

Making London's Mayor Accountable

Boris Johnson

Making London's Mayor More Accountable

I believe Londoners should have a greater say on how their city is run, more information on how decisions are made and details on how City Hall money is spent.

Ken Livingstone presides over a budget of more than £10billion and demands £311 per year from the average taxpaying household in London. Yet Londoners have little confidence in the Mayor spending their money with care and prudence.

Mayor Livingstone's extravagant spending on publicity, his jaunts to Cuba and Venezuela at taxpayers' expense, and the recent reports of his close advisers using their influence to manipulate the expenditure of public money have all confirmed that Ken Livingstone's Mayoralty is unaccountable and disdainful of scrutiny.

If elected, I will aim to create a different style of government at City Hall by introducing a series of measures designed to make my Mayoralty more accountable, and spending more transparent.

The first of these will be the reform of People's Question Times, open public forums where ordinary residents are able to question the Mayor and London Assembly members. Under my plans, not only will we hold these events more frequently, but we will establish question sessions that focus on myself and perhaps my Deputy too, giving Londoners the chance to question their Mayor more directly.

By exercising the Mayor's right to chair the Metropolitan Police Authority, I will take direct responsibility for tackling crime, and will be fully accountable for police performance. Local Borough Commanders will be required to hold monthly open public meetings so that local people can regularly hold their police to account.

Too often, Ken Livingstone has ignored the views of Londoners. Under my administration, City Hall will listen to public consultations, which will help shape policy. To this end, I will hold a new consultation on the Western extension of the Congestion Charge, and I pledge to abide by the result.

I will also take account of the concerns of all London businesses by holding biannual summits with business representatives, and I will take a less adversarial approach with locally-elected councils.

We need more open information on how City Hall spends our money. I will strip away the secrets by publishing an open register of interests for all Mayoral advisers, and I will provide a search function on the Mayor's website enabling Londoners to instantly find all grants, contracts and programmes over £1,000. I will also conduct a full review of London Development Agency grants.

Finally, to demonstrate my commitment to accountability, if elected, I pledge to run for no more than two terms – because leading this great city is a privilege, not a right.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Boris Johnson". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Boris" written in a larger, more prominent script than the last name "Johnson".

Boris Johnson

Conservative Candidate for London Mayor

My Pledges

I will:

1. Give Londoners More Say

- Communicate in plain English and listen to the results of consultations.
- Hold more People's Question Times, so Londoners can directly question the Mayor and senior officials.
- Work closely with locally-elected Councillors instead of berating them.

2. End The Culture Of Cronyism At City Hall

- Create a Cabinet for London, to assist in running London in a more business-like, transparent manner.
- Pledge to stand for only two terms if elected.
- Introduce tough new rules for Mayoral advisers to ensure their interests are declared and in the open.

3. Restore Trust In How City Hall Spends Our Money

- Launch an immediate review of City Hall finances, to report initial findings within the first 100 days.
- Launch an independent review of all London Development Agency grants.
- Enable Londoners to view all GLA grants, contracts and programmes worth over £1,000 on the Mayor's website.
- Ensure that Londoners will not pay any more than 38p per week for the Olympics.

1. Giving Londoners Their Say

I will:

- **Communicate in plain English and listen to the results of consultations.**
- **Hold more Public Question Times, where Londoners will be able to directly question the Mayor, Deputy Mayor and senior officials.**
- **Chair the Metropolitan Police Authority, so Londoners can hold me to account over what happens with the police.**
- **Ensure local police chiefs hold monthly open public meetings.**
- **Hold regular meetings with business leaders, so businesses large and small can have direct, personal contact with the Mayor.**
- **Work closely and co-operate with locally-elected Councillors instead of bullying and berating them.**

Listening To Londoners

Whenever the Mayor is required to make a major decision, he is obliged by law to hold a public consultation before making that decision. This mechanism should ensure that the views of those who will be affected by such decisions are taken into account.

However, under Ken Livingstone's administration, public consultations have become devalued.

The Federation of Small Businesses' assessment of the current administration is disheartening: *"The sense of detachment from the political system expressed by the public is also felt by the business community. This stems from a perception that consultation is frequently a sham, with loaded questions designed to obtain a pre-ordained result. Many recent GLA consultations only serve to reinforce that impression."*¹

In the first instance we are committed to communicating in plain English. Consultation documents should be short, easy to understand and use as little jargon or legal phrasing as possible.

¹ FSB, *Keeping London Open for Business; A Programme for a Working Capital*, March 2007, p.12.

