

The rhetoric of anti-populism: A computer-based analysis of British parliamentary debates about the referendum*

**Aude Biquelet
LSE, Methodology Institute**

**Draft paper for the 60th Political Studies Association Annual Conference
Panel: British Political Rhetoric: Traditions, Innovations, Comparisons II
Edinburgh, 29 March - 1 April 2010**

Acknowledgement

This research was supported by the Economic and Social Research Council (PTA- 026-27-2431).

* Work in progress. Please do not cite without author's permission.

Abstract

In his seminal book, *the Rhetoric of Reaction*, social scientist Albert Hirschman mapped the reactionary rhetoric in which conservative public figures have been arguing against progressive agendas for the past two hundred years and identified three famous patterns of argumentation; the *perversity* thesis, the *futility* thesis, and the *jeopardy* thesis.

This paper investigates whether Hirschman's patterns of argumentation are replicated when political representatives justify their positions against citizens' direct participation in decision making. To this end, the paper uses a computer-based approach (the Alceste software) to analyse successive parliamentary debates in the United-Kingdom concerning the referendum and its possible use in ratifying the Maastricht Treaty (1992-1993) and the European Constitution (2005).

Results indicate that although Hirschman's patterns of argumentation do not find resonance, British parliamentary debates on the referendum are largely 'codified' and display their own patterns of argumentation: the *Historical Opportunity v. the Opportunism* thesis, and the *Necessity v. Un-necessity* thesis.

Introduction

The participation of citizens in decision and policy making is currently experiencing a blossoming of interest in political and academic circles that is unprecedented. Ranging from concern with issues such as climate change, social inequalities, poverty or crime, the potential of the public being directly engaged in political processes in contemporary democracies has seen an increasing variety of forms for participation: focus groups, deliberative polls, citizens' juries and participatory budgeting. In the United Kingdom, as an example, experiences such as the 1994 Channel Four Deliberative Poll on Crime, 1998 Bristol Citizens' Panel, and the 2004 DTI Citizens' Jury have been acclaimed as great successes by policy makers and politicians alike.

In academic circles too, a strong advocacy for more public participation has grown, extolling its virtues and the compelling claim to making democracy both more responsible and responsive (Crosby, Kelly & Schaefer: 1986). Recent studies have shown that one can expect substantial benefits from including citizens in governance. For instance, Wang's survey of city officials across America found that collaboration between elected officials and citizens was often associated with the meeting of public needs and improving public trust in government (2001: 334). In addition, studies focusing upon 'discursive participation' have shown that public involvement in deliberative forums, conventions and panels can positively impact citizens' attitudes and behaviours, generating a greater sense of political efficacy and an increase in the frequency and recurrence of political action by citizens (Fishkin, 1995; Gutmann & Thompson, 1996).

However, one crucial mode of citizen participation continues to provoke controversy for both academics and politicians: the use of the national referendum (Qvortrup, 2007: 3). In this respect, debates at the level of high politics concerning transfers of national sovereignty in the context of the European Union are paradigmatic. In these debates, intense disagreement often arose between those parliamentarians favouring participation, who sought to defer decision-making to the people via referendums, and those opposing the use of such a device, who believed it to be their task, as elected representatives, to decide on behalf of the people.

Although much has been written about how political theorists or citizens themselves think and *feel* about direct participation, however, there remains little research that examines how political representatives conceive of the issue, or at least what stances on the subject they might make explicitly. This is a significant absence and there are several important reasons why the views of politicians about the role of the people in democratic systems should be considered.

First, as scholars specialized in *elite interviewing* or *elite approaches to politics* have pointed out:

‘Some people are much more interested, much more involved, and much more influential in public affairs than their fellows, and therefore, they merit the special attention of students of politics.’ (Putnam, 1971: 651)

The above applies especially to political representatives in democratic systems, who are not only in the unique position of translating norms and values into substantive policies, but are thus able, through their ‘speech-acts’ and decisions, to affect and alter the democratic polity in which they operate.

Second, the ways in which political representatives think about democracy, more precisely how they perceive their own roles and those of the people are fundamental questions pertinent to our understanding of how modern democratic systems function. Currently, traditional conceptions regarding the relationships between governments and the governed are being challenged more frequently and to unprecedented degrees. For instance, more recent developments in information technologies and greater social access to information raise possibilities that imply considerably altered roles and functions for political representatives in democratic systems as well as for citizens. Additionally, the ongoing perception – in European quarters particularly – that parliamentary prerogatives are being steadily eroded ‘from above’ (i.e., through the transfer of sovereignty to supranational institutions such as the EU) and ‘from below’ (e.g., through the process of devolution to regional parliaments) is a phenomenon often propagated by politicians themselves, not by some separate and disconnected ‘other’. Understanding the ways in which political representatives conceive of their own roles and that of the electorate would appear to be critical in ever-changing circumstances such as these.

This research addresses the issues raised above by investigating how political representatives justify their positions in parliamentary debates either in favour of or against the use of the referendum device. The cases considered focus on several successive debates in the United Kingdom (U.K) concerning the referendum and its possible use in ratifying the Maastricht Treaty (1992-1993) and the European Constitution (2005).

The intention here is to address two areas of interest to political and democratic theorists. The first pertains to the theoretical and empirical concerns of how the roles of citizens in democratic systems are currently conceived of in political circles. The second relates to the issue of how, if at all, political culture might inform or affect rhetorical argumentative strategies about direct participation in Britain.

Methodology

A. The rhetorical dimension

a. Quantitative and the Qualitative perspectives

In order to address the question of which concepts or other general lines of argument ‘stand out’ in parliamentary discussions about direct participation, one needs to take into account how those are deployed in both quantitative and qualitative senses. From a quantitative perspective, singling out concepts and arguments most frequently employed by the speakers, while technically a simple exercise, is analytically important. Quantifying the ‘weight’ of certain issues in overall parliamentary discussions would enable us to identify the major issues arising in debates and the concepts deployed in association. Identifying instances of repetition, furthermore, tests the argument advanced in political communication studies that it is closely linked to processes of *persuasion*. Political and advertising campaigns alike illustrate how the reiteration of the same catchphrase or argument is often used to convince voters or consumers that the choice presented is of value (See for instance Smith, 2005). One can reasonably assume that a similar rhetorical device is used in parliamentary deliberation.

Yet this approach also requires a complementary, qualitative element. One way to think about parliamentary debates is to compare them with plays. In other words, one could take deliberative assemblies and the speeches made therein as a type of regulated discourse, conducted according to several rules which similarly define classical theatre: Unity of setting (*Unité de Lieu*), unity of action (*unité d’action*), and unity of time (*unité de temps*). Unity of setting implies that political representatives are, like characters in a play, gathered on a common stage from which they cannot escape; unity of action, that there is one discursive theme or set of themes; and unity of time, in the sense that representatives have to make their case within a given timeframe. Another important rule that can apply to both parliamentary debates and classical theatre is that of *règle de bienséance* (i.e. ‘keeping with the usage’ or conventional demeanour). Just as the rule restricts what can and what cannot be said or done on stage, similar considerations can be made for the behavioural and linguistic conventions which shape parliamentary interactions. In Britain’s House of Commons, for instance, it is forbidden for an MP to call someone a liar.

Such constraints can thus be expected to have an effect on the conduct of political discourses just as they do in the staging of theatrical plays. This leads to several qualitative considerations applicable to the study of parliamentary debate. Since rules define to a large extent what can be said, special attention also needs to be given to what is *not* said, is implied, or is expressed in a circumlocutory fashion during the exchanges of arguments. Furthermore, though rules can control interactions, this

can also lead to suppression, which may occasionally and in extreme circumstances entail speech-actions that break them. The breaking of contextual or institutional rules, in being exceptional rather than the norm, is not adequately captured by a strictly quantitative approach and thus needs to be examined qualitatively.

In addition, from both macro and micro perspectives (i.e., the overall debate as conducted over time versus individual speeches within debates), the way in which argumentation in parliaments is conducted often follows a tightly regulated pattern: Description of the issue at stake; summation of the arguments espoused previously, if any; explicit defence of the position adopted by the speaker; supporting statements and critical rejoinders; *et cetera*. Given this regimentation, which affects both the macro and micro levels, one cannot deny the possibility that important points of debate might be expressed only infrequently, with significant utterances perhaps finding expression only when speeches or debates reach their climax. Such anomalous occasions are perhaps just as important as repetition in terms of persuasion (indeed, one might also consider that individual speakers take this into account when writing their speeches) and a qualitative analysis would highlight what a quantitative approach would likely ignore.

Finally, if speakers – like characters in a play – are indeed restricted by discursive conventions, then one can reasonably expect them to think very carefully about how to frame and express precisely what *to say*. The ways in which arguments are conveyed or framed in the context of parliamentary deliberations is thus of great importance. Amongst other things, a combined qualitative and quantitative approach allows one to determine whether parliamentarians are putting forward their claims by appeal to ‘rational’ or more ‘emotional’ types of argument.

b. Identifying patterns of argumentation

Conceptual historians have pointed out that concepts and discursive constructions are potentially open to reinterpretations (Ihalainen, 2007; Palonen, 2006). This is captured by Skinner’s notion of *paradiastole* which refers to political change derived from altering the normative content of a concept. Yet, contrary to the claim that language is contingent and that concepts are open to normative changes another assumption holds that universal patterns of rhetorical argumentation are invariably exhibited in political science debates.

In his seminal book *The Rhetoric of Reaction*, social scientist Albert Hirschman argued that every major stage in the development of citizenship in western civilization, from the emancipation of slaves to the extension of the franchise to women, has also seen protracted debates at those times between advocates of reform and their ‘reactionary’ adversaries. Hirschman’s approach reduced the ‘reactionary ideology’ to its general argumentative strands, seeking to uncover the major posturing

and polemical manoeuvring likely to be conducted by those trying to debunk and overturn ‘progressive’ policies (Hirschman, 1991: 6). He thus developed a rhetorical taxonomy that could be used to theoretically categorize arguments against any particular course of proposed policy action:

- *The perversity thesis* holds that any attempt to substantially reform existing institutions and social policies will inevitably result in unintended and perverse consequences that will aggravate the very conditions the reformers seek to remedy (1991: 22).
- *The futility thesis*, whereby attempts at social transformation will be unavailing and attacks on reform programs in this vein contend that the latter’s proposals will be entirely ineffectual (1991: 45); and, finally,
- *The jeopardy thesis*, which accepts the desirability of the proposed reform program, but instead focuses its attacks on the costs of reform and the adverse effects on existing benefits. This entails arguments that costs of proposed changes are too high and that they endanger some earlier, precious accomplishment (1991: 162).

