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Abstract

Is the pre-Brexit discourse one of economic reason or one of emotional affect? The official campaign organizations’ (“Vote Remain – Britain Stronger in” and “Vote Leave – take back control”) press releases are scrutinized using a qualitative content analysis, in order to assess the manifestation of economic rationales and emotional appeals in the final week prior the referendum (Mayring, 2014). The argumentative frames are deductively derived from theory on Economic Voting and from literature on political psychology and guide a structured assessment of the overarching themes of the campaign’s communicative strategies. Whereas the expectation of a generally greater use of emotional items by both camps could not be confirmed, the hypothesized focus of “Vote Leave – take back control” on an emotional framing of the vote finds support in the analysis. In contrast, “Vote Remain – Britain Stronger in’s” optimistic confidence in the persuasiveness of the EU’s economic advantages might have been too little in mobilizing enough support for the European project – a gamble that is to change Britain’s and the EU’s political future fundamentally.
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1. Introduction

While an overwhelming majority of expert predications and scientific research was clear on whether to remain was the better choice in economic terms, a majority in the 2016 EU referendum in the United Kingdom, seemed to believe otherwise. If a leave-vote potentially stands in contrast to individual and general economic utility, why did voters choose to vote inconsistently in this regard? Why did the electorate choose to follow a quintessentially emotional argument and not the normative ideal, meaning the rational economic argument of Remain? The referendum’s campaign’s use of arguments could provide clarity on the communicative strategies, especially on their narratives, which could have provided influential cognitive and affective shortcuts for the electorate. In the pre-referendum campaign, the dichotomy of reason versus emotion, as conflicting and antagonistic principles in the public discourse, could have reached its peak in Michael Gove’s statement: “People in this country have had enough of experts” (Menon & Portes, 2016). The public, he claimed, would not need more of those seemingly rational arguments, rather, the electorate would be better off relying on “common sense”. This constitutes a harsh rejection of a political culture, in which rationality is the normative expectation, and in which reason is seen as the legitimizing element of democratic politics, as such (Hopkin, 2016). As Hamilton argues in the Federalist Papers: “Why has government been instituted at all? Because the passions of men will not conform to the dictates of reason and justice, without constraint”(Hamilton, Jay, & Madison, 2011). The modern state’s principal justification of existence, he claims, is to serve as a rational stronghold against emotional illusions.

The severity of aversion against a discourse based on rational arguments and economic logic ahead of the vote, is therefore particularly striking. The understanding that democratic governance relies on expertise and on rational voters favoring economically beneficial policies, is however far from being uncontested. The belief that a democratic dispute for the better argument does not necessarily require logical consistency, seems not to be necessarily a new, but a nevertheless dangerous phenomenon. As Vasilopoulou (2016a) notes: „From a utilitarian cost-benefit analysis perspective, this choice is seemingly irrational. How is it that Brexiteers did not vote with their wallets in mind, and instead put sovereignty and immigration at the core of their decision?”. If to understand how and to what extent the campaigns employed these frames of reference, this raises the question, whether the arguments articulated in the campaign environment were of rational and economic nature, or if they rather reflected emotional affect. The narratives of the “Remain – Britain stronger in” and “Leave – take back control” campaigns could shed light on how citizens developed certain attitudes that lead them to vote one way or the other. The objective of this thesis is to understand how the campaigns framed the public discourse – essentially, whether the most central campaign organizations’ statements align around an economic reasoning or instead, if they exhibit a rhetoric of positive and negative emotion. Respectively, two theoretical expectations on how the campaigns appeal to the electorate are developed and then guide a qualitative assessment of the campaign’s press releases issued in the final week before the referendum – a time frame, in which the momentum might have shifted. First,
following an approach to voter choice in the field of Economic Voting (Lewis-Beck, 1992; Lewis-Beck & Paldam, 2000), the campaign organizations are hypothesized to focus their campaigning efforts on utilitarian economic arguments, while assuming the electorate to share an interest in maximizing their individual and the collective utility. Secondly, in contrast to that, research in the area of political psychology suggests an alternative hypothesis: Emotional appeals to group loyalty and an understanding of exclusive national identity could shape public opinion in a fundamental way, trumping rational economic reasoning (see Caplan, 2011; Westen, 2007). The objective is to analyze, how the campaign groups employed these two argumentative frames in the Brexit discourse and whether rational economic or emotional appeals prevailed in number and scope in their press releases issued, as the primary outlet of campaign communication.

Understanding this strategic dimension of public discourse is central, since – according to Habermas (1996) – the foundational element of a stable democracy, is its “discursive” character, e.g. its nature of reasonable deliberation. Emotion on the other hand, as the “structurally-banned affective dimension of politics“ is therewith implicitly regarded as its normative contradiction (Marcus, 2010, p. 6).

The dynamics of discourse are fundamental for democratic decision-making and justify an in-depth analysis. This research project draws its scientific relevance from its application of a qualitative content analysis to a phenomenon that is of crucial importance for the future and present politics in the UK. Furthermore, with its focus on the campaign environment in an EU referendum, it addresses a central dimension of domestic decision-making that appears to have a decisive effect on the EU integration project. The investigation of the manifestation of economic rationales and emotional appeals could shed light on applicable settings beyond the British island and help to understand dynamics of public discourse as such.

2. Research question

These considerations lead to the following descriptive research question:

**Which kinds of statements (rational economic or emotional) were used during the UK’s 2016’s referendum campaign by the two opposing camps, “Vote Remain – Britain stronger in” and “Vote leave – take back control”**?

Given that political parties and political elites are able to frame a public discourse and provide influential cues to the electorate (Zaller, 1992), the objective is to understand on a descriptive basis, which sorts of statements these influential actors provide. In the context of the 2016 referendum, Vasilopoulou (2016b) argues that neither Labour, nor the Conservatives could exercise a central influence on the electorate, due to inner dissent towards the referendum issue. The parties, even though key actors in the political landscape of the UK as such, are accordingly less relevant in this particular setting. It makes therefore sense to broaden the scope and consider the dichotomous nature of the referendum’s question – remain or leave – resulting in two non-partisan camps. These camps and their communications will be the focus here.
The theory chapter will introduce the theoretical debate on the theory of Economic Voting, contrasting that with a perspective of political psychology, and will explain the conceptualizations of rational economic and emotion-based statements in-depth. The collected data and methods applied will be described and the data analyzed thereafter. Following the analysis, the discussion chapter will conclude by discussing and summarizing the empirical findings.

3. Theory and Conceptualization

Following an exploration of the role of electoral campaigns in shaping voter choice, I will develop two alternative theoretical assumptions on how the two official campaigns are expected to address the public, e.g. on how the campaigns are to frame selected issues. First, I outline an argument based on the theory of Economic Voting, which suggests a narrative of economic incentives and rational statements. Secondly, I contrast this expectation with a concept of emotion as the central opposing theme of campaign communication.

3.1. Election campaigns and framing

Electoral campaigns are times of intensive political communication: Candidates, parties and other political elites employ numerous strategies to influence the outcome of the election (Schoen, 2014, p. 666). In terms of the literature on voting behavior, empirical studies confirm a causal relationship between electoral campaigns and the voting behavior of citizens: The influential works “The People’s Choice” (Lazarsfeld, Berelson, & Gaudet, 1968) and “Voting” (Berelson, 1954) first theorized this connection. Both works picture the voter as a consumer of political offers, evaluating different options and voting in accordance with individual preferences. Empirical support later gave sufficient reason to intensify research in this area (Schoen, 2014, p. 662). One way in which these effects manifest themselves and allow observation, is on how campaigns strategically select issues or rather, frames of reference in which further discourse is conducted (Jasperson, Shah, Watts, Faber, & Fan, 1998). How the issues of discussion are embedded and referred to in the public debate through political actors, is a key aspect of campaign strategy – and of research on electoral competition. Stokes (1963), for instance, argues that “[t]he skills of political leaders […] consist partly in knowing what issue dimensions […] can be made salient by suitable propaganda”. Research suggests that parties and candidates strategically accentuate issues to influence voters in their considerations (Druckman, Jacobs, & Ostermeier, 2004).

There is reason to believe this to be a valid assumption: Especially in the time before elections, strategic issue selection plays a central role. Dragu and Fan (2016) show this effect empirically in a range of different electoral settings and countries. Parties and candidates in electoral campaigns consequently have a natural interest to increase their chances of being elected by influencing the perception of specific issues. Dragu and Fan (2016, p. 9) note accordingly, „that the amount of media coverage […] of certain policy issues induces citizens to give more weight to those issues when
evaluating candidates”. Which themes are put on the agenda and how they are framed by strategic political communication accordingly matters, since parties and political elites appear to be successful in influencing which issues are debated, and consequently changing voter’s minds. Strategic accentuation of issues, specific wording to trigger positive or negative cognitive reactions developed by political actors build the basis of references for voter choice. Political campaign’s logically aim at spinning a debate, potentially activating, reinforcing or even convincing voters to convert their loyalties (Benoit, 2007). Not only have parties and campaign actors an incentive to set the agenda, but even more to establish the perspective, from which an issue is debated by spectators and commentators (Entman, 1993). Framing according to Entman (1993, p. 51) means to “select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation”.

Even though electoral campaigns vary significantly in their designs, issues and in the national contexts they take place in, individual voting behavior is responsive to political campaigning (Schoen, 2014, p. 15). Parties and campaign organizations are consequently inclined to develop and enforce specific frames of reference, which not only provide a definition of what is to be considered a policy problem, but also, which solution in terms of policy would logically be required (Entman, 1993, p. 52). Accessing specific themes in the campaign publications will therefore show how these campaigns strategically set the agenda and how they intend to frame the public debate. The campaigns slogans “Britain stronger in” and “take back control”, even though simplistic and vague, are potential indicators of these frames, allowing voters to project a range of expectations onto. They might exemplify a larger strategic line of appeal, which therefore gives reason to assess their strategies intensively. In the following paragraphs, I will derive the two distinct expectations about how the campaign camps appeal to potential voters.

3.2. Rational Economic Voting

The issue of economics is at the heart of most democratic elections in most Western Democracies (Caplan, 2011, p. 23). In the following paragraph, I will develop the argument, that campaign platforms identify voters primarily as rational individuals interested in maximizing the materialistic utility – as voters with economics in mind, when entering the voting booth. The campaign camps are therefore expected to seek voter support in holding out the prospect of personal or collective economic gains or costs by outlaying concrete economic incentives.

Not only does most research on Euroscepticism identify the issue of economics as at the heart of electoral decisions in regard to the issue of EU membership (Boomgaarden, Schuck, Elenbaas, & de Vreese, 2011), but so does the theory of Economic Voting (Lewis-Beck, 1992; Lewis-Beck & Paldam, 2000). Campaigns and political actors therefore assume voters to primarily pay attention and even alter their voting decision based on their personal or the general economic situation and its prospects.
linked to policy offers of the parties (Lewis-Beck, 1992). So-called pocketbook voting and self-interested considerations regarding the economy, represent a significant dimension in explaining voter behavior in elections, which, according to Lewis-Beck (1992), proves to be empirically stable across different national settings. The assumption that voter choice responds to material self-interest is derived from economic models of voter behavior in the tradition of Anthony Downs, known as Economic Voting (Meltzer & Richard, 1981). Downs’ (1957) “An Economic Theory of political action in a democracy” first developed a model of voter behavior assuming citizens to choose from a range of options in full knowledge of its personal economic preference. Here, Downs (1957) applied an economic hypothesis of rational consumer behavior from a market setting to the choice of political options in elections. He assumes voters to be driven by self-interest and to be rational in an instrumental way in pursuing these preferences. The notion of rationality is defined in a narrow sense: individual behavior is seen under the light of outcome-oriented and consistent consideration (Downs, 1957).

Essentially, this suggests that voters respond sensibly to policies affecting the individual material state or the collective national economic performance, either in retrospective and/or prospective terms. Individual voting decisions are either based on the perception of the current economic performance, which is attributed to the incumbent government, or possible future scenarios of economic policies proposed by all running parties. Pocketbook voting hence refers to voting, that takes mainly the design and scope of redistributive politics and its effects for the individual into account (Dixit & Londregan, 1996; Lindbeck & Weibull, 1987). Voting in regard to the collective respectively deals with the general economic performance (Rogoff & Sibert, 1988). Furthermore, there are two dimensions regarding the time of reference: Whereas the hypothesis of retrospective voting assumes citizens to vote in accordance with the current economic performance in relation to policies of the government in office, prospective voting expects citizens to vote in accordance to campaign promises (Elinder, Jordahl, & Poutvaara, 2008). Dahlberg and Johansson (2002) for instance, empirically show that governments tend to employ a strategy of providing material incentives to undecided voters. Here, since a potential Brexit would primary effect policies in a future scenario, the focus will lie on the latter. This gives reason to assume the campaigns to address the electorate in a language of economic utility.

According to Caplan (2011), “nearly all modern economic theories of politics begin by assuming that the typical citizen understands economics and votes accordingly – at least on average”. If this expectation is to be true, voters would be able to tell whether the provided statements are accurate or at least do not lack a logical reason. The campaign camps would consequently have an incentive to provide sound proof for their statements, or at least avoid blunt misinformation. Statements, if here to be considered rational, thus need a plausible argumentative justification. Due to the fact that the actual validity of the claims is hardly to be objectively assessed, this particular conceptualization of rationality, will only focus on how and in which context the arguments are presented.
Accordingly, parties and political elites are to believe economic preferences of voters to determine how they vote in elections – no matter if the choice deals with EU membership or national policy. If this is the case, both campaign camps are to design the frame of reference in terms of rationality and economics – by providing statements of economic nature, meaning messages regarding the economic influence of EU legislation and potential costs and benefits, if the UK were to leave or remain in the EU. Polls, such as form Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research ("EU Referendum Poll for the Fabian Society," 2016) earlier in the campaign, suggest that most voters perceive the issue of economics as most important in the referendum. This implies that other issues might appear under an economic frame of references, e.g. migration under the pretext of economic costs and benefits. Issues regarding health, trade and migration are hence to be framed as a question of individual or collective utility. The campaigns are accordingly likely to strategically select issues of economic nature and refer to the electoral choice as an issue of rational economic consideration, rather than an issue of identity. This leads to the conceptualization of an economic narrative as statements concerning potential costs and benefits on the individual and collective level in terms of either the ‘remain’ or the ‘leave’ scenario. All in all, economic models of voter choice suggest that campaigns strategically appeal to voters in economic utility terms. Moreover, they are expected to do so rather consistent, assuming a reasonable and self-infested electorate. Opposing this expectation, the following paragraph will develop a different angle of theory in contrast to the expectation of rational economic appeals – allowing to access the data from a different theoretical perspective.

3.3. Emotional appeal

Instead of materialist concerns, research in the field of political psychology suggests that voters hardly make up their mind on the basis of pure rational and economic reason. Westen’s (2007) “The Political Brain” makes the argument that the assumption of rationality is profoundly misleading in explaining voter behavior. Caplan goes so far in calling it a “myth” (2011). Whereas the theory on Economic Voting describes the voter as a rational utility maximizer, Westen and Caplan suggest that voting decisions are neither to be understood as material utility considerations, nor as objectively logical. Rather, the answer to what truly guides a voting choice, is to be found with regard to emotion and affective dispositions. Political communication that transcends the individual economic benefit theme and appeals to human emotion, in Westen’s view, appears as a more successful strategy in addressing the electorate. In this paragraph, a competing theoretical concept dealing with the theme of emotions will be developed, as a potential frame of reference employed by the two campaign camps. In comparison to the conception of economic voting, Caplan’s (2011) “The Myth of a Rational Voter” develops a fundamentally opposing claim, again, on the basis of empirical research on voting behavior. In opposition to the common assumption that citizens vote in accordance with their pocketbooks, he rejects the analogy to rational, self-interested consumers. In the contrary: He depicts voters as “religious devotees”: Even though favoring policies they conceive to be in the general
interest, the large majority of voters would suffer a decisive lack of information and several systematic emotional cognitive biases (Caplan, 2011, p. 19). Caplan suggests that voters simply lack the capacity to rationally assess political arguments in electoral campaigns, or do so on the grounds of emotional considerations. Some rational models however, referred to under the term ‘bounded reality’, accept these systematic distortions (Brennan, 2016). In bounded reality terms, voters may act rationally, meaning consistent with their preferences, yet, only to the extent that they choose within the confines of their cognitive and emotional dispositions. Whether within this rational paradigm or not, what drives voter decisions could therefore be attributed to emotion, rather than rational economic thinking.

In contrast to the Western ideal of politics, as the “marketplace of ideas”, where parties and candidates present their respective offers to the public, which in turn weighs the arguments and “exercises their capacity to reason”, Westen, believes election campaigns rather to be “marketplaces of emotion” (2007). The central emotional affect to be targeted by political campaigns, according to Westen, is therefore the issue of nation and identity. His evolutionary argument finds support in literature dealing with Euroscepticism: Citrin, Reingold, and Green (1990) for instance suggest that group loyalties, meaning a shared perception of identity, can be a crucial force in shaping individual affective stances on political issues, even more than economic considerations. According to Tajfel (1981) identity is “that part of an individual’s self-concept, which derives from his knowledge of his membership of a social group together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership”. Especially in the UK the construct of identity, as a way of self-definition in terms of territorial and social exclusivity, is expected to be a powerful factor determining social behavior (Colley, 1992; Gamble, 2003). The stronger an exclusive perception of British national identity, hence the more exclusive to other social groups in social and geographical terms, the more likely one is to oppose European integration, or the UK’s membership at all (Carey, 2002). The more a British identity is defined as a cosmopolitan or European concept, the less opposed one is to European integration.

Campaign groups, parties and political elites are assumed to appeal to this emotional dimension of decision making with according themes and messages. Especially in regard to the issue of migration and democratic legitimacy, if to trigger negative dispositions, and a cosmopolitan narrative of Britain as part of a larger community of European nations, if to appeal to positive affections. In the sense of the former, the issue of membership in the EU could be framed as an infringement of national sovereignty and democratic self-determination of the British nation – the anchor of reference in a globalized world. A central role falls therewith onto the immigrant, as a projection of emotional irritation and discontent due to its embodiment of the diffusion of cultural, economic and geographical borders. Crines (2016) for instance, comments that „the Vote Leave side emerged victorious by positioning their arguments in long-standing assumptions about how the UK was being mistreated by the EU. Immigration, loss of sovereignty, [...] and a growing sense of a detached liberal intelligentsia that failed to understand the plight faced by the poorest in society or the issues of a cultural shift in the UK“. The strategy of emotional framing of the issues at stake could however not be exclusive to the
leave side and therewith reduced to negative appeals to the electorate. The remain argument could frame the issue of membership, as well not as a purely utilitarian calculation, but as a choice of national belonging in the European community, so could the Leave side in emphasizing a positive image of Britain as an autonomous nation. Opposed to an exclusive British identity, the remain side could respond by highlighting a rather inclusive European identity – and the UK being a substantial part of it. The data could therefore show a range of positive appeals in the form of an enthusiastic and cosmopolitan display of the EU, as a project of reconciliation and cultural “unity in diversity”. Remain on the other hand could voice negative emotions in terms of fears of possible uncertainties, as well.

Communication intended to appeal to voter’s emotions is therefore conceptualized as statements relating to voters’ positive and negative emotions. Instead of rational cost-benefit themes, the issues made salient could revolve around emotional dispositions, rather than economic costs and benefits. As Kaufmann (2016) for instance argues, both campaigns framed the vote in an emotional tone of belonging and identity, on one hand emphasizing Britain’s natural place in a united Europe, and respectively on the other, as an independent and sovereign nation. From an empirical perspective this seems no less justified – as Westen notes: "From the standpoint of research in neuroscience, the more purely “rational” an appeal, the less it is likely to activate the emotion circuits that regulate voting behavior (2007, p. 51)". This means that a powerful emotional narrative could result in stronger mobilization effects than rational economic arguments – an insight that is not likely to be an exclusive insight by “Vote Leave – take back control”, but is here expected to be the central assumption of both camps. Therefore, in line with as Westen’s (2007) and Caplan’s (2011) argument of irrational and emotion-driven voter behavior,

H1. I expect more arguments appearing in both campaign’s press releases to be emotion-based, in relation to arguments dealing with rational economic considerations.

In respect to a comparison of the cases, some authors (..) interpret the result of the referendum (e.g. the decision to leave the EU), as proof of the leave side’s more powerful emotional message – thus winning the argument. In turn, this could be due the fact that their strategy employed a higher number of emotional arguments and frames and thus, a stronger emotional focus. Therefore,

H2. I expect the “Leave – take back control” campaign to have an even stronger use of emotional appeals than the “Remain – Britain stronger in” campaign.

Statements addressing voters are therefore likely to be framed in a tone voicing positive and negative emotions. A cosmopolitan, as well as national appeal are hence expected to be dominant themes to be reflected in the campaign communication.

In the referendum’s campaign’s competition of arguments, statements addressing economic consequences are likely to appear less in comparison to appeals to emotion. The subsequent chapter will deal with the chosen research design, the case and data selection and method of analysis, followed by the analysis.
4. Methodology

4.1. Research Design

This thesis will address the outlined research question by analyzing the degree to which statements with rational economic and emotional themes appear in the campaign’s press publications. The research question is dealt with in the form of a comparative case study, whereby potentially generalizable inferences are to be drawn from the examination and comparison of a small number of cases. This thesis will therefore conduct an in-depth investigation of two selected cases: Here, this will be the two official campaign organizations and their respective strategies of communication. The format of a comparative case study makes sense out of two reasons: Firstly, as Schoen (2014) argues, political communication may differ strongly in its objective, meaning apart from maximizing ballot share, parties may have different strategic aims: For instance, opposition parties will run campaigns different than those in office, often attacking rather than defending the status-quo. Secondly, how parties or other political actors communicate differs from electoral context, experience, and financial recourses, which further justifies a case-study design. Since intent and format are therefore hardly to be assessed across electoral settings and national boundaries, intensive assessment and comparison of these two cases alone is a methodologically sound approach. Furthermore, the focus on the EU referendum’s electoral campaign in Britain is an exemplary electoral decision, potentially a historically crucial event in British politics. A thorough investigation in the potential causes of success is hence justified in any case. Whether the findings are applicable to other national contexts is however not that simple to tell. Case study research is not immune to methodological critique, especially in this respect. To what extent inferences are applicable to other settings is to be analyzed cautiously. A transferal to a broader theoretical frame is however not the ambition of this thesis. Rather, the goal is to test suitable theoretical expectations in a real-world application.

4.2. Case selection

The public discourse on whether to leave or remain in the EU appeared to be a complex and diverse affair. Influential themes dominating media coverage were articulated by individual political elites, Labour and the Conservatives platforms, smaller parties such as UKIP, and the independent campaign organizations. The central role of the two major political parties in British politics might intrigue to focus on their communication strategies primarily. They have and continue to structure public debate, provide communication channels, forums to exchange arguments and have generally shaped public and political life throughout their existence. Since, however, the campaign outset in terms of its dichotomous question – leave or remain – transcends the classical party structure, the cases to be analyzed here will not be the parties, but the campaign camps, comprising politicians from both parties. The Conservatives, as well as Labour were furthermore highly ambiguous on the matter of the EU referendum, rendering a clear assignment impossible (Vasilopoulou, 2016b). While the
Conservatives officially announced to remain neutral, for instance Prime Minister Cameron campaigned in favor of remain, other prominent figures such as Boris Johnson, the former mayor of London and Michael Gove, former Secretary of State for Justice, sided with the leave camp (Pickard, 2015). Labour on the other hand, though officially declaring unqualified support for the remain camp, already had a remarkable history of inconsistency of attitudes towards the EU, as Vasilopoulou (2016b) argues: “Corbyn’s eurosceptic past, combined with a general caution not to appear that he is supporting Cameron, have contributed towards a sense of ambivalence with regard to Labour’s EU position”. The polarization in the referendum’s debate does hence not manifest itself primarily within old partisan structures, but becomes apparent in a campaign environment shaped by organizations and actors beyond that. It makes therefore sense to analyze the two official campaign organizations as the central cases of comparison. The cases most applicable are consequently the two official campaign groups “Vote Remain – Britain stronger in” and the “Vote Leave – take back control”. Their arguments and narratives appeal to a large audience across the classic left-right spectrum. Used in terms of a complementary perspective, they offer a concise and dense line of statements in form of their large number of publicly accessible press releases, opposed to the ambiguous mainstream party positions.

4.3. Data

The campaigns in the British referendum used a range of communication tools, employed by several independent actors. This poses a serious methodological challenge to the assessment of an overarching strategy thus poses a serious methodological challenge. The objective here however, is to uncover which communicative appeals are intentionally chosen to make their way into the public discourse. This thesis will investigate and interpret the campaigns’ press releases arguing for the ‘leave’, as well for the ‘remain’ case to an equal extent, understanding them as a primary source, over which the camps could exercise full control.

