**Online Appendix**

**The odd couple: Analysing UKIP and FSM’s EU-opposition in the EP.**

**1. Criteria used for the collection of data……………………………………………..2**

**2. Coding instructions……………………………………………….............................4**

**3. Codebook……...………………………………………………………………...……7**

**4. Information about the speech segments cited in the paper………...……………24**

**1. Criteria used for the collection of data**

For the purposes of this analysis a total amount of 1632 speeches (671 for the FSM and 961 for UKIP) has been collected for the period between May 2014 and December 2016 (first two years of the VIII EP legislature). A speech by a Member of the European Parliament (MEP) is consider as:

Each intervention held in the plenary sitting of the European Parliament (EP) or related to voting time in the plenary sitting of the EP*.*

Speeches have been collected using a Python-based script available at: [**https://github.com/alexeygridnev/MEPs-speeches**](https://github.com/alexeygridnev/MEPs-speeches)


The original version of the script allows the collection of the first 100 speeches by each MEP. To enable the collection of all the speeches by each MEP, this work, instead of relying on pages URLs, uses the HTML page sources of each MEPs’ webpage following these steps:

1. the HTML page sources reporting all the speeches of each MEPs are downloaded and saved in .txt file format;
2. the HTML page sources (in.txt format) are then used to download the entire collection of speeches through the Python shell.

Speeches have been divided into three main policy areas according to two main criteria:

1. The parliamentary committee responsible for presenting a report (e.g., ECON committee defines the speech as belonging to the macro-areas of economy);
2. The subject of the speech held in the plenary sitting as indicated by the procedural files available on the webpage of the EP. The image below shows an example of speech belonging to the macro-area ‘Immigration/Asylum/Borders control’.

Figure 1: Example of classification criteria for a specific speech held in the plenary session of the EP. Source of the image:<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/oeil/popups/ficheprocedure.do?lang=en&reference=2015/2095(INI>)



**2. Coding instructions.**

The analysis of the collected speeches is divided into two phases. First, speeches are split into quasi-sentences according to the definition provided by the Coding scheme of the Comparative Manifesto Project:

*‘One quasi sentence contains exactly one statement or “message”. In many cases, parties make one statement per sentence, which results in one quasi- sentence. Equalling one full sentence. Therefore the basic unitizing rule is that one sentence is, at minimum, one quasi-sentence. In no case can two sentences form a quasi-sentence. There are, however, instances when one natural sentence contains more than one quasi sentence’[[1]](#footnote-1)*

In the second phase each quasi-sentences is coded in one and only one of the categories belonging to the coding scheme presented below.

The general scheme of the codebook is divided according to the four main targets of EU-opposition:

1. EU-policies: to this target belong all the references that MEPs do with respect to the policies under discussion, the implementation of the specific policy or the analysis of the obtained results.
2. EU-elite: to this target belong all the references expressed by MEPs toward politicians (at the EU level) like for example some specific commissioner or groups of people like ‘technocrats’. Such mentions encompass both the evaluation of EU-elite’s performance and judgements of the moral conduct/values of the EU-elite. It is to be noted that the definition of elite is intentionally kept as broader as possible and that it encompasses also non-elected authorities playing a role in the activity of the EU.
3. EU-regime: to this target belong all the references done to the institutions of the EU, to their values, their norms and their activity. It is essential that the quasi-sentences either report the name of the institution or a substitute thereof.
4. EU-community: to this targets belong all the references that deals with:
   1. The current state of the EU;
   2. The competencies of the EU along the national vs. supranational axis;
   3. The ‘values’ of the EU (as expressed by the Treaties);
   4. The state of democracy at the EU level;
   5. The geometries resulting from the process of European integration (e.g., the Euro area or the Schengen area, main recipient of opposition in this work).

To sum up, this target includes all the reference that can be detected along the alienation-integration continuum expressing the position of each single orator with reference to the community.

**It is to be noted that the target ‘EU-regime’ is further subdivided into 4 main sub-targets:**

1. **European Parliament;**
2. **European Commission;**
3. **Council of Ministers;**
4. **Other institutions (e.g., European Central Bank).**

All the above-mentioned targets are split into three main categories:

1. Directional Positive;
2. Directional Negative;
3. Non-directional (this category has been inserted to collect all the quasi-sentences that do not report a judgement by the orator, but only a description of facts).

