘It would be a guarantee at 16 – every young person needs to be strong in both English and maths. I’m thinking you would bring that back at the end of education. You would have to have clarity about the minimum requirements for everybody. There should be one-to-one tuition. I know it’s expensive but – if you’re struggling – you get self-conscious about it and one-to-one tuition helps with learning’ (Andy Burnham, *Independent*, 17 February 2011, [link](#)).

EDUCATION

Opposing cuts to education capital spending

Labour Commitment

- ‘A new era of crumbling classrooms beckons because of Gove’s failure at CSR. Education saw capital cut by 60% - twice Govt average of 30%’ (Andy Burnham, Twitter, 25 February 2011, [link](#)).

Cost

- Capital DEL for Education is falling from £7.6 billion in 2010-11 to £3.4 billion in 2014-15, a fall of £4.2 billion in cash terms (HM Treasury, *Spending Review 2010*, p. 11).

Other Opposition

- ‘Last time I visited, Warrington was excited about building schools for the future and teachers were talking about pupils’ aspirations being lifted. But I return to find that has collapsed. Coalition cuts are too fast and too deep, not my words but the people who came to this meeting’ (Ed Balls, *Warrington Guardian*, 18 February 2011).
- ‘With an average reduction in capital investment of 28% across Government, why have schools been targeted for an 80% cut? We are looking at a return to the bad old days of the 1980s when children tried to learn in crumbling classrooms with equipment not up to the job’ (Andy Burnham, *Labour Party Press Release*, 25 February 2011).
- ‘At a local level and nationally, the Tories are betraying local children and parents. Stopping these new buildings is deeply unfair on pupils at Carleton, Knottingley, Castleford, Airedale High and Freeston College. At national level, it’s clear that the Conservative government are hitting disadvantaged areas hardest. And around here, it’s shocking that local Conservative councillors are refusing to back Carleton High when it needs support. I will keep up the campaign for new investment in our local schools’ (Yvette Cooper, *Yvette Cooper’s Website*, [link](#)).

Cuts Labour have opposed

when the voluntary sector in Newcastle is facing cuts of up to 78%. There is a risk that high-quality projects and services across communities cannot continue because funding is simply not available. It makes a mockery of David Cameron's Big Society' (Catherine McKinnell, *The Journal*, 8 March 2011, [link](#)).

- 'Voluntary groups are being hurt by the pressure on costs from... the uncertainty over the continuation of local government support' (Willie Bain, *Hansard*, 28 February 2011, Col. 90).
- 'Labour Councillors Ansar Ali Khan and Mohammed Idrees are fighting to save local youth services at the Naseby Centre from council cuts... Local Member of Parliament Liam Byrne joined a public meeting last week to pledge his support for the campaign' (Liam Byrne, *Press Release*, 17 February 2011, [link](#)).
- 'Local library campaigners across the country will be enraged by David Cameron's arrogance and hypocrisy, lecturing us all about the necessity of these cuts while intervening to save himself from embarrassment in his own backyard. It's the same old Tories: one rule for them and a different set of rules for the rest of us' (Ivan Lewis, *Independent*, 20 February 2011, [link](#)).
- 'I accept that the council has to make difficult choices because of the disproportionate cuts being imposed by their government in Westminster. But also at a local level this is a council that is seen as out of touch and not responsive... Of course you have to be imaginative and you have to be innovative but the wholesale privatisation of services is not what people want' (Ivan Lewis, *BBC News*, 2 March 2011, [link](#)).
- 'Today is world book day so seems even more important to put ministers on spot over proposed library closures. [#savelibraries](#)' (Gloria De Piero, *Twitter*, 3 March 2011, [link](#)).
- 'Many parents in my constituency are worried sick because a number of school bus services are being withdrawn, with no guarantee of an equivalent replacement-meaning that timetables, routes and fares will be at the discretion of commercial operators' (Gloria De Piero, *Hansard*, 9 March 2011, Col. 904).

HM TREASURY

Opposing the increase in VAT

Labour Commitment

- ‘One thing I tell you I wouldn’t be doing is I wouldn’t have put up VAT’ (Ed Miliband, *BBC Breakfast*, 28 February 2011).

Cost

- The increase in VAT to 20 per cent is forecast to raise £13.45 billion in 2014-15 (HM Treasury, *June Budget 2010*, Table 2.1, p. 41).

Other opposition

- ‘The rise in VAT is pushing the price of petrol at the pumps even higher’ (Ed Miliband, *Resolution Foundation speech*, 28 February 2011).
- ‘Funding rises in the personal allowance through tax rises elsewhere like VAT and cuts to family tax credits and child benefit isn’t making the tax system fairer’ (Ed Miliband, *Resolution Foundation speech*, 28 February 2011).
- ‘They’re actually hitting the people that we’re talking about, lower and middle income families, with the rise in VAT, cuts to tax credits and other things’ (Ed Miliband, *BBC Breakfast*, 28 February 2011).
- ‘His problem is that he is still refusing to change policies - such as trebling tuition fees, raising VAT or cutting child benefit and tax credits - which make this crisis worse’ (Ed Miliband, *Evening Standard*, 11 March 2011).
- ‘Families and businesses are already feeling the squeeze from the government’s hike in VAT’ (Ed Balls, *The House Magazine*, 7 March 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘He has chosen this very moment of rising oil prices and world commodity prices to hike up VAT. It’s the wrong tax at the wrong time’ (Ed Balls, *Tribune*, 4 March 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘I was probably the first person to be strong in opposing VAT. I thought there were fairer ways to make tax decisions. So my argument was that the VAT rise was unfair, I thought David Miliband’s idea of the mansion tax was attractive and it could be made to work. And if we were making choices on the economy between VAT and the top rate of tax, I’d rather have stuck with a top rate of tax at £100,000’ (Ed Balls, *Guardian*, 25 February 2011).
- ‘I think the VAT rise is so painful for families but also it is so damaging for the economy. The Governor of the Bank of England is now dealing rising inflation and people saying he should raise mortgage rates because in part of George Osborne’s I

