

THE ANDREW MARR SHOW

8TH MAY 2016

MICHAEL GOVE

AM: Good morning to you, Mr Gove.

MG: Good morning, Andrew.

AM: I guess that for an awful lot of people who still haven't made up their minds there are two huge issues they're worried about. One is economic security, will they be better or worse off, depending on what happens? And the other is security security. And I'd like to deal with both of those, as it were, today.

MG: I understand.

AM: Can I start off with economics? Now, virtually every single international body, IMF, OECD, World Bank, you name it, says that this country would be worse off if we left the EU. Why are they all wrong and you're right?

MG: Well, many of these organisations were wrong in the past about the single currency. They were cheerleaders for our entry into the euro, and we were told at the time that if we stayed outside the single currency the City of London would be devastated and our economy would go backwards. Actually the opposite was the case. And the truth is that these organisations are led by politicians and bureaucrats primarily. People responsible for actually generating growth and creating jobs, business people on the ground, are, as the whole country is, divided. And many of the most creative, energetic and successful business people, like Simon Wolfson who runs Next, or Anthony Bamford and the team behind JCB, think that Britain would be stronger outside the European Union.

AM: And you have a group of economists who agree with you, Patrick Minford being a notable one. But Patrick Minford says that British manufacturing will be virtually annihilated if we left the EU.

MG: Well, I disagree with that, and Anthony Bamford, who's one of Britain's leading manufacturers disagrees with that as well. But it's not just me –

AM: Well, if your own advisers are saying that, I mean, again, why should people believe you?

MG: Well, there are any number of people on the Remain side who have views which are radically different from the Prime Minister. Simply because an individual chooses to back the position that I share doesn't mean that I automatically agree with his views. You know, Ken Livingston and Gerry Adams back the remain argument, that doesn't mean that the Prime Minister agrees with them. These are broad coalitions. And the striking thing is that if you look at some of our most successful economics ministers, Nigel Lawson, you know, a giant as a Chancellor, he thinks that we'd be better off outside. And as I say, there are hundreds of business people, many of them directly involved in manufacturing, who say that we'd be better off out, not least because the European Union imposes costs on our business. And Open Europe, an independent think tank which has no dog in this fight says that we actually face costs of 30 billion pounds in additional regulation every year as a result of our membership of the EU.

AM: But just because the IMF and the OECD were wrong about the euro doesn't mean they're wrong about this necessarily. And they're crammed with economists and they're all completely convinced that we'd be worse off. They don't have a dog in this fight, they're not anti-British, they're not anti-EU, they are neutral and they are all saying the same thing. I come back, that's an awful lot of very serious, very intelligent and experienced people who are telling us to stay in.

MG: But as you yourself acknowledge, these are organisations that have made wrong calls in the past. And the IMF has made wrong calls about growth in this economy. It is ultimately –

AM: So have you. We've all made wrong calls in the past. It doesn't mean that everything we say should be disregarded now.

MG: No, but it does mean that we should look at the record of these people making these predictions and we should contrast them with the views of people who actually generate jobs and create growth. It's also the case that if we look at the arguments that are made now about how Britain might suffer outside the European Union economically, they are all arguments which are a reprise, a re-run of the original case that was made against staying outside the single currency. But more than that, you can see how countries which are outside the European Union are able to forge trade deals and to grow faster than the countries of the Eurozone. One of the striking things about the EU is that it's brought economic insecurity and massive youth unemployment to countries like Greece, Spain and Portugal.

AM: There is, if I may say, a fundamental difference between the Eurozone, which presupposes you can have a currency union without political union, which therefore is falling apart - a ridiculous assumption in the first place, some might say - and the single market, which is a very, very different kind of thing entirely.

MG: No, it's not a different thing entirely. Actually the European Commission defines membership of the single market as membership of Schengen and membership of the single currency. So the body that sets policy in Europe says that full membership of the single market requires you to be in the single currency. More than that, the European Commission and its other leaders in Europe have established the five presidents report, anyone can read it, anyone can Google it, it is clear that the European Union,

once this referendum is out of the way, if Britain votes to remain wants to press ahead, not just with more countries entering the euro, but with a banking union and a fiscal union, and it wants to exercise more control over banking regulation and taxes across Europe.

AM: Are you saying that if we vote to stay in the EU, then the EU will grab control of our taxes?