**Besides recognizing the target of support or opposition, this work aims at understanding the character of the expressed positioning (either pragmatic or principled). To do that different values are assigned to each quasi-sentence during the coding procedure. Details about the used values are provided below for each category. Examples of coded quasi-sentence will be provided whenever possible.**

**3. Codebook**

**1. EU-POLICIES**

* **EU-policy positive:**
  + Positive mentions of the policy under discussion or of some of its aspects (the endorsement of specific technical aspects is included);
  + Positive mentions regarding the results obtained through the implementation of the specific policy under discussion or aspects thereof (even metaphors may be accepted).
* **EU-policy negative:**
  + Negative mentions of the policy under discussion or of some of its aspects (specific technical aspects are included);
  + Negative mentions of the results obtained through the implementation of the specific policy under discussion or aspects thereof. Negative mentions of the lack of implementation of the specific policy under discussion (or aspects thereof) are also included (even metaphors may be accepted).
* **EU-policy non-directional:**
  + Explanation of what has been debated/voted or treated during the plenary session;
  + Explanation of the results brought by the (also future) implementation of some specific policies. These explanations do not provide the position of the orator but an aseptic description of the potential results of a specific policy;
  + Rhetorical questions regarding the policies but not expressing a precise direction (positive or negative).

**1.1. Values applied to the quasi-sentences referring to the target of EU-policies:**

* **EU-policy positive:**
  + **Value of 1**: defines a pragmatic character of the expressed support. The speaker expresses support for the substantial policy under discussion. Generally the speaker refers to specific details of the policy under discussion. Example: ‘I support this report that allows the EP to indicate the European Commission which are the points to be added to the legislation regarding the circular economy’ (Marco Zullo’s speech on the ‘Resource efficiency, moving toward a circular economy’ 9th July 2015)**;**
  + **Value of 2:** defines the principled character of the expressed support. The speaker expresses support deriving from the ideological stance of the party itself. Example: ‘I voted firmly in favour of EU adhesion to the Convention on international trade in Endangered spices of wild Fauna and Flora because I believe that the moment has come for the EU to work in this direction’ (Marco Zullo Speech on the ‘Convention on International Trade in Endangered Spices-CITES’, 16th December 2014).
* **EU-policies negative:**
  + **Value of 1:** defines the pragmatic character of the expressed opposition. The speaker expresses opposition for a substantial policy under discussion, generally proposing the implementation of changes. Example: ‘the funds for the reception of migrants and management of immigration fluxes allocated by the EU and by each Member State must be subjected to stricter surveillance in order to prevent frauds, speculations and wastes’ (Laura Agea’s speech on the ‘Summary expulsions and the proposed legalization of “hot returns” in Spain’ 25th November 2014);
  + **Value of 2:** defines the principled character of the expressed opposition. The speaker expresses opposition for the substantial policy under discussion that is based on principle. Example: ‘It is time to question our hysterical obsession with the new religion of climate alarmism’ (Roger Helmer’s speech ‘Towards a new international climate agreement in Paris’ 14th of October 2015).
* **EU-policies non directional:**
  + **Value of 0**: the coded quasi-sentences belonging to the ‘non-directional’ category are provided with a neutral value (0) since no evaluation of the specific character of the expressed party positioning is to be detected. Example: ‘With regard to the motion for a resolution on the EU strategic objectives for the 17th meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), to be held in Johannesburg (South Africa) from 24th September to 5th October 2016, this vote is not about CITES itself’ (Diane James’ speech on the ‘Key objectives for the CITES CoP17 meeting in Johannesburg’, 15th September 2016).

**2. EU-ELITE**

* **EU-elite positive:**
  + Positive mentions of the activity of one or more specific politician part of the EU-elite (functionaries are included in the definition of EU-elite);
  + Positive mentions concerning the moral conduct/values of a specific politician or group thereof (functionaries are included in the definition of EU-elite).
* **EU-elite negative:** 
  + Negative mentions of the activity of one or more specific politician part of the EU-elite (functionaries are included in the definition of EU-elite);
  + Negative mentions concerning the moral conduct/values of a specific politician or group thereof (functionaries are included in the definition of EU-elite);
  + Negative references to a set of people who do not strictly belong to the political sphere but are, nevertheless, considered as a sort of powerful elite ruling Europe, like in the case of lobbyists.
* **EU-elite non-directional** 
  + Non-directional references to the elite, like explanation of what they do or say in the EP plenary sittings or in other political occasions. All these mentions do not provide a judgement by the orator.