Neighbourhoods Fund, which Labour set up to help reduce joblessness in deprived areas. These cuts make a mockery of the Government’s claim it wants to create a “Big Society”. The Conservatives say they want to roll back the “Big State” so that charities can expand and thrive. The Government said it has recognised this problem and provided transitional funding to help struggling charities. However, the organisations I spoke to told me this money is only available to charities that are “undergoing change” - for example merging - and not to fund existing work, salaries or rent. If charities such as Street Vibe, which runs hugely popular activities and services for young people, are forced to shut it would be a terrible loss to the communities I represent. That’s why I’m urging the council to see if any funding can be found to help them. In the longer term, I’d like to see the council, NHS and other public bodies do more to help voluntary and community groups play their full role in delivering services’ (Liz Kendall, *Leicester Mercury*, 1 March 2011, [link](#)).

- ‘Leicester’s voluntary organisations make a huge contribution to our city. Many of them depend on money from central and local government to fund the fantastic work they do. The speed and severity of the Government’s public spending cuts threatens the existence of many of these organisations, and makes a mockery of the Conservative’s claim they want to create a ‘Big Society’ or that ‘we’re all in it together’. I’m a long standing champion of the voluntary sector and of giving local people and communities a greater say about decisions that affect their lives, and about the public services they pay for and use. Leicester’s third sector is a huge asset and resource for our city. We must fight to protect and nurture it – now and for future generations’ (Liz Kendall, *Liz Kendall’s website*, 3 March 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘TimeBank is exactly what the Big Society should be about - helping people to volunteer and build the change that they want to see in their communities. It is impossible to see how the Tory-led Government can make speeches about the Big Society one day, yet make this decision on another’ (Tessa Jowell, *Sky News*, 7 March 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘David Cameron can try as many relaunches as he likes. It doesn’t change the fact that by cutting too far and too fast, and hitting the charities and community organisations that do so much to support volunteering and social action across the country, it’s David Cameron who is undermining what he likes to call the Big Society’ (Tessa Jowell, *Labour Party Press Release*, 14 February 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘community projects also rely on revenue funding to support capital investment and according to estimates from the Association of Chief Executives of Voluntary Organisations, the total loss of revenue faced by civil society organisations will be at least £1.14 billion in the next financial year’ (Tessa Jowell, *Hansard*, 2 March 2011, Col. 282).
- ‘David Cameron’s reckless decision to cut too far and too fast, threatening the charities and voluntary organisations that do so much to support local communities, is undermining his own Big Society project. No wonder it’s in so much trouble’ (Roberta Blackman-Woods, quoted in *Daily Mail*, 19 February 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘This dramatic cut in the budget at the Northern Rock Foundation will be a huge blow to voluntary groups in the North East and is extremely worrying particularly at a time