We are also committed to approaching every consultation with an open mind. A consultation should be conducted to solicit information that will shape decision making; it should not be a box-ticking exercise.

This is in sharp contrast to the manner in which the Labour Mayor has approached consultations. Almost every time Ken Livingstone has conducted a consultation that produces results he doesn't want, he has ignored it.

For example, in 2004 over 16,000 residents in West London responded to the consultation for the West London Tram, which was proposed to run between Uxbridge town centre and Shepherds Bush. 59% opposed the scheme.²

In a further research study commissioned by Transport for London two years later, residents' views remained much the same; 44% were against, and 40% were for.³

In that same year, local residents voted out the Labour administration in Ealing who supported the scheme.

Yet despite such consistent levels of opposition, Ken Livingstone steadfastly refused to accept the results and dismissed the consultation, saying that it was "not a referendum on the scheme".⁴ He continued with his plans, spending over £30 million on development alone.⁵

The Labour Mayor has constantly ignored the views of Londoners.

In 2005, 70% of residents objected to extending the Congestion Charge zone Westwards, 80% of businesses objected and 84% of other organisations objected.⁶

Also in 2005, 76% of residents opposed the Congestion Charge increase from £5 to £8, as well as 89% of businesses.⁷

Every time, Ken Livingstone has ignored the results and proceeded as planned.

His view of consultations is clear: "I would not regard the responses to public consultation as necessarily reflecting public opinion in London."⁸

We urgently need to inject confidence into the consultation process. The Mayor must be accountable to Londoners, and they must feel that their voice will be heard – not just once every four years, but on a regular basis.

² http://www.tfl.gov.uk/assets/downloads/WLT_consultation_summary_brochure_FINAL.pdf

³ <http://www.tfl.gov.uk/assets/downloads/October-2006.pdf>

⁴ <http://www.epolitix.com/EN/News/200503/4dbccec9-abf6-4fd6-8030-eeb9cd26bd22.htm>

⁵ <http://www.london.gov.uk/mqt/question.do?id=20469>

⁶ <http://www.tfl.gov.uk/assets/downloads/Report-to-the-Mayor-2005.pdf> p.5.

⁷ http://www.tfl.gov.uk/assets/downloads/Variation_order_5.pdf p.5.

⁸ The Evening Standard, 1 April 2005.

To re-build confidence we will re-open the consultation on the Western extension of the Congestion Charge. We pledge to abide by the result of that new consultation, whatever it may be.

We believe that this will be the first step to restoring trust in the democratic process, and signal a clear change of direction at City Hall.

People's Question Time

The GLA Act 1999 obliges the Mayor and London Assembly to hold at least two 'People's Question Time' sessions each year (these are open public meetings that take place in a different borough each time). So, in the last eight years, there have been 16 meetings, meaning that half of London's boroughs have never had the chance to question their Mayor directly.⁹

We believe this is too infrequent, and we will increase the frequency of People's Question Times to a minimum of four and a maximum of six each year.

The Mayor has the discretion to change the format of People's Question Time, and we will exercise this in order to strengthen accountability. The sessions will be broadened to include senior officials from the functional bodies who make decisions on Londoners' behalf, such as the Transport Commissioner, the Chair of Transport for London, the Chair of the London Development Agency, the Chair of the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority, and senior advisers to the Mayor.

Included in the maximum of six sessions, we will hold special Mayoral question times when just the Mayor and Deputy Mayor will take questions, giving Londoners the chance to question the leader of the London government more directly.

The sessions will be well advertised to ensure maximum participation.

Taking Responsibility For The Police

The Mayor of London has the right to Chair the Metropolitan Police Authority – the body set up to scrutinise and support the work of the Metropolitan Police Service.¹⁰ Boris Johnson will exercise this right so that there is a direct link between the police and the Mayor, so the Mayor is more accountable for what happens in the police.

The MPA is the main scrutiny body for the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) and sets its strategic direction.

⁹http://www.london.gov.uk/gla/pqt/previous_meetings.jsp

¹⁰*"The Metropolitan police authority*

Chairman and vice chairmen

4 (1) The Secretary of State shall by regulations provide that—

(a) if the Mayor of London is a member of the Metropolitan Police Authority, he is to be the chairman;

(b) if not, the Mayor of London is to appoint a chairman from among the members of the Authority."

Police and Justice Act 2006, "SCHEDULE 2A 4 (1).

