

# EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

GENERAL SECRETARIAT

Directorate General for Research and Documentation

SECURITY AND ARMAMENTS: THE ROLE OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT  
IN RELATION TO THE WORK OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY AND  
EUROPEAN POLITICAL COOPERATION

Political Series No.

9

March 1985

PE: 21

Research and Documentation Papers

20 February 1985

SECURITY AND ARMAMENTS: THE ROLE OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT  
IN RELATION TO THE WORK OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY AND  
EUROPEAN POLITICAL COOPERATION

1. As early as April 1973 the European Parliament passed a resolution which expressed the view "that cooperation in the foreign policy sphere must eventually take into account defence and security policy". Since then the Parliament has pursued its interest in this area by means of several reports, resolutions and debates. The purpose of this paper is to trace the development of the Parliament's activities in this regard. It does not attempt to assess the merits or the effectiveness of the Parliament's activities.
2. The paper will consist of three sections :
  - I. The Parliament's activities in relation to security matters (Page 2)
  - II. The Parliament's activities in relation to armaments matters (Page 13)
  - III. The Diligent Report on the protection of shipping routes (Page 22)

(In order to give a continuous picture of developments, Section I will also touch briefly on the armaments matters which are dealt with extensively in Section II).

3. The paper deals principally with the resolutions adopted by Parliament. It briefly examines Parliament reports where these are substantial and relevant and summarizes some of the most important arguments which arose in the Parliament's debates on armaments and security. When particularly relevant, a number of reports drawn up by the Commission and other sources are dealt with also. The paper does not take into consideration the Parliament's on-going and regular consideration of a wide range of issues which involve the political aspects of security or have security implications (eg. the deliberations of the United Nations and of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the situation in the Middle East etc.).

I. The Parliament's activities in relation to security matters

The Mommersteeg Report

4. On 6 April 1973 the Parliament adopted a resolution on European political cooperation and unification<sup>1)</sup> which was based on a report drawn up on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee by Mr. Mommersteeg<sup>2)</sup> As mentioned above, this resolution, which deals generally with the question of European political cooperation, expresses the view "that cooperation in the foreign policy sphere must eventually take into account defence and security policy".

Declaration on European Identity

5. On 20 November 1973 the Foreign Ministers of the Nine approved a declaration on the European identity.<sup>3)</sup> The declaration states that "the Nine, one of whose essential aims is to maintain peace, will never succeed in doing so if they neglect their own security" (paragraph 8). (The paragraph then proceeds to describe in more detail the views in this regard of "those of them who are members of the Atlantic Alliance". These further comments - following an unusual departure from the consensus requirement - could not be considered to have the status of the policy of the Member States meeting in political cooperation). In paragraph 9, one of the objectives of the Nine's role in world affairs is listed as "that the security of each country is more effectively guaranteed".

Commission's Report on European Union, 1975

6. At the request of the Heads of Government, the Commission drew up a report on European Union which it transmitted to the Council on 26 June 1975.<sup>4)</sup> The report contains a chapter on defence in which it argues that the gradual development of a foreign policy for the Union will have an impact in due course in the field of defence. The report also proposes a number of concrete steps which might be envisaged before European Union such as the setting up of a "European Arms Agency".

-----  
1) OJ C26 of 30.4.73, pages 25 and 26

2) Document 12/73

3) Bulletin of the European Communities No. 12, 1973, pages 118-122

4) Bulletin of the European Communities, Supplement 5/75

The Bertrand Report

7. On 7 July 1975 the Parliament adopted a resolution on European Union<sup>1)</sup> which was based on a report drawn up on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee by Mr. Bertrand.<sup>2)</sup> One of the aims of European Union as envisaged by the resolution is to develop cooperation and security between States in Europe. The resolution also calls for the powers and responsibilities of the Union to be progressively widened to include, amongst other things, security policy.

