



EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2009 - 2014

---

*Delegation for relations with Japan*

---

**D-JP\_PV(2012)0530**

## **MINUTES**

of the

33rd EU-Japan Interparliamentary Meeting of 30 May 2012, from 15.30 to 18.30,  
and 31 May 2012, from 09.00 to 12.30  
Brussels

**30 May 2012**

### **1. Introductory remarks**

Mr van Baalen opened the 33rd EU-Japan IPM and welcomed all those present, in particular Mr Hatoyama and the rest of the Japanese delegation. He underlined the importance of regular discussion between the two sides that covered developments in the EU-Japan relationship and updates on the current situation in the EU and Japan.

Mr Hatoyama thanked Mr van Baalen for his warm welcome and introduced the members of the Japan delegation. He thanked the EU for its support to Japan following the 2011 earthquake and tsunami and stressed the gratitude of the Japanese to the EP delegation for coming to Japan shortly after those disasters. He recognised the serious economic and financial problems currently faced by the EU and stressed that Japan would support Europe however it could.

Mr Hatoyama looked forward to the eastern Asia region following the example of the EU and he was inspired by the philosophy of Robert Schuman and other European leaders. He believed that Japan and its neighbouring region could learn a great deal from the political stability that had been achieved by the EU. Tokyo had a major responsibility to push forward a similar process in East Asia. Japan had provided funds to international financial bodies to help the EU overcome its debt crisis. Japan-EU economic ties needed to be strengthened and negotiations should start as soon as possible on the Economic Partnership Agreement (EPA)/ Free Trade Agreement (FTA). The scoping exercise was in the final stages, although problems remained over railway procurement and the automotive sector and certain non-trade barriers. It was important to start negotiations and to achieve a "win-win" outcome.

## **2. Adoption of draft agenda**

Mr van Baalen introduced the members of the EP delegation. He noted that the agenda had been agreed by both sides. It was therefore deemed to have been adopted.

3.

### **Exchange of views on Current political and economic situation in the EU and Japan**

- **Political and economic situation in the European Union**

Mr van Baalen stressed that a few months ago he would have been confident that the euro crisis had been overcome, thanks to the establishment of a stronger regime to sanction budgetary overspends, agreement on the Fiscal Treaty and the preparation of a structural relief fund. Unfortunately Greece was currently facing serious problems and many Greek politicians who had been elected recently had stated that they wanted to renegotiate the agreements reached between their country's previous government and the EU.

Mr van Baalen believed that Athens should not be allowed to go back on agreements that had been reached. He noted that new elections would be held on 17 June and it remained to be seen what steps the new government would take. There were serious questions about whether Greece would be able to stay in the euro-zone.

He noted that a majority in the EP and among the EU leaders hoped that a future coalition government in Greece would respect the deals already made by its predecessors. Every member state - north and south - had to carry through austerity programmes. Indeed, the previous Dutch government had fallen over the issue of budget cuts. There was a broadly held view in the Netherlands that it was necessary to fulfil the budgetary obligations, although the upcoming elections would be the test of this

Mr van Baalen referred to the aim of the new French government to achieve growth through extra spending. The survival of the euro-zone was of vital importance for Germany, which had an economy that continued to grow because of its high level of exports to Asia. The US economy was also making some progress. He noted the decision by China and Japan to provide funds to the IMF to support the EU. He was uncertain about Chinese involvement, although he had no worries about Japan providing support. He believed that, ultimately, the EU would emerge from the crisis; however it might be without Greece.

Mr Gollnisch noted that he was from the "eurosceptic" minority in the EP, which had reservations about the path being followed by the EU. In his view, the single currency had developed in an imprudent manner and there were serious concerns about the situation of Greece. Its austerity plan did not appear to be having any positive effects and Athens was receiving many loans but it was not clear if these could be repaid. There was concern that this situation might spread to other countries.

He stressed that it was important to decide whether growth should take place through investment - the Keynesian approach - or if should there be more economic rigour. It was not clear which route would be followed by the EU, which was confronted by globalisation and competition from countries with lower salaries and very limited labour rights.

Mr Sögor stressed that it was important to restart the economy and that the EU was a union of people and not merely of banks.

Mr Otani recognised the problems faced by the EU; nevertheless he was confident that these could be overcome. He noted that the new French government was emphasising an approach based on economic stimulus. He asked about investment in a green strategy and for more detail on the EU's reconstruction plan.

Mr Gollnisch noted that legislative elections would be taking place shortly in France. If President Hollande obtained a majority he would need to determine how he would increase investment and where the money would come from. Mr Gollnisch believed that the French President would not put many of his manifesto pledges into practice. It was essential that Greece should not be abandoned; however, in the speaker's view, it would have been better for Athens to have kept the drachma, which would have enabled it to devalue its currency.

Mrs Gayashi noted that Mr Gollnisch thought the EU was becoming "too strong". She believed that from the perspective of the international community a Greek exit from the EU would send a very dangerous signal.

Mr Gollnisch stressed that there were some negative feelings about the EU in parts of Europe and he drew parallels with an equivalent construction in Asia, with an Asian parliament. He believed in cooperation between neighbouring countries but stressed that many citizens did not want to be governed by a supranational body in which they had a limited voice. He stressed that all citizens were pro-European but they also believed in equality between nations.

