

MONDAY, 29 SEPTEMBER 2014

BRUSSELS

THE COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE

HEARING OF CECILIA MALMSTRÖM

COMMISSIONER-DESIGNATE

(TRADE)

1-002

VORSITZ: BERND LANGE*Vorsitzender*

(Die Sitzung wird um 14.30 Uhr eröffnet.)

1-003

Der Vorsitzende. > Meine Damen und Herren! Bitte nehmen Sie alle Ihre Plätze ein! Ich möchte pünktlich beginnen, weil wir uns natürlich eine ganze Menge vorgenommen haben. Zunächst möchte ich ganz herzlich hier die designierte Kommissarin für Handel, Frau Cecilia Malmström, begrüßen. Herzlich willkommen!

Gestatten Sie mir, bevor ich vielleicht ein paar einleitende Bemerkungen mache, noch einmal die Regeln dieser Anhörung zu beschreiben. Wir haben sie in der Anlage XVI zu unserer Geschäftsordnung festgelegt, sodass wir auch da eine klare Sprachregelung dessen haben, was wir hier heute tun. Wir haben auch eine schriftliche Beantwortung der eingereichten Fragen von der Kommissionskandidatin bekommen. Damit ist auch diese Notwendigkeit erfüllt worden.

Heute folgt nun die mündliche Anhörung der Kommissionskandidatin. Wir haben dafür 180 Minuten Zeit. Wir sind übereingekommen, dass Frau Malmström eine Einleitung von zehn Minuten halten wird. Dann fangen wir mit der Befragung an. Insgesamt werden wir 45 Fragestellungen der Kolleginnen und Kollegen haben.

Ich möchte darauf hinweisen, dass wir eine klare zeitliche Begrenzung haben werden. Bei jeder Rede wird, kurz bevor die Redezeit abläuft, ein Sternchen in der eingeblendeten Redezeit sichtbar. Nach Ende der Redezeit wird das Mikrophon abgestellt, weil wir sonst gar keine Chance haben, unsere Anhörung vernünftig durchzuführen.

In einer ersten Fragerunde der Fraktionen wird es die Möglichkeit geben, jeweils insgesamt fünf Minuten mit der Kandidatin zu kommunizieren, also vielleicht eine Minute Frage, zwei Minuten Antwort, eine Minute Nachfrage und eine Minute ergänzende Antwort.

Diese ergänzende Fragestellung ist aber nur in der ersten Runde der Fraktionen möglich. Ab der zweiten Runde haben wir dann ganz klare Drei-Minuten-Takte: eine Minute Frage, zwei Minuten Antwort. Damit möchte ich Sie alle bitten, sich auf das Wesentliche zu konzentrieren, damit wir diese Anhörung so durchführen können, dass wir am Ende eine qualifizierte Stellungnahme abgeben können, ob wir mit der Kandidatin Cecilia Malmström einverstanden sind oder nicht.

Hier ist also ein ganz klares Zeitregiment einzuhalten, und wir werden das auch durchführen. Das soll die Kollegen jetzt nicht dazu bringen, möglichst schnell und viel zu reden. Sie können sich vorstellen: Das geht dann an die Grenze der Dolmetschmöglichkeiten. Also konzentrieren Sie sich bitte wirklich auf die wesentlichen Fragestellungen, und halten Sie die Zeit trotzdem ein.

Als letzte organisatorische Vorbemerkung möchte ich darauf hinweisen, dass natürlich diese wichtige Anhörung live auf der Parlamentswebsite zu sehen ist und dass auf derselben Website auch eine Videoaufzeichnung erhältlich sein wird.

Also, meine Kolleginnen und Kollegen, ein ehrgeiziges Programm. Ich bin mir aber sicher, dass wir das hier im Ausschuss für internationalen Handel in guter Manier – wie wir auch die anderen Debatten bewältigen – durchführen können. Wir haben noch Gäste aus dem Ausschuss für auswärtige Angelegenheiten und aus dem Entwicklungsausschuss, die jeweils eingeladen sind, vom Entwicklungsausschuss eine Frage und vom Ausschuss für auswärtige Angelegenheiten zwei Fragen zu stellen.

Damit schließe ich die organisatorischen Hinweise.

Frau Malmström, Handel ist sicherlich der Katalysator der wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung in der Europäischen Union und weltweit darüber hinaus. Es ist evident, dass Handel in der globalisierten Welt Regeln braucht. Genau darum wird es gehen: die Regeln korrekt zu setzen.

Jüngst ist in den Vereinigten Staaten eine Untersuchung über die öffentliche Wahrnehmung von Handelspolitik erschienen. Es ist schon bemerkenswert, dass doch immer mehr Menschen Handelspolitik sehr kritisch sehen und wenig Vertrauen und eine skeptische Grundhaltung gegenüber Handelspolitik an den Tag legen. Die Angst, dass man quasi auf der falschen Seite der Globalisierung Regeln setzt, ist weit verbreitet. Deswegen ist für den Ausschuss für internationalen Handel ein ganz entscheidender Punkt, dass wir klarmachen, dass Handelspolitik nicht im Interesse weniger stattfindet, sondern im Interesse der Bürgerinnen und Bürger.

Das bedarf nach unserer Auffassung eines größeren Maßes an Transparenz und Diskurs mit der Zivilgesellschaft als in der Vergangenheit. Ich bin der festen Überzeugung – ich denke, viele Kollegen teilen das –, dass wir Handelspolitik nur dann weiter gestalten können, wenn wir wieder Vertrauen zurückgewinnen. Deswegen möchte ich Sie eindringlich darum bitten, noch einmal klar darzulegen, wie Sie in Ihrer Rolle Transparenz gestalten und auch Vertrauen in die Arbeit der Europäischen Kommission zurückgewinnen wollen.

Neben der Frage der Transparenz ist die Frage eines fairen Handels für den Ausschuss für internationalen Handel genauso wichtig. Die pure Eliminierung von Handelsschranken – also das Modell von Herrn Ricardo – ist nicht mehr angemessen, heutzutage moderne Handelspolitik zu gestalten. Um faire Bedingungen, die einen Nutzen für die Menschen in der Europäischen Union, aber auch für die Handelspartner in der Welt bringen, muss es gehen. Insofern ist es mehr als angesagt, nicht nur die klassischen Bereiche der Handelspolitik anzusehen, sondern auch darauf zu achten, dass die Frage der Arbeitnehmerrechte, der Umweltstandards und sonstiger Regeln angepackt wird, damit Handel eben nicht nur frei, sondern auch fair ist. Das wird sicherlich auch in vielen Handelsabkommen – gerade auch bei den EPAs, die vor uns liegen – eine zentrale Herausforderung sein.

Insofern: Transparenz und fairer Handel vielleicht als Rahmen für das, was dem Ausschuss insgesamt am Herzen liegt. Ich bin mir sicher, dass die Kolleginnen und Kollegen viele detailreichere Fragestellungen auf den Tisch legen werden, und freue mich auf die Beantwortung durch Sie, Frau Malmström.

1-004

Cecilia Malmström, *Commissioner-designate*. > I will try to stick to the rules as outlined by the Chair. It is a true honour and a privilege to be here as Commissioner-designate for Trade. I hope that you will be able, after this hearing, to support my candidacy, because working on these issues is a long-standing dream of mine.

International trade and investment touch upon so many aspects of people's lives around the world. Trade also clearly shows the added value of Europe working together. Fighting for democratic freedoms, transparency and accountability has been the cornerstone of my political engagement in this Parliament, in the Council and in the European Commission, and I would like to bring that commitment to trade policy.

A trade policy inspired by democratic values would have a simple goal: to improve people's quality of life, and trade can do that. Historically, trade has been an important part of our economic success. It

has given Europe some of the highest living standards in the world. Today, it is helping driving economies to recover in countries like Spain, Ireland, etc. And those recoveries are giving hope to many unemployed people that they may soon be able to get their lives back on track.

In the future, trade will become even more important for European jobs and growth. As the world economy has become more connected, more and more people depend on trade for their livelihoods – some 30 million people in Europe today. This will only increase as emerging economies become more successful. The more growth that happens outside Europe, the more important it is that we have access to those markets. That growth shows trade's power to be a tool to fight poverty globally. Hundreds of millions of people have been given the possibility of a better life in recent decades thanks to trade. I have seen, in my current work as Commissioner for Home Affairs, how important trade is for giving people a real chance to support their families from where they live, meaning that they are not forced to leave them behind in order to migrate for economic reasons. Finally, trade also brings people together on a human level, allowing for increased contacts between people and the exchange of ideas.

So there can be no doubt that trade is a response to people's need for a secure future all over the world. But that does not mean that trade and open markets are an end in themselves; it is a means to an end. That is why trade policy cannot be motivated by narrow vested interests, whether those interests want to protect or expand their markets. It must be about advancing the broad interests of the whole society.

If confirmed as Trade Commissioner, I will assess all the EU's current and future action using the following principles.

First, trade policy must be driven by the interests of citizens. That means we must be ambitious in our negotiations if we want to create jobs and growth. But trade policy must also be part of a wider set of domestic policies to support growth. We need to help workers make the transition from the few sectors that find new competition too tough to the many areas that benefit from the new opportunities increased trade provides.

Second, trade negotiations must be open and transparent, to allow all interested people and groups to understand what is on the table so that they can express their views.

Third, trade policy is about cooperation – but also about backbone. I will make sure that Europe stands up for its interests in trade negotiations. That means ensuring trade agreements support rather than weaken protections for the environment, labour rights and human rights in general. It means

securing reciprocal economic concessions from our negotiating partners. And it means enforcing the rules, including on anti-competitive practices.

Fourth, trade is a powerful foreign policy tool. It must support Europe's wider international goals, promoting our values of peace, freedom and democracy throughout the world. I will apply these four principles across the board.

First of all, to our work in the WTO. As a liberal, I am an instinctive multilateralist. I am convinced that, despite the current difficulties, the WTO can – and must – deliver results, for rich and poor countries alike. The multilateral agenda will be a priority for me.

I will also bring it to our agenda of all our ongoing bilateral trade negotiations, and I am sure we will discuss more about them in a minute. I will bring it to our relationship with China, our second largest trading partner. This must be based on cooperation as well as following the rules of the game to achieve a level playing field. I will bring it to the efforts to promote development, including to the new strategic partnership with Africa, as called for by President-elect Juncker. And I will bring that commitment to our own neighbourhood, which has shown us how directly linked trade, geopolitics and fundamental principles can be.

But if there is one area where the next trade Commissioner will need to be particularly vigilant, it is the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, TTIP. TTIP is our most demanding negotiation, and is certainly the most debated by the public. Over the last several years I have been following these important talks a little bit from a distance, and I have been amazed by what I have heard.

I expected to hear about the 2 billion euros traded every day across the Atlantic. And about how the untapped potential of the relationship means that an agreement like this can create such new opportunities. Most of all, the opportunities to put our trade agenda at the service of our collective efforts to put the economy of Europe back on track and create new jobs and possibilities. But instead, I have heard claims that the Commission is negotiating lower safety standards for food, restricting Europe's ability to regulate on health and the environment, and that we are doing this through secret backroom negotiations. This is not the case. But I hear those concerns, and I think people need reassurances and that we need to engage in a dialogue.

So I have spent some time looking into this negotiation and have come to the following conclusions.

First, TTIP has a significant potential to create lots of jobs and growth. To seize it, we need an ambitious agreement on tariffs, services and procurement and to come to a number of concrete, practical regulatory solutions. We need to get the deal right, so substance must prevail over timing.

Second, on the regulatory part of this negotiation, the EU's position is firm. Levels of current protection cannot and will not be lowered. Decision-making power for new regulation must stay under current European democratic control. Trying to find a common approach to health, environment, labour, consumer safety and financial risk can never be about lowering standards, but avoiding extra costs – the costs entailed, for example, in the duplication of factory inspections and unnecessary divergences of approach.

Third, there is a strategic dimension to the regulatory work. If the world's two biggest powers when it comes to trade manage to agree standards, these would be the basis for international cooperation to create global standards.

Fourth, investment, and in particular investment arbitration, or ISDS. This is, of course, something that is of immense concern.

Let me first make a more general statement on the question of investor-to-state dispute settlement (ISDS). As you know, we have had several thousand of them in the world already for a long time. It is in my view possible to design a system in a way that it addresses people's concerns. We must continue to set unambiguous rules to avoid abuses of ISDS that many worry about, to bring full transparency into the system, and – most importantly – to ensure that ISDS cannot be used to inhibit the right to regulate the public interest. This must remain our guiding principle in all future negotiations. And this is in my view what the Commission has done in CETA, which will be submitted to Parliament and the Council for approval next year. By the way, last Friday I ensured that the entire text was posted on-line on DG Trade's website.

On TTIP, specific public concerns have been raised about the idea of a possibility to include ISDS, and this is why the Commission had decided to freeze that chapter. In his political guidelines, President-elect Juncker committed himself, in front of the European Parliament plenary on 15 July, not to accept that the jurisdiction of courts in the EU Member States is limited by special regimes for investor disputes. He underlined that the rule of law and the principle of equality before the law must also apply in this context. There can be no doubt that as Trade Commissioner, if confirmed, I will live up to that commitment. We are in a broad negotiation on this. The issue is on the table. It will have to be addressed. As to our position, we have engaged in a wide public consultation on the future of

investment protection. We should see what concrete proposals can come out of this. As I said, for the moment the ISDS chapter is frozen, and I am looking forward to discussing these issues with you.

Fourth, it will take a few months of the new term to make a political assessment of our objectives and our progress, on the basis of the existing negotiating mandate. I will present the result of my assessment to you and the Member States by the end of the year. But in one area in particular I would like to make a very firm commitment, and that area is transparency. We must demonstrate that we are not negotiating a secret deal behind the public's back. The Commission has made considerable efforts here, but I will insist that more is done if you put your trust in me. I will ensure greater transparency on the EU proposals in the different areas of TTIP negotiation, and I will, as President Juncker has asked, publish lists of my meetings with stakeholders and continue, as I have already done for some years, to publish a large part of my correspondence with outside organisations.

I will make engaging with civil society organisations and social partners a personal priority of my first month in office, and I will address the issues that affect your work as the democratic conscience of the negotiating process.

I am prepared to make sure that all Members of this House can consult the negotiating documents we currently send only to a restricted group. To make this happen, Parliament will need to ensure a system that guarantees confidentiality, and I am ready to engage with the Chair, Mr Lange, on how to figure this out.

1-005

Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, le partenariat transatlantique de commerce et d'investissement (TTIP) est assurément l'un des défis les plus importants pour la politique commerciale de l'Union européenne pour les années à venir. La politique commerciale de l'Union européenne ne se limite toutefois pas aux relations transatlantiques. Nous sommes engagés dans un programme de négociation sans précédent dont la mise en œuvre peut contribuer à créer des millions d'emplois et à apporter un soutien décisif à la croissance et à l'investissement dont l'Europe a tant besoin.

J'ai constaté en préparant cette audition à quel point la politique commerciale pouvait être un sujet aride et technique, mais je mesure en même temps combien elle touche en réalité chacun de nous, concerne l'ensemble de nos politiques et porte directement sur le rôle de l'Europe dans le monde. C'est une question sur laquelle chacun veut et doit avoir la possibilité de s'exprimer, et c'est précisément la raison pour laquelle cette audition est si importante.

Dans une démocratie représentative comme la nôtre, c'est en effet au Parlement d'exprimer les vues et les souhaits des citoyens. La politique commerciale ne pourra pas traiter de manière satisfaisante les questions sociétales auxquelles elle est confrontée sans la légitimité que vous lui conférez. J'ai donc à cœur de développer avec vous une relation de travail très étroite, si vous voulez bien me confirmer à ce poste.

Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs, je vous remercie de votre attention. Je me tiens à votre disposition pour répondre à vos questions.