The Gladwyn Report

8. On 15 December 1975, the Parliament adopted a resolution on the effects of a European foreign policy on defence questions.<sup>3)</sup> The resolution was based on a report drawn up on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee by Lord Gladwyn.<sup>4)</sup> The resolution, amongst other things, observes that there has been no progress towards the harmonization of the defence policies of the Nine, draws attention to the need for Members of the Community to strengthen the North Atlantic Alliance by developing their own specifically European effort and expresses the conviction that there is an evident and urgent need "to achieve the most effective form of defence by rationalizing both the production of armaments, and logistics and infrastructure in the Community" and also a need "to demonstrate that Community members are making an appropriate contribution to the common defence". In the operative paragraphs of the resolution, the European Parliament urges those Governments of the Nine which may wish to take part in such a programme :

- "a) to initiate immediately, as part of the existing procedure for harmonizing the foreign policy of Member States, a technical study of the best means of achieving the objectives set out above;

-----  
1) OJ C179 of 6.8.75, pages 28-31  
2) Document 174/75  
3) OJ C7 of 12.1.76  
4) Document 429/74 of 13.1.75

- b) to set up an agency ultimately aimed at the joint manufacture of weapons to meet the requirements of the Member States;
  - c) to draw up and adopt as soon as possible a general plan embodying the above proposals."
9. In the course of a lengthy debate on the resolution, the Socialist Group and the Communist Group had indicated their opposition to it. Speaking on behalf of the Socialist Group, Sir Geoffrey de Freitas' principal criticism was that "it involves us in yet another field of activity when we already have more than enough to do". The Communist Group opposed the resolution in part because it did not regard it as appropriate to discuss such matters "in this Parliament today" because the Parliament did not have the necessary powers and because of the political and economic difficulties facing the Community. A number of other members of the Parliament expressed objections to the resolution, Mr. Broeks of the Socialist Group commenting that "defence should be properly dealt with in NATO". Lord Gladwyn's report was strongly supported by representatives of the CD, Liberal and Democratic, and European Conservative Groups. Speaking on behalf of the Commission in the course of the debate, Mr. Scarascia Mugnozza stated: "It is our opinion that no progress can be made in the external policy sector without also considering defence, and that no progress can be made in defence without an armaments agency which takes account of the requirements in this sector".

Report by Mr. Leo Tindemans on European Union

10. The Prime Minister of Belgium, Mr. Leo Tindemans, submitted a report on European Union to his European Council colleagues on 29 December 1975.<sup>1)</sup> In his report, Mr. Tindemans argued that "security cannot ... be left outside the scope of the European Union" and that European Union "will not be complete until it has drawn up a common defence policy". In the short-term, he proposed to the Member States :

"- regularly to hold exchanges of views on our specific problems in defence matters ...

-----  
1) Bulletin of the European Communities, Supplement 1/76

- to cooperate in the manufacture of armaments ..."

Commission Proposals on an Action Programme for the European Aeronautical Sector

11. On 6 July 1976, the Parliament adopted a resolution embodying its opinion on proposals from the Commission on an Action Programme for the European Aeronautical Sector.<sup>1)</sup> One section of the resolution deals with a military aircraft procurement agency. (This resolution will be dealt with in more detail in Section II of this paper which concerns armaments matters).

The Blumenfeld Report

12. On 19 January 1978, the Parliament adopted a resolution on European political cooperation<sup>2)</sup> which was based on a report drawn up on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee by Mr. Blumenfeld.<sup>3)</sup> The resolution deals with European political cooperation in general terms and does not refer specifically to security. The report itself, however, refers to the section of the Tindemans report dealing with security, and comments that defence and arms procurement questions are matters to which the Foreign Ministers, with their defence colleagues, "should address themselves with a view to widening discussions under political cooperation".

The Klepsch Report

13. On 14 June 1978 the Parliament adopted a resolution on European armaments procurement cooperation<sup>4)</sup> which was based on the report drawn up on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee by Mr. Klepsch.<sup>5)</sup> (This report is dealt with in Section II of this report concerning armaments matters).

Oral Question with debate on Community armaments procurement programmes

14. On 25 September 1979, the Parliament debated at some length an oral question on Community armaments programmes within the framework

-----  
1) OJ C178 of 2.8.76, pages 8-10  
2) OJ C36 of 13.2.78, pages 32-3  
3) Document 427/77  
4) OJ C163 of 10.7.78, pages 23-24  
5) Document 83/78

of industrial policy.<sup>1)</sup> (This debate also is dealt with in Section II of this report concerning armaments matters).