Mr Sögor accepted that many people did not want a supranational government. However, he argued, the current Greek crisis had shown the need for some form of supranational body to tackle these problems. It was important to continue enlargement and the development of the EU to ensure that it could respond effectively to the crisis.

Mr van Baalen stressed that the overwhelming majority of Europeans were in favour of cooperation between countries; however the institutions of the EU often appeared to be remote and people identified more with their national governments. It was clear that not everything could or should be done in Brussels - the debate was about how much should be done at national and supranational level. Nevertheless, he did not believe that member states could manage the euro crisis on their own.

Mr Harbour stressed that the priority for the Internal Market and Consumer Protection Committee, which he chaired - and indeed the European Council - was to pursue growth enhancing measures and to keep the Single Market open and make it fit for the 21st century. He highlighted the very complex issues surrounding the digital single market, including copyright and cross border payments. He pointed to the importance of major reform of the public procurement aspects of the Single Market. Innovation and research - including instruments related to science and technology - were also crucial, he concluded.

Mr Nakagawa underlined that the EU sovereign debt crisis could also be Japan's problem in the near future. He noted that the Greek government debt was around 200% of GDP and in France the debt figure was 90% of GDP. He noted that the new French government was aiming to focus on growth; however he cautioned against spending too much money to

stimulate the economy, as this could compound the crisis. He referred to the very high government debt in Japan, which currently stood at around 220% and was one of the highest in the developed world. However most of this debt was held by domestic investors and there was still a low interest rate on government bonds. The consumption tax only stood at 5% at present and there was therefore potential for it to be raised. Nevertheless, Japan faced significant challenges with a decreasing birth-rate and an aging population and might have the same problems as the EU.

Mr van Baalen stressed that Japan was perceived as a "serious country" in its financial policies and fulfilment of its obligations and a contrast could be drawn by some with the approach of Greece.

Mr Yamamoto raised the issue of international relationships and the limitations placed on national sovereignty following the Second World War.

Mr Gollnisch contrasted the Greek and French government debts, where many of the creditors were foreign, with the Japanese government debt where the creditors were mainly domestic householders. France also had a deficit in trade - in contrast to Japan's surplus. He was in favour of upholding the rule of law and respecting international treaties, including the European treaties on free trade. However, he did not believe that the EU should open up to free trade with countries which did not follow the same rules. He also considered that states should have control of their own destinies. Finally, he contended that wars broke out when borders were not respected or safeguarded.

Mr van Baalen stressed that crises were now global and the situation in the EU would have an impact on Japan. Although he supported the national sovereignty of the Netherlands, he recognised that some challenges - such as the environment - needed to be tackled together. The Dutch guilder had been too small to stand on its own and had tracked the Deutschmark. He underlined the need for the EU's member states to respond together to the challenge of migration as it was not possible to integrate an unlimited number of migrants. On all these issues it was essential to decide how far the EU should pool its efforts.

### **Political and economic situation in Japan**

Mr Otani referred to the great hopes when the new government took power; however these had not been fulfilled. This was partly because the government did not have a majority in both houses of parliament and partly because of the effects of the Great East Japan Earthquake. There was a desperate need to reform the social security and tax systems to cope with the ageing population, with more people retiring than entering the labour market. Other challenges faced by the government included the American bases in Okinawa and the Trans Pacific Partnership (TPP). The current government was seeking to boost consumption to stimulate the economy but this was proving difficult.

Mrs Hayashi stressed Japan's problem of a population that was ageing and declining. This was compounded by the huge government debt. The authorities were aiming to reform the social security system to encourage couples to have more children. At present they were discouraged from starting families by economic insecurity and the difficulty of balancing work and family life. In order to tackle this situation it was proposed to increase the eligibility for child allowances and to minimise the effects of tuition fees. In addition, the government was

seeking to reduce the waiting lists for nurseries.

Mrs Kondo was one of many speakers to thank the EU for its support following the disasters of March 2011. She referred to the "twisted Diet" in which the ruling party had a majority in the House of Representatives and the opposition had a majority in the House of Councillors. A debate was currently underway over the reform of the tax and social security systems. She was a member of the opposition party which had proposed the raising of the consumption tax to 10%. The governing party broadly agreed with this approach; however the sticking point was how to use the extra funds raised by the tax. The opposition LDP tended to put the emphasis on self help, mutual assistance and then public health. Elections to the House of Representatives would take place by August 2013 at the latest.

Ms Kondo highlighted the challenges facing Japan: the strong yen; the high corporation tax of 30%; the limitations placed on growth by environmental protection measures; the delays in starting negotiations on the EPA; the inflexible labour market; and the restrictions on the use of nuclear power following the Fukushima disaster., which would require Japan to develop alternative sources of power.

She referred to the high levels of EU-Japan trade, noting that the EU was Japan's third largest trading partner and Japan was the EU's sixth largest trading partner. 300 Japanese companies invested in the EU, employing 400,000 people and 1,298 EU companies invested in Japan. She stressed that it was imperative that parliamentarians should be pushing for the starting of negotiations on the EPA/FTA. An agreement would strengthen the EU-Japan relationship, which was economically important but was also based on the common values of freedom and democracy.

Mr van Baalen thanked the Japanese Ambassador for his support and willingness to contribute to delegation meetings.