Using Hirschman’s analytical prism, this research will assess whether anti-populism at the theoretical level is matched by reactionary rhetoric in real political debates.¹

For instance, anti-populist arguments as expressed by political theorists might be recast in Hirschman’s terms in the following way:

- *The perversity thesis* would hold that any attempt to substantially encourage popular and direct participation will inevitably foster extremism.
- *The futility thesis* would hold that any attempt to involve ordinary people significantly in decision-making would be in vain, since the ideal of ‘government by the people’ is a vacuous conception.
- *The jeopardy thesis* would argue that, though a desirable end in itself, the prospect of significantly involving ordinary people in political decision-making would wreck the functional balance already achieved by representative regimes.

It is important to note that this is only one possible way of formulating the rhetoric of anti-populism along the lines of Hirschman’s taxonomy. Since the primary emphasis is on the *pattern* of argumentation, the *content* itself can be expressed in different ways. For instance, another example of

¹ In the following analyses, I will take the Progressives to be those who support the referendum and the Reactionaries those who oppose it, regardless of their party affiliations. Therefore, the dichotomy Reactionaries/Progressives will not necessarily reflect the ideological dichotomy Conservative/Liberals (or Labour). Indeed, Liberals might thus be Reactionaries in this case if they oppose the use of the referendum.

the futility thesis could maintain that any attempts to involve people significantly in decision-making would be in vain, for people are apathetic and largely disengaged from politics. Finally, bearing in mind that the patterns of argumentation uncovered by Hirschman might not necessarily be exhaustive, one might yet obtain argumentative strands from real debates that are additional to those identified by him.

B. Computer-assisted methods and the analysis of political texts: The Alceste software

Traditionally, the study of parliamentary debates has faced practical and analytical obstacles since a substantial amount of data needs sorting and analysis suffers from cumulative biases via selection, coding and interpretation. Recent advances in computer-based textual analysis, however, allow such problems to be minimised and it is this method that is used here in the form of the software package Alceste (see Schonhardt-Bailey, 2005, 2008; Bara, Weale and Biquelet, 2007).

Unlike other approaches to automated content analysis, Alceste does not require the researcher to specify a dictionary, but instead uses its own dictionary to search for the co-occurrence of those content terms that give meaning to a text, discarding function words that serve a purely grammatical purpose. The basic unit of analysis is a gauged sentence that is to say a unit of expression that has some grammatical and lexical coherence, and in which issues are thematised. Alceste groups these sentences together with one another according to a χ^2 measure of distance. Initially, two groups of sentences are separated comprising the greatest measure of difference, and each of these classes is further separated to the point where no major partitionings would be justified by the χ^2 metric. Sentences are therefore grouped into classes and each class can be thought of as a dimension of debate, in the sense that specific words and speakers are associated with that class to a greater or lesser degree (see Reinert, 1983; Brugidou, 2003; Guerin-Pace, 1998).

Alceste should be regarded as an exploratory tool to be used for classifying sentences and speakers in a debate rather than a method of hypothesis testing. Hypothesis testing is difficult, because within parliamentary debates it is not clear what the null hypothesis would be. Speaker interactions are not logically independent events, but occur in conformity with the rules and norms of procedural intervention, as well as the patterns of argumentation available within political culture more broadly. Alceste does not substitute for the substantive interpretation of a competent language speaker, but enables such speakers to explore the structural characteristics of a debate.

Background and Transcripts Examined

A. The Maastricht Treaty

As a prominent political commentator once put it, referendums in Britain 'are like ghosts in the political machine' (King, 2007: 277). Although they are frequently discussed, only one has ever been held; this was in 1975 to decide whether the United Kingdom should remain a member of the European Common Market. Observers have often suggested that this first and only national referendum was held more for reasons of internal party politics than by commitment to the principle of popular sovereignty or the perception that citizen participation is of value (Bogdanor, 1994: 41). Despite agreeing to defer decision making to the people in 1975, ministers had not intended to set a precedent; rather, they were responding *ad hoc* to what were considered unique circumstances at the time (Bogdanor, 1994: 42). If the referendum were to be formally conceded to replace parliamentary decision-making, it would be difficult thereafter to prevent it from being called for again. This is not say, however, that it was dead and buried.

Between 1992 and 1993, 'referendum' was to be invoked again in a most vigorous series of debates concerning the ratification of the Treaty of Maastricht. In the General Election of 1992, all three major parties, Labour, Conservative and Liberal Democrat, were in favour of the Treaty. Factions within the parties, however, had started to materialise and distance themselves from the respective party lines on Maastricht, generally revolving around concerns about the proposed monetary union (Watts & Pilkington, 2005: 123). By the time the Bill concerning the ratification of the Treaty had reached parliament, representatives from various political backgrounds had come together to voice their opposition to the notion of Maastricht being forced down the collective throat of the electorate: the question of European integration should once again be deferred to the people.

Prime Minister John Major, leader of the Conservatives, was opposed to the idea of holding a referendum on Maastricht. So was Edward Heath, and John Smith, leader of the Labour Party (unlike his predecessor, Harold Wilson). Referendum advocates included Paddy Ashdown, leader of the Liberal Democrats, and Margaret Thatcher, John Major's predecessor as prime minister, who still had considerable clout amongst the Tories despite having stood down from the premiership several years previously. Rebels in the Conservative party and so-called Euro-sceptics, led by Thatcher, agreed to withdraw their opposition to the Treaty only on condition that the government let ratification be decided by the people (Watts & Pilkington, 2005: 123-124).

Several attempts were made by Ministers of Parliament (MPs) to formalise the referendum device with the impending arrival of Maastricht. In the House of Commons, Richard Shepherd introduced a Private Member's Bill in 1992 which proposed that certain treaties should require a referendum to be

held for their ratification. Although the Bill did not progress past a first reading, it saw the issue of referendum fully debated. Later, in March 1993, a motion that a referendum must be held before an Act could take effect was discussed in the Commons; but this was eventually defeated by 363 votes to 124. This was followed up in April 1993 by Labour MP Bryan Gould with his introduction of 'New Clause 49' to the House (more properly entitled the Referendum Provision to the European Communities (Amendment) Bill 1992). This bill sought to amend the commencement provisions of the relevant Act of Parliament to allow for a referendum on the Treaty of Maastricht. New Clause 49 was also defeated, by 363 votes to 124. Such efforts in the Commons were mirrored briefly in the Upper Chamber of parliament, with Lord Blake proposing a motion in July 1993 for an amendment that would guarantee a referendum on Maastricht; but this attempt met a similar fate. Despite continued debate on the referendum in both houses of parliament over Europe, as well as numerous opinion polls showing significant support from the British public for its use, the Treaty of Maastricht went on to be ratified through parliamentary process.

B. The European Constitutional Treaty

In 2005, a draft text for a new European Constitution, a document already several years in the making by that point, was to be considered for adoption by EU member states. The mode of ratification used by member states to approve the so-called EU Constitutional Treaty, however, was left for respective governments to decide. In Britain, the Labour Government had by this stage become well-entrenched in its position that parliament would ratify the EU Treaty and a referendum would not be necessary. The government firm stance on the issue was born from facing down numerous criticisms from various Conservative, Liberal Democrat and Labour backbenchers who, since early 2003, had fought for a referendum on the matter. As far back as February 2003, David McShane, then-Minister of State for Europe, was already responding to Conservative demands that a referendum be held on the EU Constitution:

'This country does not have a tradition of plebiscites that allow populists to range over plebiscitary politics, using their weekly magazines to pump out endless anti-European propaganda. Every previous treaty from the treaty of accession in 1973 to Maastricht, Nice and Amsterdam has been debated properly in the House, and I think that ratification by Parliament is the right way forward.' (HC Deb 25 Feb 2003 c 114)

Shortly after, Labour MP Frank Field proposed a Private Member's Bill, entitled *The Draft Constitutional Treaty on the Future of Europe (Referendum) Bill*, stipulating the use of a national referendum to determine whether the United Kingdom should become signatory to the EU Constitutional Treaty. A Second Reading of the Bill was scheduled for 11th July 2003; but following a procedural objection, this was postponed for 21st November 2003. Since the House was prorogued on 20th November, the Referendum Bill made no further progress. Further such moves met similar ends.

On 12th November 2003, John Maples' Ten Minute Rule Bill, the Constitution for Europe (Referendum Bill) was read. Although it reached a Second Reading on 23rd April 2004, it was subsequently dropped. A 30th March 2004 motion proposed by Michael Ancram calling for a referendum on the EU Constitution was also debated, but was defeated by 328 to 212.

Under considerable pressure from the Opposition and even members of his own party, then-Prime Minister Tony Blair announced after a Parliamentary debate on the EU Constitution on 20th April 2004 that a referendum would indeed be held, despite his Government having denied the need for a popular vote for months. He did not, however, specify a date for this, even though he later reiterated this commitment on 21st June 2004. In addition, the Government had not only pledged a referendum on the EU Treaty, but to hold one regardless of the outcome of prior referendums in other EU Member States. Conservative MP David Heathcoat-Amory had earlier asked of Tony Blair:

'If another member state - a small country - holds a vote and rejects a [European] constitution before we hold a referendum [on the issue], will he, assuming he is still the Prime Minister, go ahead with his promised referendum, or will he use that as an excuse to cancel the British national referendum, even though that other country may subsequently be bullied into changing its mind?'

To which the Prime Minister replied: 'No, of course not. The referendum should go ahead in any event.' (HC Deb 20 April 2004 c164)

The *European Union Bill*, which formally raised the issue of ratification for the EU Treaty, was introduced to the Commons on 25th January 2005.² It received a Second Reading scheduled for 9th February, but this was annulled with the calling of a General Election and the Bill had to be reintroduced on 24th May 2005.³ On 6th June 2005, however, after the popular rejection of the EU Treaty in both France and the Netherlands, then-Foreign Secretary Jack Straw announced in the Commons that the Government had decided to postpone the Bill's Second Reading. He insisted, however, that neither the legislation nor a referendum had been ruled out, stating that '[w]e reserve completely the right to bring back for consideration the Bill providing for a UK referendum should circumstances change, but we see no point doing so at this moment' (HC Deb 6 June 2005 c 992).

² Bill 45 of 2004-05.

³ Bill 5 of 2005-06.

Table 1: Transcripts Examined for the Maastricht Treaty Ratification by the UK House of Commons and House of Lords.

Date	House	Debate Type and Hansard Reference	Analysis Type
21 st Feb 1992	Commons	Private Member's Bill Richard Shepherd [HC Deb 581- 650]	
8 th Mar 1993	Commons	European Communities (Amendment) Bill [HC Deb 665- 715]	
21 st Apr 1993	Commons	European Communities (Amendment) Bill [HC Deb 380- 483]	
<i>Integrated Debate</i> <i>(contains the 3 above debates)</i>	Commons		- Double classification on the ECUs
14 th Jul 1993	Lords	European Communities (Amendment Bill) [HC Deb 239-334]	- Double classification on the ECUs

Table 2: Transcripts Examined for the Ratification of the EU Constitutional Treaty by the UK House of Commons and House of Lords.