#### Lady Elles Report

15. On 9 July 1981, the Parliament adopted a resolution on European Political Cooperation and the role of the European Parliament.<sup>2)</sup> The resolution was based on the Report drawn up on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee by Lady Elles.<sup>3)</sup> The resolution itself notes "the particular significance attached at the informal meeting of Foreign Ministers of 19 May 1981 in Venlo to the inclusion of European security in matters covered by European political cooperation".<sup>4)</sup> It also invites, wherever appropriate, other ministers and officials, who are affected by the agenda to attend meetings within the EPC framework, in order to ensure that all matters pertaining to international relations and the foreign policies of the Member States may be fully and adequately dealt with, "including those that have a bearing on the security of the Member States of the European Community".

In her report, Lady Elles analyses the degree to which security has already been discussed within European political cooperation, outlines some of the ideas in this regard contained in the Tindemans and Blumenfeld reports and endorses these ideas. Among her proposals is that the Foreign Ministers should consider establishing close and continuous links with the Permanent Representatives to the North Atlantic Council of the nine Member States which take part in the work of the Atlantic Alliance.

---

1) Debates of the European Parliament, September 1979, Pages 91-112

2) OJ C234 of 14.9.81, pages 67-70

3) Document 1-335/81

4) I have not dealt with the informal meeting of Foreign Ministers referred to because such meetings are informal, confidential and do not produce conclusions.

The London Report on European Political Cooperation

16. In October 1981 the Foreign Ministers of the Ten adopted a report on European Political Cooperation.<sup>1)</sup> Amongst the matters dealt with in the report is the consideration of aspects of security within the European Political Cooperation framework. The report states :

"As regards the scope of European Political Cooperation, and having regard to the different situations of the Member States, the Foreign Ministers agree to maintain the flexible and pragmatic approach which has made it possible to discuss in Political Cooperation certain important foreign policy questions bearing on the political aspects of security".

17. It will be seen from the use of the word "maintain" (the underlining is my own) that the London Report did not commit the Ten to discuss aspects of security which they had not previously discussed. The text quoted above is, however, significant because for the first time the Ten formally acknowledged and committed themselves to continue the practice of discussing questions bearing on the political aspects of security. The phrase "political aspects of security" is worth noting.

The Diligent Report on the protection of shipping routes

18. On 14 December 1981 the Parliament adopted a resolution on the surveillance and protection of shipping routes for supplies of energy and strategic materials to the countries of the European Community.<sup>2)</sup> The resolution was based on the report drawn up by Mr. Diligent on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee<sup>3)</sup>. (This report will be dealt with in more detail in Section III of this paper).

-----  
1) PE 75.249 of 20 October 1981  
2) OJ C327 of 14.12.81, pages 46-48  
3) Document 1-697/80 of 7.1.81



The Haagerup Report

19. On 13 January 1983, the Parliament adopted a resolution on European Security and European Political Cooperation.<sup>1)</sup> The resolution was based on the report drawn up by Mr. Haagerup on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee.<sup>2)</sup>
  
20. In justifying the Parliament's consideration of security matters, preambular paragraph N of the resolution recognises that "while the European Community and its institutions have no explicit responsibility for defence and military security, the Parliament can discuss any matter that seems to it relevant". The following paragraph refers to "the impossibility of separating a large number of foreign policy issues of vital interest to Europe from their direct or indirect security implications".
  
21. Since this is the Parliament's first and only resolution dealing specifically and exclusively with the relationship in general terms between European security and European political cooperation, it is worth quoting a substantial portion of it:
  - "1. The Member States of the European Community share a number of vital security concerns even if the Community has no military dimension of its own;
  
  2. These shared security concerns should be fully explored and elaborated, particularly within the context of European political cooperation, in order to give substance to a true concept of European peace and security and to promote them for the benefit of all European peoples;
  
  3. Efforts should be made to bring about a wider understanding by the public, political parties and governments of the many diverse elements which contribute to the evolving European security concept, without infringing the rights and responsibilities of national governments in defence matters;