Mr Gollnisch noted that there was not much knowledge in the EU about the Japanese political situation. He stressed that Japan was a key player in global politics. He wanted to learn about Tokyo's reaction to the rising military power of China and whether there was discussion of amending Article 9 of the Constitution. He was also curious to hear about Japan's response to the North Korean missile launch. Mr Gollnisch asked too about possible cooperation with Russia in the development of Siberia or if the issue of the Northern Territories hampered any such cooperation. He was also interested in the position of the Japanese on relations with the USA and the situation over the American bases in Okinawa - was Tokyo likely to be trying to be more self-reliant in future? Finally he referred to the attractiveness of the EU to migrants and its difficulties in competing on equal terms with developing countries with lower labour costs - he was interested in how Japan dealt with these challenges. .and asked how ancient civilisations could preserve their national identities in a globalised world.

Mrs Nakabayashi stressed that Japan accepted that China was a leading economic power on which the Japan depended for its own prosperity. However, its military expansion, notably in the Sea of Japan, was not necessarily conducive to the stability of Japan. The US bases in Okinawa were a serious issue; however Japan was currently reliant on the American military and to alter this situation would take time.

It was not clear in which direction North Korea was going and it was important to monitor the situation closely - China had an important role to play in this respect.

The Northern Territories was certainly a serious issue between Japan and Russia, nevertheless there was potential for the two sides to cooperate in the development of Siberia. She referred finally to the competition which Japan faced from many developing countries in Asia and the need for it to be more innovative. However she believed that protectionism was not the answer and would lead to a shrinking of the global economy.

Mr Hatoyama noted Japan's concerns over China's increasing military power and the double digit growth in its military budget. The Japan-US military relationship remained very significant. It was important that there was economic cooperation with China and resolution of the existing problems. However Tokyo should be prepared for the worst case scenario and not rule out the revision of Article 9 of the Constitution.

Japan shared its information on North Korea with South Korea and the USA and was constantly monitoring the situation.

He acknowledged the problems with Russia over the Northern Territories and stressed the need to establish mutual confidence. There was potential to cooperate with Russia - and possibly South Korea - in the development of Siberia and to increase the level of trust. The return to power of President Putin could present an opportunity to tackle these issues. Finally, Mr Hatoyama stressed that globalisation was not a panacea to the problems faced by the world and that a new type of capitalism was needed - "capitalism 4.0".

Mr Nakagawa noted that the Japanese constitution was an inheritance of the post-war era and had not been amended for over 60 years. The LDP considered that Article 9 should be amended to allow Japan the right to self defence and protect the country. The issue of amending the constitution had been taboo in the past but people were coming round to the idea and the DPJ was also examining the possibility.

Mr Zasada asked whether there were concerns in Japan that a doubling of the consumption tax - together with an increase in the cost of electricity - might not stifle consumption, which was one of the key motors of the economy. He drew parallels with Poland which had encouraged internal consumption, investment and exports, thereby preventing any negative growth. He was also interested at which point the consumption tax would be levied.

Mr Zasada stressed that both Germany and Poland had benefited from the European project. The Cohesion Funds had helped Poland to develop its economy and its citizens had therefore not needed to go to Germany to work. German exports to Poland had boosted the economies of both countries.

Mr Hamamoto noted that the Japanese government was reviewing the military principles on which it based its defence policy. He pointed to Tokyo's diplomatic and cultural power which it used to protect the country, including its provision of development assistance. Japan recognised that China was an important trade partner but there were some concerns about its military ambitions. In order to balance this Tokyo was strengthening relations with India and other Asian countries.

Mr Otani noted that consumption had decreased in the short term when the tax was previously raised from 3 to 5%; however it had rallied over time. The closure of nuclear plants had meant that Japan was becoming more reliant on energy imports and costs had therefore increased. An expansion in the development of renewable energy might encourage economic growth and increased consumption.

Mrs Hayashi noted that many people in Japan were saving for their retirement or other future expenditure and that this money was not going into the economy. The consumption tax would be increased progressively from 8% to 10% and steps would be taken to protect those on low incomes.

Mrs Schaldemose noted that the equivalent tax varied in Europe and that in Denmark it was 25%. There was compensation for those on lower incomes and the system worked fairly well. She considered that Japan might study the various approaches in the EU.

Mr van Baalen stressed the importance of reducing the burden of red tape on small and medium businesses. He then thanked all those present and looked forward to resuming the meeting on the following day.

**31 May 2012**

### **Future Framework for EU-Japan relations**

#### **Prospects for an EU-Japan Free Trade Agreement (FTA)/ Economic Partnership Agreement (EPA)**

Mr Hatoyama opened the meeting by reviewing the discussions that had taken place in the previous day's session. He noted that in the bilateral meeting with Mr Brok that had just taken place he had urged the European Parliament to support the launch of negotiations on the EPA/FTA. He stressed that there was also a political element to the agreement.

Mrs Nakabayashi referred to the bilateral meeting the previous day with President van Rompuy in which the Japanese delegation had stressed how important it was to start negotiations as soon as possible. She stressed that Japan was facing problems as a knock-on effect of the European crisis and had responded by providing £60 billion in funding via the IMF and buying EFSF bonds. Japan and the EU made up 35% of the international economy and 40% of world trade. The EPA/FTA was essential to the development of the global economy.

She underlined that Japan had dealt with Non Tariff Barriers (NTBs) and was developing transparency in public procurement and the safety tests on cars. It was seriously addressing other issues such as restrictions on liquor sales. On the other hand, there had been no commitment by the EU to abolish its own tariffs. She regretted that Japan - which was now a mature economy - was still seen in the EU as a threat.

