

Procedure : 2010/2110(INI)

[Document stages in plenary](#)

Document selected : [A7-0030/2011](#)

Texts tabled :
A7-0030/2011

Debates :
 PV 07/03/2011 - 26
 CRE 07/03/2011 - 26

Votes :
 PV 08/03/2011 - 9.9
 Explanations of votes
 Explanations of votes

Texts adopted :
 [P7_TA\(2011\)0083](#)

Texts adopted

Tuesday, 8 March 2011 - Strasbourg

Provisional edition

Agriculture and international trade

[P7_TA-PROV\(2011\)0083](#)

[A7-0030/2011](#)

▶ European Parliament resolution of 8 March 2011 on EU agriculture and international trade (2010/2110(INI))

The European Parliament,

- having regard to Part Three, Title III and Part Five, Titles II and V of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU),
- having regard to the principles relating to the welfare requirements of animals laid down in Article 13 of the TFEU,
- having regard to the WTO agreements, and in particular to the Agreement on Agriculture which was negotiated during the Uruguay Round and entered into force on 1 January 1995,
- having regard to the Declaration adopted at the fourth Ministerial Conference held in Doha from 9 to 14 November 2001, to the Decision adopted by the WTO General Council on 1 August 2004 and to the Declaration adopted at the sixth Ministerial Conference held in Hong Kong from 13 to 18 December 2005,
- having regard to its resolution of 4 April 2006 on the assessment of the Doha Round following the WTO Ministerial Conference in Hong Kong ⁽¹⁾,
- having regard to the revised draft modalities for agriculture circulated on 6 December 2008 by the WTO chairperson of the agriculture negotiations,
- having regard to the Memorandum of Understanding of 15 May 2009 between the United States of America and the European Commission regarding the importation of beef from animals not treated with certain growth-promoting hormones and increased duties applied by the United States to certain products of the European Communities,
- having regard to the mutually agreed solution reached on 15 July 2009 between Canada and the European Union to the dispute entitled 'European Communities – Measures Affecting the Approval and Marketing of Biotech Products',
- having regard to the agreement initialled on 15 December 2009 between the EU and Latin American countries setting the conditions for the final settlement of pending disputes on the EU import regime for bananas (Geneva Agreement),
- having regard to its resolution of 16 December 2009 on the prospects for the Doha Development Agenda (DDA) following the Seventh WTO Ministerial Conference ⁽²⁾,
- having regard to the conclusion, on 17 December 2009, of the negotiations between the EU and Morocco on an agreement concerning liberalisation measures on agricultural and fisheries products,
- having regard to the conclusion, on 1 March 2010, of the negotiations between the EU, Peru and Colombia on the signing of a Multi-Party Agreement,
- having regard to the mutually agreed solution reached on 18 March 2010 between the Argentine Republic and the European Union to the dispute entitled 'European Communities - Measures Affecting the Approval and Marketing of Biotech Products',
- having regard to its resolution of 25 March 2010 on 'Agricultural product quality policy: what strategy to follow?' ⁽³⁾,
- having regard to the conclusion, on 19 May 2010, of the negotiations between the EU and Central America on the trade pillar of the

Association Agreement,

- having regard to its resolution of 8 July 2010 on the future of the Common Agricultural Policy after 2013⁽⁴⁾,
- having regard to the Free Trade Agreement between the EU and South Korea signed on 6 October 2010,
- having regard to the ongoing negotiations between the EU and Mercosur towards an Association Agreement,
- having regard to the ongoing negotiations between the EU and Canada towards a Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement,
- having regard to the ongoing negotiations between the EU and India towards a Free Trade Agreement,
- having regard to the ongoing negotiations between the EU and Ukraine towards an Association Agreement,
- having regard to its study entitled 'Stocktake of the WTO Agricultural Negotiations after the Failure of the 2008 Talks', of June 2009,
- having regard to the guide entitled 'Geographical Indications and TRIPs: 10 Years Later. A roadmap for EU GI holders to get protection in other WTO Members', which was commissioned by the Commission,
- having regard to the Commission proposal of 15 September 2010 for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on OTC derivatives, central counterparties and trade repositories (COM (2010)0484),
- having regard to the issue of the liberalisation of duties for Pakistan, as provided for in Article 1 of the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council introducing emergency autonomous trade preferences for Pakistan (**COM(2010)0552**),
- having regard to the UN Millennium Development Goals,
- having regard to Article 208 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union,
- having regard to Rule 48 of its Rules of Procedure,
- having regard to the report of the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development and the opinions of the Committee on International Trade and the Committee on Development (**A7-0030/2011**),