Data, drawn from the two organizations’ official websites, will then be analyzed in a hermeneutic fashion employing a qualitative approach based on a concept by Mayring (2014). If to assess the public discourse to the full extent, personal interviews and newspaper coverage could be used as supplementation. This would allow to evaluate how and to what degree these campaign narratives effectively manifest themselves in the public discourse. However, since the focus is to shed light on the campaign strategies primarily, as opposed to the resonance in media reporting, the press releases will provide sufficient empirical data and leave the question of media resonance to further research. Since media coverage essentially does not fall under the direct control of the campaigns, their influence on what issues are eventually discussed is limited: “[…]n the press releases […] issued by the two campaigns we have a clear indication of which messages were deliberately chosen, what timing was preferred and which spokespeople were viewed as credible”, argues Keaveney (2016). Cho and Benoit (2005, p. 178), who investigated press releases during US parliamentary elections, argue
accordingly: "News and messages from presidential candidates contribute to the voters’ knowledge of the candidates and their views on specific issues and policies so it is important to examine press releases.” This thesis’ focus is to shed light on the campaign strategies primarily, as opposed to the resonance in media reporting, therefore the press releases will provide sufficient empirical data and leave the question of media resonance to further research. The releases contain texts, speeches and videos. Subject matter will however only be text material, excluding video clips, which make up only a small part of the issued releases. The text material is formulated in a journalistic fashion, often combining clear statements with arguments in support, sometimes in the form of political speeches. Their target group ranges from individual voters to online and print media. This particular instrument of communication even allows campaigns to counter claims of opponents in near to real time. The format of press releases may thus not allow to derive inferences on which communicative frames mattered in individual voter considerations, yet, allow to assess the campaign’s overall strategies in stirring and changing the public’s mind.

According to Mayring’s (2014) approach, careful reflection about what is to be analyzed in the data – a direction of analysis – is central in defining the research’s scope. Here, the statements and statements selected will be grouped in terms of their overarching objective in the referendum, meaning whether they favor leave or remain, and, which is the focus, in respect of their theme of appeal: rational and economic or emotional. Derived from the economic assumptions in the field of voter behavior, rational statements are conceptualized as statements that articulate future individual or societal material benefits and that qualify as rational in the sense of logic reasoning. Emotional appeals are defined as statements that stress group attachments, either as particularly exclusive in terms of a British national identity, or as a European, cosmopolitan identity – the Chapter on Operationalization, will further specify that and supplement these definitions with according anchor examples.

This thesis will use a sample consisting of a comparable number of press releases that were issued in the last week prior to 23rd of June, thus a time, where most of the issues are released – furthermore, a timeframe in which the momentum might have shifted. Issues from the remain campaign are downloaded from their official website “strongerin.co.uk” under the section “news”. Issues form the leave campaign are downloaded from “webarchive.com” as a copy of the website from the date of the election, since the official website has taken their news section offline. The leave campaign, e.g. the chief executive of the Vote Leave campaign Mathew Elliot, declined an inquiry of the author to grant access to the original data via email on 24th of May 2017.

4.4. Data Analysis

Critique of qualitative research often raises the issue of transparency – whether hermeneutic assessment of text material provides more than subjective and context specific results. Addressing this very weakness of qualitative methods, the Mayring (2014) qualitative method provides a clear methodological structure for the interpretation of text material. Common especially in case study
applications, this form of qualitative research is a systematic, rule-bound and transparent procedure of assessment of text material (Flick, 2014, p. 144). A central role falls to the deductive development of categories of investigation: Opposed to purely inductive approaches, the procedure and the theoretic focus are developed a priori and then guide the assessment. Specific theoretical expectations are derived from theory and translated in concrete textual codes that structure and direct the investigation of the material under scrutiny (Mayring, 2014). The objective is to maintain the open character of text interpretation, yet integrating the methodological merits of rule-based procedures. Here, the categories are two central approaches to campaign appeals that are developed based on theoretic models of voter behavior (see Chapter 3). This deductive formulation of specific assumptions not only allows to structure the research, but it also helps in overcoming interpersonal biases in the assessment of political texts – hence allows intersubjective reproducibility (Mayring, 2014).

Among other procedures, Mayring (2014, p. 104) proposes to combine this deductive category assignment with an inductive element, where specific themes are developed on the basis of theory and then the data is structured and analytically explored. There are essentially two steps to be followed: (1) As done in the Ch. 3, a set of themes is derived from theory, which is further specified in a concise coding scheme, including thematic categories. The text material is then coded accordingly. This allows to structure the content and assess the frequencies in usage of the themes in quantitative terms. (2) Secondly, the coded material for each category is summarized and further analyzed. Whereas the first step provides descriptive insights concerning which themes were used in what number per campaign camp, the second step allows an in-depth analysis of the themes.

All in all, this allows to reveal certain elements in number and quality, instead of pure inductive interpretation. This thesis therewith adapts Mayring’s (2014) method of a “content structuring/theme analysis” in the following procedural organization:

1. Determination of units of analyses, here the press releases of the “Vote Remain – Britain Stronger In” and the “Vote Leave – take back control” campaigns,
2. Definition of central categories of assessment, here the concepts of rational economic and emotional appeals,
3. Development of coding guidelines, formulation of definition and examples,
4. Preliminary assessment of text material,
5. Adjustments of coding scheme,
6. Full assessment of text,
7. Summarizing of codes per category and
8. Final analysis of findings.

4.5. Operationalization

As described earlier, the data collected and analyzed here will be qualitative data in form of press releases. The objective is to analyze statements assuming an intended strategy of appeal. On the basis
of Mayring’s (2014) concept, this thesis analyzes whether these data points can be categorized into two distinct dimensions derived from theory – rational economic and/or emotional appeals. The text material will be interpreted and items will be assigned accordingly, if showing positive attributes of either of the categories. In the following table, I will specify a set of clear definitions and anchor examples that allow identifying whether to code a statement in one way or the other.

The unit of coding, in accordance with Werner, Lacewell, and Volkens (2011), is a quasi-sentence. Accordingly, a combination of words or natural sentence transmitting a distinct position is the central unit of coding. Arguments that follow up issue-specific statements without adding a new thematic angle are not coded as independent items. Furthermore, one statement or quasi-sentence can be selected for two categories at the same time – if for instance a statement formulating critique to the state of free movement is linked to an economic argument (Werner et al., 2011).

Concerning rational economic appeals, the press issues are coded accordingly, if stating benefits of the Single Market in positive terms, highlighting its individual and collective material features on one hand, and potential expenses as a result of a Brexit or remain scenario, on the other. In addition, the focus lies on the theme and character of appeal, rather than if a claim is true or false. The following tables list category definitions, examples and coding rules for each of the categories.

Table 1 – Operationalization, coding examples and rules Rational economic appeal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category label</th>
<th>Category definition</th>
<th>Anchor examples</th>
<th>Coding rules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Rational economic appeal       | Quasi-sentences that deal with prospective individual and collective material costs and benefits that are to be expected in the case of the UK remaining in/leaving the EU. This includes taxes, employment, consumer prices, trade and economic growth. | “If we Vote Leave we can create 300,000 jobs by doing trade deals with fast growing economies across the globe.” (Vote Leave, 2016b)  
“Brexit would lead to economic uncertainty and would put jobs at risk. Smaller businesses and the people they employ are particularly vulnerable to any economic shock that could follow a vote to leave.” (Vote Remain, 2016d) | One of the listed economic aspects must be met to allow the diagnosis as a rational and economic appeal |

In terms of emotional appeals three central themes that relate to negative emotional affections can be identified after a preliminary assessment of the data: the appearance of the issue of migration (1), the issue of national sovereignty and democratic legitimacy (2) and the issue of distrust in a distant bureaucratic elite (3). In terms of positive emotional appeals the focus lies on an affirming display of
the EU, as a mean to foster cultural diversity and cosmopolitan force. The category definition and according examples are given in the following table 2:

Table 2 – Operationalization, coding examples and rules Positive and Negative emotional appeals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category label</th>
<th>Category definition</th>
<th>Anchor examples</th>
<th>Coding rules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive emotional appeal</td>
<td>Quasi-sentences relating to voters’ emotions in terms of a positive conceptualization of a European, cosmopolitan identity</td>
<td>“Britain is an amazing country but we’ll achieve much more if we’re a team player – working with others to get things done. I believe we need to work with our friends and neighbours in Europe if we want to make changes our children can be proud of.”</td>
<td>The central aspect of the definition must be met to allow the diagnosis of an emotional appeal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Negative emotional appeal | Quasi-sentences relating to voters’ emotions in terms of fear, anger, threat and distrust, comprising one of the following elements:                           | 1. “Government policy and EU policy is to have five more countries join the EU - including Turkey. It's also their plan to open up visa free travel from Turkey after our referendum this year. If we stay in the EU then this is bound over time to lead to further movement of people into the UK.”  
2. “The EU is costly, bureaucratic and blind.”  
3. “We will be even greater if we take back control of our own democracy.” | One of the aspects of the definition must be met to allow the diagnosis of an emotional appeal |

This categorization will allow to conduct a thorough comparison between the two camp’s usages of arguments and their strategy to appeal to voters. The analysis will thereby provide an answer to the outlined research question and could potentially help in explaining why certain narratives resonated among voters and what eventually drove them to vote ‘remain’ or ‘leave’. This “theoretical triangulation”, meaning a deductive approach to the empirical data from at least two opposite theoretical perspectives, is chosen limit systematic biases and improve the validity of the findings (Flick, 2014, p. 225). Finally, it could shed light on how populist politicians across Europe are able to frame the public discourse.
5. Analysis

This chapter will present the results of the analysis of the press releases issued by the “Vote Remain – Britain stronger In” and the “Vote Leave – take back control” campaign in the last week prior to the referendum. Both cases will be assessed and compared in accordance with their general appeals – first in terms of formal structure and frequencies of used appeals, and secondly, in terms of the thematic frames applied. In line with Mayring’s (2014) qualitative content analysis, the objective is to structure the content of the campaigns publications on one hand, and to identify, which kinds of arguments (rational economic or emotional) were primarily used, on the other. Subsequently, the central frames in which the themes are referred to are discussed in detail.

5.1. Frequencies and formal aspects

From June 15th to June 23rd of 2016, the “Vote Remain – Britain Stronger In” campaign released 28 issues under their section “campaign news”, of which 9 contained video material of referendum debates, short TV spots and statements by political affiliates. Since these are not subject of analysis here and constitute material that is not produced by the campaign itself, which leaves 19 issues and 20,955 words to be assessed, with an average length per press release of 1102 words. All in all, 296 items were identified, 202 of which meet the requirements of a rational economic appeal, and respectively 94 that were coded as emotional appeals. Regarding the balance of arguments, this shows that about 68% of items coded fall under the first category and 32%, under the second (see Table 3). All in all, there is a strong predominance of rational economic items over those containing an appeal of positive or negative emotion. This significantly larger share of rational economic arguments does not confirm the expectation of H1, which suggested a greater use of emotional items by both camps. This tendency however, resembles a considerable insight, which will be subject of further qualitative elaboration, later in this chapter.

The “Vote Leave – take back control” campaign issued 24 press statements within the selected time frame, none of which contained video material of any kind. These 24 issues comprise 32,905 words, with an average of about 1,371 words per release. The number of issues is therewith larger in comparison to the first case of analysis, as well as the overall number of words. Moreover, most releases are formulated in a distinct style, if not a speech, beginning with a statement of campaign director Mathew Elliot followed by a brief summary of the central arguments, which are introduced with the headline “notes to editors”. Thereafter, each of these claims is supported with a list of bullet-points, each giving specifications and quotes from external sources.

In terms of the frequencies of coded items, the relation appears to be as follows: Due to the greater amount of issues and words, there were in sum 444 items coded – 213 as rational economic and 231, as emotional appeals. This constitutes a slightly larger proportion of emotional items, with about 52% to 48%. Compared to the “Vote Remain – Britain Stronger in” sample, the tendency is however not as
clear, especially when considering that a small number of the items were coded belonging to both categories. Again, this noteworthy aspect will be subject of further discussion later. In comparison to the “Vote Remain – Britain Stronger In” issues, which do not appear to follow a reoccurring structural theme of presentation of statements and argumentative support, the “Vote Leave – take back control” issues show a more coherent formal style. This suggests that their central object is to provide quotable statements, information and appropriate sources to journalists and news outlets, rather than to voters directly. The “Vote Remain – Britain Stronger In’s” variation in terms of content and form does not allow a consistent inference of who is to be addressed primarily – the media or voters themselves. This slight numerical majority of emotional items already justifies accepting H2. However – with regard to the fact that there is only a small surplus of emotional frames and several items meets the requirements of both categories – there is reason to accept the implication of H2, rather on a qualitative basis.

Table 3 – Frequencies of items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cases</th>
<th>Rational appeal</th>
<th>In per cent</th>
<th>emotional appeal</th>
<th>In per cent.</th>
<th>sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vote Remain – Britain stronger in</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>68,24%</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>31,76%</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote Leave – take back control</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>47,97%</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>52,03%</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. word count “Vote Remain – Britain stronger In”: 20.955, ”Vote Leave – take back control”: 32.905

The following paragraph will touch upon these formal findings, using these formal observations as focal points to a qualitative assessment of the data – which Mayring (2014) refers to as “theme analysis”.

5.2. Framing the argument

Following the assessment of the data through the lens of frequencies, the objective of this paragraph is to conduct an in-depth analysis of the argumentative frames, by assessing how the central issues are communicated. Applying Entman’s conceptualization of framing, the analysis focusses on the campaign’s central strategies in promoting a particular view of (1) what is to be considered a political problem, (2) a diagnosis of the central cause, (3) an appropriate moral evaluation and consequently, (4) a presentation of likely effects, that logically require a certain policy solution, hence a specific voting instruction (1993, p. 52). The first part will deal with the “Vote Remain – Britain Stronger in’s” argument, the second with “Vote Leave – take back control”. In both cases, the theme analysis will
follow Entman’s four-step-approach of framing, each of which is indicated by the corresponding number in brackets.

5.3. “Vote Remain – Britain Stronger in”

“Vote Remain – Britain Stronger in’s” stronger use of rational economic items, in relation to emotional items, suggests a deliberate strategy of highlighting personal and collective economic benefits, if Britain were to remain in the Union – and potential costs, if the Britain were to leave.

5.3.1. Rational Economic appeal: Strong economy versus foreseeable risk

Remaining a part of the EU is presented as the only rational economic choice, when considering fiscal and economic stability, growth, job security, and investment. Following Entman (1993), this corresponds to the first step of constructing a communicative frame. (1) The campaign develops an explicit angle on what is to be considered problematic: "Our reasons are straightforward: businesses and their employees benefit massively from being able to trade inside the world’s largest single market without barriers" (Vote Remain, 2016a). EU membership is argued to be primarily a Single Market membership – a membership to a community of shared cultural roots and belonging, secondarily. Leaving a market of “500 million consumers” – leaving an “economic stronghold” – would in turn create an unnecessary and potentially devastating economic risk (Vote Remain, 2016a). An exit from the EU would accordingly lead to economic uncertainty, hence endanger growth, price stability and investment. (2) “Vote Remain – Britain Stronger in” therefore defines leaving the EU as the central cause to likely economic instability and uncertainty. A Brexit would accordingly necessarily inflict economic damage on the UK, ranging from individual job losses to reduced funding of the National Health Services: "Every credible economic expert is clear – leaving the EU, our biggest market, would hit trade, boost inflation, and increase the price of imports. This would be devastating for working people who cannot afford a rise in the cost of living" (Vote Remain, 2016b). (3) This analysis and identification of the central cause goes along with an implicit moral judgement: To what extent is a “terrible gamble” on economic prosperity, employment and growth justifiable (Vote Remain, 2016c)? Risking high economic costs on the individual and collective level is therefore in numerous occasions implicitly condemned as immoral and irrational. (4) As a result, this economic narrative of risk versus prosperity, leaves no other choice than opting for remaining ‘in’, hence voting on the grounds of logical utilitarian incentives.

This rational economic framing is straightforward and clear: If interested in securing economic prosperity, then voting leave is to be understood as a bluntly inconsistent choice. “Vote Remain – Britain Stronger in” attaches not only great attention to the referendum in this regards, in terms of the number of items, but further, in leaving no doubt, that if discussed in economic terms, the voter has no choice, but to vote remain. The general frame of reference therefore focuses on communicating this distinct narrative of economic rationales, which, since higher in terms of items in relation to emotional
appeals, resembles the overarching theme of “Vote Remain – Britain stronger in”. Potential implications are to be discussed in the discussion chapter. The following paragraph will deal with the emotional framing, which however appears less in terms of items coded.

5.3.2. Emotional appeal: little England versus Europe

“Vote Remain – Britain Stronger in” appeals in an overwhelmingly economic voice, yet, constructs a complementary emotional – though to a smaller extent. In doing so, the focus lies on a positive, cosmopolitan display of the EU, as a political instrument to further a rather ideational purpose – a Europe, as a point of cultural anchorage. A choice for a Brexit in opposition, is pictured as a road to cultural decline, as a mindset of ‘little England’, instead of a continuation of British world reach and influence among equals, within the institutional structure of European nations.

In terms of Entman’s model, the data sample depicts the EU referendum choice as a once-in-a-generation opportunity to express one’s emotional belonging to the European family of nations (in most items the EU is referred to as ‘Europe’, thus avoiding to depict it as a political entity). (1) The problem to be dealt with in the voting booth is to be regarded in subordination to the rational economic consideration, as an issue of identity, and how one’s self-conception is to be defined: “Tomorrow we all face a stark and irreversible choice about what kind of country we want to be” (Vote Remain, 2016d). (2) The cause at hand is encapsulated within that: Voting leave would divert Britain’s influence in world politics, exclude Britain from the European community of shared values and lead to cultural isolation – especially, when in a time of a European crisis of solidarity and unity: "As a taxi driver said to me in Paris recently, we really need you, the UK. Don't desert us when times are tough, stand with us like you always have. That rang true"(Vote Remain, 2016e). (3) The corresponding moral claim revolves around the confronting images of the referendum’s two options: Either, one could express alignment with the idea of the UK as an inward-looking, closed and intolerant island in metaphorical and geographical terms, or – here with an implicit positive connotation – with the image of an outward-looking, confident and tolerant nation, alongside European partners:

We have a choice on Thursday – we can either be confident, inclusive and together or isolated, divided and insular. I know the future I want for the next generation and it’s not one behind borders and barriers - mental or physical between countries or people (Vote Remain, 2016c).

(4) The “Vote Remain – Britain Stronger in” campaign therewith develops a critique of the mindset of those favoring a Brexit, instead of a powerful and independent narrative of a European British nation of its own. The central objective is to emotionally frame the leave approach as a reflection of negative attitudes such as fear, retreat and resent, in opposition to a positive image of a tolerant and multicultural Europe. The narrative established therewith regards the nation state as an outdated and morally suspect political construct, whose legitimacy is to be called into question. Favoring leave and thereby clinging to a British nation state as an anachronistic relict, is to be attributed to an antiquated,
short-sighted and anxious mindset, which is to be overcome by a modern attitude of cherishing multicultural diversity and an ongoing economic, political, and social diffusion of national boundaries. As a matter of time, the nation state is to merge into a morally superior societal structure, overcoming the artificial invention of national communities.

The “Vote Remain – Britain Stronger in” focusses most of its releases on the rational economic argument, asking British voters to vote in accordance with their pocketbooks. Only in a second instance, the issue of a European identity is made explicitly salient. Whether that could have contributed to the electoral defeat is to be left to the discussion chapter.

However, this confirms the rejection of H1, which assumed a larger share of emotional items and themes in both samples.

5.4. “Vote Leave – take back control”

Next, the central frames of the “Vote Leave – take back control” campaign will be subject of analysis.

5.4.1. Rational Economic appeal: the cost of immigration

As done with the Remain sample, the analysis will follow Entman’s model in investigating the central framing in the “Vote Leave – take back control” campaign’s issues.

“Vote Leave – take back control’s” rational economic appeal and initial problem definition is developed as follows: (1) The benefits of membership in the Single market are presented as not outweighing its collective costs and constrains – especially when it comes to prices, wages, and the National Health Service: "The IMF ignores a major Treasury study showing that the cost of the EU could be as high as 7% of GDP, or £4,638 per household"(Vote Leave, 2016a). (2) The EU is pictured as the central cause of these pressures, which, on one hand, imposes disproportionate cash transfers to other EU member states, and on the other, would enable large numbers of low-skilled migrants to settle in the UK and therewith increase constrains on public services: "We will take back control of our money - our official EU bill is £350 million every week. We'll be able to spend our money on the public's priorities, particularly public services"(Vote Leave, 2016b). (3) The moral critique relates to an unjust balance between effort and reward: British taxpayers are alleged to carry the burden of an expensive ideational project, while having to accept a growing inflow of low skilled-migrants, thus high pressures on social systems. The EU’s contractual agreement’s economic effects are qualified as everything but beneficial – and thus hardly economically justifiable. A continued EU membership would therewith come at a high individual and collective price. Costs and financial contributions to the EU, which could however be made completely redundant, among other seemingly avoidable tax regulations imposed by EU law: "If we Vote Leave, we will scrap VAT on household energy bills, saving £64 for each household each year"(Vote Leave, 2016c). The money saved could be spend on other, more pressing priorities: "We could have avoided the public sector pay freeze, which saved £8 billion or 17% of our net EU contribution"(Vote Leave, 2016d). (4) The policy implication in terms of
economics reflects this moral judgment and the overarching theme of ‘taking back control’. Exercising central economic governance competences would provide the ability to deal with Britain’s individual market features and characteristics, that an one-size-fits-all approach would fail to do. Voters are therefore to opt for the leave option, not only on the grounds of legitimacy considerations, but based on rational cost benefit reasons, being able to protect certain industries, special tax-codes etc. Clinging to the status quo on the other hand, would just increase disproportionate pressures, while lacking any economic necessity. Equivalent trade agreements could be negotiated after the election, countering the remain side’s argument of trade benefits within the Single Market. The “Vote Remain – Britain stronger in’s” rational economic argument is thereby framed as economically misleading, hence driven by ideology.

All in all, “Vote Leave – take back control’s” rational economic framing makes use of uncertainties of economic costs and benefits of European membership, emphasizing certain dimensions of EU membership and complementary transfers, while downplaying others – for instance agricultural subsidies and poorer regions in the UK. The most salient claim dominating the sample under investigation, demonstrates this approach: "We will take back control of our money - our official EU bill is £350 million every week”(Vote Leave, 2016b). Repeatedly using the term ‘sending’ or ‘bill’, as there was an invoice to pay, arbitrarily imposed by technocrats in Brussels, highlights British contributions, while deliberately ignoring the return side. In opposition to the hypothesized subordination of arguments articulating economic costs and benefits, the press releases disclose hardly any reluctance, rather an intentional strategy of confronting the economic arguments of the Remain side. In addition, the “Vote Leave – take back control” campaign reinforces their rational economic narrative with an underlying emotional sentiment, blurring the distinction between arguments of rational economic and emotional nature. The campaign frames a characteristic Eurosceptic and emotional attitude as a rational economic posture, by emphasizing the metaphoric of sending, and ignoring the reciprocal nature of financial transfers. The independent organization “Full fact”, which specializes in evaluating political claims in the UK’s political discourse, as well as the UK statistics authority therefore consider the argument “potentially misleading” (Arnold, 2016). Similar items, especially those dealing with the potential accession of Turkey and other Eastern European states employ the same seemingly rational economic appeal, while covering an emotional aversion against a distant, bureaucratic EU and Islamic migration: "The EU is paying €17.7 billion to Albania, Serbia, Turkey, Macedonia and Montenegro to join the EU. The UK is paying almost £1.8 billion to these five countries to join"(Vote Leave, 2016e). Again, the issue of migration is subject to critique on the basis of financial considerations – potentially, to avoid being accused of making a cultural argument.

The sample discloses a profound blurring of boundaries between economic and emotional appeals, which is however to be understood as the central characteristic of “Vote Leave – take back control’s” communication strategy. Furthermore, there is a corresponding and more direct emotional narrative to be described, which will be dealt with in the following paragraph.
5.4.2. Emotional appeal: Radical loss and erosion of autonomy, ‘we’ against ‘them’

“Vote Leave – take back control’s” emotional theme exceeds its rational economic appeal in terms of the frequency ratio only to a small extent. Their emotional undertone however transcends the mere construction of anti-EU emotional sentiment. Rather, the rational economic appeal is framed in subtle, but consistent emotional narrative.

(1) The emotional issue made most salient is the perceived progressing loss of autonomy and the diffusion of British identity. Distant and unelected elites are depicted as deciding upon the British fate, while the heart of British democratic pride and the expression of democratic sovereignty – the parliament in Westminster – merely follows arbitrary instructions: "If we vote to stay, we are voting to continue being ruled by people we cannot chuck out. We will keep losing control" (Vote Leave, 2016b). The notion of ‘control’ is therewith central to “Vote Leave – take back control’s” economic narrative, as well as their emotional message. (2) Sovereignty over economic policies, trade and foremost control of migration are understood as key powers of an autonomous, e.g. hence sovereign, nation state. The EU’s extensive legislative and judiciary reach allegedly deprives Britain of these core competences. (3) The depiction of the EU as a democratically deficient and elitist project, underlines the moral need to regain lost and truly legitimate competences of governance: "If we vote leave, it will be a glorious strengthening of our democracy" (Vote Leave, 2016b). This demand is embedded in an emotional tone of ‘we’ against ‘them’; of the referendum as a choice between a “glorious,” democratic, free and independent nation versus the rule of intransigent and self-interested career politicians (one release for instance exclusively deals with dining habits of EU officials). Thus, the objective is to construct a deeply felt appropriate critique of an erosion of common sense, of a detachment of elitist technocrats, and of an infringement of national autonomy.

