## Initial Coalition Agreement – Pledge by Pledge Analysis

### Section 1: Deficit Reduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pledge</th>
<th>Party(s)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pledge 1 – The parties agree that deficit reduction and continuing to ensure economic recovery is the most urgent issue facing Britain. We have therefore agreed that there will need to be:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1 CON  |          | a) a significantly accelerated reduction in the structural deficit over the course of a Parliament, with the main burden of deficit reduction borne by reduced spending rather than increased taxes;  
  • Con: ‘Cutting the deficit is the most urgent task we need to undertake if we are to get the economy moving’ – p. 22  
  • Con: ‘eliminate the bulk of the structural deficit over a Parliament … we will ensure that by far the largest part of the burden of dealing with the deficit falls on lower spending rather than higher taxes’ – pp. 10 and 22 |
| 2 BOTH |          | b) arrangements that will protect those on low incomes from the effect of public sector pay constraint and other spending constraints; and  
  • Con: ‘freeze public sector pay for one year in 2011, excluding the one million lowest paid workers’ – p. 13  
  • LD: ‘Setting a £400 pay rise cap for all public sector workers, initially for two years, ensuring that the lowest paid are eligible for the biggest percentage rise’ – p. 11 |
| 3 BOTH |          | c) protection of jobs by stopping Labour’s proposed jobs tax.  
  • Con: ‘stop Labour’s jobs tax’ – p. 9  
  • LD: ‘the increase in National Insurance Contributions is a damaging tax on jobs and an unfair tax on employees, so when resources allow we would seek to reverse it’ – p. 76 |
| 4 BOTH |          | Pledge 2 – The parties agree that a plan for deficit reduction should be set out in an emergency budget within 50 days of the signing of any agreement; the parties note that the credibility of a plan on deficit reduction depends on its long-term deliverability, not just the depth of immediate cuts. New forecasts of growth and borrowing should be made by an independent Office for Budget Responsibility for this emergency budget.  
  • Con: ‘We will provide an emergency Budget within 50 days of taking office... we will set up an independent Office for Budget Responsibility to restore trust in the government's ability to manage the public finances’ – p. 12  
  • LD: ‘an emergency budget and interim spending review would be held by no later than the end of June 2010... We will establish a Council on Financial Stability’ – p. 77 |
| 5 CON  |          | Pledge 3 – The parties agree that modest cuts of £6 billion to non-front line services can be made within the financial year 2010-11, subject to advice from the Treasury and the Bank of England on their feasibility and advisability. Some proportion of these savings can be used to support jobs, for example through the cancelling of some backdated demands for business rates. Other policies upon which we are agreed will further support job creation and green investment, such as work programmes for the unemployed and a green deal |
for energy efficiency investment.
- Con: ‘We will start by cutting a net £6 billion of wasteful departmental spending in the financial year 2010/11’ – p. 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pledge</th>
<th>BOTH</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>The parties agree that reductions can be made to the Child Trust Fund and tax credits for higher earners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Con: ‘stop paying tax credits to better-off families with incomes over £50,000; cut government contributions to Child Trust Funds for all but the poorest third of families and families with disabled children’ – p. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LD: ‘Ending government payments into Child Trust Funds ... Restricting tax credits’ – p. 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 2: Spending Review – NHS, Schools and a Fairer Society**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pledge</th>
<th>LD</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>The parties agree that a full Spending Review should be held, reporting this Autumn, following a fully consultative process involving all tiers of government and the private sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LD: ‘Throughout the summer and early autumn a Comprehensive Spending Review of all departments would be conducted’ – p. 77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pledge</th>
<th>CON</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>The parties agree that funding for the NHS should increase in real terms in each year of the Parliament, while recognising the impact this decision would have on other departments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Con: ‘We will increase health spending every year.’ – p. 42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pledge</th>
<th>BOTH</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>The target of spending 0.7% of GNI on overseas aid will also remain in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Con: ‘A new Conservative government will be fully committed to achieving, by 2013, the UN target of spending 0.7 per cent of national income as aid. We will stick to the rules laid down by the OECD about what spending counts as aid. We will legislate in the first session of a new Parliament to lock in this level of spending for every year from 2013 – pp. 89-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LD: ‘Increase the UK’s aid budget to reach the UN target of 0.7 per cent of GNI by 2013 and enshrine that target in law’ – p. 49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pledge</th>
<th>BOTH</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>We will fund a significant premium for disadvantaged pupils from outside the schools budget by reductions in spending elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Con: ‘we will introduce a pupil premium – extra funding for children from disadvantaged backgrounds.’ – p. 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LD: ‘Increase the funding of the most disadvantaged pupils, around one million children. We will invest £2.5 billion in this ‘Pupil Premium’ to boost education opportunities for every child’ – p. 26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pledge</th>
<th>CON</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>The parties commit to holding a full Strategic Security and Defence Review alongside the Spending Review with strong involvement of the Treasury.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Con: ‘We will review the structure of the Ministry of Defence to reduce running costs by 25 per cent’ – p. 84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pledge</th>
<th>COMP</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Government will be committed to the maintenance of Britain’s nuclear deterrent, and have agreed that the renewal of Trident</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
should be scrutinised to ensure value for money. Liberal Democrats will continue to make the case for alternatives. We will immediately play a strong role in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference, and press for continued progress on multilateral disarmament.

