



**COUNCIL OF  
THE EUROPEAN UNION**

**Strasbourg, 10 October 2013**

**14739/13**

**PE 452  
PESC 1214  
ECOFIN 889  
RELEX 912  
MED 31  
FRONT 145  
COMIX 548  
COEST 313  
COTRA 34**

**NOTE**

---

from: General Secretariat of the Council  
to: Delegations

---

Subject: Summary record of the extraordinary meeting of the European Parliament  
**Committee on Foreign Affairs (AFET)** held in Strasbourg on 10 October 2013  
Chair: Mr Brok (EPP, DE)

---

**I. Votes**

**a) EU guarantee to the European Investment Bank against losses under financing operations supporting investment projects outside the Union**

AFET/7/12839, \*\*\*I 2013/0152(COD) COM(2013)0293 – C7-0145/2013

*Rapporteur for the opinion: Jacek Protasiewicz (PPE)*

Responsible: BUDG – Ivailo Kalfin (S&D)

The opinion, as modified by a number of amendments, was adopted by 48 votes in favour, 1 against and 4 abstentions.

**b) Macro-financial assistance to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan**

AFET/7/12674, \*\*\*I 2013/0128(COD) COM(2013)0242 – C7-0119/2013

*Rapporteur for the opinion: Annemie Neyts-Uyttebroeck (ADLE)*

Responsible: INTA – Vital Moreira (S&D)

The opinion, as modified by a number of amendments, was adopted by 40 votes in favour, 2 against and 10 abstentions.

**c) Surveillance of the external sea borders in the context of operational cooperation coordinated by the European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the Members States**

AFET/7/12491, \*\*\*I 2013/0106(COD) COM(2013)0197 – C7-0098/2013

*Rapporteur for the opinion: Norica Nicolai (ADLE)*

Responsible: LIBE – Carlos Coelho (PPE)

The opinion, as modified by a number of amendments, was adopted by 34 votes in favour, 8 against and 5 abstentions.

**d) European Neighbourhood Policy, working towards a stronger partnership: EP's position on the 2012 progress reports**

AFET/7/13314, 2013/2621(RSP)

*Rapporteur: Jacek Saryusz-Wolski (PPE)*

*Corapporteurs: Pier Antonio Panzeri (S&D)*

The motion for resolution, as modified by a number of amendments, was adopted by 54 votes in favour and 6 against.

**e) The Annual Report from the Council to the European Parliament on the Common Foreign and Security Policy in 2012**

AFET/7/12555, 2013/2081(INI)

*Rapporteur: Elmar Brok (PPE)*

Opinions: BUDG – Nadezhda Neynsky (PPE)

The report, as modified by a number of amendments, was adopted by 48 votes in favour, 12 against and 7 abstentions. The GUE/NGL group, that had voted against, announced that it would draft a minority report.

## II. Reports

### **Recommendation to the Council, the Commission and the EEAS on the negotiations for an EU-Canada Strategic Partnership Agreement**

AFET/7/13189, 2013/2133(INI)

*Rapporteur: Elisabeth Jeggle (PPE)*

Responsible: AFET –

The chair (Brok) opened the debate focusing on the controversial issue of the inclusion of the human rights clause in the PCA with Canada. He acknowledged that this constituted a problem for the Canadians, whose country was considered a "democratic giant". At the same time he noted that, should this clause not be included in this PCA, that would set a precedent and in any further negotiations with other (less democratic) countries the inclusion of the clause could be put into question. This, according to Mr Brok, would mean "killing the clause itself". Therefore he suggested finding the right wording in the recommendation, a sort of middle ground that would not upset the Canadians and would not set a precedent either.

The rapporteur said that she agreed and stood ready to work on an alternative wording and pointed out that the EP had a big responsibility here. Ms Gomes (S&D, PT), speaking on behalf of her group, said that she was certainly available to work with the rapporteur, but her group was firmly convinced that the clause should stay in the PCA with Canada. She argued that even the best democracies, including the EU, could experience breaches of human rights. Moreover the price to pay for setting a precedent would be too high. Mr Tannock disagreed and considered that including a human rights clause in this case would be a very arrogant move on the part of the EU. He added that losing Canada, and maybe India later on, because of this dispute would be not only tragic for EU trade policy but also for UK on the occasion of the 2017 referendum: no English-speaking third country would support the continuation of UK's EU membership. Ms Neyts noted that what the Canadians opposed

was the automatic suspension of the agreement in case of breaches of human rights. So she suggested to work on this specific issue rather than on the inclusions of the clause as such. Mr Peterle pointed out that the same problem existed for Japan.

The chair Brok, in agreement with the rapporteur, suggested taking more time to debate this issue, taking into account that there was no time pressure to adopt the recommendation.

## **II. Next meeting(s)**

- 16 October 2013, 12.30 – 14.00 (Brussels)
  - 17 October 2013, 9.00 – 12.30 (Brussels)
-