1-006

Daniel Caspary (PPE). – Sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin! Herzlichen Dank für Ihre Präsentation und Ihre sehr umfangreichen Antworten auf unsere schriftlichen Fragen. Ich bin Ihnen sehr dankbar: Sie haben am Wochenende und auch heute nach den Ereignissen im Zusammenhang mit den schriftlichen Antworten Rückgrat bewiesen. Ich glaube, viele hätten heute einfach geschwiegen und am Wochenende keine korrigierten schriftlichen Antworten hinausgeschickt, sondern sich heute im Applaus der Investitionsschutzgegner gesonnt. Dann hätten Sie auch heute einen angenehmeren Nachmittag.

Aber Sie haben Haltung bewahrt. Sie haben Ihre Position vertreten. Sie haben Ihre Position noch einmal deutlich gemacht. Ich sage ganz offen: Auch wenn wir sicherlich nicht in allen Fragen die gleiche Meinung haben, bin ich Ihnen sehr dankbar, dass wir voraussichtlich eine Kommissarin haben werden, die nicht einfach Stichwortempfängerin und Marionette ist, sondern für ihre Überzeugung kämpft.

(Zwischenruf)

Herzlichen Dank dafür, dass Sie für Ihre Position eintreten und nicht gleich umkippen!

Sie haben viele Verhandlungen angesprochen. Es stehen unglaublich viele Herausforderungen vor uns: Sie müssen viele Verhandlungen führen. Wir haben im Moment rund 30 laufende Verhandlungen. Sie wollen mehr Transparenz darstellen. Glauben Sie, dass in der Generaldirektion Handel überhaupt das nötige Personal da ist, um das alles zu leisten? Haben Sie vor, im Zweifel hier Veränderungen vorzunehmen und die Generaldirektion neu aufzustellen?

1-007

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner-designate. > Yes indeed we are engaged in many different negotiations, both bilaterally and multilaterally, and DG Trade is a very hard-working DG, which I have come to know in the past few days. Do we need more resources? Of course, everybody needs more resources, but we also live in a very difficult time where the Commission, as well as all the

institutions and many Member States, are under austerity measures. So for the moment we will try to use the competences and the staff that we have. Of course that demands some prioritisation when it comes to opening new negotiations, but I am quite confident that we can manage what we have on our table and also some of what we are planning in the near future. With your support I hope that we can move forward on this.

1-008

Daniel Caspary (PPE). – Frau Malmström! Haben Sie in Ergänzung zu den Verhandlungen, die Sie vorhin genannt haben – TTIP hat ja einen großen Teil Ihrer Ansprache eingenommen –, bestimmte Prioritäten, wo Sie sagen, diese Abkommen möchte ich auf jeden Fall im Rahmen meiner fünfjährigen Amtszeit als mögliche Handelskommissarin zum Erfolg und zum Abschluss führen und uns dann zur Ratifizierung vorlegen?

1-009

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner-designate. > As you know, we have just concluded politically the agreement with Canada. As from last week we are engaged in TTIP. We are also quite advanced with Japan and with Singapore. The Parliament has discussed this a lot with Ukraine and our eastern neighbourhood friends, but also in the Mediterranean where we are about to launch free trade association agreements or deep and comprehensive trade association agreements with Morocco, Tunisia – for instance – and Jordan. We are also involved in lots of EPA negotiations with the ACP countries and we hope that our investment agreement with China can be concluded before too long.

Apart from this and many others I could list, as I said in my introductory comments, the multinational agenda is very important for me so we will do everything we can to get Bali back on track and to see if we can continue to move on the very positive agenda that was agreed there a year ago and which some countries are now making difficult. But it will be a clear priority to see if there is anything we can do in the coming weeks to save that.

1-010

David Martin (S&D). – Commissioner-designate, firstly, as you have indicated in your comments, investor-state dispute has become not just a difficult issue in trade negotiations but a toxic issue for this Parliament. It looked on Friday as if you actually shared some of our concerns on investor-state dispute; by Sunday your position seems to have changed and softened somewhat. I would like to ask you specific questions about three investor-state dispute components of trade deals that are going on at the moment.

Firstly, Singapore. Singapore has a stand-alone goods and services agreement which has been negotiated and completed, completely separate from investment. Why not bring the goods and services element of Singapore to this Parliament as a stand-alone agreement and bring investment separately? On Canada, my group would still like you to go back to the Canadians and ask them to reconsider the inclusion of investor-state dispute. On the US agreement, would you consider going back to the Council and asking them to consider removing investor-state dispute from the negotiating

mandate? If you did all three things, getting trade deals through this Parliament would become much easier.

On an entirely separate matter and more delicate, but I feel I have to ask you this. ACCESS, the international human rights organisation, claims that your office undermined efforts by Commissioner Reding to get a strong data protection reform package agreed. They have published e-mails. Do you disassociate yourself from these e-mails? If you cannot disassociate yourself from these e-mails, how can we trust you to negotiate with the United States on such a delicate trade package?

1-011

Chair. > This is a case of two questions in one.

1-012

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner-designate. > Yes, and two complicated questions. The first one on the trade defence instrument is indeed a very toxic issue in this Parliament and elsewhere and this is why we need to approach this very delicately. You saw, and I quoted the fact all through my introduction, that President Juncker has expressed great concerns about many of these issues and I share those concerns. It is clear that how they work is abused today and that they are not clear on how to preserve the right to regulate in the public interest. But we have them; we have 4 000 in the world and more than 1 400 within the European Union, so they exist. They will not disappear, and this Parliament has asked the European Commission to find a European solution to replace these bilateral agreements.

Now, this has left too much room for interpretation, so we need to change this. What the European Commission has done so far – not me, but the current Commissioner – is to try to address these issues within CETA, to take away the ambiguity that you clearly preserve the right to regulate in the public interest; that you limit the scope; that you limit the possibility of abuse; that you increase the transparency and that it is clear that this is the last resort if the normal court does not function. I think this moves very much towards a European open system and of course it is open to discussion whether we can improve this further in the future.

Eliminating it from the Canada agreement right now, as you asked, I think would not be a good idea because then it would open the whole Canada agreement. That would risk falling apart and it is a very good agreement. We have achieved a lot there, but I am of course no stranger to look into this and see how we can build upon what we have agreed on CETA for the future.

Does this mean that we will include it automatically in the TTIP? No, it does not mean that. I do not exclude that in the end it will be taken out of this, but this is too early to say. Let us also hear your

views, the views of the Council, who by unanimity asked this to be in the mandate, and see how we can move on. It is frozen, as you know, and we need to take it from there.

On the other question: I have read those allegations; I totally reject them. I have always defended the European data protection proposals internally and externally. These are based on misconception or on lies and I think I have shown to this Parliament and other committees that I can negotiate with the United States tough agreements, where we stand up for European values, and I will certainly continue to do so. So I totally reject false allegations based on alleged leaked emails. I have always stood up for this formally, publicly and in all informal discussions.

1-013

David Martin (S&D). – I want to come back on investor-state dispute, particularly in Singapore. If you believe in investor-state dispute, unlike Canada, the Goods and Services Agreement was negotiated as an entirely separate package, so there is no danger of that falling apart. I have spoken to the Singaporean government. They would be happy for the Goods and Services Agreement to come to this Parliament as a stand-alone agreement and the investment agreement to come separately. Why do you not test the court of public opinion – the European Parliament – and see if you can get investor-state dispute through this Parliament as a stand-alone agreement?

1-014

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner-designate. > Sorry, I forgot to answer that the first time. I think it is too premature to have such a discussion because we must remember that Canada and the USA is one thing but we need the trade investor-state dispute settlement mechanisms in our agreements with other countries. So if we start taking them out we will have difficulty putting them in with other countries where these issues can be even more problematic. We already have problems in Canada and the USA.

So I am certainly willing to sit down and discuss these issues, but it is too premature to have such a discussion and we must really reflect on what possible consequences that could have for other agreements.

1-015

Emma McClarkin (ECR). – My question will focus on deliverables, because the people of Europe, from my country and from even my region, are waiting for trade to deliver the real boost that Europe needs in growth and jobs so that we can get out of the crisis that we have found ourselves in. In fact my region and my country have depended on the trade that we have done outside of the EU in order to build up again and recover our economy. So I would like to ask you about your commitment to delivering, with the powers that you have been given to deliver for Europe on those agreements that are deliverable soon.

So, what priority are you going to put in place? When is Singapore going to come before us, and what is next on the list? How are you balancing what you can deliver in the short term, given the very protracted nature of these negotiations? How will you balance that, with the resources you have, also with our long-term goals that we have in terms of more ambitious trade agreements?

1-016

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner-designate. > That is an extremely good question and difficult to answer because when we negotiate trade agreements we can provide for all the tools that open up markets; that facilitate, that do away with red tape and tariffs. But then of course it is for the companies to use them, and when exactly you see the result of this is difficult to measure. But we have already started to see concrete results from the Korea agreement, for instance, and statistically you can measure increase in trade from that. I am also convinced about the Canadian agreement, which will be brought to you sometime in spring next year, because it takes time to do the legal scrubbing, the translation and so on.

And I am committed that the US agreement is a comprehensive agreement that really includes everything – most of it – that we have in the mandate there, to make sure not only about tariffs but noting that overall what can really contribute to growth would be to get rid of the regulatories and ease the red tape that is making life difficult for so many SMEs in Europe as well.

Because you are absolutely right: trade is a powerful instrument for growth both for Europe – many countries are totally dependent on growth – but also globally. That is why, in parallel with the agreements that we are negotiating and about to finalise, we must also make sure that we can bring the rest of the world into this in the multilateral system and see if there is any chance to make sure that we can follow on the Doha Agenda as agreed.

1-017

Emma McClarkin (ECR). – I would like to press upon you the need to deliver that to the people as fast as we possibly can. They need that boost and they need those jobs.

I would also like to say that, whilst you have the powers to negotiate and there is need for a confidence in you in using and exercising those powers in making our trade agreements, we need also to make sure the implementation of those and the enforcement of them has a similar confidence. The European economy has been built on our ideas, and our creative industries need to know that their intellectual property rights are going to be protected and enforced with our trading partners. So what are you going to do to reinforce IPR rights within our trade agreements to make sure that we have the confidence, when we do trade with people, that they will be protected?

1-018

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner-designate. > I absolutely agree and that is why trade is part of a bigger agenda. President-elect Juncker has been very clear on that, wanting the Commission to work

in a slightly different way so that trade is part, not only of foreign policy, but also very much part of our general aim to put the economy back on track. I would work closely with Vice-President Katainen and other colleagues to make sure that trade can complement the other reforms that we make – in our internal market for instance – and to make sure that it boosts all the reform and is not seen as a separate issue.

You are right that evaluation, follow-up and monitoring of existing agreements is extremely important in EPR but also in other areas, to make sure that, once we have agreed that it is also actually functioning, we will commit a lot to monitoring and evaluation. I am prepared to share all that with the European Parliament as we go on with this in the coming time.

1-019

Marietje Schaake (ALDE), – Commissioner-designate, you are applying for a difficult job. I think that the confusion over TTIP and the discussion about ISDS, especially last weekend, was a confirmation of that. I think it is good that you admitted that a mistake was made in the version of the letter that was sent out. It is rare in politics to admit mistakes and I think that this is admirable, especially as it was very clear who was responsible for the last-minute changes and for sending your written answers to the European Parliament because these track-changes were left in the document that we received – I have it right here – by Martin Selmayr, who is the head of President Juncker's transition team. What these track-changes reveal, in addition perhaps to a proper understanding of the IT Word program, is how the confusion should be interpreted and who we should look for to receive clarification.

About ISDS: I too am very critical of it and still wonder whether we need it in TTIP. But the Commission has put out a public consultation to which more than 150 000 people replied. When can we expect the first assessment of this by your Commission and your DG, as this will be crucial in guiding the discussion forward?

1-020

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner designate. > Let me apologise for the confusion last Friday. The written questions were ready to send and I was asked whether I minded including a quote by President Juncker, which of course, I do not, but someone over-interpreted that quote a little bit and a wrong version was sent out. Immediately we tried to correct that, and that was sent to the Parliament at 3.04 on Friday and for different reasons, probably because of the stress, that came to you very late but I think I made my view on this very clear in the answer to Mr Martin.

You are perfectly right; there is a public consultation going on and more than 150 000 answers are being analysed right now. I think a first assessment more on a quantitative basis can come out very soon, but a more qualitative analysis I hope can be done before the year and, if I am confirmed, I am happy to come to the Committee on International Trade or a smaller group of interested parties,

depending on how the Chair wants to organise that, to go through and to discuss how we should put it forward.

I agree that there are problems with ISDS, as there have been abuses, but we must all recognise – many of you have worked with these issues for a long time – they exist. We cannot just think them away; there are thousands of them globally so we need to find a way to approach this. In some countries we need it more than others; in others not so much. It is a little bit too premature to say how we will do with the United States. I do not exclude the possibility that in the end they will not be there, but let us sit down, discuss, evaluate, talk to the different institutions on this and see how we can move on together during the beginning of this mandate.

1-021

Marietje Schaake (ALDE). – It is, I think, clear, especially with regard to trade, that transparency is the best medicine against confusion and leaked documents going round with questions about what the final texts would be. So what – and particularly how – can you commit to make sure that you will apply more – and especially maximum – transparency with regard to this House, with regard to access to documents, and also towards civil society, small and medium-sized enterprises and other stakeholders to make sure that the trade negotiations that we engage in benefit people, that they have a word in it and that we can apply maximum accountability throughout?

1-022

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner designate. > I think if we are going to win the hearts and minds of people for trade, and especially TTIP, we need to be much more transparent. A lot has been done, but more must be done as well, and that regards both making sure that the Members of the European Parliament – a broader group than today, possibly all interested Members – can have access to the documents that we normally share only with a limited group. I will sit with the Chair, if confirmed, to see exactly how we can find the modalities to do this in a confident way. But I think this is necessary so that the legislators can have full access and see that there are no secret deals going on there.

I also think we need to engage much more with the different stakeholders: businesses – small and big, but civil society, the different NGOs (who have a lot of interests here), consumer organisations. We have, of course, dialogues on-going with them on a technical level, but I would personally commit to meet them already before Christmas, but then on a regular basis to see how we can talk, and then also explore how we can put more documents concerning TTIP, that are already agreed, to a broader community. This, again, needs to be discussed in detail with the coordinators and the Chair. This is definitely a commitment, because we need to increase the transparency and we need to broaden the communication on this to address some of the concerns. There are also a lot of myths and misconceptions – they need to be addressed – but overall, make people feel that they are part of this; that they are part of a dialogue; that this is not something that is done by a few behind closed doors.

1-023

Helmut Scholz (GUE/NGL). – A new Commissioner is always an opportunity to hope for change and progress for all citizens in the EU28 and, regarding the Commissioner for International Trade, even globally from Quito, over Arusha to the province of Sichuan.

My short question to you, after the weekend and after what we have already discussed on the ISDS chapter and CETA, do you stick nevertheless to the announcement to reopen the CETA negotiations to provide for the opportunity to at least to get rid of the ISDS provisions which seem to be a tool of international trade from the last century and not of the 21st century? We also have to tackle the question with TTIP and the investment treaty with China.

1-024

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner-designate. > Coming back to the trade defence instruments: they exist, they are there. Most Member States have quite a lot of them in different bilateral agreements, so we need to address them. This Parliament has asked the Commission to make sure that we can have a European approach to this, which makes sure that we limit the abuse, that we state very clearly that every state has the right to regulate in the public interest when it comes to health, environmental standards, etc. that limits the abuse and makes sure that this is a transparent proceeding.