MG: I think there is a real danger that if we vote to remain, that five presidents report and the fact that the countries which are in the Eurozone have a majority within the EU mean that we could lose autonomy economically. One of the terrible things about the dynamic within the EU is that those countries which have suffered most as a result of the euro haven't learnt any lessons, haven't said that they want to change. They want to deepen integration, and they have a majority within the EU which means that they can impose policies on us.

AM: So you think that the deal negotiated by the Prime Minister, which appears to give us special opt-outs and special protections, actually the reverse will happen, we'll be drawn in by a ratchet and he's completely wrong about that?

MG: Well, there are many things that the Prime Minister's done in our relationship with Europe which are good. But one of the problems with the deal is that we actually give up the right to veto other countries progressing towards greater integration. And I think that's one of the reasons why it is safer for us to vote Leave. Because if we vote Leave, then we're in a position to dictate the terms in Britain's economic interest.

AM: Before we leave the economics, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, George Osborne – you mentioned a previous Chancellor – the current Chancellor says that every family in this

country would be £4,200 worse off if we vote to leave. And he says that is a fact.

MG: Well, this is one area where I disagree with George. I think he's an outstanding Chancellor, I think he's a brilliant politician, but this is the one area where we do disagree.

AM: It's not just about disagreeing though, is it? It's whether it's true or not. I mean, people are casting around for some desperate hand-hold of fact. And he says, here is a hand-hold, it's a fact.

MG: It's a projection. What is a fact is that we give more than 350 million pounds to the European Union –

Am: Well, hold on -

MG: And hand over control of that money to the European Union every week. That is a fact.

AM: That's not a fact, because actually we get –

MG: It is, the Office of National Statistics says that.

AM: But they also say the rebate has to be taken into account and we get back from that. And when you take account transfers into businesses it's about 200 pounds off that.

MG: Two critical things: the EU control both of those. The rebate is not in any treaty. The rebate can be whittled away. And secondly, the money that the European Union spends in this country, yes that's welcome, but the European Union decides, they control that £350 million every week. If we vote Leave we can control how that money is spent.

AM: Well, we'll see. Let me ask you, just before we leave the economics actually, a very simple question I have tried to get an answer to from various people on your side – is should we or

should we not be inside the single market? Do you want us to stay inside the single market? Yes or no.

MG: No. We should be outside the single market. We should have access to the single market, but we should not be governed by the rules that the European Court of Justice imposes on us, which cost business and restrict freedom.

AM: So the European Court of Justice is something you've been focusing on again today when it comes to the other security matter. Now, your proposal is that before we actually formally leave the EU, post-referendum, we should have emergency legislation to get us out from under the ECJ. Correct?

MG: Absolutely right.

AM: Now, is that not breaking our international treaty obligations? In other words, we're still inside the EU and we are unilaterally removing ourselves from the ECJ? Would that not cause a great deal of anger and irritation just at the time we're trying to have a helpful, friendly, considerate negotiation?

MG: Absolutely not. When we vote Leave, that is a clear mandate, a democratic decision that the European Union will, I'm sure, respect. And of course there are all sorts of things that we will negotiate with our European partners in our interests and in theirs. But we can take immediate steps in order to make this country safer. At the moment the European Court of Justice has interfered in our capacity to share data and intelligence with our American allies. The European Court of Justice has interfered to prevent us deporting people whose presence here is not conducive to the public good.

AM: Sir John Sawers says this is absolutely untrue. You heard him earlier on in the programme.

MG: I have enormous respect for Sir John and his tradition of public service. But he's flat wrong. The ECG, a court, has intervened specifically to say that data sharing arrangements that we had passed in parliament were wrong, and therefore we have to wait for the judgement of the European Court of Justice to decide how our data and our information and our intelligence can be shared with our American allies. I think that is wrong. And it is clear that intelligence experts from Richard Dearlove...

AM: The head of MI6 is nothing if not an intelligence expert.

MG: Intelligence experts –

AM: He disagrees with you on this.

MG: He does. But there are other people who disagree with John. So Ron Noble, who's the head of Interpol, says that the European Union's open borders policy is like hanging out a welcome sign for terrorists. Richard Dearlove, the former head of MI6, says that the open borders policy and also the way in which European courts operate, is against our interests. Richard Walton, the most recent head of anti-terrorism at the Met, says that we would suffer not one whit by being outside the EU.

AM: What about Sir John's point that we only know which bad guys are coming in because we are sharing intelligence across the EU and that Brussels has been incredibly helpful in this? He's been there, he must know.