Date	Place	Type of debate & Hansard reference	Analysis Type
16 th Sep 2003	Commons	Amendment (Michael Ancram) [HC Deb 777- 822]	
12 th Nov 2003	Commons	Ten Minute Rule Bill. John Maples (<i>Constitution for Europe [Referendum] Bill</i>) [HC Deb 307-315]	
30 th Mar 2004	Commons	Motion Calling for a referendum on the EC (Michael Ancram) [HC Deb 1484-1535]	
20 th Apr 2004	Commons	Statement (Tony Blair) [HC Deb 156-171]	
23 rd Apr 2004	Commons	Second Reading. John Maples [HC Deb 555- 608]	
21 st Jun 2004	Commons	Statement (Tony Bair) [HC Deb 1080-1096]	
9 th Feb 2005	Commons	Second Reading (<i>European Union Bill</i>) [HC Deb 1527-1618]	
6 th Jun 2005	Commons	Statement (Jack Straw) [HC Deb 991-1005]	
<i>Integrated Debate</i> <i>(all 8 debates from</i>	Commons	[HC Deb 777- 822] [HC Deb 307-315] [HC Deb 156-171] [HC Deb 555- 608] [HC Deb 1484-1535]	-Double Classification on the ECUs - Simple

<i>above combined)</i>		[HC Deb 1080-1096] [HC Deb 1527-1618] [HC Deb 991-1005]	Classification on the ECUs of Class 2
10 th Dec 2003	Lords	Motion. Lord Forsyth of Drumlean [HL Deb 759-828]	
10 th Sep 2004	Lords	Second Reading (<i>Constitution for Europe [Referendum] Bill</i>) [HL Deb 817-856]	
<i>Integrated Debate</i> <i>2 above debates and the following discussions:</i> 5 th Mar 2003 27 th Jan 2005 6 th Jun 2005 18 th Apr 2006 18 th May 2006	Lords	[HL Deb 759-828] [HL Deb 817-856] [HL Deb 803-806] [HL Deb 1385-1388] [HL Deb 684-697] [HL Deb 971-976] [HL Deb 377-419]	Double Classification on the ECUs - <i>Tri-Croisé</i> – ‘Referendum’

Results and Discussion

[Figures 1, 2, 3, 4 about here]

Table 3: Interactions in Parliamentary Deliberations: Ratification of the Treaty of Maastricht, 1992-1993 & EU Constitutional Treaty Ratification, 2005, in the UK House of Commons and House of Lords.

<p><i>Topical Dimension</i></p>	<p>Main argumentative divisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conceptual <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Exercise of Sovereignty • Political Representation and MP's Responsibility - Political <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Constitutional changes • Instrumentalization of Direct Participation - Technical <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complexity of the text • Timing of the Referendum • Wording of the question
<p><i>Rhetorical Dimension</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Exchanges between speakers remain 'cordial' - Absence of Hirschman's Jeopardy/Futility/Jeopardy Theses - British debates on the referendum display their own patterns of argumentation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historical Opportunity Thesis v. the Opportunism Thesis • Necessity v. Un-necessity Thesis.

A. The Topical Dimension

a. Conceptual Disputes.

The debates on Maastricht between 1992 and 1993 were conducted in a slightly different context to those on the EU Constitutional Treaty between 2003 and 2006. The issue of referendum in both sets of debates, however, came to be discussed in a similar fashion, despite the twenty years separating

Maastricht and the Constitutional Treaty. The issue of deferring treaty ratification to the people in both instances of British parliamentary debate have, for the most part, revolved around the same argumentative divisions.

The first and arguably one of the most significant such divisions that dominates these two sets of debates on the referendum is the dispute over the conceptualisation of sovereignty. The disagreement does not necessarily focus on the matter of definition or the question of rightful authority in the state. Both referendum advocates and critics seem to agree that sovereignty derives from the people, who then transfer their power to parliament. The main point of contention, rather, concerns the exercise of that sovereignty once it has been transferred to parliament. On the one hand, it is argued that the people have the right to decide on matters that can significantly affect their lives since they have only temporarily *transferred* the authority to make political decisions to representatives. On the other hand, it is countered that this transfer legitimises the decision-making of representatives, even on those issues that are of the utmost importance, which by definition must take place on behalf of the people (Figure 1 Class 1 & Figure 3 Class 2).

As a corollary of the disagreement over what the transfer of sovereignty entails, how representation *per se* is conceived poses another point of contention. As shown by the analyses, the way in which MPs conceive of their own role is often correlated with their views on sovereignty. Particularly noteworthy here is the notion of ‘responsibility’ that is often invoked. There are significant variations in what constitutes ‘responsible’ behaviour according to different MPs and Lords. Some believe it is their duty to defer to popular decision-making when the issue at stake is of crucial importance, others consider responsible behaviour to mean that such decisions are properly made on behalf of the people, regardless of public opinion polls showing that a majority of the electorate would in fact prefer to decide for themselves (Figure 2 Class 2 & Figure 3 Class 2).

b. Political Disputes.

A second argumentative division that is apparent from both sets of debates concerns the political or constitutional aspects of the referendum. The analyses show that the question of whether or not the Treaty under consideration required significant ‘constitutional changes’ in Britain was raised in exactly the same manner in both the sets of debates for Maastricht and the EU Constitutional Treaty (Figure 1 Class 1 & Figure 3 Class 1). Just as referendum advocates in the two settings typically argued that the transfer of power from British to European institutions demanded that decisions be made by the people, so have critics normally responded that so-called crucial treaties adopted earlier were all ratified by parliament (as with the mention of the Single European Act during Maastricht discussions and that of Maastricht during the debate on the EU Constitutional Treaty). Interesting to note here is the fact that referendum critics are not necessarily against the referendum *per se* or even

in principle. As Lord Jenkins of Hillhead puts it ‘I am not against referenda in all circumstances. I can envisage circumstances in which a further European one might be desirable.’ (HL Deb 14 July 1993 c 253). Yet they have arguably initiated a trend, that of dismissing the referendum on the grounds that it was not previously used to ratify equally important treaties, which may yet perpetuate.

Argumentative divisions about the use of the referendum have also focused on another political issue; that of politicians alleging that their peers are instrumentalizing direct participation in their speeches. In both sets of debates, referendum advocates have often accused opponents of denying the people their right to express themselves on a fundamental political issue simply for fear of the result. On the other hand, referendum critics have often alleged that advocates have simply instrumentalised the device so as to appeal to the people; not only to pressure the government of the day, but also to utilise a ‘no’ in the referendum to occasion a British withdrawal from the EU (Figure 4 Class 3).

c. Technical Disputes.

A third point of contention pertains to the technical aspects involved in conducting a referendum. In the two sets of debates analysed above, the question of whether or not the treaty text under consideration could be resolved by a ‘Yes/No’ answer was raised and was established as an essential precondition for the deferral of decision-making to the people (Figure 2 Class 5 & Figure 3 Class 3). This again might suggest a trend that could continue to be replicated in future debates. Yet, since all EU treaties so far have necessarily involved ‘complex matters’, it is difficult to see how one in future might be resolved by such a clear-cut distinction so as to be feasible for submission to the people.

Furthermore, arguments about the ‘complexity of the text’ put forward in the two sets of debates to justify parliamentary ratification may yet be obfuscating concerns about the ability of voters to make informed choices in public policy. Although rarely advanced, the argument is indeed occasionally made that the people lack the required knowledge to adequately take part in decision-making. In the debate concerning the ratification of the EU Constitutional Treaty, for instance, Labour MP Chris Bryant argued:

‘Although a referendum might be appropriate for pop idol when deciding whether Gareth Gates or Will Young should win, it is unsuitable for examining a treaty. That needs to be done with due diligence and only parliament can do that.’ (HC Deb 12 Nov 2003 c 310)

Intriguingly, the responses of referendum advocates to those who claimed that the EU treaties were ‘too complex’ for the majority of ordinary people to make informed decisions upon are reminiscent of the classical ‘developmental’ theories. Referendum advocates in both sets of debates have countered that it is only by participating that people will acquire information and knowledge on a particular

issue and that experience will develop their aptitude for participation in future. As Viscount Tonyandy put it:

‘People outside feel that they do not know what the issues are and I believe that a referendum where both sides could argue their case could do nothing but good for the future of our people.’ (HL Deb 14 July 1993 c 252)

Although not consistently captured by Alceste, a further technical issue raised by representatives was that of the ‘timing’ of a referendum. In the Maastricht debates, critics typically argued that the organization of a referendum would considerably delay the treaty ratification. Lord Richard, for instance, argued that:

‘[...] for practical purposes, we are talking about a referendum being organized and taking place in approximately February of next year, two and a quarter years after the treaty was negotiated. This is far too long, my Lords.’ (HL Deb 14 July 1993, c 248)

In the debate about the EU Constitutional Treaty, the issue of timing also appears as a central issue for both referendum advocates and critics, albeit in different guises. Once Tony Blair had agreed to a referendum in 2004, one of the principal concerns expressed by Conservative MPs was that it should take place before the next General Election. Typically, the main line of defence adopted then by Labour was that the treaty text required proper parliamentary debate and scrutiny. Responding to then-leader of the Conservatives, MP Michael Howard, and his willingness to hasten the organization of a referendum, Tony Blair advanced the following:

Why is the Right Honourable and learned gentleman so anxious to have a referendum without the parliamentary debate and scrutiny? Because he has everything to fear from a detailed understanding and everything to gain from haste and headlines...’ (HC Deb 21 June 2004 c 1084)

A final point of contention in terms of the technical aspects of referendum arising in both sets of debates (though perhaps more apparent in the consideration of the EU Constitutional Treaty debate) pertains to the wording of the question to be asked to the electorate. First, during the Second Reading of the Referendum Bill introduced by John Maples on 23rd April 2004, a major objection voiced by Labour MPs was that the Bill remained unclear as to who would be charged with devising the wording of the question to be issued to the people. As Labour MP David Cairns put it, for instance:

‘What is a referendum if it is not a question? This seems to be the major flaw in the Bill. I might have been more inclined to support it, the other flaws notwithstanding, had it said, “the question to be asked in the referendum shall be decided by the electoral commission and ratified by parliament”.’ (HC 23 Apr 2004 c 567)

Other examples of such disagreement appears during the Second Reading of the European Bill introduced by the Government on 25th January 2005, prompted in this instance by the choice of words to be put on the ballot. The Government proposed that the question asked should be: ‘Should the

United Kingdom approve the Treaty establishing a Constitution for the *European Union*?' The Opposition contended that the wording should instead be: 'Should the United Kingdom approve the Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe?' For Conservative MPs, such as David Davis and David Heathcoat-Amory, the wording was being manipulated by the government to its own advantage. As the latter argued:

'The wording on the ballot paper refers to the Constitution for the European Union, which implies that it is simply a rule for the existing Union—which, incidentally, simply gets abolished if the Constitution comes into effect. They do not like the idea of the true wording, which is 'a constitution for Europe', which perhaps sounds more ambitious and threatening.' (HC Deb 9 Feb 2005 c 1578)

B. The Rhetorical Dimension

Despite the importance of the topic being debated and the directly opposed lines of argument on display, exchanges between speakers in the British House of Lords and House of Commons tend to remain cordial and based on rational arguments, rather than giving way to emotive outbursts (as was observed in a separate study, not reported here, on the French case).

