

20/6/95 2233 EST, 2^o APP
INT CON INQ → ITA ANNO 30
T④ LESCE BRADY T-5'00"

1120/B

Poettering (PPE), rapporteur. - (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I very much welcome the fact that we are able to hold a wide-ranging debate on issues of security policy and welcome the fact that the President-in-Office is back in the Chamber. We are holding a joint debate on six reports on security policy as well as an oral question tabled by the Committee on Foreign Affairs and Security. The purpose of today's debate is to think beyond Maastricht. I consider that, viewed in terms of the common foreign and security policy, Maastricht was a success. But we can also use an image to convey this: the glass is half full; that is something positive. But if a glass is half full, then it is also half empty, even if the positive factor holds sway.

For that reason, we have even now, in 1994, to look to 1996, that is to the next intergovernmental conference. In that connection, I should like to mention a number of factors for the further development of a European foreign, security and defence policy.

- First: it has to be clear that a policy designed to preserve and create peace has in the first instance to be based on non-military means. That therefore means that we require a preventive foreign and security policy which must make a contribution to resolving conflicts through non-military means.
- Second: if the latter fail and we perceive that human rights and democracy in Europe are being challenged, then we as a European Union have to be prepared to use military force in the last resort, to defend democracy and human rights.
- Third: it is a matter of regret that the Maastricht Treaty failed fully to integrate the Western European Union into the European Union. Only last week in Brussels, we approved the De Gucht report and called for the 1996 intergovernmental conference to discuss and decide that, in 1998, the WEU together with all of its machinery and provisions on assistance should be completely incorporated into the European Union.
- Fourth: the European Union does not at present have legal capacity. We are calling for the European Union to be provided with that in the future so that it is able *per se* to be part of international organizations, such as the UN or its Security Council. I personally regret that the debate on reform of the UN is in fact being conducted on the basis of old national considerations. The European Union must assume responsibility in the Security Council also.
- Fifth: if the European Union is to remain capable of action, then we have, of course, also to have for the common foreign and security policy qualified majority decisions in the Council of the European Union. We established this morning, in the context of the enlargement debate, that it is not acceptable to the House if the blocking minority in the Council continues to amount to 23 votes. That would be a retrograde step. In that case the House would not be able to approve enlargement. Something similar also applies

01-1170 B con 5

in principle to foreign and security policy, even though special conditions of course apply there. The European Parliament has, naturally, also to be involved in a process of this kind.

- Sixth: this then means in the final analysis that a decision of the Council of the European Union taken by a qualified majority and concerning the deployment of soldiers in a crisis spot must be founded on an absolute majority in the House, so that it has democratic legitimacy. In that case, the national parliaments of those states which take part in such actions, by providing troops, have also to be brought in.
- Seventh: in the view of the Committee, the Eurocorps provides a basic structure for the joint forces of the Union which can be deployed, if necessary, together with the UN, the CSCE and NATO.
- Eighth and last: I am calling in this report for the Subcommittee on Security and Disarmament which I have chaired since it was established, that is since 1984, and which has covered a lot of ground, also to be made into a full committee, namely the 'Committee on Security and Defence'. I know of no other instance in which a politician calls for the abolition of an office he currently holds. I hope that the new Parliament will establish a Committee for Security and Defence, so that we can work actively in those areas. I should like here to extend my warmest thanks to all honourable Members who supported this work in the subcommittee over the past ten years. I should like further to thank honourable Members and the chairman of the full Committee for the understanding they have shown us and their support for this work.

Foreign + Security Policy