We have tried to do that in CETA. My predecessor tried to do that. I think we have come a very long way, and the German Government, which asked for an evaluation of this, is giving positive signs about the direction which CETA is taking. We can maybe go even further. We did not reach the whole way on appeal, for instance, and the Canadians are willing to engage with talks on this. But again, I think it would be a mistake to open up the Canadian agreement – the Canadians would not want to do that – and if we do because of the ISDS, they will open other chapters, and then the whole agreement is in danger. That would be a pity, because it is a very important agreement for Europe and for Canada.

When it comes to global trade and the labour, environmental and human rights standards, these things are very important to me as well. Can trade solve all of it? No, but it can definitely be a tool to do much more. As I said in answering another question, President Juncker wants us to work in a slightly different way. I will work with Vice-President and High Representative Federica Mogherini to see how trade can be better integrated in our foreign policy, where we have very clear goals to work towards – what you were just saying: fundamental rights, human rights, environmental standards, labour standards. Many of our agreements contain chapters on this – more and more – and I will be committed to make sure that all future agreements or upgrading of old agreements do contain sustainable chapters where we can address these issues with our partners.

1-025

Helmut Scholz (GUE/NGL). – So to be precise, do you then include binding dispute settlement procedures in the respective sustainable development chapters throughout the negotiating process, as well as necessary sanction regimes in the event that international conventions are violated?

1-026

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner designate. > In all our agreements there are sustainable development chapters and then there are specific provisions from the GSP+, for instance, and in EPA in order to make sure that we set up systems to handle agreements like this. To totally sanction or to suspend the whole agreement is of course the very last resort that should be avoided, because many other people will be victims of such a very strong nuclear weapon. There are mechanisms to involve obligatory experts, civil society, in sitting down and finding a way to handle the dispute. And, yes, I am committed to make sure that we make the maximum out of this and on a general basis evaluate this and in this regard engage with the Parliament.

1-027

Yannick Jadot (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, Madame Malmström, je suis derrière vous (*l'orateur se réfère au banc de la Présidence*), un peu au-dessus, pour quelques jours encore. Ne considérez-vous pas qu'aujourd'hui, un des grands problèmes de la politique en général, et notamment de la politique européenne, est la cohérence entre les discours qui sont tenus et, finalement, la façon dont on gère les choses dans la réalité? En ce qui concerne la question du règlement des différends entre investisseurs et États (ISDS), tout le monde à l'intérieur et à l'extérieur de ce Parlement a très bien compris ce que disait le président Juncker pendant les auditions des groupes politiques devant le Parlement européen, à savoir qu'il ne voulait pas d'ISDS et qu'il ne devait pas y avoir ce type de juridiction au-delà de nos juridictions nationales, ni aux États-Unis, ni en Europe. Nous sommes dans des républiques bananières sans juridiction nationale.

Aujourd'hui, finalement, à travers vos corrections dans votre courrier, vous faites une réponse totalement technocratique et incompréhensible pour les citoyens européens et pour bien la moitié de ce Parlement européen sur ce qu'est, aujourd'hui, votre position ou la position de Juncker sur ce sujet. Finalement, vous nous annoncez que cela va évoluer, que l'on va essayer d'améliorer un petit peu les choses et que c'est peut-être très positif. Ne considérez-vous pas qu'il y existe un vrai problème de politique européenne aujourd'hui en constatant un tel éloignement par rapport aux promesses faites maintenant que vous vous trouvez dans la réalité de la gestion?

1-028

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner designate. > I am sorry if you perceived my answer as very technocratic. I tried to quote President-elect Juncker – he has made it very clear that he does not accept ISDS if they do not fully preserve our right to regulate in the public interest; that they are not fully transparent; and if they do not include clear definitions of concepts like fair and equitable treatment, and I agree with that.

Is there a way to find a balance between the legitimate interest of investors' and states' right to legislate and to protect their citizens, and is there a way to find a way that we can solve disputes when they occur? Normally it should go to the court, of course, but we know that there are cases when that does not work, because national courts are bound by national legislation, not international trade agreements. This is a problem in many counties of the world, and we have seen the result in Venezuela, in Zimbabwe, in Argentina, but we also have nine bilateral investment agreements with the US and eight with Canada. They will not disappear.

So how do we address them to make sure that they are fair, that they are transparent, that they are not abused? Well, we have come a long way with Canada. Is it enough? I do not know – let us discuss that together. We have a public consultation going on. But it is certainly a very important way towards more transparency and limiting the possibility to abuse but still leaving, as a last resort, a way to handle this dispute. That is why I think it is consistent with the European Union's ambitions to try, in a

comprehensive way, to address complicated matters. We will sit down together with you and the Council and see how we can move on. Will it stay in TTIP? I do not know. Maybe not, but it is a little bit too early to judge upon that. We need to discuss with Parliament and the Member States, who unanimously said that this will be dealt with in TTIP, and also to take into account what possibly can come out of the public consultation, to see if we can move it further. Because the problem of ISDS is there – it will not disappear just because we today make a decision or not on the United States.

1-029

Yannick Jadot (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, Madame Malmström, justement, puisque la question du traité transatlantique, la question du traité avec le Canada et la question de l'investissement sont aujourd'hui largement dans le débat public, puisqu'il y a un débat au sein du Conseil et un débat au sein du Parlement, ne serait-il pas temps de faire une pause sur ce que vous appelez un agenda très ambitieux – et ce que j'appelle, moi, une fuite en avant – pour la stratégie commerciale de l'Union européenne? Quelle est notre place dans la globalisation et quels sont les outils que nous déterminons en commun pour garantir cette place dans la globalisation?

Ne serait-il pas temps qu'il y ait une vraie évaluation de ces négociations – vous l'avez dit – sur l'accord avec le Canada, sur l'accord avec les États-Unis, sur l'accord avec les pays du Sud, qui sont parfois terribles pour ces pays du Sud? Ne serait-il pas temps, une nouvelle fois, de voir quelles ont été les conséquences réelles des accords passés? Cela ne sert à rien de nous dire que cela a créé des millions d'emplois, nous n'en avons pas la preuve.

Aujourd'hui, la situation de l'Europe est plus dramatique que positive. Aussi, ne serait-il pas temps, encore une fois, qu'il y ait un grand débat européen dans toutes les institutions sur la stratégie commerciale à adopter?

1-030

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner designate. > I am always open to debate and evaluation on any subject and would certainly be so in this regard as well, but we might not share the same point of departure here. I am convinced that trade is a very powerful tool to get out of the economic crisis, both for Europe and for the rest of the world. No country in the world has come out of poverty without engaging in trade, so this is a way for us to pursue our European, our national and our international agenda. Exactly how should we do it? Of course, we should always discuss, and you – together with the Council – are the legislators here. We should always evaluate; we should always monitor very closely what we do and analyse the positive effects and the possible negative effects. But to take a break in our trade agenda right now? I do not think that is on the agenda.

1-031

William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFDD). – I am going to ask a question which relates to the United Kingdom, which I have the honour to represent. In the United Kingdom, an in-out referendum may not happen, but it is certainly fully on the political agenda and within the term of the Commissioner's term of office. So, in the event that the UK votes to leave the European Union, would

you, as a Commissioner, then favour some kind of retaliations in trade, a trade war, which regrettably, as we have just seen, many MEPs and Commissioners support – and, by the way, such a trade war would be entirely against the rules of the World Trade Organisation and contrary to the multilateral system – or would you, as Commissioner for Trade, support and fully politically back a new UK-EU trade agreement after the UK leaves?

1-032

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner-designate. > Well, first of all let me hope that the United Kingdom stays with us in the European family: we want you and we need you, and we hope that your citizens can be convinced that this is a good thing for you as well. Should you, the British people, in a possible referendum choose to leave the European Union, then let us deal with the consequences then. I am not in a position today to promise any strategy back and forth on this. It is not really in the European tradition to seek trade wars; we are trying to find ways to amicably deal with disputes. But I am not going into hypothetical discussions on the possible consequence of a referendum that we do not know will take place if and when.

1-033

William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFDD). – I would first of all say that these are hearings. This is the one opportunity that we have in the course of a proposed five-year term to ask questions. Simply to give an evasive politician's answer is just totally contemptuous of this committee and of these hearings.

(Murmurs of dissent)

I am sorry that you do not agree, but I have asked a question and it has just been ludicrously, overtly evaded. So I will ask another question.

You describe trade as a powerful tool to get out of the economic crisis. Would you then confirm that you as Trade Commissioner would support a new UK-EU trade agreement so that all the trade between the UK and the EU continues? And I am going to ask you politely, but firmly, not to grossly evade the question, which you have just done.

1-034

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner-designate. > I will have to graciously evade that question, because it is not in my power to answer such a hypothetical question. I hope that you and your people will stay with the European Union. If you choose not to, well then we will have to address this issue and many, many others, and I am certainly not in a position to give the answers to that now.

(Applause)

1-035

Chair. – We are moving on to further questions but this time without the possibility of asking additional questions. Members are limited to a one-minute question and the Commissioner-designate to a two-minute answer.

1-036

Tokia Saïfi (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire désignée. La situation dramatique de l'emploi en Europe nécessite de placer, enfin, le principe de réciprocité au cœur de notre stratégie commerciale. Avec, par exemple, des marchés publics ouverts à 85 % contre 32 % aux États-Unis, l'Europe donne l'impression, au mieux, de chercher à être le meilleur élève de la mondialisation et, au pire, de faire preuve d'une coupable naïveté économique. Soumises à cette véritable concurrence déloyale, nos entreprises ne peuvent pas lutter à armes égales.

Madame Malmström, première question: partagez-vous cette analyse, selon laquelle l'ouverture du marché européen, sans contrepartie équivalente, présente un coût disproportionné par rapport aux avantages retirés?

Deuxième question: la Commission va-t-elle enfin passer aux actes pour faire de la réciprocité, exigée d'ailleurs dès le Conseil européen du 16 septembre 2010, une condition sine qua non de la conclusion d'accords commerciaux?

1-037

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner-designate. > The establishment of free trade agreements is a means in itself to make sure that there is reciprocity. Europe is traditionally a very open market. It is more open than most and probably the most open market in the world. That has basically been very good for us. It has led to new possibilities, new investment, growth and possibilities for small and big companies. That has been good for citizens and consumers.

If there is a lack of reciprocity, the way for me, if I am concerned, would rather be to try to open other markets than to close our own. This is what we intend to do with the free trade association agreements. It is true that there is some lack of reciprocity with some of the less developed countries in the world where we give them possibilities in an asymmetric way that has very little impact on our economy but is important for them.

We will of course make sure that the reciprocity is there. We have different instruments at our disposal. We are also working with an increased strategy on market access instruments to make sure that we give the correct picture to our companies to make sure what rules and what bureaucracies there are. We also have a website on this that is used by almost 4 000 companies or individuals per day. We will certainly try to pursue that agenda, but to close our own markets as a response to this

would only be legitimate if there is a series of concrete abuse here. I do not share your view that there is a systematic lack of reciprocity in our trade agreements.

1-038

Victor Bo tinaru (S&D). – From my last mandate experience, me and my group believe that we have to give more coherence and strength to the EU's global external action. Therefore, it is very important to have better coordination horizontally between the EU foreign affairs and its trade policy, which is one of our main foreign affairs instruments when acting globally.

Do you agree, and how do you intend to work closely and effectively with our High Representative? I will kindly ask you to give us not a vague political answer but state how you imagine practising the coordination with the High Representative.

1-039

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner-designate. > I fully understand the honourable Member's willingness to have very concrete commitments, but you must also understand that this Commission is not confirmed yet. We have not started working. I can only outline how I think it will work. I fully agree with your assessment that trade must be – even better than today – incorporated in a foreign policy agenda. President-elect Juncker has asked us explicitly to do that. He has set up a RELEX group, headed by Federica Mogherini and sometimes even by himself, to make sure that she, the Commissioner for Development, the Commissioner for Migration (when appropriate), me, the Commissioner for Enlargement, and others work much closer together in order to make sure that, for instance, for countries where we have a partnership agreement, trade and our ambitions to work on democracy, on fundamental rights, on good governance, on trade access, of course, but also issues related to development, migration, etc., are much more coordinated than today, that there is no seesaw mentality between interior and exterior that unfortunately has influenced our and many other governments, which are hindered by this old-fashioned mentality.

I will certainly do my part to make sure that this can happen, not least with our very ambitious agenda for the least-developed countries that we want to get on board, but also when it comes to our neighbourhood and others. We will sit together, under the supervision of the President himself but also with Vice-President Mogherini, and I can imagine that we will have regular meetings and stocktakings on that. That is why it is very important that the European Parliament – of course also between the committees (it is not for me to tell you how to work) – but that we can have broader cooperation for the whole range of partnership and cooperation – including trade – with some of our key partners.

1-040

Jan Zahradil (ECR). – I have a very concrete question on our EU trade relations with one particular region which is Asia, and more particularly south-east Asia and ASEAN countries and even more particularly three partners: Vietnam, China but also, last but not least, Taiwan. How would you

promote strengthening of our trade and investment relations and all these ongoing negotiations with those three countries?

1-041

Cecilia Malmström, *Commissioner designate*. > To start with that it would of course be fantastic if we could agree on an agreement between EU and ASEAN. That is the ultimate goal but for the moment, as you know so well, that is not possible. So we need to work with those where we can. China is an important but complicated partner. The priority there will first of all be to make sure that we complete our investment agreement with them. That is the priority with China.

When that is done we will see how we can pursue other possible agreements and I think we need to see Taiwan in that light as well. We have good relations with Taiwan. As Commissioner for Home Affairs one of the first things I decided upon and got through the system was to eliminate the visa with Taiwan, which proved to be a very important boost for tourism, for instance. But I think that how we advance with the investment agreement with China needs to be looked at. On Vietnam we are almost there; we are quite advanced in our agreement with them; not done yet, but I hope that can be concluded in not too long a time. And these are all three of course very different but very important agreements.

1-042

Marielle de Sarnez (ALDE). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire désignée, les temps changent et c'est heureux! Aujourd'hui, la politique commerciale est devenue affaire de peuple et d'opinion publique; il faut vraiment que la Commission l'accepte et assume en conséquence des changements de fond. C'est très important. J'en vois quatre, pour ma part.

Il y a un besoin vital de transparence et, de ce point de vue, il est extrêmement choquant qu'un accord UE-Canada ait été signé vendredi dernier sans même que les résultats de la consultation publique qui a été lancée soient connus, et sans même que nous sachions si cet accord était mixte. Premier point.

Deuxièmement, il y a un besoin vital que l'Europe soit, au fond, à armes égales avec ses principaux partenaires. Il nous faut donc renforcer nos instruments de défense commerciale et avoir une vraie politique de soutien à nos propres entreprises.

Nous devons également faire respecter la souveraineté européenne et donc, selon moi, refuser qu'il y ait demain des tribunaux d'arbitrage qui s'imposent et qui soient au-dessus de nos lois.

Enfin, nous avons besoin de cohérence. Je veux rappeler que, au moment où nous essayions de nous défendre contre les panneaux photovoltaïques chinois, la BEI était en train de financer les mêmes producteurs chinois qui les fabriquaient.

J'aimerais, Madame la Commissaire, entendre votre point de vue sur ces quatre points.

1-043

Cecilia Malmström, *Commissaire désignée*. > Monsieur le Président, je suis tout à fait d'accord qu'il faut plus de transparence au sujet du TTIP, mais aussi dans toute la politique commerciale si l'on veut garantir, comme je l'ai dit dans mon introduction, la légitimité de cet accord et un dialogue avec les citoyens, qui constitue un élément essentiel pour que cet accord soit accepté. J'ai aussi déclaré que j'étais prête à discuter avec vous – le président et les coordinateurs – pour déterminer comment nous pouvons obtenir plus de transparence et transmettre les documents, etc.