Indeed, at the end of his speech in the House of Lords on the 14th July 1993, Viscount Tonypanody remarked: 'Two things have impressed me about your Lordships' House ever since I came here. The first is the courtesy here. Hardly anyone is rude [...] The courtesy of this House is one of our precious assets' (HL Deb 14 July 1993 c 252). In the House of Commons, exchanges can become quite heated, but civility and courtesousness between speakers dominate during discussions on the whole.

If exchanges remain cordial, then it is perhaps due to the fact that each side of the debate can anticipate the arguments that will be put forward by the other side. In a way, Parliamentary debates about the referendum in Britain can be said to be rhetorically 'codified' – there is little room for 'surprise' or 'unexpected' arguments to arise.

As the results of the analyses suggest, Hirschman's Theses hardly resonate in the British case, except possibly on the one occasion that something akin to the Perversity Thesis was expressed by Lord Wakeham in the debate on Maastricht:

'Noble Lords calling for a referendum have made much of their desire to defend Parliament's sovereignty. But by calling for a referendum they are in fact undermining this sovereignty. They are advocating that Parliament abdicates its responsibility to take a decision in this case.' [HL 14 Deb July 1993 c 244]

Here, support for the referendum to defend Parliament's sovereignty will result, according to the speaker, in perverse consequences that will aggravate the very conditions which proponents of the reform seek to remedy. It is a way of framing the argument that follows the logical format of the

Perversity Thesis. Yet this example remains somewhat exceptional and there are only a few points that mirror Hirschman, with echoes of Reactionary Theses (i.e., Jeopardy, Futility, Perversity) elsewhere. Instead, the referendum and its use as discussed in the British debates on Maastricht and the EU Constitutional Treaty displays its own distinctive pattern of argumentation.

On the one hand, there is the *Historical Opportunity Thesis*; that is, the argument that the decision to ratify an EU Treaty (i.e., the Single European Act, Treaty of Maastricht, the EU Constitutional Treaty and any future European treaties) is one of historical importance and a unique opportunity which the Government should seize to conduct a referendum. In Lord Forsyth's words, for instance:

'It is to the undying shame of this Administration, who have allowed 34 referendums since 1997—one of which allowed the people of Mr Peter Mandelson's constituency to vote for a monkey as mayor—that they are still refusing to allow a referendum on the most important constitutional issue, certainly of my lifetime.' [HL 10 Dec 2003 c 762]

On the other hand, typically juxtaposed against the above, is the *Opportunism Thesis*; that one who favours the referendum here is in fact motivated by ulterior and strategic political motives, rather than a principled adherence to the referendum and its use. As Lord Hannay of Chiswick puts it:

'I have noticed that when the idea of a Europe-wide referendum is mentioned, their [Conservative] enthusiasm evaporates rapidly. Could it possibly be that their position is determined more by their calculation of the probable outcome than by attachment to a particular constitutional practice?' [HL 18 May 2006 c 388]

Or, as Baroness Symons of Vernham Dean sees it:

'I do not think that it [the EU Constitutional Treaty] is of any greater order of magnitude than what was discussed in the Maastricht Treaty, which included the laying down of the stages for progress towards economic and monetary union (...). If that was not a matter for a referendum, when the Conservative Party had the ability to decide whether to hold one, I do not see why it is so keen when it is out of office to urge one on us.' [HL 5 Mar 2003 c 805]

Arguably, on a more mundane level, the above analyses have also shown that one can anticipate how British parliamentary debates about the referendum and its use will proceed according to the logic of the *Necessity* versus *Un-necessity* Theses. Proponents of the referendum have typically raised the argument that the proposed treaty would involve significant changes to Britain's constitution; changes of such magnitude that the decision to adopt the treaty should be given over to the people instead of being taken in parliament. As expressed by Conservative MP Richard Shepherd for instance;

'I believe most solemnly, and the house should in my view, believe most solemnly, that there ought to be a direct exposition to the people of this country of what theses changes [changes entailed by the Maastricht Treaty] amount to and why they are necessary' [HC 21 FEB 1992 c 586].

Critics of the referendum, by contrast, can be expected to respond here that the magnitude of the implied changes in the treaty are not so great after all; since other important European treaties had been ratified before without the use of the referendum, it is unnecessary to use it now.

Interestingly, if one looks at other debates during which the referendum was discussed in the UK House of Commons and House of Lords, it seems that the patterns of argumentation identified above also found recurrent expression. One example of this is provided by MP Michael Havers, who, whilst commenting on the appropriateness (or principle) of holding a referendum on Britain's continued membership of the EEC, declared in 1975:

'My Right Honourable Friend, the Member for Grantham (Mr. Godber), asked the question which has raised itself time after time, not only today but in the debate a month ago—what is the overriding reason which makes this referendum necessary? Really, there has been no answer. Time after time the question is asked, but whenever one gets down to it we merely get the answer: "This is a unique occasion."' [HC Deb 10 April 1975 c123].

Even when the question of direct popular participation arises in British parliamentary debates in relation to matters other than the EU, it seems that whether a case is made for or against it does not greatly differ. In 1983, for instance, Michael McNair raised the issue of the referendum in relation to capital punishment, asking 'If the subject of capital punishment arose again in this country would it not be vital to hold a referendum?' To which Leon Brittan answered:

'If the object of a referendum is an inquiry, I do not think that is necessary. If the object is a decision, [then] for the reasons that I gave earlier, I do not think that it (i.e., a referendum) is appropriate.' [HC Deb 14 July 1983 c995].

Of course, one could argue that the above quotes are only suggestive of recurrent patterns of argumentation across different debates on direct popular participation and that further research would be needed in order to confirm this. It seems, nevertheless, that in the British Parliament discussions on the topic invariably proceed along argumentative divisions which for the most part are well established and somehow unsurprising.

Bibliography

- Bara, J. Weale, A. and Biquelet, A. (2007) 'Analysing Parliamentary Debate with Computer Assistance', *Swiss Journal of Political Science*.
- Bogdanor, V. (1994) 'Western Europe' in Butler, D. and Ranney, A. (eds) *Referendums Around the World* (Washington: AEI Press), pp. 24-98.
- Brugidou, M. (2003) 'Argumentation and Values: An Analysis of Ordinary Political Competence via an Open-Ended Question', *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 15:4, pp. 413- 430.
- Crosby, N., Kelly, J. M. and Schaefer, P. (1986) 'Citizen panels: A New Approach to Citizen Participation', *Public Administration Review*, 46:2, pp. 170-178.
- Fishkin, J. S. (1995) *The Voice of the People* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press).
- Guérin-Pace, F (1998) 'Textual Statistics. An Exploratory Tool for the Social Sciences', *New Methodological Approaches in the Social Sciences*, 10:1, pp. 73-95.
- Gutmann, A. and Thompson, D. (1996) *Democracy and Disagreement* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press).
- Hirschman, A. O. (1991) *The Rhetoric of Reaction* (Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press).
- Ihalainen, P. (2007) 'British, Swedish and Dutch Late Eighteenth-Century Parliamentary Debates as Sources for Comparative Conceptual History' (unpublished manuscript) available at <http://www.jyu.fi/yhtfil/PolCon/coepolcon/PolTCH/events/summary%20ihalainen.pdf>
- King, A. (2007) *The British Constitution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Palonen, K. (2006) *The Struggle with Time. A Conceptual History of 'Politics' as an Activity* (Münster: LIT).
- Putnam, R. (1971) 'Studying Elite Political Culture: The Case of 'Ideology'', *American Political Science Review*, 65:3, pp. 651-81.
- Qvortrup, M. (2007) *The Politics of Participation: from Athens to e-democracy* (Manchester : Manchester University Press).
- Reinert, M. (1983) 'Une methode de classification descendante hierarchique: application a l'analyse lexicale par contexte' *Les Cahiers de l'Analyse des Donnees*, 8:2, pp. 187-198.
- Schonhardt-Bailey, C. (2005) 'Measuring Ideas More Effectively: An Analysis of Bush and Kerry's National Security Speeches', *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 38:3, pp. 701-711.
- Schonhardt-Bailey, C. (2008) 'The Congressional Debate on Partial-Birth Abortion: Constitutional Gravitas and Moral Passion', *British Journal of Political Science*, 38:3, pp. 383-410.
- Skinner, Q. (2002) *Visions of Politics* (Cambridge : Cambridge University Press).
- Smith, R. (2005) *Strategic Planning for Public Relations (2nd edition)* (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates).
- Wang, X. (2001) 'Assessing Public Participation in U.S. Cities', *Public Performance and Management Review*, 24:4, pp. 322-336.

Watts, D. and Pilkington, C. (2005) *Britain in the European Union Today (3rd edition)* (Manchester: Manchester University Press).

Annexes

Figure 1: Integrated Debates for House of Commons, ratification of Maastricht Treaty (Alceste analysis).

Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4	Class 5
<p>The Sovereignty issue</p>	<p>Procedural Terms</p>	<p>Security and Economic issues</p>	<p>Public opinion</p>	<p>Clause 49 and the consultative referendum on the social chapter</p>
<p>u.c.i. : 18 *18 *name_shore *party_lab *K_1</p> <p>u.c.e. : 142 Classe : 1 Khi2 : 18</p> <p>I would not accept it, because those members of the european parliament are not the representatives of the british people. we would be only a small minority in that parliament. no one should have the right to pass laws that are binding on the british people unless they can be dismissed by the british people.</p>	<p>u.c.i. : 122 *122 *name_carttiss *party_con *K_2</p> <p>u.c.e. : 906 Classe : 2 Khi2 : 56</p> <p>I shall reduce my remarks in recognition of the fact that other hon. members wish to speak. my hon. friend the member for harrow, east, mr. dykes, who has temporarily left his seat, in recognising the sincerity with which my hon. friend the member for aldridge brownhills, mr.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 184 *184 *name_moate *party_con</p>	<p>u.c.i. : 22 *22 *name_shore *party_lab *K_3</p> <p>u.c.e. : 168 Classe : 3 Khi2 : 61</p> <p>in particular through the implementation of a common foreign and security policy including the eventual framing of a common defence policy. the treaty goes on: the union and its member states shall define arid implement a common foreign and security policy the member states shall support the union' s external and security policy actively, unreservedly,</p> <p>u.c.i. : 269</p>	<p>u.c.i. : 45 *45 *name_nelson *party_con *K_4</p> <p>u.c.e. : 282 Classe : 4 Khi2 : 27</p> <p>however, bearing in mind the kind of constituency that I represent, she will understand that I cannot agree with that.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 291 *291 *name_robertson *party_lab *K_4</p> <p>u.c.e. : 2037 Classe : 4 Khi2 : 27</p> <p>we are told</p>	<p>u.c.i. : 285 *285 *name_robertson *party_lab *K_5</p> <p>u.c.e. : 1970 Classe : 5 Khi2 : 71</p> <p>during the past few weeks only, the scottish national party has been campaigning for a vote on the referendum and for the labour party to join SNP members in the division lobby to defeat the government.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 251 *251 *name_taylor *party_con *K_5</p> <p>u.c.e. : 1749</p>