- Con: ‘We support the decision to renew Britain’s submarine-based nuclear deterrent, based on the Trident missile system’ – pp. 83-4
- LD: ‘Rule out the like-for-like replacement of the Trident nuclear weapons system’ – p. 51

13 LD Pledge 11 – The parties commit to establishing an independent commission to review the long term affordability of public sector pensions, while protecting accrued rights.

- LD: ‘Reforming public sector pensions to ensure that they are sustainable and affordable for the long term, with an independent review to agree a settlement that is fair for all taxpayers as well as for public servant’ – p. 51

14 BOTH Pledge 12 – We will restore the earnings link for the basic state pension from April 2011 with a “triple guarantee” that pensions are raised by the higher of earnings, prices or 2.5%, as proposed by the Liberal Democrats.

- LD: ‘We will restore the earnings link for pensions’ – p. 38
- Con: ‘We will help stop the spread of means-testing by restoring the link between the basic state pension and average earnings’ – p. 16

Section 3: Tax Measures

15 BOTH Pledge 13 – The parties agree that the personal allowance for income tax should be increased in order to help lower and middle income earners. We agree to announce in the first Budget a substantial increase in the personal allowance from April 2011, with the benefits focused on those with lower and middle incomes. This will be funded with the money that would have been used to pay for the increase in Employee National Insurance thresholds proposed by the Conservatives, as well as revenues from increases in Capital Gains Tax rates for non-business assets as described below. The increase in Employer National Insurance thresholds proposed by the Conservatives will go ahead in order to stop Labour’s jobs tax.

- Con: ‘raise the secondary threshold at which employers start paying National insurance by £21 a week’ – p. 14
- LD: ‘To put in place the necessary tax changes in order to raise the personal allowance to £10,000 for the start of the financial year 2011-12’ – p. 77

16 BOTH Pledge 14 – We also agree to a longer term policy objective of further increasing the personal allowance to £10,000, making further real terms steps each year towards this objective. We agree that this should take priority over other tax cuts, including cuts to Inheritance Tax.

- LD: ‘To put in place the necessary tax changes in order to raise the personal allowance to £10,000 for the start of the financial year 2011-12’ – p. 77
- Con: ‘And we will raise the inheritance tax threshold to £1 million to help millions of people who aspire to pass something on to their children’ – p. 17
Pledge 15 – We also agree that provision will be made for Liberal Democrat MPs to abstain on budget resolutions to introduce transferable tax allowances for married couples without prejudice to this coalition agreement.

Pledge 16 – The parties agree that a switch should be made to a per-plane, rather than per-passenger duty; a proportion of any increased revenues over time will be used to help fund increases in the personal allowance.
- LD: ‘Ensuring pollution is properly taxed by replacing the per-passenger Air Passenger Duty with a per-plane duty (PPD), ensuring that air freight is taxed for the first time. We will also introduce an additional, higher rate of PPD on domestic flights if realistic alternative and less polluting travel is available’ – p. 10

Pledge 17 – We further agree to seek a detailed agreement on taxing non-business capital gains at rates similar or close to those applied to income, with generous exemptions for entrepreneurial business activities.
- LD: ‘Taxing capital gains at the same rates as income, so that all the money you make is taxed in the same way’ – p. 10

Pledge 18 – The parties agree that tackling tax avoidance is essential for the new government, and that all efforts will be made to do so, including detailed development of Liberal Democrat proposals.
- LD: ‘Tackling tax avoidance and evasion, with new powers for HM Revenue & Customs and a law to ensure properties can’t avoid stamp duty if they are put into an offshore trust’ – p. 10

Section 4: Banking Reform

Pledge 19 – The parties agree that reform to the banking system is essential to avoid a repeat of Labour’s financial crisis, to promote a competitive economy, to sustain the recovery and to protect and sustain jobs.
- Con: ‘We will reform the regulation and structure of the banking system to ensure lower levels of leverage, less dependence on unstable wholesale funding, and greater availability of credit for SMEs – p. 30.
- LD: ‘That starts with banking reform’ – p. 17