En ce qui concerne le Canada, l'accord a été publié vendredi dernier et a été envoyé à tous les coordinateurs de cette commission début août. Quant à savoir s'il s'agit d'un accord mixte ou pas, c'est une discussion qui mérite d'être approfondie. On ne pourra le déterminer que lorsque le *legal scrubbing* sera terminé. Je constate aussi que le Conseil a tendance à déclarer à l'avance que tous les accords sont mixtes, ce qui complique un peu notre tâche. Nous aurons intérêt à essayer de clarifier le traité à cet égard.

Le commissaire actuel, M. Karel de Gucht, vous a proposé des moyens de moderniser les instruments de défense commerciale afin de les rendre plus efficaces, plus précis et plus transparents. C'est une discussion qui se tient au sein de cette commission et aussi au sein du Conseil, où je comprends qu'elle traîne un peu, même si j'aurais aussi espéré qu'elle avance.

Cohérence – oui tout à fait – je suis d'accord qu'il faut plus de cohérence ici. C'est pour cela qu'il nous faut des instruments de défense commerciale qui soient pointus, efficaces, et tels que nous n'hésiterons pas à les utiliser. Le problème est que s'il y a vraiment un conflit et que l'on utilise le système de l'arbitrage de l'OMC, par exemple, cela va prendre du temps. Il nous faudra des mois et des mois pour réunir toutes les preuves et tous les documents. C'est nécessaire pour une question de légitimité, mais cela rend encore plus nécessaire de disposer rapidement d'instruments complémentaires et de moderniser les instruments que nous avons déjà.

J'espère que nous pourrons discuter de ces questions et je sais que la présidence italienne veut avancer sur ce sujet des instruments de défense et que nous pourrons examiner les modalités de leur utilisation d'une manière plus précise.

1-044

Anne-Marie Mineur (GUE/NGL). – Goedemiddag, mevrouw Malmström. De Europese Commissie zegt dat de vrijhandelsverdragen ons veel handel en miljoenen banen zullen opleveren. Maar als je het CEPR-rapport goed leest dan blijkt dat 1,3 miljoen Europeanen hun baan juist zullen verliezen. Uit een rapport van de OESO blijkt dat de Noord-Amerikaanse Vrijhandelsovereenkomst NAFTA, 20 jaar oud, alleen maar geleid heeft tot werkloosheid, arbeidsonzekerheid en dalende lonen. Hoeveel mensen zullen hun banen verliezen door deze vrijhandelsverdragen? En wat gaat u in de vrijhandelsverdragen regelen om te voorkomen dat mensen hun arbeidszekerheid verliezen?

Een ander zorgwekkend punt is dat de enorme winsten die ons worden voorgespiegeld, alleen behaald kunnen worden door het afschaffen van non-tarifaire beperkingen, beperkingen die de volksgezondheid en het milieu beschermen. De enige uitzondering die gemaakt is heeft betrekking op de audiovisuele sector. Bent u van plan om nog meer non-tarifaire beperkingen af te schaffen en zo ja, welke? En tot slot, kunt u garanderen dat dit niet de privacyverordening in gevaar brengt?

1-045

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner-designate. > Yes, not only me but a lot of experts, economists, academics, professors and think tanks – both European and global – are of the firm conviction, and can also prove, that trade is positive for the economy. Of course it has to be encompassed with certain rules and follow a general growth and economic agenda. This is very important for this Commission, and it will be very important for the coming Commission as well.

Competition is a good thing. We would be naive if we did not think that there would also be – at least part of the time – a few groups not included in that growth, and this is of course something we need to address. We have the Globalisation Adjustment Fund – we can support that – and there are other means to ensure that those who are not immediately touched by the advantages of trade agreements are being compensated. We will look into that.

Neither in TTIP nor in any other agreement will we agree to lower standards. The audiovisual sector is out of TTIP. It is out of all our agreements. It is an exception. I also want to state here very clearly that it is not about lowering any standards when it comes to consumer protection, environmental or health. We will remain dedicated to defending the rules that we have here in Europe and will not lower them. The proof of the pudding will be if we deliver an agreement that shows this to you, because you ultimately will have to agree upon it. But we will not sacrifice the European model for the benefit of free trade. This is a commitment that President Juncker has made and that I can make here. The former Commission and the future Commission will do that. They are not part of the agreement.

1-046

Ska Keller (Verts/ALE). – Already I now have more clarity about these two different versions of your written answers. That is very interesting, and thanks for pointing that out, Marita, earlier. But I do still wonder: is the original version then what you actually think, and then are you in disagreement

there with Commission President Juncker about what should happen with ISDS? What is your actual take on that, and what are you going to fight for, and from which direction?

My actual question is about something that the Commission committed itself to in 2012: namely, to have human rights dimensions inserted in all its impact assessments with trade agreements that have significant economic, social and environmental impacts. The Commission has so far failed to do this human rights impact assessment. Will you commit to do this human rights impact assessment, and will you also commit to follow the methodology proposed by the UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food, Mr De Schutter, so that we can actually have good human rights impact assessments?

1-047

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner-designate. > I am not in disagreement at all with President-elect Juncker. In the written answers there was an inclusion of his quote, what he said on 15 July in the European Parliament, but by mistake there was an additional sentence added that was not part of his quote, so he and I agreed that there are several problems with the agreements as they exist today, and I think we have elaborated quite a lot of them. Is there a way to find a way to protect the investors? We invest for billions and billions not only in Europe but in the world. There needs to be some protection for illegal expatriation or for discrimination or for failure to access the normal course.

This is generally not a problem with our Western partners, but we have some cases and there are bilateral agreements – eight in the US, nine in Canada – so we need to address them. A better way than to have murky bilateral agreements would be to have transparent, open, limited in scope European agreements. I think we can agree to that, though as a general principle.

Then have we managed to find the exact balance in CETA? I think we are very far on our way. Many of the concerns that I have heard are actually addressed in the way we deal with it in CETA. Can we do more? Possibly. Does this mean that we will apply the CETA model in TTIP? Well, first of all we are not that advanced with TTIP, so that has been frozen. It is possible that is not possible, but it is a little bit too premature to make that decision. We need to have a dialogue with you and with the Council and listen to the public consultation and see how that develops, but I am sure we will come back to this if I am confirmed, already before Christmas and see how we can move further.

On the human rights impact assessment, yes, in all our new agreements and all the other later agreements, we have impact assessment where we take human rights, environmental standards, labour rights as a whole and we try more and more as a response to questions on coherence to do that in relation to partnership agreements. We also have binding commitments in the GSP+ with twelve or thirteen countries. We will evaluate them and come back to the Parliament next year and we are of course looking forward to you providing input to that.

We can probably do more on this, and we have some old agreements where it has not been the same case so, when we upgrade them, we will make sure that we also have a larger ambition on this. Exactly what model to use? I know that has been proposed by the special rapporteur. There are also others circulating. I am not willing today to make any commitment on that. As I said, we try to include them in the general impact assessment with environmental and labour standards, to have a broader view on this and we should not create a parallel system, but we need to make sure that we enforce the current systems that we have.

1-048

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (EFDD). – Signora Commissario, come lei ben sa, nel 2016 decadrà un fondamentale paragrafo contenuto nel protocollo di adesione della Cina al WTO, per cui non sarà più possibile presumere, in via automatica, che il mercato cinese sia una *non-market economy*. Da allora ci troveremo in una situazione di inversione dell'onere della prova: toccherà cioè all'UE dimostrare lo stato di non economia di mercato della situazione cinese. In altre parole, l'UE potrà continuare a non riconoscere alla Cina lo status di economia non di mercato, ma per continuare a trattare la Cina come una *non-market economy* dovrà dimostrarlo.

La proposta di modernizzazione degli strumenti di difesa commerciale non sembra, a nostro avviso, tener conto in maniera adeguata dei prossimi scenari. Poiché prevenire è sempre meglio che curare, e considerati gli importanti effetti che si avranno per i nostri operatori economici a partire dal 2016 a seguito di questa vicenda, le chiederei di illustrarci quali strategie intende mettere in campo sul piano sia economico che giuridico che di negoziazione commerciale.

1-049

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner-designate. > If you refer to the issue of the market economy status of China, as you said there is this timetable. This is in a way a purely technical exercise. There are criteria there. Today China does not fulfil all these criteria. Will they do so in time for us to make that decision to keep the 2016 timetable? This is one of the first decisions the new Commission will have to take. We will have to look at where we are, where China is and to make a joint decision in the College. That decision will follow possible amendments proposed to the Parliament so I can assure you that you will be fully engaged in that process.

1-050

Matteo Salvini (NI). – Desidero formulare tre domande. Uno: stiamo dialogando con i paesi di mezzo mondo e facciamo sanzioni economiche contro la Russia, che solo in agricoltura ci costeranno cinque miliardi di euro e migliaia di licenziamenti. Qual è il suo approccio nei confronti di un'iniziativa, a mio avviso demenziale, come quella delle sanzioni economiche nei confronti della Russia?

Due: questa commissione in passato ha agevolato solo le multinazionali e gli importatori. Magari non è un problema sentito in Svezia. Le faccio due esempi, su cui chiedo due risposte. Uno: l'accordo di libero scambio per la frutta e la verdura e la pesca dal Marocco ha sacrificato migliaia di posti di

lavoro in Italia e nei paesi del Mediterraneo e ha bloccato le importazioni di alcuni prodotti perché pericolosi – penso ai pomodori ritirati in Francia e in Repubblica ceca nello scorso giugno. Due: l'aver tolto i dazi dal riso che arriva dalla Cambogia significa sterminare un intero settore produttivo come quello del riso; in Italia hanno chiuso la metà delle superfici coltivate a riso e siamo passati da seimila tonnellate importate dalla Cambogia a duecentomila l'anno scorso, con buona pace anche della salute dei consumatori europei visto che gli standard igienico-sanitari non sono assolutamente rispettati.

1-051

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner-designate. > I am not totally clear about what the actual question was here. But starting with the Russia sanction: you might think it is crazy, but this is something that the European Council has agreed upon, to make sure that the behaviour of Russia is not acceptable. The invasion of a sovereign country will have to have consequences, and the European Council – our Prime Ministers – has agreed on a set of different categories of sanction, and this is one of them. Whether they will be expanded or changed in the future is a decision for the European Council, depending very much also on developments in Ukraine.

On tomatoes and rice, you quoted a lot of figures. I cannot possibly comment on that, but I agree with you that the working conditions in Cambodia are problematic. This is something we are trying to assess within our agreements with that particular country and see if we can have a dialogue to improve the labour conditions there.

1-052

Jarosław Leszek Wałsa (PPE). – Let us return to TTIP again, but in the context of policy coherence. How do you see it possible for the EU to profit from an agreement that abolishes customs duties on imports of products from the country which has such a huge competitive advantage in energy costs especially, while we simultaneously implement policies like ETS or a climate package, which results in higher energy prices? That is one question.

Another question: Commissioner De Gucht vigorously promoted, with his US counterparts, the issue of streamlining the SPS acceptance procedures for European fruit and vegetables, both in the context of the current Russian embargo but also the systematic issue for TTIP, because these procedures are very important. Will you keep this matter as your priority?

1-053

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner-designate. > Starting with your last question, I have no intention to change the policy of Commissioner de Gucht in this; I have to look more carefully at this. This is an area I am not very familiar with – I have had a very short time to prepare for this hearing. So you will forgive me if I need to come back to answer that a little bit later.

When it comes to the energy situation, the main discussions on energy and on climate are under the auspices of the United Nations, where the European Union is pushing very hard to get an agreement in

Paris later this spring. This must be the main forum of negotiations, so trade cannot solve that issue. It is true that the Americans have a different policy on this, and we cannot change that by trade only. But we can make sure that we take away unfair competition – that is why we want to include energy as a chapter in the TTIP Agreement. This will be a difficult chapter, but we need to make sure that we take away the hindrances, and then it will be up to the Member States, of course, if they want to make use of it. Energy, by the way, is one of the priorities of President-elect Juncker, to make sure that we diversify and have a more coherent energy policy in general in the European Union. TTIP is only one small part of that, of course.

1-054

Inmaculada Rodríguez-Piñero Fernández (S&D). – Señor Presidente, señora Malmström, le agradezco su exposición inicial y sus respuestas, y confío en su colaboración permanente con el Parlamento si es designada. Comparto su apuesta por la multilateralidad, pero también, dadas las dificultades, la necesidad de impulsar acuerdos de libre comercio.

En este sentido, me gustaría que respondiera a las siguientes preguntas:

¿Qué prioridad otorgaría a las negociaciones con América Latina y, en particular, a la renovación del Acuerdo comercial con México? Me preocupa que no haya habido ninguna referencia a América Latina en el futuro de las relaciones comerciales.

También querría saber cuál es su posición respecto al futuro acuerdo de inversiones con China; cuál es su nivel de ambición en estos acuerdos y si, en aras de la transparencia, estaría dispuesta a hacer lo mismo que se ha venido haciendo en las negociaciones del ATCI respecto a informarnos en el Parlamento antes y después de cada ronda de negociación.

Y, por otro lado, teniendo en cuenta los acuerdos de libre comercio y la importancia que tienen para el desarrollo, ¿qué mecanismos específicos haría para la evaluación de las medidas de protección?

1-055

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner-designate. > It is true and I apologise. I have not mentioned Latin America at all. Having an agreement with Mercosur would of course be fantastic. It has great potential. An untapped market would be good for us and them, but it is a very protective market and so far we have not found ways to advance in our negotiations.

With Mexico it is a priority. We have an old agreement with Mexico. There is an agreement between the European Union and Mexico that we should upgrade it. We are, right now, in a so-called scoping exercise to see what can be done and what are the different ambitions from both sides. I cannot give

you an exact timetable but I do not exclude that by next year we can start asking for a mandate to do that. We are in a similar exercise with Chile. Maybe it will take a little longer but this is also clearly a priority.

On China, as I said, the trade investment agreement is the most important there. Before that is done I do not think we can embark on any other type of negotiations directly with China. Should we do so, this would of course merit a very careful assessment and discussion with the Parliament and I can assure you that you will be involved in that.

1-056

Joachim Starbatty (ECR). – Frau Malmström! Für einen Ökonomen ist der Freihandelsteil des TTIP-Abkommens nicht so wichtig wie das Schiedsgericht und der Investitionsschutz. Man kann beim Freihandel nur noch marginale Erfolge erzielen. Entscheidend ist die Idee, dass mit dem Investitionsschutzabkommen ein binnenmarktähnlicher Zustand geschaffen werden soll. Daraus werden auch die Arbeitsplätze resultieren. Daher haben Ökonomen keine Schwierigkeiten mit dem Investitionsschutzabkommen, sondern der Widerstand kommt aus der Bevölkerung. Das ist ganz eindeutig: Wer Vorträge über TTIP in Deutschland gehalten hat – obwohl wir ja vom Welthandel profitieren –, sieht, wie stark der Widerstand gegen dieses Investitionsschutzabkommen war. Auch die Reaktion der Kommission verstehe ich, dass das politisch begründet war.

Die Frage ist natürlich jetzt: Ist es ein abgespecktes Investitionsabkommen, das Sie machen? Auf welcher Ebene wollen Sie es durchziehen? Wie ist es mit unseren amerikanischen Partnern, werden die da mitziehen?

1-057

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner-designate. > Both the Americans and the Europeans want an ambitious TTIP. That means covering the whole range: public procurement, tariffs, regulatory services, also on energy etc., so we want to have a very broad agreement. This is their ambition, that is our ambition reflected in our negotiating mandate and this is what we will aim for. I think it would make no use to have a very limited agreement but to try to have it as broad as possible.

Having said that, it will of course be a living agreement. It will have to be renovated and updated all the time but the aim is clearly that it should be broad and ambitious in order for us to have those gains and profits that you refer to, but again of course we need to make sure on behalf of the citizens of Europe. That is our responsibility but there is also criticism in the US from the citizen side that we increase the transparency, that we increase the dialogue and make sure that there is no hidden agenda here, and that we take the concerns seriously and try to work together with people, because otherwise we will never have that agreement.