- ‘It’s very distressing to hear that our leisure centres are under threat as a result of deep cuts the Government are forcing the Council to make. We will be working with the Council to see if there’s any way we can save our sports centres and put them on a more stable footing for the future’ (Roberta Blackman-Woods, *The Journal*, 22 February 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘Cameron is cutting Manchester by £136 per person – one of highest in country’ (Andy Burnham, *Twitter*, 16 February 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘PM cuts his own council by £20 per head but cuts Manchester by £136 per head’ (Andy Burnham, *Twitter*, 16 February 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘As my hon. Friend the Member for Liverpool, West Derby (Stephen Twigg) said, it is a matter of record that the city of Liverpool has the greatest need but is getting the biggest cuts’ (Luciana Berger, *Hansard*, 2 March 2011, Col. 344).
- ‘Liverpool has been one of the hardest hit in the funding cuts announced by the Tory-led Government. Almost a quarter of Liverpool City Council’s budget has been taken away, with painful ramifications for the services we all currently depend on. It is extremely unfair how Liverpool has been targeted, bearing the greatest burden despite our greater need’ (Luciana Berger, www.lucianaberger.com, *A fair deal for Liverpool*, 23 February 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘Today, a bus full of Nottingham people has travelled down to Westminster to highlight the devastating impact that cuts to local authority funding will have on them, their families, their communities and our city. Will the Minister or a member of his team come and meet them in Committee Room 5 after questions to explain how it is fair that a city such as ours with a high level of need is suffering some of the largest reductions in funding?’ (Lilian Greenwood, *Hansard*, 28 February 2011, Col. 20).
- ‘Charity cuts: a disaster of Eric Pickles’ own making <http://t.co/CHQh3Un> via @guardian’ (Kerry McCarthy, *Twitter*, 3 March 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘Voluntary groups lie at the centre of our local community but now Westminster’s real Big Society will face cuts of over £1 million as a result of decisions made by the ruling Conservative Group’ (Karen Buck, *Karen Buck website*, 23 February 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘Whatever the Government’s plans for reforming public services, the more immediate and pressing issue is the speed and severity of their public spending cuts. There is no getting away from that. Two weeks ago in my constituency I met a whole load of charities, which told me that the cuts threaten their very existence. I am talking about brilliant organisations such as Lighthouse Learning, which has played a huge role in reducing the large number of young people not in education, employment or training in Leicester’ (Liz Kendall, *Leicester Mercury*, 4 March 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘Leicester’s voluntary and community organisations make a huge contribution to our city. Lighthouse learning, which provides skills and training for young people, is facing devastating cuts because the Government has abolished the Working think foolish decision to shove VAT up in January’ (Ed Balls, *The Politics Show*, 27 February 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘All we’ve heard from this Conference is the reheated rhetoric and warmed up policies of 30 years ago – a VAT rise...’ (Ed Balls, *Labour Party Press Release*, 7 March 2011).
- Labour said that hiking up VAT to 20 per cent was the wrong tax at the wrong time. It’s hurting families, businesses and our fragile economy’ (Ed Balls, *The Sun*, 28 February 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘Families are feeling the squeeze and this has been compounded this month by the Tory-led government’s broken-promise hike in VAT’ (Angela Eagle, *Liverpool Daily Post*, 16 February 2011).
- ‘This Tory-led government’s smoke and mirrors over efficiency savings will not mask their plan to hit the economy with a £13bn VAT rise and £20bn of cuts this year’ (Angela Eagle, *Guardian*, 2 March 2011).
- ‘The British economy should be growing strongly this year, but George Osborne’s deep spending cuts and VAT rise are sending things into reverse’ (Angela Eagle, *Labour Party Press Release*, 8 March 2011).
- ‘The Government have already, before Lord Hutton penned his interim report, announced increases, big increases in contributions that people have to pay into their public sector pensions and the difficulty is that at a time of rising prices, big VAT increases, squeezed living standards and a pay freeze in the public sector, will people stay in the schemes, that’s the issue’ (Angela Eagle, *Sky News*, 10 March 2011).
- ‘I think we have to also look to see what the Government announced before Lord Hutton even started his report, which was huge increases in contributions, three per cent on average across on the board for public sector workers, at a time of a two year pay freeze, rising VAT and squeezed living standards’ (Angela Eagle, *BBC News*, 10 March 2011).
- ‘Putting up VAT to 20 per cent was a mistake’ (Kerry McCarthy, *Labour Party Press Release*, 9 March 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘I’ve consistently opposed the Tory-led Government’s VAT rise’ (John Denham, *News from John Denham*, March 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘I have consistently opposed the increase in VAT to 20% that has helped push up petrol prices to their current record levels’ (Anne McGuire, *Press Release*, 1 March 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘...with your government obviously hammering communities like mine with cuts and a VAT rise’ (Chuka Umunna, *Twitter*, 26 February 2011, [link](#)).

- ‘The rise in VAT and cuts to housing benefit will be extremely difficult’ (David Hanson, *Hansard*, 16 February 2011, Col. 282WH, [link](#)).
- ‘Our suspicion is that the Government may well trigger the provisions in the Bill that provide that fiscal circumstances mean that they cannot meet those targets as they pile on the VAT, cut tax credits and education maintenance allowances and so on and so forth’ (Chris Leslie, *Hansard*, Public Bill Committee, 1 March 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘For example, we know that Ministers’ rather depressing defence of the increase in VAT was that somehow it was not a regressive step’ (Chris Leslie, *Hansard*, Public Bill Committee, 1 March 2011, Col. 33, [link](#)).
- ‘That is not the only Government measure to hit pensioners. The Minister proudly and fairly read out a list of excellent things that the previous Government did for pensioners, which the present Government will not abolish. I am glad that they will not. However, they have increased VAT, which means that pensioner couples will be £275 a year worse off, and single pensioners £125 a year worse off’ (Stephen Timms, *Hansard*, 17 February 2011, Col. 1184, [link](#)).
- ‘The Government have increased VAT, which is destroying our tourist industry’ (Ivan Lewis, *Hansard*, 3 March 2011, Col. 438).
- ‘The long delayed and much hyped tourism strategy has little to offer the industry and the VAT hike will make life even tougher for the hotels and restaurants’ (Gloria de Piero, *Politics Home*, 4 March 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘I’ve consistently opposed the Conservative-led government’s VAT rise which has hit families in Midlothian and helped to push up petrol prices to their current record levels’ (David Hamilton, *David Hamilton’s website*, 4 March 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘Tory VAT hike (on fuel particularly) is causing big problems’ (Toby Perkins, *Twitter*, 1 March 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘Voluntary groups are being hurt by the pressure on costs from the hike in VAT to 20% from 4 January this year’ (Willie Bain, *Hansard*, 28 February 2011, Col. 90).

Opposing Child and Working Tax Credit savings

Labour Commitment

- ‘And we’ve got to take action in our tax and benefits system to support those families with children’ (Ed Miliband, *BBC Breakfast*, 28 February 2011).
- ‘Just when the costs of childcare are rising twice as fast as wages, this Government has cut the childcare element of working tax credit’ (Ed Miliband, *Resolution Foundation speech*, 28 February 2011).