She noted that Japanese imports from China had increased four-fold from 1995 to 2010, whereas they had only increased by 1.5% from South Korea and 1.3% from the EU. She stressed that Japanese consumers would be very keen to buy European brands and there was a huge sales potential. Two thirds of Japanese cars that were made in the EU were sold locally, whereas all European cars sold in Japan were imported from the EU. Some Japanese airlines were now buying Airbus and Japan was buying many railway parts from Germany.

Mrs Nakabayashi concluded by stressing that the EU-Japan relations were based on democracy and human rights, unlike relationships with other countries that did not share the same values. The aims of an agreement should be ambitious and reflect the depth of the

relationship.

Mr Harbour noted that the Commission appeared to be pleased at the progress made on the scoping study but it was not yet a "done deal". It was not an auspicious time to negotiate any such agreement and the current imbalances in trade could sway people against the agreement. He accepted that his view was not shared by all MEPs.

Mr Harbour pointed in particular to the issue of car imports and the active lobbying by the European car industry against the current proposals. This was influenced by weak European car sales and worries about over-capacity, which would make it difficult to accept the reduction of tariffs on imported Japanese cars. He noted the Japanese offer to deal with NTBs on motor vehicles; however it was important to show that change was taking place not merely at the level of political commitments but also at operational level, including mutual recognition of testing standards.

There were many other concerns over NTBs on products such as medical devices, pharmaceuticals, and railway equipment. Together with Mrs Kalniete and other members of the delegation he had been working at an informal level by holding meetings with different sectoral interests to examine these issues. In conclusion, Mr Harbour acknowledged that there were concerns about whether the European Parliament and the Council would endorse the position that was likely to be proposed by the Commission.

Mr Hatoyama recognised the concerns over the automobile industry - and in particular the NTBs such as auto inspections.

Mr Walesa noted that he was responsible for the EPA/FTA within the EPP group and was not happy with the level of progress in the negotiations to date. In his view the European Parliament's concerns, which had been set out in the 2011 resolution, had not been sufficiently taken into account. Consequently a plenary resolution was being tabled under rule 90.2 stating that Council should not authorise the opening of trade negotiations until a new report setting out Parliament's position. He stressed at the same time that this was not an attempt to block the negotiations.

Mr Hatoyama recognised the concerns and stressed that Japan was seeking to deal with them very seriously. He believed that the two sides were close to resolving the issues of the automobile industry.

Mrs Schaldemose noted that she had spoken on the previous day with the Danish Minister and it was clear that the Council were minded to start negotiations as soon as possible. She believed that doing so would enable the areas of concern to be tackled.

Mrs Hayashi stressed that many Japanese cars were produced in the EU, thereby boosting European employment. There were also many European cars in Japan. It was important for the two sides to be equals in this area and to take a broader view.

Mr Hatoyama noted that 73% of Japanese cars driven in the EU had also been manufactured in the EU, creating 164,000 jobs. He contrasted this with South Korean cars which were not generally manufactured in Europe.

Mrs Kalniete stressed that the EPA/FTA would be of benefit to both sides and it was important to convince all the main stakeholders of the huge advantages to be derived. She



supported the call to open negotiations and stressed the symbolic and political nature of the agreement, while criticising the "technocratic" approach of the European Commission.

Mr van Baalen argued for going forward with the negotiations and closing the scoping exercise as soon as possible. Ultimately, he said, it was a political decision.

Mr Hatoyama stated that negotiations should be started to address the concerns raised. This was echoed by Mrs Nakabayashi who called for the political process to take over and for two partners with the same values to come together in negotiations.

Mr Gollnisch argued that the recent treaty changes had made the EU institutional architecture more complex and that this had hampered negotiations. He also made a plea for EP Delegations to be represented in the summits with other countries, such as the EU-Japan summit.

Mr Hatoyama recognised the complexity of 27 member states being involved in the process. Mr van Baalen referred to the power of the EP to influence the negotiating mandate and stressed that it was not clear how this issue would be played out among the political groups. Mrs Nakabayashi asked whether it might be helpful for Japanese MPs to communicate their message to the EP. Mr van Baalen stressed that the focus should be on MEPs who were in favour of going forward and there was a clear role for the Japanese embassy in Brussels to demonstrate the benefits of such an approach.

- **other aspects of bilateral cooperation (including human rights)**

In the absence of Mr Harbour the order of agenda items was adjusted.

Mr Hamamoto expressed his long standing opposition to the death penalty. He noted, however, that polls in Japan had shown support of around 80% for its retention. 2011 had been the first year since 1992 when there had been no executions; however on 29 March 2012 there had been three executions. This development had been preceded by a resolution from the European Parliament calling for no executions. Mr Hamamoto referred to the work of the Ministry of Justice Study Group on the Death Penalty which had been set up in August 2010 and had concluded its work on 9 March 2012. It would be preparing a report that was aimed at opening up public discussion on the issue.

He noted that supporters of the death penalty in Japan regarded criticism - such as the EP resolution - as unwarranted interference in an internal Japanese issue. Abolitionists, on the other hand, considered that protection of human rights should be international. Mr Hamamoto referred to proposals that the death penalty should be replaced by a life sentence without parole and wondered whether this was an even more cruel punishment.

Mr Hatoyama noted that many in Japan would not share Mr Hamamoto's opinion.