The issue of migration is among the most important issues on the list of emotional anger and distrust. The EU’s principle of free movement, as an ideological imposition, would according to the campaign’s releases, result in the legal obligation to accept large numbers of migrants, with even more states lining up to become EU members, thus likely increase migration flows: "Turkey and four other countries are joining the EU. This is being accelerated with unanimous support. Talks could begin the day after the referendum" (Vote Leave, 2016f). Migration becomes an issue subject to the projection of insecurity and fear of a globalizing world economy – a rejection of which metaphorically embodies the aversion against a leftist dogma of a future overcoming culturally homogeneous nations. Since culturally incompatible, the migrant would increase competition for employment and social protection, subsequently raising the question, why Britain is to be obliged to care for foreigners equally as it does for its own citizens. Concerning a moral evaluation, this proposition is to be considered highly immoral and unjust for the British people. (4) The policy proposal or alternative to a multi-cultural Europe is consequently clear: Only regaining lost competences, especially the sovereignty over the UK’s borders will allow to decide upon who is given the privilege of living and working in the UK. More importantly, the issue at stake is, who is to make the judgment of who is to be considered
‘British’ – the British parliament versus EU bureaucrats. This again proves to be a claim aiming at emotional affection rather than a rational foundation: Most of Britain’s residing migrants are born outside the EU (about 5 million) over which the UK could generally exercise a sovereign control of its borders, while a significantly smaller number stems from within the EU (about 3 million) (Clark, 2016). Whether an exit from the Single Market will therefore allow more effective control over the number of migrants, is at least unclear. The emotional appeal of this framing, yet, is to resonate with the electorate on the basis of perceived injustice and ‘foreign infiltration’.

All in all, the key notion of “taking back control” thereby implicitly portrays Britain, as to have presumably lost control of its sovereign borders, its policy-making competences and its judiciary powers to expel foreign criminals in the first place. Merely opting for ‘common sense’ and voting leave, could restore these lost competences and therewith reestablish control – as the foundation of political, economic and cultural autonomy. “Vote Leave – take back control’s” merges migration resentment, perceived cultural decline, and a rejection of presumed loss of sovereignty into an emotional sound message, expressing a deeply felt aversion against a British integration into an anonymous supranational polity, thus in its argumentative scope outweighing their rational economic account. Based on this qualitative assessment, the second hypothesis, which theorizes a stronger number and more comprehensive extent of an emotional theme in the “Vote Leave – take back control” campaign, is to be accepted.

6. Discussion

The referendum’s press releases essentially expose a story of predominantly sober reason and economic utility on one hand, and of negative emotion, suspicion and a powerful British identity narrative, on the other. The first hypothesis, which assumes the analysis to disclose a general tendency of emotion, fueled by both sides of the isle, does not find support in the analysis of the campaign’s publications in the week prior to the referendum. “Vote Remain – Britain Stronger in’s” framing of the election as a rational economic choice, repeatedly voicing concerns of economic risks and uncertainties and appealing to individual voter’s economic utility, did not make an equivalently apparent emotional case. The manifestation of a narrow cost-benefit theme therefore lacked a corresponding emotional theme, aiming to mobilize more than just voter’s pocketbooks. The strategy of communication of “Vote Remain – Britain Stronger in” demonstrates the campaign’s reluctance and potential anxiety of making a persuasive argument for a European Britain, including qualified support for free movement, thus confronting the Brexiteers upfront. Relying on a strategy of setting out the numerous economic advantages of EU membership, could have meant to neglect the necessity to develop a positive reinforcing emotional theme. Foster (2016) attests the remain argument in general, as well as the communication on the matter of EU politics, a general “emotional deficit”, which supports this analysis. Merely condemning “Vote Leave – take back control’s” aggressive nationalist rhetoric therefore failed to put forward a positive emotional case of its own. The failure of
the remain argument therefore, as Hughes argues, “stems not just from weak communication and weak strategy, but from a lack of real commitment to the strategic case for the EU.”

“Vote Leave – take back control’s” more coherent and balanced communication strategy in terms of economic and emotional arguments, stands in stark contrast to that. By blurring the lines between fact and fiction and by referring to the referendum as a choice of identity and self-determination – and therewith as larger than economic cost and benefit considerations – the campaign skillfully merged familiar EU stereotypes with a corresponding emotional narrative and moral accusations. Their framing of the vote, founded on a long tradition of Eurosceptic thought, rhetorically reinforced classic social cleavages, such as of the wealthy elites against the poor, of cities against the countryside and of the center against the periphery, by framing the EU as a force of globalization, emphasizing its elite character, and its supposed democratic deficit. Economic anxieties, especially those of weaker national public institutions, build the foundation of a comprehensive identitarian critique of European integration. According to Clark (2016), this “may also explain why the smart, articulate arguments of the Remainer camp bounce off Brexit-minded voters like rain off a barrel: they feel as if they come from above, with a strong aftertaste of elite condescension”. Potentially indicating the success of “Vote Leave – take back control’s” strategy, Hobolt finds similar tendencies in survey data identifying the globalization cleavage as the central divide in the electorate: Her approach finds evidence for the assumptions that the so-called left-behind favored a British exit, whereas an urban, young, educated and wealthy strata did not (Hobolt, 2016). Matti and Zhou (2016) provide further support for the relevance of these central lines of divide: “the results are indicative of an ageing UK population seeking isolation from the national, racial and religious diversity associated with globalization.” Finally, Goodwin and Heath (2016) find stronger turnout in pro-leave districts, suggesting a more successful mobilization effect, and describe pro-leave sentiment as rather “widespread and socially distinct”. All in all, these findings suggest that the leave framing of the argument could have played a role in making these cleavages – globalization, migration, and anti-establishment – salient. The qualitative assessment alone does however not allow to reliably draw this inference.

7. Conclusion

A rational public, according to Habermas, is one that comes to rational policy decisions on the basis of reasonable deliberation. A so-called near-to “ideal speech situation” becomes the explicit normative expectation – a state, in which discourse is based on rational reasonability (Habermas, 1996). This implies that emotions rather contaminate a discourse, than to conciliate conflicting positions, e.g. to guarantee a stable and fair process of balancing contrary interests. Emotions, according to Habermas, are therewith implicitly identified as a force of obstruction; as an element of contradiction, in the ideal state of a rational democratic process (Marcus, 2010, p. 6). This normative principle of rational individuals in the political sphere explains the wide use of rational choice models, as theoretical and methodological instruments in explaining voter behavior (see Lewis-Beck, 1992; Lewis-Beck &
Paldam, 2000). It further explains, why the “Vote Remain – Britain Stronger in” campaign put forward a narrative of economic reason, framing the referendum as a choice of rationality against emotional delusion. Emotion, on the other hand, is to be contained and balanced through democratic institutions, aggregating and prioritizing reasonable positions over emotional affections. Findings obtained in the field of political psychology (see Marcus, 2010; Westen, 2007), however, suggest that this ideal state of democratic rationality and voter behavior is far from being the empirical reality. “Vote Leave – take back control’s” press releases are a prime example of a communication strategy that focusses on an emotional metaphoric, rather than on rational economic logic. The Brexiteers therewith chose a mode of communication that appealed to affective dispositions based on long-standing traditional Eurosceptic sentiments and on arguments that prevailed through making the vote an issue of identity, instead of a decision of the electorate’s pocketbooks. The electoral victory of the leave argument stands for itself. There is good reason to suggest that “Vote Leave – take back control’s” emotional appeal contributed in mobilizing a critical mass, changing Britain’s and the EU’s future for years to come. If the press releases however entail one decisive realization, then its “Vote Remain – Britain Stronger in’s” crucial reluctance in making a positive emotional case for Europe. “Vote Remain – Britain Stronger in” did apparently not dare to develop a complementary emotional counter-narrative that goes beyond picturing the EU as a partnership of economic convenience – which could have been their profoundest fallacy.
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8. Appendix

“Vote Remain – Britain Stronger In’s” emotional appeals:

1. "Britain is stronger, safer and better off in Europe, while leaving would be an irreversible leap in the dark."

[Vote Remain\June 22 Leaders In All Fields Are Clear Britain Is Stronger ; Position: 6 - 6]

2. "keep Britain a decent, tolerant nation, rejecting the false promises and divisive rhetoric of the Leave campaign."

[Vote Remain\June 22 Leaders In All Fields Are Clear Britain Is Stronger ; Position: 6 - 6]

3. "Britain will have a stronger, brighter and more secure future in the European Union."

[Vote Remain\June 22 Leaders In All Fields Are Clear Britain Is Stronger ; Position: 6 - 6]

4. "Quitting Europe is a risk to your family's future because a vote to leave on Thursday means there is no going back on Friday."

[Vote Remain\June 22 Leaders In All Fields Are Clear Britain Is Stronger ; Position: 6 - 6]

5. "But the vote tomorrow is about more than that. It is a momentous, generation-defining decision about what kind of country we are and what kind of future we offer our children."

[Vote Remain\June 22 Leaders In All Fields Are Clear Britain Is Stronger ; Position: 6 - 6]

6. "Britain should be leading in Europe, not leaving it."

[Vote Remain\June 22 Leaders In All Fields Are Clear Britain Is Stronger ; Position: 6 - 6]

7. "Britain faces a historic choice between prosperity, influence and security as part of Europe, or a reckless leap in the dark and years of damaging uncertainty."

[Vote Remain\June 22 Leaders In All Fields Are Clear Britain Is Stronger ; Position: 6 - 6]

8. "If we vote to leave, there is no going back."

[Vote Remain\June 22 Leaders In All Fields Are Clear Britain Is Stronger ; Position: 6 - 6]

9. "Voting Remain will secure Britain’s place as a proud, influential country with a strong economy and a bright future."

[Vote Remain\June 22 Leaders In All Fields Are Clear Britain Is Stronger ; Position: 6 - 6]
"It is patriotic to work with others to ensure our security, improve our economic wellbeing and carry British influence around Europe and the world."

"Tomorrow – millions of our fellow citizens can save our country from a mistake we would live to regret for a very long time to come."

"The Wales that we believe in, is a Wales that is outward-looking and confident. We totally reject the scaremongering and fear being whipped up by the Leave campaign and urge voters to give our children and grandchildren the best chance for a secure, prosperous future inside the EU."

"A vote for Remain is for economic security, social justice and going forward as an outward looking nation."

"We have a choice on Thursday – we can either be confident, inclusive and together or isolated, divided and insular. I know the future I want for the next generation and it’s not one behind borders and barriers - mental or physical between countries or people."

"Here in Northern Ireland we have seen the benefits of what can be achieved when people work together and I believe we have a positive role to play and a bright future - working together in the European Union."

"This vote is the biggest decision of a generation"

"By staying in Europe we secure a chance to make the EU work better for British people, defend hard won protections at work and continue to play a part in the fight against climate change."

"Britain is fairer, safe and greener in Europe"
"Tomorrow is about the future of Britain as an outstanding, outward-looking and tolerant nation."

[Vote Remain June 22 Leaders In All Fields Are Clear Britain Is Stronger ; Position: 6 - 6]

20.

"This is the biggest decision of a generation."

[Vote Remain June 22 Leaders In All Fields Are Clear Britain Is Stronger ; Position: 6 - 6]

21.

"Our children and grandchildren will have to live with its consequences - for their jobs, hopes and future prospects. For all their sakes we are Stronger In."

[Vote Remain June 22 Leaders In All Fields Are Clear Britain Is Stronger ; Position: 6 - 6]

22.

"Leaving would be a one-way ticket to a poorer and diminished Britain"

[Vote Remain June 22 Leaders In All Fields Are Clear Britain Is Stronger ; Position: 6 - 6]

23.

"Vote Remain for more jobs, lower prices, workers’ rights, stronger public services and a decent, tolerant United Kingdom."

[Vote Remain June 22 Leaders In All Fields Are Clear Britain Is Stronger ; Position: 6 - 6]

24.

"Britain has always been at its best not on its own, but as the leader of an alliance of diverse nations and peoples working together."

[Vote Remain June 22 Leaders In All Fields Are Clear Britain Is Stronger ; Position: 6 - 6]

25.

"The Leave campaign are asking us to take a step backwards into being more isolated, inward-looking and insular country."

[Vote Remain June 22 Leaders In All Fields Are Clear Britain Is Stronger ; Position: 6 - 6]

26.

"A vote to remain will secure our place as a beacon of tolerance, freedom and equality in the world."

[Vote Remain June 22 Leaders In All Fields Are Clear Britain Is Stronger ; Position: 6 - 6]

27.

"As an entrepreneur I have been known for taking risks throughout my career, but leaving the European Union is not one of the risks I would want the UK to take – not as an investor, not as a father and not as a grandfather. I am deeply concerned about the impact of leaving."

[Vote Remain June 22 Leaders In All Fields Are Clear Britain Is Stronger ; Position: 6 - 6]

28.

"We must vote to remain in the European Union and avoid becoming Little England again."

[Vote Remain June 22 Leaders In All Fields Are Clear Britain Is Stronger ; Position: 6 - 6]

29.

"Tomorrow we all face a stark and irreversible choice about what kind of country we want to be."
"This is our chance to reject division, isolationism and blame, and choose an open, tolerant United Kingdom at the heart of Europe."

"My grandfather, Sir Winston Churchill, knew we could not cut ourselves off from Europe. To do so would be always to lessen our influence and heighten the risk of conflict and instability amongst our near neighbours in our world."

"Britain is a great nation, and to cut ourselves off from the world would be a betrayal of our long history. For the sake of our children and grandchildren, I urge the nation to vote to remain in Europe."

"We live in a world where we need international agreements to confront international crises and challenges – political, environmental, economic, humanitarian. If the EU didn’t exist (imperfect as it may be), we’d have to invent it: our problems in the UK are not just ours, and we are not and should not be insulated from the problems of the rest of the continent and the world."

"Our culture and society are all enriched by being part of Europe."

"This decision is not about Britain’s past, it’s about our future."

"I believe Britain's farmers are stronger, safer and better off in the EU."

"withdrawing from the EU would diminish the UK’s role in the world"

"Brexit would undoubtedly lead to a loss of British influence, undermine Nato and give succour to the West’s enemies"
"Numerous WWII veterans have appealed to the UK to remember the terrible conflicts that the EU was set up to avoid and reiterated that the UK’s membership reinforced British values."

40.
"we will be a more valuable and influential partner for them that way, and better able to help keep us all safe."

41.
"We live in an increasingly interdependent and globalised world. No nation can afford to be too isolated. … all the member states should strive to strengthen [the EU] rather than to weaken it."

42.
"we are stronger working together"

43.
"we are stronger working together with other countries with the ability to travel, work and play sport right across the continent."

44.
"To remain a world leader in sport, we need to remain in the European Union. And that's why we'll be voting to remain on 23rd June."

45.
"Britain is an amazing country but we’ll achieve much more if we’re a team player – working with others to get things done. I believe we need to work with our friends and neighbours in Europe if we want to make changes our children can be proud of."

46.
"The sort of things young people care about: tackling climate change, helping refugees, fighting disease in Africa — they can only get fixed if we all work together."

47.
"This referendum has been hard to watch at times but, at heart, this is what I feel: I have travelled all over the world and have noticed, so often, how many of the most vulnerable people look to the UK for character and leadership, as if we are like beacons of good manners and fortitude. Our country’s values and contribution are respected across Europe and beyond; the UK is a trusted friend to so many nations. Those things can get lost in the maze of headlines."
"At such a time for the UK to retreat, run and cut ourselves loose from Europe, when there are so many challenges on our doorstep, to me just doesn't feel either courageous or kind. Europe has many flaws, but I also believe the way to help resolve many of those tough issues is from within. History has taught us that together we achieve more. I guess I believe that to help make the future of the world a better place then that future has to be about partnership."

"As a taxi driver said to me in Paris recently, we really need you, the UK. Don't desert us when times are tough, stand with us like you always have. That rang true."

"I have never been a good quitter and I am so proud of the UK and our values: tolerance, kindness, respect, courage and resilience. This is why I want us to stay together and Remain in Europe."

"I'm passionate about my country and whatever the result of Thursday's referendum, we will always be Great. Each side has the right to their opinion and that should always be respected whatever the outcome of the European Referendum."

"I was also privileged to play and live in Madrid, Milan and Paris with teammates from all around Europe and the world. Those great European cities and their passionate fans welcomed me and my family and gave us the opportunity to enjoy their unique and inspiring cultures and people."

"We live in a vibrant and connected world where together as a people we are strong. For our children and their children we should be facing the problems of the world together and not alone."

"Britain is stronger, safer and better off in Europe, while leaving would damage our economy and lessen our place in the world"
"The loss of one of the EU’s biggest members would gouge a deep wound in the rest of Europe. And, with the likes of Donald Trump and Marine Le Pen fuelling economic nationalism and xenophobia, it would mark a defeat for the liberal order that has underpinned the West’s prosperity."

[Vote Remain\June 19 Divided We Fall; Position: 3 - 3]

56.

"If Britain leaves the EU, it is likely to end up poorer, less open and less innovative."

[Vote Remain\June 19 Divided We Fall; Position: 6 - 6]

57.

"Far from reclaiming its global outlook, it will become less influential and more parochial. And without Britain, all of Europe would be worse off."

[Vote Remain\June 19 Divided We Fall; Position: 6 - 6]

58.

"Even if Britain can leave the EU it cannot leave Europe."

[Vote Remain\June 19 Divided We Fall; Position: 16 - 16]

59.

"It would weaken Europe and it would impoverish and diminish Britain."

[Vote Remain\June 19 Divided We Fall; Position: 17 - 17]

60.

"Europe is stronger with Britain in it; and likewise, Britain is stronger, more prosperous and more influential as a member of the European Union.""

[Vote Remain\June 19 Europe was key to my $1bn funding, Gates warns; Position: 11 - 11]

61.

"Today, the UK faces a decision where the risks are great. My reputation is of being a risk-taker – the cat with nine lives – but leaving the European Union is not a risk I would want to take."

[Vote Remain\June 19 Richard Branson on why he's voting Remain; Position: 5 - 5]

62.

"certainly not as a father and grandfather concerned about the world we leave to the next generation."

[Vote Remain\June 19 Richard Branson on why he's voting Remain; Position: 5 - 5]

63.

"I very rarely agree with the Prime Minister but on this he’s right: we are stronger, safer and better off in."

[Vote Remain\June 19 Jo Cox; Position: 15 - 15]

64.

"The human head knows that, especially in the world we now inhabit, our deepest desires must somehow be moderated to suit the increasingly tough reality of a competitive world in which, though still a great nation, we no longer have the power or the wealth which once allowed us to live in splendid isolation."
"Those who would have you believe in the plucky Little England of the past are selling a dangerous illusion."

"This newspaper believes that this is not the time to risk the peace and prosperity of our nation."

"For modern Great Britain to thrive and prosper we must work with, not against, our European partners; we must keep our seat at Europe’s top table and help shape its destiny; our strong, clear voice must be heard inside Europe, not be shouted from the sidelines."

"This newspaper believes in a safe, free, and prosperous future for this proud country. And so we urge you, our readers, not to take a leap into the dark. Vote to remain in the European Union – for an even greater Britain."

"Despite its many flaws, this paper believes the EU has, without question, been a force for good. It has succeeded in its aim of preventing another European conflict."

"Britain has global responsibilities. To turn our back on them would be a dereliction of our duty. Internationalism, co-operation and compromise are the tenets of modern diplomacy. Whether or not we choose to live by them will affect the stability of the world our children and grandchildren inherit."

"At its core, the European Union remains a practical expression of the belief that liberal democracies can achieve more acting in concert than they can alone. We must not turn our backs on that."

"This referendum is not just about our previous history. Where you put your X on the ballot paper is about making our own history. It is not about our past, but how we forge our future. And it is a once in a lifetime opportunity. This is truly the battle for Britain. Make Thursday Victory in Europe Day."
73.
"A vote to withdraw would be irrevocable, a grievous blow to the post-1945 liberal world order."

[Vote Remain; June 15 Britain should vote to stay in the EU - the FT; Position: 2 - 2]

74.
"The referendum campaign is a contest between competing values: between liberal internationalism and a pinched nationalism, between an open-trading system and marginalisation. This is why Britain’s allies, from Australia to Japan and the US, have unanimously supported Remain — and why Marine Le Pen and Donald Trump favour Brexit."

[Vote Remain; June 15 Britain should vote to stay in the EU - the FT; Position: 4 - 4]

75.
"Membership of the EU and, crucially, the single European market, entails some transfer of sovereignty in return for an actual gain in power as part of a greater whole."

[Vote Remain; June 15 Britain should vote to stay in the EU - the FT; Position: 6 - 6]

76.
"Britain would end up a rule-taker, not a rule-maker."

[Vote Remain; June 15 Britain should vote to stay in the EU - the FT; Position: 8 - 8]

77.
"It would trigger a political crisis in the UK — Mr Cameron would surely go — and reawaken the ghosts of nationalism in Europe."

[Vote Remain; June 15 Britain should vote to stay in the EU - the FT; Position: 10 - 10]

78.
"In 1975, when a Labour government called for a referendum on British membership of the European Economic Community, the FT rejected the notion of Britain as “a tight little island, seeking refuge in a siege economy, opting out of the main stream of world politics”. The sentiment remains resonant today. This is no time to revert to Little England. We are Great Britain. We have a contribution to make to a more prosperous, safer world. The vote must be “Remain”."

[Vote Remain; June 15 Britain should vote to stay in the EU - the FT; Position: 12 - 12]

79.
"We’re just yards from the Eurostar, which put London at the heart of Europe, and that’s where I believe the UK belongs."

[Vote Remain; June 15 Tom Watson on Brexit; Position: 3 - 3]

80.
"But if we leave the EU we leave for good - the door will be shut and we will never be allowed back in."

[Vote Remain; June 15 Tom Watson on Brexit; Position: 3 - 3]
"By joining forces with our neighbours our strong and proud nation becomes a more powerful force than any nation can ever be alone. And by partnering with our closest neighbours, we consign conflict to history."

82.
"I’ve heard people say we don’t need the EU to keep us safe anymore, because the threat of European war is behind us. That’s like saying we no longer need to generate power, because there’s electricity in every home. It’s the cooperation and interdependence of the EU that has – finally – brought peace to our time."

83.
"And today is exactly two weeks short of a century since the start of the Battle of the Somme – in which a million European men were wounded or killed in the mud, for six miles of trench. That is our common history in this continent."

84.
"Now is not the time to forget and it’s why one of the founders of the European Coal and Steel Community, Robert Schuman, saw greater economic cooperation between France, Germany and the nations of Europe as ‘the fulfilment of the same recurrent dream that for ten centuries has revisited the peoples of Europe: creating between them an organisation putting an end to war and guaranteeing an eternal peace.’"

85.
"Winston Churchill, in that famous speech in 1947, amidst the wreckage and smoke of a war-torn continent, said the goal should be: ‘to re-create the European Family…and provide it with a structure under which it can dwell in peace, in safety and in freedom.’"

86.
"This was the goal of the post-war generation. And their noble plan for peace in Europe has been their enduring legacy. Peace in Europe."

87.
"The EU is the gearbox of civility that has kept the peace in Europe for over half a century."

88.
"We’ve been reminded about how pragmatic sovereignty works: how successive governments have chosen to pool aspects of sovereign power to achieve national objectives. To protect our country in an
age of deepening globalization: this objective cannot be met in any other way. This is not a time for isolationism."

[Vote Remain\June 15 Tom Watson on Brexit; Position: 4 - 4]

89.
"When I think of the peace dividend that the EU has given us I can’t help but shudder at the sheer recklessness of leaving, not so much a leap in the dark as a leap backwards, trying to recreate a Europe of Nationalist competition rather than peaceful co-operation between nations."

[Vote Remain\June 15 Tom Watson on Brexit; Position: 4 - 4]

90.
"In fact, there is an economic case, a social case, a patriotic case, and a political case for us to remain in the EU."

[Vote Remain\June 15 Tom Watson on Brexit; Position: 4 - 4]

91.
"Co-operation. Peaceful co-existence. International solidarity. These are Labour values."

[Vote Remain\June 15 Tom Watson on Brexit; Position: 4 - 4]

92.
"John Smith rebelled against a Labour whip only once. It was in 1971, and he and 68 other Labour MPs defied a three-line whip to support Britain’s membership of the EEC. John did so because he believed in the ideals of Europe, in strong institutions, in the common market. He thought it the most important issue he would ever face as a Labour MP."

[Vote Remain\June 15 Tom Watson on Brexit; Position: 4 - 4]

93.
"The Leave campaign has no plan. They’ve admitted they ‘just don’t know’ what leaving looks like. But we do. Leaving is a leap in the dark that would put our children’s future and Britain’s place in the world at risk."