**2.1. Values applied to the quasi-sentences regarding the EU-elite target:**

* **EU elite positive:**
  + **Value of 1:** defines the pragmatic character of the expressed support. In this case refers to pragmatic support for the activity exercised by either a specific authority or group thereof. Example: ‘Mister President, honourable colleagues, I will use these two minutes to thank the colleagues who gave me the opportunity to show that it does not matter where one seat in this Parliament if one really wants to represent citizen’s needs’ (Laura Agea’s speech onthe ‘Green employment initiative- Guidelines for the employment policies of Member States’, 7th July 2015)**;**
  + **Value of 2:** defines the principled character of the expressed support. In this case refers to the principled support for either a specific authority or group thereof (e.g., positively stressing their moral value or their moral conduct)
* **EU-elite negative:** 
  + **Value of 1:** defines the pragmatic character of the expressed opposition. In this case it refers to the pragmatic opposition of the activity exercised either by a specific component of the elite or group thereof. Example: ‘So one lesson that I want to leave with you all is that you have created mass unemployment by pushing forward this legislation that kills jobs and kills British industry’ (Tim Aker’s speech concerning the ‘Limitation of emissions of certain pollutants into the air’, 7th October 2015);
  + **Value of 2:** defines the principled character of the expressed opposition. This criticism is centred on the evaluation of the moral conduct/values of the specific component of the EU-elite or group thereof. Example: ‘Instead of censure of politicians like Mr Juncker, who were involved in allowing corporations to extract exceedingly large profits from the ordinary citizens of Europe (…)’ (Steven Woolfe’s speech on ‘Tax rulings and other measures similar in nature and effect’ 24th November 2015).
* **EU-elite non directional**:
  + **Value of 0:** the coded quasi-sentences belonging to the non-directional category are provided with a neutral value (0) since no evaluation of the specific character of the expressed party positioning is to be detected.

**3. EU-REGIME**

**As stressed before, this target is split to enable the observation of parties’ attitudes to the three most important institutions of the EU (the Commission, the Council and the Parliament) including also an ‘Other institutions’ category (encompassing institutions like the ECB). Nevertheless, it is to be noted that positive, negative or non-directional mentions can regard the whole complex of EU-institutions. During the coding procedure also these mentions are taken into consideration. Here we have an example.**

* Helmer UKIP (10/2015) ENVIRONMENT: ‘These decisions and these targets should be taken and set by democratically elected parliaments at the national level, and not by *unrepresentative, unaccountable bureaucratic institutions* in foreign countries’.
* **3.1. EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT**
* **European Parliament positive:**
  + Positive mentions of the EP in general (e.g., references to the values of the EP);
  + Positive mentions of the activity and the competencies of the EP;
  + Positive mentions of the powers and role played by the EP;
  + Positive mentions of a potential implementation of the role and powers of the EP.
* **European Parliament negative:**
  + Negative mentions of the EP in general (e.g., references to the values of the EP);
  + Negative mentions of the activity and the competencies of the EP;
  + Negative mentions of the powers and role played by the EP;
  + Negative mentions of the potential implementations of the role and powers of the EP.
* **European Parliament non-directional:**
  + Reference to the activity of the EP, to its role and/or powers that do not express any kind of evaluation;

**3.2. EUROPEAN COMMISSION**

* **Commission Positive:**
  + Positive mentions of the Commission in general;
  + Positive mentions of the activity and the competencies of the Commission;
  + Positive mentions of the powers and role played by the Commission;
  + Positive mention of a potential implementation of the role and powers of the Commission.
* **Commission negative** 
  + Negative mentions of the Commission in general;
  + Negative mentions of the activity and the competencies of the Commission;
  + Negative mentions of the powers and role played by the Commission (e.g., a power grab accusation directed toward the Commission);
  + Negative mentions of the potential implementations of the role and powers of the Commission.
* **Commission non directional:** 
  + Reference to the activity of the Commission, to its role and/or powers that do not express any kind of evaluation;

**3.3. COUNCIL**

* **Council Positive:**
  + Positive mentions of the Council in general;
  + Positive mentions of the activity and the competencies of the Council;
  + Positive mentions of the powers and role played by the Council;
  + Positive mention of a potential implementation of the role and powers of the Council.
* **Council negative:** 
  + Negative mentions of the Council in general;
  + Negative mentions of the activity and the competencies of the Council (e.g., lack of transparency);
  + Negative mentions of the powers and role played by the Council (e.g., interference or imposition of the Council over other institutions of the EU);
  + Negative mentions of the potential implementations of the role and powers of the Council.
* **Council non-directional:**
  + Reference to the activity of the Council, to its role and/or powers that do not express any kind of evaluation.