Pledge 20 – We agree that a banking levy will be introduced. We will seek a detailed agreement on implementation.
- Con: ‘We will put in place a levy on banks.’ – p. 30
- LD: ‘We would introduce a Banking Levy’ – p. 16

Pledge 21 – We agree to bring forward detailed proposals for robust action to tackle unacceptable bonuses in the financial services sector; in developing these proposals, we will ensure they are effective in reducing risk.
- Con: ‘empower the bank of England to crack down on risky bonus arrangements’ – p. 31
- LD: ‘Ensure that the bonus system can never again encourage banks to behave in a way that puts the financial system at risk or offers rewards for failure’ – p. 16
Pledge 22 – We agree to bring forward detailed proposals to foster diversity, promote mutuals and create a more competitive banking industry.

- Con: ‘Increase competition in the banking industry, starting with a study of competition in the sector to inform our strategy for selling the government's stakes in the banks; and, as the government comes to sell off its holdings in the banks, offer a ‘people’s bank bonus’, so that everybody in the country has the chance to buy a stake in the state-owned banks’ – p. 31
- LD: ‘Break up the banks, to ensure taxpayers are never again expected to underwrite high-risk banking. We would establish a clear separation between low-risk retail banking and high-risk investment banking, and encourage the development of local and regional banks. We would introduce a Banking Levy, so that banks pay for their taxpayer guarantee, until the break-up is complete’ – p. 16

Pledge 23: We agree that ensuring the flow of credit to viable SMEs is essential for supporting growth and should be a core priority for a new government, and we will work together to develop effective proposals to do so. This will include consideration of both a major loan guarantee scheme and the use of net lending targets for the nationalised banks.

- Con: ‘We will create more diverse sources of affordable credit for small businesses, building on our proposals for a National Loan Guarantee Scheme’ – p. 31

Pledge 24: The parties wish to reduce systemic risk in the banking system and will establish an independent commission to investigate the complex issue of separating retail and investment banking in a sustainable way; while recognising that this would take time to get right, the commission will be given an initial time frame of one year to report.

- Con: ‘Pursue international agreement to prevent retail banks from engaging in activities, such as large-scale proprietary trading, that put the stability of the system at risk’ – p. 31
- LD: ‘Break up the banks, to ensure taxpayers are never again expected to underwrite high-risk banking. We would establish a clear separation between low-risk retail banking and high-risk investment banking, and encourage the development of local and regional banks’ – p. 16

Pledge 25 – The parties agree that the regulatory system needs reform to avoid a repeat of Labour’s financial crisis. We agree to bring forward proposals to give the Bank of England control of macro-prudential regulation and oversight of micro-prudential regulation.

- Con: ‘We will abolish Gordon Brown’s failed tripartite system of regulation and put the bank of England in charge of prudential supervision’ – p. 30

Pledge 26 – The parties also agree to rule out joining the European Single Currency during the duration of this agreement.

- Con: ‘We will never join the Euro’ – p. 81
- LD: ‘We believe that it is in Britain’s long-term interest to be part of the euro. But Britain should only join when the economic conditions are right, and in the present economic situation, they are not’ – p. 53
**Section 5: Immigration**

29 **CON**  
Pledge 27 – We have agreed that there should be an annual limit on the number of non-EU economic migrants admitted into the UK to live and work. We will consider jointly the mechanism for implementing the limit.  
- **Con**: ‘setting an annual limit on the number of non-EU economic migrants admitted into the UK to live and work’ – p. 24

30 **LD**  
Pledge 28 – We will end the detention of children for immigration purposes.  
- **LD**: ‘End the detention of children in immigration detention centres’ – p. 61

**Section 6: Political Reform**

31 **LD**  
Pledge 29 – The parties agree to the establishment of five year fixed-term parliaments. A Conservative-Liberal Democrat coalition government will put a binding motion before the House of Commons in the first days following this agreement stating that the next general election will be held on the first Thursday of May 2015. Following this motion, legislation will be brought forward to make provision for fixed term parliaments of five years. This legislation will also provide for dissolution if 55% or more of the House votes in favour.  
- **LD**: ‘Introduce fixed-term parliaments to ensure that the Prime Minister of the day cannot change the date of an election to suit themselves.’ – p. 70