A. whereas the EU remains by far the largest importer of agricultural goods in the world, with imports having almost doubled in value over the past decade and now accounting for nearly 20% of world imports,

B. whereas the EU's share of global agricultural exports is declining as a result of the faster growth of other key agricultural trading partners; whereas final products accounted for 68% of the value of EU exports in 2007-2009, while intermediate products and commodities represented 23% and 9% respectively; whereas, furthermore, world market prices are a factor in the difficulties the EU is experiencing in exporting its products, given that, in general, prices are low and the Union has higher production costs,

C. whereas the EU agricultural trade deficit reached a record high of €7 billion in 2008; whereas the EU's trade deficit with Mercosur, for example, has more than doubled since 2000 and EU imports of agricultural products from Mercosur are now worth €19 billion worth, as against €1 billion worth of exports,

D. whereas the EU is the world's largest importer of agricultural goods from developing countries, importing more than the US, Japan, Canada, Australia and New Zealand combined; whereas around 71% of the EU's total agricultural imports originate from developing countries, as a result of the Everything but Arms (EBA) initiative for least developed countries (LDCs), the generalised system of preferences (GSP), and the Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs),

E. whereas the 2008 WTO draft modalities on agriculture would require even greater concessions from the EU than those set out in the already substantial offer made by the EU in October 2005,

F. whereas the application of policy coherence for development (PCD) to agriculture and trade will also impact on the fulfilment of Millennium Development Goals 1 (eradication of extreme poverty and hunger) and 8 (global partnership for development), including through provisions for fairer trade rules and market access,

G. whereas the EU has already drastically reduced its trade-distorting domestic support, unlike key trading partners, in particular the US, which maintained and in some cases strengthened its instruments under the 2008 Farm Bill,

H. whereas the EU has unilaterally made a substantial reduction in its export refunds, with their share of the CAP budget falling from 29.5 % in 1993 to only 1.2 % in 2009, and with the proportion of the value of agricultural exports for which export refunds are paid falling from 25% in 1992 to only 0.9% in 2009; whereas some key trading partners are continuing to make considerable use of other forms of export incentives,

I. whereas, in the framework of the 'beef hormones' dispute, the US is continuing to impose sanctions on the EU and had even announced that they will be rotated to cover other EU agricultural products, in order to increase their impact ('carousel' legislation); whereas under the

Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) the EU grants a zero-duty import tariff quota of 20 000 tons of beef,

J. whereas the US has challenged, within the WTO, the EU rules governing the hygiene and marketing of poultry,

K. whereas a mutually agreed solution was reached with Canada and Argentina on the 'GMOs dispute'; whereas the US has made a general retaliation request,

L. whereas the ruling of the WTO panel on sugar was one of the main drivers of the 2006 EU sugar reform and is still having a major impact on trade in sugar; whereas the common market organisation for sugar respects all EU trade commitments; whereas in the space of three years the EU has changed from being the second largest exporter of sugar to the second largest net importer, mainly for the benefit of developing countries (LDCs and ACP countries),

M. whereas the 2006 sugar reform has achieved the objectives of increasing competitiveness, reducing sugar prices and decreasing the sugar production quota by about 30%; whereas, however, it has led to the closure of 83 factories out of a total of 189 in the EU-27, the loss of over 16 500 direct jobs in rural areas, and the end of sugar beet cultivation for around 140 000 farmers,