**3.4. OTHER INSTITUTIONS:**

* **Other institutions positive:**
  + Positive mentions of other institutions in general;
  + Positive mentions of the activity and the competencies of other institutions;
  + Positive mentions of the powers and role played by other institutions;
  + Positive mention of a potential implementation of the role and powers of other institutions.
* **Other institutions negative:**
  + Negative mentions of other institutions in general;
  + Negative mentions of the activity and the competencies of other institutions (e.g., lack of electoral accountability);
  + Negative mentions of the powers and role played by other institutions;
  + Negative mentions of the potential implementations of the role and powers of other institutions.
* **Other institutions non-directional** 
  + References toward other institutions that do not express any judgement either concerning their activity or their role/powers.

**3.5. Values applied to the quasi-sentences coded under the category EU-regime:**

* **EU-regime positive:**
  + **Value of 1:** pragmatic support for one or a group of EU institutions. Within these quasi-sentences the speaker generally proposes endorsement for the activity done by each EU institution or group thereof. Example: ‘This revision has been improved thanks to the EP’ (Marco Zanni’s speech on the ‘Access to anti-money-laundering information by tax authorities’ 22nd October 2016);
  + **Value of 2:** principled support for one or a group of EU institutions. The speaker express principled support for the values underpinning the specific institutions. Favouring also a potential enlargement of the competencies of the specific institution. Example: ‘I’d like to recall that the European Parliament is the only institution democratically elected by citizens, it represents, de facto, European citizens’ will’ (Laura Ferrera’s speech on the ‘Provisional measures in the area of international protection for the benefit of Italy and Greece’, 8th September 2015).
* **EU-regime negative:**
  + **Value of 1:** pragmatic opposition to one or a group of EU institutions. In these quasi-sentences the speaker opposes the activity of that specific institution or group thereof, without contesting its existence. Example: ‘we denounced the management of the Supervision Mechanism by the ECB, demanding to the ECB a higher transparency’ (Marco Valli’s speech regarding the ‘European Central Bank annual report 2014’, 25th February 2016);
  + **Value of 2:** principled opposition to one or a group of EU- institutions. In these quasi-sentences the speaker opposes the values underpinning that specific institution and/or contests its existence. Example: ‘We do not trust the unelected EU Commission to decide on the protection of the environment and animal welfare’ (Gerard Batten’s speech on the ‘Mid-term review of the EU biodiversity strategy’, 2nd February 2016).

**4. EU-COMMUNITY**

* **Community positive:** 
  + Positive mentions of the current state of the EU;
  + Positive mentions of the competencies of the EU (the national vs. supranational debate on EU competencies);
  + Positive mentions of the current state of democracy in the EU;
  + Positive mention of the some geometries deriving from the process of European integration (i.e., Euro area or Schengen area);
  + Positive mentions of the values of the EU.
* **Community negative:**
  + Negative mention of the current state of the EU;
  + Negative mentions of the competencies of the EU (the national vs. supranational debate on EU competencies);
  + Negative mentions of the state of democracy in the EU;
  + Negative mentions of some geometries deriving from the process of European integration (e.g., Euro area or Schengen area);
  + Negative mentions referring to values of the EU.
* **Community non-directional:** 
  + References toward the EU in general or some of its specific configurations that do not imply any judgement.

**4.1. Values applied to the quasi-sentences coded under the category EU-community**:

**N.B:** Since this target (EU-community) implies also the various geometries deriving from the process of EU-integration (Euro and Schengen area) a further variable is created such that it is possible to understand when a quasi-sentence refers to the EU in general or to one of its different geometries. To do that three further values are during the coding procedure:

* Value of 5: for all the quasi-sentences that refers to the EU-community in general;
* Value of 3: for all the quasi-sentences that refer to the Euro area;
* Value of 4: for all the quasi-sentences that refer to the Schengen area.