32 **COMP**  
Pledge 30 – The parties will bring forward a Referendum Bill on electoral reform, which includes provision for the introduction of the Alternative Vote in the event of a positive result in the referendum, as well as for the creation of fewer and more equal sized constituencies. Both parties will whip their Parliamentary Parties in both Houses to support a simple majority referendum on the Alternative Vote, without prejudice to the positions parties will take during such a referendum.  
- **LD**: ‘We would introduce a recall system so that constituents could force a by-election for any MP found responsible for serious wrongdoing’ – p. 71

33 **BOTH**  
Pledge 31 – The parties will bring forward early legislation to introduce a power of recall, allowing voters to force a by-election where an MP was found to have engaged in serious wrongdoing and having had a petition calling for a by-election signed by 10% of his or her constituents.  
- **Con**: ‘a Conservative government will introduce a power of 'recall' to allow electors to kick out MPs’ – p. 58  
- **LD**: ‘We would introduce a recall system so that constituents could force a by-election for any MP found responsible for serious wrongdoing’ – p. 71

34 **BOTH**  
Pledge 32 – We agree to establish a committee to bring forward proposals for a wholly or mainly elected upper chamber on the basis of proportional representation. The committee will come forward with a draft motions by December 2010. It is likely that this bill will advocate single long terms of office. It is also likely there will be a grandfathering system for current Peers. In the interim, Lords appointments will be made with the objective of creating a second chamber reflective of the share of the vote secured by the political parties in the last general election.  
- **Con**: ‘We will work to build a consensus for a mainly-elected second
chamber to replace the current House of Lords, recognising that an efficient and effective second chamber should play an important role in our democracy and requires both legitimacy and public confidence’ – p. 60

- LD: ‘Replace the House of Lords with a fully-elected second chamber with considerably fewer members than the current House’ – p. 70

35 BOTH Pledge 33 – The parties will bring forward the proposals of the Wright Committee for reform to the House of Commons in full – starting with the proposed committee for management of programmed business and including government business within its scope by the third year of the Parliament.

- Con: ‘establishing a Backbench Business Committee to give the House of Commons more control over its own timetable; allowing MPs the time to scrutinise law effectively’ – p. 60
- LD: ‘We will increase Parliamentary scrutiny of the budget and of government appointments and give Parliament control over its own agenda so that all bills leaving the Commons have been fully debated’ – p. 70

36 CON Pledge 34 – The parties agree to reduce electoral fraud by speeding up the implementation of individual voter registration.

- Con: ‘We will swiftly implement individual voter registration, giving everyone the right to cast their vote in person and making it easier for UK citizens living overseas to vote’ – p. 60

37 COMP Pledge 35 – We have agreed to establish a commission to consider the ‘West Lothian question’.

- Con: ‘A Conservative government will introduce new rules so that legislation referring specifically to England, or to England and Wales, cannot be enacted without the consent of MPs representing constituencies of those countries’ – p. 71
- LD: ‘Address the status of England within a federal Britain, through the Constitutional Convention set up to draft a written constitution for the UK as a whole’ – p. 73

38 CON Pledge 36 – The parties agree to the implementation of the Calman Commission proposals and the offer of a referendum on further Welsh devolution.

- Con: ‘We will produce our own White Paper by May 2011 to set out how we will deal with the issues raised by Calman, and we will legislate to implement those proposals within the next Parliament... We will not stand in the way of the referendum on further legislative powers requested by the Welsh Assembly’ – p. 71

39 BOTH Pledge 37 – The parties will tackle lobbying through introducing a statutory register of lobbyists. We also agree to pursue a detailed agreement on limiting donations and reforming party funding in order to remove big money from politics.

- Con: ‘The lobbying industry must regulate itself to ensure its practices are transparent – if it does not, then we will legislate to do so’ – p. 59
- LD: ‘Curb the improper influence of lobbyists by introducing a statutory register of lobbyists, changing the Ministerial Code so that ministers and
Officials are forbidden from meeting MPs on issues where the MP is paid to lobby, requiring companies to declare how much they spend on lobbying in their annual reports, and introducing a statutory register of interests for parliamentary candidates based on the current Register of Members’ Interests’ – p. 71

40 LD Pledge 38 – The parties will promote the radical devolution of power and greater financial autonomy to local government and community groups. This will include a full review of local government finance.
- LD: ‘Review local government finance completely as part of these tax changes’ – p. 72