Cost

- ‘These ConDem cuts will decimate key frontline services. Weekly bin collections gone, the youth service destroyed, elderly care reduced, lollipop ladies and men sacked and Radcliffe Civic Hall privatised. This unholy and dishonest Tory Lib Dem alliance at Bury Town Hall has let us down. This budget should be the final nail in their coffin’ (Ivan Lewis, *Bury Times*, 7 March 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘I’m afraid for all the rhetoric of the Big Society from the Tory-Lib Dem Government in Westminster, when it comes to making decisions in our area the Conservatives in county hall simply aren’t listening. I believe in a real big society and that’s why I’ll continue to fight for the local groups who are supporting our community and challenge the Tories’ damaging cuts’ (Gloria de Piero, *Gloria de Piero’s website*, 28 February 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘The Tory-led Government’s cuts to local government are so deep it is impossible for Durham County Council to make savings without hitting frontline services. The proposed closure of six sport centres in the county, including Ferryhill in my constituency, can be put squarely at the door of 10 Downing Street’ (Phil Wilson, *The Northern Echo*, 22 February 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘The government’s decision to hit councils with cuts that are too deep and too fast means even the most optimistic back-room savings projections won’t be enough to prevent local jobs being lost and cutbacks to services like children’s centres, bin collection, road maintenance, social care and libraries’ (Caroline Flint, *Local Government Chronicle*, 1 March 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘What is your department’s estimate of the number of jobs that would be lost in the voluntary sector as a result of the front-loaded cuts imposed on councils?’ (Caroline Flint, *Evening Standard*, 28 February 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘These cuts [of £320 million in Birmingham City Council] are the biggest in history and risk undermining the very foundations of the good society’ (Jack Dromey, *ThisIsWalsallOnline.co.uk*, 4 March 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘Building the new interchange will bring much needed jobs this year, and it’s vital to the regeneration of that end of town, as the Town Centre Partnership have long made clear. It would be a real boost for businesses, commuters and shoppers, just when our local economy needs it most. Local people were promised a new rail-bus station and it would be outrageous for the new Government to break that promise so late in the day when all the work has been done. Cutting this now will just cost us more through fewer jobs, less business and higher unemployment for Castleford’ (*Yvette Cooper’s Website*, [link](#)).
- ‘Hull’s Labour Opposition, Council staff and others fought hard to protect local services today from saving that go too deep and too fast, but these frontline cuts pushed through by Lib Dem councillors will hit the weakest people the hardest...These are cuts are more severe than those of the 1980s – all in return for Nick Clegg’s seat in the Cabinet’ (Diana Johnson, *Diana Johnson’s Website*, 24 February 2011, [link](#)).

- ‘Con-Dem cuts to council budgets mean Lambeth’s budget falls by £104.10 per person <http://bit.ly/euJPZp>. I’m clear where responsibility lies’ (Chuka Umunna, *Twitter*, 25 February 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘The cuts from the Treasury, via Eric Pickles to Nottingham City Council, are now starting to bite on the concessionary fares that many in the city have enjoyed in recent years’ (Chris Leslie, *Chris Leslie website*, 21 February 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘RT @andyburnhammp: PM cuts his own council by £20 per head but cuts Manchester by £136 per head’ (Kerry McCarthy, *Twitter*, 16 February 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘The £90 million of cuts to the budget of Leeds city council means that Bramley baths in my constituency will have its hours cut so that school children will not be able to swim there any more. How does that fit with the Government’s ambition for school sports and for the Olympic legacy for Leeds?’ (Rachel Reeves, *Hansard*, 2 March 2011, Col. 300, [link](#)).
- ‘The Council understands the schools’ concerns, and we understand that David Cameron and George Osborne’s unfair cuts to the Council’s budget makes things very difficult for them’ (Rachel Reeves, *Rachel Reeves’ website*, 22 February 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘Leeds City Council has proposed shorter opening hours for the facility, as part of cost cutting measures across the city, as a result of the Tory-led government’s 28% cut to Leeds City Council budgets’ (Rachel Reeves, *Rachel Reeves’ website*, 22 February 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘Last week, Islington Council passed a budget after the Government removed £40 million from the services that sustain our community. Those Government cuts represent nothing less than an attack on the thousands of low income families in our borough’ (Emily Thornberry, *Emily Thornberry’s website*, 24 February 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘They are just the first blow in the Conservative - Liberal Democrat Government’s plan to cut £335 million from our community over the next four years. Despite the cuts, the Council’s Labour Group managed to minimise the damage and work on the side of ordinary people by providing extra funds for the voluntary sector, for adult social care, to protect free school meals and to help get people into work. We need to build a movement against these unfair cuts. That is why we are organising for the TUC demonstration on 26 March. We call on all of Islington’s residents to join us there to stand up for our community’ (Emily Thornberry, *Emily Thornberry’s website*, 24 February 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘Debating Tory MP Lefroy’s clause that wld cut funding 2 Islington- gets 36.5% more funding than av. Will patiently explain why we need it!!’ (Emily Thornberry, *Twitter*, 3 March 2011).
- ‘Read this! <http://bit.ly/g9RJq2> Spot on:re local gvt cuts,real responsibility +gesture politics #IslingtonLabour #Labour #ProgressiveLondon’ (Emily Thornberry, *Twitter*, 3 March 2011).

- Reversing the Child and Working Tax Credit savings from the June Budget and the Spending Review would cost £5.4 billion by 2014-15 (HMT, *June Budget 2010*, Table 2.1 and OBR, *Economic and Fiscal Forecast*, Table A1, p. 150). However, this is included in the welfare reforms below.