-----  
1) OJ C42 of 14.2.83, pages 74-77

2) Document 1-946/82 of 3 December 1982

4. The European Parliament can play a significant role in bringing about such an understanding by its active and growing participation in European political cooperation, by identifying and debating common European security concerns and by arranging hearings and seminars on security-related issues;
  5. As all present and probable Community Member States but one are members of the Atlantic Alliance, it is urged that a more effective coordination take place between the consultations in EPC and the Atlantic Council when political and economic subjects touching on matters related to European peace and security are under discussion;
  6. The determination of a common European policy on security matters presupposes:
    - a) commitment to the principles of détente policy and to a policy aimed at limiting arms levels;
    - b) the peaceful co-existence of all States and all peoples on the basis of the principles of the UNO and the Helsinki Declaration of 1975;
  7. Consultations in EPC must not negate political consultations within the Atlantic Alliance but should on the contrary strengthen such consultations."
22. In the report itself, which is rather lengthy, Mr. Haagerup says that he is dealing primarily with the present and the immediate future. "It is not a blueprint for how a future European defence community can and should look and it is not recommending policies and steps which are only realizable in a European context more advanced and very different from the present Community and EPC structure". He says that the revival of the European Defence Community is not realistic under present conditions and is also considered highly undesirable by many. Mr. Haagerup also explains that the report makes no recommendation as to the setting-up of

new institutions in the immediate future to deal with vital security concerns. "Such concerns will for the time being have to be dealt with by the Member States and by the Community within the context of existing institutions ...".

23. In the plenary debate the resolution was strongly supported by the Group of the European People's Party and by the European Democratic and Liberal groups.<sup>1)</sup> The Socialist Group also voted for the resolution, although several members of the Socialist Group spoke and voted against it. The President of the Commission, Mr. Thorn, also supported the resolution in a personal capacity, although he stressed that the Commission had "not decided to adopt any stance for the legal reasons you are well aware of". The President-in-office of the Council, Mr. Mertes, regarded the report as an encouraging development, but he was also speaking principally in a personal capacity. During the debate a frequently voiced objection to the resolution was in relation to its call for closer coordination between the EEC and NATO (paragraph 5: "it is urged that a more effective coordination take place between the consultations in EPC and the Atlantic Council ...").

#### Solemn Declaration on European Union

24. On 19 June 1983 in Stuttgart the ten Heads of State and Government signed the Solemn Declaration on European Union, which resulted from the German/Italian (Genscher/Colombo) proposals for a draft European Act submitted in November 1981. In relation to security, the wording of the London Report ("political aspects of security", see paragraphs 16-17 above) is slightly expanded in the Solemn Declaration. One of the measures agreed upon to ensure the necessary reinforcement of European Political Cooperation is the "coordination of positions of Member States on the political and economic aspects of security".

#### The Fergusson Report

25. On 26 October 1983, the Parliament adopted a resolution on arms procurement within a common industrial policy and arms sales.<sup>2)</sup>

-----  
1) Debates of the European Parliament No. 1-293, pages 221-245  
2) OJ C322 of 28.11.83, pages 42-44

This resolution was based on the report drawn up by Mr. Fergusson on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee.<sup>1)</sup> (This report is dealt with in Section II of this report concerning armaments matters).

The Klepsch Report (II)

26. On 11 April 1984 the Parliament adopted a resolution on shared interests, risks and requirements in the security field.<sup>2)</sup> The resolution was based on a report drawn up on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee by Mr Klepsch.<sup>3)</sup> The resolution was adopted by 156 votes to 67 with 8 abstentions. The following are the main operative paragraphs of the resolution:

'The European Parliament ...

1. Calls on the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation to use all available expertise to produce a thorough analysis of the Member States' shared interests, risks and requirements in the security field with a view to establishing a European security concept; and to make efforts to ensure that the Member States' positions in present institutions having a bearing on European security are based as far as possible on a common approach;
2. Calls on the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation
  - (a) to express, with a single voice, in the North Atlantic Council, the views of the Member States concerning selected issues dealt with by the North Atlantic Council;
  - (b) to ensure effective consultation between the US Government and the Foreign Ministers meeting in EPC concerning major foreign policy initiatives, including those with security implications, such as East-West arms control negotiations;
  - (c) to strengthen the peace-keeping role of the UN by continuing to contribute contingents to peace-keeping forces in trouble