**Pensions and Welfare**

41 BOTH Pledge 39 – The parties agree to phase out the default retirement age and hold a review to set the date at which the state pension age starts to rise to 66, although it will not be sooner than 2016 for men and 2020 for women. We agree to end the rules requiring compulsory annuitisation at 75.
- Con: ‘We will reward those who have saved for their retirement by ending the effective obligation to buy an annuity at age 75 ... We will look at how to abolish the default retirement age, as many older people want to carry on working’ – pp. 17, 20
- LD: ‘Scrap compulsory retirement ages, allowing those who wish to continue in work to do so. Give you control over your own pension by scrapping the rules that compel you to buy an annuity when you reach 75’ – p. 41

42 BOTH Pledge 40 – We agree to implement the Parliamentary and Health Ombudsman’s recommendation to make fair and transparent payments to Equitable Life policy holders, through an independent payment scheme, for their relative loss as a consequence of regulatory failure.
- Con: ‘We will implement the ombudsman’s recommendation to make fair and transparent payments to Equitable Life policy holders, through an independent payment scheme, for their relative loss as a consequence of regulatory failure’ – p. 17
- LD: ‘Meeting the government’s obligations towards Equitable Life policyholders who have suffered loss. We will set up a swift, simple, transparent and fair payment scheme.’ – p. 13

43 CON Pledge 41 – The parties agree to end all existing welfare to work programmes and to create a single welfare to work programme to help all unemployed people get back into work.
- Con: ‘We will scrap Labour’s failing employment schemes and create a single Work Programme for everyone who is unemployed’ – p. 18

44 CON (NON-MANIFESTO) Pledge 42 – We agree that Jobseeker’s Allowance claimants facing the most significant barriers to work should be referred to the aforementioned newly created welfare to work programme immediately, not after 12 months as is currently the case. We agree that Jobseeker’s Allowance claimants aged under 25 should be referred to the programme after a maximum of six months.
- Con: ‘Through The Work Programme, we will offer people targeted,
personalised help sooner – straight away for those with serious barriers to work and at six months for those under 25’ – *Get Britain Working*, October 2009, p. 6¹

- Con: ‘We will … make sure you [jobseekers] get help as soon as you need it – straight away for those really struggling to find work, and after six months if you’re less than 25 years old’ – *A New Welfare Contract*, April 2010, p. 1²

45  **CON (NON-MANIFESTO)**  
Pledge 43 – The parties agree to realign contracts with welfare to work service providers to reflect more closely the results they achieve in getting people back into work.

- Con: ‘Providers will be paid by results, driving up quality and encouraging innovation. The principle behind payment by results is simple: if you don’t place someone in a sustainable job, you don’t earn your fee.’ – *Get Britain Working*, October 2009, p. 6³

46  **CON (NON-MANIFESTO)**  
Pledge 44 – We agree that the funding mechanism used by government to finance welfare to work programmes should be reformed to reflect the fact that initial investment delivers later savings in lower benefit expenditure.

- Con: ‘Changing Treasury rules to allow the so called DEL:AME switch will allow benefit savings in AME budgets to be used as payment to successful welfare to work providers traditionally funded out of DEL budgets. Once initial benefit savings have been paid to welfare to work providers, the savings associated with a lower benefit bill continue for the Exchequer, alongside further benefits such as increased National Insurance and Income Tax payments’ – *Get Britain Working*, October 2009, p. 58⁴

47  **CON**  
Pledge 45 – We agree that receipt of benefits for those able to work should be conditional on the willingness to work.

- Con: ‘people who refuse to accept reasonable job offers could forfeit their benefits for up to three years’ – p. 19

---

**Education – Schools**

48  **CON (NON-MANIFESTO)**  
Pledge 46 – We agree to promote the reform of schools in order to ensure:

a) that new providers can enter the state school system in response to parental demand;

b) that all schools have greater freedom over curriculum; and,

c) that all schools are held properly accountable.

- Con: ‘A Conservative government will … Create over 220,000 new school places. We will allow educational charities, philanthropists, existing school

---


federations, not-for-profit trusts, co-operatives and groups of parents to
set up new schools in the state sector and access equivalent public funding
to existing state schools ... Expand the existing programme of Academies,
which are themselves based on the model of City Technology Colleges
introduced by the last Conservative Government. We will make it easier
for educational charities, philanthropists, livery companies, existing school
federations, not-for-profit trusts, co-operatives and groups of parents to
set up new schools in the state sector and access public funding equivalent
to the provision for existing state schools’ – Repair: Plan for Social Reform,
October 2008, p. 11-125