MG: I'm a Justice Secretary, I know that the European criminal records information system, ECRIS, doesn't allow us to know whether or not criminals come into this country. We only find out whether or not people have criminal records after they've already committed an offence in this country. It's a gossamer-thin protection. And we do also know that the most valuable intelligence sharing that we have is with the other countries, the five eyes, the anglosphere America, Australia, New Zealand and

Canada. The truth is that within the European Union intelligence sharing doesn't work effectively. Even within Belgium; you can't get the police and the security services within Belgium to share intelligence effectively. So we would be safer if we were outside the European Union, had control of our borders and we did not have European judges telling us who we can and cannot deport.

AM: I'm not going to follow you down the slippery road of what's going on or not going on inside the Belgian security services. I do want to come back – if you don't mind me dotting around a bit – to what you said earlier on about the single market. You said we should not be in the single market. You're very clear about that. But we should have access to it. So your idea is that we would negotiate a new deal inside the single market. Do you accept that that would come with a price?

MG: No. We have a free trade arrangement. I think it is the case that free trade prevails across the European continent.

AM: So we'd work under the WTO rules.

MG: No, we'd have – at the moment there are not tariffs between the United Kingdom and other countries in the European Union. Why should we seek to impose those tariffs when we're outside?

AM: But once we're outside we either have to negotiate a new agreement with the EU or we don't. Those agreements become null and void once we leave. That's the point of leaving.

MG: I think this is a misunderstanding that many people have. If you negotiate a trade agreement with a country with whom you currently have tariffs, then you need to negotiate which tariffs will remain and which will be reduced. If you don't have tariffs, then both sides can accept that there is no need to erect them. And German car manufacturers are not going to want to have tariffs

erected when they sell many more cars to us than we sell to them. And I cannot imagine a situation where if any individual nation within the European Union were to erect tariffs that others would let them.

AM: So we would be able to be inside – have the effect of the single market without paying any money in and without accepting free movement of people. If we do that – we've had Wolfgang Schauble on this programme and many others from the EU, the French Finance Minister as well, both saying the trouble with that is if we allowed the UK to do that the entire project unravels and unravels very fast, because everyone will want, you know, all the advantages with none of the pay-outs. That we just can't have it.

MG: Well, I think the British people want to vote for a deal which you describe as all the advantages and none of the pay-outs, that would be a great thing on June 23rd.

AM: (talking together)

MG: Well, it would be in their interests. At the moment the Germans and others – well, the German political establishment, I should say, and others, want us to stay in because it suits them. Because we pay into the European Union and we import far more from them. It's win-win for them at the moment. It should be win-win for us. And it will be if we vote to leave and we can then maintain free trade, stop sending money and also have control of our borders.

AM: It's 13 per cent of our trade and three per cent of their trade, so in proportional terms they are not so interested in this as we are.

MG: Well, they are sector by sector. I think it would be very difficult for any German Finance Minister to go to BMW and to say, 'I'm afraid you're going to have to lay off workers because I want to punish the British for being democratic by erecting trade

barriers.' I can't imagine that the French President is going to say to French farmers, 'do you know what? You can no longer sell wine and cheese to the Brits because we're very upset that they voted to leave in a referendum.' That won't happen.

AM: We'll be able to call their bluff, is what you're saying? Call their bluff.

MG: Well, in any negotiation the most important thing is to defend your own interests. But more than that, it would be in Europe's interest if we vote to leave as well. Because as we just discussed, and as you've acknowledged, the European Union establishment are set on a course of deeper integration and that course has brought misery to the poorest people in Europe, the people of Greece, Italy and Spain. Europe needs to change. One of the things that we wanted to do through our renegotiation was to reform Europe. We haven't unfortunately. It hasn't change. But by leaving we can both make sure that Britain is stronger and Europe changes.

AM: Isn't there a severe danger that if we leave the EU, the rest of the EU is more dysfunctional, more dangerous and less good for us to trade with as a result? In other words, one of the reasons the Germans want us to stay is because they regard us as an essentially liberal, free-trading country with whom they can do alliances against countries which are much more dirigiste and much more statist. And that therefore by leaving you change the nature of the beast you leave and you make it more difficult for us not less difficult?

MG: It's really worrying if the Germans believe, or anyone else in the European Union believe that the EU is so dysfunctional and so dangerous that an assertion of democracy by the British nation state will mean that things come tumbling down. On that basis, the key question is that they should look at America – sorry.