Mrs Brepoels was pleased to hear the comments of Mr Hamamoto and stressed that the EU-Japan relationship was a mature one based on freedom, democracy and the rule of law. She regretted the resumption of executions in Japan on 29 March 2012 - the first since July 2010 - and the presence of 130 people on death row. She was keen to learn more about the work of the study group that had been set up within the Ministry of Justice and asked for clarification of its status. Mrs Brepoels referred to the EP resolution of 16 February 2012 on capital

punishment in Japan and stressed that the EU was seeking to secure the global abolition of the death penalty.

She also raised concerns about the system of custody on remand in Japan which allowed people to be held for 23 days without any formal charge. She pointed to concern by NGOs such as Amnesty International that people were being coerced into confessions and stressed that the system in Japan needed to be in line with international standards, with questioning taking place in the presence of a lawyer.

Mrs Brepoels then turned to the issue of the "comfort women". She argued that - despite recognition by the Japanese government of the suffering which the women had undergone - the compensation that they had received had been inadequate and not in line with international standards.

Finally Mrs Brepoels noted the steps taken in Japan to set up a Human Rights Committee. She contended that there had been a lack of clarity in the scope of powers of such a committee and the proposals would have given the government too much influence. She stressed the need for the committee to be fully compliant with the Paris Principles.

Mr Hamamoto noted that Prime Minister Murayama and Secretary of State Konno had made statements expressing responsibility and apologies for the sufferings of the comfort women. The Asian Women's Fund had been set up to provide compensation and support to the surviving women. In his personal view Japan had dealt with the issue in terms of international law; however many in the international community considered that the matter was not closed. He considered that resolving the outstanding issues was best left to international organisations. Finally he confirmed that the study group on the death penalty in the Ministry of Justice had been disbanded on 9 March 2012.

Mr Zasada stressed the right to life "from conception to natural death". He appreciated the protection afforded in Japan to "conceived life" but stressed this should be extended to a "natural death". He had previously been a supporter of the death penalty but now believed that guilty parties should be kept separate from society and have an opportunity to feel remorse for their crimes.

Mr Hatoyama noted that Japan would not use war to resolve conflicts and in this respect was very strict about protecting life.

Mrs Kondo argued Japan should make any decision about whether it had the death penalty and a recent poll had shown that 85% of the population was in favour of capital punishment. According to Japanese law the death penalty was not a cruel punishment and Criminal Law 497 excluded those who were mentally ill from the death penalty.

Regarding the comfort women, Mrs Kondo gave details of the compensation that had been provided to 285 women through the Asian Women's Fund. She stressed that Japan had extended its apologies and was still reflecting on the issue; however the matter had been resolved.

Mr Hatoyama noted that there was a question about whether the death penalty was an effective deterrent and added that there had been no executions during his time as Prime Minister.

Mr van Baalen underlined that the Cabinet Secretary who had expressed his apologies was a very high official and his words carried a great deal of weight. He contrasted the approach of Germany after the Second World War - which had allowed individuals to demand compensation from the government - with that of Japan which had made arrangements between states. Finally, he drew a distinction between Europe - where apologies tended to be emotional - with Japan, where they were more formal. He was nevertheless convinced of the sincerity of the Japanese apology. He considered that the issue of the comfort women should be dealt with in a more unofficial way, otherwise it would remain blocked.

Mr Gollnisch argued that the death penalty could be seen as a legitimate and collective expression of the right to collective defence. He noted that a number of murderers had been released and had killed again and that these victims had lost their life because of the abolition of the death penalty. He cited the case of Mohammad Merah who had recently killed seven people in Toulouse, including three children. He agreed with Mr Zasada on the right to life of unborn children and warned that Japan and Western Europe were heading towards a "collective suicide" with a declining and ageing population. He did consider that there should be a much shorter time between sentencing and execution in Japan. However, he strongly opposed the recent declaration by Lady Ashton on the death penalty in Japan as discriminatory and inappropriate, contrasting it with her approach to the USA or China. He did not believe that Europe should be seeking to give lessons to Japan which had a far lower crime rate.

Mr Hatoyama noted that he had been hesitant about abolishing the death penalty as it was also important to respect the right to life of innocent victims. It was essential to proceed cautiously in the matter, he stressed.

Mr Sögor agreed that the EU should be pushing the USA harder on the death penalty. It should also be helping Japan on the issue of the comfort women by setting a good example and he drew parallels with what had happened post 1945 in parts of Europe. Although he was generally opposed to the death penalty, he believed in a case by case approach, noting the specific instances of the execution of President Ceausescu and child killers. He considered that this same approach should apply to abortion, highlighting the situation of women who had been raped during the war in the former Yugoslavia.

Mr Hamamoto noted that 27 states in the USA had abolished the death penalty. He agreed that the right to life was very important and cited the case of Norio Nagayama who had been executed many years after he had been convicted and who had shown a great deal of remorse. Mr Hamamoto argued that in such cases life imprisonment was more appropriate. He regretted too that the compensation provided to victims was so low.

Mr Hatoyama thanked the speakers for a "very fruitful" exchange of views, noting that the opinions expressed on both sides were not always so different.

- **Prospects for a parallel EU-Japan Agreement on political, global and sectoral issues, including cooperation in the fields of security, energy, science & technology and the environment.**

Mrs Kondo outlined the wide range of areas in which the EU and Japan might cooperate and emphasised the importance of their partnership in both the political and the economic spheres.