-----  
1) Document 1-455/83 of 27 June 1983  
2) OJ C127 of 14 May 1984, pages 69 - 72  
3) Doc. 1-80/84

areas, possibly through contingents officially representing the Ten as an entity, even if they do not contain elements from all Member States;

- (d) to seek the earliest possible resumption of East-West negotiations aimed at reducing and eventually eliminating intermediate-range nuclear forces in Western and Eastern Europe and in the Soviet Union, on a balanced, mutual and identifiable basis;
- (e) to examine with the State-trading countries of Eastern Europe ways in which economic, technical and scientific contracts could be developed, particularly within the framework of the CSCE follow-up;

3. Instructs its Political Affairs Committee to establish a permanent sub-committee on the political and economic aspects of security;...

27. The explanatory statement describes the report as 'a kind of blueprint for the future'. It deals with a wide range of issues including East-West arms control negotiations, CSCE follow-up, the role of the European Parliament and relations between the Ten and the Atlantic Alliance.

28. In the course of the debate in plenary, the resolution was supported by spokesmen for the Socialist Group, the Group of the European People's Party (CD), the European Democratic Group (Conservative), the Liberal and Democratic Group and the European Progressive Democrat Group. However, the spokesman of the Communist and Allies Group opposed the resolution, saying that 'matters of defence and security are not and never have been within the competence of the European Parliament'. Among others to oppose the resolution were Greek, Irish and Danish members from several groups.

#### Subcommittee on Security and Disarmament

29. The Klepsch report (see paragraphs 26-28 above) had instructed the Political Affairs Committee 'to establish a permanent subcommittee on the political and economic aspects of security'. Following the direct elections to the European Parliament in June 1984, the Political Affairs Committee duly established a subcommittee on security and disarmament. This subcommittee now meets regularly under the chairmanship of Mr. Pöttering and has decided to draw up a number of reports in the fields of security and disarmament.

II. The Parliament's activities in relation to armaments matters

30. The Parliament's activities in relation to armaments matters have already been touched on in Section I of this report. It seems appropriate, however, to devote this separate section to armaments matters because they form a distinct and sometimes technical aspect of the general security question. Furthermore, the reports which have been drawn up in this regard have tended to locate armaments related questions within the common industrial policy of the Community rather than as part of its common foreign policy.
31. Armaments were briefly referred to in the Commission's Report on European Union 1975 ("European Arms Agency"), in the Gladwyn Report ("to set up an agency ultimately aimed at the joint manufacture of weapons ..."), and in the Tindemans Report ("to cooperate in the manufacture of armaments").<sup>1)</sup>
32. On 6 July 1976 the Parliament adopted a resolution embodying its opinion on proposals from the Commission on an Action Programme for the European Aeronautical Sector.<sup>2)</sup> As regards that part of the Commission's Action Programme which dealt with the question of a military aircraft procurement agency, the following was what the Parliament had to say:
- "13. Draws attention to the close relationship between the production of military aircraft and the production of civil aircraft;
  - 14. Feels that sales of military aircraft are an essential basis for the future of the European aircraft industry;
  - 15. Therefore regards the proposal as an element in the Community's industrial and employment policies;
  - 16. Fully appreciates, however, the contribution that cooperation within such an agency can make to an understanding of the need for subsequent defence policy cooperation as part of the European union;

-----  
1) For details of these reports see paragraphs 6, 8 and 10 above  
2) OJ C178 of 2.8.76, pages 8-10

17. Requests the European Council to set up the proposed agency and:

- to ensure close contact between the agency and the Commission as regards economic, employment and research aspects;
- to ensure close contact between the agency and the Eurogroup in NATO as regards defence aspects;

18. Will return to the question of parliamentary control over such an agency later."

33. On 19 January 1978, the Parliament adopted a resolution on European political cooperation which was based on a report drawn up on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee by Mr. Blumenfeld.<sup>1)</sup> Although the resolution does not refer specifically to security matters, the report itself comments that defence and arms procurement questions are matters to which the Foreign Ministers, with their defence colleagues, "should address themselves with a view to widening discussions under political cooperation".