AM: Things are very, very dodgy at the moment. We are in a very, very dangerous position across Europe because of the migration crisis. This is a moment of crisis for Europe, which could be provoked and pushed much more further in a dangerous direction if we come out now.

MG: Well, you do say that it's a moment of crisis and things are going wrong inside Europe. Why are they going wrong? They're going wrong because of Schengen, the open borders deal, which was a big mistake. And they're going wrong because of the euro, the single currency, which was a big mistake. The two biggest projects of European integration over the last ten years have been bad for the continent and bad for its citizens. Europe needs to think again. And we can make it think again by showing how greater democratic control is in everyone's interests.

AM: Alright, let me turn to a domestic matter, which is relevant to this, which is what's happened in Scotland with the Conservative success in Scotland, because one of the arguments against Brexit, as it were, I suppose, would be that the Scots would then vote to leave and the entire UK would be broken. Now, the SNP has been checked to a certain extent in this election, but Nicola Sturgeon again on this programme has been very clear that her two triggers for another referendum would be a Brexit vote and a majority in Scotland saying in opinion polls they wanted independence. So it's not to do with this election. So my question is this: if we vote to leave the EU and if Scotland then wants a second referendum to vote to leave the UK, what should the British government do? At that point should you say, no?

MG: IF we vote to leave then I think the union will be stronger. Scottish nationalism has grown since we entered the European Union. There wasn't a Scottish Nationalist MP elected at any general election when we were outside the EU. Secondly, as you

say, the SNP's been checked. Nicola Sturgeon is not mistress in her own house anymore. She does not have a majority. Ruth Davidson led the Scottish Conservatives to a storming result on the basis that there should not be a second referendum. And the third thing that I'd say – sorry.

AM: I'm sorry, just to jump in – in the end, Nicola Sturgeon won that election nevertheless. She is the winner of the election and she won it having said that if we vote to leave the EU and/or more than half the Scottish people vote, say in opinion polls that they want to leave the UK, there will be a second referendum. My question is what then happens. As a leading Conservative and a Scot, what do you think should then happen?

MG: I think two things. Firstly I think when we vote to leave I think a majority of people in Scotland will also vote to leave as well. And I think when we vote to leave it will be clear that having voted to leave one union the last thing people in Scotland wanted to do is to break up another. The economic basis on which Nicola Sturgeon and the Scottish Nationalists made the case for separation was based on an oil price much higher than it is at the moment, so there is no case for it.

AM: We're slightly veering off the point. My question was what would you do? Would you stop the Scots having a second referendum or not?

MG: I don't believe that there's a need for one, and Ruth Davidson has said there is no need for one. I agree with Ruth.

AM: Okay. Now, some of your critics in this European argument still accuse you of being the person who leaked the Queen's view about Brexit. Now, I know you have said you have not told a newspaper about that story, and we'll accept that. But can I ask you directly, did you have a conversation with other people in

which you discussed the Queen's view about this, which could then have leaked?

MG: I'm not going to talk about any private conversations that I had with the Queen.

AM: It might be a bit late for that.

MG: I'm not going to talk about any private conversations I had with the Queen.

AM: Alright, but do you accept that it's caused a great deal of embarrassment for Buckingham Palace? I'm asking a very direct question, and the fact that you won't talk about it suggests that you did have these conversations.

MG: I'm not going to go there, Andrew. I think it's very important – and we've just heard from Prince Harry – that we respect the role that the Queen has, so I'm not going to speculate about conversations that she's had on any subject with anyone.

AM: Alright, well let's not go into purring about a Scottish referendum result and so forth, but your relationship with the Prime Minister. Now, you know, you have been very, very close friends and allies for a long time. And we all hear stories coming out of the Whitehall machine that this has been a very, very difficult time for you both, and that relations are at best frosty. Your wives have tried to keep things going between you but it's been a very, very difficult time. Just tell us exactly what it feels like now.

MG: Well, every week, every Wednesday morning I go to help the Prime Minister as we prepare for Prime Minister's Question Time. Obviously these are private meetings, but I think any fly on the wall could tell you far from being in the deep freeze, these are

warm and friendly and good-humoured occasions. The great thing about the Prime Minister is that he has tremendous generosity of spirit. And a great sense of humour. He's made it clear that he would rather that I'd supported his deal, and I've obviously explained that I'd rather he'd taken a different position. But the great thing about the Prime Minister is that he was generous enough to allow colleagues to differ, he's been generous enough to accept the nature of that debate. We're lucky to have him as Prime Minister. Long may he remain so.