Although the Mayor has no operational control over the police, he has considerable influence through setting the budget, and will be able to directly set the strategic direction by chairing the MPA, to get more officers on the streets.¹¹

The Police and Justice Act 2006 gives the Mayor the right to chair the MPA, and Boris Johnson will exercise this right so that the police are directly accountable to the Mayor, and so that he can personally oversee his strategy to get more police on the streets and cut red tape.¹²

We will use the local policing plan as a lever to deliver our priorities.

The Commissioner is required to submit a local policing plan to the MPA for its consideration. The MPA can amend that plan according to the strategic priorities it wishes to set, and the Commissioner must 'have regard' to that plan. The Police and Justice Act 2006 stipulates:

*"A draft of a policing plan required to be issued by a police authority under this section shall be prepared by the relevant chief officer of police and submitted by him to the authority for it to consider. The authority shall consult the relevant chief officer of police before issuing a policing plan which differs from the draft submitted by him under this subsection."*¹³

However, the Commissioner of the Metropolis still retains direct control, as the GLA Act 1999 stipulates:

*"The Metropolitan Police force shall be under the direction and control of the Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis appointed under section 9B. In discharging his functions, the Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis shall have regard to the local policing plan issued by the Metropolitan Police Authority under section 8."*¹⁴

Therefore, we will draft a new local policing plan, in consultation with the Commissioner, that will have as its priority the pledges in our crime manifesto.

Increasing Police Accountability

Increasing police accountability will boost Londoners' confidence in the Met. The more accountable they are, the more responsive they will be.

¹¹ "The Mayor of London sets the annual budget for five functional bodies, which have become known as the 'GLA Group'. The group comprises the Metropolitan Police Authority, the Greater London Authority, Transport for London, the London Development Agency and London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority." The MPA budget factsheet, <http://www.mpa.gov.uk/about/publications/factsheets/mpa-budget.htm>

¹² Police and Justice Act 2006, SCHEDULE 2A, Section 4 (1), http://www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts2006/pdf/ukpga_20060048_en.pdf

¹³ Police and Justice Act 2006, http://www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts2006/pdf/ukpga_20060048_en.pdf

¹⁴ Greater London Authority Act 1999, http://www.England-legislation.hmso.gov.uk/acts/acts1999/ukpga_19990029_en_22

There should be a stronger link between local people and their Borough Commanders. There is currently a structure to enable local people to question local police chiefs, through forums like Police Community Consultative Groups and Borough Community Engagement Groups. However, in practice, most local residents do not know about such arrangements, and they are poorly attended.

We will change the format of these meetings so that all local residents can actively participate.

We will direct the Commissioner to ensure that Borough Commanders hold open public meetings every month, where they will answer questions from local residents. We will expect these meetings to be convenient and well publicised. Community engagement will be further bolstered by the greater availability of crime mapping data.

Regular Meetings With Business Leaders

Under Ken Livingstone many sections of London's business community have frequently felt ignored and marginalised. In their manifesto for London, the Federation of Small Businesses reported that *"business owners feel that politicians ignore their views because they are seen as less important than other groups in society"*.¹⁵

If London's businesses are to thrive and therefore deliver jobs and prosperity for the capital it is vital that the Mayor communicates frequently and openly with all of London's businesses – from the sole traders to the City banks.

The Mayor's responsibility for major policy areas like transport, policing, planning and the environment means that he has a direct impact on all businesses in London – yet the Labour Mayor has frequently ignored the views of London's business community.

The Federation of Small Businesses recently stated that *"consultation is frequently a sham, with loaded questions designed to obtain a pre-ordained result"*.¹⁶

We believe there should be greater dialogue between the Mayor and the business community in London, with levels of contact above and beyond the standard consultation procedures, which are deeply flawed at present.

We propose to hold meetings every six months between the Mayor and representatives of businesses large and small.

We are particularly keen to use these events as an opportunity to engage with some of the smaller businesses – the sole traders and the market stall holders, for instance

¹⁵ FSB, *Keeping London Open for Business; A Programme for a Working Capital*, March 2007, p.12.

¹⁶ FSB *Keeping London Open for Business*, March 2008

– who typically don't belong to a business organisation and whose views are therefore often overlooked.

These meetings will provide an opportunity for businesses to have personal contact with the Mayor so that they can raise their concerns directly.

This will give business a greater voice in the administration at City Hall, and allow businesses to give first-hand accounts of how the Mayor's policies affect them.

Working With Local Councillors

Many aspects of life in London are the responsibility of locally-elected councils. Recycling and rubbish collection, social services, education, and the care of most roads are just some of the services that councils run – and for the most part run well.