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education – Higher education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 49  CON  | Pledge 47 – We await Lord Browne’s final report into higher education funding, and will judge its proposals against the need to:
  a) increase social mobility;
  b) take into account the impact on student debt;
  c) ensure a properly funded university sector;
  d) improve the quality of teaching;
  e) advance scholarship; and,
  f) attract a higher proportion of students from disadvantaged backgrounds.
  • Con: ‘consider carefully the results of Lord Browne’s review into the future of higher education funding, so that we can unlock the potential of universities to transform our economy, to enrich students’ lives through teaching of the highest quality, and to advance scholarship’ – p. 21. |

| 50  COMP  | Pledge 48 – If the response of the Government to Lord Browne’s report is one that Liberal Democrats cannot accept, then arrangements will be made to enable Liberal Democrat MPs to abstain in any vote.
  • Con: ‘consider carefully the results of Lord Browne’s review into the future of higher education funding, so that we can unlock the potential of universities to transform our economy, to enrich students’ lives through teaching of the highest quality, and to advance scholarship’ – p. 21.
  • LD: ‘Scrap unfair university tuition fees for all students taking their first degree’ – p. 30. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relations with the EU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 51  BOTH  | Pledge 49 – We agree that the British Government will be a positive participant in the European Union, playing a strong and positive role with our partners, with the goal of ensuring that all the nations of Europe are equipped to face the challenges of the 21st century: global competitiveness, global warming and global poverty.
  • Con: ‘We will be positive members of the European Union’ – p. 87.
  • LD: ‘We will ensure that Britain maximises its influence through a strong and positive commitment ... Working together, the member states of the EU have a better chance of managing the impacts of globalisation, such as cross-border crime and environmental pollution’ – p. 52. |

5 http://www.conservatives.com/News/News_stories/2008/09/We_will_reverse_Labours_skewed_priorities.aspx
52 CON Pledge 50 – We agree that there should be no further transfer of sovereignty or powers over the course of the next Parliament. We will examine the balance of the EU’s existing competences and will, in particular, work to limit the application of the Working Time Directive in the United Kingdom.
- Con: ‘We will introduce a United Kingdom Sovereignty Bill to make it clear that ultimate authority stays in this country, in our Parliament...’ – p. 88.

53 CON Pledge 51 – We agree that we will amend the 1972 European Communities Act so that any proposed future Treaty that transferred areas of power, or competences, would be subject to a referendum on that Treaty – a ‘referendum lock’. We will amend the 1972 European Communities Act so that the use of any passerelle would require primary legislation.
- Con: ‘We will amend the 1972 European Communities Act so that any proposed future Treaty that transferred areas of power, or competences, would be subject to a referendum – a “referendum lock”’ – p. 88

54 CON Pledge 52 – We will examine the case for a United Kingdom Sovereignty Bill to make it clear that ultimate authority remains with Parliament.
- Con: ‘We will introduce a United Kingdom Sovereignty Bill to make it clear that ultimate authority stays in this country, in our Parliament ... Conservative government will negotiate with our European partners ... to return powers that we believe should reside with the UK, not the EU’ – pp. 89-90

55 BOTH Pledge 53 – We agree that Britain will not join or prepare to join the Euro in this Parliament.
- Con: ‘we will never join the Euro’ – p. 81
- LD: ‘We believe that it is in Britain’s long-term interest to be part of the euro. But Britain should only join when the economic conditions are right, and in the present economic situation, they are not’ – p. 53

56 LD Pledge 54 – We agree that we will strongly defend the UK’s national interests in the forthcoming EU budget negotiations and that the EU budget should only focus on those areas where the EU can add value.
- LD: ‘Campaign for continuing reform of the EU budget so that money is spent only on the things the EU really needs to do’ – p. 53

57 LD Pledge 55 – We agree that we will press for the European Parliament only to have one seat, in Brussels.
- LD: ‘Fight to stop MEPs having to travel to the Strasbourg Parliament every month, wasting €200 million a year’ – p. 53

58 COMP Pledge 56 – We agree that we will approach forthcoming legislation in the area of criminal justice on a case by case basis, with a view to maximising our country’s security, protecting Britain’s civil liberties and preserving the integrity of our criminal justice system. Britain will not participate in the establishment of any European Public Prosecutor
- Con: ‘A Conservative government will negotiate for three specific guarantees – on the Charter of Fundamental Rights, on criminal justice, and on social and employment legislation – with our European partners to return powers that we believe should reside with the UK, not the EU... a
Conservative government will not agree to the UK’s participation in the establishment of a European Public Prosecutor's Office or permit its jurisdiction over the UK’ – pp. 88-89

- LD: ‘Keep Britain part of international crime-fighting measures such as the European Arrest Warrant, European Police Office (Europol), Eurojust, and the European Criminal Records Information System, while ensuring high standards of justice’ – p. 53