AM: Michael Gove, thank you very much indeed for joining us.
(ends)

The truth is that within the European Union intelligence sharing doesn't work effectively. Even within Belgium; you can't get the police and the security services within Belgium to share intelligence effectively. So we would be safer if we were outside the European Union, had control of our borders and we did not have European judges telling us who we can and cannot deport.

AM: I'm not going to follow you down the slipper road of what's going on or not going on inside the Belgian security services. I do want to come back – if you don't mind me dotting around a bit – to what you said earlier on about the single market. You said we should not be in the single market. You're very clear about that. But we should have access to it. So your idea is that we would negotiate a new deal inside the single market. Do you accept that that would come with a price?

MG: No. We have a free trade arrangement. I think it is the case that free trade prevails across the European continent.

AM: .. WTOs.

MG: No, we'd have – at the moment there are not tariffs between the United Kingdom and other countries in the European Union. Why should we seek to impose those tariffs when we're outside?

AM: But once we're outside we either have to negotiate a new agreement with the EU or we don't. Those agreements become null and void once we leave. That's the point of leaving.

MG: I think this is a misunderstanding that many people have. If you negotiate a trade agreement with a country with whom you currently have tariffs, then you need to negotiate which tariffs will remain and which will be reduced. If you don't have tariffs, both sides can accept that there is no need to erect them. And German car manufacturers are not going to want to have tariffs erected when they sell many more cars to us than we sell to them. And I cannot imagine a situation where if any individual nation within the European Union were to erect tariffs that others would let them.

AM: So we would be able to be inside – have the effect of the single market without paying any money in and without accepting free movement of people. If we do that – we've had Wolfgang Schauble on the programme and many others from the EU, the French Finance Minister as well, both saying the trouble with that is if we allowed the UK to do that the entire project unravels and unravels very fast, because everyone will want, you know, all the advantages with none of the payouts. That just can't happen.

MG: Well, I think the British people want to vote for a deal which you describe as all the advantages and none of the payouts, that would be a great thing on June 23rd.

AM: (talking together)

MG: Well, it would be in their interests. At the moment the Germans and others – well, the German political establishment, I should say, and others, want us to stay in because it suits them. Because we pay into the European Union and we import far more from them. It's win-win for them at the moment. It should be win-win for us. And it will be if we vote to leave and we can then maintain free trade, stop sending money and also have control of our borders.

AM: It's 30 per cent of our trade and three per cent of their trade, so in proportional terms they are not too interested in this as we are.

MG: Well, they are sector by sector. I think it would be very difficult for any German Finance Minister to go to BMW and to say, 'I'm afraid you're going to lay off workers because I want to punish the British for being democratic by erecting trade barriers.' I can't imagine that the French President is going to say to French farmers, 'do you know what? You can no longer sell wine and cheese to the Brits because we're very upset that they voted to leave in a referendum.' That won't happen.

AM: We'll be able to call their bluff, is what you're saying?

MG: Well, in any negotiation the most important thing is to defend your own interests. But more than that, it would be in Europe's interest if we vote to leave as well. Because as we just discussed, and as you've acknowledged, the European Union establishment are set on a course of deeper integration and that course has brought misery to the poorest people in Europe, the people of Greece, Italy and Spain. Europe needs to change. One of the

things that we wanted to do through our renegotiation was to reform Europe. We haven't unfortunately. It hasn't change. But by leaving we can both make sure that Britain is stronger and Europe changes.

AM: Isn't there a severe danger that if we leave the EU, the rest of the US is more dysfunctional, more dangerous and less good for us to trade with as a result? In other words, one of the reasons the Germans want us to stay is because they regard us as an essentially liberal, free-trading country with whom they can do alliances against countries which are much more dirigiste and much more statist. And that therefore by leaving you change the nature of the beast you leave and you make it more difficult for us not less difficult?

MG: It's really worrying if the Germans believe, or anyone else in the European Union believe that the EU is so dysfunctional and so dangerous that an assertion of democracy by the British nation state will mean that things come tumbling down. On that basis, the key question is that they should look at America – sorry.

AM: Things are very, very dodgy at the moment. We are in a very, very dangerous position across Europe because of the migration crisis. This is a moment of crisis for Europe, which could be provoked and pushed much more further in a dangerous direction if we come out now.