Ken Livingstone's approach is to criticise, berate and bully councils who do not always follow his policies, and to seek to strip away their powers whenever he can. A council's first responsibility is to their local residents, and sometimes what is good for a local area may differ from the strategic direction set by City Hall.

We believe strongly in localism, and allowing councils the freedom to pursue policies that their local residents have elected them to implement. Therefore, we intend to drastically improve the relationship between City Hall and local councils by working with local Councillors, not against them.

One area for such work will be planning. Currently, the Mayor is obliged by law to produce the London Plan, which sets the general strategic direction for planning in London. Ken Livingstone has used this as a means to consistently undermine councils and try to impose his will upon them.

We will take a more flexible approach, removing the stringent 50% affordable housing target and instead seeking to agree individual targets with boroughs, that strike a balance between the London-wide strategic need and what the local area can sustainably support.

We will also reform the way in which City Hall does business with the boroughs over transport. In the past, Ken Livingstone has publicly threatened to withhold local funding because he did not agree with a council's transport policies. For example, in 2004 the Labour Mayor issued a press release stating he was withholding £1.5 million in funding from Barnet Council because it had pursued policies opposed to his agenda.¹⁷

And there have been numerous other occasions when Transport for London has threatened to withhold funding for various schemes unless the borough went along with its instructions.

¹⁷ http://www.london.gov.uk/view_press_release.jsp?releaseid=3122

We will take a lighter, more flexible approach.

We will also use our influence to ensure Council Leaders have a greater say in the appointment of Borough Commanders, so that there is stronger local accountability for the police.

We believe the tone of conversation with boroughs needs to change.

Ken Livingstone has repeatedly used the resources of his office to attack borough councils. This occurs most often in relation to housing policies. When locally-elected councils approve planning applications that do not conform to his rules, the Labour Mayor uses highly provocative language to attack them.

For example, in 2006 he attacked Hammersmith & Fulham when they went against his London Plan: "*Hammersmith's actions have the stench of Shirley Porter's regime at Westminster Council in the 1980s*"¹⁸ and criticised Redbridge's housing policies as "*a betrayal of local people*".¹⁹

His provocative language is not confined to planning. He has previously intimated that Southwark Council was racist,²⁰ and accused Barnet Council of "*putting children's lives at risk*".²¹

We do not believe that this adversarial approach is beneficial to Londoners, and we will focus more on working with councils, taking a constructive approach to deliver real change.

2. Ending The Culture of Cronyism At City Hall

I will:

- **Create a Cabinet for London, to run London in a more business-like and efficient manner.**

¹⁸ http://www.london.gov.uk/view_press_release.jsp?releaseid=10269

¹⁹ http://www.london.gov.uk/view_press_release.jsp?releaseid=13393

²⁰ "they (the black community) experience racism within the local authority led regeneration process."

http://www.london.gov.uk/view_press_release.jsp?releaseid=6546

²¹ http://www.london.gov.uk/view_press_release.jsp?releaseid=3122

- **Strengthen the accountability of Mayoral advisers by putting a separate register of interests online, and requiring them to appear before the London Assembly on a regular basis.**
- **Stand for only two terms.**

A Cabinet For London

Ken Livingstone's model for the Mayoralty should not be a blueprint for future Mayors; London needs more professional, transparent government.

The current system, in which the Mayor and a coterie of advisers can take executive decisions with no formal checks and balances, is unsuitable. We believe City Hall should follow the model that is pursued at national and local level – strong cabinet government. An informal style of 'sofa government', in which no formal notes are taken during important meetings, leads inevitably to bad government.²²

We will strengthen the decision-making process in City Hall by introducing a Cabinet for London. The Cabinet will meet on a regular basis, formal minutes will be taken, and the full agenda papers will be put on the Mayor's website.

This will lead to a more open and transparent decision making process, which will help restore Londoners' trust in City Hall.

Strengthening Accountability Of Advisers

The Mayor's advisers have a hugely influential role in the running of London government. Two are directly appointed by the Mayor, and he can have up to twelve in total. Ken Livingstone admitted on the *Today* programme that he believes in a strong executive system. When presented with the charge that he operates a personal fiefdom he replied; "*....it's a much better mechanism to deliver change.*"²³

In light of the scandals surrounding Ken Livingstone's former policing and race adviser Lee Jasper, and his alleged business links to companies which have received significant funds from the London Development Agency, we believe it is time that Mayoral advisers are subject to the same levels of accountability that elected politicians are.