1-058

Alexander Graf Lambsdorff (ALDE). – Frau Malmström! Auch zum Investorenschutz: Wir haben hier eine ganz interessante Situation gehabt: Sigmar Gabriel, der deutsche Bundeswirtschaftsminister, hat den deutschen Europaabgeordneten einen Brief geschrieben, in dem er sich ausgesprochen lobend über den Investitionsschutz im CETA-Abkommen geäußert hat: „Der gesetzgeberische Handlungsspielraum zum Schutz öffentlicher Interessen wie nationale Sicherheit, Umwelt, öffentliche Gesundheit ist damit gewahrt.“ Es gibt also keinen Grund, das kanadische Abkommen auseinanderzupflücken. Ich glaube, das sollte man hier verstehen.

Ganz konkret: Sehen Sie es auch so, Frau Kommissarin, dass gerade der Mittelstand von Investitionsschutz profitiert? Großkonzerne können sich Anwälte leisten, können lange Verfahren durchlaufen. Aber für den Mittelstand sind schnelle und klare Konfliktregelungen besonders wichtig.

Ein ganz anderes Thema: Der Staat Washington in den USA hat Boeing eine Subvention von sage und schreibe 8,7 Mrd. Dollar gewährt. Was tut die Kommission dagegen, damit unser europäischer Champion Airbus nicht untergeht?

1-059

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner-designate. > On CETA I agree with you: we have achieved a lot there that will protect investments and that will limit abuse and make sure that we have a very fair and transparent procedure. It would be unfortunate to take out the ISDS part of the Canadian agreement because it is a good agreement, and if we start to dismantle it I am afraid that it will fall totally, and that would really be a pity because it is a good agreement. Of course, clear rules – transparent rules – and few possibilities of arbitrary interpretation is always more beneficial to small and medium-sized companies than big companies, because they have other resources. On the Boeing and Airbus dispute, I think we need to come back to that. I am not ready to sit here and discuss the different strategies – we have dispute ongoings, and we will have to look into that more precisely.

1-060

Eleonora Forenza (GUE/NGL). – Servizi pubblici e beni comuni fondamentali come l'acqua, la salute, l'istruzione e la raccolta dei rifiuti sono elementi fondamentali di una società più giusta e inclusiva e, per noi del gruppo GUE, garantirne in maniera efficace l'accesso a tutti i cittadini è una priorità irrinunciabile. Quindi chiedo alla Commissaria designata qual è la sua opinione sull'introduzione nei negoziati futuri, soprattutto su dossier come TTIP, TISA e CETA, di clausole che prevedano la privatizzazione di beni comuni e servizi pubblici fondamentali come l'acqua, la sanità e l'istruzione. Cosa pensa, per quanto riguarda i negoziati TISA e TTIP, del *negative list approach*, che prevede la liberalizzazione orizzontale di tutti i servizi non esplicitamente esclusi? Chiedo se può garantire a questa commissione che verrà esclusa qualsiasi possibilità per gli investitori di perseguire attraverso l'arbitrato dell'ISDS gli enti locali che decidono di ripubblicizzare la gestione di beni comuni come l'acqua. Infine, riguardo al settore finanziario, le chiedo se lei pensa che sia importante preservare nei futuri negoziati le prerogative degli Stati membri di regolare il settore a partire dal contrasto al riciclaggio e ai paradisi fiscali.

1-061

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner designate. > I agree with you. It is extremely important that Member States retain their possibility to regulate in public services: school, health, waste, as you said, but also when it comes to water procurement or delivery – and that is excluded from TTIP. It is excluded from all our free trade agreements. I have never heard of any WTO member engaging in trying to trade the water management in any agreement. So that is protected and it will remain protected.

1-062

Yannick Jadot (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, Madame Malmström, c'est assez intéressant: la Commission, depuis plusieurs jours, voire plusieurs semaines, nous explique que le volet ISDS du CETA n'est pas très bon parce qu'elle n'a pas eu le temps d'intégrer le débat politique tel qu'il existe aujourd'hui, et c'est finalement la nouvelle Commission qui vient pour dire que cet accord est excellent. C'est un petit peu surprenant.

Mais ma question porte sur le principe de précaution. L'Europe défend le principe de précaution. C'est un principe essentiel pour la question de la santé, pour la question de l'environnement, pour bien des sujets. Est-ce que vous êtes prête à vous battre pour que, dans l'article SPS des différents accords, il y ait explicitement le principe de précaution, que ce soit avec le Canada, si c'est rouvert, ou avec les États-Unis?

1-063

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner-designate. > I think it depends on what you mean by the precautionary principle, but yes, we are ready to include it in the ISDS. It is in the Canadian one that national and local legislators have the right to legislate to protect the public interest, and this is not something that an ISDS can reveal. In the general agreements with TTIP, CETA and others, we are based very much on the precautionary principle in that things are not allowed in the European Union, such as hormone beef or certain GMOs, that are not certified by EFSA. They will also not be allowed to be imported.

1-064

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (EFDD). – L'industria del falso e della contraffazione è un fenomeno di prima grandezza nell'economia mondiale e coinvolge tutti i paesi, siano essi produttori o consumatori di beni contraffatti. Per molto tempo in Europa soltanto l'Italia si è preoccupata di difendere le produzioni dalle falsificazioni, non solo dei brand ma anche contrastando le false indicazioni di origine che sono anch'esse delle vere e proprie falsificazioni.

Continuiamo ad aprire i nostri mercati ai grandi competitori economici, come il Canada o gli Stati Uniti, ma non siamo ancora stati in grado di creare un meccanismo di controllo all'origine di tali merci, bloccati dal mancato interesse di paesi come purtroppo il suo, signora Commissario, dove non si è ancora capito che senza la manifattura e la produzione non si potrà avere quell'Europa dei servizi tanto voluta dai banchieri.

Quali sono allora le sue proposte in merito? Come intende la Commissione creare degli strumenti effettivi di lotta alla contraffazione per la rinascita di un sistema industriale, manifatturiero che ha fatto la storia della nostra Europa? Come può metterci allo stesso livello di paesi come gli Stati Uniti, se ancora esiste una tale discrepanza normativa?

1-065

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner-designate. > Counterfeit goods are of course a very big problem globally, independent of trade, and this is something that we are looking into in different sectors. I have been looking into it under my responsibility as Commissioner for Home Affairs. We are also looking into it with different Commissioners when it comes to the internal market and economy and so on.

We should do more there, but it is prohibited because it is legal and it is legal in the trade agreements as well. Can we find ways in trade agreements with our partners, new mechanisms to fight it? Yes, possibly, because of course it is in everybody's interests that this is not part of the sort of the good trade that we want to have. So I disagree that we have not done anything. We have done a lot. There is European legislation, there is a commitment, and there are on-going consultations and communications.

We will have to come back to this but we have to do everything we can to make sure that this is not something that is boosted by trade agreements but rather there are new possibilities to fight it.

1-066

Franz Obermayr (NI). – Frau Malmström! Kommissar De Gucht hat zu den umstrittenen Investitionsschutzklauseln eine Konsultation eingeleitet. Frau Kommissarin, gedenken Sie die Ergebnisse überhaupt vorzulegen, eine parlamentarische Debatte dazu abzuhalten? Nach Ihren heutigen Äußerungen hier fürchte ich, das wird nicht der Fall sein. Und da der durchgepeitschte CETA-Text sehr wohl die strittigen Klauseln, die ISDS-Bestimmungen, enthält, frage ich mich, ob diese Konsultation nicht mehr ein Placebo-Tabletchen war, um die Bürger ein bisschen zu beruhigen, eine Show sozusagen.

Weiters würde mich interessieren, wie Sie als Handelskommissarin künftig mit dem Thema Lohn und Sozialdumping umgehen werden. Ein aktuelles Beispiel aus dem CETA-Abkommen: Kanada hat zentrale Punkte des IAO-Abkommens wie das Recht auf Kollektivverträge, Mindestalter der Beschäftigten nicht unterschrieben. Wie kann Europa sein Modell der sozialen Marktwirtschaft bewahren, wenn man die Einhaltung arbeitsrechtlicher Grundnormen im Handelsabkommen dann nicht durchsetzen kann?

1-067

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner-designate. > Regarding CETA, there was a meeting last Friday when the agreement as a whole was published. It had also been sent to Members before. That has now been politically concluded but now enters the next phase – the legal scrubbing and the translation – and of course this is the place where the Parliament and the Member States also start to scrutinise it.

As members of the Committee on International Trade, you have been regularly informed about all the steps taken in negotiating CETA, both before and after. There has been regular contact with the civil servants of DG Trade but also Commissioner De Gucht himself has engaged many times in discussing with you the different elements of CETA. They are now on the table for you to decide. As the co-legislators, the Parliament and the Member States, you will have to make an assessment of this. That will probably land on your table by the summer next year. That is when it is up to you to vote.

1-068

Artis Pabriks (PPE). – As the rapporteur on CETA, I am happy about the large amount of attention being given to this issue, and good luck. But my question is about Ukraine.

Before ratifying the association agreement with Ukraine, including the deep and comprehensive free trade agreement, Commissioner De Gucht was involved in three lateral talks, including Russia. This happened without the prior notification of Parliament and, as far as I know, also the Member States. It allowed Russia to interfere in the European-Ukrainian Treaty and actually interpret it from the Russia side on their own terms.

What would be your response if the pressure from Russia to renegotiate the DCFTA increases and if it retaliates against Ukraine? Would you in future consult prior to such things with the Committee on International Trade, and how do you think these issues might affect future ratifications which are pending?

1-069

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner-designate. > Yes of course, the meeting of 12 September – everything happened very quickly. This was a decision to postpone the ratification of the Deep Free Trade Association Agreement in order to allow for a dialogue between Ukraine, Russia and the European Union. This was also something that President Poroshenko asked to do. It went very quickly. Of course, the ideal situation is always to be able to consult beforehand. In this case it was not, and that is deplorable. But there was a very quick sequence of events and a lot of international pressure there.

I will not, if I am confirmed – and the Commission will not – allow Russia to amend the agreement. They have expressed many concerns; as far as I can judge, those concerns are, mostly if not all, not

justified, but if this can give a little bit of time to try to find a solution, it was the only way forward. Should such an emergency situation arise in the future, I cannot promise that there is not an emergency, but I can promise that I will try to avoid it and to make sure that at least a short contact with the Chair or some member of the committee is taken beforehand. In the meantime, of course, the Association Agreement should be provisionally applied. We should continue to show that this is it and that it has already shown positive effects, and then we will see the exact timetable to sit down and discuss. As I said, the time that we have tried to buy here is not to allow Russia to amend the agreement; it is only the European Union and the Ukraine who can ask for amendments, not Russia.

1-070

Alessia Maria Mosca (S&D). – Signora Commissario designato, per quanto riguarda il TTIP sta crescendo, specialmente nell'ambito del Congresso degli Stati Uniti, l'opposizione a che venga inserita la protezione delle indicazioni geografiche, contrariamente a quanto è avvenuto nell'accordo con il Canada.

Se effettivamente da parte degli Stati Uniti proseguirà questa posizione, volevo chiederle come l'Unione europea intende muoversi per valorizzare e proteggere specialmente i prodotti agricoli. Inoltre, la Commissione europea ha recentemente lanciato una consultazione pubblica sulla possibilità di estendere la protezione delle indicazioni geografiche anche a prodotti non agricoli e mi interessava sapere come intendesse anche in questo senso procedere, quali settori pensava potessero essere coinvolti da questo allargamento e come questo possa essere un modo per valorizzare le nostre produzioni.

1-071

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner-designate. > In the Canadian agreement, the Commission successfully managed to protect 145 geographical indications, including the most well known in agriculture. I think that was a good achievement.

I think it is no secret that this would be much more difficult with the United States. We are not there yet. We have certainly not given up – it is very clear in the mandate of the Commission to negotiate this, but it will be difficult. The ambition would, of course, be to have an internationally-agreed list of geographical indications within the auspices of WTO. For the moment, that is not possible, but I know that my colleague Michel Barnier is working on a list of non-agricultural products to be listed as well on geographical indications, and this is work that he has started and that probably the next Commission will follow up.

It is a very clear ambition from us to do that, which will also involve geographical indications for certain issues in technical innovations and so on, where we think that we need protection. But how the work is going with that list, I just know that it is on its way. But certainly many committees in this House will be involved in the elaboration of that list.

1-072

Louis Ide (ECR). – Goedemiddag, mevrouw Malmström. Ik heb een specifieke vraag voor u over de gevolgen van het vrijhandelsverdrag tussen de EU en de Verenigde Staten voor de farmaceutische industrie. TTIP is controversieel, maar het kan ook een opportuniteit betekenen als er een maatschappelijk draagvlak voor is. Het zal dus uw taak zijn als commissaris om de voordelen van TTIP zichtbaar te maken en te concretiseren. Dat kan bijvoorbeeld door in te zetten op de harmonisatie van de dossiers voor erkenning van geneesmiddelen bij het EMA en de FDA. Een uniek transatlantisch dossier voor de erkenning van geneesmiddelen leidt tot minder bureaucratie, minder kosten en meer efficiëntie.

Vandaar mijn vraag: hoe zal TTIP bijdragen tot een betere samenwerking tussen EMA en FDA met betrekking tot de erkenning van geneesmiddelen? Wilt u er zich toe verbinden de erkenningsprocedure tot één procedure te harmoniseren in ieders belang en op deze bescheiden wijze bij te dragen tot het noodzakelijke maatschappelijke draagvlak?

1-073

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner-designate. > The general issue of standardisation and mutual recognition is, of course, where, under the regulatory headline, so to say, in TTIP is where the most gains could be made, because a lot of red tape, without lowering any standards – I repeat that again – where, if we can find common ways for approval, for qualifications, for procedures in giving our agreement to certain issues in pharmaceutical but in others, that is a huge gain for our companies, and it would also lead to cheaper products for the citizens.

This is clearly included in the talks, it is in the mandates – exploratory talks are already ongoing there – and this is an issue where we need to engage with the citizens to explain to them what the advantages can be here. I am not in a capacity today to tell you exactly where we are on those negotiations; you must understand that I have had very few days to prepare for this and I have not looked into every negotiating chapter, but I know that this is an issue and I know that this is an issue where we can get rid of a lot of red tape: that would be beneficial.

1-074

Dita Charanzová (ALDE). – It looks as though we have been travelling all over the world already, but let me stop for a while again in Russia. After all, Russia is one of our most important trading partners and what we see currently is that different sectors of industry are hit by the current EU Russian sanctions.

My question is not about whether the sanctions are right or wrong, but I would like to know the lessons you learnt from the current situation and how can these lessons be effectively applied in the future. Do you think we should adjust our overall trade policy, that we should re-shape our trade priorities?

1-075

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner-designate. > I think the situation we are in right now with Russia and the Ukraine is quite unique. This is something that nobody has wanted. A few years ago we had much more positive aspects when it came to our relations with Russia, both in trade and in other areas of cooperation. Unfortunately, the relationship has developed in the wrong direction already before the invasion of Ukraine, and also the situation in general internally in Russia is preoccupying when it comes to the state of democracy, the right of NGOs and certain fundamental rights, freedom of speech and so on. This is really something that we have a responsibility to react and to condemn. Having said that, Russia is a neighbour; it is a potentially important partner, and we will see what comes out after this. The current political situation is not very favourable for future agreements, but of course we are not opposed to look at this when the situation changes.