In particular she highlighted the threat posed by Iran's nuclear programme, which was fully recognised by Japan and she stressed the need for the two sides to cooperate.

She outlined the recent history of cooperation in science and technology dating back to the Action Plan of December 2001 and the 2009 Science and Technology Agreement, which had come into effect in 2011. Mrs Kondo gave details of the cooperation in solar power development and the use of efficiency in cell convergence, stressing the need for this to become commercially viable and for parliamentarians to support the process. She also detailed recent developments in energy cooperation and the recognition by both sides of the need to tackle climate change. She drew attention to the challenges created by Japan's shift away from nuclear energy in the post-Fukushima era and the possible effects that this might have on its aim to reduce the 2020 CO2 emissions by 25% from 1990 levels.

Mr Nakagawa underlined the importance of promoting innovation among SMEs, stressing that they could also be major players in the development of advanced technology. He called for the establishment of an exchange and training programme of highly skilled employees of innovative companies. Finally he stressed the need for Japanese and European citizens to be made aware of the benefits of cooperation and the importance of properly monitoring progress in these areas.

Mr Harbour agreed that it was essential to support innovative companies, especially SMEs. He referred to the emphasis being placed by the EU on promoting the rate of knowledge transfer to exploitable technologies. He stressed that the EU and Japan had a common interest in seeing which projects were successful and the potential for the sharing of good practice needed further attention. He highlighted the work of the European Institute of Technology and the development of networks and communities of inventors, researchers and students at pan-European level.

He welcomed the coming into force of the EU-Japan Science and Technology Agreement, while stressing that it needed to work better. He referred to the work of the Joint Research Centre of the European Commission, in particular its close collaboration with Japan on nuclear safety and the lessons that could be learned from Fukushima. He hoped that this would lead to the reintroduction of nuclear power into Japan's energy mix.

Mr Harbour then highlighted the collaboration that was underway on developing common international standards at pan European level. The USA was also involved in this process and it was also essential to include countries such as Japan, in order to prevent the erection of trade barriers in the future. In this respect he emphasised the importance of common standards on smart grids, in electric vehicles and in nano-technology. He urged the EP delegation to be closely involved in this process and stressed the strong link between this and a future EU-Japan EPA/FTA.

Mr Hatoyama agreed that it was essential to step up cooperation and to develop the appropriate framework for this cooperation. He agreed that there was a need to ensure that Japan and the rest of Asia were not excluded from the development of international standards as this could indeed lead to the creation of new NTBs.

#### **4. Closing remarks**

#### **5. Time and place of next meeting**

Mr van Baalen concluded by stressing that the EP Delegation for relations with Japan was one of the oldest in the European Parliament. This was a sign of the importance to both sides of a relationship based on shared values between two democracies. He looked forward to furthering the discussions in Tokyo in October 2012. The discussion in the meeting had shown that everything could be debated. He also looked forward to a speeding up of progress on the FTA.

Mr Hatoyama also thanked all those present for their contributions and reviewed the discussions. He reiterated the need to start negotiations on the EPA and hoped that they would have begun by the time of the next meeting in October of this year. He looked forward to welcoming the full delegation to Japan for the next interparliamentary meeting in the spring of 2012.

**ПРИСЪСТВЕН ЛИСТ/LISTA DE ASISTENCIA/PREZENČNÍ LISTINA/DELTAGERLISTE/  
ANWESENHEITSLISTE/KOHALOLIJATE NIMEKIRI/KATAΣΤΑΣΗ ΠΑΡΟΝΤΩΝ/RECORD OF ATTENDANCE/  
LISTE DE PRÉSENCE/ELENCO DI PRESENZA/APMEKLĒJUMU REĢISTRS/DALYVIŲ SĄRAŠAS/JELENLÉTI ÍV/  
REĢISTRU TA' ATTENDENZA/PRESENTIELIJST/LISTA OBECNOŠCI/LISTA DE PRESENÇAS/LISTĂ DE PREZENȚĂ/  
PREZENČNÁ LISTINA/SEZNAM NAVZOČIH/LÄSNÄOLOLISTA/DELTAGARLISTA**

Бюро/Mesa/Předsednictvo/Formandskabet/Vorstand/Juhatus/Προεδρείο/Bureau/Ufficio di presidenza/Prezidijs/Biuras/Elnökség/ Prezydium/Birou/Predsednictvo/Predsedstvo/Puheenjohtajisto/Presidiet (*)
Johannes Cornelis van Baalen, Sandra Kalniete, Artur Zasada
Членове/Diputados/Poslanci/Medlemmer/Mitglieder/Parlamendiliikmed/Μέλη/Members/Députés/Deputati/Deputăți/Nariai/Képviselők/ Membri/Leden/Posłowie/Deputados/Deputați/Jäsenet/Ledamöter
Frieda Brepoels, Dolores García-Hierro Caraballo, Bruno Gollnisch, Mike Nattrass, Christel Schaldemose
Заместници/Suplentes/Náhradníci/Stedfortrædere/Stellvertreter/Asendusliikmed/Αναπληρωτές/Substitutes/Suppléants/Supplenti/ Aizstājēji/Pavaduojantys nariai/Póttagok/Sostituti/Plaatsvervangers/Zastępcy/Membros suplentes/Supleanți/Náhradníci/Namestniki/ Varajäsenet/Suppleanter
Adam Bielan, Malcolm Harbour, Csaba Sógor, Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa

187 (2)
193 (3)
49 (6) (Точка от дневния ред/Punto del orden del día/Bod pořadu jednání (OJ)/Punkt på dagsordenen/Tagesordnungspunkt/Päevakorra punkt/Ημερήσια Διάταξη Σημείο/Agenda item/Point OJ/Punto all'ordine del giorno/Darba kārtības punkts/Darbotvarkės punktas/ Napirendi pont/Punt fuq l-aġenda/Agendapunt/Punkt porządku dziennego/Ponto OD/Punct de pe ordinea de zi/Bod programu schôdze/ Točka UL/Esityslistan kohta/Föredragningslista punkt)

Присъствал на/Presente el/Přítomný dne/Til stede den/Anwesend am/Viibis(id) kohal/Παρών στις/Present on/Présent le/Presente il/Piedalījās/  
Dalyvauja/Jelen volt/Prezenti fi/Aanwezig op/Obecny dnia/Presente em/Prezent/Přítomný dňa/Navzoči dne/Läsnä/Närvarande den:

- (1) 30.5.2012  
(2) 31.5.2012

Наблюдатели/Observadores/Pozorovatelé/Observatører/Beobachter/Vaatlejad/Παρατηρητές/Observers/Observateurs/Osservatori/ Novērotāji/Stebėtojai/Megfigyelők/Osservatori/Waarnemers/Obserwatorzy/Observadores/Observatori/Pozorovatelia/Opazovalci/ Tarkkailijat/Observatörer

По покана на председателя/Por invitación del presidente/Na pozvání předsedy/Efter indbydelse fra formanden/Auf Einladung des Vorsitzenden/Εσιμεhe kutsel/Με πρόσκληση του Προέδρου/At the invitation of the Chair(wo)man/Sur l'invitation du président/Su invito del presidente/Pēc priekšsēdētāja uzaicinājuma/Pirmininkui pakvietus/Az elnök meghívására/Fuq stedina tal-President/Op uitnodiging van de voorzitter/Na zaproszenie Przewodniczącego/A convite do Presidente/La invitația președintelui/Na pozwanie predsedu/Na povabilo predsednika/Puheenjohtajan kutsusta/På ordförandens inbjudan

Съвет/Consejo/Rada/Rådet/Rat/Nðukogu/Συμβούλιο/Council/Conseil/Consiglio/Padome/Taryba/Tanács/Kunsill/Raad/Conselho/Consiliu/Svet/Neuvosto/Rådet (*)
Комисия/Comisión/Komise/Kommissionen/Kommission/Euroopa Komisjon/Επιτροπή/Commission/Commissione/Komisija/Bizottság/Kummissjoni/Commissie/Komisja/Comissão/Comisie/Komisja/Komissio/Kommissionen (*)
Европейска служба за външна дейност/Evropská služba pro vnější činnost/EU-Udenrigstjenesten/Europäischer Auswärtiger Dienst/Euroopa välisteenistus/Ευρωπαϊκή Υπηρεσία Εξωτερικής Δράσης/European External Action service/Servicio Europeo de Acción Exterior/Service européen pour l'action extérieure/Servizio europeo per l'azione esterna/Eiropas Ārējās darbības dienests/Europolis išorės veiksmų tarnyba/Európai Külügyi Szolgálat/Servizz Ewropew għall-Azzjoni Esterna/Europese dienst voor extern optreden/Europejska Służba Działañ Zewnętrznych/Serviço Europeu para a Acção Externa/Serviciul european pentru acțiune externă/Európska služba pre vonkajšiu činnosť/Evropska služba za zunanje delovanje/Euroopan ulkosuhdehallinto/Europeiska avdelningen för yttre åtgärd (*)
Christopher Dashwood, Luisa Rahger
Други институции/Otras instituciones/Ostatní orgány a instituce/Andre institutioner/Andere Organe/Muud institutsioonid/Άλλα θεσμικά όργανα/Other institutions/Autres institutions/Altre istituzioni/Citas iestādes/Kitos institucijos/Más intézmények/Istituzzjonijiet oħra/Andere instellingen/Inne instytucje/Outras Instituições/Alte instituții/Iné inštitúcie/Druge institucije/Muut toimeilimet/Andra institutioner/organ

Други учасници/Otros participantes/Ostatní účastníci/Endvidere deltog/Andere Teilnehmer/Muud osalejad/Επίσης Παρόντες/Other participants/Autres participants/Altri partecipanti/Citi klātesošie/Kiti dalyviai/Más résztvevők/Partecipanti ohra/Andere aanwezigen/Inni uczestnicy/Outros participantes/Alți participanți/Iní účastníci/Drugi udeleženci/Muut osallistujat/Övriga deltagare

Секретариат на политическите групи/Secretaría de los Grupos políticos/Sekretariát politických skupin/Gruppernes sekretariat/Sekretariat der Fraktionen/Fraktsioonide sekretariaat/Γραμματεία των Πολιτικών Ομάδων/Secretariats of political groups/Secrétariat des groupes politiques/Segreteria gruppi politici/Politisko grupu sekretariāts/Fracijų sekretoriai/Képviseletcsoportok titkársága/Sekretarjat gruppi poliitici/Fractiesecretariaten/Sekretariat Grup Politycznych/Secr. dos grupos políticos/Secretariate grupuri politice/Sekretariát politických skupín/Sekretariat političnih skupin/Poliittisten ryhmien sihteeristö/Gruppernas sekretariat