At present, Londoners cannot easily find out who the major Mayoral advisers are. There is no section on the Mayor's website detailing who they are and what they do.

²² To paraphrase former Cabinet Secretary Lord Butler, http://www.spectator.co.uk/archive/features/12935/part_6/how-not-to-run-a-country.shtml?SelectedIssueDate=11%20December%202004

²³ Today Programme, 24th January 2008.

It is entirely up to the Mayor to set their job descriptions, and they report directly to him.

We will make this information easily accessible for Londoners, by including a Mayoral adviser section on the Mayor's website, which will contain the biographies of all the advisers, their direct contact details, their backgrounds and their declared interests.

The current GLA staff code of conduct requires staff to register any financial interests. However, this register is not immediately accessible by the public.

After the resignation of Lee Jasper over unethical behaviour and alleged misuse of public funds, it is clear that the system of declaring interests needs to be more open and transparent.

Therefore, we will create a separate register of interests for advisers and require that this is open for public viewing at all times on the Mayor's website.

Currently, the London Assembly questions the Mayor and officials from the functional bodies of the GLA once a month, usually in a two-hour session at City Hall. Whilst the relevant adviser will often attend such question times, and will take questions on the work of the functional body, there are no set question times for the advisers alone.

And although the Assembly has the power to summon advisers, they usually only do so if a serious incident warrants it, which would be, in most cases, too late.

We believe that the Assembly should question Mayoral advisers at least once a month so that their activities are subject to consistent scrutiny. This will mean that, in practice, advisers will be accountable to the official scrutiny body as well as to the Mayor, ensuring that powerful advisers are of a high calibre and that their work is open to public scrutiny.

Term Limits

In many other major cities with Mayoral systems, there are term limits.²⁴ Ken Livingstone once supported this idea, stating: *"...corruption tends to flourish the longer an incumbent is able to hold onto power. In a city that changes as rapidly as London it is hard to believe that a Mayor who has served two terms will have the freshness of approach that is required to stay abreast of such a dynamic city. I therefore recommend that no Mayor should serve more than two terms."*²⁵

Londoners should be clear on how long their Mayoral candidates intend to serve if elected. Therefore, I will not stand for more than two terms.

²⁴ Such as New York, Philadelphia and San Francisco,

²⁵ Manifesto for a Mayor and Assembly for London by Ken Livingstone, March 1998

3. Restoring Trust In How City Hall Spends Our Money

I will:

- **Launch an immediate review of City Hall and its finances within the first 100 days.**
- **Launch an immediate independent review of the London Development Agency and all grants given by that body.**
- **Enable Londoners to view all GLA expenditure over £1,000 with a comprehensive search engine on the Mayor's website.**
- **Review the process of making appointments to all the functional bodies to ensure maximum transparency.**
- **Ensure Londoners pay no more than 38p per week for the Olympics.**

City Hall Finances

Londoners have lost confidence in the ability of City Hall to manage taxpayers' money effectively. Ken Livingstone now takes £311 at Band D in Council Tax, and controls a budget of some £10 billion.²⁶

The recent allegations in the press concerning grants given by the London Development Agency (LDA) have served to strengthen Londoners' belief that their money is not properly accounted for.

At the time of publication, six projects funded by the LDA have been referred to the police for criminal investigation – demonstrating the need for reform.

Value For Money

There are a number of examples to illustrate Ken Livingstone's cavalier attitude to taxpayers' money:

He recently spent £36,000 on a trip to Venezuela, despite President Chavez being too busy to see him.²⁷

His 'free' paper, *The Londoner* costs Londoners £2.8 million a year,²⁸ yet research commissioned by the Labour Mayor shows that 45% of Londoners do not recall receiving a copy.²⁹

²⁶ Total budget requirement for the GLA is around £3 billion, for TfL it is around £6 billion and for the LDA around £800 million.

²⁷ <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/england/london/6145382.stm>

²⁸ Mayor answers to London, 12 December 2007, Question number 2971/2007.

²⁹ Mayor answers to London, 12 December 2007, 2973/2007.

Staffing costs at City Hall have nearly trebled over recent years, from £12 million in 2000/01 to £33 million in 2005/06.³⁰

We will launch an immediate review of City Hall finances, which will look at every aspect of Mayoral spending – including *all* schemes and programmes – and will investigate why running costs have inflated over the last 8 years. The review will be conducted independently, and will be set up within the first 100 days.

The purpose of such a review will be to restore confidence in City Hall's handling of London taxpayers' money, and wipe the slate clean so London can have an administration that clearly provides value for money.