Other opposition

- ‘Funding rises in the personal allowance through tax rises elsewhere like VAT and cuts to family tax credits and child benefit isn’t making the tax system fairer’ (Ed Miliband, *Resolution Foundation speech*, 28 February 2011).
- ‘They’re actually hitting the people that we’re talking about, lower and middle income families, with the rise in VAT, cuts to tax credits and other things’ (Ed Miliband, *BBC Breakfast*, 28 February 2011).
- Just when the costs of childcare are rising twice as fast as wages, this Government has cut the childcare element of working tax credit’ (Ed Miliband, *Resolution Foundation speech*, 28 February 2011).
- ‘His problem is that he is still refusing to change policies - such as trebling tuition fees, raising VAT or cutting child benefit and tax credits - which make this crisis worse’ (Ed Miliband, *Evening Standard*, 11 March 2011).
- ‘Families are being badly squeezed by this Conservative-led government’s hit on living standards through... cuts to tax credits’ (Ed Balls, *Tribune*, 4 March 2011).

Opposing in-year spending cuts in 2010-11

Labour Commitment

- ‘And my fear is that the economy is set to underperform as the full impact of tax rises and deep spending cuts hits the fragile economy this year and holds back the recovery’ (Ed Balls, *The House Magazine*, 7 March 2011).

Cost

- Savings made in 2010-11 amount to £6.2 billion per year (HM Treasury, *June Budget 2010*, p. 16).

Opposing two year public sector pay-freeze

Labour Commitment

- ‘I think we have to also look to see what the Government announced before Lord Hutton even started his report, which was huge increases in contributions, three per cent on average across on the board for public sector workers, at a time of a two year pay freeze, rising VAT and squeezed living standards’ (Angela Eagle, *BBC News*, 10 March 2011).

Cost

- The public sector pay freeze will save £3.3 billion annually by 2014-15 (HM Treasury, *June Budget 2010*, p. 17).

Other Opposition

- ‘The Government have already, before Lord Hutton penned his interim report, announced increases, big increases in contributions that people have to pay into their public sector pensions and the difficulty is that at a time of rising prices, big VAT increases, squeezed living standards and a pay freeze in the public sector, will people stay in the schemes, that’s the issue’ (Angela Eagle, *Sky News*, 10 March 2011).
- ‘This is a second squeeze at a time when public sector workers already face a pay freeze’ (Angela Eagle, *Labour Party Press Release*, 10 March 2011, [link](#)).

Opposing increase in public sector pension contributions

Labour Commitment

- ‘I think we have to also look to see what the Government announced before Lord Hutton even started his report, which was huge increases in contributions, 3 per cent on average across on the board for public sector workers, at a time of a two year pay freeze, rising VAT and squeezed living standards’ (Angela Eagle, *BBC News*, 10 March 2011).

Cost

- The increase in contribution rates will save £1.8 billion in 2014-15 (OBR, *Economic and Fiscal Forecast*, November 2010, Table A1, p. 150).

Other Opposition

- ‘But anyone reading this [Hutton] report needs to remember that the government has already pre-empted its findings by significantly increasing employee contributions’ (Angela Eagle, *Labour Party Press Release*, 10 March 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘The Government have already, before Lord Hutton penned his interim report, announced increases, big increases in contributions that people have to pay into their public sector pensions and the difficulty is that at a time of rising prices, big VAT increases, squeezed living standards and a pay freeze in the public sector, will people stay in the schemes, that’s the issue’ (Angela Eagle, *Sky News*, 10 March 2011).

Opposing cuts to the HMRC budget

Labour Commitment

- ‘The £2 billion cut in the [HMRC] service causes concern... I am concerned that the 25% potential efficiency savings and the £2 billion cut in the budget will result in job

COMMUNITIES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Opposing cuts to local government grants

Labour Commitment

- ‘The second myth we have got to take on is the idea that somehow it is the fault of local authorities that the cuts are hitting front line... They are asking for 28 per cent cuts on average across local authorities’ (Ed Miliband, *Speech to the Labour Local Government Group*, 6 March 2011).
- ‘We should remember that in Southwark people voted strongly for a Labour council last May. But this Labour council is being compelled to take action that it would never have imagined at the time it was elected. Southwark is in an incredibly difficult position - having to implement cuts of 30% over the next four years as a direct result of the settlement it received from the Government - the biggest cash cuts in London’ (Tessa Jowell, *Southwark News*, 2 March 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘I am concerned about the implications of the massive cuts that the coalition Government have agreed to implement. In particular, the cuts of up to 30 per cent that local authorities face over the next four years, and cuts in other public services, will lead to the loss of almost 500,000 jobs in the public sector’ (Chris Williamson, *Hansard*, 16 February 2011, Col. 314WH).

Cost

- Resource DEL for CLG Local Government is falling from £28.5 billion in 2010-11 to £22.9 billion in 2014-15, a cut of £5.6 billion in cash terms (HM Treasury, *Spending Review 2010*, p. 10).