[Vote Remain\June 15 Leaving the Eu would spark deep spending cuts; Position: 48 - 48]

94.
"we're stronger together, working with not apart from our closest neighbours and allies."

[Vote Remain\June 15 Leaving the Eu would spark deep spending cuts; Position: 66 - 66]

“Vote Leave – take back control’s” emotional appeals:

95.
"Whichever party is in charge, the Government cannot sort out our problems or deliver their promises because they have to follow EU rules. If we want things to change we must take back control."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 22 2016 VOTE LEAVE FOR A FAIRER BRITAIN - Vote Leave; Position: 6 - 6]
96. "This vote is about whether the British public are able to choose the people who make their laws and spend their money."

97. "If we vote to stay, we are voting to continue being ruled by people we cannot chuck out. We will keep losing control"

98. "If we vote leave, it will be a glorious strengthening of our democracy."

99. "We will take back control of our laws."

100. "We will take back control of our money"

101. "We will take back control of migration policy. Migration brings many benefits but we have lost democratic control. This is even more dangerous because there are five more countries in the queue to join. If we Vote Leave, we can introduce a humane and fair points-based system that does not discriminate against people based on the country they live in. The public will again be able to control migration policy at elections."

102. "The IN campaign has nothing to offer except threats and talking down Britain. They've spent month after month saying Britain is too weak to take back control. They’ve even claimed that a Leave vote will mean World War Three. They've given up on the EU improving. They admit it's rubbish but say we have to sacrifice democracy for trade."
103. "This referendum is not a choice between democracy and trade. Countries around the world trade with the EU without giving away control over their own laws."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 22 2016 VOTE LEAVE FOR A FAIRER BRITAIN - Vote Leave; Position: 14 - 14]

104. "Britain is a great country. We will be even greater if we take back control of our own democracy."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 22 2016 VOTE LEAVE FOR A FAIRER BRITAIN - Vote Leave; Position: 15 - 15]

105. "Britain is all about fairness. We believe that Britain will be a fairer country if we vote leave tomorrow."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 22 2016 VOTE LEAVE FOR A FAIRER BRITAIN - Vote Leave; Position: 17 - 17]

106. "David Cameron has been criticised for not being straight with the British public over Turkish membership of the EU."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 22 2016 Turkish government and Major contradict Cameron - ; Position: 2 - 2]

107. "This morning Sir John Major admitted that Turkey could join the EU in ‘a decade’,"

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 22 2016 Turkish government and Major contradict Cameron - ; Position: 3 - 3]

108. "David Cameron has repeatedly claimed that Turkey is not going to join the EU despite it being Government policy. Now the Turkish government has confirmed that he is the ‘chief supporter’ of their bid to join the EU."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 22 2016 Turkish government and Major contradict Cameron - ; Position: 5 - 5]

109. "Cameron also said that Turkey will not join until the year 3000 but Sir John Major has let the cat out of the bag - Turkey could be in the EU in ten years’ time."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 22 2016 Turkish government and Major contradict Cameron - ; Position: 6 - 6]

110.
"I’m afraid there is no conclusion you can draw from this, except that David Cameron is colluding with the EU and lying to the British people. Families are suffering the consequences of uncontrolled migration - a direct result of the EU’s obsession with freedom of movement."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 22 2016 Turkish government and Major contradict Cameron - ; Position: 7 - 7]

111.

"With five more countries lining up to join the EU - Albania, Serbia, Montenegro, Macedonia, and Turkey - this problem can only get worse."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 22 2016 Turkish government and Major contradict Cameron - ; Position: 8 - 8]

112.

"Former Prime Minister, Sir John Major, admitted on the last day of the campaign that Turkey may join the EU in 10 years."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 22 2016 Turkish government and Major contradict Cameron - ; Position: 11 - 11]

113.

"Turkey and four other countries are joining the EU. This is being accelerated with unanimous support. Talks could begin the day after the referendum."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 22 2016 Turkish government and Major contradict Cameron - ; Position: 12 - 12]

114.

"The UK Government is actively considering granting visa-free access to Turkey after the referendum."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 22 2016 Turkish government and Major contradict Cameron - ; Position: 13 - 13]

115.

"The Home Secretary, Theresa May, has acknowledged that Turkish accession is a risk to our security."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 22 2016 Turkish government and Major contradict Cameron - ; Position: 14 - 14]

116.

"Former Prime Minister, Sir John Major, admitted on the last day of the campaign that Turkey may join the EU in 10 years."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 22 2016 Turkish government and Major contradict Cameron - ; Position: 16 - 16]

117.

"Sir John Major said that Turkey ‘won't get in for one decade [or] two decades’"
"This directly contradicts the Prime Minister, who has claimed that Turkey would not join for a thousand years (Daily Telegraph, May 2016, link)."

"Turkey and four other countries are joining the EU. This is being accelerated with unanimous support. Talks could begin the day after the referendum."

"This confirmed a report that David Cameron has agreed to the talks being sped up. These could begin the day after the referendum (Financial Times, 14 June 2016, link)."

"There is unanimous support in the EU for the quickening pace of Turkish accession."

"David Cameron strongly supports this. In 2010, Cameron said he was ‘angry’ at the slow pace of Turkish accession, that he was the ‘strongest possible advocate for EU membership’ for Turkey, and that ‘I want us to pave the road from Ankara to Brussels’ (Prime Minister’s Office, 27 July 2010, link)."

"The Government admitted it supported Turkish accession last month. Last month, the Europe Minister, David Lidington, said: ‘The UK supports Turkey’s EU accession process’ (Turkey: EU Accession: Written question - 33258, 14 April 2016, link)."

"The British public will not get a vote on the accession of Turkey to the EU."
"The Government opposes giving the British people a say."

"The UK is paying £2bn to help Turkey, Albania, Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia to join the EU."

"The Government is actively considering granting approximately 1 million Turkish citizens visa-free travel to the UK."

"The Government also described the possibility of visa-free access for ‘1.8 million Kosovars’ to be ‘a drop in that larger ocean’ and noted the Commission was planning to ‘slipstream’ Kosovo ‘behind Turkey’ (Sunday Times, 12 June 2016, link; BBC News, 12 June 2016, link)."

"As Sir James Dyson said today, this is the last opportunity to regain control of our futures. If we want to take back control and have a more secure and more prosperous future, we have to Vote Leave on 23 June."

"can’t explain how we can ever control immigration from inside the EU."

"They couldn’t even be honest about how many laws in this country come from Brussels."
"they can choose project fear and vote IN or they can chose project hope and take back control of their money and their borders."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 21 2016 IN campaign cant find a positive reason to stay in; Position: 3 - 3]

133.

"A vote to Leave on Thursday is a vote for democracy."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 21 2016 IN campaign cant find a positive reason to stay in; Position: 3 - 3]

134.

"The Government gave up its veto over the next Treaty as part of the renegotiation."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 21 2016 IN campaign cant find a positive reason to stay in; Position: 5 - 5]

135.

"This means the UK is committing to support the planned new EU Treaty."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 21 2016 IN campaign cant find a positive reason to stay in; Position: 9 - 9]

136.

"Research by the House of Commons Library shows that in 2013, 61.2% of legislation was made by Brussels (House of Commons Library, 2 June 2014, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 21 2016 IN campaign cant find a positive reason to stay in; Position: 11 - 11]

137.

"The CBI has admitted ‘over 50% of all government legislation originat[es] in Brussels’ (CBI, August 2005, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 21 2016 IN campaign cant find a positive reason to stay in; Position: 12 - 12]

138.

"The CBI has said: ‘It is calculated that 70% of all new legislation relevant to business is now European rather than national in origin’ (CBI, 1999, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 21 2016 IN campaign cant find a positive reason to stay in; Position: 13 - 13]

139.

"Nick Clegg has admitted: ‘half of all new legislation now enacted in the UK begins in Brussels’ (Guardian, 8 December 2003, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 21 2016 IN campaign cant find a positive reason to stay in; Position: 14 - 14]

140.
"Chuka Ummuna has said: ‘EU legislation… accounts for around half of all new regulation’ (Speech, 25 October 2011, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 21 2016 IN campaign cant find a positive reason to stay in; Position: 15 - 15]

141.

"The new EU Treaty will transfer major powers to the EU institutions from the British Parliament and courts."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 21 2016 IN campaign cant find a positive reason to stay in; Position: 16 - 16]

142.

"Taking control of the NHS: Last February, European Commissioner for Health, Vytenis Andriukaitis, called to ‘change the European Union treaties in the future’ to allow the EU to take control of public health, including over alcohol (Politico, 7 February 2015, link). He has said ‘I can’t imagine a more economically effective possibility than to manage health issues at EU level’ (EU Reporter, 2 October 2015, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 21 2016 IN campaign cant find a positive reason to stay in; Position: 19 - 19]

143.

"The EU has stopped us removing dangerous individuals from the UK."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 21 2016 IN campaign cant find a positive reason to stay in; Position: 22 - 22]

144.

"Terrorists."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 21 2016 IN campaign cant find a positive reason to stay in; Position: 23 - 23]

145.

"Murderers."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 21 2016 IN campaign cant find a positive reason to stay in; Position: 24 - 24]

146.

"Rapists."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 21 2016 IN campaign cant find a positive reason to stay in; Position: 25 - 25]

147.

"Turkey and four other countries are joining the EU. This is being accelerated with unanimous support. Talks could begin the day after the referendum."
"preparatory work continues at an accelerated pace to make progress on five Chapters’ (European Commission, 15 June 2016, link)."

"There is unanimous support in the EU for the quickening pace of Turkish accession."

"David Cameron strongly supports this. In 2010, Cameron said he was ‘angry’ at the slow pace of Turkish accession, that he was the ‘strongest possible advocate for EU membership’ for Turkey, and that ‘I want us to pave the road from Ankara to Brussels’ (Prime Minister’s Office, 27 July 2010, link)."

"The Government admitted it supported Turkish accession last month. Last month, the Europe Minister, David Lidington, said: ‘The UK supports Turkey’s EU accession process’ (Turkey: EU Accession: Written question - 33258, 14 April 2016, link)."

"The British public will not get a vote on the accession of Turkey to the EU."

"The UK is paying £2bn to help Turkey, Albania, Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia to join the EU."
"which would keep a convicted killer in the UK because of EU law."

"This case shines a light on the skewed moral compass at the heart of EU rules on free movement.

"An EU national convicted of brutally killing someone in this country, by hammering and strangling them to death, can't be removed on the basis of the conviction by a UK court. It's dangerous and undemocratic. The Prime Minister is absolutely right to describe the legal position as "complete madness"."

"The only way to restore some sanity is to vote leave and take back control of our borders on 23 June."

"was convicted of a brutal killing in 2002, but the Court of Appeal ruled that Theresa May could not remove him from the UK."

"EU law has meant the UK cannot remove convicted murderers and persons involved in terrorism. David Cameron once described this as 'complete madness'."

"If we Vote Leave, we will take back the power to remove dangerous persons whose presence in the UK is not conducive to the public good."
"Nonetheless, in September 2012, the Court of Appeal ruled his deportation was inconsistent with EU law because, in light of rulings of the European Court, ‘imperative grounds’ did not exist to justify his deportation (FV (Italy) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2013] 1 WLR 3339, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 21 2016 EU law keeps killers in the UK - Vote Leave; Position: 15 - 15]

163.

"EU law stopped the UK removing convicted murderer Learco Chindamo."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 21 2016 EU law keeps killers in the UK - Vote Leave; Position: 17 - 17]

164.

"Cameron said: ‘This does seem to be complete madness’ (ITN Source, 21 August 2007, clip 3, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 21 2016 EU law keeps killers in the UK - Vote Leave; Position: 17 - 17]

165.

"EU law stops us removing persons who have been involved in terrorism."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 21 2016 EU law keeps killers in the UK - Vote Leave; Position: 18 - 18]

166.

"On 8 May 2016, Vote Leave set out plans immediately to ‘amend the European Communities Act 1972 to provide that the Home Secretary can remove all foreign nationals on the ground their presence would not be conducive to the public good and that all foreign nationals sentenced to more than a year’s imprisonment are subject to automatic deportation’"

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 21 2016 EU law keeps killers in the UK - Vote Leave; Position: 24 - 24]

167.

"EU judges are stopping us from deporting dangerous criminals and terrorist suspects. This makes us less safe - that’s why we should take back control’"

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 21 2016 EU law keeps killers in the UK - Vote Leave; Position: 25 - 25]

168.

"we should ‘end the situation where an international court can tell us who we can and cannot deport’"

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 21 2016 EU law keeps killers in the UK - Vote Leave; Position: 26 - 26]

169.

"The EU is costly, bureaucratic and blind"

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 21 2016 The EU and the European Court increase the cost of; Position: 3 - 3]
170. "Not only is a vote to leave on Thursday a vote for democracy, it is also a vote for a more prosperous future."

[Vote Leave - take back control|June 21 2016 The EU and the European Court increase the cost of; Position: 3 - 3]

171. "If we vote to leave we can take back control of the money we send to the EU and spend it on our own priorities. Over the course of this Parliament our net contributions to Brussels are set to total almost £50 billion - think what we could do with that if we were able to take back control and spend it on our own priorities. Think about the changes we could make to improve the lives of people and communities across the UK."

[Vote Leave - take back control|June 21 2016 We could have avoided austerity - Vote Leave; Position: 20 - 20]

172. "It is time to take back control, and reclaim the right to spend our own money on the things that matter to us."

[Vote Leave - take back control|June 21 2016 We could have avoided austerity - Vote Leave; Position: 21 - 21]

173. "British Embassy staff in multiple non-EU countries, including Turkey and Serbia, are working to facilitate their entry into the European Union."

[Vote Leave - take back control|June 20 2016 British embassies have dedicated teams to help Tur; Position: 2 - 2]

174. "The Government webpage for the British Embassy in Ankara states ‘we have a dedicated team working on projects to improve Turkey’s prospects of joining the EU’, whilst the Government webpage for the British Embassy in Belgrade explains that ‘the UK’s main goal in Serbia is to see the implementation of the political, economic and social reforms necessary for Serbia’s EU accession.’"

[Vote Leave - take back control|June 20 2016 British embassies have dedicated teams to help Tur; Position: 3 - 3]

175. "Furthermore, the webpages for British Embassies in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Ukraine and Georgia all contain statements that the UK is supporting their ambitions of EU membership."

[Vote Leave - take back control|June 20 2016 British embassies have dedicated teams to help Tur; Position: 4 - 4]
"UK taxpayers are already paying almost £2 billion to support the accession of Albania, Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia and Turkey, however these findings suggest that further dedicated resources are being used to help them join the EU."

"It is clear that despite David Cameron protestations, the machinery of Government is being used to accelerate the pace at which Turkey and other nations join the EU."

"This evening the Prime Minister failed to clarify whether it remains official Government policy to pave the road from Ankara to Brussels and how much, and in what way, taxpayers’ money is being spent to help Turkey and other nations join the European Union, on top of the £2 billion bill we already know about."

"We send £350 million every week to the EU. With our public services already under huge pressure, it is perverse for taxpayers’ money to be spent on helping these countries join the EU when the result would inevitably be increased migration to the UK, only adding to the strain. This is why it’s safer to take back control on 23 June."

"British embassies clearly show that the UK is supporting the accession of countries to join the EU"

"The official Government website for the British Embassy in Turkey states that there is ‘a dedicated team working on projects to improve Turkey’s prospects of joining the EU.’"

"The official Government website for the British Embassy in Serbia states that ‘the UK’s main goal in Serbia is to see the implementation of the political, economic and social reforms necessary for Serbia’s EU accession.’ (link)"
The official Government website for the British Embassy in Bosnia and Herzegovina states ‘we are working in Bosnia and Herzegovina to help reform areas including the rule of law, justice, anti-corruption and defence, to meet conditions for EU and NATO membership.’

"The official Government website for the British Embassy in Ukraine states ‘we work closely with Ukrainian authorities to support the EU integration of Ukraine’"

"The official Government website for the British Embassy in Georgia states ‘we support Georgia’s Euro-Atlantic aspirations.’"

"UK pays £1.8 billion to help Albania, Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia and Turkey to join the EU"

"We should have the power to set our own tax rates in this country rather than being told what to do by the EU. It is an affront to democracy and it directly impacts on British families - with their latest plans set to cost every household more than £2500. That’s on top of the £350 million we send to the EU every week. The only way to take back control is to Vote Leave on Thursday."

"David Cameron repeatedly refused to say that he would veto Turkey joining the EU. That’s because - in his own words - he is the “strongest possible advocate” of Turkey joining. He has said before that he is “angry” that it is taking too long for Turkey to join. The EU has recently accelerated talks with Turkey with David Cameron’s support and UK taxpayers are sending £1 billion to Turkey to help them join. You cannot trust Cameron on Turkey."
"Cameron had no answers to people’s legitimate concerns on immigration tonight and failed to set out how he would meet his manifesto pledge to bring the numbers back down to the tens of thousands while remaining in the EU. He had no answer on how we would fund the NHS to cope with higher levels of immigration."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 19 2016 David Cameron repeatedly refused to answer basic q; Position: 4 - 4]

"If you don’t believe Cameron’s spin and want to take back control you need to Vote Leave on Thursday."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 19 2016 David Cameron repeatedly refused to answer basic q; Position: 5 - 5]

"David Cameron strongly supports Turkish accession and has said he is ‘angry’ at the slow pace of Turkish accession."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 19 2016 David Cameron repeatedly refused to answer basic q; Position: 8 - 8]

"The EU is accelerating Turkish accession with unanimous support."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 19 2016 David Cameron repeatedly refused to answer basic q; Position: 9 - 9]

"The Government admitted it supported Turkish accession during the campaign. In April, the Europe Minister, David Lidington, said: ‘The UK supports Turkey’s EU accession process’ (Turkey: EU Accession: Written question - 33258, 14 April 2016, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 19 2016 David Cameron repeatedly refused to answer basic q; Position: 10 - 10]

"The British public will not get a vote on the accession of Turkey to the EU."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 19 2016 David Cameron repeatedly refused to answer basic q; Position: 11 - 11]

"The Government opposes giving the British people a say."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 19 2016 David Cameron repeatedly refused to answer basic q; Position: 12 - 12]
"We are paying billions to Turkey and other candidate countries to join. Turkey is set to receive £1 billion of UK funds to help prepare it for membership. The EU is paying €17.7 billion to Albania, Serbia, Turkey, Macedonia and Montenegro to join the EU. The UK is paying almost £1.8 billion to these five countries to join (Vote Leave, 27 April 2016, link)."

"Persons coming to the UK with EU law rights account for more than half of net migration."

"Oxford University’s Migration Observatory concluded that the proposed welfare reforms are ‘unlikely’ to ‘lead to a large reduction in EU migration to the UK’ (Oxford University Migration Observatory, 4 May 2016, link)."

"The public want change. ICM polling shows that by 49% to 26%, the public think recent EU migration has been bad for the UK and that 58% would be unhappy if current levels continue. A majority of the public think recent EU migration has been bad for the NHS (55%), schools (58%) and housing (67%) (Daily Mail, 2 June 2016, link)."

"EU migrants can claim unemployment benefit"

"The UK is an open and tolerant nation and immigration has made the UK better and stronger. We should be proud that as a country we help refugees and people in need from around the world."

"Both Jeremy Corbyn and George Osborne today said that we should accept having no control over free movement of people into the UK from the EU - we disagree."
203.
"Government policy and EU policy is to have five more countries join the EU - including Turkey. It's also their plan to open up visa free travel from Turkey after our referendum this year. If we stay in the EU then this is bound over time to lead to further movement of people into the UK."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 19 2016 Stuart PM has questions to answer on Turkey - Vote; Position: 6 - 6]

204.
"will he use his veto to stop Turkey joining the EU?"

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 19 2016 Stuart PM has questions to answer on Turkey - Vote; Position: 7 - 7]

205.
"Will he commit to stopping Turkish citizens being given visa free access to the UK?"

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 19 2016 Stuart PM has questions to answer on Turkey - Vote; Position: 7 - 7]

206.
"Leading members of the IN campaign, including Tom Watson and Theresa May, called for controls on free movement last week."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 19 2016 Stuart PM has questions to answer on Turkey - Vote; Position: 25 - 25]

207.
"The former Secretary of State for Children, Schools and Families, Ed Balls, recognised that free movement was causing problems, stating ‘while a limit has been secured on the benefits paid to migrant workers - I don’t think that can be the end of the story. We need to press Europe to restore proper borders, and put new controls on economic migration’ (Daily Mirror, 13 June 2016, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 19 2016 Stuart PM has questions to answer on Turkey - Vote; Position: 28 - 28]

208.
"David Cameron has to explain whether he will stop paying money to Turkey to facilitate its accession."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 19 2016 Stuart PM has questions to answer on Turkey - Vote; Position: 30 - 30]

209.
"Turkey is set to receive over £1 billion of UK funds to help prepare it for membership. The EU is paying €17.7 billion to Albania, Serbia, Turkey, Macedonia and Montenegro to join the EU. The UK is paying almost £1.8 billion to these five countries to join (Vote Leave, 27 April 2016, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 19 2016 Stuart PM has questions to answer on Turkey - Vote; Position: 31 - 31]
"David Cameron strongly supports Turkish accession."

"The British public will not get a vote on the accession of Turkey to the EU."

"The Government opposes giving the British people a say."

"In addition, preparatory work continues at an accelerated pace to make progress on five Chapters’"

"The Commission also issued a detailed statement on the rapidly accelerating progress of Turkish accession."

"Turkey’s EU membership talks are set to be given a boost within a fortnight, after Britain abandoned its attempt to freeze the process of opening a new “negotiating chapter” with Ankara until after its EU referendum"

"There is unanimous support in the EU for the quickening pace of Turkish accession."

"On 18 March 2016, the European Council unanimously agreed that the EU should ‘re-energise the accession process’ and that Turkish acceleration should be ‘accelerated’ (European Council, 18 March 2016, link)."
"The Government is considering granting visa-free access to over a million Turkish citizens."

"The Government is actively considering granting approximately 1 million Turkish citizens visa-free travel to the UK. The Government admitted this was ‘a risk’. The Government also described the possibility of visa-free access for ‘1.8 million Kosovars’ to be ‘a drop in that larger ocean’ and noted the Commission was planning to ‘slipstream’ Kosovo ‘behind Turkey’ (Sunday Times, 12 June 2016, link; BBC News, 12 June 2016, link)."

"This morning, Jeremy Corbyn acknowledged that there can be no upper limit on migration if we stay in the EU. Minutes later, George Osborne admitted that there is no prospect of meeting the Government's migration targets."

"The IN campaign have no answers on how we can control immigration if we stay in the EU."

"The only way to get a fairer immigration policy and to bring in an Australian style points-based system is to Vote Leave on 23 June."

"there could be no limits on immigration while we remain in the EU"

"Jeremy Corbyn admitted the EU’s failing economic policies were causing population flows into the UK."
"Reviving the Migration Impact Fund would not alleviate the burden on public services"

"uncontrolled migration"

"George Osborne said there is no evidence migration would fall if we left the EU."

"'upper limit’ on migration, Jeremy Corbyn said: ‘I don’t think you can have one while you have the free movement of labour’.

"free movement of labour should be renegotiated"

"If you actually deliberately lower living standards and increase poverty in certain countries in south east and eastern Europe, then you’re bound to have a flow of people looking for somewhere else to go"

"this would not alleviate pressure on public services caused by uncontrolled migration."

"If the fund were revived, it would be the equivalent of an additional £106 per net migrant to the UK in 2015 (ONS, 2015, link). This is much less than the cost of providing public services."
"I've seen absolutely no evidence migration levels will fall’ if the UK left the EU."

"Are the people able to choose the governments that make their laws and to throw them out when they fail? I believe leaving the EU is the way to safeguard this precious right."

"The European Commission has already announced it intends to silence the UK’s voice in the IMF."

"The European Parliament voted for the UK to be silenced in the IMF in April."

"The European Court will force this through."

"Our NHS is being hit hard by population growth driven in large part by migration from other EU member states of 270,000 a year."

"The numbers coming to the UK are likely to increase further as people escape crisis-hit areas of the Eurozone such as Greece."
"In addition, five low-income countries are being lined up to join the EU -- Turkey, Macedonia, Serbia, Albania and Montenegro."

"A major trade deal with the United States could hand increasing control and power over the NHS to the EU."

"The Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) allows for an undemocratic institution potentially to tear down regulatory barriers and reduce protection against big businesses who want unprecedented access to Europe’s public health services."

"Britain currently sends £10 billion a year net of taxpayers’ money to the EU to fund an undemocratic institution."

"we want fair, well controlled migration"

"It will be built using an Australian-style points system that welcomes the skilled people we need in the NHS and other walks of life, but ends the uncontrolled free-for-all which allows anyone from an EU country to come and live here."

"By remaining in the EU we have no legally binding assurance that the NHS, its staff and patients will be protected."
"The UK will have little power over the EU changing its mind"

"I am voting Leave to protect one of the most fundamental and valued institutions in our society: the National Health Service."

