

ANDREW MARR SHOW, 26th JUNE, 2016

IDS

AM: First of all can I ask about the status of some of the promises that were made by your side of the argument. We've already - Is the £350m that we were told going to go to the NHS is that going to go to the NHS and when?

IDS: Well the £350m was an extrapolation of the 19.1 billion. That's the total amount of money that last year we gave across to the European Union. We can talk about money back and everything else.

AM: Your side said it was all going to go to the NHS.

IDS: Well actually what we actually said was, a significant amount of it will go to the NHS and that is essentially down to the government but I actually believe that is what was pledged and that's what should happen.

AM: So that £350m will go to the NHS?

IDS: That money will go – well we must talk about it going to the NHS but there are also other bits and pieces like agriculture and stuff which is part of that process, so that is the divide up. It was never total but it is a commitment. It is the commitment that we should stand by and the other one is the migration commitment so ask me another question.

AM: I want to get onto that as you suspected but I want to carry on with this one first, because if all of that £350m or almost all of it goes to the NHS to build as your video said, a hospital every week, whatever, however it's spent, that means that quite a lot of money in regional and structural funds which are included in that

which goes to Cornwall, Wales, other parts of the country, money going to universities can't go to those places.

IDS: No, no, Andrew what was actually said at the time, and I said it myself consistently through, which was we hand over 19.1 billion pounds, half of which is gone into the European Union and other bits come back directed by the European Union. So one second. We said throughout that we would stand by some critical areas. Those areas that are being funded in structural and regional funds, would be funded, we'd have more money to spend on the NHS because we wouldn't be losing half of that sum of money, and we'd stand by commitments that have been made to things like agriculture. The rest were all just a series of possibilities of what you then could do beyond those main commitments and that was a commitment made at the time.

AM: So how much do you think will go to the NHS then of that 350?

IDS: Well of the monies that we give away to the EU which never comes back, I would think the lion's share.

AM: Which never comes back. That's only half of the 350. I mean let me remind you about the posters that you put up because you suggested in those posters, 'let's give our NHS the £350 million the EU takes every week.' That's pretty explicit, no ifs, no buts that's what we're going to do.

IDS: And that's down to the government –

AM: But that's not happening.

IDS: - what proportion they want to do with that, can suit themselves, but the point that everybody should bear in mind is that money which goes to the EU that comes back, that money

now is able to be spent on a priority like the NHS but others that were already commitments made they'll be done.

AM: But it won't be £350m, that is a promise broken?

IDS: No it's not a promise broken. I never said that during the course of the election. What I said was, we would be able to spend the lion's share –

AM: On the side of the bus, it was huge.

IDS: Yeah but the lion share of that money now the government is now able to spend, so people can say that there's more money available now for the NHS, categorically more which is what's required and that's the key point.

AM: Let's move onto immigration. Daniel Hannan who was a very important part of the Leave campaign has said there was no great promise to get immigration sharply down during the campaign which surprised a lot of us watching this campaign. Is immigration now going to come down pretty sharply?

IDS: Well I'm not quite sure what he actually said, but here is the commitment. The government itself right now, the Conservative government stood on a manifesto pledge to get migration down to tens of thousands. I stood believing that's the case, I'm old fashioned enough to believe you have a manifesto pledge, you should work to deliver it. During the course of this campaign this was a very big issue and I said consistently throughout that what we need to do is get control of our borders and the only way to do that is you leave the EU, it's a red line area for us. Once we do that we're in a much stronger position to then achieve that objective of bringing down migration to tens of thousands within this parliament. I will stand by that. I believe my government

should stand by that and that is exactly what I fought that election – referendum on.

AM: So we are going to see a fairly sharp decline in the EU side of migration into this country and presumably an Australian based point system. That will now happen.

IDS: Well what I've been very strong about is it's now the job of government to ensure that what they actually have is a clear target for overall numbers, which has been missing for some time, partly because we don't have control over the European end of migration, but also, because I suspect, also on the other side of it we've been less clear about the points based system about bringing in talent and not allowing so many low paid, low skilled workers to come in and we need to bare down on that because that's one of the big issues which affect –

AM: But will be a point system in terms?

IDS: Well that's what I believe is the right way to do it with a kind of cap system inside it.

AM: It sounded like a promise at the time. Does the VAT cut –

IDS: My point very clearly about migration is this. We have a manifesto commitment. That manifesto commitment was not being delivered on. Part or – or perhaps the biggest part of that, but still nonetheless part of that problem was that we did not control our borders. Controlling our borders now gives that opportunity when we leave to be able to say we will deliver on that. In the meantime by the way, we should be trying to deliver on that anyway because that is absolutely what we got elected on.

AM: Currently, your side of the argument in the Conservative Party does not command the majority of the House of Commons. Are

the promises that were made, that mini Manifesto which came out from the Leave campaign really worth the paper it's written on?

IDS: No. I actually think it is because -

AM: But you're not going to get it through the HoCommons.