#### The Klepsch Report

34. On June 1978, the Parliament adopted a resolution on European armaments procurement cooperation<sup>2)</sup> which was based on the report drawn up on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee by Mr. Klepsch.<sup>3)</sup>

35. The key paragraph in the resolution "calls on the Commission to submit to the Council in the near future a European action programme for the development and production of conventional armaments within the framework of the common industrial policy". The resolution situates this call in the context of the belief "that the establishment of a jointly organized European armaments industry with a structural market is an essential element in developing a common industrial policy". The resolution also considers that "the civil and defence aspects of certain key industries ... cannot be separated in planning their future development".

-----  
1) Document 427/77 of 13.12.77  
2) OJ C163 of 10.7.78, page 23  
3) Document 83/78

36. The lengthy report accompanying the resolution describes in detail the attempts which have been made to achieve European Procurement Cooperation in several fora. It concludes that the Commission should make proposals for the creation of a single, structured Community market in military equipment, but that the Community can only move in this direction within the context of parallel development in the IEPG as part of the overall "two-way street" relationship between Europe and the United States. It also suggests that EPC meetings might be broadened, where appropriate, to include defence ministers and officials from national defence ministries.
37. In opening the debate,<sup>1)</sup> Mr. Klepsch stressed that his report and motion for a resolution were drawn up in the context of the Community's failure to develop a common industrial policy. He said that "the only real proposal made in the motion for a resolution is essentially industrial in character".
38. The European Conservative Group, the Liberal Group and the Christian Democratic Group spoke in favour of the resolution. The Socialist Group, the Communist and Allies Group and the European Progressive Democrat Group spoke against it. Despite the assertion of the rapporteur that his report should be seen in the context of a common industrial policy, a major objection voiced during the debate was that, in effect, it also related to the defence field. Mr. Dankert, for example, speaking on behalf of the Socialist Group said that the rapporteur had used the existence of problems in the European defence industry "to take a few steps forwards towards European cooperation in the defence field". On behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, Mr. Soury described the real purpose of the report as being "under the cloak of an industrial policy ... to promote a European defence policy". (Mr. Dankert also objected to the emphasis on inter-operability, to the absence of a European export policy in this field and to the suggestion that the armaments industry in Europe should be protected).

-----  
1) Debates of the European Parliament, June Session 1978 : Pages 42 and following and pages 69 and following.



39. In replying to the debate for the Commission, Mr. Davignon argued against the view that any question involving defence or security is outside the Community's competence. At the same time, he stressed "that national defence remains an area where the sovereignty of the States is still absolute and is qualified only by decisions which they have taken as allies". The division of responsibility, he said, is clear: "When the political and military decisions have been taken, the Community can take the industrial decisions".

Oral Question with debate on Community armaments procurement programmes

40. On 25 September 1979, the Parliament debated at some length an oral question on Community armaments programmes within the framework of industrial policy.<sup>1)</sup> The oral question (Doc. 1-300/79) was tabled by Mr. Fergusson on behalf of the European Democratic Group and by Mr. von Hassel, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party. The timing of the debate is worth noting since it took place very shortly after the first direct elections.
41. Placing his question in the context of industrial policy, Mr. Fergusson said that the nub of his question was to ask what had been done about the Klepsch report passed 15 months earlier by the Parliament. In reply, Mr. Davignon for the Commission repeated the view of the Commission that it could not attain at once the objective set out in the Klepsch report. He indicated that the Commission was carrying out two studies (one to determine the precise impact of public purchases on the development of various technologies; the other to determine how, when programmes have been decided under the sovereignty of the individual States and within their sphere of competence, industrial development can be pushed ahead most effectively). Mr. Davignon promised to "make available to Parliament and to its responsible Committees the results of these two studies in the manner which is felt to be most opportune and appropriate".
42. Mr. Glinne, speaking on behalf of the Socialist Group, described the debate as precipitate. He argued that other crucial industrial sectors should be given priority, that military expenditure was too high everywhere and referred to the scandal of arms exports

-----  
1) Debates of the European Parliament, September 1979, pages 91-112

to the third world. Mr. von Hassel, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, supported the thrust of the oral question. Mr. Robert Jackson, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, defended the Parliament's right to discuss the matter before the House. (He did not, incidentally, see the question as purely an industrial one and referred to "the competence of this House in respect of the defence matters which underly and are raised by this question). Mr. Marchais, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, did not accept that the Parliament had any right to discuss the subject. Mr. Berkhouwer, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, argued in favour of the rationalisation of armaments production. On behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, Mr. Messmer referred to the legal grounds which made it impossible for the agenda to include this oral question. He described the question as "debatable in law, useless in fact and politically dangerous". Following a lengthy debate, no resolution was adopted.