<p>u.c.i. : 155 *155 *name_shepherd *party_con *K_1</p> <p>u.c.e. : 1171 Classe : 1 Khi2 : 17</p> <p>we are talking about powers that we are moving. they are not my powers or the powers of the house. this house is the symbol of the sovereignty of the people.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 1 *1 *name_shepherd *party_con *K_1</p> <p>u.c.e. : 9 Classe : 1 Khi2 : 16</p> <p>my contention is that no such profound constitutional change should take place without reference to the people. involved in that concept is the idea of where sovereignty in this country lies.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 11 *11 *name_shepherd *party_con</p>	<p>u.c.e. : 1291 Classe : 2 Khi2 : 51</p> <p>my right hon. friend the foreign secretary advanced an argument in an intervention during the speech of my hon. friend for aldridge brownhills, mr. shepherd. my hon. friend the member for aldridge brownhills quoted precedents. as on other occasions, my right hon. friend the foreign secretary challenged a referendum as the right constitutional formula.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 250 *250 *name_carlisle *party_con *K_2</p> <p>u.c.e. : 1738 Classe : 2 Khi2 : 49</p> <p>I congratulate my hon. friend the member for aldridge brownhills, mr. shepherd, on a most splendid speech. we expect of him the patriotism he showed, and it was appreciated by both sides of the committee.</p>	<p>*269 *name_kennedy *party_ld</p> <p>u.c.e. : 1829 Classe : 3 Khi2 : 45</p> <p>maastricht is a constitutional issue. I have much sympathy with the so called euro sceptics as they have dissected the various aspects of the treaty. they have examined citizenship, the meaning of a european union, the provision of a central bank and the longer term development of a single currency, which are all issues of massive constitutional import for the united kingdom.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 21 *21 *name_GJones *party_con *K_3</p> <p>u.c.e. : 162 Classe : 3 Khi2 : 43</p> <p>gentleman is now describing, because it builds on european political co operation which, as he knows, is intergovernmental? it seeks to entrench the common foreign security policy and interior justice matters as intergovernmental</p>	<p>that public opinion must be the criterion. I agree that public opinion is extremely important. however, hardly a single politician in the committee, if asked to comment on an opinion poll, would not say, if it were on a matter that he thought was contrary to his party's interest, ah well, it is only a snapshot, I am interested only in trends,</p> <p>u.c.i. : 16 *16 *name_cash *party_con *K_4</p> <p>u.c.e. : 114 Classe : 4 Khi2 : 24</p> <p>friend whether he agrees that 1 he statement that was made at last year's party conference by the chairman of the conservative party that we, the conservatives,</p> <p>u.c.i. : 276 *276 *name_hurd</p>	<p>Classe : 5 Khi2 : 67</p> <p>although the scottish nationalists did engage in a dreadful deal, they have tried to redeem themselves tonight by offering the labour party the chance of getting its glorious social chapter if its members will vote for amendment, a, to new clause 49 tonight.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 229 *229 *name_salmond *party_snp *K_5</p> <p>u.c.e. : 1607 Classe : 5 Khi2 : 58</p> <p>I warn those on the opposition front bench that, although they may prefer to forget the dirty deeds that will be done later this evening, the scottish national party will make sure that the people of scotland neither forgive nor forget if they support the government on this vote.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 197</p>
---	--	---	--	--

<p>*K_1</p> <p>u.c.e. : 89 Classe : 1 Khi2 : 16</p> <p>I believe most solemnly, and the house should, in my view, believe most solemnly, that there ought to be a direct exposition to the people of what these changes amount to and why they are necessary.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 122 *122 *name_carttiss *party_con *K_2</p> <p>u.c.e. : 939 Classe : 1 Khi2 : 16</p> <p>why are we afraid to say, this is your country. sovereignty is too great to be handed away by 650 people sitting in parliament? it would not denigrate the sovereignty of this place, because, as my hon.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 132 *132 *name_shepherd *party_con</p>	<p>u.c.i. : 174 *174 *name_cunningham *party_lab *K_2</p> <p>u.c.e. : 1241 Classe : 2 Khi2 : 45</p> <p>I am being fairly generous in taking interventions. I am just beginning to respond to my hon. friend the member for walsall, north, mr. winnick, and I have been asked to give way again. regretfully, I have to say, sorry, not for the moment. in response to my hon.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 258 *258 *name_carlisle *party_con *K_2</p> <p>u.c.e. : 1782 Classe : 2 Khi2 : 44</p> <p>however, I am grateful to him for his intervention. my hon. friend the member for southend, east, sir T_ taylor, drew attention to one of the most helpful remarks in the debate.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 108 *108 *name_GJones</p>	<p>l and therefore does precisely the opposite of what he says.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 211 *211 *name_gould *party_lab *K_1</p> <p>u.c.e. : 1443 Classe : 3 Khi2 : 38</p> <p>that union, if we examine it, has, as I said in an earlier debate, all the trappings of a state. it has its own head of state, chief executive, legislature, civil service, bank, foreign representation, defined boundaries and territories and its own economic, agricultural, industrial and trade policies.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 111 *111 *name_cryer *party_lab *K_3</p> <p>u.c.e. : 734 Classe : 3 Khi2 : 37</p> <p>no other treaty provides for legislation affecting the united kingdom. regulations have direct application and directives are required to be applied through subordinate legislation in</p>	<p>*party_con *K_2</p> <p>u.c.e. : 1903 Classe : 4 Khi2 : 22</p> <p>we had a vote at the end of that debate and the result was very satisfactory from my point of view. that was after the danish referendum and after the events of 16 september.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 36 *36 *name_spearin g *party_lab *K_4</p> <p>u.c.e. : 235 Classe : 4 Khi2 : 20</p> <p>the hon. gentleman will be surprised to learn that I understand and agree with much that he is saying. he represents a particular area, and the alternative method to a referendum would surely be for him to obtain from his electorate a mandate on certain serious matters.</p>	<p>*197 *name_gould *party_lab *K_5</p> <p>u.c.e. : 1375 Classe : 5 Khi2 : 50</p> <p>I am sure that the hon. gentleman is exactly right. if the committee supports the new clause, I hope that it will support the amendment, because that would meet the stated objectives of my front bench spokesmen.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 285 *285 *name_robertson *party_lab *K_5</p> <p>u.c.e. : 1980 Classe : 5 Khi2 : 49</p> <p>member for banff and buchan gave so much attention this evening, the critical point that he says obliges the labour party to vote for the referendum, was tabled last thursday.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 168 *168 *name_cunningham *party_lab *K_5</p>
--	---	--	--	--

<p>*K_1</p> <p>u.c.e. : 1041 Classe : 1 Khi2 : 16</p> <p>I can think of no system of democratic government on earth that would take away the rights of ordinary people, without explanation, and ultimately without regard to their view in the matter.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 247 *247 *name_watson *party_lab</p> <p>u.c.e. : 1695 Classe : 1 Khi2 : 16</p> <p>that is hardly the way of advancing a representative democracy. so when we talk about representing people we have to be clear that we have a grasp of what their views are and what they think are the issues.</p>	<p>*party_con *K_3</p> <p>u.c.e. : 716 Classe : 2 Khi2 : 41</p> <p>the bill, which was introduced in such a distinguished way by my hon. friend the member for aldridge brownhills, is mistaken, not only because it invites the house to abdicate its responsibilities,</p> <p>u.c.i. : 73 *73 *name_spearing *party_lab *K_2</p> <p>u.c.e. : 425 Classe : 2 Khi2 : 36</p> <p>if not brief, I hope to be pungent and to the point. I am sorry that the hon. member for chichester, mr. nelson, has left the chamber.</p>	<p>this country.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 106 *106 *name_GJones *party_con *K_2</p> <p>u.c.e. : 691 Classe : 3 Khi2 : 35</p> <p>those treaties are narrowly defined as those relating to the establishment of the european communities, which would further diminish the authority of the queen in parliament to regulate the affairs of the united kingdom.</p>	<p>u.c.i. : 122 *122 *name_carttis s *party_con *K_2</p> <p>u.c.i. : 216 *216 *name_higgins *party_con *K_4</p> <p>u.c.e. : 1513 Classe : 4 Khi2 : 19</p> <p>I had to study dicey at cambridge. it was an unbelievable bore. dicey has been given too much weight. the former right hon. member for finchley was keen on quoting dicey. in her famous speech one might almost say notorious at the time of the 1975 referendum debate, she referred to the various editions of dicey.</p>	<p>u.c.e. : 1226 Classe : 5 Khi2 : 46</p> <p>in 1992 at the labour party conference, an overwhelming majority of the national executive committee and the shadow cabinet voted in favour of the maastricht process, as did the trades union congress and most of the constituent members of the trade unions.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 196 *196 *name_salmond *party_snp *K_5</p> <p>u.c.e. : 1370 Classe : 5 Khi2 : 45</p> <p>the hon. gentleman will have heard the labour front bench accuse me of offering a false perspective in the amendment which we have tabled to his new clause 49.</p>
--	---	---	---	---

Figure 2: 14th July 1993 Debate for House of Lords, ratification of Maastricht Treaty (Alceste analysis)

Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4	Class 5	Class 6
Relations between Lords and Commons	The right of the people and parliamentary sovereignty	The 1992 general election and the referendum	Procedural language	Pre-conditions of holding referendum	Maastricht and national sovereignty
<p>u.c.i. : 42 *42 *name_wallasey *party_con *vote_A *K_5</p> <p>u.c.e. : 1141 Classe : 1 Khi2 : 46</p> <p>the case for a referendum was debated at length in another place and there was a large majority against it. I am confident that your lordships' house will arrive at a similar verdict tonight.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 9 *9 *name_whitel</p>	<p>u.c.i. : 8 *8 *name_swindon *party_lab *vote_F *K_2</p> <p>u.c.e. : 292 Classe : 2 Khi2 : 18</p> <p>if the people of those countries can understand the issues and come to a decision then surely we british can do likewise. furthermore, it is not as though the labour party is against referendums per se. it is in favour of an immediate referendum for the scots as to whether power should be devolved to them.</p>	<p>u.c.i. : 26 *26 *name_hooson *party_ld *vote_A *K_3</p> <p>u.c.e. : 755 Classe : 3 Khi2 : 51</p> <p>in their election manifesto, the government were wholly in favour and explained the maastricht treaty to the electorate. the labour party and the liberal democrats did the same and were all in favour. the election took place only last</p>	<p>u.c.i. : 7 *7 *name_abevaron *party_con *vote_A *K_4</p> <p>u.c.e. : 232 Classe : 4 Khi2 : 63</p> <p>my noble friend lord lawson first served in government as one of my junior ministers in the treasury. I am delighted to be able to follow him. I welcome him and congratulate him on the quality of his speech.</p>	<p>u.c.i. : 13 *13 *name_crickhowell *party_con *vote_A *K_5</p> <p>u.c.e. : 399 Classe : 5 Khi2 : 88</p> <p>or, again to quote my noble friend lady thatcher by, going written constitution or at least part of the way. official report, commons, 11/ 3/ 75; col. 310. A few weeks ago my noble friend told me that she had been reading our</p>	<p>u.c.i. : 14 *14 *name_jakobovits *party_n *vote_F *K_6 *K_5</p> <p>u.c.e. : 438 Classe : 6 Khi2 : 38</p> <p>any derogation of national sovereignty threatens rather than promotes europe's security. I utter a word of caution. in the aspired european union all member states will of course be equal in theory.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 6 *6 *name_blaby *party_con</p>