Other Opposition

- ‘People are angry about the threat to the forests, so too the threat to local libraries, children’s centres, other common institutions’ (Ed Miliband, *Labour Party Press Release*, 17 February 2011).
- ‘The local government finance settlement is arbitrary and has a sense of disproportionality’ (Chris Leslie, *Hansard*, 1 March 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘The most deprived local authorities, like Lambeth, are being hit hardest by cuts to local government budgets. For all Ministers’ talk of fairness, localism and devolving power, they have dumped cuts on local councils and left them facing the toughest financial settlement in living memory. The government has chosen to front-load the heaviest cuts and to impose the worst cuts on deprived communities rather than distributing them fairly. I am deeply concerned at the impact this will have on our area, particularly our community and voluntary sector’ (Chuka Umunna, *Press Release*, 16 February 2011, [link](#)).

when child benefit is scrapped' (Ed Miliband, *Resolution Foundation speech*, 28 February 2011, [link](#)).

Cost

- Removing Child Benefit from families with a higher rate taxpayer from January 2013 will save £2.59 billion per year in 2014-15 (OBR, *Economic and Fiscal Outlook*, November 2010, Table A1, p. 150). However, this is included in the total welfare savings above and so cannot be counted separately.

Other Opposition

- 'Funding rises in the personal allowance through tax rises elsewhere like VAT and cuts to family tax credits and child benefit isn't making the tax system fairer' (Ed Miliband, *Resolution Foundation speech*, 28 February 2011).
- 'His problem is that he is still refusing to change policies - such as trebling tuition fees, raising VAT or cutting child benefit and tax credits - which make this crisis worse' (Ed Miliband, *Evening Standard*, 11 March 2011).
- 'He will also doubtless have noticed that once people begin to earn £43,400, they will lose their child benefit, which is worth several thousand pounds a year. That all puts pressure on second earners to go out to work' (Liam Byrne, *Hansard*, 9 March 2011, Col. 939).

Opposing the extension of savings limits

Labour Commitment

- 'As the Minister is on a bit of roll, may I suggest that he go further in changing the Government's proposals? Under the existing system, most out-of-work benefits are subject to savings limits-currently £16,000, but the Government intend to extend that threshold to in-work benefits as part of the universal credit, and I notice that that threshold is not uprated in the order before us. Under the proposed limit, in future anyone in work who would be entitled to tax credits but has savings of more than £6,000 will have their payment reduced. Those who have savings of more than £16,000 will lose their entitlement to tax credits altogether... The Opposition cannot possibly support the proposed change, and I cannot imagine that many Government Members would want to see such an extraordinary assault on family savings either' (Stephen Timms, *Hansard*, 17 February 2011, Col. 1188).

Cost

- A credible costing for this is not available.

losses, which will equate to revenue losses and lower morale among the staff' (David Hanson, *Hansard*, 2 March 2011, Col. 396, [link](#)).

Cost

- HMRC total DEL is falling from £3.7 billion in 2010-11 to £3.4 billion in 2014-15, a cut of £0.3 billion in cash terms (HM Treasury, *Spending Review 2010*, p. 71).

Other Opposition

- 'At this crucial time, why are HMRC being asked to do more with less?' (Chuka Umunna, *Twitter*, 2 March 2011, [link](#)).
- 'At this crucial time, why are HMRC being asked to do more with less? <http://bit.ly/gGNHcx>" an article about today's debate' (David Hanson, *Twitter*, 2 March 2011, [link](#)).

Opposing increases to the State Pension Age

Labour Commitment

- 'I've been contacted by women who, after working for 30 or 40 years, have already started preparing for retirement, by reducing their hours or taking on more responsibilities like caring for elderly parents or grandchildren. Now they are told they could have to work for another two years and they'll lose £10,000 in pension income. It's another sign the Government is out of touch and has no idea what life is like for most people—and how much tougher they're making it' (John Healey, *Rotherham Advertiser*, 4 March 2011, [link](#)).

Cost

- DWP states: 'This will result in £30.4 billion of savings between 2016/17 and 2025/26, which would otherwise need to be met by the working-age population' (DWP, *A sustainable State Pension: when the State Pension age will increase to 66*, November 2010, p. 8, [link](#)).
- However, this change falls outside of the Spending Review period and so does not provide a saving in 2014-15.

Other Opposition

- 'Almost 6,000 ppl have signed a petition against changes to the State Pension Age - sign up at www.unionstogether.org.uk' (Rachel Reeves, *Twitter*, 21 February 2011, [link](#)).
- 'It is an absolute insult to tell women that they should go on the dole. These women have worked and brought up families - they don't want handouts, they want to be able to draw their pensions at the date it was promised to them' (Rachel Reeves, *Sunday Express*, 20 February 2011).

- ‘It’s unnecessary and unfair for the government to move the goalposts so late, when women won’t be able to change their plans. It’s another sign the government is out of touch and has no idea what life is like for most people – and how much tougher they’re making it. Labour is trying to make the government rethink its proposals and is arguing for no change before 2020, as the Coalition Agreement promised, followed by an increase in the state pension age for men and women to 66 between 2020 and 2022. This would affect 1.2m fewer people and would affect men and women equally’ (John Healey, *John Healey’s website*, 28 February 2011, [link](#)).

Opposing cuts in capital and investment allowances

Labour Commitment

- ‘However, it is clear that, at a UK level, the cut in capital and investment allowances is affecting manufacturing exporters and harming Glasgow business’ (Willie Bain, *Hansard*, 16 February 2011, Col. 279WH).

Cost

- The changes to capital allowances announced at the June 2010 Budget will raise £1.8 billion in 2014-15, and the changes to investment allowances raise £1.0 billion in 2014-15, giving a total of £2.8 billion (HM Treasury, *June Budget*, Table 2.1, p. 40).