The Davignon Note and the Greenwood Study<sup>1)</sup>

43. During the debate on the Klepsch Report on 8 May 1978 and again in the debate on an oral question on 25 September 1979, Commissioner Davignon had undertaken to keep Parliament informed about the Commission's thinking in the area of arms procurement. With an explanatory note dated December 1980, Commissioner Davignon communicated to the Parliament a study by Mr. David Greenwood, Director of the Centre for Defence Studies, Aberdeen, concerning "A policy for promoting defence and technological cooperation among West European countries".
44. In his explanatory note, Mr. Davignon sets out the general position of the Commission with regard to its competence in the field of arms procurement:

"It is not the business of the Commission of the European Community to develop a defence policy or defence collaboration. It is, however, our business to make any proposals necessary to ensure the effective development of the Community's economy

-----  
1) Both are contained in Document PE 71.650 of 11.2.81

and the effective realisation of the internal market, the procurement of arms, and research and development of military technologies both have a major impact on the modern industrial economy, and have financial implications, it is necessary to take it into account in framing industrial policy proposals."

45. The note outlines, briefly, the economic importance of public procurement. It emphasises the lack of adequate information at the European level and concludes that "any policy initiative in this field should be preceded by a systematic effort to gather information". It suggests that one possibility might be the setting up of a "defence procurement analysis unit" but "does not recommend that such a body should be created in the framework of the Community". The establishment could also be envisaged, it says, of some "new forum in which Member States and the Commission could exchange information on public procurement and relate public procurement and promotion policies to an overall strategy for arms production and technology development".
46. Mr. David Greenwood, in his report, appended to the explanatory note, outlines the background of attempts to achieve greater cooperation in arms procurement and production. "The long-term objective", he says, "of the defence-industrial synthesis is indisputable".
47. The principal conclusions of the Greenwood Report may be summarised as follows (the "ends" comments Mr. Greenwood are more or less the same as those of the Klepsch Report, but the advocated means are significantly different):

"Rather than striving to devise elaborately integrated arrangements for the demand and supply sides of the European defence industry, the policy emphasis should be on formally separate efforts to gain the military and industrial benefits of each side."

The key institutional innovations required are relatively modest: creation of a European Defence Analysis Bureau, and establishment of a European Public Procurement Task Force to help nations choose sensible purchasing and production policies.

policies for themselves <sup>1)</sup> (given that they are not prepared to have supranational or intergovernmental agencies make their choices for them)."

48. Although recognizing that there is a strong case for facilitating further cooperation in defence procurement and production among the Members of the EEC, Mr. Greenwood argues that the time is not propitious for definition by the Commission of the kind of comprehensive "action programme" envisaged by the Klepsch Report.

#### The Fergusson Report

49. On 26 October 1983, the Parliament adopted a resolution on arms procurement within a common industrial policy and arms sales. <sup>2)</sup> This resolution was based on the report drawn up by Mr. Fergusson on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee <sup>3)</sup> on the basis of motions for resolutions tabled after the debate in September 1979.
50. As concerns armaments procurement, the resolution calls on the Council to encourage member governments taking part in the work of the IEPG to give its Panel I - concerned with equipment planning - the functions of a European Defence Analysis Bureau and to urge those member governments to, in various ways, increase cooperation between the US and Europe (IEPG) in this field.
51. Also concerning armaments procurement, the resolution calls on the Commission to take various actions in this regard and to report annually to the European Parliament on the action taken.
52. As far as arms sales are concerned, the resolution calls on the Council "to establish rules governing the export of arms from Member States to third countries".