All the quasi-sentences coded under the main category of ‘EU-community’ (thus also to the ones referring to the various EU geometries) report a value to distinguish between principled and pragmatic positioning:

* **EU-community positive:** 
  + **Value of 1:** pragmatic support for the EU or for some of its geometries. The speaker refers positively to some aspects of the EU or of some of its geometries. These quasi-sentences are positive in nature: ‘The EU can play an ambitious role taking the responsibility to act as an example in the important field of climate change’ (Marco Zullo’s speech on the ‘UN Climate change Conference in Marrakesh’ 6th October 2015);
  + **Value of 2**: principled support for the current state of the EU, its values and the state of democracy in the EU (also principled support for one or some of the geometries deriving from the process of European integration have a value of 2). Example: ‘Yet, belonging to the CITES[[2]](#footnote-2) will enable the Union to act with a single voice in facing international actors that have a less advanced legislation in the field, thus reinforcing its vision aiming at protecting plants and animals’ (Marco Zullo’s speech on the ‘Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species- CITES’, 16th October 2014).
* **EU-community negative:** 
  + **Value of 1:** pragmatic opposition to the EU. These quasi-sentences are negatively constructed, however, the expressed critique is pragmatic in the sense that it is open to potential changes of the EU. In other words, these negatively coded quasi-sentences referring to the EU community do NOT refer to a rejection of the EU as such but proposes changes. The same value is used also for quasi-sentences referring to one or some EU’s geometries. Example: ‘The EU cannot be transformed in an under siege fortress for those people living on the other side of the Mediterranean’ (Laura Agea’s speech on the ‘Summary expulsions and the proposed legislation of ‘hot returns’ in Spain’, 25th November 2014);
  + **Value of 2**: principled opposition expressed to the EU community. Such opposition is not open to compromises but delineates a rejection per se of the EU (and/or of its geometries). Example: ‘Madam President, having been to the camps along the northern coast of the Schengen area, I can tell you it is a bonanza for criminal gangs and terrorists’ (Jane Collins and Diane James’ speech on the ‘Situation in the Mediterranean and the need for a holistic approach to migration’, 12th April 2016).

**6. NO-MATCH**

* + Formally addressing gratitude toward some rapporteur, commissioners or other political actors for the work done in preparation of the plenary sitting (generally done by all MEPs and should be considered as lacking specific meaning, like a formal address);
  + Simple points of order are generally regarded as no match;
  + Sentences that remains incomplete (e.g., due to the cuts of speaking time);
  + Statistical data or descriptions of the state of the specific policy field;
  + Citations are generally also considered as a no match category;
  + Descriptions of some specific events that do not make any reference to any other of the above-cited categories.

**4. Information about the speech segments cited in the paper**

This section reports the cited segments of speeches in order of appearance in the texts , providing further information about:

* the name of the speaker;
* the speakers’ national party (in parenthesis);
* title of the debate reported in the agenda of the EP (in italics);
* place and date of the plenary sittting;
* cited fragment in the original language.

Ignazio Corrao (FSM). *The situation in the Mediterranean and the need for a holistic EU approach to migration*. Strasbourg, 12th of April 2016. ‘È emersa la totale impotenza del Parlamento europeo di fronte all'egoismo degli Stati membri’.

Laura Ferrera (FSM). *Provisional measures in the area of international protection for the benefit of Italy and Greece*. Strasbourg, 8th of September 2015. ‘Bene, mi piace ricordare che il Parlamento europeo è l’unica istituzione che è eletta democraticamente dai cittadini, che rappresenta di fatto il volere dei cittadini europei’.

William (the Earl of) Dartmouth (UKIP). *Mid-term review of the EU biodiversity strategy.* Strasbourg, 2nd of February 2016. We believe that the best people to decide on natural habitats in Britain are the British people.

Marco Zullo (FSM). *Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES).* Strasbourg, 16th of December 2014. Far parte della CITES, d'altro canto, permetterà all'Unione di confrontarsi con una voce unica con gli attori internazionali che presentano legislazioni meno avanzate nel settore e far pesare maggiormente il proprio punto di vista a tutela di flora e fauna.

Dario Tamburrano (FSM)**.** *Objection pursuant to Rule 106 on emissions from light passenger and commercial vehicles (Euro 6).* Strasbourg, 3rd of February 2016. Le lobby delle auto sono riuscite a vincere questa battaglia facendo credere al Parlamento che, se il rigetto fosse passato, avrebbe significato la fine delle case automobilistiche e quindi la perdita di numerosi posti di lavoro.