- ‘Their spending cuts, though, are still targeting those who can least afford it, and the reply I received previously from the Minister for Welfare Reform indicated that they do not appreciate the hardship simply cutting Housing Benefit could cause to the unemployed, working people and disabled people’ (Kerry McCarthy, *Kerry McCarthy website*, 18 February 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘We have also seen a raft of cuts in housing benefit, which has undermined that twin process of economic and social regeneration’ (Margaret Curran, *Hansard*, 16 February 2011, col. 267WH, [link](#)).
- ‘I hope that the Minister will listen and will take back Glasgow’s message to the Government. That message is that they should think again about cuts in housing benefit in particular and that they should support our fight for jobs, particularly as we have seen the job crisis increase’ (Margaret Curran, *Hansard*, 16 February 2011, col. 267WH, [link](#)).
- ‘There are a lot of unintended consequences [to the housing benefit cuts]. There are a lot of potentially innocent victims’ (Alison Seabeck, *The Plymouth Herald*, 18 February 2011, [link](#)).

Opposing the abolition of the Child Trust Fund

Labour Commitment

- ‘We all know how important it is to learn to save and manage our finances. That’s why I believe The Child Trust Fund is so important. It helps our children save for the future’ (Yvette Cooper, *Yvette Cooper’s Website*, [link](#)).
- ‘The Government is also cancelling a number of policies, like Child Trust Funds, specifically designed to help young people get on in life. These changes will have a damaging effect for many families and young people in Glasgow North East throughout the course of their lives’ (Willie Bain, www.williebain.com, *William Bain MP warns of tough times ahead for the young people in Glasgow North East*, 21 February 2011, [link](#)).

Cost

- The abolition of the Child Trust Fund will save £0.56 billion in 2014-15 (HM Treasury, *June Budget 2010*, Table 2.1, p. 41). However, this is included in the total welfare savings above and so cannot be counted separately.

Opposing Child Benefit withdrawal from higher rate taxpayers

Labour Commitment

- ‘A single-earner couple with two children with earnings of £44,000 sounds well off. But such a family will be hard hit by the £1,750 a year they will lose in one fell swoop

WELFARE REFORMS

Labour Commitment

- ‘As my hon. Friend the Member for Glasgow East intimated in her remarks, incomes will also be damaged by the Government’s proposals on housing benefit, which it has been estimated will cost £10 million to £12 million a year in lost spending capacity by the poorest families and individuals in the city’ (Willie Bain, *Hansard*, 16 February 2011, Col. 279WH).
- ‘This time, however, we object because we know exactly what the Secretary of State is going to do. He has proposed a housing benefit cap, which he says will save money, but the Mayor of London has now said that the measure will cost more money because homelessness costs will rocket’ (Liam Byrne, *Hansard*, 9 March 2011, Col. 946).

Cost

- The savings announced in the June Budget to Housing Benefit reforms worth £1.765 billion in 2014-15. The Spending Review also introduced an increase in the age limit for a shared room rate worth £0.215 billion in 2014-15 (HMT, *June Budget 2010*, Table 2.1, p. 40 and OBR, *Economic and Fiscal Outlook*, November 2010, Table A1, p. 150). However, this is included in the total welfare savings above and so cannot be counted separately.

Other Opposition

- ‘The Government’s policies on public spending and also on social issues will damage the economy of Glasgow... Linking local housing allowance to the consumer prices index will result in lower income for people locally. The cut to housing benefit ignores the fact that, in an area with rising unemployment, long-term unemployed people who are trying their best to find work, who are going to interviews and sending out applications and who are turning up at the Jobcentre but are still unable to secure employment will face a reduction in their income’ (David Hanson, *Hansard*, 16 February 2011, Col. 282).
- ‘It’s ridiculous to expect people who have hardly got enough to live on already to be using some of that to pay rent and having less and less money, which means that with prices going up, especially on food and things, they are going to be really struggling’ (Nia Griffith, *South Wales Evening Post*, 19 February 2011).
- ‘In just over a year from now, the most far-reaching cuts to housing benefit will kick in, hurting thousands across the Nottingham area. Government ‘reforms’ are going to see the housing benefit reduced from the average of the local market rental rate to a new lower 30% equivalent of the local market rate. But the really bad news is that single people under the age of 35 years old will be forced onto the ‘shared room rate’, which could see their housing benefit cut from around £90 per week to just £60 per week. With very little shared accommodation available in the city, the downstream consequences for homelessness and overcrowding are very worrying’ (Chris Leslie, *Chris Leslie website*, 21 February 2011, [link](#)).

Opposing welfare savings

Labour Commitment

- ‘With the... cuts in the welfare system and the axe being taken to council services, this will only add to the number of children in the city living and suffering in poverty’ (Peter Soulsby, *Leicester Mercury*, 23 February 2011).

Cost

- The June 2010 Budget set out welfare changes which would collectively save £11.04 billion in 2014-15 (HM Treasury, *June Budget 2010*, p. 40). The Spending Review set out further welfare savings which were revised to £6.845 in the OBR’s Economic and Fiscal Outlook (OBR, *Economic and Fiscal Outlook*, November 2010, Table A1, p. 150).
- Labour support the CPI switch for three years, but implied they would reverse it in 2014-15. As such it is included below as a spending commitment (see Spending Commitments section below). As a result we have deducted £5.84 billion from the total welfare saving to avoid double-counting.
- It is also necessary to exclude the £0.11 billion housing benefit measure that reduces Housing Benefit awards to 90 per cent after 12 months for claimants of Jobseekers Allowance. It was announced at the time of the Welfare Reform Bill that this would not be going ahead.
- Therefore the total welfare saving in 2014-15 outlined in the June Budget and the Spending Review that Labour oppose is £11.935 billion.