I think it is, frankly, too early to draw any conclusions from the situation here, because it is a quite unique sequence of events. We know that some producers – farmers but also others – are suffering from the embargo. We are trying to find ways, especially in the agriculture sector, with the Commission to compensate those farmers in the most targeted countries, and we will see if we need to upscale that, should the conflict continue. We need to assess how this evaluates before being able to draw any general conclusions. This is, of course, not a situation that we want to happen again. It is a very serious situation, it involves not only trade but most of our sectors with an important neighbour, and hopefully we will find common ground to find a good solution. It does not look very promising right now, but hopefully we might be able in a few years to sit down again and see what possible new agreements can be made.

1-076

Lola Sánchez Caldentey (GUE/NGL). – Señor Presidente, señora Malmström, mi pregunta es muy concreta y muy clara y me gustaría que su respuesta también lo fuera. Voy a hablar de una cuestión de la que no se ha hablado todavía aquí: de Israel.

Ante las continuas agresiones de Israel —sobre todo esta última contra Gaza, en la que han sido asesinadas más de dos mil personas; 500 niños; 11 000 heridos; casi medio millón de personas desplazadas... —, el continuo asedio, las continuas violaciones de los derechos humanos y los evidentes crímenes de guerra cometidos por el ejército israelí —documentados además por el Tribunal Russell hace poco y expuestos por diputados de este Parlamento la semana pasada—, ¿no cree usted que la Unión Europea tiene la obligación de suspender el Acuerdo de Asociación entre la Unión Europea e Israel a la luz del artículo 2, que dice, y leo textualmente: «Las relaciones entre las partes estarán basadas en el respeto de los derechos humanos y principios democráticos, que guían la política interna e internacional y constituyen un elemento esencial de este Acuerdo»? Me gustaría saber su opinión concreta.

1-077

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner-designate. > With all respect, this is not an easy question. We have a very clear view when it comes to trade from occupied territories. They are excluded from the

preferential treatment, and we are now looking with Member States to see if there are ways to have a more common approach to labelling in order to make sure that this is working. So that is very clear and has been so far.

When it comes to totally sanction all trades with Israel, this is not on the table for the moment, and it would be for Member States to take such a decision.

1-078

Ska Keller (Verts/ALE). – I want to return to a question raised by David Martin earlier. You said you reject any allegations based on a leaked e-mail. The e-mail I think we are talking about concerns a freedom of information request and therefore was not leaked. Are you referring to others or are you saying that this e-mail that comes from a freedom-of-information request is not a correct one or a fake one? Could you clarify that?

I have a second question. Sustainable development chapters are always a key concern for Parliament but they are very weak. We put them in the trade agreements but they are not enforceable; we cannot apply pressure through them. Are you planning to make them more effective in their implementation, more enforceable, and, if so, how?

1-079

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner-designate. > On the first question, I do not know where that e-mail comes from so I am not commenting on any alleged e-mail. What I am commenting on is that there is an allegation that I have tried to undermine the data protection in the European Union and that I have worked against this in different countries. This is not true. In all official, unofficial, formal and informal meetings I have always defended the need for first an umbrella agreement with the United States and also the data protection agreement that is being negotiated by Viviane Reding and now her successor. We have had a common approach to this and it makes me very upset that this comes because it is definitely not founded.

On your other question: sustainable development chapters. Well, they had developed over the years, I would say. They did not exist a long time ago. We tried to include them and we tried to learn and to see how we can make the best out of them. They include an obligatory conflict resolution mechanism that allows for the civil society to be engaged and that we invite international stakeholders such as ILO to look at this and that we will take into consideration different information that we get that there is a violation of labour law or environmental laws or human rights and so on, so that we can set up a dialogue that would have to be transparent. If this leads to a process, all the documents will have to be public and thereby we can engage in dialogue, we can make sure that we have some sort of name and shame procedures and hopefully this will lead to improvement.

Ultimately of course, if there is a very severe case, it can lead to a total suspension but then you would have to weigh what consequences that has for other sectors in trade with that country if they suffer in a disproportionate way, so it always a bad ultimate need, but sometimes it might have a need to be activated – we have done so with Syria and a few other cases as well – but the European model is to try, via dialogue, influence and push, and we will keep on doing so and we would value very much the European Parliament input in this on the GSP+ agreements where we have engaged with 14 countries that they should not only follow and ratify but also in their daily life apply the 27 international conventions. This gives us more pressure because this would be evaluated next year as well. I will come back to you next year, if I am confirmed, to discuss our agreements and, of course, the aim would be to put more and more countries in that context in the GSP+ but it is difficult to force countries to go from GSP to GSP+, but we are trying to push more and more to do that.

1-080

William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFDD). – My question follows on from Ska Keller’s question. When negotiating future trade agreements, what degree of importance would you as Commissioner give to specifically non-trade criteria, by which I mean the European Union’s stated wider policy goals, for example on governance, human rights, labour laws, sustainability and foreign policy? And as Commissioner would you choose or decide not to progress or conclude a trade agreement if it became apparent that the specifically non-trade criteria could not be met?

1-081

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner-designate. > The trade agreements are, of course, primarily about tariffs, access to markets, services, regulatory, and so on: that you are aware of. That is the main aim of having trade agreements. But the whole world, and the EU as well, have moved towards a more inclusive policy on this, so it makes sense to include – it does not only make sense, I think we have an obligation – to also take into consideration how that trade is done. Who works there? Under what conditions? Can we make sure of this in international standards and conventions – when it comes to how people are being treated, how we apply fundamental rights, how we have the environmental standards?

It is our obligation to engage in that and with most countries of the world we do not only have trade arrangements, we also have a partnership agreement, where this is very specifically mentioned. You mentioned democracy, governance, labour laws, etc. So it makes sense to have them both. I do not think that you do either/or: you do both. This is something we will continue to do.

1-082

Der Vorsitzende. > Jetzt ist es mir eine besondere Freude, den Vorsitzenden des Ausschusses für auswärtige Angelegenheiten, Elmar Brok, hier bei uns zu begrüßen.

1-083

Elmar Brok, Vorsitzender des Ausschusses für auswärtige Angelegenheiten. – Herr Vorsitzender, Frau Malmström! Gestatten Sie mir, in der einen Minute ein paar Punkte unterzubringen. Ich möchte Frau Malmström bitten, auch unseren amerikanischen Freunden gegenüber deutlich zu machen, dass es schwer wird, im Europäischen Parlament eine Mehrheit für das TTIP zu bekommen – und ich bin

engagierter Anhänger des TTIP –, wenn es uns nicht gelingt, die Datenschutzfragen vorher in vernünftiger Weise zu regeln. Es wird wegen des gesellschaftlichen Prozesses schwierig sein, dann eine Mehrheit zu organisieren. Dies sollte in den Verhandlungen auch von der Handelsseite – nicht nur von dem, was Frau Reding bisher gemacht hat – deutlich gemacht werden.

Ich möchte auch im Zusammenhang mit dem TTIP noch fragen: Ist es nicht möglich, bewusst einen gemischten Vertrag zu vermeiden und sich konkret auf das zu konzentrieren, was europäische Kompetenz ist? Es ist für die Verwirklichung des Vertrages von entscheidender strategischer Bedeutung, dass man die Fähigkeit zu dieser Begrenzung hat.

Nun zum allgemeinen Thema: Wir haben ja, wie Sie gerade auch in Ihrer letzten Antwort deutlich gemacht haben, die Auffassung, dass man auch Handelspolitik mit Gesamtpolitik befasst, wenn man sich in Krisen befindet – da sind jetzt die Sanktionen gegen Russland beispielsweise ein Thema. Wenn ich mir aber anschau, dass Länder wie China und andere einen gesamtstrategischen Ansatz haben, auch weil sie natürlich keine freie Wirtschaft in dem Sinne haben, dass Unternehmen selbständig entscheiden können, sollte man sehr viel mehr versuchen, eine wirtschaftliche, handelspolitische, politische, außenpolitische Gesamtsicht zu haben, und einen *comprehensive approach* entwickeln, um auf dieser Grundlage unsere Interessen wahrzunehmen.

Dabei möchte ich Sie allerdings ermuntern, nicht in die Falle zu laufen, dass der Handel als gemeinschaftliche Politik verlorengelht. Er ist nicht Teil zwischenstaatlicher Außenpolitik der Europäischen Union, sondern gemeinschaftliche Zuständigkeit. Das muss gewahrt werden. Aber es sollte dennoch versucht werden, dass ein *comprehensive approach* verfolgt wird. Wie werden Sie versuchen, das mit der neuen Hohen Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin der Kommission zu verwirklichen?

1-084

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner-designate. > I have no illusion that TTIP is not going to be very difficult. The discussion here and elsewhere shows this. This is a very important agreement, but there is a lot of scepticism. That is why I would hope, if I am confirmed, that we can sort of have a new start on this, both when it comes to how we work and also on transparency, and take stock on where we are.

We have been given a very broad mandate that the Council has given and that you have also pronounced yourself on in this Parliament. It is a clear mandate to go broad and to try to include all these issues that we have discussed today. I think it would be very unfortunate if, at the end of the day, we said that we would only go for this small little sector or this sector. This is the most important partner that we have in the world. We trade every day for two billion euros, but there is so much untapped potential there.

It would also have a strategic importance to have this agreement in place. It would facilitate global negotiations, and we could set global standards. Will it be a mixed agreement or not? This requires a more institutional discussion. The Council has had a tendency to declare every agreement beforehand as mixed. I think that is an unfortunate approach, but I realise that TTIP will probably be a mixed agreement, as it is today, and it would make sense if we could get some legal clarity on where the competences on agreements are – where is the Commission competence and where is the Member States’?

When it comes to China, as I said, the most important thing to get there is the investment agreement. I think it would be a big important step forward if we could engage China in a few other plurinational negotiations such as TISA for instance – this is the clear commitment of the Commission – and then we will see how we can move on in the issue of market access for China. This could be very important building stones for a broader relationship. After that we will need to see and to discuss with Member States – and the Chinese – if they are willing to follow the rules, if they are willing to comply with WTO, if they are willing to open their markets, and in that case, what kind of agreement could be possible with them. This is not for tomorrow; possibly during the mandate, but definitely not for tomorrow. It would have to be very thoroughly discussed, internally in the European Union but also with our Chinese partners.

1-085

Linda McAvan, *Chair of the Committee on Development*. – I am going to ask you about the link between trade and development. You mentioned in your introduction the link in connection with the strategic partnership with Africa. What about the other aspects? What about the EPAs? What about the conflict mineral policies, which I think are a bit weak and voluntary? How are you going to make sure that your counterpart development ministers are involved in that? How are you going to make sure that trade contributes to the post-2015 agenda for sustainable development?

Secondly, I don’t know what you know about the fair trade movement and the concept of fair trade. Do you think that could play an important role in promoting a different way of promoting trade and also of supporting marginal producers and farmers in developing countries?

1-086

Cecilia Malmström, *Commissioner-designate*. > As I said, there has been quite some work done in this, but I think we should do more, and this is also why I am looking forward to working with my colleague – not least if he is confirmed as the new Development Commissioner – to see how we can be more coherent in our foreign policy and in development.

Of course, the best thing would be if we could bounce new energy into the Doha agenda. This would be very beneficial for everybody, not least for the developing countries, and we will do everything we

can in the coming weeks to see if we can get the Bali agenda back on track. What is happening now is very unfortunate, not least for the poorest countries in the world. So this would be a priority, a special track.

We have development clauses or development chapters in many other agreements. We have some specific provisions in EPAs. Most countries are now on their way to enter into EPA, which will mean that only one country will be left outside when the preferential system moves over to the EPA. That is, of course, unfortunate, but in that, there are very clear provisions for development. We also have the initiative Aid for Trade. I think we have not fully tapped the potential there, but this is something that we need to explore further, because in there, there are provisions on how we can help to diversify trade. That might be a role; not committing myself, but I could imagine that the movement Fair Trade could have a role in this to make sure that we can diversify trade and that we can also build up the capacity, the governance, the administrative knowledge for these countries to engage globally with trade in a fair way.

When it comes to the conflict in minerals, this is right now in Parliament – I think you have made your first reading, and the Council as well. I know that Parliament wants an obligatory. For the companies there, the Commission has proposed a voluntary in order to make sure that they really do engage so that they can get this certificate and that they bind up to those commitments. This is, of course, only one step in working with other international agreements, such as the blood diamonds and illegally harvested woods, and there are also different multinational agreements on their way. So this needs to be put much better in context, to see how they can reinforce each other. This would surely be my commitment – not to solve the issues but to try to work in that direction with my fellow colleagues, the Commissioner of Development but also the other RELEX Commissioners.

1-087

Chair. > The Chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs is not really satisfied with your answer because he thinks there is no real answer.

1-088

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner-designate. > It is not easy to satisfy Mr Brok.

1-089

Elmar Brok *Vorsitzender des Ausschusses für auswärtige Angelegenheiten.* – Dabei bin ich ein so netter Mensch, der im Angesicht solcher Frauen immer weich wird!

Aber der zweite Teil meiner Frage zu einem *comprehensive approach* ist in keiner Weise beantwortet worden. Ich habe nicht danach gefragt, welche Handelsbeziehungen wir mit China haben, sondern in welcher Weise wir einen gesamtheitlichen Bezug unserer Außenbeziehungen haben, zu denen auch die Handelspolitik und auch die anderen Fragen gehören, und in welcher Weise wir uns auch *a priori*, präventiv darauf einstellen können, solche Strategien zu entwickeln, dass man das als eine Einheit

sieht, ohne dabei Gemeinschaftliches und Zwischenstaatliches durcheinanderzuwerfen, aber doch zu einer Einheit zu kommen. In welcher Weise stellen Sie sich das organisatorisch vor, dies mit Ihren Kollegen in der Kommission und mit der Vizepräsidentin, die ja auch Hohe Vertreterin ist, zu organisieren?

1-090

Der Vorsitzende. > Jetzt erteile ich noch einmal Herrn Belder, der auch aus dem Ausschuss für auswärtige Angelegenheiten kommt, das Wort.

1-091

Bas Belder, namens de Commissie AFET – Mevrouw de kandidaat-commissaris, zeer gewaardeerde oud-collega, de Europese Unie en Israël hebben de afgelopen decennia wederzijds buitengewoon vruchtbare handelsrelaties onderhouden. Israël is qua wetenschap en expertise een krachtbron die de Europese Unie van essentiële noodzakelijke impulsen voorziet. Mevrouw Malmström, bent u het met me eens dat de EU haar betrekkingen met Israël dient te versterken om een wereldspeler te blijven, met name nu de EU in wetenschappelijk en technologisch opzicht moet concurreren met India en China en andere landen? Op welke wijze denkt u de handelsbetrekkingen tussen de Europese Unie en Israël met succes te bevorderen?

1-092

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner-designate. > Thank you, Mr Brok. I hope that you will put that question to Federica Mogherini when she appears before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and that you will compare the answers. Of course it would not be fair for me to try to answer in her regard, because she will be the boss on this. But of course, you know and I know that our foreign policy consistency is only as strong as Member States want it to be, and I would wish that, now that we have the external action service, now that we are on our second Vice-President / High Representative, that this could lead to a more coherent view when it comes to certain strategic partners such as China. Without having discussed that with her, I would certainly do everything I can to contribute to a more strategic approach to China, including trade.

When it comes to Israel, Mr Velda, what exactly is planned when it comes to science and research cooperation, I am not in a capacity to tell you. You will have to ask my Research Commissioner about this. For the moment, and also referring to the discussions we have had with some Members of priorities and how we will set the priority with the limited resources that we have, we have no plans to further engage in new agreements with Israel, but to have the one that we have.

1-093

Johannes Cornelis van Baalen (ALDE). – It is of course also a pleasure for me to meet Ms Malmström on this occasion. I have two related questions. If an agreement that has been discussed by Parliament, for example an association agreement, has to be changed at the last instance, it is good that Parliament does not get that information from the free press but we get it directly, for instance through a communication from the Commissioner to the chair of this committee. And then I refer of course to the Association Agreement with Ukraine, of which a part will only be implemented after one

and a half years. So I would like to have an answer in general on the way you will inform the committee on these issues.