IDS: Well hold on a second. The party now, and this is the main message I want to take to my colleagues, we've had this debate. It was robust, sometimes very angry at times, it's the nature of referenda, they always do do this. They divide families, they divide communities of course, but the key point now is we are in government, unlike the Labour Party that is struggling in opposition. We are in government and we have a set of commitments already made to the British people. The referendum was clear. The British people have said they want to leave the European Union. Instead of raking over the coals of this now for days and days and days, I simply say to colleagues on either side of this argument our job now is to come together and actually deliver on that commitment which is to leave the European Union, commensurate with that, the whole series of other obligations that come as a result, red lines over things like border control etc, those are part of the process. And you say that there's a complication because we don't hold a majority.

AM: You don't.

IDS: The Conservative Party is in a majority in the House of Commons and my view about this is there are also a number of Labour MPs who are very clear that they want this to be delivered on.

AM: so you think there is a Brexit majority in the House of Commons?

IDS: I think there is a significant sense that the government itself has a majority. There may be some who don't want to see that through but there are also others. And I only have one simple point to make, is you know, we have an obligation. That obligation is to deliver on the British people's verdict. That means no matter what your view – and by the way I had said publicly, if the view was that we should remain, I would then support that and that was the end of the debate for me. So this has been about ending the debate, getting on with the aftermath of that debate.

AM: I understand that. Now your party has to choose a new leader. Do you think that that leader has to come from your side of the argument, the winning Brexit side of this argument?

IDS: I think it's pretty clear in my mind that whoever takes up the job – and by the way I want to say that I'm incredibly sad the Prime Minister has taken this decision to go. I was one of those that publicly said endlessly I wished he would remain to help stabilise the situation and get us moving before he left. I think he's done a pretty good job throughout all the way in some tough circumstances, particularly during the coalition. But I do think that the principle point here is that it would be very, very difficult for the public who have voted for the leaving of the European Union to find that they then had a prime minister who actually was a opposed to leaving the European Union. So I think it is quite clear that at least the leadership end of it, but I'd like all the others Remain and us to come together.

AM: That suggests you wouldn't think somebody like Theresa May or something could be plausible. It would have to be yourself or Michael Gove or Boris Johnson.

IDS: I'm not standing, that's enough for me.

AM: You've had enough of that, all right, so it's Boris or Gove?

IDS: Well no, there's lots of others. I don't know who's going to stand. All I do say quite clearly is that –

AM: It can't be a Remainer really.

IDS: Well my sense about this really is at the end of it all you know there was a clear decision and what has to happen is delivery on that and somebody who's been involved in that clearly has to be the case, because you know the government itself now had a view as it stands now which was to Remain. And so now we need to change that position and actually deliver on this very clear mandate from the British people and stop raking over the coals, come back together.

AM: Without raking over the coals, during the campaign we were told again and again by people from your side of the argument this would be a mature, benign, friendly negotiation with European leaders who didn't want to cut off their noses to spite their faces, they seem in a very different mood today.

IDS: Well I'm fascinated. We were told there would be terrible consequences for the UK alone and what we saw, even in the early days was of course turbulence, but the market fell, the market came back pretty much to where it was in February. But what I noticed in Europe and listening to what European leaders have been saying, and this was raised by Tim Montgomery in the course of your newspaper review, is that there is a seismic issue taking place across the European Union which is, Germany has slapped down the President of the European Union, of the Council by saying of course we have to sort this out with the UK. We want to get on with it, which I agree with them over, but we need to have a deal –

AM: Trigger Article 50 quickly.

IDS: Well whether it's Article 50 or whether it's a combination of Article 5 and domestic legislation, is

AM: Crack on is your message?

IDS: Well my view is we need to get going on the shape of how this negotiation takes place. Of course it's up to the new leader to decide what emphasis they place, but I think in the meantime, I want colleagues to come together, I'm bringing colleagues together in the course of the next few days, I want to look to businessmen, I want to look to you know QCs etc who are clear on legal ramifications and start to build the position going forward. That's the critical bit that I want to be helping build on.

AM; A last question. Nigel Farage thinks that he should be part, after leading that great movement of the UKIP voters and so forth of the negotiation team. Do you accept that he has a right after all those votes to be there too?

IDS: Well I accept that UKIP were part of that process and I happen to know that there is a UKIP MP who is part of that process in parliamentary sense. I'm very happy to discuss and everyone is of course with UKIP about what their expectations were, but the government itself right now, actually dictates how this will happen. We will reach out to the Labour Party –

AM: To ensure there isn't an establishment stitch up to stop Brexit happening a lot of UKIP leading voters would want UKIP to be represented at the top table.

IDS: Yes and I think they have a reasonable expectation and as I say, there is an MP in the House of Commons who himself was a Conservative at some point and he's very clear on it. But the one point I want to make is we've got to get on with putting the

structure right. Europe is ready now to talk about having free trade deals, we should move onto that as soon as possible.

ENDS