"The IN campaign maintains that there is no prospect of Turkey joining the EU. Some IN campaigners have claimed that Turkish accession will not happen ‘until the year 3000’. Others have asserted that Turkish accession is not ‘on the cards’. These claims are in conflict with official Government policy and that of the European Union."

"It is Government policy that Turkey should join the European Union and ‘to pave the road from Ankara to Brussels.’"

"It is Government policy that the United Kingdom is the ‘strongest possible advocate of Turkish accession’ and that Turkish accession will make the UK ‘more secure’ and ‘richer’, the same argument the Government makes for why the UK must remain in the European Union."

"It is also the policy of the European Union that Turkey should join the EU."

"In March, the Heads of Government unanimously agreed that the EU should ‘re-energise the accession process’ and that Turkish acceleration should be ‘accelerated’."

63
"The European Commission has confirmed that this is its policy on several occasions since, most recently on 15 June. The new building in which the European Council will sit is specifically designed to accommodate more members of the European Union. There are enough translation booths to accommodate the five current candidate countries, Albania, Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia and Turkey. Official designs show that the European Council table itself will have a seat for the President of Turkey."

"It is also a fact that both the European Union and the United Kingdom are paying billions to Turkey in order to facilitate its accession."

"The EU is paying €17.7 billion to Albania, Serbia, Turkey, Macedonia and Montenegro to join the EU. The UK is paying almost £1.8 billion to these five countries to join."

"the Government is actively considering granting approximately 1 million Turkish citizens visa-free travel to the UK. The Government admitted this was ‘a risk’."

"The Government also described the possibility of visa-free access for ‘1.8 million Kosovars’ to be ‘a drop in that larger ocean’ and noted the Commission was planning to ‘slipstream’ Kosovo ‘behind Turkey’."

"Just this week, the United Kingdom Government dropped its objections to the opening of another chapter, on financial and budgetary issues. It is expected that formal talks could begin as early as 24 June 2016, the day after the public will vote on whether to remain in the European Union or to take
back control. On 15 June, the Commission confirmed the accuracy of this report, stating talks could begin ‘by end of June’.

"rapidly accelerating pace of accession negotiations"

"This claim is obviously artificial given the Government’s commitment to Turkish accession at the earliest possible opportunity."

"They also insist that this is the public’s last opportunity to have a say on Europe in our lifetimes."

"To veto the accession of Turkey to the European Union and the continuation of accession talks"

"To stop the extension of visa-free travel to Turkey, planned for this year"

"The only way to avoid having common borders with Turkey is to Vote Leave and take back control"

"Can you confirm whether it is Government policy not to seek any further reforms of EU ‘free movement’ laws and regulations?"

"David Cameron wants to “pave the road from Ankara”."
"the Commission in their own words are accelerating the bid"

"Voters want to take back control, not see a border free zone from the English Channel to Syria."

"The European Commission has this morning announced that Turkish membership talks are being conducted ‘at an accelerated pace’ with talks to begin ‘by end of June’."

"This confirms yesterday’s report that David Cameron has agreed to a quickening of accession talks, which could begin as early as the day after the referendum."

"This is just the latest example of Turkey’s accession being fast-tracked."

"David Cameron strongly supports Turkish accession at the earliest moment."

"Turkey is set to join the EU in the near future"

"The European Commission has this morning announced that Turkish membership talks are being conducted ‘at an accelerated pace’."
"preparatory work continues at an accelerated pace to make progress on five Chapters’ (European Commission, 15 June 2016, link)."

"The Commission issued a detailed statement on the rapidly accelerating progress of Turkish accession this morning. Part of this process will occur ‘at the end of June’, just after the public votes."

"This confirms yesterday’s report that David Cameron has agreed to a quickening of accession talks, which could begin as early as the day after the referendum."

"Turkey’s EU membership talks are set to be given a boost within a fortnight, after Britain abandoned its attempt to freeze the process of opening a new “negotiating chapter” with Ankara until after its EU referendum… At a meeting of diplomats on Tuesday morning, Britain was the only member state to refuse to give its consent for talks to begin with Ankara on financial and budgetary issues, in spite of its traditional standing as one of the biggest champions of Turkish membership talks. However, London’s resistance only lasted a few hours, which means the formal opening of talks is expected on June 24 or 30, in line with the Turkey-EU deal’ (Financial Times, 14 June 2016, link)."

"This is just the latest example of Turkey’s accession being fast-tracked."

"the EU welcomed a re-energizing of the accession process’ as part of its attempt to contain its migrant crisis (European Council, link)."

"his represented a quickening of Turkish accession talks (European Commission, January 2016, link)."
In May 2016, the Commission announced that progress towards accession would ‘accelerate’ (European Commission, 4 May 2016, link).

David Cameron strongly supports Turkish accession at the earliest moment.

David Cameron strongly supports Turkish accession.

The Government admitted it supported Turkish accession during the campaign.

The British public will not get a vote on the accession of Turkey to the EU.

The Government opposes giving the British people a say.

Turkey is set to join the EU in the near future:

Turkey is due to join the EU in the next few years, having already signed a deal with the EU to prepare for accession (European Commission, March 2016, link).
"The new European Council building contains chairs and building space for Turkey when it joins (Daily Mail, May 2016, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control] June 15 2016 IN campaign’s claims on Turkey are falling apart -;
Position: 29 - 29]

293.

"British businesses, the job creators, deserve credit - as well as the hardworking British people. We are a great nation, and next week we have the once in a lifetime opportunity to be even greater - if we vote to leave the EU, with it’s job destroying single currency."

[Vote Leave - take back control] June 15 2016 Employment statistics confound IN campaign’s attem;
Position: 4 - 4]

294.

"A vote to leave is a vote to get back control of our economy, our borders, and our democracy - and to look forward to a safer, more secure, and more prosperous future."

[Vote Leave - take back control] June 15 2016 Employment statistics confound IN campaign’s attem;
Position: 5 - 5]

295.

"If we Vote Leave, we will be able to take back control of the millions we send to the EU every week and we will be able to invest in our priorities like the NHS instead."

[Vote Leave - take back control] June 15 2016 Steve Baker I could not support Osborne’s plans to;
Position: 4 - 4]

296.

"If you want a brighter future the only option is to Vote Leave on 23 June."

[Vote Leave - take back control] June 15 2016 Steve Baker I could not support Osborne’s plans to;
Position: 4 - 4]

297.

"Now they want us to believe that we can’t take back control from Brussels"

[Vote Leave - take back control] June 15 2016 EU-funded CBI does not represent British business;
Position: 3 - 3]

298.

"The CBI knows the real Albanian option is to vote to stay and supports free movement with Turkey."

[Vote Leave - take back control] June 15 2016 EU-funded CBI does not represent British business;
Position: 7 - 7]

299.

"Business polling has consistently shown a majority of firms want the British Government, not the EU, in charge of trade policy and reject the premise of the so-called ‘single market’."

[Vote Leave - take back control] June 15 2016 EU-funded CBI does not represent British business;
Position: 14 - 14]
"The CBI knows the real Albanian option is to vote to stay and supports free movement with Turkey."

"Albania is currently a candidate country to join the EU"

"would support free movement in relation to Turkey"

"Business polling has consistently shown a majority of firms want the British Government, not the EU, in charge of trade policy and reject the premise of the so-called ‘single market’."
"This is literally the gravy train that the £350 million a week we send to Brussels is paying for. If we weren’t paying for the fine dining and extravagant cuisine of MEPs we would have more money to spend on our priorities like the NHS."

"Too many in Brussels seem more concerned with their lunch menu than they are with dealing with the challenges the EU is incapable of solving. If we want to take back control of our borders, economy and democracy we have to Vote Leave on 23 June."

"MEPs and EU bureaucrats have their pick of 34 eateries and bars. There are 16 places to eat or drink within the EU institutions in Brussels and 15 at Strasbourg (EU, Handbook for Members, pp. 102-103)."

"‘Standard’ European Parliament fare includes white asparagus and blood orange mousse. Menu options at one of the standard cafeterias includes white asparagus with avocado and citrus fruit dressing, gnocchi with spinach and sundried tomatoes and mandarine and blood orange mousse (European Parliament Brussels, Cafeteria PHS)."

"The options at the MEPs’ private Members’ Restaurant are even more lavish. These include:

- ‘Guinea fowl with mushrooms and tartufata, fried and raw fruit tartare, veal gravy flavoured with balsamic vinegar’
- ‘Lobster tempura with mashed peas, asparagus espuma’
- ‘Lamb fillet ‘Welsh irish’ stuffed with a Morriles curry, candided vegetables tartlet, gratin dauphinoise, thyme gravy’ (Parlement Europeen, Members’ Restaurant ASP 00G, Photographs of Members’ Restaurant Menus)."
"They also have the choice of an extensive wine list. Options include Chateau Carbonnieux Pessac Leognan 2008, at €60 and Chateau Dutruch Grand Poujeaux 2004 at €50,50 (Photographs of Members’ Restaurant Wine List)."

314.

"But MEPs have actually been complaining about the standard of food at the European Parliament. One MEP asked the following official question of the Parliament: ‘The quality of the food in the canteen in Brussels has been perceived as decreasing in the last two years. This is especially serious during Strasbourg sessions. Has this been evaluated?’ (European Parliament, 2011 Discharge Questionnaire, 22.3)."

315.

"The Parliament spends huge amounts catering for MEPs and their staff. A brief insight into the costs behind this were revealed in references to €38,000 being spent on a vegetable cutter and €53,000 on cooking vessels for the main Strasbourg kitchen in 2010 (European Parliament, 2010 Discharge Questionnaire, p. 12)"

316.

"MEPs can actually order alcohol from the Parliament’s operations department to be delivered to their office. The European Parliament’s operations directorate, DG INLO, has a special form or ‘Bon de commande’ which MEPs can fax to the central purchases department. They can order a three carton box of 3 x 70cl bottles of five year old blended scotch whisky for €80 each; 10 year old Speyside Single Malt at €115; 10 year old Islay Single Malt at €130 for the three bottles; or six bottles of champagne for €187.50 (European Parliament DG Inglo, Bon de Commande)."

317.

"MEPs can claim a €306 subsistence allowance. If the official activity takes place within the EU, the Member receives a lump-sum allowance of €306 per diem (European Parliament Website, 2016, link)."
"take back control from the EU"

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 15 2016 A framework for taking back control and establishi; Position: 11 - 11]

319.
"taking real steps to limit immigration"

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 15 2016 A framework for taking back control and establishi; Position: 11 - 11]

320.
"to end the situation where an international court can tell us who we can and cannot deport."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 15 2016 A framework for taking back control and establishi; Position: 11 - 11]

321.
"It would immediately end the rogue European Court of Justice’s control over national security, allow the Government to remove EU citizens whose presence is not conducive to the public good (including terrorists and serious criminals), end the growing use of the EU’s Charter of Fundamental Rights to overrule UK law"

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 15 2016 A framework for taking back control and establishi; Position: 13 - 13]

322.
"This would end the automatic right of all EU citizens to enter the UK by the next election. We will be able to carry out proper security checks on those entering and refuse entry to known criminals. EU citizens will be subject to UK law rather than EU immigration legislation."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 15 2016 A framework for taking back control and establishi; Position: 17 - 17]

323.
"The Bill will also end the European Court’s control of the UK’s asylum policy by the next general election."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 15 2016 A framework for taking back control and establishi; Position: 17 - 17]

324.
"The EU Treaties will cease to form part of UK law and the European Court’s jurisdiction over the UK will come to a permanent end."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 15 2016 A framework for taking back control and establishi; Position: 19 - 19]

325.
"The UK would cease to make contributions to the EU budget."
“Vote Remain – Britain Stronger In’s” rational economic appeals:

1. "We own and run more than 1,200 businesses, from micro companies to the FTSE 100, employing more than 1.75 million people. We know our firms are stronger in Europe." [Vote Remain June 22 British Business "Benefits Massively From EU"; Position: 2 - 2]

2. "Our reasons are straightforward: businesses and their employees benefit massively from being able to trade inside the world’s largest single market without barriers." [Vote Remain June 22 British Business "Benefits Massively From EU"; Position: 3 - 3]

3. "As business people, we always look to the future — and a future inside the EU is where we see more opportunities for investment, growth and new jobs." [Vote Remain June 22 British Business "Benefits Massively From EU"; Position: 3 - 3]

4. "We know that Britain leaving the EU would mean having to re-establish terms of trade from scratch with our home market of 500 million consumers. That wouldn’t just hurt exporters but the hundreds of thousands of small and medium firms who do business with them." [Vote Remain June 22 British Business "Benefits Massively From EU"; Position: 3 - 3]

5. "Even those that want Britain to leave say that, in the short term, Brexit would lead to economic uncertainty and would put jobs at risk. Smaller businesses and the people they employ are particularly vulnerable to any economic shock that could follow a vote to leave." [Vote Remain June 22 British Business "Benefits Massively From EU"; Position: 4 - 4]

6. "Britain leaving the EU would mean uncertainty for our firms, less trade with Europe and fewer jobs. Britain remaining in the EU would mean the opposite: more certainty, more trade and more jobs. EU membership is good for business and good for British jobs." [Vote Remain June 22 British Business "Benefits Massively From EU"; Position: 5 - 5]

7. "If we want to create more jobs, better-paid jobs and higher-quality jobs, and if we want to keep protecting the rights of British workers, there is no road to the future that does not go through Europe." [Vote Remain June 22 Leaders In All Fields Are Clear Britain Is Stronger; Position: 6 - 6]
"with a strong economy and a bright future"


"improve our economic wellbeing"


"European funding is playing key role in regenerating our communities and funding future projects - as well as supporting training and opportunities for our young people. We should not put that at risk."


"Scotland is better for being in the European Union - it helps us create more jobs, a stronger economy, and guarantees vital rights for working people and citizens."


"By leaving we take a gamble with the economy – and put people at risk"


"Our children and grandchildren will have to live with its consequences - for their jobs,"


"From businesses to trade unions, and academics to farmers, representatives from every part of our society are united in saying that British families are better off in Europe."


"Leaving would be a one-way ticket to a poorer and diminished Britain"

[Vote Remain June 22 Leaders In All Fields Are Clear Britain Is Stronger ; Position: 6 - 6] 16.

"Vote Remain for more jobs, lower prices, workers’ rights, stronger public services"


"This is a once in a generation choice and workers’ rights, jobs and wages are all on the line."


"A vote to Remain will mean a brighter future for working people across Britain, with more jobs created and vital rights at work protected"

"As an entrepreneur I have been known for taking risks throughout my career, but leaving the European Union is not one of the risks I would want the UK to take – not as an investor"

20.

"A vote to remain will mean more opportunities, more jobs and a brighter future for people across the UK"

21.

"This is a crucial moment for the future of British farming and those looking to build a career in agriculture."

22.

"Having access to the single market - our home market of 500 million customers - is critical to the long term prosperity of farmers across the country."

23.

"set out why we should remain in the EU if we care about our health and the future of the NHS."

24.

"It is Brexit that is the threat to the NHS, not our membership of the EU."

25.

"There has been an overwhelming response from businesses of all sizes urging Britain to remain in the EU, and appealing to their employees to remain in particular. The culmination of this has been an unprecedented letter signed by 1,285 companies, employing 1.75 million people, from companies large, medium and small, to The Times to say that Britain’s economy is better off in Europe."

26.

"The leaders of England’s eight largest city economies plus Glasgow and Cardiff said that leaving Europe would put Britain’s great cities in “serious economic danger”."

27.

"manufacturing is better off in Europe, and that “leaving would be a terrible gamble, amounting to playing poker with people's jobs, businesses and the country's economic stability.”"
"Unions and manufacturers alike know that Britain’s economy is stronger in Europe, supporting jobs, lower prices and financial security for families across the country."

"Nine out of ten economists say that outside the EU’s single market trade and investment would be hit and jobs would be lost."

"When workers, experts and employers unite behind a single argument it cannot be dismissed by leave campaigners, who have no economic plan for Britain."

"Vote Remain for more jobs, lower prices, stronger public services and a decent, tolerant Great Britain. If we vote to leave, there is no going back. Don't risk it."

"The preponderance of views points to a post-Brexit world of considerable and prolonged uncertainty which will persist until the UK comes to an agreement with the EU on all aspects of their relationship. Questions have been raised over the future role of the City of London as the leading financial centre. Some say that the pool of talent that exists there will slowly begin to haemorrhage and other, principally European, financial centres will benefit from their knowledge and expertise and from increasing volumes of transactions in the future."

"In the run-up to the referendum, we are aware of a number of deals that have been put on hold until the outcome is known. Merrill can look at deals that have been initiated in our systems and see that a significant amount of them have been stalled. A number of clients approach us, full of optimism, at the start of a deal only to inform us that, “Our buyer has pulled out or stalled pending the results of the referendum.” Anecdotally, our clients are telling us that deals are being suspended simply because if you are buying a UK business that has significant exports into the EU, they are going to be very cautious about executing that deal due to the uncertainty surrounding Brexit."

"Many people believe there will be less investment in the UK if Britain decides to leave. In a post-Brexit world it is unclear what trade agreements will be in place and whether any restrictions in the movement of goods would change these investment decisions."

"When workers, experts and employers unite behind a single argument it cannot be dismissed by leave campaigners, who have no economic plan for Britain."

"Vote Remain for more jobs, lower prices, stronger public services and a decent, tolerant Great Britain. If we vote to leave, there is no going back. Don't risk it."

"The preponderance of views points to a post-Brexit world of considerable and prolonged uncertainty which will persist until the UK comes to an agreement with the EU on all aspects of their relationship. Questions have been raised over the future role of the City of London as the leading financial centre. Some say that the pool of talent that exists there will slowly begin to haemorrhage and other, principally European, financial centres will benefit from their knowledge and expertise and from increasing volumes of transactions in the future."

"In the run-up to the referendum, we are aware of a number of deals that have been put on hold until the outcome is known. Merrill can look at deals that have been initiated in our systems and see that a significant amount of them have been stalled. A number of clients approach us, full of optimism, at the start of a deal only to inform us that, “Our buyer has pulled out or stalled pending the results of the referendum.” Anecdotally, our clients are telling us that deals are being suspended simply because if you are buying a UK business that has significant exports into the EU, they are going to be very cautious about executing that deal due to the uncertainty surrounding Brexit."

"Many people believe there will be less investment in the UK if Britain decides to leave. In a post-Brexit world it is unclear what trade agreements will be in place and whether any restrictions in the movement of goods would change these investment decisions."
“But,” he continues, “our research did point to the pricing of ‘uncertainty’ and we estimated that there would be a 50 basis point (BPS) risk premium on debt - a result that would have a major impact on a deal, reducing the price a buyer could pay. Such uncertainty reduces confidence. We believe a hiatus in dealmaking is likely if Brexit wins the vote, and one that could persist for a number of years until we all understand what the full terms of Brexit really mean.”

Over 65% of survey respondents felt that the UK would be less likely to prosper if it left the EU. A similar proportion said that Britain would be less likely to attract overseas investment.

"69% of respondents felt that uncertainty over the UK’s EU membership is likely to affect the current M&A and markets."

"67% said that investment decisions are being negatively affected"

"64% of survey respondents said that UK businesses would be less attractive to overseas acquirers in the short term if Britain votes to leave the EU."

"65% of our survey respondents felt that a vote for Brexit would have a negative long-term effect on M&A and high-yield markets."

"EU funding promotes UK sport at the local level and funding for school sport is essential too, and this is at risk if we decide to leave."

"Former bosses of Tesco, Sainsbury’s, M&S, Asda, Waitrose, Morrisons and B&Q warn that “prices will rise” if Britain leaves the EU."

"Research by retail union USDAW finds that, if we were to leave, the hit to sterling and the imposition of tariffs would increase prices for families by £580 a year."
"Stronger In analysis shows higher inflation as a result of leaving would cause a hike in rail fares."

"Today [Tuesday], in an unprecedented intervention, the bosses of Britain’s biggest retailers, the USDAW trade union, and new research from Britain Stronger In Europe show that leaving the EU would cause prices for essential goods and services to rise, hitting working people and their families in the pocket."

"In an open letter, the former bosses of Britain’s retail giants, as well as the USDAW trade union, warn that “prices will rise” if Britain leaves the EU, as the pound would weaken and supply chains would be disrupted. This would be “catastrophic for millions of ordinary families”, they say."

"It comes as USDAW, the union that represents 425,000 workers in the retail industry, unveils new research showing that workers would be at least £580 a year worse off if Britain leaves the EU, due to a hit to sterling and new tariffs imposed on imported goods like food, drink and clothing. The union’s General Secretary, John Hannett, concludes that: “Brexit will harm the UK economy, leading to fewer jobs, increased pressure on workers’ rights and greater insecurity for Usdaw members.”"

"Meanwhile, new Stronger In analysis demonstrates yet another crippling cost for working people if Britain leaves the EU – higher rail fares. If inflation was 2.7 percentage points higher, as the Treasury have said it might be if Britain leaves, the price of popular rail season tickets would rocket. A season ticket from Birmingham to London would increase by £270, from Ashford to London by £165, and from Liverpool to Manchester by £80."

"Every credible economic expert is clear – leaving the EU, our biggest market, would hit trade, boost inflation, and increase the price of imports. This would be devastating for working people who cannot afford a rise in the cost of living."
"The economic consequences of leaving Europe could well be worse than the damage done by the Great Recession of 2008. Workers, families and small businesspeople would all be hammered if we leave. The safe choice is to vote to remain in Europe"

[Vote Remain June 21 Retail Giants Warn Families; Position: 6 - 6]

51.
"As the Governor of the Bank of England has made clear, if Britain votes to leave the EU we risk a devaluation of the pound and unnecessary inflation. For millions of British commuters that could mean a 'Brexit penalty' of more than £100 a year on rail fares."

[Vote Remain June 21 Retail Giants Warn Families; Position: 6 - 6]

52.
"In other words, rail users from across the UK will have to help foot the bill for leaving the EU. For British commuters concerned about prices there is only one sensible course of action this Thursday – say no to the leavers' price hike and vote for Britain to remain economically secure within the EU."

[Vote Remain June 21 Retail Giants Warn Families; Position: 6 - 6]

53.
"As someone who has spent years at Which? working to get a better deal for consumers, I am now convinced that leaving the EU will give ordinary British families a worse deal for years to come, including higher prices at the pump, higher prices at the till and higher prices on their holidays. My advice to consumers is clear - this could be an expensive mistake, don't risk it."

[Vote Remain June 21 Retail Giants Warn Families; Position: 6 - 6]

54.
"We are experienced retailers from Tesco, Sainsbury's, Marks & Spencer, Asda, Waitrose, Morrisons and B&Q and with USDAW, who represent hundreds of thousands of trade union members, believe that if we leave the European Union prices will rise."

[Vote Remain June 21 Retail Giants Warn Families; Position: 6 - 6]

55.
"supply chains. We've spent the last few decades building very strong supply chains with the EU, which are fully integrated in order to deliver better quality, choice and value for the UK consumer. The single market and free trade are critically important to the strength of the consumer economy. Food is always one of the battle grounds for trade negotiations and the idea that we can reshape supply chains which have taken 45 years to build, in two to three years, is delusional."

[Vote Remain June 21 Retail Giants Warn Families; Position: 6 - 6]

56.
"the value of the pound. In the past two weeks alone, as worries over leaving Europe have increased, the pound has fallen dramatically. This will push up prices. A 'Leave' vote will very likely make this worse and lead to a further rise in prices - such as the cost of filling a petrol tank, and the price of a weekly shop. We strongly believe that a Brexit will see less money in people's pockets and be
catastrophic for millions of ordinary families. That is why we believe that Britain should remain in the EU on 23rd June.

“New analysis has found that voting to leave could mean hundred-pound rises in commuter fares across the country.”

"The cap on annual rail fare rises is set by inflation, which analysis from the Treasury, the Bank of England, and leading banks has warned, would be driven up by the hit to sterling as a result of leaving."

"As recent market turmoil has demonstrated sterling could be heavily impacted by a vote to leave, with some analysts forecasting falls of as much as 30%. That would mean higher prices for imported goods, driving up inflation. This would be passed in full on to commuters for each year inflation was higher as a result of Brexit, with warnings that the effect could last several years."

"Example of the possible Brexit-penalty rail fare rises for just one year – based on the conservative estimate sterling would fall by up to 15% include:

- Oxford – London: £152
- Ashford – London: £165
- Gloucester – Birmingham: £104
- Liverpool – Manchester: £80
- Edinburgh – Berwick: £99"

"The Governor of the Bank of England has highlighted how there could be “pressure on prices” if we vote to leave. “there can be short term implications for activity in the United Kingdom, and therefore, for pressures on prices… there could be movements in the exchange rate which would push up on inflation.”"

"HM Treasury have forecast inflation will be 2.3 – 2.7 ppts higher. “In the shock scenario, a vote to leave would result in a recession, a spike in inflation and a rise in unemployment… the analysis shows that the fall in the value of the pound would be around 12%...the exchange-rate-driven increase in the
price of imports would lead to a material increase in prices, with the CPI inflation rate higher by 2.3 percentage points after a year...In the severe shock scenario...sterling would depreciate by 15% and CPI inflation would increase by 2.7 percentage points after a year."

