

Question for written answer E-001695/2018
to the Commission
Rule 130
Claude Rolin (PPE)

Subject: Opinion 2/15 of 16 May 2017 of the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) and its legal implications on the agreements with Singapore and Japan

Opinion 2/15 of 16 May 2017 of the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) serves to clarify the competences of each party in these new-generation free trade agreements. It will have a major impact on the future trade agreements involving the European Union.

Does the Commission consider that the 'trade pillar' of the agreement with Singapore and Japan falls within the scope of the exceptions to the qualified majority rule established in Article 207(4) TFEU, including, in particular, the exceptions mentioned below?

'The Council shall also act unanimously for the negotiation and conclusion of agreements:

- in the field of trade in cultural and audiovisual services, where these agreements risk prejudicing the Union's cultural and linguistic diversity;
- in the field of trade in social, education and health services, where these agreements risk seriously disturbing the national organisation of such services and prejudicing the responsibility of Member States to deliver them.'

Does the Commission intend to ask the Court of Justice to give its opinion on the exact meaning of those exceptions?