N. whereas the world sugar market is one of the most volatile agricultural commodity markets and is dominated by one country (Brazil); whereas EU sugar production provides a reliable supply to the world market and ensures a regular internal supply of high quality and sustainable products for European users,

O. whereas the EU is promoting sustainable production of renewable energy, through requirements to be applied by the end of 2010; whereas the EU already imports more than 25% of its fuel bioethanol consumption, not including bioethanol imported in the form of mixtures with the aim of circumventing import duties; whereas the Commission needs to ensure that there is a balance between internal bioethanol production and imports, in accordance with Article 23(5)(a) of the Renewable Energy Directive (Directive 2009/28/EC⁽⁵⁾),

P. whereas the 4th Session of the Conference of the Parties to the WHO's Framework Convention on Tobacco Control will be held in November 2010; whereas a public consultation has been launched on the possible revision of the Tobacco Products Directive (Directive 2001/37/EC⁽⁶⁾); whereas several WTO members have raised the issue of the conformity with the TBT Agreement of Canadian Bill C-32, which effectively involves the banning of all traditional blended tobacco products except those using solely Virginia tobacco, the only variety produced in Canada and used in the manufacturing of Canadian tobacco products,

Q. whereas the EU must strike a balance in international trade agreements between market liberalisation and protection for economic sectors and the rights of workers and consumers,

R. whereas EU trade agreements with third countries must safeguard EU sectors that are experiencing difficulties – in particular the fruit and vegetables, livestock and cereals sectors, in which incomes have fallen substantially – and, at the same time, offer them genuine export opportunities,

S. whereas local small farmers, who make a significant contribution to food security in their regions, must not be adversely affected by the EU's conclusion of international trade agreements,

T. whereas the EU must aim to secure better monitoring of human rights and social and environmental standards when concluding international trade agreements,

U. whereas Parliament's consent is required for the conclusion of trade agreements negotiated by the Commission,

Consistency between EU agricultural and common commercial policies

1. Considers that the EU agricultural sector has a clear added value for the European economy and a strategic role to play in the EU 2020 strategy towards tackling the economic, social and environmental challenges that the EU is facing; underlines the need to ensure policy coherence between the EU's agricultural, trade and development policies;

2. Stresses that external trade policy must not jeopardise the EU's ability to maintain a strong agricultural sector and to ensure food security against a background of increased market volatility; calls on the Commission to defend, in all fora, and in the WTO in particular, the multifunctional role of EU agriculture, including the vital role it plays in providing employment and in sustaining the vitality of rural areas, and the European agri-food model, which is a strategic component of Europe's economy;

3. Condemns the Commission's approach, which far too often makes concessions on agriculture in order to obtain enhanced market access in third countries for industrial products and services; calls on the Commission to stop putting agricultural interests behind the interests of the industrial and services sector;

4. Calls on the Commission to propose an approach that strikes a balance between domestic production and imports, taking into account, for each agricultural sector, the development of multilateral and bilateral trade negotiations, as well as EU environmental, social, animal welfare and safety standards and respect for human rights;

5. Stresses that, in relation to the agricultural sector, the Commission must conduct impact assessments which must be made public before the commencement of negotiations and proposed updates to take account of new positions arising in the negotiations; emphasises the need for a proper and transparent process for consulting all interested parties, particularly in Parliament and the Commission; recalls that a domestic advisory council was included in the Free Trade Agreement between the EU and South Korea and notes that this could be a precedent for the

involvement of interested parties and stakeholders in future trade agreements;

6. Underlines that impact assessments must look at the specificities of each commodity, such as the beef market, taking market segmentation into account; highlights the fact that previous impact assessments have provided only global figures; urges the Commission therefore to provide detailed impact assessments taking into account the effects on specific segments of the market arising from the opening up of EU agricultural markets to the Mercosur trade bloc;

7. Takes the view that decisions to further open up the EU market to imports of agricultural goods should not be taken without ensuring that EU farmers can be compensated for their losses;