<p>aw *party_con *vote_A *K_1</p> <p>u.c.e. : 305 Classe : 1 Khi2 : 35</p> <p>I want 263 mainly to argue the case against this proposal as a matter of judgment concerning the relationship of the two houses of parliament. for what it is worth, my opinions are based on practical experience in my career as leader both of another place and of your lordships' house.</p> <p>u.c.e. : 316 Classe : 1 Khi2 : 31</p> <p>instead, there would be a damaging controversy between the two houses and further delay, which would do much harm to our nation. in those circumstance</p>	<p>u.c.i. : 11 *11 *name_blackbu rn *party_lab *vote_F *K_2</p> <p>u.c.e. : 360 Classe : 2 Khi2 : 18</p> <p>it is a great betrayal of our sacred trust to those people if we take this dramatic step without involving them, their minds and their hearts as we have not yet begun to do.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 16 *16 *name_beloff *party_con *vote_F *K_5</p> <p>u.c.e. : 492 Classe : 2 Khi2 : 16</p> <p>or do you wish them to be made by foreigners sitting in brussels? surely people can make up their minds one way or another. one 278 does not have to be a learned</p>	<p>year.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 12 *12 *name_chelt enham *party_ld *vote_A *K_3</p> <p>u.c.e. : 372 Classe : 3 Khi2 : 47</p> <p>they have not consulted opposition parties. they have not tried to build a national consensus. they have not taken the electorate into their confidence. they kept quiet about maastricht throughout the general election. consequentl y, there is a gap between the government and the people on this issue.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 1 *1 *name_blake *party_con *vote_F *K_3</p>	<p>u.c.e. : 231 Classe : 4 Khi2 : 45</p> <p>my lords, slightly to my surprise I find myself following the precedent set by the noble lord, lord jenkins. it fell to him to pay tribute to someone who served as his junior minister.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 8 *8 *name_swind on *party_lab *vote_F *K_2</p> <p>u.c.e. : 269 Classe : 4 Khi2 : 45</p> <p>my lords, I, too, congratulat e the noble lord, lord lawson, on his excellent maiden speech. indeed, there was much in it with which I would</p>	<p>report.</p> <p>u.c.e. : 387 Classe : 5 Khi2 : 47</p> <p>in april 1978, my noble friend lady thatcher appointed a committee under my chairmanshi p to consider the place of the referendum in our constitutio nal arrangement s. we presented our report to the shadow cabinet in july of the same year.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 42 *42 *name_walla sey *party_con *vote_A *K_5</p> <p>u.c.e. : 1111 Classe : 5 Khi2 : 45</p> <p>my noble friend said, as she also said at second</p>	<p>*vote_A *K_6</p> <p>u.c.e. : 227 Classe : 6 Khi2 : 35</p> <p>without monetary union the maastricht treaty is not, in my judgment, of any greater constitution al importance than the single european act, in the preamble to which, incidentally , the objective of monetary union was for the first time brought back to life from the grave in which it had lain since the collapse of the werner plan in the mid 1970s.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 14 *14 *name_jakobo vits *party_n *vote_F *K_6</p> <p>u.c.e. : 435 Classe : 6 Khi2 : 35</p> <p>without</p>
--	---	---	--	---	--

<p>s, I cannot believe that your lordships' house will proceed on such an unwise course. I trust that the amendment will be rejected by an overwhelming majority.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 2 *2 *name_wakeham *party_con *vote_A *K_1</p> <p>u.c.e. : 84 Classe : 1 Khi2 : 28</p> <p>I urge your lordships to reject the amendment.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 15 *15 *name_alloway *party_con *vote_A *K_1</p> <p>u.c.e. : 448 Classe : 1 Khi2 : 28</p> <p>at this stage I hope I am looking at the matter objectively I consider</p>	<p>lawyer to be able to answer that question. if that question is put, I think we know what the british people' s answer would be.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 1 *1 *name_blake *party_con *vote_F *K_3</p> <p>u.c.e. : 38 Classe : 2 Khi2 : 15</p> <p>I am not saying that they would reconsider it to the extent of actually reversing their verdict, but they would consider it. if we do not give them the chance to reconsider, how are we to know what their reaction would be?</p> <p>u.c.i. : 2 *2 *name_wakeham *party_con *vote_A *K_1</p> <p>u.c.e. : 56</p>	<p>u.c.e. : 20 Classe : 3 Khi2 : 39</p> <p>I would not argue that that is inconceivable or necessarily wrong; but I do argue that the people should have a say in the matter. so far, they have not. there was no real choice in the general election of april last year. all three parties put maastricht in their manifestos.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 41 *41 *name_tebbit *party_con *vote_F *K_2</p> <p>u.c.e. : 1077 Classe : 3 Khi2 : 38</p> <p>I invite anyone to read the section in the conservative party</p>	<p>concur, although he will know that I believe that it would be right for us to have a referendum at this time.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 23 *23 *name_donington *party_lab *vote_F *K_4</p> <p>u.c.e. : 659 Classe : 4 Khi2 : 39</p> <p>of course, the noble and learned lord has every right to speak and I am very pleased to hear his contribution this afternoon. before thanking the house for the kind indulgence that it periodically extends to me throughout these proceedings</p>	<p>reading, that maastricht created the structures of a european sovereign state. my lords, please allow me to repeat the response to that comment of my noble friend which my noble and learned friend the lord chancellor made in the second reading debate.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 15 *15 *name_alloway *party_con *vote_A *K_1</p> <p>u.c.e. : 472 Classe : 5 Khi2 : 39</p> <p>suggested at second reading from his experience that there could not be fewer than 25 questions. that is a view which</p>	<p>such pressure, and especially nowadays, people insist on freedom and national sovereignty even more than on prosperity, and sometimes even more than on life itself. only under the dictatorships of stalin and tito could the diverse national and ethnic elements in the soviet union and in yugoslavia be held together and in check.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 23 *23 *name_donington *party_lab *vote_F *K_4</p> <p>u.c.e. : 661 Classe : 6 Khi2 : 28</p> <p>to admit that a single european currency and economic monetary union mean what sir</p>
--	--	---	---	--	---

<p>it would be wholly premature to consider any question of confrontation with another place.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 2 *2 *name_wakeham *party_con *vote_A *K_1</p> <p>u.c.e. : 76 Classe : 1 Khi2 : 27</p> <p>when it came to vote on the referendum question, it rejected the idea by an overwhelming majority of 239 votes. of course, and here I agree with my noble friend, it is perfectly within the rules and conventions of this house for your lordships to seek to ask the other place to think again on the issue.</p>	<p>Classe : 2 Khi2 : 15</p> <p>they are advocating that parliament abdicates its responsibility to take a decision in this case. I believe it wrong to place our experience and judgment in baulk and to stand aside while the people decide.</p> <p>u.c.e. : 82 Classe : 2 Khi2 : 15</p> <p>that would be a dereliction of our duty. it would do the greatest possible damage to britain' s reputation if this country were to take such a step after we signed the treaty,</p>	<p>manifesto in which it states that the government are committed to the ratification of the treaty. it says that the treaty is a good thing; that it was a brilliant success of the government; and it lists the priorities of the british presidency to come.</p>	<p>I wish to congratulate the noble lord, lord lawson of blaby, on his excellent maiden speech.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 3 *3 *name_richard *party_lab *vote_A *K_1</p> <p>u.c.e. : 85 Classe : 4 Khi2 : 31</p> <p>my lords, I listened to the speech of the noble lord, lord blake, when he introduced the amendment, as I always do. this is an important amendment and the noble lord made an important speech.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 23 *23 *name_donington *party_lab *vote_F *K_4</p>	<p>warrants some credence. as stated by the noble and learned lord, lord wilberforce, the constitutional position is that with maastricht we do not go beyond the parameters of the logical steps taken at stuttgart and under the single european act,</p> <p>u.c.i. : 13 *13 *name_crick howell *party_con *vote_A *K_5</p> <p>u.c.e. : 384 Classe : 5 Khi2 : 32</p> <p>official report, commons, 11/ 3/ 75; col. 310. in a thoughtful speech my noble friend argued against the</p>	<p>edward heath reiterated three or four months ago; that is, the establishment of a unitary state. what we are discussing today is the progress that we are making towards that unitary state.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 29 *29 *name_skidelsky *party_cb *vote_F *K_6</p> <p>u.c.e. : 813 Classe : 6 Khi2 : 28</p> <p>it is a treaty of european union. union is not a word used in jest, as the noble and learned lord, lord wilberforce, implied. the citizens of member states are to become citizens of the union. the union has an identity which it will assert</p>
--	--	---	---	--	--

				<p>use of a referendum simply for the purpose of political expedience for, as she pointed out at col.</p>	<p>on the international scene.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 1 *1 *name_blake *party_con *vote_F *K_3</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

Figure 3: Integrated Debates for House of Commons, ratification of EU Constitutional Treaty (Alceste analysis)

Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4
<p>References to past referendums</p> <p>u.c.i. : 140 *140 *249 *name_straw *party_lab *gender_m *vote_no *K_3 *K_1</p> <p>u.c.e. : 571 Classe : 1 Khi2 : 40</p> <p>I also supported a manifesto at the last election that spelled out our negotiating mandate for the inter governmental conference, and did not promise a referendum.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 210 *210 *359 *name_blair *party_lab *K_2 *K_1</p> <p>u.c.e. : 853 Classe : 1 Khi2</p>	<p>The issue of rightful authority</p> <p>u.c.i. : 347 *347 *666 *name_shepherd *party_con *gender_m *vote_yes *K_2 *K_2</p> <p>u.c.e. : 1231 Classe : 2 Khi2 : 26</p> <p>it would lend dignity to the government if they would accept the proposition that these matters are profound, and that the constituents whom we temporarily represent cannot lose their inalienable right to determine who shall govern this country\$</p> <p>u.c.i. : 332 *332 *648 *name_heathcoat *party_con *gender_m</p>	<p>Preconditions of holding referendum</p> <p>u.c.i. : 118 *118 *215 *name_bryant *party_lab *K_2 *K_3</p> <p>u.c.e. : 500 Classe : 3 Khi2 : 32</p> <p>if the ink is not yet dry on the document, how can the conservatives already call for a referendum? they do not know whether the constitution will involve a substantial change\$</p> <p>u.c.i. : 181 *181 *326 *name_howard *party_con *K_2 *K_3</p> <p>u.c.e. : 757 Classe : 3 Khi2</p>	<p>Relationship between the Britain and the EU</p> <p>u.c.i. : 189 *189 *335 *name_blair *party_lab *K_2 *K_4</p> <p>u.c.e. : 797 Classe : 4 Khi2 : 63</p> <p>you move to a different form of relationship with the european union. that is why he wrote: the state concerned would probably allow the others to go ahead, having negotiated an associate membership of some kind\$</p> <p>u.c.i. : 188 *188 *333 *name_blair *party_lab *K_2 *K_4</p>

<p>: 40</p> <p>for example, when the shadow chancellor stood for election, he said not merely that he was against the single currency, but that he wanted to repatriate powers from brussels\$</p> <p>u.c.i. : 110 *110 *202 *name_maples *party_con *K_3</p> <p>u.c.e. : 445 Classe : 1 Khi2 : 28</p> <p>I am happy with the single european act, which introduced the single market. however, no one then signed up to what we are now approaching. A referendum took place in the 1970s. before the next stage in the process, the british people should be consulted; there should be a referendum\$</p> <p>u.c.i. : 336 *336 *653 *name_bell *party_lab *gender_m</p>	<p>*vote_yes *K_2 *K_2</p> <p>u.c.e. : 1195 Classe : 2 Khi2 : 20</p> <p>and hon. friends, to the arbitration of the british people. let us remind ourselves that the opening words of this constitution are about reflecting the will of the citizens and states of europe\$</p> <p>u.c.i. : 171 *171 *313 *name_paisley *party_du *gender_m *vote_yes *K_2 *K_2</p> <p>u.c.e. : 688 Classe : 2 Khi2 : 18</p> <p>we are dealing with matters that are at the heart of centuries of development of democracy in this country. we have to take a stand, and the day to do that is when we say, let us put the question to the people\$</p> <p>u.c.i. : 235 *235 *399</p>	<p>: 22</p> <p>but there is no case whatever for asking parliament to spend months on ratification legislation before obtaining the consent of the british people. interruption. after all, it was this prime minister who held referendums for the scottish parliament and the welsh assembly before this parliament had passed the necessary legislation\$</p> <p>u.c.i. : 103 *103 *189 *name_brady *party_con *gender_m *vote_yes *K_2 *K_3</p> <p>u.c.e. : 407 Classe : 3 Khi2 : 21</p> <p>we' re stuffed. we' ve got to give a referendum. I don' t think we can hold out' now we have the government' s grubby attempt to push the referendum back to autumn 2006 the very last moment to prevent the people from having their say\$</p>	<p>u.c.e. : 792 Classe : 4 Khi2 : 40</p> <p>the state concerned would probably allow the others to go ahead, having negotiated an associate membership of some kind. that is why I keep saying that he is favour of that, and he is\$</p> <p>u.c.i. : 357 *357 *681 *name_mcshane *party_lab *gender_m *vote_no *K_4</p> <p>u.c.e. : 1265 Classe : 4 Khi2 : 27</p> <p>the liberal democrats' position is even odder. I can understand why the conservatives, with their obsessive dislike of europe, want to command headlines in the anti european press\$</p> <p>u.c.i. : 75 *75 *151 *name_macshane *party_lab *gender_m *vote_no *K_2 *K_1</p>
---	--	--	---

<p>*vote_no *K_1</p> <p>u.c.e. : 1202 Classe : 1 Khi2 : 24</p> <p>what has happened to that principle? the only time that principle slipped was on the maastricht treaty, when, in order to keep the tory party together, the prime minister at the time offered a referendum on the single currency\$</p> <p>u.c.i. : 357 *357 *681 *name_mcs Shane *party_lab *gender_m *vote_no *K_4</p> <p>u.c.e. : 1263 Classe : 1 Khi2 : 24</p> <p>I was elected 10 years ago and I love this place. it has been good to me and I cannot think of any greater honour for any citizen of this country, especially one such as me, whose parents did not come from here, than to sit in the house of commons\$</p>	<p>*name_shepherd *party_con *K_2</p> <p>u.c.e. : 919 Classe : 2 Khi2 : 16</p> <p>some of us feel strongly that the british people have never properly examined any of them and have never been allowed to express their views on them\$</p> <p>u.c.i. : 85 *85 *164 *name_heathcoat *party_con *gender_m *vote_yes *K_2 *K_2</p> <p>u.c.e. : 295 Classe : 2 Khi2 : 15</p> <p>we do not have a serious choice. we are being invited to give up powers that are not ours, so I ask this chamber and this house to strike the first blow for the people whom we represent, and for democracy, by saying no to this constitution and this bill this evening\$</p> <p>u.c.i. : 98 *98 *182</p>	<p>u.c.i. : 250 *250 *425 *name_maples *party_con *K_2 *K_3</p> <p>u.c.e. : 970 Classe : 3 Khi2 : 21</p> <p>the measure would be on the statute book, and the prime minister and government would not be able to say, oh well, we've got to get the referendum bill through parliament, because it would have been done in advance\$</p> <p>u.c.i. : 113 *113 *207 *name_bryant *party_lab *K_2 *K_3</p> <p>u.c.e. : 461 Classe : 3 Khi2 : 19</p> <p>the first condition, then, is that if we are going to have a referendum, it should be susceptible to a yes/ no answer. secondly, it should be advanced only when a substantial change in how we are to be</p>	<p>u.c.e. : 248 Classe : 4 Khi2 : 23</p> <p>more than anything else is the prospect of the conservative party becoming sensible again on europe\$</p> <p>u.c.i. : 219 *219 *370 *name_blair *party_lab *K_2 *K_4</p> <p>u.c.e. : 897 Classe : 4 Khi2 : 23</p> <p>we will have to argue our case, and I have no doubt that it will be a most interesting political battle. I have no doubt, too, that the position taken by the conservative party in effect, to use a no vote to renegotiate the existing terms of britain's membership would be a terrible mistake\$</p> <p>u.c.i. : 310 *310 *598 *name_straw *party_lab *gender_m *vote_no *K_3 *K_4</p>
---	---	---	--

<p>u.c.i. : 344 *344 *662 *name_shepherd *party_con *gender_m *vote_yes *K_2 *K_1</p> <p>u.c.e. : 1218 Classe : 1 Khi2 : 22</p> <p>many labour supporters, especially old labour supporters, must be distressed to find that, when the glorious day in 1997 was repeated at the subsequent election, they elected a bourbon government\$</p> <p>u.c.i. : 181 *181 *326 *name_howard *party_con *K_2 *K_3</p> <p>u.c.e. : 746 Classe : 1 Khi2 : 21</p> <p>even though he could not bring himself to utter the word referendum in his statement this afternoon. six months ago, the prime minister stood before his party conference and said, with all the lip quivering</p>	<p>*name_browning *party_con *gender_f *vote_yes *K_2 *K_2</p> <p>u.c.e. : 376 Classe : 2 Khi2 : 14</p> <p>these significant powers are being given to people who have not been elected by the people of this country, and who are not answerable to us as our elected representatives\$</p> <p>u.c.i. : 328 *328 *639 *name_davidson *party_ld *gender_m *vote_abs *K_2 *K_2</p> <p>u.c.e. : 1164 Classe : 2 Khi2 : 13</p> <p>we must recognise that other countries are prepared to trust their peoples. why are we not prepared to trust ours\$</p> <p>u.c.i. : 342 *342 *659 *name_bell *party_lab *gender_m *vote_no *K_2</p>	<p>governed is being proposed\$</p> <p>u.c.i. : 118 *118 *215 *name_bryant *party_lab *K_2 *K_3</p> <p>u.c.i. : 132 *132 *234 *name_ancram *party_con *gender_m *vote_yes *K_2 *K_3</p> <p>u.c.e. : 546 Classe : 3 Khi2 : 18</p> <p>we want to make it work. indeed, the logic of the prime minister' s attack is mind boggling interruption. the foreign secretary would do well to listen because he will have to explain this to his colleagues abroad\$</p> <p>u.c.i. : 250 *250 *425 *name_maples *party_con *K_2 *K_3</p> <p>u.c.e. : 977 Classe : 3 Khi2 : 17</p> <p>in respect of both the danish</p>	<p>u.c.e. : 1117 Classe : 4 Khi2 : 23</p> <p>it must be changed in exactly the same way, with this difference: if a member state wishes to leave the EU as some opposition members wish to do a procedure allows them to avoid having to go through the rather complicated and uncertain procedure of renunciation of the whole treaty\$</p> <p>u.c.i. : 114 *114 *209 *name_bryant *party_lab *K_2 *K_4</p> <p>u.c.e. : 465 Classe : 4 Khi2 : 22</p> <p>the hon. gentleman' s argument does not hold water in terms of the facts, but it does not do so in terms of logic either. the logic of the hon. gentleman' s argument is that, since everyone else is doing it, we should do it too, but that would take us down the route of</p>
---	--	---	---

<p>intensity for which he has become famous: I can only go one way\$</p>	<p>u.c.e. : 1216 Classe : 2 Khi2 : 13</p> <p>member for wells mentioned, and a national matter, which falls back to the chamber. we are elected; we have a mandate. the people our constituents expect us to do their work for them and make a decision in the interests of our country\$</p>	<p>and irish people, we heard governments say: you' ve got the answer wrong guys, peasants; you don' t understand this issue, but we in the government understand it\$</p>	<p>having qualified majority voting for treaty ratification processes\$</p> <p>u.c.i. : 119 *119 *217 *name_bryant *party_lab *K_2 *K_4</p>
---	--	---	---

Figure 4: Integrated Debates for House of Lords, ratification of EU Constitutional Treaty (Alceste analysis)

Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4
Economic issues	Institutional Issues	The referendum issue	Procedural Terms
<p>u.c.i. : 88 *88 *name_guildford *party_con</p> <p>u.c.e. : 722 Classe : 1 Khi2 : 41</p> <p>our interests and skills lie as much in our bilateral links with india, japan, china and the transcontinental and multi faith commonwealth network as in our immediate geographical neighbours.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 89 *89 *name_triesman *party_lab *K_1</p> <p>u.c.e. : 775 Classe : 1 Khi2 : 35</p> <p>being part of the world' s largest free trade area has plainly helped to</p>	<p>u.c.i. : 73 *73 *name_blackwell *party_con *K_1</p> <p>u.c.e. : 290 Classe : 2 Khi2 : 58</p> <p>it included the charter of fundamental rights, layering a common legal framework and european court of justice competence over vast new areas of social policy and civil rights.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 83 *83 *name_deBroke *party_ukip *K_3</p> <p>u.c.e. : 610 Classe : 2 Khi2 : 52</p> <p>A short list includes the EU space programme, the european defence agency, the common asylum policy, the</p>	<p>u.c.i. : 20 *20 *name_dean *party_lab *K_4</p> <p>u.c.e. : 45 Classe : 3 Khi2 : 23</p> <p>the government will of course take consideration of the advice that is offered by the independent commission.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 76 *76 *name_chiswick *party_cb *K_3</p> <p>u.c.e. : 396 Classe : 3 Khi2 : 19</p> <p>ever entering into force. there is not the slightest sign of either the french or dutch governments, whose electorates rejected the treaty by substantial</p>	<p>u.c.i. : 88 *88 *name_guildford *party_con</p> <p>u.c.e. : 694 Classe : 4 Khi2 : 33</p> <p>but it doesn' t. many other ministers spoke in even more virulent terms about the idea. yet, along came the decision that there should be referendum. later on, as my noble friend lord waddington reminded us, the same man, the prime minister, said that no one knew what the constitutional treaty was for.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 34 *34 *name_triesman *party_lab *K_4</p> <p>u.c.e. : 137 Classe : 4 Khi2</p>

<p>deliver prosperity in the UK. today we are the strongest large economy in europe, enjoying the longest period of economic growth in decades.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 73 *73 *name_blackwell *party_con *K_1</p> <p>u.c.e. : 312 Classe : 1 Khi2 : 33</p> <p>I believe that those regulations and costs reflect an outdated 20th century european social model the concept of somehow protecting european union workers from the need to compete with the world.</p> <p>u.c.e. : 335 Classe : 1 Khi2 : 33</p> <p>we will opt to maintain a free trade relationship with europe. we seek to engage co operatively on common programmes across europe which are in our interests, whether they be on environmental protection, transport policy</p>	<p>external border agency, the fundamental rights agency and the EU external action agency.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 33 *33 *name_saltaire *party_ld *K_2</p> <p>u.c.e. : 120 Classe : 2 Khi2 : 38</p> <p>we are more aware than we were of the extent to which brussels institutions appear remote, not just to our own population but to the populations of all other member states, and of the failure of political elites throughout the european union,</p> <p>u.c.i. : 80 *80 *name_rannoch *party_ukip *K_2</p> <p>u.c.e. : 533 Classe : 2 Khi2 : 37</p> <p>official answers in your lordships' house and in the european parliament reveal that at least four major initiatives are</p>	<p>majorities, being willing to resubmit the text for approval,</p> <p>u.c.i. : 81 *81 *name_harrison *party_lab</p> <p>u.c.e. : 542 Classe : 3 Khi2 : 16</p> <p>the second myth that I would like to challenge is the one that the french and dutch no was a no to the constitution. incidentally, 15 countries have said yes to that constitution.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 84 *84 *name_Bowness *party_con *K_2</p> <p>u.c.e. : 624 Classe : 3 Khi2 : 16</p> <p>is luxembourg' s referendum irrelevant because it is a small country? although a majority of member states have approved the treaty, any attempt to change the outcome of the french and dutch referenda would in my view be doomed to failure.</p>	<p>: 32</p> <p>I shall try to do my best to answer the comments made from the two front benches. as the noble lord, lord wallace, said, the prime minister is in washington which I imagine is one reason why he was unable to make the statement in the house of commons dealing with preparations for the G8 conference.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 88 *88 *name_guildford *party_con</p> <p>u.c.e. : 685 Classe : 4 Khi2 : 29</p> <p>my lords, I join others in warmly thanking my noble friend lord blackwell for his eloquent opening of this debate and, like the noble lord, lord wallace of saltaire, I have greatly enjoyed sitting here listening.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 32 *32 *name_guildford *party_con *K_4</p> <p>u.c.e. : 94</p>
--	---	--	--

<p>or security;</p> <p>u.c.e. : 310 Classe : 1 Khi2 : 31</p> <p>our initial objective in europa was the opportunity to develop and expand free trade with our neighbours free movement of goods and capital without barriers and protectionism and, through trade, to learn to live together better in peace.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 89 *89 *name_triesman *party_lab *K_1</p> <p>u.c.e. : 778 Classe : 1 Khi2 : 31</p> <p>20 billion for the UK economy. there are all sorts of mechanisms and reasons why that is true. this is no argument for diminishing our interests and trade with the rest of the world, but it is a recognition of where some of the largest and most significant forces of trade necessarily are.</p>	<p>proceeding in the legal vacuum the charter of fundamental rights, the foreign service,</p> <p>u.c.i. : 73 *73 *name_blackwell *party_con *K_1</p> <p>u.c.e. : 303 Classe : 2 Khi2 : 35</p> <p>the commission has built the charter of fundamental rights into all new legislation, and the european court of justice is making judgements on the basis of a political declaration, despite it never having been approved by the UK parliament.</p> <p>u.c.e. : 288 Classe : 2 Khi2 : 33</p> <p>it included a significant extension of so called shared competences, which covered most areas of domestic policy where the constitution states that national parliaments could not legislate on any matter where the european</p>	<p>u.c.i. : 31 *31 *name_triesman *party_lab *K_1</p> <p>u.c.e. : 78 Classe : 3 Khi2 : 15</p> <p>as of a week ago, nine countries had approved the treaty through their parliamentary processes and one, spain, by referendum. in the last week, however, as the house and the country are very well aware, in referenda the electors in france voted no by 55 per cent to 45 per cent and in the netherlands by 62 per cent to 38 per cent.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 49 *49 *name_swinton *party_other *K_3</p> <p>u.c.e. : 211 Classe : 3 Khi2 : 15</p> <p>in the last week, however, as the house and country are well aware, in referenda the electors in france voted no by 55 per cent to 45 per cent and</p>	<p>Classe : 4 Khi2 : 28</p> <p>it is at the heart of government strategy and raises questions of the utmost profundity. however, even if the prime minister had made the statement, I would still be answering, because my noble friend lord strathclyde is in huntingdon for the sad occasion of the funeral of my noble friend lady blatch.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 39 *39 *name_chelmsford *party_none *K_4</p> <p>u.c.e. : 174 Classe : 4 Khi2 : 28</p> <p>my lords, perhaps we on these benches may also be associated with the remarks about emily blatch. the whole house not only had huge respect for her skill in the contributions she made to this house but I am sure also carried a great deal of affection for her as a human being.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 4 *4</p>
--	--	---	---

<p>u.c.i. : 33 *33 *name_saltaire *party_ld *K_2</p> <p>u.c.e. : 134 Classe : 1 Khi2 : 29</p> <p>international security and the management of the world economy is to work constructively, conscientiously and multilaterally with our european partners to maximise our influence in the world. we therefore welcome the statement.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 73 *73 *name_blackwell *party_con *K_1</p> <p>u.c.e. : 313 Classe : 1 Khi2 : 25</p> <p>the truth is that our economic future now lies primarily outside the european union. with the advent of 21st century communications and globalised business systems, the world economy is simply no longer divided into isolated geographic blocks.</p>	<p>union decided that it had an interest in legislating.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 78 *78 *name_waddington *party_con *K_2</p> <p>u.c.e. : 472 Classe : 2 Khi2 : 33</p> <p>the EU will cease to be a collection of states that have chosen to share sovereignty over agreed aspects of their affairs. thenceforward, the EU will derive its powers not from the treaties but from a constitution with its own authority. the EU will become a legal entity in its own right.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 73 *73 *name_blackwell *party_con *K_1</p> <p>u.c.e. : 286 Classe : 2 Khi2 : 32</p> <p>which was based on europe as a legal and political entity in its own right rather than as just a set of co operative agreements. it contained, for</p>	<p>in the netherlands by 62 per cent to 38 per cent.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 76 *76 *name_chiswick *party_cb *K_3</p> <p>u.c.e. : 416 Classe : 3 Khi2 : 14</p> <p>could it possibly be that their position is determined more by their calculation of the probable outcome than by attachment to a particular constitutional practice? that certainly seems to have been the case with the french decision to require a referendum before ratifying any more accession treaties after that with croatia.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 61 *61 *name_swansea *party_lab</p> <p>u.c.e. : 248 Classe : 3 Khi2 : 13</p> <p>bulgaria and romania. have the government no views on what should be done in the interim? is</p>	<p>*name_dean *party_lab *K_4</p> <p>u.c.e. : 8 Classe : 4 Khi2 : 26</p> <p>my lords, the noble lord, lord blackwell, has had a good run for his money. I counted about five questions. A number of those issues are being considered, not only by my right honourable friend the prime minister but also by mr hain, who is leading the government side in the discussions on the convention of europe.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 34 *34 *name_triesman *party_lab *K_4</p> <p>u.c.e. : 154 Classe : 4 Khi2 : 26</p> <p>the issue about working in public is extremely strong. I also pay tribute to the noble lord, lord kerr, for his maiden speech. I know that that is not strictly a matter for this statement, but he raised such tremendously important</p>
---	---	--	--

<p>u.c.e. : 311 Classe : 1 Khi2 : 23</p> <p>over time, even that economic benefit has been offset by the burdens of regulations, social costs and even import quotas that have been imposed on our economy under the mantra of the single market.</p> <p>u.c.e. : 314 Classe : 1 Khi2 : 23</p> <p>nor are the old economies of europa the main source of growth. in the 21st century, countries such as india, china and russia will be the biggest areas of growth and wealth creation.</p>	<p>example, a clear declaration that the commission saw itself as an executive arm of that european constitutional entity,</p> <p>u.c.i. : 83 *83 *name_deBroke *party_ukip *K_3</p> <p>u.c.e. : 617 Classe : 2 Khi2 : 29</p> <p>last september the european court of justice ruled that the EU has the right to require EU states to introduce criminal laws to uphold EU legislation in combating pollution.</p>	<p>it the view of the government that the result of the italian election will lead to a new pressure for movement on the constitution?</p> <p>u.c.i. : 75 *75 *name_rogart *party_ld *K_3</p> <p>u.c.e. : 378 Classe : 3 Khi2 : 13</p> <p>none the less, the ratification by the fifteenth member state of the union estonia last week indicates that there is still a groundswell of positive approval. we understand that it is quite likely that finland will become the sixteenth.</p>	<p>questions.</p> <p>u.c.i. : 19 *19 *name_guildford *party_con *K_4</p> <p>u.c.e. : 41 Classe : 4 Khi2 : 25</p> <p>my lords, I thank the minister for that rather informative and helpful reply. whether one believes that this massive new constitution is good for the united kingdom and the future of europe or bad for them I admit that I am in the latter camp, like most people will the minister at least reassure us, after what she said,</p>
--	--	---	--