LDA Grants

The recent controversy surrounding grants given by the LDA has shown that the procedures by which grants are given, and for following up on how such money is spent, need drastic overhaul.

We will launch a genuinely independent review of how the LDA operates, which will investigate every element of the organisation. The review will cover:

- The eligibility criteria for grants
- The follow-up criteria after grants are given
- The procedure by which grants are approved
- Appointments to the LDA Board

The review will be asked to report initial findings within six months, and be expected to produce a final report within the first year of our administration.

Clear Money

In future, we need more transparent information about how the Mayor spends Londoners' money. Currently, information on GLA expenditure over £4,000 to suppliers is made available quarterly to the London Assembly Budget Sub-Monitoring Committee. In addition, information can be obtained through Assembly questions to the Mayor once a month, and Freedom of Information Requests.

However, we believe this system requires the average Londoner to do far too much researching and requesting, which is a disincentive to scrutiny. We want to make access to information easier, to increase transparency and accountability.

We propose to lower the threshold at which GLA expenditure to suppliers must be reported, from £4,000 to £1,000.

³⁰ Cash Flow, GLA Statement of Accounts 2000/01 and 2005/06.

The information would be easily accessible on the Mayor's website, and published in a format that is clear and easy to understand. We would look to incorporate a comprehensive search function which will enable Londoners to find details of City Hall spending on contracts, grants and schemes over £1,000.

A similar scheme is now operated by the U.S. government. A dedicated website has been set up, www.usaspending.gov, and anyone is able to search for specific budget items.

Creating a culture of transparency and openness from day one of our administration is an essential first step in re-establishing Londoners' trust in City Hall.

Transparent Appointments

We will also reform the process of making important appointments to the functional bodies under the Mayor's control. The Mayor has influence over key appointments to Transport for London, the London Development Agency, the Metropolitan Police Authority, and the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority.

We believe that all appointments should be based on merit, and not on personal patronage. Our administration will seek to recruit the right people for London who have the experience and the skills to deliver our agenda for change.

In order to achieve this, we will instigate a wide-ranging review of the appointments to the boards of the functional bodies with a view to making the process as transparent and independent as possible.

Controlling Olympic Spending

The Olympic and Paralympic Games provide an excellent opportunity to showcase the city and regenerate parts of East London. However, it is now clear that the estimated cost of the Games was highly inaccurate.

The original bid estimated that the cost of the Games would be around £3billion, and since then there have been constant reports of that figure increasing.

Reports of increases in the Olympic budget started to come to light as early as November 2005, when the Chairman of the London Organising Committee of the Olympic Games, Lord Coe, categorically denied the budget would double from the figure stated in the bid, telling the BBC: "*The reports are wrong. It is not the first scare story and it won't be the last.*"³¹

However, in December 2007 the Olympics Minister, Tessa Jowell MP, was forced to confirm to Parliament that the budget had almost quadrupled to over £9 billion.³²

³¹ http://news.bbc.co.uk/sport1/hi/other_sports/olympics_2012/4459646.stm

³² RT Hon Tessa Jowell MP, Written Ministerial Statement, cols 12WS – 14WS, 10 December 2007.

Analysis by the National Audit Office confirmed that the budget was some £5 billion higher in gross terms than originally estimated.³³

In January 2007, the House of Commons Culture, Media and Sport Select Committee criticised the Government over the financial controls, saying; “*we are very disappointed that the cost estimates have been found to be faulty so early in the process*”,³⁴ and in July 2007, the Public Accounts Committee warned that the Government had left itself “*financially exposed*”.³⁵

Londoners are contributing around £600 million in total to the cost of the Olympic and Paralympic Games through the Mayor’s Council Tax precept. Now we must ensure that Londoners are protected against further financial mismanagement.³⁶

The current cost is 38p a week at Band D, yet with the cost for the Games constantly increasing, more and more pressure will be exerted to increase Londoners’ contribution. We will resist this pressure to ensure that Londoners are not penalised for the Government’s financial incompetence.

³³ http://www.nao.org.uk/publications/nao_reports/06-07/0607612es.htm

³⁴ <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200607/cmselect/cmcumeds/69/69i.pdf>

³⁵ http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/sport/london_2012/article2051221.ece

³⁶ <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200607/cmselect/cmcumeds/69/69i.pdf>

Campaign Headquarters
County Hall
Riverside Building
Belvedere Road
London SE1 7PB
Telephone
020 7202 7042
backboris.com

**BACK
BORIS**
for a greater London



Conservatives