8. Underlines the fact that financial compensation cannot offset the negative impacts of the discontinuation of EU agricultural production, which guarantees food safety and quality and is essential for the prosperity of EU rural areas and the protection of rural landscapes against the threat of land abandonment and rural depopulation; emphasises, therefore, the need to maintain the conditions necessary for EU farmers to remain viable and receive a fair income in all Member States, thus clearing the way for the revitalisation of farming in Europe, in the light of the key role played by the CAP in the EU setup;

9. Recalls that EU producers are obliged to meet the highest standards in terms of quality, product hygiene, sustainable production methods, plant health, animal health and welfare, traceability, pesticide residue control, veterinary medicine and additives;

10. Is adamant that third-country production methods for export to the EU must provide European consumers with the same guarantees in terms of health, food safety, animal welfare, sustainable development and minimum social standards as those required of EU producers; underlines that this is the only way to ensure that EU producers can compete on a level playing field with third countries, and insists on the need for tighter import controls at borders and for checks on production and marketing conditions carried out by the Food and Veterinary Office in countries exporting to the EU to be stepped up, so that compliance with EU standards is guaranteed;

11. Stresses the need, in relation to imports, for strict compliance with origin rules and mechanisms for the prevention of triangular trade;

12. Urges the Commission proactively to promote the EU's offensive agricultural interests and to make it easier for EU products to gain access to third-country markets, given the vast export and world market stabilisation potential of the EU's high quality agri-food products; underlines, *inter alia*, the need to step up promotion programmes; notes that these measures are WTO-compatible, falling as they do into the 'green box';

13. Notes that the outermost regions (ORs) are an integral part of the EU and that trade agreements apply in their entirety to such regions; stresses that lower customs tariffs pose a threat to the fragile economies of ORs, which are based mainly on farming and produce goods similar to those produced by, among others, Latin American partner countries; points out that, under Article 349 of the TFEU, EU policies may be tailored to the specific geographical and economic circumstances of such regions; calls accordingly on the Commission to take account, during negotiations, of the specific situation of ORs, so as to ensure that their development is not undermined;

Agriculture in the multilateral trading system Doha Development Agenda (DDA)

14. Considers that, in a bid to secure a successful outcome to the DDA, the EU made an extremely generous offer on agriculture, which cannot be increased, but this has not, to date, been reciprocated by an equivalent level of ambition from other developed and advanced developing countries;

15. Recalls that the 2003 CAP reform and the 2008 'Health Check' have demonstrated the seriousness of the EU's reform commitments by anticipating the likely results of the Doha round, while equivalent concessions are still expected from the EU's trading partners;

16. Calls on the Commission to comply strictly with its negotiating mandate from the Council, which sets the most recent reform of the CAP as the limit of its action, provided that equivalent concessions are obtained from its trading partners; asks it to refrain from making any proposals that would predetermine the decisions to be made on the future of the CAP post-2013;

17. Emphasises the role of non-trade concerns (NTC) in the Doha Development Agenda; takes the view that, in the agriculture sector negotiations, a balance needs to be struck between the economic dimension of trade and non-economic values, such as social values, environmental concerns, human health and animal health and welfare;

18. Deplores the absence of progress on the establishment of a multilateral register for wines and spirits as well as on the extension of the protection of geographical indications to all agricultural products; recalls that these elements are *sine qua non* for a balanced outcome to the agricultural negotiations; emphasises the need for the principles underpinning the EU's agricultural product quality policy to be promoted more widely at multilateral and bilateral level;

19. Recalls that the EU has already significantly reduced its trade-distorting domestic support and asks for firm commitments to do the same from other trading partners;

20. Recalls the commitment made by the WTO members during the 2005 Hong Kong Ministerial Conference to achieving the elimination of all forms of export subsidies in full parallelism with the imposition of disciplines on all export measures with equivalent effect, notably export credits, agricultural state trading enterprises and the regulation of food aid;

21. Considers that the general reduction in customs tariffs should be assessed in the light of the EU offer concerning the domestic support and export competition pillars, and should depend on the possibility of keeping the Special Safeguard clause, on a specific exemption from tariff simplification disciplines and on adequate flexibility in the formula for tariff cuts and in the designation of sensitive products; is of the opinion

that the proposed mechanism for designating sensitive products is fatally undermined by the obligation to achieve a significant tariff quota expansion;