"Regulated rail fare rises are determined by inflation – so the higher inflation would be completely passed on. Regulated rail fare rises, which cover commuter fares and protected fares like standard returns, are capped at the July RPI inflation figure. As the main differences between CPI and RPI is that RPI also includes housing costs, and it uses an arithmetic mean, which tends to be higher than the geometric mean used to calculate CPI, it is reasonable to assume that the impact on RPI inflation would be similar."

"Some analysts have forecast that the rise in inflation could last several years – meaning multiple years of higher fare rises. Citi have said higher inflation could last several years."

"Treasury forecasts for the fall in the value of the conservative compared to other forecasts. The Treasury forecast is based on a 12%-15% fall in the pound."

"Citi has predicted a sterling fall of up to 20%. Citi has predicted that if the UK votes to leave the EU the pound would depreciate significantly, “with sterling’s trade-weighted exchange rate probably retesting the lows after the 2007-09 crisis … 15-20 percent below current levels”, pushing inflation up to 3-4% for several years and possibly causing the Bank of England to hike interest rates."

"HSBC predict that sterling could fall 20% against the dollar. HSBC has said the UK “will need to get beyond Brexit fears” before sterling recovers from the weakness seen in early 2016. If the UK votes to leave the EU, HSBC predicts sterling could fall by 20% against the dollar."

"Goldman Sachs predicts a sterling fall of up to 20%. Goldman Sachs has predicted that sterling could fall by 15-20% if the UK votes to leave the EU, as capital inflows required to finance the capital account deficit dry up."

82
"Ian Harnett, Chief Investment Strategist, Absolute Strategy Research: “The downside risk is probably 30% to sterling and another 20% to equities”"

"Much of the debate around a potential British exit (Brexit) from the EU has centered on the potential macroeconomic impact. In this paper, we instead focus on understanding market expectations for price action around the Brexit referendum date. Extracting implied distributions from the GBPUSD option volatility surface, we estimate that the market expects a vote to leave could result in a move in GBPUSD from 1.4390 (spot reference on 10 June 2016) down to a range in 1.10 to 1.30, i.e. a 10-25% decline"

"The market for sterling and sterling protection is being led by the nose by the opinion polls.’ If the UK votes to leave, he forecast the pound will drop to $1.30 within two weeks and $1.20 in the longer term.’"

"In the event that the polls provide strong indication that the UK is heading for the Brexit door, the pound sterling will resume its free fall and move towards the $1.30.”"

"It would also be harder to afford the current rail fares policy after the £40 billion cost of leaving. The independent IFS have warned of a £40 billion hole in the public finances if we leave. That would make it harder to afford the pledge made to cap regulated fare rises at RPI. If this was abandoned that would mean even higher fare rises. The IFS said: “The estimates of NIESR for a GDP hit of between 2.1% and 3.5% probably provide a good central range for the likely impact on GDP in 2019. Including the direct benefits of reduced budget contributions, these would lead to the public finances being between about £20 billion and £40 billion less healthy than in a scenario in which we did not leave the EU.”"

"10 Nobel Prize-winning economists say “the economic arguments are clearly in favour of remaining in the EU”"

"Over 5,000 scientists sign statement say leaving the EU would “stifle our science, innovation and jobs”"
"Over 1,000 academics at UK universities say: “The interests of British universities and the knowledge economy they represent, as well as the wider future of the United Kingdom and of our continent, are best served by staying In”"

"Britain is stronger, safer and better off in Europe, while leaving would damage our economy and lessen our place in the world"

"EU membership has “boosted our science networking, access to talent, shared infrastructure and UK science policy impact”. If we leave the EU, they warn, the UK will “lose its driving seat”, which would “stifle our science, innovation and jobs”.

"Economic issues are central to the UK referendum debate. We believe that the UK would be better off economically inside the EU. British firms and workers need full access to the single market.”

"In addition, Brexit would create major uncertainty about Britain’s alternative future trading arrangements, both with the rest of Europe and with important markets like the USA, Canada and China. And these effects, though on-off, would persist for many years.”

"The EU leads the world in science output, is beating the US in science growth – and is rapidly increasing investment in research."

"If we leave the EU, the UK will lose its driving seat in this world-leading team. Free-flow of talent and easy collaboration would likely be replaced by uncertainty, capital flight, market barriers and costly domestic red-tape. This would stifle our science, innovation and jobs.”

"The possibility of British exit from the EU is already damaging the British economy, the Bank of England’s Monetary Policy Committee has said today in their starkest warning of the risks to Britain’s economy of leaving the EU.”
"The independent MPC has concluded that “uncertainty about the referendum is leading to delays in major economic decisions” including new car purchases and businesses investment, and is already hitting the value of sterling."

"The MPC concludes that the possibility of Britain leaving the EU is “the largest immediate risk facing UK financial markets, and possibly also global financial markets”."

"They say that “past evidence” suggests a vote to leave the EU will increase unemployment."

"They also say that a vote to leave would likely cause the value of the pound to fall, business investment to fall, inflation to rise, economic growth to fall, asset prices to fall, and the terms of Britain’s global trade to get worse."

"These are the minutes of the Monetary Police Committee of the Bank of England. These people are independent and their job is to advise us about the risks facing our economy, and they couldn’t be clearer."

"If we vote to leave the European Union, we are facing higher unemployment, less growth, we’re facing a falling pound, therefore rising prices. The price of the family shop would go up. There would be fewer jobs, fewer opportunities. This is a risk to every family in Britain. This couldn’t be clearer. We shouldn’t risk it."

"The Bank of England is independent. It’s independent in law, and the Monetary Policy Committee of the Bank of England has met and has discussed the risks of leaving the European Union and they couldn’t be clearer. People have been waiting for some independent, authoritative information about this referendum. Here it is. The Bank of England, paid to be independent, saying to us that unemployment could rise, growth could be hit, the pound will fall, prices will rise, our economy will suffer, and families will suffer. This is a risk to every family in the country, and we shouldn’t risk it."
91.
"A vote to leave the European Union could materially affect the outlook for output and inflation. In the face of greater uncertainty about the UK’s trading arrangements, sterling was likely to depreciate further, perhaps sharply. The behaviour of sterling in response to opinion polls over the past month made this seem increasingly probable. Past evidence suggested that a general increase in uncertainty led to households deferring consumption and businesses delaying investment, lowering labour demand and increasing unemployment."

[Vote Remain\June 19 Monetary policy committee warns possible EU exit; Position: 5 - 5]

92.
"Asset prices might fall, leading to tighter financial conditions with further deleterious effects on consumption and investment. Through financial market and confidence channels, there were also risks of adverse spill-overs to the global economy. Slower capital accumulation and the need to reallocate resources across the economy in response to changing trading and investment patterns would be likely to reduce potential supply over the forecast period."

[Vote Remain\June 19 Monetary policy committee warns possible EU exit; Position: 7 - 7]

93.
"Taken together, the combination of movements in demand, supply and the exchange rate could lead to a materially lower path for growth and a notably higher path for inflation than in the projections set out in the May Inflation Report. In those circumstances, the MPC would face a trade-off between stabilising inflation on the one hand and output and employment on the other. The implications for the direction of monetary policy would depend on the relative magnitudes of the demand, supply and exchange rate effects."

[Vote Remain\June 19 Monetary policy committee warns possible EU exit; Position: 9 - 9]

94.
"On the evidence of the recent behaviour of the foreign exchange market, it appears increasingly likely that, were the UK to vote to leave the EU, sterling’s exchange rate would fall further, perhaps sharply. This would be consistent with changes to the fundamentals underpinning the exchange rate, including worsening terms of trade, lower productivity, and higher risk premia. In addition, UK short-term interest rates and measures of UK bank funding costs appear to have been materially influenced by opinion polls about the referendum."

[Vote Remain\June 19 Monetary policy committee warns possible EU exit; Position: 11 - 11]

95.
"Overall, the outcome of the referendum on EU membership continued to be the largest immediate risk facing UK financial markets, and possibly also global financial markets. According to the Bank of America Merrill Lynch Global Fund Manager Survey, the referendum was considered the biggest tail risk. This was consistent with the Bank’s own market intelligence."

[Vote Remain\June 19 Monetary policy committee warns possible EU exit; Position: 13 - 13]
While consumer spending has been solid, there is growing evidence that uncertainty about the referendum is leading to delays to major economic decisions that are costly to reverse, including commercial and residential real estate transactions, car purchases, and business investment."

"A vote to quit the European Union on June 23rd, which polls say is a growing possibility, would do grave and lasting harm to the politics and economy of Britain."

"Even those voting Leave accept that there will be short-term damage (see article). More important, Britain is unlikely to thrive in the longer run either. Almost half of its exports go to Europe. Access to the single market is vital for the City and to attract foreign direct investment."

"Europe has dozens of trade pacts that Britain would need to replace. It would be a smaller, weaker negotiating partner. The timetable would not be under its control, and the slow, grinding history of trade liberalisation shows that mercantilists tend to have the upper hand."

"Many of the biggest obstacles to growth—too few new houses, poor infrastructure and a skills gap—stem from British-made regulations. In six years of government, the Tories have failed to dismantle them. Leaving the EU would not make it any easier."

"Indeed, economists, businesspeople and statesmen from around the world have queued up to warn Britain that leaving would be a mistake (though Mr Trump is a fan)"

"The answer is not to storm out but to stay and work to create the Europe that Britain wants."

"Competition policy, the single market and enlargement to the east were all championed by Britain, and are profoundly in its interests."

"If the EU is prospering, Britain needs to share in the good times."
"Bill Gates, the world’s wealthiest man and the most generous philanthropist, warns today that Britain will be a “significantly less attractive place to do business and invest” if outside the European Union."

"In a letter to The Times, the Microsoft founder, who has invested more than $1 billion in Britain, raises questions over his future commitment to the country if voters back Brexit next week. He indicates that access to the EU’s single market, which other European leaders say they will deny to Britain if it leaves the bloc, helped to swing Microsoft’s decision to site research facilities in Cambridge."

"He warns, however, that the country would lose ground as it struggled to attract the best international talent outside the EU."

"These investments [in Britain] make sense because of the unique assets that the UK has — excellent universities with a strong heritage in science and innovation, world-class healthcare businesses like GlaxoSmithKline and access to the single European market,” he writes."

"While ultimately a matter for the British people to decide, it is clear to me that if Britain chooses to be outside of Europe, it will be a significantly less attractive place to do business and to invest."

"It will be harder to find and recruit the best talent from across the continent; talent which, in turn, creates jobs for local people in the UK. And, it would be harder to raise the investment needed for public goods like new medicines and affordable clean energy solutions, for which we need the scale of collaboration, knowledge sharing and financial backing that the combined strength of the EU provides."

"His intervention came as evidence emerged that big businesses were more worried about Brexit than their smaller competitors. Almost two thirds (62 per cent) of large companies with turnovers of more than £25 million think leaving the EU would hit the economy, according to a poll of 3,394 business owners and finance directors by the Charterhouse Research consultancy."
"Only 38 per cent of start-ups and 34 per cent of small companies with turnovers of less than £100,000 believed it would be bad for the economy."

"Leaving the European Union is not a risk I would want to take. Not as an investor, not as an entrepreneur"

"I am one of a rare breed of business people still going who can remember what it was like before the European Union was formed. When I took my first steps in business in the 1960s and 70s, trade and travel were a drag."

"Most voters recognise that our country has reaped many benefits from immigration, from the brilliant doctors in our NHS to the skilled workers helping our economy to grow."

"The whole purpose of their system is to allow businesses to control who comes into their country. For us this would lead to an increase in cheap labour, bringing down wages and doing nothing to ease voter concerns about insecure employment."

"The only way to do that is to leave the single market – an act of economic self-destruction that would be catastrophic for businesses and jobs across the country."

"And finally, the overall benefits of EU membership are massive. From businesses in Yorkshire to the President of the United States - and pretty much everyone in between - there is now an unprecedented consensus that leaving the EU would hurt our economy and hit our pockets."

"It has established the world’s biggest single market while preventing a race to the bottom on employment rights."
"Outside the EU, our role in the world would be diminished. This matters: not as a throwback to bombastic colonialism, but because, as a significant economic power"

[Vote Remain \ June 19 Newspapers from across the political divide say: vote r; Position: 15 - 15]

121.

"A vote for Brexit is unquestionably economically riskier than a vote to remain."

[Vote Remain \ June 19 Newspapers from across the political divide say: vote r; Position: 22 - 22]

122.

"Experts overwhelmingly concur. Paul Johnson, of the fiercely independent Institute for Fiscal Studies, puts the chances of Britain being worse off after a vote to leave at 90 per cent. The Treasury has projected an “immediate and profound” downturn in the short term in the event of a Brexit win, and a 15-year outlook of less trade, less investment and less growth than if Britain stayed in. The Bank of England, the US Federal Reserve, the IMF, the World Bank, the World Trade Organisation (WTO), the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and nine out of ten economists polled by Ipsos MORI broadly agree."

[Vote Remain \ June 19 Newspapers from across the political divide say: vote r; Position: 23 - 23]

123.

"Brexiters now claim we can magic up sovereignty by leaving the international organisation which gives us access to 500 million customers and feeds three million British jobs which go with that."

[Vote Remain \ June 19 Newspapers from across the political divide say: vote r; Position: 32 - 32]

124.

"the incoherence surrounding the economic case for Brexit"

[Vote Remain \ June 16 Post Brexit Legal Tangle Would Be A Lawyers’ Bonanza; Position: 3 - 3]

125.

"The first point to note is that if we still wanted access to the EU single market of 500 million consumers, our largest trading partner and the biggest single market in the world, then we would have to abide by the EU regulations and laws governing that market – so, for example, safety standards for food, cars, toys, chemicals and medicines. But, crucially, we would no longer have any say on those regulations and laws, despite the fact that a substantial proportion of UK business would have to abide by them."

[Vote Remain \ June 16 Post Brexit Legal Tangle Would Be A Lawyers’ Bonanza; Position: 5 - 6]

126.

"It is clear that it would be a very substantial endeavour, diverting huge resources from within the Civil Service away from the big challenges of the day and toward a complex, legal and bureaucratic process."

[Vote Remain \ June 16 Post Brexit Legal Tangle Would Be A Lawyers’ Bonanza; Position: 11 - 11]

127.
"We believe it is clear that this diversion would paralyse us in our ability to deal with the issues that matter to families across the EU – health, education, housing to name just a few and instead jeopardise the efficient governance of the UK for a period of years to come."

[Vote Remain\June 16 Post Brexit Legal Tangle Would Be A Lawyers’ Bonanza; Position: 18 - 18]

"The Financial Times does not favour membership of the single currency. It makes no economic sense. But opting out of the euro is quite different from opting out of the EU, which would seriously damage the UK economy."

[Vote Remain\June 15 Britian should vote to stay in the EU - the Ft; Position: 3 - 3]

"The economic costs of withdrawal are substantial;"

[Vote Remain\June 15 Britian should vote to stay in the EU - the Ft; Position: 4 - 4]

"The rewards are indisputable. Since Britain joined the EU in 1973, real gross domestic product per head has grown faster than in France, Germany and Italy. Thatcher’s labour reforms and the Bank of England’s independence were vital too. But membership of the single market has been a magnet for foreign direct investment, funding a bulging current account deficit and guaranteeing British jobs."

[Vote Remain\June 15 Britian should vote to stay in the EU - the Ft; Position: 6 - 6]

"An arrangement akin to Norway’s would require paying into the EU budget and accepting free movement of labour."

[Vote Remain\June 15 Britian should vote to stay in the EU - the Ft; Position: 7 - 7]

"The fallback — relying on World Trade Organisation rules — would involve tariffs on UK goods, a poor deal on services (vital for the City of London) and years of fraught negotiations."

[Vote Remain\June 15 Britian should vote to stay in the EU - the Ft; Position: 8 - 8]

"Britain’s seat at the table has allowed it to win big arguments in Brussels: on free trade, liberalisation of air travel and telecoms, and EU enlargement to central and eastern Europe."

[Vote Remain\June 15 Britian should vote to stay in the EU - the Ft; Position: 9 - 9]

"It retains control of income tax and corporate taxation. Education, skills and a skewed housing market hold the UK economy back, not a Brussels bureaucracy the size of Birmingham city council."

[Vote Remain\June 15 Britian should vote to stay in the EU - the Ft; Position: 9 - 9]
The positive case for Britain in the EU is easily made. To abandon the cause of constructive reform of an admittedly imperfect EU would be more than defeatist. It would be a gratuitous act of self-harm. Business leaders have a duty to spell out the cost of leaving before it is too late.

"The European Union influences very important aspects of Tata Steel’s business in the UK," says Tim Morris, Head of Public Affairs for Tata Steel in Europe. “The EU is by far our largest export market, with over a third of our UK steel heading there. And that’s not including the steel that goes via our customers – the EU is a critical export market for the UK’s car makers for example. So access to that market is fundamental to our business.”

"One of the preconditions for this trade is that EU laws and regulations are followed. “These include critical regulations that impact our business – environmental controls and anti-dumping rules to name but two,” says Tim. “But if the UK were to exit the EU and we set these rules ourselves, it is likely we would still need to adhere to EU rules to enter that market. The difference: we would no longer have a say in how they are set up or applied.”

"The EU is a source of cash for the UK business – funds for environmental improvements, infrastructure development and R&D,” Tim points out. That’s one of the reasons for support for remaining in the EU from groups such as the CBI, EEF, TUC and individual trade unions. The trade union movement is also stressing the role of the EU in protecting workers rights.”

"You may be a Brexiteer or you may be a Bremainer. But either way the choice you make on 23 June will make a difference to your working life.”

"The jobs and livelihoods that depend on our membership of the EU, the worker’s rights it guarantees and the opportunities it represents will be lost forever. "

"Actually, by working with the European Union past Labour governments brought in the agency workers directive, the working time directive, and a whole host of social legislation that protected British workers and provided a level playing field of rights across the whole of Europe."
"We can take collective action on tax havens with our European partners to claw back the one trillion euros that are held offshore."

"A UK Presidency in 2017 could also dramatically reduce energy prices and household bills by hastening the introduction of an EU-wide energy grid that will allow consumers and businesses to benefit from economies of scale across the continent."

"If we remain in the EU we can extend the worker’s rights that it already underpins – many of which were introduced by Labour governments - so that no member state permits employers to use insecure or exploitative contracts. That will prevent a race to the bottom and improve conditions at work."

"Widening and deepening the European single market in energy, tourism, digital services and other industries will boost GDP by 4 percent if we stay in the EU, according to the Treasury. That means an extra 1.3m jobs could be created by 2030. On top of those reforms, we can use our share of the European Union’s 315 billion Euro infrastructure fund - that’s 50 billion Euros - to spend on regeneration and rebuilding – money that could transform our steel and industrial communities."

"If we want to tame and temper the power of global capital, to protect our jobs, give decent working conditions and promote peaceful trade, we must remain in a reformed EU."

"Jobs. Workers’ rights."

"We’ve heard about the jobs that depend on our continued membership."

"We’ve heard about the range of individual rights protected by the EU: protection from discrimination; equal pay; maternity, paternity and parental leave; protection for part-time, fixed term and agency workers; paid leave and working time; health and safety: rights for all people, fought for by the TUC and British Unions working with their counterparts in the EU."
"In response to that the IFS said: “Leaving the EU would not, as Michael Gove claims we said, leave more money to spend on the NHS. Rather it would leave us spending less on public services, or taxing more, or borrowing more”.

[Vote Remain\June 15 Tom Watson on Brexit; Position: 4 - 4]

"Claim Number three: is that leaving the EU will help our economy grow and create more jobs. But nine of out ten economists say that leaving would hurt our economy. The Governor of the Bank of England has said leaving could lead to a “technical recession”. The Treasury says it could lead to 800,000 job losses.”

[Vote Remain\June 15 Tom Watson on Brexit; Position: 4 - 4]

"Claim Number Four: Nigel Farage said it doesn’t matter if the economy is smaller. But we all know that if the economy shrinks living standards will fall and people will lose their jobs.”

[Vote Remain\June 15 Tom Watson on Brexit; Position: 4 - 4]

"In fact, there is an economic case, a social case, a patriotic case, and a political case for us to remain in the EU."

[Vote Remain\June 15 Tom Watson on Brexit; Position: 4 - 4]

"So as we step up our campaign into the last week, we will fight on the bread and butter issues of jobs, growth and rights at work.”

[Vote Remain\June 15 Tom Watson on Brexit; Position: 4 - 4]

"Say ‘yes’ to growth, ‘yes’ to worker’s rights and ‘yes’ to jobs.”

[Vote Remain\June 15 Tom Watson on Brexit; Position: 4 - 4]

"Today, Chancellor of the Exchequer George Osborne and former Chancellor Alistair Darling will come together to warn that an emergency Budget involving tens of billions of pounds of spending cuts and tax rises will be necessary to plug a black hole in the public finances if Britain votes to leave the EU next week.”

[Vote Remain\June 15 Leaving the Eu would spark deep spending cuts; Position: 2 - 2]

"Sharing a platform for the first time, Mr Osborne and Mr Darling will set out the £30bn of spending cuts and tax rises that would be needed to preserve the public finances in the event of a vote to leave the EU.”

[Vote Remain\June 15 Leaving the Eu would spark deep spending cuts; Position: 3 - 3]
158.
"This is based on Institute for Fiscal Studies research showing that the economic damage caused by British exit from the EU would cause a black hole in the public finances of between £20bn and £40bn."

[Vote Remain\June 15 Leaving the Eu would spark deep spending cuts; Position: 4 - 4]

159.
"It's this investment we don't want to see put at risk – and it will be if we quit the EU."

[Vote Remain\June 15 Leaving the Eu would spark deep spending cuts; Position: 13 - 13]

160.
"And today we are here together because we agree on this: a vote to Leave the EU would do it to us all over again. Quitting the EU would hit investment, hurt families and harm the British economy."

[Vote Remain\June 15 Leaving the Eu would spark deep spending cuts; Position: 19 - 19]

161.
"As the Chairman of your firm here, Hitachi, has said “take away the UK’s membership of the EU, and the future investment case looks very different”."

[Vote Remain\June 15 Leaving the Eu would spark deep spending cuts; Position: 19 - 19]

162.
"“He goes on investors would ‘hold back on investment, and jobs would be lost. This is the cold economic reality of Brexit”.”

[Vote Remain\June 15 Leaving the Eu would spark deep spending cuts; Position: 20 - 20]

163.
"The uncertainty of a vote to leave would mean businesses delaying investment and deciding not to hire."

[Vote Remain\June 15 Leaving the Eu would spark deep spending cuts; Position: 23 - 23]

164.
"Think of the impact that has on families - worried about their jobs, seeing their wages fall and putting off spending wherever they can."

[Vote Remain\June 15 Leaving the Eu would spark deep spending cuts; Position: 24 - 24]

165.
"Add all that together, and it means less money coming in to the Exchequer for the government to spend."

[Vote Remain\June 15 Leaving the Eu would spark deep spending cuts; Position: 25 - 25]

166.
"And less money to spend means less money for our vital public services – schools, hospitals, local government, roads, pensions, our armed forces – services millions of people work in and millions of people depend on."

[Vote Remain\June 15 Leaving the Eu would spark deep spending cuts; Position: 26 - 26]
"The impeccably independent Institute for Fiscal Studies says there would be a £30bn black hole in the public finances which we would have to try to fill. “And this would be a permanent and structural hole – we couldn’t just borrow more money to tide us over."

"As Chancellor, it would be my responsibility to try to restore stability to the public finances if we quit the EU – and – that would mean there would need to be an emergency budget."

"Legislating for the kind of measures required to tackle a large structural deficit takes time. Britain would need to get on with it. “You can do it by raising taxes, or you can do it by cutting spending. Almost certainly, you’d have to do both."

"Rather than finding out the consequences for the nation’s budget after we quit the EU, the public should know what they are before they take that choice - so they can avoid these hard consequences altogether."

"So today we are setting out examples of the difficult decisions that would have to be made to stabilise the British economy if Britain quits the EU. “Filling in a £30 billion a year black hole would require sharp and difficult tax rises."

"The sorts of tax rises we could see include: - A 2p rise in the basic rate of income tax, to 22% - A 3p rise in the Higher rate, to 43% - Five per cent increases in duties on alcohol - A five per cent increase in the basic rate of inheritance tax, to 45%"
"Far from freeing up money to spend on public services as the Leave campaign would like you to believe, quitting the EU would mean less money. Billions less. And as the economy shrinks, so too would the cash the country has to spend."

"It's a lose-lose situation for British families and we shouldn’t risk it."

"If you doubt it, look at what’s happening on financial markets. The economic uncertainty the Leave campaign carelessly insist won’t be caused by a vote to Leave is already being seen."

"We don’t have to choose this risky and damaging future. A vote to Remain next week means we can see the economy keep on going, go on building jobs, cutting taxes, protecting the public services that people most depend on."

"That’s if we stick with our economic plan and don’t quit the EU, turning our backs on our trading partners and allies."