Secondly, on Ukraine and the EU, I think it is of vital importance that the whole Association Agreement will be implemented and that in one and a half years we will not come to the conclusion that Russia puts Ukraine under further pressure in order to change something about this agreement. In the light of statements in the media, the Russians are already preparing to change and to ask for change.

So I request an answer to both questions.

1-094

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner-designate. > Yes, Mr van Baalen, I agree with you in principle: of course, should there be any dramatic changes like this, Parliament should be informed. If it is not possible to meet at a plenary session (because that is not very often), at least with a phone call or with some contact. This I commit to, to my best extent, to try to do that. Of course there are always extraordinary circumstances, like the one in this case, where this procedure could be followed. That is deplorable, and let us hope that such occasions will not arise again.

When it come to the Ukraine agreement, I hope – and I noted how you voted last week on that in Parliament – that we can start to provisionally apply the Association Agreement and hope that the rest of the agreement can be applied as soon as possible. As I stated before, it is not the intention of the European Union to let Russia amend this agreement. It can only be amended if one of the partners does it – and the two partners are Ukraine and Europe. As far as I can see, the problems that Russia has with this agreement are unfounded. Some might be addressed by informing, and some – well, we will not be able to address them, because we come from totally different political views. We happen to think that competition, open markets and engaging in trade is a good thing. If Russia does not share that view, there is not much we can do. But the Commission is not going to amend this agreement because Russia wants it.

1-095

Chair. > So we have agreed to exchange mobile numbers and e-mail addresses so that in future communication will be better than in the last period.

1-096

Iuliu Winkler (PPE). – Commissioner-designate, one of the issues that was quite widely debated this afternoon was that of the mixed agreements. Once again that we have the normal practice of the Council that specific points are added to the negotiating mandate: basically the agreement stays a trade agreement or an overwhelmingly trade agreement, maybe 99% of its content is trade agreement, but nevertheless, as a consequence, a double certification process has to be envisaged. So the European Parliament, the national parliaments too, could face the situation that such a mixed

agreement could be rejected by a national parliament, despite the consent of the European Parliament. We have already heard that maybe legal clarification is needed about what a mixed agreement really means, also the lessening of ambition. Which would be the way forward, Commissioner-designate? What would you prefer?

1-097

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner-designate. > I think this is increasingly problematic because, as I said before, there is this tendency, even before we start negotiations, for the Council to declare that this would be a mixed agreement. What happened with Lisbon was that the Commission got the exclusive competences to negotiate trade agreements, and then it would be up to Parliament and the Member States to ratify it afterwards.

It is true that in some areas of public procurements, it is a bit vague to see how exactly it could be interpreted, but this sort of automaticity by the Council is very unfortunate. I know that my colleague Karel de Gucht is looking into this and seeking legal advice and seeing if it is possible to challenge the concept in the Court of Justice, to get clarity once and for all. But having said that, I am not sure we can get clarity once and for all, because there are certain areas which are mixed competence, of course. But I agree, it is going to be very complicated in the future if we are going to have 28 national parliaments and then sub-parliaments in some countries to ratify. We risk not being able to achieve anything. So if we can get clarity here it would be very, very good, and if it is not under Mr de Gucht's mandate, I will continue the discussions with our legal advisers to see if there is a way to try to seek an opinion from the Court.

1-098

Maria Arena (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Madame Malmström, je vais aborder deux thèmes que vous avez déjà un peu effleurés. Vous avez dit, en début de votre intervention, que la politique commerciale de l'Union était une politique internationale et donc qu'il était important de pouvoir utiliser cela comme moyen.

Actuellement, de nombreux conflits ont lieu dans le monde et ces conflits sont souvent générés par les ressources naturelles – minières, pétrolières, eau, bois ou autres. Celles-ci génèrent non seulement ces conflits mais elles les entretiennent également – on ne peut que prendre comme exemple la République démocratique du Congo. Dans d'autres cas encore, des biens sont importés librement vers l'Union européenne, alors même qu'ils sont produits dans des territoires illégalement occupés – je parle ici bien entendu de la question israélienne et des colonies israéliennes en territoire palestinien.

Je voudrais vous poser clairement deux questions. La première: êtes-vous prête, par rapport au texte qui existe aujourd'hui, qui a été produit par la Commission, en ce qui concerne les minerais, à élargir le texte à d'autres ressources que les quatre minerais qui sont prévus dans le texte et êtes-vous prête, vous l'avez dit tout à l'heure, à rendre ce texte, ce cadre régulateur, contraignant? Nous sommes convaincus que l'aspect volontaire des entreprises n'est pas ce qui va nous amener à plus d'attitudes

positives de ces entreprises. Enfin, concernant Israël, êtes-vous prête à avoir un cadre contraignant concernant la traçabilité des produits qui sont issus des colonies?

1-099

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner-designate. > On the minerals, this text is now in Parliament and in the Council. It has left the Commission, so it is not the appropriate moment now to take it back and amend it. It is there, the Commission has made its choice to have these four minerals in, because they are the most pressing. There are other minerals as well, but there is other legislation regarding diamonds, for instance; they are on illicit-produced – harvested woods, for instance – so these were the four most acute to have in the proposal.

The Commission is also of the conviction that we should start having it voluntary in order to engage the companies to do that. If we make it mandatory, we risk that the companies will not engage at all, and it will be even more difficult to have them there. I am well aware that Parliament has proposed it to be mandatory – now it is in your hands, you make the legislation together with the Council. But the Commission will not withdraw the proposal and amend it.

When it comes to Israel, I think I had the possibility to answer that question just a moment ago. As you know, products produced in the occupied territories are not given preferential treatment. This is very clear in the European Union policy, and we are right now engaged in a dialogue with Member States to see if there are common practices on how to deal with the traceability and labelling of this, and this could possibly lead to a common approach.

1-100

Christofer Fjellner (PPE). – Herr talman! Jag skulle bara vilja påtala för fru Malmström att hon inte får lämna det här rummet och tro att Europaparlamentet är emot ISDS. Det är huvudsakligen opportunisterna som nu vill ompröva varenda förhandling EU har gjort för att lyfta ut det. Det vore förödande för våra möjligheter att i framtiden skydda europeiska investeringar i förhandlingar med länder som Indien och Kina. Titta gärna på parlamentets resolution om TTIP och Kanada där man inte ens nämner ISDS.

Nu till min fråga. Jag har under mina tio år i Europaparlamentet aldrig träffat någon protektionist, däremot väldigt många människor som säger att de vill *protect* en eller annan sak. Då kommer vi till motsägelsen att ungefär 30 procent av värdet av vår export består av import av insatsvaror. Därför undrar jag hur du som kommissionär kommer att arbeta för att få lägre tullar in i EU, så våra företag kan dra nytta av globala värdekedjor och på så sätt bli starkare globalt.

1-101

Cecilia Malmström, nominerad kommissionsledamot. – Jag kommer att gå härifrån om ungefär en timme med övertygelsen att det finns många olika uppfattningar i det här utskottet, precis som jag har haft förmånen att såväl i egenskap av europaparlamentariker som i egenskap av minister och

kommissionär ha fått ha kontakt med många olika utskott. Det är skilda synpunkter, och det är det som är det fina med Europaparlamentet. Förhoppningsvis kan man sedan hitta en bra kompromiss.

Jag delar din uppfattning om att vi måste hitta sätt att skydda våra investeringar globalt och att göra det på ett sätt som är rättvist, som inte skapar parallella system, och som är transparent. Det är det vi tillsammans måste jobba på – i avtalet med Kanada och med USA, men också i alla våra avtal. Jag tror att detta blir en av de största utmaningarna framöver.

Naturligtvis måste vi se till att vi kan få ökat tillträde på det sätt som du skissar på i din fråga. Det är ju hela poängen med våra frihandelsavtal, nämligen att öka europeiskt tillträde till andra marknader, att se till att det blir enklare för oss att exportera, att det blir billigare för oss att importera, eftersom värdekedjorna i dag ju är så komplexa att vi måste importera för att kunna exportera – de sitter ju liksom ihop så att man inte kan göra det ena och inte det andra. Det är därför avtalen är så komplexa, och det är därför som jag står fast vid min övertygelse att både CETA och TTIP bör vara komplexa. Annars får nämligen inte små och medelstora företag i huvudsak men också andra företag tillträde till de möjligheter som liberaliserad handel innebär. Det är ett av målen med dessa avtal.

1-102

Jude Kirton-Darling (S&D). – I would like to come back to the question of public services, which you responded on earlier. The CETA, the TiSA and the TTIP negotiations are raising major concerns – certainly across my country and I know other countries across the EU – because of the alleged or confirmed use of negative lists, by which all services are not explicitly excluded if they are not explicitly included in the list.

The EU Treaty recognises the special nature of public services, and the EU has a duty to ensure public service objectives can be fulfilled. Those objectives, just to remember a universality, include access, affordability, continuity and non-discrimination. It is unclear that those can be guaranteed when public services are open to international competition. DG Trade has traditionally distinguished between publicly-funded and privately-funded public services. Would you be willing today to explicitly commit that public services – including health care, social services, education, water and sanitation – will be excluded from EU trade agreements, irrespective of how these services are funded or organised?

1-103

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner-designate. > I am, of course, aware – not least after the discussion here – that there is a lot of public concern about this, so this is a fundamental issue to be addressed, today and for the future.

Public services, health, education, water, provisions and so on are excluded from the negotiations in TTIP, and in all others. If Member States have chosen to open some of these for privatisation, they can decide to unregulate or unprivatise this as well, and this is fully allowed and in compliance with this agreement. But of course, there are Member States who want to open up for competition, because they feel that they are competitive in one of these areas, and if they do on a bilateral basis agree to do that, it can be included in the negotiations. But this is a decision from each Member State to be made, and generally all public services as well as other services related to defence, justice, military and, of course, water are excluded and will remain so.

1-104

Salvatore Cicu (PPE). – Signora Commissario, come sappiamo, gli oltre venti milioni di piccole e medie imprese rappresentano il 99% delle imprese europee e sono un fattore chiave non solo per la crescita economica ma anche per quanto riguarda l'innovazione, la ricerca e l'integrazione sociale.

I costi della crisi economica hanno colpito soprattutto questo settore. L'Italia ha 4,4 milioni di microimprese – sono sessantaquattro ogni mille abitanti – e sia in Italia che in Europa c'è una grande sofferenza, quella dell'accesso alla liquidità, del credito, della domanda che è stata frenata. Le chiedo – naturalmente condividendo tutti gli aspetti che riguardano la trasparenza, le regole, la sicurezza ambientale e la tutela dei diritti umani – su questo aspetto specifico, che costituisce uno degli aspetti centrali rispetto alla nostra possibilità di garantire l'economia, cosa intende fare per sostenere il processo di questa piccola e media impresa che ha bisogno di essere comunque rafforzata e accompagnata ed inserita all'interno dei contesti delle regole rispetto a delle multinazionali che comunque le regole se le fanno per conto loro.

1-105

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner-designate. > I fully agree with you that small and medium-sized companies have suffered a lot during the crisis, but they are also our hope for the future. In many countries, these are the companies who will, hopefully, deliver growth and jobs. But it is difficult: some of them are really small and they have limited resources not only to do what they should do – trade and present goods or services – but also there is a lot of administration and bureaucracy, which is easier for a big company but not for the small ones.

That is why trade is specifically important for small and medium-sized companies, because they need clearer rules. They need to get rid of red tape. They would gain the most if we managed to liberalise the regulatory agenda without lowering our standards when it comes to food safety and health and so on, but if we could increase the possibilities of recognitions, get away with procedures, standards and so on. And that is why we have explicitly included a chapter on SMEs in the TTIP, because it is so important for both sides of the Atlantic. So I agree with you, and this will be an additional support to SMEs, because, of course, in our general recovery policy on the European level, SMEs will need to have special attention as well, and they do.

1-106

Emmanuel Maurel (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire désignée, ce qui est intéressant dans cette audition, c'est que cela nous permet aussi de voir les évolutions possibles par rapport à la Commission précédente et, notamment, par rapport à votre prédécesseur, qui a toujours fait preuve, sur les questions du libre-échange, d'une sorte de candeur un peu échevelée.

Je me souviens notamment de la façon dont il défendait les arguments favorables au TTIP en disant: "Vous verrez, à l'horizon 2025, ce sera 300 euros gagnés par Européen". La question que j'ai envie de vous poser personnellement est la suivante: croyez-vous à ce genre de chiffres sortis d'on ne sait où? Apparemment, les techniciens de la Commission ont beaucoup travaillé pour nous sortir ces chiffres. C'est ma première question.

Voici ma deuxième question: je reviens – parce que c'est un sujet qui nous intéresse, nous, le groupe de l'Alliance progressiste des Socialistes et Démocrates – sur cette histoire des conflits miniers qui me paraît très importante. Vous avez botté en touche en disant que cela nous concernait nous, parlementaires, mais j'ai envie de savoir ce que vous, vous pensez. Pensez-vous qu'il faille imposer des mesures obligatoires, non seulement aux entreprises européennes qui importent des minerais bruts mais aussi à celles qui les commercialisent auprès des consommateurs sous forme de produits finis? Est-ce que, oui ou non, vous êtes d'accord pour étendre à d'autres minerais – vous avez parlé des diamants, mais il y a aussi le cuivre et les rubis (nous pourrions aussi parler plus tard du pétrole et du lien, notamment, avec ce qui se passe avec l'État islamique en Iraq)? Quelles sont vos convictions par rapport à cela? Et enfin – ce qui nous intéresse nous – est-ce que cela va changer par rapport à votre prédécesseur?

1-107

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner-designate. > I always think you should be careful in throwing around figures and statistics like that. It is clear that TTIP – to take TTIP as an example – will be beneficial for the European and American economies. There are different calculations on exactly how many jobs will be created and how much the percentage of growth will be – around 0.2 % of TTIP has been circulating, and a couple of hundred thousand jobs. Then there are all the effects that you cannot really measure. It is, of course, very difficult. What we can note is that there are lots of different estimations done by economists, by think tanks, by academics, OECD and others, that point to the same direction – this we can say. But to say that exactly EUR 325 will be for your family is, of course, something you should be very careful about. I definitely believe – and I am convinced – that this will be a very beneficial agreement, not only for the companies but for every family in Europe.

When it comes to the mineral conflicts, the current Commission has made a proposal. It is now in Parliament and in the Council, so it would not be appropriate for the Commission to withdraw it and to see if we can change it. In that proposal it says that we believe that it is preferable to have voluntary engagement by the company in order to make sure that they do engage. If it was mandatory, you could risk that some of the murkiest businesses did not engage at all, and then that illegal trade would even

increase, and that would have an opposite effect. So let us get this through the legislators, you and the Council. Let us evaluate it before we engage in taking new steps. I agree with you that there is lots to do there in the whole area. Preferably we should do it in multilateral fora with international partners, so we have a common approach to this. Let us explore possibilities to do that before we come with a new proposal from the European Commission.

1-108

Franck Proust (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire désignée, j'aimerais revenir trente secondes sur l'ISDS parce que j'ai du mal à voir où l'on veut en venir. En effet, on peut s'opposer, mais s'opposer c'est aussi proposer. Nous avons un objectif commun, qui est de protéger les investissements de nos entreprises européennes. Je rappelle simplement qu'en 2012, 60 % des procédures dans le monde émanaient d'entreprises européennes car en dehors de l'Europe – on le sait tous –, les investissements sont moins sûrs.