22. Stresses the need for the 'single undertaking' principle to be upheld in the WTO's DDA negotiations; points out that, for some time now, there has been a tendency for the negotiations to focus on a limited range of negotiating areas, including agriculture, in which the EU has major defensive interests, with relatively less progress being made in other negotiating areas, and this is threatening to undermine the EU's negotiating position; points out, in addition, that this is making it difficult to take stock of the Round as a whole;

23. Reaffirms that developing countries should legitimately be allowed to enact policies which create domestic added value;

24. Stresses that the volatility of prices has aggravated malnutrition problems worldwide, as the FAO observes, and that greater liberalisation of world trade in agricultural products, which has been encouraged by WTO agreements, has not so far made it possible to curb the threat of hunger in the world; stresses that the EU also has a duty to contribute to world food security;

WTO dispute settlement

25. Notes the fact that the agreement on trade in bananas settles 20 years of the most technically complex, politically sensitive and significant WTO-dispute, constitutes an important step towards the consolidation of a rule-based multilateral trading system, and at the same time could make a decisive contribution to the resolution of issues relating to tropical products and preferences in WTO negotiations;

26. Calls on the Commission to ensure that the settlement of the 'beef hormones' dispute will allow for the suspension of the sanctions on EU products, while guaranteeing that beef imports to the EU will be in line with EU requirements;

27. Considers, with regard to the 'chlorinated poultry' dispute, that the importation of such products into the EU would be contrary to the public demand in the EU for safe products and to the principles underpinning the European food model;

28. Asks the Commission vigorously to defend the EU regime for authorising and marketing GMOs against challenges in the WTO;

Agriculture in plurilateral, inter-regional and bilateral trade relations

29. Believes that the conclusion of multilateral negotiations is a priority to be pursued by the EU; believes that bilateral trade agreements must complement multilateral processes in the form of respect for equal working conditions, common environmental rules and food safety standards already in force in the European Union and avoid the fostering solely of sustainable development programmes; recalls that the EU has substantial offensive interests in agriculture, in particular as regards high-quality processed products; believes that bilateral trade agreements with major trade partners can successfully promote the export interests of the EU agro-food industry, providing substantial economic benefits;

30. Calls for agricultural imports into the EU to provide European consumers with the same guarantees in terms of consumer protection, animal welfare, environmental protection and minimum social standards as those provided by European production methods, and draws attention to Parliament's firm position on this matter; calls on the Commission to include clauses in bilateral trade agreements that oblige third countries to comply with the same sanitary and phytosanitary conditions that are imposed on European producers; considers that such agreements must provide at least for compliance with international obligations and standards;

31. Stresses that in order to avoid 'paying twice'— first at bilateral and then at multilateral level – the concept of a 'single pocket agreement' must be supported, under which concessions in bilateral agreements will be linked to the final outcome of the Doha negotiations;

32. Emphasises the importance of strict implementation of the preferential rules of origin; calls for a review of all trade preferences given to emerging countries which are members of the G-20 by the European Union;

33. Takes the view that curbs should be put in place to prevent irregular practices in agri-food trade, such as triangular trade, when a country exports its production to the EU, taking advantage of EU market access preferences, and then meets its own needs by importing the products from abroad; considers that, in order to prevent such irregularities, EU market access concessions offered by the EU in trade agreements concluded with third countries should not exceed the actual production and export capabilities of the countries concerned;

34. Calls on the Commission strongly to defend the inclusion of geographical indications (GIs) as an essential part of the Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement (ACTA); regrets that, in the framework of recently concluded or ongoing trade negotiations, only a 'short list' of EU GIs is to be protected by our trading partners; points out that, in line with the Global Europe strategy, bilateral agreements must secure enhanced international protection for geographical indications through WTO+ provisions; emphasises the need for a proper and transparent process for consulting all interested parties, particularly in Parliament and the Commission;

