

Working Group VIII

Working document 35

WORKING GROUP VIII « DEFENCE »

Subject : **Comments by Mr Esko Seppänen on the preliminary draft final report of
Working Group VIII "Defence" (WD 022)**

Members of Working Group VIII will find attached comments by Mr Esko Seppänen, alternate member of the Convention, on the preliminary draft final report.

Working Group VIII Defence/ MEP Esko Seppänen's amendments to the draft conclusions /8.11.2002

- The document should be more balanced between the introduction and conclusion. The introduction should be shortened.
- The seminar, referred to in Article 1, was not the official hearing decided in the working group and as a reference point should be deleted from the text.
- In Article 35 you cannot say "all members", if you refer to the subsequent points a-d.
- I cannot agree to the fund you propose to establish in Article 35(d). If it is established, the members who do not want to participate in the operations would pay for the costs. I do not believe that strict Parliamentary scrutiny is possible, if there is not as strict a responsibility between the Members and the Council who operate the fund.
- Article 38. I support the idea that was raised in the first exchange of views: the working group should not propose any institutional arrangements.
- I read your Article 42 as it is written. It is formulated so that it can be read as a territorial solidarity clause, even though Mr. Barnier said it was only for terrorist acts. I am also against the idea that the military should be involved in terrorist actions, as would be the result of such a clause.
- Article 42 is, as formulated, a solidarity clause requested by some members and proposed also by the French and German Foreign Ministers. I strongly oppose such a clause. We should not militarise the EU by including such texts in a constitutional treaty.
- Article 47. Do you mean in the - in French - "l'imposition de la paix" or "le retablisement de la paix"? You should decide.
- Concerning Article 49, Mr Barnier clarified that these objectives were proposed only to those countries participating in the "defence Eurozone". This clarification should be expressly included in the text.

- I am against both the idea of a “Capabilities Agency” (Article 51) and a Council of Ministers for defence (Article 53). I know that in the working group there is a broad consensus to include these proposals in the final conclusions, but this is not unanimous.