"Leaving the EU would undo all the hard work we’ve done together to recover from the Great Recession."

"A vote to Remain is a vote for a strong economy."

"For every one pound we put in to the EU, we get ten pounds back in terms of economic benefits."

"Membership of the EU and the biggest free trade single market in the world has brought us prosperity and will continue to do so"

"Its benefits are unarguable and obvious. It’s about jobs."
"Businesses big and small are able to trade freely across a market of 500 million consumers, and generate wealth that boosts business within this country."

"And people here in Britain are able to buy from that market free from tariffs and higher prices."

"Because Britain is a gateway to Europe, international firms like this one want to invest and create jobs here."

"Workers' rights are protected too."

"Maternity and paternity pay, paid holidays, the right not to be discriminated against at work – all these stemmed from EU law. And they'd be threatened by the Leave campaigners who talk euphemistically about wanting to scrap "red tape" but actually don't believe workers deserve any rights at all. Economic security and social justice go hand in hand – and that’s why the Labour Party is fighting for a Remain vote."

"Every single credible economic observer in the world now agrees about the impact that a vote to leave would have on Britain’s public finances."

"It is beyond doubt that it would lead to a profound economic shock that would hit the economy and tip Britain back into recession."

"Investment decisions are on hold. Almost £100bn has been wiped off the FTSE in recent days. And, for the first time ever, we saw long term German government bonds offering a negative yield – in other words, investors are paying Germany to look after their money as they seek safe havens. “All of this will damage investment and productivity.”"
"Every sensible authority is agreed that if we vote to Leave, our ability to deal with the consequences will be reduced – and what’s more, the markets will know it."

[Vote Remain June 15 Leaving the Eu would spark deep spending cuts; Position: 78 - 78]

193.

"As the head of the World Trade Organisation has made clear, it will take a decade or more for Britain to negotiate new trading arrangements."

[Vote Remain June 15 Leaving the Eu would spark deep spending cuts; Position: 83 - 83]

194.

"Britain’s economy would be smaller and Britain’s families would be poorer."

[Vote Remain June 15 Leaving the Eu would spark deep spending cuts; Position: 84 - 84]

195.

"There would be not just one emergency budget – but one after another."

[Vote Remain June 15 Leaving the Eu would spark deep spending cuts; Position: 85 - 85]

196.

"Far from having more to spend on public services - the giant con trick at the heart of the leave campaign - we’d have tens of billions of pounds less."

[Vote Remain June 15 Leaving the Eu would spark deep spending cuts; Position: 86 - 86]

197.

"We know from bitter experience that it’s the poorest who suffer when the economy fails."

[Vote Remain June 15 Leaving the Eu would spark deep spending cuts; Position: 87 - 87]

198.

"Clearly there will always be choices about the balance between tax and spend, and the pace of fiscal consolidation."

[Vote Remain June 15 Leaving the Eu would spark deep spending cuts; Position: 88 - 88]

199.

"But any chancellor would have to look at both tax rises and spending cuts to make, in a central scenario, the £30 billion of savings required by 2020."

[Vote Remain June 15 Leaving the Eu would spark deep spending cuts; Position: 89 - 89]

200.

"You’ve heard about some of the tax measures that would have to be considered. “But even with those, you’d still have half the money to make up through spending."

[Vote Remain June 15 Leaving the Eu would spark deep spending cuts; Position: 90 - 91]

201.

"So you’d have to consider cutting NHS, education and defence spending by two per cent in real terms. That means a £2.5 billion a year cut to the health service: fewer staff, fewer operations, poorer care. There would be £2 billion to find from the pensions budget."

[Vote Remain June 15 Leaving the Eu would spark deep spending cuts; Position: 92 - 92]
"We have a lot to gain from a vote to Remain. And so much more to lose from a vote to Leave."
[Vote Remain\June 15 Leaving the Eu would spark deep spending cuts; Position: 100 - 100]

“Vote Leave – take back control’s” rational economic appeals:

"Our children and grandchildren will find it harder to buy a house, to get their kids into a good school, to get a GP appointment, and they'll be paying for the bailouts of the euro."
[Vote Leave - take back control\June 22 2016 VOTE LEAVE FOR A FAIRER BRITAIN - Vote Leave; Position: 8 - 8]

"We will take back control of our money - our official EU bill is £350 million every week. We'll be able to spend our money on the public's priorities, particularly public services."
[Vote Leave - take back control\June 22 2016 VOTE LEAVE FOR A FAIRER BRITAIN - Vote Leave; Position: 11 - 11]

"after we Vote Leave, there won't be a sudden change that disrupts the economy."
[Vote Leave - take back control\June 22 2016 VOTE LEAVE FOR A FAIRER BRITAIN - Vote Leave; Position: 16 - 16]

"They are suffering from downward pressure on their wages, and facing increased competition for housing, school places, and GP appointments to name but a few. With five more countries lining up to join the EU - Albania, Serbia, Montenegro, Macedonia, and Turkey - this problem can only get worse."
[Vote Leave - take back control\June 22 2016 Turkish government and Major contradict Cameron - ; Position: 8 - 8]

"The UK is paying £2bn to help Turkey, Albania, Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia to join the EU."
[Vote Leave - take back control\June 22 2016 Turkish government and Major contradict Cameron - ; Position: 28 - 28]

"New research shows that 5.5 million jobs in the EU depend on trade with the UK while the Chief Executive and Director General of the German CBI has said it would be 'very, very foolish' to impose trade barriers and called for continued free trade between the UK and the EU if we Vote Leave."
[Vote Leave - take back control\June 22 2016 German industry calls for free trade deal if we Vo; Position: 2 - 2]
"After the incessant doom mongering of the IN campaign, we now hear the truth from the “Voice of German Industry” - that they would be desperate for free trade after we Vote Leave. Of course EU countries will continue trading with us on a tariff free basis - they would be damaging their own commercial interests if they didn’t."

"The Chief Executive and Director General of the BDI, Markus Kerber, has called for continued free trade if the UK leaves the EU."

"New research from the House of Commons Library shows 5.5 million jobs in the EU depend on trade with the UK."

"It is in other EU countries’ interests to strike a free trade agreement with the UK."

"Markus Kerber, the Chief Executive and Director General of the BDI, which represents German industry, has said his organisation would make the case for continued free trade in the event the UK votes to leave the European Union tomorrow."

"Mr Kerber said ‘Imposing trade barriers, imposing protectionist measures between our two countries – or between the two political centres, the European Union on the one hand and the UK on the other – would be a very, very foolish thing in the 21st century. The BDI would urge politicians on both sides to come up with a trade regime that enables us to uphold and maintain the levels of trade we have’ (BBC News, June 2016, link)."
"New research from the House of Commons Library has revealed a ‘rough estimate’ of over 5.5 million EU jobs dependent on exports to the UK (House of Commons Library, 2016, link). It’s in the EU’s interests to strike a free trade deal with the UK."

[Vote Leave - take back control June 22 2016 German industry calls for free trade deal if we Vo; Position: 20 - 20]

216.

"The research concludes: ‘Compared to the figures for 2011, the number of EU jobs associated with exports to the UK has increased from 5.0 million to 5.5 million. This is because EU exports to the UK have increased by 10% in cash terms over this period. By contrast, the number of UK jobs associated with exports to the EU has fallen... as UK exports to the EU have fallen by 5% in cash terms between 2011 and 2014’ (House of Commons Library, 2016, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control June 22 2016 German industry calls for free trade deal if we Vo; Position: 21 - 21]

217.

"The EU sells the UK far more than the UK sells the EU. In 2015, the UK bought £67.8 billion more in goods and services than the UK sold to the EU (ONS, March 2016, tab c, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control June 22 2016 German industry calls for free trade deal if we Vo; Position: 23 - 23]

218.

"In 2014, 20 EU member states sold the UK more than the UK bought from them (ONS, October 2015, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control June 22 2016 German industry calls for free trade deal if we Vo; Position: 24 - 24]

219.

"The UK is the EU's largest single export market for goods, larger even than the United States, with whom the EU is presently trying to negotiate a free trade agreement (NIESR, 2 November 2015, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control June 22 2016 German industry calls for free trade deal if we Vo; Position: 25 - 25]

220.

"The Prime Minister, David Cameron, has admitted: 'If we were outside the EU altogether, we’d still be trading with all these European countries, of course we would ... Of course the trading would go on ... There’s a lot of scaremongering on all sides of this debate. Of course the trading would go on' (The Andrew Marr Show, 6 January 2013, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control June 22 2016 German industry calls for free trade deal if we Vo; Position: 27 - 27]

221.
"The Foreign Secretary, Philip Hammond, has admitted that a free trade agreement in goods ‘would be relatively simple to negotiate’ (Hansard, 26 February 2015, col. 501, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control|June 22 2016 German industry calls for free trade deal if we Vo; Position: 28 - 28]

222.

"The UK’s former Ambassador to the EU and leading supporter of the IN campaign, Lord Kerr of Kinlochard, has admitted: ‘there is no doubt that the UK could secure a free trade agreement with the EU. That is not an issue’ (Lords Hansard, 2 November 2015, col. 1492, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control|June 22 2016 German industry calls for free trade deal if we Vo; Position: 29 - 29]

223.

"Even the pro-EU CBI has said: ‘the UK is highly likely to secure a Free Trade Agreement with the EU, and such an agreement would be likely to be negotiated at an extremely high level of ambition relative to other FTAs [free trade agreements]’ (CBI, 4 November 2013, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control|June 22 2016 German industry calls for free trade deal if we Vo; Position: 30 - 30]

224.

"The pro-EU Centre for European Reform has accepted that, ‘given the importance of the UK market to the eurozone, the UK would probably have little difficulty in negotiating an FTA’ (CER, June 2014, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control|June 22 2016 German industry calls for free trade deal if we Vo; Position: 31 - 31]

225.

"They’ve lost the economic argument, they don’t want to spend the £350 million we send to Brussels every week on our priorities"

[Vote Leave - take back control|June 21 2016 IN campaign cant find a positive reason to stay in; Position: 3 - 3]

226.

"we, in Britain, can support you in the Eurozone make the lasting changes that you need to see strengthen the euro. In return, you can help us make the changes we need to safeguard the interests of those economies who are not in the Eurozone’"

[Vote Leave - take back control|June 21 2016 IN campaign cant find a positive reason to stay in; Position: 7 - 7]

227.

"Scrapping the UK’s zero rates of VAT: The Economics Commissioner, Pierre Moscovici, has called for further harmonisation of taxation, including scrapping the UK’s zero rates, stating a ‘zero rate is not the best idea’ (Guardian, 28 January 2016, link)."
"The Commission suggests areas such as wages, union rights, pensions and access to social services could form part of the ‘pillar’ (European Commission, January 2016, link). This could mean the UK’s more generous social protections are weakened by EU harmonisation."

"The UK is paying £2bn to help Turkey, Albania, Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia to join the EU."

"The UK has gone further than EU law on workers’ rights. Further harmonisation of social legislation poses a threat to the UK’s more generous protections."

"The minimum wage, which was introduced in 1998, had nothing to do with the EU (National Minimum Wage Act 1998, link)."

"There is no need to be in the EU to ensure equal pay for equal work."

"The Employment Protection Act 1975 provided that a woman who was dismissed on the grounds of pregnancy was to be treated as unfairly dismissed (Employment Protection Act 1975, link). This was adopted long before the Pregnant Workers Directive (1992/85/EEC, link)."

"The UK has been more generous than EU law on paid holidays, with 5.6 weeks entitlement each year, rather than the four contained in EU law (HM Government, 2016, link; Council Directive 2003/88/EC, art. 7, link)."
"The UK is more generous on maternity pay. Statutory maternity pay lasts for 39 weeks under UK law (Statutory Maternity Pay (General) Regulations 1986, SI 1986/1960, art. 2(2), link). This is much more generous than EU law, which provides for a period of 14 weeks (Directive 1992/85/EC, art. 8, link)."

"UK legislation also gives women the right to receive 90% of their salary during the first six weeks of leave (Social Security Contributions and Benefits Act 1992, s. 166, link). EU law only requires that the rate of pay be equivalent to statutory sick pay in this period (Directive 1992/85/EC, art. 11(3), link). This is £88.45 per week (Welfare Benefits Up-rating Order 2015, SI 2015/30, link)."

"The UK is more generous on maternity leave. UK maternity leave may be taken for up to 52 weeks (Maternity and Parental Leave etc. Regulations 1999/3312, reg 7; HM Government, 2016, link). EU law only requires a period of four months (Directive 2010/18/EU, Annex, clause 2, link)."

"The right of part-time workers not to be discriminated against is contained in UK legislation (Part-time Workers (Prevention of Less Favourable Treatment) Regulations 2000, SI 2000/1551, link). The enabling legislation was the Employment Relations Act 1999 (Employment Relations Act 1999, s. 19, link). This means that protections for part-time workers would remain in UK law if we left the EU."

"The UK had legislation against discrimination on grounds of race long before the EU did."

"The UK passed the legislation against race discrimination, the Race Relations Act 1965 and the Race Relations Act 1968, before we joined the EU."
"High Court Judge Sir Rabinder Singh has said: 'The Race Relations Act 1976 [which consolidated the 1960s legislation] was perhaps one of the strongest pieces of legislation of its kind in the world and certainly in Europe. It long predated legislation against racial discrimination in EU law' (Runnymede Trust Conference, 29 July 2015, link)."

"EU membership and the meddling court that comes with it have put up prices and hurt our economic growth."

"If we Vote Leave, we can take back control of the £350 million we hand to Brussels every week and spend it on our priorities. The EU is costly, bureaucratic and blind to the impact it has had on people’s wages and soaring energy bills."

"it is also a vote for a more prosperous future."

"Independent studies have shown the EU increases the cost of living."

"The European Court has consistently increased the price of everyday goods and services, such as insurance, beer and the installation of solar panels."

"If we Vote Leave, we will scrap VAT on household energy bills, saving £64 for each household each year."
"The EU and European Court are putting up the cost of travelling on the West Coast Mainline by forcing the UK to create a new freight corridor, as the Government has admitted."

"Sterling is currently higher than where it was shortly after the referendum was called. There is nothing to suggest a major devaluation would follow a leave vote."

"The IN campaign wrongly assumes the UK would impose tariffs on imports."

"The independent House of Commons Library has concluded that EU membership actually increases the costs of consumer goods, stating that the EU’s Common Agricultural Policy ‘artificially inflates food prices’ and that ‘consumer prices across a range of other goods imported from outside the EU are raised as a result of the common external tariff and non-tariff barriers to trade imposed by the EU. These include footwear (a 17% tariff), bicycles (15% tariff) and a range of clothing (12% tariff)’ (House of Commons Library, 18 September 2013, link)."

"Richard Asquith, the Vice President of Avalara, said the judgment could increase the cost of car insurance policies by £14 per year in the UK (The Sun, 1 April 2016, link)."

"Richard Insole, direct tax partner at Deloitte LLP, has said the decision could result in significantly increased operating costs for UK insurers and an impact on policy premiums as a result (Deloitte, 17 March 2016, link)."
"In March 2011, the European Court ruled that the EU’s Charter of Fundamental Rights meant that women could not be charged lower premiums than men, increasing the cost of car and life insurance (Test-Achats ASBL v Conseil des ministres [2011] ECR I-773, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control] June 21 2016 The EU and the European Court increase the cost of: Position: 16 - 16]

255.

"On 12 July 1981, the European Court ruled that the UK’s low duty on beer ‘afford[ed] protection to domestic beer production’ and was therefore illegal under EU law (Commission v United Kingdom [1983] ECR 2265, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control] June 21 2016 The EU and the European Court increase the cost of: Position: 17 - 17]

256.

"In his 1984 budget statement, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Nigel Lawson, said ‘we lost; and I am now implementing the judgment handed down by the court last year. Accordingly, I propose to increase the duty on beer by the minimum amount needed to comply with the judgment and maintain revenue: 2p on a typical pint of beer’ (Hansard, 13 March 1984, col. 302, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control] June 21 2016 The EU and the European Court increase the cost of: Position: 17 - 17]

257.

"In June 2015, the European Court ruled the UK’s 5% rate of VAT on the installation of energy saving materials such as solar panels and wind turbines was illegal (Commission v United Kingdom, Case C-161/14, link). HMRC is now proposing to raise VAT to 20%, which will cost consumers £310 million between 2016-2017 and 2021-2022 (HMRC, 9 December 2016, link). The Solar Trade Association predicts that the cost of installing solar panels could increase by approximately £1,000 if the Government’s proposed changes are introduced (Solar Trade Association, February 2016, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control] June 21 2016 The EU and the European Court increase the cost of: Position: 18 - 18]

258.

"European Union law prevents the UK from cutting VAT on household energy bills (Council Directive 2006/112/EC, art. 102, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control] June 21 2016 The EU and the European Court increase the cost of: Position: 20 - 20]

259.

"If we Vote Leave, we will be able to scrap VAT on household energy bills, as the UK will have left the EU’s common system of VAT. Each household on average spends £25.80 per week on electricity, gas and other fuels, or £1,341.60 per year (ONS, 8 December 2015, link). Subtracting VAT of 5% would reduce this figure to £1,277.70, a saving of £63.89 per household."
260. "This will benefit low income households in particular. The lowest decile on average spends 9.1% of average household income on electricity, gas and other fuels. The average UK household spends 4.9% of its income on energy, while the top decile spends just 3.1% of its income on energy (ONS, 8 December 2015, link)."

261. "This could mean international freight trains have the right to operated instead of passenger services (Regulation 2013/1316/EU, Annex II, link; Regulation 2010/913/EU, art. 14, link; European Commission, June 2015, link)."

262. "Mr Goodwill stated that the Decision left ‘the UK exposed to some potentially significant risks’, including that the EU will ‘have more influence on decisions of infrastructure use and transport planning that fall within Member State competence’ and that Network Rail could have ‘to set aside more capacity for international freight at the expense of well-used passenger services’, with particular consequences for ‘the heavily used West Coast Main Line’ (HM Government, 13 March 2014, link)."

263. "Mr Goodwill accepted that ‘there are likely to be... financial costs and physical impacts to the UK’s rail network’ (HM Government, 13 March 2014, link)."

264. "Sterling is higher than where it was shortly after the Prime Minister's deal. The value of the currency has increased from to 1.3871 $/£ on 26 February to 1.4624 $/£ today (Bloomberg, 13 June 2016, link)."

265. "It is simply wrong to suggest that a fall in the currency would necessarily lead to higher inflation. Consumers might choose to buy domestically produced goods instead of imported goods."
"The UK will strike a free trade deal with the EU, as leading IN campaigners have accepted, so there is no prospect of new import duties being imposed. The UK's former Ambassador to the EU and leading supporter of the IN campaign, Lord Kerr of Kinlochard, has admitted: ‘there is no doubt that the UK could secure a free trade agreement with the EU. That is not an issue’ (Lords Hansard, 2 November 2015, col. 1492, link)."

"In any event, there is no obligation under World Trade Organization rules to impose tariffs on imports."

"A group of high profile Labour MPs have highlighted a series of austerity measures, perpetrated by George Osborne and David Cameron, that could have been avoided if we had kept the hundreds of millions we send to the EU every week."

"When George Osborne introduced the bedroom tax, the cuts to social services, and the public sector pay freeze, he said it was necessary in order to get the economy back on track. Today's letter shows that this is not true and that in fact it is a matter of priorities. If we had been in control of the £350 million we spend on EU membership every week, all this could have been avoided."

"In analysis published today we show that many of the harshest policies introduced as part of George Osborne and David Cameron’s austerity programme could have been avoided if the UK had been able to keep the money we currently send to the EU."
"From 2010 to 2015 George Osborne and David Cameron made £70 billion of austerity cuts. Over the same period UK taxpayers paid £47 billion into EU coffers. This is the net figure, and does not include either our rebate or the money the EU spends on our behalf in the UK."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 21 2016 We could have avoided austerity - Vote Leave; Position: 8 - 8]

272.

"The hated Bedroom Tax, which saved £987 million or just 2% of our net EU contribution"

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 21 2016 We could have avoided austerity - Vote Leave; Position: 10 - 10]

273.

"The cuts to adult social services, which saved £2.5 billion or 5.4% of our net EU contribution"

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 21 2016 We could have avoided austerity - Vote Leave; Position: 11 - 11]

274.

"Cuts to the NHS Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services, which saved £33 million or just 0.07% of our net EU contribution"

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 21 2016 We could have avoided austerity - Vote Leave; Position: 12 - 12]

275.

"Cuts to flood defences, which saved £107 million or just 0.2% of net EU contribution"

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 21 2016 We could have avoided austerity - Vote Leave; Position: 13 - 13]

276.

"Cuts to Legal Aid, which saved £874 million or 1.5% of our net EU contribution"

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 21 2016 We could have avoided austerity - Vote Leave; Position: 14 - 14]

277.

"Cuts to public libraries, which saved £708 million or 1.5% of our net EU contribution"

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 21 2016 We could have avoided austerity - Vote Leave; Position: 15 - 15]

278.

"There would have been no need to privatise Royal Mail. This privatisation raised £3.3 billion equivalent to 7% of our net EU contribution"

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 21 2016 We could have avoided austerity - Vote Leave; Position: 17 - 17]

279.
"We could have avoided the public sector pay freeze, which saved £8 billion or 17% of our net EU contribution"

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 21 2016 We could have avoided austerity - Vote Leave; Position: 18 - 18]

280.

"All eight of these measures could have been avoided if we had retained just 35% of the money we gave to the EU over the same period."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 21 2016 We could have avoided austerity - Vote Leave; Position: 19 - 19]

281.

"If we vote to leave we can take back control of the money we send to the EU and spend it on our own priorities. Over the course of this Parliament our net contributions to Brussels are set to total almost £50 billion - think what we could do with that if we were able to take back control and spend it on our own priorities. Think about the changes we could make to improve the lives of people and communities across the UK."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 21 2016 We could have avoided austerity - Vote Leave; Position: 20 - 20]

282.

"UK taxpayers are already paying almost £2 billion to support the accession of Albania, Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia and Turkey, however these findings suggest that further dedicated resources are being used to help them join the EU."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 20 2016 British embassies have dedicated teams to help Tur; Position: 5 - 5]

283.

"This evening the Prime Minister failed to clarify whether it remains official Government policy to pave the road from Ankara to Brussels and how much, and in what way, taxpayers’ money is being spent to help Turkey and other nations join the European Union, on top of the £2 billion bill we already know about."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 20 2016 British embassies have dedicated teams to help Tur; Position: 8 - 8]

284.

"We send £350 million every week to the EU. With our public services already under huge pressure, it is perverse for taxpayers’ money to be spent on helping these countries join the EU when the result would inevitably be increased migration to the UK, only adding to the strain."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 20 2016 British embassies have dedicated teams to help Tur; Position: 9 - 9]
"UK pays £1.8 billion to help Albania, Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia and Turkey to join the EU"

[Vote Leave - take back control June 20 2016 British embassies have dedicated teams to help Tur; Position: 17 - 17]

286.

"The table shows that the UK will pay £1.19 billion to the EU’s pre-accession assistance programme between 2014 and 2020, or £170 million each year."

[Vote Leave - take back control June 20 2016 British embassies have dedicated teams to help Tur; Position: 23 - 23]

287.

"In addition, the UK agreed to pay up to an additional £640 million to Turkey as part of the recent EU-Turkey deal. This deal has been struck with the stated aim of ‘re-energis[ing] the accession process’ of Turkey to the EU (European Council, 18 March 2016, link). The UK will pay Turkey £250 million in bilateral assistance and will pay a further £97 million as part of EU payments to Turkey: £347 million in total between 2016 and 2017 (Turkey Refugee Facility: Written statement - HCWS582, 7 March 2016, link; HM Treasury, December 2015, link; HMRC, March 2016, link). A further €3 billion will be provided by the EU by 2018 (European Council, 18 March 2016, link). The UK’s share of this payment will be at least £293 million (HM Treasury, December 2015, link; HMRC, March 2016, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control June 20 2016 British embassies have dedicated teams to help Tur; Position: 24 - 24]

288.

"Combining commitments under the Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance and obligations to Turkey under the recent deal, the UK’s total payments to candidate countries will be £1.8 billion."

[Vote Leave - take back control June 20 2016 British embassies have dedicated teams to help Tur; Position: 25 - 25]

289.

"Total UK payments to Turkey in the period 2014 to 2020 could be as high as £1.09 billion."

[Vote Leave - take back control June 20 2016 British embassies have dedicated teams to help Tur; Position: 26 - 26]

290.

"The EU has made no secret of its plans to abolish the UK’s zero and reduced rates of value added tax (VAT)."

[Vote Leave - take back control June 20 2016 EU tax bombshell to cost each household over £2600; Position: 3 - 3]
"Official figures from the Commissioners for HM Revenue and Customs (HMRC) show that the revenue raised if these lower rates did not exist would have been £71.3 billion in 2015-2016. This would constitute an effective 61.5% rise in VAT, or a 10.5% increase in the total tax burden."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 20 2016 EU tax bombshell to cost each household over £2600; Position: 4 - 4] 292.