35. Recalls that the Free Trade Agreement with South Korea allowed significant numbers of GIs to be recognised; calls for further efforts to be made to provide for this in future trade agreements; notes that the protection and recognition of GIs in third countries is potentially of great value to the EU's agri-food sector;

36. Notes that, according to the Commission, the EU-South Korea Free Trade Agreement (FTA) would relieve EU exporters of the burden of €380 million in duties annually, by eliminating duties on 99% of EU agricultural exports;

37. Asks the Commission to ensure that trade agreements do not undermine the EU system of entry prices for fruit and vegetables, while maintaining the current import schedules; urges the Commission, nevertheless, to make the changes necessary to improve the system's functioning as soon as possible;

38. Stresses, in particular, that the complex system of entry prices that applies to tomato imports from Morocco is causing problems; calls, therefore, on the Commission to make the relevant changes without delay;
39. Expresses its strong concern about the EU-Morocco agreement; points out that, while European markets have opened up almost completely to imports from Morocco, some agricultural products are still subject to quotas on exports from the EU, including important products such as pomaceous fruits;
40. Regrets that, in the negotiations on the agricultural chapter of the association agreement with Morocco, no guarantees were given in respect of compliance with the preferential import quotas or the entry prices applying to Moroccan exports;
41. Calls on the Commission to abide by its commitments regarding the EU sugar sector and to end systematic concessions on sugar in bilateral and multilateral trade negotiations; notes in this context the initiatives of the sugar sector, which have increased its competitiveness while improving its environmental sustainability and contributing to the EU development agenda via the preferences granted to ACP countries and LDCs;
42. Points out that any additional bilateral EU sugar market access concessions granted to third countries (for example Latin American countries and Ukraine) will be destabilising for the EU sugar market and will cause preference erosion for LDCs and ACP countries; is all the more concerned by the fact that such concessions, when granted to net importing countries, encourage swap mechanisms; calls on the Commission to continue to exclude sugar and sugar-derived products, including ethanol, from the scope of bilateral negotiations;
43. Calls on the Commission to guard against the circumvention of import duties on ethanol, since growing quantities of ethanol are now entering the EU in the form of mixtures with a very low import duty;
44. Calls on the Commission to ensure that there are symmetrical tariff concessions in free trade area agreements concluded by the EU with countries with significant agricultural production and export capabilities, e.g. Mercosur;
45. Notes the resumption of negotiations on the EU-Mercosur Association Agreement – an agreement of the utmost importance, which would affect 700 million people and would be the world's most ambitious bi-regional agreement – and therefore stresses that the European Parliament should be closely involved at all stages of the negotiations;
46. Considers it unacceptable that the Commission resumed negotiations with Mercosur without making publicly available a detailed impact assessment and without engaging in a proper political debate with the Council and Parliament; calls for a study into the impact of these negotiations on European agricultural sectors and regions to be produced and discussed before any tariff proposals are exchanged between the EU and Mercosur; points out that, given the agricultural implications of the negotiations, a link with the Doha Round must necessarily be established; calls accordingly on the Commission not to conclude the negotiations with Mercosur until the WTO round has been brought to a close, as stipulated in its mandate; calls on the Commission to keep the Council and Parliament duly informed of developments in the negotiations with Mercosur and in future to inform Council and Parliament before such trade negotiations commence;
47. Is deeply concerned about the impacts on the EU agricultural sector as a whole of a possible association agreement with Mercosur, given the request made by Mercosur in March 2006 for access to the EU agricultural market, which went considerably further than the already substantial offer made by the EU in 2004; considers it is necessary, therefore, to review the concessions so as to protect our farmers' interests;
48. Considers that the position of the new Member States has not been taken into account in the negotiations between the EU and Mercosur, based on the mandate agreed by the Council in 1999;
49. Notes that farm businesses in Mercosur countries have much lower production costs, including land, labour and other capital costs, and that Mercosur producers do not have to meet the same standards as EU producers, with regard to the environment, animal welfare, food safety and phytosanitary measures; emphasises that a balanced outcome for both parties must be achieved by making sure that the negotiations take full account of consequences and impacts, in particular on environmental and social challenges; calls on the Commission to carry out an impact assessment on the consequences of such an agreement for the agricultural sector;
50. Is of the opinion that the level of market integration in the Mercosur customs union is currently insufficient to guarantee an adequate circulation of imported goods within the region; takes the view that an agreement would not yield any real dividends in the absence of provisions ensuring full and effective circulation of goods within the Mercosur area;
51. Regrets the tariff concessions recently granted by the Commission to the countries that export bananas to the EU; calls for a review of the aid received by European producers under aid programmes for the outermost regions (POSEI) in order to compensate these producers for the effects that this cut in tariffs will have on prices in the EU market; believes that the interests of Community producers and ACP producers must be taken into consideration in similar future negotiations, so that these sectors, which provide numerous jobs, are not weakened;
52. Underlines the fact that a series of reports from the Food and Veterinary Office highlights the ongoing failure of Brazilian beef to meet EU producer and consumer standards on food safety, animal identification and traceability, animal health and disease controls;
53. Urges the Commission to study the various reports published by the Brazilian National Health Surveillance Agency (Anvisa) on the widespread use in Brazil of pesticides that are banned in the EU and most other parts of the world, which highlight the grave health risks stemming from this practice;
54. Expresses its strong concern about the policy that Argentina is implementing, in violation of its WTO obligations, with a view to restricting imports of food products competing with domestic production; points out that those measures come on top of the Argentine non-automatic import licensing system, which is already having an adverse impact on EU exports; calls on the Commission to take all necessary action to