Jonathan Arnott (UKIP). *European Semester for economic policy coordination: implementation of 2014 priorities.* Strasbourg, 22nd of October 2014. As a UKIP MEP, this resolution goes against the fundamental principles of what I believe about economic policy, which could and should be the preserve of the Member States.

David Coburn (UKIP). *European Semester Package- Annual growth survey 2016.* Strasbourg 11th of November 2016. the only medicine with a hope of curing Europe is a euro exit and a return to the original currencies

Marco Valli (FSM). *European Semester for economic policy coordination: Annual growth survey 2016.* Strasbourg, 25th February 2016. Noi abbiamo insistito sulla necessità di cambiare rotta, introducendo subito meccanismi democratici che consentano di uscire dall'euro e preparando un piano per la dissoluzione controllata e coordinata dell'Eurozona.

Giulia Moi (FSM). *Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP).* Strasbourg, 15th of July 2014. Signor Presidente, fino a che punto volete danneggiare noi cittadini, pur di garantire profitti miliardari a poche multinazionali assetate di soldi?

Steven Woolfe (UKIP). *Tax rulings and other measures similar in nature and effect .* Strasbourg, 25th of November 2015. Were involved in allowing corporations to extract exceedingly large profits from the ordinary citizens of Europe.

Margot Parker (UKIP). *European Structural and Investment Funds and sound economic governance.* Strasbourg, 28th of October 2015. The fact that the Commission can tell the Council to withdraw funding from Member States without consulting the elected Parliament highlights the democratic deficit.

Diane James (UKIP). *Mobilisation of the Flexibility Instrument for immediate budgetary measures under the European Agenda on Migration*. Strasbourg, 14th of October 2015. Each country should manage its own policy and work together on a bilateral basis to deal with the current crisis

Jane Collins (UKIP). *The situation in the Mediterranean and the need for and holistic approach to migration.* Strasbourg, 12th of April 2016.Facilitator and accelerator of both the migrant crisis and the movement of terrorists within Europe

Bill Etheridge (UKIP). *Smart Borders*. Strasbourg, 28th of October 2015. The EU is not a country, so I am really confused by the whole concept of why something that is not a country should look to control borders that do not exist.

Ignazio Corrao (FSM). *Report of the extraordinary European Council meeting (23rd April 2015) - The latest tragedies in the Mediterranean and EU migration and asylum policies*. Strasbourg, 29th of April 2015.La riflessione che dovremmo fare è se il metodo intergovernativo che continuiamo ad utilizzare su un tema così importante sia sufficiente a far fronte a quello che è un disastro, un'emergenza di dimensioni davvero incontrollabili.

Laura Ferrara (FSM). *Conclusions of the Justice and Home Affairs Council on migration (14th September 2015)*. Strasbourg, 16th of September 2015.Bene, noi ci stiamo impegnando, come movimento 5 stelle, a fare in modo che sia possibile un'alternativa, a fare in modo che esista un'altra Europa, ma i fatti, purtroppo, ci costringono a pensare che questa convinzione debba diventare un'utopia, un sogno infranto, un'illusione.

Jonathan Arnott (UKIP). *Council Decision establishing provisional measures in the area of international protection for the benefit of Italy, Greece and Hungary*. Strasbourg, 17th of September 2015. *EU refugee quotas are the wrong way to go about handling this situation*.

Nigel Farage (UKIP). *European Agenda on Migration*. Strasbourg, 20th of May 2015. It is pretty clear that, actually, when it comes to renegotiation, nothing substantial can be achieved, because already all big bosses in Europe have said that the freedom-of-movement rules are not up for re-negotiation and that there will be no Treaty change on this point.

Steven Woolfe (UKIP). *The situation in the Mediterranean and the need for a holistic EU approach to migration.* Strasbourg, 12th of April 2016. They have rejected the idea that Angela Merkel’s open welcome has caused millions of people to feel that they should come to the EU and they have rejected the idea that Australia’s solutions have meant fewer people dying.

1. Definition taken from the “Handbook” of the Comparative Manifesto Project. Electronic version of the handbook available at <https://manifestoproject.wzb.eu/information/documents?name=handbook_v4> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)