"This amounts to £2,649 per household and suggests that the EU’s continued control of the UK’s tax system could prove very costly in the event of a ‘remain’ vote on 23 June."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 20 2016 EU tax bombshell to cost each household over £2600; Position: 5 - 5] 293.

"VAT is an EU tax, and the EU is always keen to control it more firmly. Doubtless in the future they will want to tax us more - and will use VAT to do so. The latest consultation is on centralising the tax, with no mention of the UK’s wish to abolish the tampon tax or VAT on fuel, policies which are against EU law today. Tomorrow EU law might make us put up VAT on various necessities of life."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 20 2016 EU tax bombshell to cost each household over £2600; Position: 7 - 7] 294.

"We should have the power to set our own tax rates in this country rather than being told what to do by the EU. It is an affront to democracy and it directly impacts on British families - with their latest plans set to cost every household more than £2500. That’s on top of the £350 million we send to the EU every week."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 20 2016 EU tax bombshell to cost each household over £2600; Position: 9 - 9] 295.

"In January this year, the Economics Commissioner, Pierre Moscovici, called for further harmonisation of taxation, including scrapping the UK’s zero rates, stating a ‘zero rate is not the best idea’ (Guardian, 28 January 2016, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 20 2016 EU tax bombshell to cost each household over £2600; Position: 12 - 12] 296.

"The table shows that the total amount of revenue that would be raised if these reliefs were scrapped would have been £71.3 billion in 2015-2016. This would amount to an increase in the revenue collected from VAT of 61.5%, or a 10.5% rise in total taxes (HM Treasury, March 2016, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 20 2016 EU tax bombshell to cost each household over £2600; Position: 17 - 17] 297.
"The table shows that an additional tax burden of £2,639 would fall on each household in the event that the UK’s major VAT reliefs were scrapped."

[Vote Leave - take back control] June 20 2016 EU tax bombshell to cost each household over £2600; Position: 20 - 20]

298.
"The EU has recently accelerated talks with Turkey with David Cameron’s support and UK taxpayers are sending £1 billion to Turkey to help them join."

[Vote Leave - take back control] June 19 2016 David Cameron repeatedly refused to answer basic q; Position: 3 - 3]

299.
"He had no answer on how we would fund the NHS"

[Vote Leave - take back control] June 19 2016 David Cameron repeatedly refused to answer basic q; Position: 4 - 4]

300.
"We are paying billions to Turkey and other candidate countries to join. Turkey is set to receive £1 billion of UK funds to help prepare it for membership. The EU is paying €17.7 billion to Albania, Serbia, Turkey, Macedonia and Montenegro to join the EU. The UK is paying almost £1.8 billion to these five countries to join (Vote Leave, 27 April 2016, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control] June 19 2016 David Cameron repeatedly refused to answer basic q; Position: 13 - 13]

301.
"Wages will rise if we Vote Leave as the leader of David Cameron’s campaign admitted. ‘Experts’ such as the Bank of England and the Chancellor’s former advisor agree."

[Vote Leave - take back control] June 19 2016 David Cameron repeatedly refused to answer basic q; Position: 14 - 14]

302.
"The Chairman of the IN campaign, Lord Rose of Monewden, has said that: ‘the price of labour will go up’ in the event of a vote to leave (Evidence to Treasury Committee, March 2016, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control] June 19 2016 David Cameron repeatedly refused to answer basic q; Position: 15 - 15]

303.
"The Bank of England has found that ‘the immigrant to native ratio has a small negative impact on average British wages’ (Bank of England, December 2015, link). The study found that ‘immigrants in recent years are most predominant in low-skill occupations’ (Bank of England, December 2015, link). The study concluded that: ‘the biggest effect is in the semi/unskilled services sector, where a 10 percentage point rise in the proportion of immigrants is associated with a 2 percent reduction in pay’ (Bank of England, December 2015, link)."
"A BlackRock report in February co-written by Rupert Harrison, a former close advisor to the Chancellor, said leaving the EU could mean 'lower immigration [which] could make labour scarcer in the long run, pushing up wage costs' (BlackRock, February 2016, link)."

"David Cameron admitted ‘we pay in more than we get out’.

"In 2014, the UK’s gross contributions to the EU budget were £19,107 million, or £367 million per week (ONS, October 2015, tab 9.9, link). The Head of the UK Statistics Authority, Sir Andrew Dilnot, has said ‘Yes, the £19.1 billion figure is a legitimate figure for gross contributions... the official statistics are the £19.1 billion’ (Evidence to Public Administration and Constitutional Affairs Committee, 26 April 2016, link)."

"In 2015, the UK’s net contribution was £10.6 billion (ONS, 31 March 2016, link)."

"Details of the proposals for restricting in-work benefits for EU nationals will be subject to further negotiation and we cannot speculate on these’. The Minister was unable even to state which benefits the ‘emergency brake’ might apply to (Social Security Benefits: EU Nationals: Written question - HL5972, 22 February 2016, link)."

"Public services are under pressure due to EU migration."
"If net migration continues at current levels, there is almost no chance of today’s overcrowding or undersupply being addressed. Shelter has already noted that: ‘Each year we build 100,000 fewer homes than we need, adding to a shortage that has been growing for decades’ (KPMG/Shelter, 2014, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control June 19 2016 David Cameron repeatedly refused to answer basic q; Position: 51 - 51]

311.

"EU migrants can claim unemployment benefit,"

[Vote Leave - take back control June 19 2016 David Cameron repeatedly refused to answer basic q; Position: 54 - 54]

312.

"There is no requirement under EU law to pay non-contributory cash benefits designed to provide subsistence to persons who entered the UK seeking work and who have never found it."

[Vote Leave - take back control June 19 2016 David Cameron repeatedly refused to answer basic q; Position: 56 - 56]

313.

"It is illegal under EU law to remove all jobseekers after six months and there is no mechanism for doing so, despite David Cameron’s claims."

[Vote Leave - take back control June 19 2016 David Cameron repeatedly refused to answer basic q; Position: 57 - 57]

314.

"The EU Treaties forbid the removal of all jobseekers after six months."

[Vote Leave - take back control June 19 2016 David Cameron repeatedly refused to answer basic q; Position: 59 - 59]

315.

"The Free Movement Directive forbids the removal of all jobseekers after six months."

[Vote Leave - take back control June 19 2016 David Cameron repeatedly refused to answer basic q; Position: 60 - 60]

316.

"Leading car manufacturers have made clear that jobs and investment would not be affected if we Vote Leave."

[Vote Leave - take back control June 19 2016 David Cameron repeatedly refused to answer basic q; Position: 75 - 75]

317.

"Tim Tozer, Chairman and Managing Director, of Vauxhall Motors has said: ‘If this country would vote to leave the EU, would that trouble or concern us? There my answer is no because I don’t think
that in that event there would not be a trade agreement with what was left of the EU” (BBC Radio 4, Today Programme, 15 September 2015, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 19 2016 David Cameron repeatedly refused to answer basic q; Position: 76 - 76]

318.

"Kevin Rose, board member, at Bentley has said: ‘We made our plans, we've announced the investments … and they were in full knowledge that there was a referendum so we believe in the UK … Regardless [of the outcome], we think that the UK is a good place for investment’ (Reuters, 17 September 2015, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 19 2016 David Cameron repeatedly refused to answer basic q; Position: 77 - 77]

319.

"Karl-Thomas Neumann, Chief Executive of Opel has said: 'We have plants in Luton and Ellesmere port. We will not turn our back on England... life would carry on... We would continue to find ways to invest' (Reuters, 17 September 2015, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 19 2016 David Cameron repeatedly refused to answer basic q; Position: 78 - 78]

320.

"Trevor Mann, Chief Performance Officer at Nissan has said: 'If there was a future trade agreement between the UK and EU then it wouldn't make a lot of difference' (Financial Times, 11 January 2016, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 19 2016 David Cameron repeatedly refused to answer basic q; Position: 79 - 79]

321.

"Takahiro Hachigo, Chief Executive of Honda, has said: 'Honda remains firmly committed to car production in the UK and Europe. Our production activity in the UK plays a key role for our business in terms of providing products to the European market… and beyond' (AutoExpress, 1 October 2015, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 19 2016 David Cameron repeatedly refused to answer basic q; Position: 80 - 80]

322.

"Akio Toyoda, Chief Executive of Toyota, has said: 'We want to deepen our roots to deliver ever better cars, so when that capsule is opened after 100 years, all can see we’ve built a truly British company.... I think a strong manufacturing workforce and parts supply chain are characteristic of the UK... I understand it was judging on those factors that we choose to put our first European plant in Britain' (Financial Times, 11 January 2016, link). Toyota does not even mention the EU in its corporate document giving its reasons for investing in the UK (link)"
"Carlos Ghosn, the chief executive of Renault-Nissan, has said: ‘Whatever is the decision of the UK we will adapt to it. I don’t think there is a reason to worry. We knew for many years that [an exit] was possible. So we’ll deal with it’ (Guardian, 21 January 2016, link)."

"Claims about a shock and decline in trade which would hit the public finances have been disputed by David Cameron"

"Economists have made serious errors before. Most supported the euro. The Bank of England supported the Exchange Rate Mechanism. This was a disaster."

"The debate in this referendum is about our lack of control over economic migration from parts of Europe whose economies are being destroyed by the euro. This is now affecting families in Britain because it is putting the NHS under pressure and it is pushing down wages."

"Our communities and public services are already under pressure. To make this worse would be a mistake and the only vote we get on this is on Thursday."

"Will he stop sending taxpayers’ money to Turkey to help them join the EU?"

"The former Secretary of State for Children, Schools and Families, Ed Balls, recognised that free movement was causing problems, stating ‘while a limit has been secured on the benefits paid to
migrant workers - I don’t think that can be the end of the story. We need to press Europe to restore proper borders, and put new controls on economic migration’ (Daily Mirror, 13 June 2016, link)."

"Turkey is set to receive over £1 billion of UK funds to help prepare it for membership. The EU is paying €17.7 billion to Albania, Serbia, Turkey, Macedonia and Montenegro to join the EU. The UK is paying almost £1.8 billion to these five countries to join (Vote Leave, 27 April 2016, link)."

"They have no plan for how we will fund the NHS so it can cope with the extra pressures that staying in the EU will create."

"They have no plan for where we will build the extra houses and they have no plan to help people who will see further pressure on their pay packets."

"Jeremy Corbyn admitted the EU’s failing economic policies were causing population flows into the UK."

"Reviving the Migration Impact Fund would not alleviate the burden on public services"

"The Bank of England has found that uncontrolled migration has reduced wages."

"this would not alleviate pressure on public services caused by uncontrolled migration."
"If the fund were revived, it would be the equivalent of an additional £106 per net migrant to the UK in 2015 (ONS, 2015, link). This is much less than the cost of providing public services."

[Vote Leave - take back control June 19 2016 IN campaign acknowledge there is no way of control; Position: 25 - 25]

"The Bank of England has found that ‘the immigrant to native ratio has a small negative impact on average British wages’ (Bank of England, December 2015, link). The study found that ‘immigrants in recent years are most predominant in low-skill occupations’ (Bank of England, December 2015, link). The study concluded that: ‘the biggest effect is in the semi/unskilled services sector, where a 10 percentage point rise in the proportion of immigrants is associated with a 2 percent reduction in pay’ (Bank of England, December 2015, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control June 19 2016 IN campaign acknowledge there is no way of control; Position: 31 - 31]

"wages will go up’ if we Vote Leave, stating: ‘If you are short of labour, the price of labour will go up’ (Evidence to Treasury Committee, 2 March 2016, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control June 19 2016 IN campaign acknowledge there is no way of control; Position: 32 - 32]

"lower immigration [which] could make labour scarcer in the long run, pushing up wage costs' (BlackRock, February 2016, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control June 19 2016 IN campaign acknowledge there is no way of control; Position: 33 - 33]

"Withdrawal from the EU could also provide scope for the imposition of tighter controls on inward migration. This would reinforce the endogenous effects on economic migration coming from a weaker UK economy and labour market. Net inward migration is assumed to decline by 84 000 per year over 2019-2023, with around 75% of this reflected in the labour force’ (OECD, 26 April 2016, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control June 19 2016 IN campaign acknowledge there is no way of control; Position: 42 - 42]

"If we Vote Leave we can create 300,000 jobs by doing trade deals with fast growing economies across the globe."

[Vote Leave - take back control June 18 2016 Vote Leave response to IMF report - Vote Leave; Position: 3 - 3]
"We can stop sending the £350 million we pay Brussels every week. That is why it is safer to Vote Leave."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 18 2016 Vote Leave response to IMF report - Vote Leave; Position: 3 - 3]

344.

"UK growth in the medium-term could increase if we left the EU and that EU membership does not increase economic growth"

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 18 2016 Vote Leave response to IMF report - Vote Leave; Position: 7 - 7]

345.

"The IMF underplays the value of new free trade agreements to the British economy, which could create 300,000 jobs."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 18 2016 Vote Leave response to IMF report - Vote Leave; Position: 8 - 8]

346.

"The IMF ignores a major Treasury study showing that the cost of the EU could be as high as 7% of GDP, or £4,638 per household."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 18 2016 Vote Leave response to IMF report - Vote Leave; Position: 9 - 9]

347.

"The Bank of England has said the IMF is wrong and that wages would rise."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 18 2016 Vote Leave response to IMF report - Vote Leave; Position: 10 - 10]

348.

"The real risk to the economy is staying tied to the failing Eurozone"

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 18 2016 Vote Leave response to IMF report - Vote Leave; Position: 11 - 11]

349.

"This is despite the IMF acknowledging that a ‘new UK-EU Free Trade Agreement’ is possible"

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 18 2016 Vote Leave response to IMF report - Vote Leave; Position: 16 - 16]

350.

"The IMF claims that leaving the EU could mean that the UK loses the financial passport. The Governor of the Bank of England has said: ‘that mutual recognition arrangements are possible to achieve’ (Evidence to Treasury Select Committee, 8 March 2016, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 18 2016 Vote Leave response to IMF report - Vote Leave; Position: 18 - 18]
351. "The IMF finds UK growth in the medium-term could increase if we left the EU and that EU membership does not increase economic growth."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 18 2016 Vote Leave response to IMF report - Vote Leave; Position: 19 - 19]

352. "The IMF finds that in the medium-term growth could be higher if we left the EU. It concludes that, in 2020, growth if we remain in the EU would be 2.1% but if we left the EU would be between 2.1% and 2.6%. In 2021, it finds growth if we remain in the EU would be 2.1% but if we left the EU, it would be between 2.1% and 2.9% (p. 32)."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 18 2016 Vote Leave response to IMF report - Vote Leave; Position: 21 - 21]

353. "The IMF acknowledges that Foreign Direct Investment from the EU has fallen."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 18 2016 Vote Leave response to IMF report - Vote Leave; Position: 22 - 22]

354. "The IMF report states that ‘FDI inflows to the UK reached a peak… in 2008 and have since fallen in subsequent years’ (p. 17)."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 18 2016 Vote Leave response to IMF report - Vote Leave; Position: 23 - 23]

355. "Official figures from the ONS show that over the last ten years the EU’s net investment into the UK has declined. Recently, the EU as a whole has disinvested from the UK. Today flows of FDI from the United States are more important to the British economy than those from the EU (ONS, December 2015, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 18 2016 Vote Leave response to IMF report - Vote Leave; Position: 24 - 24]

356. "The IMF underplays the value of new free trade agreements to the British economy, which could create 300,000 jobs."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 18 2016 Vote Leave response to IMF report - Vote Leave; Position: 25 - 25]

357. "The IMF downplays the value of new trade agreements to the British economy, stating that ‘substituting to other export markets would likely take time’ (p.25). As the IMF itself accepts,
however, ‘the China-Switzerland agreement was reached relatively quickly-three years’. The EU, by contrast, has not struck a free trade agreement with China."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 18 2016 Vote Leave response to IMF report - Vote Leave; Position: 26 - 26]

358.
"The EU’s failure to conclude just five trade agreements it has promised to strike has, according to the European Commission’s own figures, cost the UK 284,000 jobs (Vote Leave, 12 May 2016, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 18 2016 Vote Leave response to IMF report - Vote Leave; Position: 28 - 28]

359.
"The IMF ignores a major Treasury study showing that the cost of the EU could be as high as 7% of GDP, or £4,638 per household."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 18 2016 Vote Leave response to IMF report - Vote Leave; Position: 29 - 29]

360.
"This has brought costs: expensive subsidies still remain in some sectors and it is estimated that barriers to external trade and investment - such as tariffs, quotas and unjustifiably restrictive standards - could cost Europe’s consumers up to 7 per cent of EU GDP’ (HM Treasury, October 2005, link).

- This is the equivalent of £125.2 billion per year in today’s prices, or £4,638 per household (ONS, February 2016, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 18 2016 Vote Leave response to IMF report - Vote Leave; Position: 31 - 32]

361.
"The Bank of England has said the IMF are wrong and that wages would rise."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 18 2016 Vote Leave response to IMF report - Vote Leave; Position: 33 - 33]

362.
"The Bank of England has found that ‘the immigrant to native ratio has a small negative impact on average British wage’ (Bank of England, December 2015, link). The study found that ‘immigrants in recent years are most predominant in low-skill occupations’ (Bank of England, December 2015, link). The study concluded that: ‘the biggest effect is in the semi/unskilled services sector, where a 10 percentage point rise in the proportion of immigrants is associated with a 2 percent reduction in pay’ (Bank of England, December 2015, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 18 2016 Vote Leave response to IMF report - Vote Leave; Position: 34 - 34]

363.
"‘the price of labour will go up”"
"George Osborne’s former close adviser, Rupert Harrison, agrees. A BlackRock report in February co-written by Harrison said leaving the EU could mean ‘lower immigration [which] could make labour scarcer in the long run, pushing up wage costs’ (BlackRock, February 2016, link)."

"The real risk to the economy is staying tied to the failing Eurozone, as the IMF admitted yesterday."

"The medium term outlook is still weak… Productivity remains below pre-crisis levels and faces greater pressures from adverse demographics… high unemployment and debt burdens are likely to persist, leaving the euro area vulnerable to the risk of stagnation’ (IMF, 16 June 2016, link)."

"First, British trade with Germany will not decline significantly. As economists have long known, trade is embedded in business and social networks into which partners invest enormous social capital. Studies repeatedly show that businesses make accommodations in profit margins to retain the benefits of trust and reliability. For this reason, all productive trading relationships will remain intact."

"And even if British trade with the EU falls, trade with other regions will undoubtedly increase’"

"Our NHS is being hit hard by population growth"

"To Vote Leave is a vote to protect the NHS."
"The Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) allows for an undemocratic institution potentially to tear down regulatory barriers and reduce protection against big businesses who want unprecedented access to Europe’s public health services."

"the NHS is still in the firing line"

"The best way to ensure the safety of our NHS is to leave the EU, safeguarding our health service for generations to come."

"Britain currently sends £10 billion a year net of taxpayers’ money to the EU to fund an undemocratic institution. Instead it should be invested in Britain’s priorities, like providing patients and staff with excellent resources and increasing capacity."

"But it is absurd to suggest the UK would turn away much-needed doctors and nurses. In the Leave campaign, we want fair, well controlled migration."

"By ending the unfair discrimination against non-Europeans, we will provide more opportunities for talented healthcare professionals from across the world to contribute to our health service and provide patients with the best care."

"The UK will have little power over the EU changing its mind and policy in relation to agreements such as TTIP."
378. "I am voting Leave to protect one of the most fundamental and valued institutions in our society: the National Health Service."

[Vote Leave - take back control 2016 Maria Caulfield MP - Vote Leave for the Nurses and Position: 9 - 9]

379. "It is also a fact that both the European Union and the United Kingdom are paying billions to Turkey in order to facilitate its accession."

[Vote Leave - take back control 2016 Letter to the Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary; Position: 7 - 7]

380. "The EU is paying €17.7 billion to Albania, Serbia, Turkey, Macedonia and Montenegro to join the EU. The UK is paying almost £1.8 billion to these five countries to join."

[Vote Leave - take back control 2016 Letter to the Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary; Position: 7 - 7]

381. "the Commission in their own words are accelerating the bid and when UK taxpayers are paying money to make it happen."

[Vote Leave - take back control 2016 IN campaign’s claims on Turkey are falling apart; Position: 3 - 3]

382. "we are paying them £1 billion to join."

[Vote Leave - take back control 2016 IN campaign’s claims on Turkey are falling apart; Position: 9 - 9]

383. "we are paying them £1 billion to join."

[Vote Leave - take back control 2016 IN campaign’s claims on Turkey are falling apart; Position: 26 - 26]

384. "It is set to receive over £1 billion of UK funds to help prepare it for membership (Vote Leave, 27 April 2016, link)."

[Vote Leave - take back control 2016 IN campaign’s claims on Turkey are falling apart; Position: 28 - 28]

385. "This is a fantastic set of figures, showing almost half a million more people in work over the last year, and unemployment at the lowest rate in over a decade. It confounds the doom-laden statements
from the IN campaign - who have tried to make us believe that the referendum is hurting the labour market."

"to leave the EU, with it’s job destroying single currency."

"First, British trade with Germany will not decline significantly. As economists have long known, trade is embedded in business and social networks into which partners invest enormous social capital. Studies repeatedly show that businesses make accommodations in profit margins to retain the benefits of trust and reliability. For this reason, all productive trading relationships will remain intact."

"And even if British trade with the EU falls, trade with other regions will undoubtedly increase’ (Independent, 1 June 2016, link)."

"If we Vote Leave, we will be able to take back control of the millions we send to the EU every week and we will be able to invest in our priorities like the NHS instead."

"Leaving the EU will benefit the public finances."

"claims that leaving the EU would be as bad as 2008."
"Leaving the EU will benefit the public finances."

"In 2014, the UK’s net contribution was £9.872 billion (ONS, October 2015, tab 9.9, link). This rose to £10.649 billion in 2015 (ONS, 31 March 2016, tab H, link)."

"First, British trade with Germany will not decline significantly. As economists have long known, trade is embedded in business and social networks into which partners invest enormous social capital. Studies repeatedly show that businesses make accommodations in profit margins to retain the benefits of trust and reliability. For this reason, all productive trading relationships will remain intact."

"And even if British trade with the EU falls, trade with other regions will undoubtedly increase’ (Independent, 1 June 2016, link)."

"If Norway, Switzerland and Canada have such a bad deal, why do the peoples of those countries not want to join the EU?"

"Business polling has consistently shown a majority of firms want the British Government, not the EU, in charge of trade policy and reject the premise of the so-called ‘single market’."

"The CBI’s own report on the EU referendum showed growth would be higher in the event of a vote to leave the EU"
"Albania is currently a candidate country to join the EU and the UK is currently paying nearly £2 billion to it and four other countries to join the EU (Vote Leave, May 2016, link)."

"If Norway, Switzerland and Canada have such a bad deal, why do the peoples of those countries not want to join the EU?"

"A majority of IoD members (50%) agree that the UK could make an economic success of leaving the EU (Institute of Directors, 9 May 2016, link)."

"Business polling has consistently shown a majority of firms want the British Government, not the EU, in charge of trade policy and reject the premise of the so-called ‘single market’."

"further transfer of control to Brussels"

"The CBI’s own report on the EU referendum showed growth would be higher in the event of a vote to leave the EU."

"A report by PwC for CBI found that in the periods 2021-2025 and 2026-2030, growth would be higher (or the same) if the UK left the EU (whether or not in struck a free trade agreement with the EU) than in the counterfactual in which the UK remained in the EU (PwC/CBI, March 2016, link)."
"The report also found the economy would grow substantially in the event of a leave vote, stating: ‘Compared to 2015 levels, real UK GDP would be 39% larger in the FTA scenario and 36% larger in the WTO scenario in 2030’ (PwC/CBI, March 2016, link)."

"The report showed that 3 million jobs would be created even in the event the UK left the EU and traded on WTO terms (Vote Leave, 21 March 2016, link)."

"the £350 million a week we send to Brussels is paying for"

"We can also start negotiating new trade deals to promote free trade before we have left the EU."

"to abolish VAT on fuel and tampons"

"end payouts under EU law to big businesses, saving between £7 billion and £43 billion for public services by 2021"

"This would abolish the 5% rate of VAT on household energy bills by the date of the next general election by amending the Value Added Tax Act 1994, and will be a major benefit for low income households. This will be paid for by savings from the UK’s contributions to the EU budget."
"This would require that by the next general election, the NHS receives a £100 million per week real-terms cash transfusion over and above current plans. This will be paid for by savings from the UK’s contributions to the EU budget and other savings from leaving"

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 15 2016 A framework for taking back control and establishing Position: 16 - 16]

"That would restore the UK Government’s power to control its own trade policy. That would create jobs. The UK would take back its seat on the World Trade Organization, becoming a more influential force for free trade and friendly cooperation. After we Vote Leave, we would immediately be able to start negotiating new trade deals with emerging economies and the world’s biggest economies (the US, China and Japan, as well as Canada, Australia, South Korea, New Zealand, and so on), which could enter into force immediately after the UK leaves the EU."

[Vote Leave - take back control\June 15 2016 A framework for taking back control and establishi; Position: 18 - 18]