ensure that those measures, which go against the spirit of negotiating an EU-Mercosur agreement, are effectively discontinued;

55. Is concerned about concessions made on fruit and vegetables within the Euro-Mediterranean agreements; maintains, in this connection, that the complementarity between the growing seasons in southern and northern Mediterranean countries should continue to be a guiding factor in the liberalisation of agricultural trade within the Union for the Mediterranean;

56. Stresses that, while tobacco products must be governed by a strict regulatory framework, the regulation of ingredients in tobacco products at EU and international level must follow a proportionate, risk-based approach reflecting scientific evidence; warns against any non-science-based ban on any ingredient, which would effectively lead to the banning of European traditional blended tobacco products, as this would have severe socio-economic repercussions for EU tobacco growers (of oriental and burley varieties) without yielding any public health benefits;

57. Calls on the Commission, in negotiations on EU trade agreements, including those with Canada and Ukraine, to take account of the interests of EU citizens, to maintain openness and to inform Parliament regularly about the progress of the negotiations; regrets that the Commission has not yet informed Parliament about the negotiations for a free trade agreement between the EU and Canada, even though these negotiations commenced in October 2009; calls on the Commission to provide Parliament and the committees responsible with detailed information on each further round of negotiations; is also concerned at possible concessions by the Commission in the negotiations, particularly in the areas of the opening up of markets, GMOs, milk, protection of intellectual property and origin labelling, and calls on the Commission not to make any concessions that might have a negative impact on European agriculture;

58. Is concerned at the prospect of concessions on cereals in the negotiations with Ukraine, in view of the fact that Ukrainian production is highly competitive and that Ukraine is already the main user of reduced-tariff cereal quotas (wheat and barley) offered to third countries; calls, therefore, on the Commission to limit its offer in this sector;

59. Reaffirms the importance of agricultural trade for economic development and poverty alleviation in developing countries; calls on the EU to help ACP countries to adapt to the increasing global competition;

60. Calls on the Commission to take due account of this resolution when drafting and implementing its future trade strategy;

o
o o

61. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council and the Commission.

(1) OJ C 293 E, 2.12.2006, p. 155.

(2) Texts adopted, **P7_TA(2009)0110**.

(3) Texts adopted, **P7_TA(2010)0088**.

(4) Texts adopted, **P7_TA(2010)0286**.

(5) OJ L 140, 5.6.2009, p.16.

(6) OJ L 194, 18.7.2001, p. 26.