Je ne veux pas me faire l'avocat d'une solution plus que d'une autre, mais je voudrais savoir, Madame Malmström, quelle serait l'alternative à l'ISDS. Comment nos entreprises européennes verront-elles leurs investissements protégés, comment les PME qui veulent aller chercher la croissance là où elle se trouve, vont-elles pouvoir se protéger, notamment en Asie. On a parlé également du conflit entre Boeing et Airbus qui s'enlise auprès de l'Organisation mondiale du commerce (OMC). En fait, comment négocier des accords de libre-échange (ALE) sans ISDS, sans soutien politique pour nos entreprises?

Mais je vois également des failles dans l'ISDS, dans le système existant, qu'il nous faut combler. L'objectif que nous avons tous ici est de protéger nos entreprises européennes tout en protégeant notre niveau de législation. Comment pouvez-vous nous assurer que les sociétés ne pourront pas engager une procédure avec succès contre un État au sujet de politiques réglementaires nationales dès lors que celles-ci ont été décidées dans l'intérêt général? On pourrait penser, peut-être, à la création d'une Cour européenne de règlement des différends.

1-109

Cecilia Malmström, Commissaire désignée. > Je vais vous répondre en anglais parce que je connais mieux la terminologie en anglais. Dans quelques mois, je pourrai vous répondre en français.

1-110

To start with your last question: if we had an international court on this, this would be ideal. If we managed to have an international court to solve all the ISDs, this would be a good thing, but we are not there and it is not likely to happen in the short term either. There is a very legitimate interest to protect European investments against expropriation, against abuses, against unfair treatment in courts. This interest is bigger with certain countries – we have the REPSOL in Argentina, we have other problems in other countries – but they also exist with our like-minded countries. We have agreements – 1 400 European bilateral agreements. So it is not always sure that we will have the treatment in national courts. This is the preferred way: to go to national courts. What the Commission has tried to

do is to elaborate, in the agreement with Canada and CETA, a new way to address this, to make sure that there will be no frivolous claims, that is it absolutely clear that states have the right to regulate when it comes to public safety, public services and so on. It defines the scope of this. It defines what the term 'illegal expropriation' is. It makes it their codes of conduct and ethical codes for those who deal with it to guarantee their independence, and it includes transparency mechanisms. All the documents, all the proceedings will be in public. This is a way to address the concerns expressed by President-elect Juncker and by many people here. I think it is a very important step forward. Can it even further improve? Yes, possibly, for instance when it comes to appeal. We have not managed to find a way there with our Canadian friends, but there is an openness to further engage in this. And of course, public consultation might lead to good ideas as well on how do this. So I think there is a way to combine the legitimate interest to protect our investments but to make sure this is done in procedures that have very limited but crystal clear limits – the possibilities of abuse and creating other systems. We will need them in agreements with other parties of the world, so let us see if we can find a model – the European Parliament has asked for a European model – to do this.

1-111

Marita Ulvskog (S&D). – You said earlier that perhaps not everyone will benefit from TTIP. My reaction is: OK, let us talk about those who could end up as losers. What measures will you take, for example, in order to ensure that especially labour and human rights standards are made binding and are strongly enforced in the TTIP – including the ILO's decent work agenda – in order to ensure that the ILO's core labour standards are properly implemented?

The TTIP mandate also includes monitoring of the implementation of these provisions through a mechanism including civil society participation. What will you do to include trade unions as a major stakeholder in the monitoring mechanisms concerning the implementation of these provisions? And will you be committed to ensuring binding standards on corporate social responsibility based on the revised OECD guidelines?

Lastly, I and my political group would like to have a written statement (explanation, whatever you want to call it) on the e-mail sent on 12 January 2012 from your office to the US Department of Commerce, where Jade Nester says that your cabinet reached out to the US to advise on the timing of a lobby paper. We would like to have the answer in writing. We heard your explanation earlier but we would like to clarify it.

1-112

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner-designate. > It is clear that, even if the US and Europe share a lot of common values and standards, there are differences, of course. Let me start by making clear that those who trade and operate in Europe are obliged to follow European laws, so the European laws apply here for, in this case, US firms or companies who will operate in Europe, and we cannot change American laws through the TTIP. American counterparts have made clear for us that, for different reasons, they will not sign up to the ILO conventions that we wanted them to sign up to, but they intend to operate in that direction. This is something, of course, that we will monitor. We have also

agreed that it is too premature in our negotiations to have language on human rights, so this will have to be solved at a later stage.

We will have civil society participation in looking into this. From the European Union side we have envisaged to be advised on this by the ECOSOC Committee – the Economic and Social Committee – and, of course, trade unions are represented there. So that view will be channelled through that forum and possibly others as well.

When it comes to corporate social responsibility, the whole issue with them is that they are voluntary. They are not mandatory; they are voluntary, and they are encouraging companies to engage in quite vast measures in order to improve different areas. It depends on where we are. We have the compact in Bangladesh, for instance, where some companies have really taken very far-reaching commitments. So I do not foresee any possibilities to have them binding: not in TTIP and not elsewhere. When it comes to the email you referred to, I have no idea what it comes from and I reject those allegations firmly.

1-113

Santiago Fisas Ayxelà (PPE). – Señor Presidente, señora Malmström, permítame profundizar sobre instrumentos de defensa comercial como el antidumping, la antisubvención y las medidas de salvaguarda. Estas medidas son esenciales para defender a los productores europeos de la competencia desleal y, muy especialmente, a las pequeñas y medianas empresas. Y permítame al respecto tres preguntas. ¿Considera que las reformas propuestas por la Comisión son suficientes para defender los intereses de los productores europeos? ¿Qué opina de las propuestas del Parlamento? Y, finalmente, como parece que este proceso ha llegado a un punto muerto en el Consejo, ¿qué va a hacer para conseguir superar esta situación de bloqueo?

1-114

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner-designate. > I agree with you that we need to have sharper trade defence instruments. The WTO way is a good way but it takes time, and there are other things we can do before or in parallel. That is why the Commission proposed this communication on this. Are they sufficient? I do not know. I cannot answer whether they are sufficient. I think that the Commissioner responsible now for trade tried to include as many as possible and to be exhaustive at that moment. It is now for you and the Council to decide.

I know that it is stuck in the Council. It will certainly be – if I am confirmed – one of my priorities to see if we can unblock that file and see ways to move forward, because it is definitely in the European Council's interests as well that we formulate efficient, targeted, sharp and not too time-consuming instruments in order to move forward on this. The exact reasons why it is blocked and in what countries – well, that I would have to analyse later. If Parliament comes up with further instruments that are not in the document from the Commission, I think that would be positive. I have not had the

possibility to follow those negotiations, for obvious reasons, as I am still Commissioner for Home Affairs, but I am looking forward to working with you on that.

1-115

Pedro Silva Pereira (S&D). – Muito obrigado, Senhora Comissária designada, trouxe-nos nesta audiência um conjunto de princípios muito razoáveis, também alguma teoria geral sobre o comércio internacional e aquilo a que eu poderia chamar uma vista panorâmica sobre a agenda da Comissão Europeia.

Mas tenho de confessar uma certa desilusão porque não nos trouxe o caminho que tenciona seguir para resolver a questão crítica das cláusulas ISDS e porque não ficou claro quais são as suas prioridades, por exemplo, em relação aos acordos comerciais. Quais são aqueles que tenciona concluir durante o seu mandato? Por exemplo, o acordo sobre o Japão, disse-nos que estava muito avançado, mas a meta de 2015 é uma meta razoável? Acha que o Japão tem dado os passos necessários para dar garantias de eliminação das cláusulas não alfandegárias, não pautais? Acha que realmente é possível um acordo que proteja a indústria europeia ou vamos precisar, como no caso da Coreia, de medidas de salvaguarda para um acordo verdadeiramente justo e equilibrado?

1-116

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner-designate. > I am sorry if I disappointed you. Of course, there is so much on the agenda, and the current Commission and the outgoing Parliament had a very busy agenda starting up all these negotiations. So of course, my priority will be to conclude as many of them as possible or at least to bring them forward. The whole process around CETA, of course, and TTIP Japan is clearly a priority.

We have advanced there quite a lot. There is still this issue of cars. There is progress, but this is still the trickiest issue. Will there be safeguard clauses? It is a little bit too early to say; the mandate provides for it, as in Korea, as you mentioned. It is possible that they will be used, but let us see how far we can go before we decide to use those safeguard clauses. Is 2015 realistic? I think so. 2015 or the beginning of 2016 would be the window to close this if we continue in this path.

Someone said we have talked almost about the rest of the world here. There are lots of issues that are priority, of course: Ukraine and our Eastern partners; we have Morocco and Tunisia; Jordan, that I hope we can launch formally; Mexico, Chile; we have the finalisation of the EPAs and, not least, we have the international agenda – the multinational agenda – which is very dear to my heart, and I would do everything to see if we can put some life into that. I probably forgot some of the agreements that we have ongoing, but there is a lot at stake: finalise, implement and then evaluate. So neither you nor I will be unemployed for the coming five years.

1-117

Adam Szejnfeld (PPE). – Pani Komisarz! Umowy międzynarodowe w zakresie wolnego handlu mają znaczenie przede wszystkim gospodarcze, integrują gospodarki krajów Europy i świata, ale mają także wymiar szerszy, bo zbliżają państwa i społeczeństwa do siebie. Ich efekty, te gospodarcze, zawsze przekładają się także na efekty społeczne, bo jeżeli mamy do czynienia z podniesieniem poziomu konkurencji, to zawsze ktoś musi stracić dostępną ilość towarów i usług, ale także zwikszczeniem ich jakości i zmniejszeniem cen. Pozytywy w długim okresie czasu moim zdaniem zawsze są ewidentne. Natomiast w krótkim okresie czasu, czy w średnim, wywołują wiele emocji i pewnie dlatego jest wielu przeciwników tak wielu umów. Chciałem więc zapytać, czy Pani Komisarz zamierza być może w ramach swojej kadencji przyjrze się, być może także zmieni system analizy wdrażania umów, tak aby również w zakresie promocji pokazywać społecznie europejskim dobre efekty wdrażania tych umów, co ułatwiłoby także podejmowanie inicjatyw w zakresie nowych umów, zresztą tych na przykład, o których Pani wspomniała? Budowanie szerszej wiedzy na temat dobrych efektów otwierania rynków jest, moim zdaniem, zasadniczą kwestią oprócz skutków gospodarczych.

1-118

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner-designate. > It is only natural that in this context we discuss different difficulties and possibilities and challenges, and sometimes it is easy to focus much more on those and forget that trade is actually something that is beneficial for us, for all the reasons that you mentioned – for the consumers, for the countries, for our economies – but also on a people-to-people basis. By bringing people together, we can also address a lot of other issues that come out that are not strictly related to the trade agenda. That is why we need to constantly look at how to improve our assessments before, during and after an agreement, to see if there are things we can do there.

We would definitely need to engage in a sort of new approach when it comes to dialogue with citizens. I know that a lot has been done, but we really need to make sure that all those concerns that are related not only to TTIP – but now mainly TTIP – are addressed and that we find new ways of dialogue, of setting up citizens' panels or – I do not know, we will have to think about that – to engage and listen to those concerns and to address them so that people feel included in our common trade agenda.

1-119

Der Vorsitzende. > Ganz herzlichen Dank an die Mitglieder für die 45 Fragen! Natürlich auch ganz herzlichen Dank an die Kommissionskandidatin, Frau Malmström, für ihre Antworten! Frau Malmström, ich erteile Ihnen noch einmal für fünf Minuten das Wort, falls Sie noch eine abschließende Bemerkung an uns richten möchten.

1-120

Cecilia Malmström, Commissioner-designate. > I am really impressed by the knowledge and commitment in this Committee for trade issues, and it has certainly showed that trade is something that can provoke a lot of passion. It is not surprising, because trade is not only technical discussion, it is really something that goes into the hearts and minds of people and that very much says something about the society we live in and that we want to live in. Do we want to be open to the world? Are we

ready to exchange not goods but also knowledge and ideas? Because international trade means exposure to other cultures and encourages human contacts across the borders. It stimulates economic development but also development of science and creative thinking, and it has made Europe what it is today. This I find tremendously inspiring. Trade can be hugely beneficial to our society while helping our partners to develop as well. This is the beauty: it is not a zero sum game, everybody can win – not least the poorer parts of this world.

Still, if you confirm me as Commissioner for Trade, I realise that this will not be an easy ride. We are involved in a number of bilateral negotiations. They are complicated, and I will do my best to take them in hand. TTIP is the biggest open negotiations, and we have discussed it at length. I am keen to get really involved and come to grips with the details on this and address the issues that people are concerned about. You, as their elected representatives, have, of course, a very important responsibility here. I commit to work with you in the most open and transparent way possible. I know that much has been done, and I am committed to build up on that and to develop it further, because very much is at stake and we need to get this deal right.

As I mentioned, there are not only economic benefits; you can also see TTIP as being of strategic importance. If the two largest economies in the world manage to work together, we have the chance to maximise our influence in setting high global standards. So we need to work with our allies if we want to protect our values and promote the rule of law, high standards of health and safety, strong labour rights and more open markets.

The EU represents 7% of the world's population and 20% of the world's GDP, but we expect our part to shrink – actually economies outside Europe will produce 90% of the world's growth in the coming 20 years. This leads me back to my absolute priority: the multilateral agenda. The WTO is the centrepiece of the global trading system, and it is really in everybody's interest to make sure it continues to play that role and set uniform rules for the entire world economy. It is the world's best international dispute settlement system, and this must be preserved and expanded. WTO is an indispensable forum.

Ladies and gentlemen, Honourable Members, Chairman, Vice-Chairman, there is so much to talk about. We have talked about some of the issues today, many policy areas that are affected: food safety, agriculture, competition, foreign affairs, development and human rights. We have covered a lot, but there are definitely many issues that merit separate discussions. I hope that I have managed to shed some light on the priorities for the future and how I want to work. I hope that we will have many chances to dwell further on this. It is a wide and important agenda, and I would be looking forward to working with you on this.

Thank you very much for all the questions and the discussions and the possibility to be here with you today.

(Applause)

1-121

Der Vorsitzende. > Frau Malmström! Ganz herzlichen Dank, auch noch einmal für Ihre abschließenden Bemerkungen! In der Diskussion sind jenseits von politischen Einschätzungen über ISDS und anderes zwei Dinge noch einmal sehr deutlich geworden: dass wir zum einen natürlich das Vertrauen in die Handelspolitik zu stärken haben, insbesondere die Kommission. In der letzten Woche hatte ich eine Diskussion in Berlin und habe lange über das TTIP und über die Europäische Kommission diskutiert. Ganz zum Schluss sagte ein hochrangiger Vertreter der Kulturszene in Deutschland: „Aber ich traue der Europäischen Kommission nicht.“ Dieser Gefahr, Frau Malmström, müssen wir entgegenwirken. Wenn wir eine Zukunft für europäische Politik gewinnen wollen, dann muss wieder Vertrauen herrschen, und dazu braucht man sicherlich insbesondere Transparenz in der Politik, sodass wir zusammenwirken können.

Der zweite Punkt, auch von vielen angesprochen, ist die Frage der Zusammenarbeit. Es ist ja völlig klar, dass das Parlament letztendlich über Abkommen entscheidet, und Sie wissen, wir haben auch schon das eine oder andere Mal ein Abkommen abgelehnt. Insofern ist die vertrauensvolle Zusammenarbeit und auch die permanente Kommunikation zwischen der Kommission und dem Europäischen Parlament zentral, und ich hoffe, dass diese Botschaft auch angekommen ist: Ohne vernünftige Zusammenarbeit wird es keine vernünftige Handelspolitik geben können.

Ich danke Ihnen noch einmal ganz herzlich. Ich lade die Koordinatoren dann für 18.30 Uhr in ASP 1E2 ein, wo wir dann diese drei Stunden Befragung plus die schriftlichen Antworten analysieren und bewerten, sodass der Ausschuss dann ein profundes Urteil über die Performance von Frau Malmström finden kann.

(Die Sitzung wird um 17.25 Uhr geschlossen.)