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil liberties</th>
<th>Pledge 57 – The parties agree to implement a full programme of measures to reverse the substantial erosion of civil liberties under the Labour Government and roll back state intrusion. This will include:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>A Freedom or Great Repeal Bill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD:</td>
<td>‘Introduce a Freedom Bill’ – p. 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOTH</td>
<td>The scrapping of ID card scheme, the National Identity register, the next generation of biometric passports and the Contact Point Database.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con:</td>
<td>‘We will scrap ID cards, the National Identity Register and the Contactpoint database’ – p. 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD:</td>
<td>‘Scraping ID cards and the next generation of biometric passports’ – p. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD</td>
<td>Outlawing the finger-printing of children at school without parental permission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD:</td>
<td>‘stop children being fingerprinted at school without their parents’ permission’ – p. 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD</td>
<td>The extension of the scope of the Freedom of Information Act to provide greater transparency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD:</td>
<td>‘extending Freedom of Information legislation to private companies delivering monopoly public services such as Network Rail – p. 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOTH</td>
<td>Adopting the protections of the Scottish model for the DNA database.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con:</td>
<td>‘The indefinite retention of innocent people's DNA is unacceptable, yet DNA data provides a useful tool for solving crimes. We will legislate to make sure that our DNA database is used primarily to store information about those who are guilty of committing crimes rather than those who are innocent. We will collect the DNA of all existing prisoners, those under state supervision who have been convicted of an offence, and anyone convicted of a serious recordable offence. We pushed the Government to end the permanent retention of innocent people's DNA, and we will change the guidance to give people on the database who have been wrongly accused of a minor crime an automatic right to have their DNA withdrawn’ – p. 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD:</td>
<td>‘Remove innocent people from the police DNA database and stop storing DNA from innocent people and children in the future, too’ – p. 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD</td>
<td>The protection of historic freedoms through the defence of trial by jury.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD:</td>
<td>‘defend trial by jury’ – p. 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD</td>
<td>The restoration of rights to non-violent protest.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• LD: ‘Restore the right to protest by reforming the Public Order Act to safeguard non-violent protest even if it Offends’ – p. 74

66 BOTH h) The review of libel laws to protect freedom of speech.
• Con: ‘We will review and reform libel laws to protect freedom of speech’ – p. 69
• LD: ‘PRotect free speech, investigative journalism and academic peer-reviewed publishing through reform of the English and Welsh libel laws’ – p. 74.

67 CON i) Safeguards against the misuse of anti-terrorism legislation.
• Con: ‘curtailing the surveillance powers that allow some councils to use anti-terrorism laws to spy on people making trivial mistakes or minor breaches of the rules’ – p. 69.

68 LD j) Further regulation of CCTV.
• LD: ‘We will regulate CCTV’ – p. 74.

69 LD k) Ending of storage of internet and email records without good reason.
• LD: ‘End plans to store your email and internet records without good cause’ – p. 75.

70 LD l) A new mechanism to prevent the proliferation of unnecessary new criminal offences.
• LD: ‘Halt the increase in unnecessary new offences with the creation of a “stop unit” in the Cabinet Office. Every department in Whitehall would have to convince this unit of the need for a new offence’ – p. 75.

Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pledge</th>
<th>BOTH</th>
<th>LD</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pledge 58 – The parties agree to implement a full programme of measures to fulfil our joint ambitions for a low carbon and eco-friendly economy, including:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The establishment of a smart grid and the roll-out of smart meters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Con: ‘a highly interactive network, based on a new smart grid that will interact with smart meters in people’s homes, to manage supply and demand’ – p. 74.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• LD: ‘Crack down on waste from the water companies and introduce compulsory smart meters in areas of shortage’ – p. 66.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The full establishment of feed-in tariff systems in electricity – as well as the maintenance of banded ROCs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• LD: ‘you will be able to sell the energy back to the National Grid at a profit, with a more attractive feed-in tariff than under current government plans’ – p. 46.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures to promote a huge increase in energy from waste through anaerobic digestion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• LD: ‘That means less packaging, more recycling, and a huge increase in anaerobic digestion to generate energy from food and farm waste’ – p. 65.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The creation of a green investment bank.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Con: ‘so we will create Britain’s first Green Investment Bank’ – p. 32.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The provision of home energy improvement paid for by the savings from lower energy bills.
- Con: ‘Rising energy costs hit families hard, so we will create a ‘Green Deal’, giving every home up to £6,500 worth of energy improvement measures – with more for hard-to-treat homes – paid for out of savings made on fuel bills over 25 years.’ – p. 93.