PPE	Anne Vahl
S&D	Angelos Lepouras
ALDE	Conan D'Arcy
ECR	
Verts/ALE	
GUE/NGL	
EFD	
NI	

Кабинет на председателя/Gabinete del Presidente/Kancelář předsedy/Formandens Kabinet/Kabinett des Präsidenten/Presidendi kantselei/Γραφείο Προέδρου/President's Office/Cabinet du Président/Gabinetto del Presidente/Priekšsēdētāja kabinets/Pirmininko kabinetas/Elnöki hivatal/Kabinett tal-President/Kabinet van de Voorzitter/Gabinet Przewodniczącego/Gabinete do Presidente/Cabinet Președinte/Kancelária predsedu/Urad predsednika/Puhemiehen kabinetti/Talmanens kansli

Кабинет на генералния секретар/Gabinete del Secretario General/Kancelář generálního tajemníka/Generalsekretærens Kabinet/Kabinett des Generalsekretärs/Peasekretäri büroo/Γραφείο Γενικού Γραμματέα/Secretary-General's Office/Cabinet du Secrétaire général/Gabinetto del Segretario generale/Ģenerālsekretāra kabinets/Generalinio sekretoriaus kabinetas/Főtitkári hivatal/Kabinett tas-Segretarju Ġenerali/Kabinet van de secretaris-generaal/Gabinet Sekretarza Generalnego/Gabinete do Secretário-Geral/Cabinet Secretar General/Kancelária generálneho tajomníka/Urad generalnega sekretarja/Pääsihteerin kabinetti/Generalsekreterarens kansli



Генерална дирекция/Dirección General/Generální ředitelství/Generaldirektorat/Generaldirektion/Peadirektoraat/Γενική Διεύθυνση/ Directorate-General/Direction générale/Direzione generale/Ģenerāldirektorāts/Generalinis direktoratas/Főigazgatóság/Direttorat Ġenerali/Direktoraten-generaal/Dyrekcja Generalna/Direcção-Geral/Direcții Generale/Generálne riaditeľstvo/Generalni direktorat/ Pääosasto/Generaldirektorat	
DG PRES DG IPOL DG EXPO DG COMM DG PERS DG INLO DG TRAD DG INTE DG FINS DG ITEC	Stefan Schulz  Sandro D'Angelo
Правна служба/Servicio Jurídico/Právní služba/Juridisk Tjeneste/Juristischer Dienst/Õigusteenistus/Νομική Υπηρεσία/Legal Service/ Service juridique/Servizio giuridico/Juridiskais dienests/Teisės tarnyba/Jogi szolgálat/Servizz legali/Juridische Dienst/Wydział prawny/ Serviço Jurídico/Serviciu Juridic/Právny servis/Pravna služba/Oikeudellinen yksikkö/Rättstjänsten	
Секретариат на комисията/Secretaría de la comisión/Sekretariát výboru/Udvalgssekretariatet/Ausschusssekretariat/Komisjoni sekretariaat/Γραμματεία επιτροπής/Committee secretariat/Secrétariat de la commission/Segreteria della commissione/Komitejas sekretariāts/Komiteto sekretoriatas/A bizottság titkársága/Sekretarjat tal-kumitat/Commissiesecretariaat/Sekretariat komisji/ Secretariado da comissão/Secretariat comisie/Sekretariat odbora/Valiokunnan sihteeristö/Utskottssekretariatet	
Tim Boden	
Сътрудник/Asistente/Asistent/Assistent/Assistenz/Βοηθός/Assistant/Assistente/Palīgs/Padējējas/Asszisztens/Asystent/Pomočnik/ Avustaja/Assisterter	
Monste Gabás, Kathleen Huygen	

- \* (P) = Председател/Presidente/Předseda/Formand/Vorsitzender/Esimees/Πρόεδρος/Chair(wo)man/Président/Priekšsēdētājs/Pirmininkas/  
Elnök/President/Voorzitter/Przewodniczący/Preşedinte/Predseda/Predsednik/Puheenjohtaja/Ordförande
- (VP) = Заместник-председател/Vicepresidente/Místopředseda/Næstformand/Stellvertretender Vorsitzender/Aseesimees/Αντιπρόεδρος/  
Vice-Chair(wo)man/Vice-Président/Priekšsēdētāja vietnieks/Pirmininko pavaduotojas/Alelnök/Víci President/Ondervoorzitter/  
Wiceprzewodniczący/Vice-Présidente/Vicepreşedinte/Podpredseda/Podpredsednik/Varapuheenjohtaja/Vice ordförande
- (M) = Член/Miembro/Člen/Medlem/Mitglied/Parlamendiliige/Μέλος/Member/Membre/Membro/Deputāts/Narys/Képviselő/  
Membbru/Lid/Członek/Membro/Membbru/Člen/Poslanec/Jäsen/Ledamot
- (F) = Длъжностно лице/Funcionario/Úředník/Tjenestemand/Beamter/Ametnik/Υπάλληλος/Official/Fonctionnaire/Funzionario/  
Ierēdnis/Pareigūnas/Tisztviselő/Ufficial/Ambtenaar/Urzędnik/Funcionário/Funcionar/Úradník/Uradnik/Virkamies/Tjänsteman