-----  
1) The European Defence Analysis Bureau is envisaged as an independent entity but having close links with the IEPG, the WEU and the EEC Commission. The European Public Procurement Task Force is envisaged as being set up by the EEC Council of Ministers.  
2) OJ C322 of 28.11.83, pages 42-4  
3) Document 1-455/83 of 27 June 1983

53. The debate on the Fergusson Report took place on 11 October 1983<sup>1)</sup> although voting on the resolution was postponed until the following session. The resolution was adopted by 170 votes to 142 with 13 abstentions. During the debate the resolution was supported, as previous resolutions in the same field had been, by the Liberal and Democratic Group, the European Democratic Group and the Group of the European People's Party. Mr. Klepsch described it as a realistic basis for action, and welcomed the rapporteur's approach as going further than that of the Greenwood Report.
54. On the other hand, Mr. Hänsch on behalf of the Socialist Group said that it was the wrong approach to start with cooperation on arms procurement before formulating a joint defence policy. He described the section of the resolution dealing with arms exports as inadequate because what was required were rules which would "reduce arms sales and not rules to sanction the status quo". Mr. De Pasquale, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, opposed the report not on the grounds of the Parliament's competence, but for general political reasons. Mr. de la Malène, on behalf of the French Members of the European Progressive Democratic Group, opposed the resolution on the grounds of "competence, procedure and the fundamental issue."
55. On behalf of the Irish Members of the EPD Group, Mr. Lalor argued that the report blurred the distinction between the European Community and NATO. "The motion for a resolution also fails", he argued, "to take account of the limits of the competences of the Community and both it and the report seem to involve a certain confusion in regard to the nature and scope of political cooperation ... . The motion for a resolution also tended to ignore the basic fact that one Member State of the Community, Ireland, is not a member of a military alliance". (Similar reservations were expressed by other Irish members of the Parliament in this and other debates). Mrs. Charzat of the Socialist Group, categorically rejected the report arguing "that a common industrial policy in the arms field is diametrically opposed to the principle of French national independence".

-----  
1) Debates of the European Parliament No. 1-304, pages 53-76

III. The Diligent Report on the protection of shipping routes

56. On 14 December 1981, the Parliament adopted a resolution on the surveillance and protection of shipping routes for supplies of energy and strategic materials to the countries of the European Community.<sup>1)</sup> The resolution was based on the report drawn up by Mr. Diligent on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee.<sup>2)</sup> It has seemed appropriate to devote a brief separate section of this paper to the Diligent report because it goes further than, and is more specific than, the Parliament's attitude to security matters in general (Section I) and does not relate to arms procurement (the subject matter of Section II). (In this regard, see also the explanatory statement of the 2nd draft report by Mr. Klepsch (Doc. 1-80/84 B) which is dealt with in paragraphs 26-28 above).

57. The resolution is based on the view that freedom of movement by sea is vital to the economies of both the EEC countries and the Third World countries with which they maintain relations. In the crucial paragraph 5, the Parliament:

"Calls on the Member States with naval forces to coordinate their patrols outside the zone covered by the North Atlantic Treaty and to strengthen their naval forces, and to do so within the framework of European political cooperation".

58. In the plenary debate, the resolution was supported by the Group of the European People's Party, and European Democratic Group and the Liberal Group. The Socialist and Communist and Allies Groups voted against it and the European Progressive Democrats abstained.<sup>3)</sup>

Mr. Hänsch, speaking for the Socialist Group, did not object to the Parliament discussing the protection of sea routes, but rejected the report because "it was inadequately prepared, set out in an unbalanced way and dangerous in its treatment of the prospects

-----  
1) OJ C327 of 14.12.81, pages 46-48

2) Document 1-697/80 of 7.1.1981

3) Debates of the European Parliament No. 1-277, pages 153-170, 248-9

for peace". Mr. Galluzzi, for the Communist and Allies Group, argued that safeguarding supplies is above all a political problem rather than a military problem and found unacceptable the attempt to extend the North Atlantic Treaty to cover the area south of the Tropic of Cancer. Mr. de Lipkowski, explaining the intention to abstain of the European Progressive Democrats, argued that Mr. Diligent had raised the right question in the wrong place (since the report covered defence matters).