MG: Well, you do say that it's a moment of crisis and things are going wrong inside Europe. Why are they going wrong? They're going wrong because of Schengen, the open borders deal, which was a big mistake. And they're going wrong because of the euro, the single currency, which was a big mistake. The two biggest projects of European integration over the last ten years have been bad for the continent and bad for its citizens. Europe needs to

think again. And we can make it think again by showing how greater democratic control is in everyone's interests.

AM: Alright, let me turn to a domestic matter, which is relevant to this, which is what's happened in Scotland with the Conservative success in Scotland, because one of the arguments against Brexit, as it were, I suppose, would be that the Scots would then vote to leave and the entire UK would be broken. Now, the SNP has been checked to a certain extent in this election, and Nicola Sturgeon again on this programme has been very clear that her two triggers for another referendum would be a Brexit vote and a majority in Scotland saying in opinion polls they wanted independence. So it's not to do with this election. So my question is this: if we vote to leave the EU and if Scotland then wants a second referendum to vote to leave the UK, what should the British government do? At that point should you say, no?

MG: IF we vote to leave then I think the union will be stronger. Scottish nationalism has grown since we entered the European Union. There wasn't a Scottish Nationalist MP elected at any general election when we were outside the EU. Secondly, as you say, the SNP's been checked. Nicola Sturgeon is not mistress in her own house anymore. She does not have a majority. Ruth Davidson led the Scottish Conservatives to a storming result on the basis that there should not be a second referendum. And the third thing that I'd say – sorry.

AM: I'm sorry, just to jump in – in the end, Nicola Sturgeon won that election nevertheless. She is the winner of the election and she won it having said that if we vote to leave the EU and/or more than half the Scottish people say in opinion polls that they want to leave the UK, there will be a second referendum. My question is what then happens. As a leading Conservative and a Scot, what do you think should then happen?

MG: I think two things. Firstly I think when we vote to leave I think a majority of people in Scotland will also vote to leave as well. And I think when we vote to leave it will be clear that having voted to leave one union the last thing people in Scotland wanted to do is to break up another. The economic basis on which Nicola Sturgeon and the Scottish Nationalists made the case for separation was based on an oil price much higher than it is at the moment.

AM: We're slightly veering off the point. My question was what would you do? Would you stop the Scots having a second referendum or not?

MG: I don't believe that there's a need for one, and Ruth Davidson has said there is no need for one. I agree with her.

AM: Okay. Now, some of your critics in this European argument still accuse you of being the person who leaked the Queen's view about Brexit. Now, I know you have said you have not told a newspaper about that story, and we'll accept that. But can I ask you directly, did you have a conversation with other people in which you discussed the Queen's view about this, which could then have leaked?

MG: I'm not going to talk about private conversations that I had with the Queen.

AM: It might be a bit late for that.

MG: I'm not going to talk about any private conversations I had with the Queen.

AM: Alright, but do you accept that it's caused a great deal of embarrassment at Buckingham Palace? I'm asking a very direct

question, and the fact that you won't talk about it suggests that you did have these conversations.

MG: I'm not going to go there, Andrew. I think it's very important – and we've just heard from Prince Harry – that we respect the role the Queen has, so I'm not going to speculate about conversations that she's had on any subject with anyone.

AM: Alright, well let's not going into her ... about a Scottish referendum result and so forth, but your relationship with the Prime Minister. Now, you know, you have been very, very close friends and allies for a long time. And we all hear stories coming out of the Whitehall machine that this has been a very, very difficult time for you both, and that relations are at best frosty. Your wives have tried to keep things going between you but it's been a very, very difficult time. Just tell us exactly what it feels like now.

MG: Well, every week, every Wednesday morning I go to help the Prime Minister prepare for Prime Minister's Question Time. Obviously these are private meetings, but I think any fly on the wall could tell you far from being in the deep freeze, these are warm and friendly and good-humoured occasions. The great thing about the Prime Minister is that he has tremendous generosity of spirit. And a great sense of humour. He's made it clear that he would rather that I'd supported his deal, and I've obviously explained that I'd rather he'd taken a different position. But the great thing about the Prime Minister is that he was generous to allow colleagues to differ, he's been generous enough to accept the nature of that debate. We're lucky to have him as Prime Minister. Long may he remain so.

AM: Michael Gove, thank you very much indeed for joining us.
(ends)