Other Opposition

- ‘Although the Chancellor likes to pretend that the welfare cuts are somehow hitting shirkers not workers, will the Minister confirm that once we factor out the lower uprating the truth is that more than half the cuts in welfare spending are hitting working families?’ (Liam Byrne, *Hansard*, 16 February 2011, Col. 974).
- ‘In fact, more than half the welfare cut will hit working families’ (Liam Byrne, *Hansard*, 16 February 2011, Col. 975).
- ‘Once you factor out the lower rate of benefit uprating, around half the Government’s ‘welfare’ cuts are actually paid by working families, starting with a £1 billion raid on family budgets this April’ (Liam Byrne, *Liam Byrne Website*, 20 February 2011, [link](#)).
- ‘Universal Credit is to be introduced in a few years time – after benefits for working families have been well and truly slashed; £1 billion comes off the support for working families starting this April’ (Liam Byrne, *Liam Byrne Website*, 17 February 2011).

- ‘Just when the costs of childcare are rising twice as fast as wages, this Government has cut the childcare element of working tax credit’ (Ed Miliband, *Resolution Foundation speech*, 28 February 2011).
- ‘Funding rises in the personal allowance through tax rises elsewhere like VAT and cuts to family tax credits and child benefit isn’t making the tax system fairer’ (Ed Miliband, *Resolution Foundation speech*, 28 February 2011).
- ‘They’re actually hitting the people that we’re talking about, lower and middle income families, with the rise in VAT, cuts to tax credits and other things’ (Ed Miliband, *BBC Breakfast*, 28 February 2011).
- ‘Families are being badly squeezed by this Conservative-led government’s hit on living standards through... cuts to tax credits’ (Ed Balls, *Tribune*, 4 March 2011).
- ‘It is concerning that this Government’s welfare reforms are perhaps undermining regeneration’ (Margaret Curran, *Hansard*, 16 February 2011, Col. 267).

Opposing a cap on benefits

Labour Commitment

- ‘Is not the cap just a crude piece of social engineering, forcing people not to live in expensive areas, such as the constituency that I represent? Is it not directed at vulnerable people and the poorest in society, making it possible for them to live only where the Secretary of State chooses for them to live?’ (Andy Slaughter, *Hansard*, 9 March 2011, Col. 922).

Cost

- The DWP impact assessment forecasts that this will save £0.27 billion in 2014-15 (DWP, *Impact assessment for the household benefit cap*, 16 February 2011, [link](#)). However, this is included in the total welfare savings above and so cannot be counted separately.

Opposing time-limiting Employment Support Allowance

Labour Commitment

- ‘I beg to move an amendment, to leave out from “That” to the end of the Question and add: this House... declines to give a Second Reading to the Welfare Reform Bill... because the Bill disadvantages people suffering from cancer or mental illness due to the withdrawal of contributory Employment Support Allowance’ (Liam Byrne, *Hansard*, 9 March 2011, Col. 934).
- ‘That alarm is simply magnified by the proposals to set a one-year limit for those who can receive contributory employment and support allowance... This simply cannot be right, and it needs to be looked at again’ (Liam Byrne, *Hansard*, 9 March 2011, Col. 945).

Cost

- Introducing a time limit for those in the Work Related Activity Group to one year will save £1.37 billion in 2014-15 (OBR, *Economic and Fiscal Outlook*, November 2010, Table A1, p. 150). However, this is included in the total welfare savings above and so cannot be counted separately.

Opposing reforming the Disability Living Allowance gateway

Labour Commitment

- ‘More alarming for many people is the lack of any safeguards on what the Government have in mind for the future of DLA, especially as we know that the Chancellor is determined to take £1 billion off the bill and then ask what kind of reform will be necessary to deliver his sums’ (Liam Byrne, *Hansard*, 9 March 2011, Col. 944).
- ‘One group of people who are seriously concerned about what the future holds for them are those in receipt of disability benefits’ (Anne McGuire, *Stirling Observer*, March 2011, [link](#)).

Cost

- Reforming the DLA gateway from 2013-14 will save £1.075 billion in 2014-15 (HM Treasury, *June Budget 2010*, Table 2.1, p. 40). However, this is included in the total welfare savings above and so cannot be counted separately.

Opposing 10 per cent Council Tax Benefit reduction

Labour Commitment

- ‘I beg to move an amendment, to leave out from “That” to the end of the Question and add: this House... declines to give a Second Reading to the Welfare Reform Bill... because it fails to clarify how Council Tax Benefit will be incorporated in the Universal Credit system’ (Liam Byrne, *Hansard*, 9 March 2011, Col. 934).
- ‘Local authorities will apparently be free to design council tax benefit as they wish, except that it will have to cost 10% less than before’ (Stephen Timms, *Hansard*, 9 March 2011, Col. 1017).

Cost

- A 10 per cent reduction in the cost of Council Tax Benefit will save £0.52 billion in 2014-15 (OBR, *Economic and Fiscal Outlook*, November 2010, Table A1, p. 150). However, this is included in the total welfare savings above and so cannot be counted separately.

Opposing Housing Benefit reforms, including a cap