Retention of energy performance certificates while scrapping HIPs.
- Con: ‘We will also abolish Home information Packs, which have made a significant contribution to problems in our housing market... keep Energy Performance Certificates to help people improve the environmental rating of their property’ – pp. 66, 67.
- LD: ‘Scrap burdensome Home Information Packs, retaining the requirement for homes to have an energy performance certificate’ – p. 62.

Measures to encourage marine energy.
- Con: ‘establishing at least two Marine Energy Parks’ – p. 75.
- LD: ‘Invest up to £400 million in refurbishing shipyards in the North of England and Scotland so that they can manufacture offshore wind turbines and other marine renewable energy equipment’ – p. 46.

The establishment of an emissions performance standard that will prevent coal-fired power stations being built unless they are equipped with sufficient CCS to meet the emissions performance standard.
- Con: ‘creating four carbon capture and storage- quipped plants, taking coal – one of the most polluting fuels of all – and transforming it into a low carbon fuel of the future’ – pp. 74-5.
- LD: ‘Block any new coal-fired power stations – the most polluting form of power generation – unless they are accompanied by the highest level of carbon capture and storage facilities’ – p. 46.

The establishment of a high-speed rail network.
- LD: ‘Set up a UK Infrastructure Bank to invest in public transport like high speed rail’ – p. 63.

The cancellation of the third runway at Heathrow.
- Con: ‘We will stop the third runway and instead link Heathrow directly to our high speed rail network, providing an alternative to thousands of flights – p. 26.
- LD: ‘Cancel plans for the third runway at Heathrow and any expansion of other airports in the South East’ – p. 64.

The refusal of additional runways at Gatwick and Stansted.
- LD: ‘Cancel plans for the third runway at Heathrow and any expansion of other airports in the South East’ – p. 64.
l) The replacement of the Air Passenger Duty with a per flight duty.
   - LD: ‘Replace the per-passenger Air Passenger Duty with a per-plane duty (PPD)’ – p. 63.

m) The provision of a floor price for carbon, as well as efforts to persuade the EU to move towards full auctioning of ETS permits.
   - Con: ‘We will reform the Climate Change Levy to provide a floor price for carbon’ – p. 32.
   - LD: ‘Boost investment in clean energy by reforming the EU emissions trading scheme – bringing in a tighter cap on emissions, auctioning as many allowances as possible, and encouraging other European countries to increase the use of reserve prices in allowance auctions’ – p. 47-48.

n) Measures to make the import or possession of illegal timber a criminal offence.
   - Con: ‘introducing a new criminal offence under UK law for the import and possession of illegal timber’ – p. 79.
   - LD: ‘a new law making it illegal to import or possess timber produced illegally in foreign countries’ – p. 49.

o) Measures to promote green spaces and wildlife corridors in order to halt the loss of habitats and restore biodiversity.
   - Con: ‘In this vision, our homes require less energy and more of the energy we produce comes from renewable sources. Our countryside is better cared for, we conserve more natural habitats, and we create new green spaces and plant many more trees. Our landscape is protected and our wildlife is enjoyed by more people of all ages’ – p. 72.

p) Mandating a national recharging network for electric and plug-in hybrid vehicles.
   - Con: ‘we will introduce incentives for electricity network operators to establish a new national car recharging network’ – p. 27.

q) Continuation of the present Government’s proposals for public sector investment in CCS technology for four coal-fired power stations; and a specific commitment to reduce central government carbon emissions by 10 per cent within 12 months.
   - Con: ‘creating four carbon capture and storage-equipped plants, taking coal – one of the most polluting fuels of all – and transforming it into a low carbon fuel of the future’ – pp. 74-5.

r) We are agreed that we would seek to increase the target for energy from renewable sources, subject to the advice of the Climate Change Committee.
• Con: ‘One important way of accelerating that move away from dependence on imported oil and gas is to increase domestic renewable energy’ – speech by David Cameron, June 2008.⁶

89 COMP

Pledge 59 – Liberal Democrats have long opposed any new nuclear construction. Conservatives, by contrast, are committed to allowing the replacement of existing nuclear power stations provided they are subject to the normal planning process for major projects (under a new national planning statement) and provided also that they receive no public subsidy. We have agreed a process that will allow Liberal Democrats to maintain their opposition to nuclear power while permitting the government to bring forward the national planning statement for ratification by Parliament so that new nuclear construction becomes possible. This process will involve:

a) the government completing the drafting of a national planning statement and putting it before Parliament;

b) specific agreement that a Liberal Democrat spokesman will speak against the planning statement, but that Liberal Democrat MPs will abstain; and

c) clarity that this will not be regarded as an issue of confidence.