

THE TRANSATLANTIC TRADE AND INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIP

Background

This paper provides background on the process and negotiations of the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) which is a trade agreement that is being negotiated between the European Union (EU) and the United States (US). TTIP aims to remove trade barriers in a wide range of economic sectors to make it easier to buy and sell goods and services between the EU and the US.

According to the European Commission:

“On top of cutting tariffs across all sectors, the EU and the US want to tackle barriers behind the customs border – such as differences in technical regulations, standards and approval procedures. These often cost unnecessary time and money for companies who want to sell their products on both markets. For example, when a car is approved as safe in the EU, it has to undergo a new approval procedure in the US even though the safety standards are similar.”¹

According to the Office of the United States Trade Representative:

“The main aims of the partnership are to increase trade and investment between the US and EU by reducing tariffs (particularly on agricultural products), aligning regulations and standards, improving protection for overseas investors, and increasing access to services and government procurement markets by foreign providers.”²

Context³

The EU has already agreed trade agreements with some 50 partners including Chile, South Korea, Mexico, South Africa, the Central American countries and most recently reached broad agreement with Canada on the [Comprehensive Trade and Economic Agreement](#) (CETA) which still needs to be ratified. In addition, negotiations for further Free Trade Agreements are currently taking place with, amongst others, Japan, India and China.⁴

Negotiations for a Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership between the European Union and the United States of America began in July 2013. Whilst it is unclear how long negotiations may take to reach an agreement, the recently concluded CETA with Canada

¹ <http://ec.europa.eu/trade/policy/in-focus/ttip/about-ttip/>

² Office of the United States Trade Representative - [Fact Sheet: United States to Negotiate Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership with the European Union](#)

³ <http://ec.europa.eu/trade/policy/in-focus/ttip/questions-and-answers/>

⁴ European Commission: The EU's bilateral trade and investment agreements – where are we?
http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2012/november/tradoc_150129.pdf

took five years to be negotiated and is not likely to come into effect until 2016 at the earliest.⁵

In trade policy, the European Commission negotiates on behalf of the EU and its 28 Member States: The Commission, led by the EU Trade Commissioner (now Cecilia Malmström), will represent the EU at the negotiating table. The Commission will negotiate on the basis of guidelines agreed by the Council, where the governments of all EU Member States are represented. The Commission's Trade Directorate General will take the lead. It will work closely with other Commission departments, especially those dealing with the areas that will be the main focus of the negotiations.

For the US, the United States Trade Representative (USTR) will be the main negotiator.

The Negotiation Process

During the negotiations of a trade deal, the European Commission is required to keep the EU's Member States and the European Parliament informed about progress. The European Commission has provided background information explaining how this is done for all trade deals it negotiates:

“The European Commission negotiates on behalf of the EU according to instructions from EU Member State governments in the Council and regularly informs the Council and the Parliament of how the negotiations are going. After each negotiation round and at other key points in the negotiations the Council and the European Parliament are simultaneously informed about the state of play. The Trade Policy Committee continues as the main forum for dialogue between the negotiators and the representatives of Member States. The Commission is also always available to answer any questions from MEPs or to attend the meetings of MEPs involved in the International Trade Committee (“INTA”). Discussion takes place regularly with Council and with the Parliament at working level, but it may also be raised periodically at Ministers level or in plenary debates.

The Commission also updates civil society in regular meetings to explain how the negotiations are progressing. The negotiations and their texts are not themselves public. This is entirely normal for trade negotiations, not just those involving the EU.”⁶

The Negotiating Mandate⁷

The Council of Ministers met on 14 June 2013 to agree a negotiating mandate for the European Commission.⁸ The Commission's negotiators are also being guided by position papers covering particular areas (e.g. regulation) and sectors (e.g. raw materials and energy).⁹

Unusually for trade negotiations, and following significant pressure on the European Commission the negotiating mandate was made public in October 2014, it can be viewed at: <http://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-11103-2013-DCL-1/en/pdf>.

The negotiating texts for each chapter can be downloaded at:
<http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/press/index.cfm?id=1230>

⁵ <http://ec.europa.eu/trade/policy/in-focus/ceta/questions-and-answers/>

⁶ http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2013/june/tradoc_151381.pdf

⁷ http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-13-564_en.htm

⁸ <http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/press/index.cfm?id=917>

⁹ <http://ec.europa.eu/trade/policy/in-focus/ttIP/resources/>

The Negotiations

The European Union and United States negotiating teams have now met for eight rounds of negotiations, the most recent round taking place in Brussels at the start of February 2015. A report on the 8th round of negotiations is available to download at: http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2015/february/tradoc_153110.pdf.

The final agreement will have 24 chapters grouped under the following three parts—

1. Market access
2. Regulatory cooperation
3. Rules

Whilst it is unclear how long negotiations may take to reach an agreement, the recently concluded CETA with Canada took five years to be negotiated and is not likely to come into effect until 2016 at the earliest.¹⁰

On 8 December 2014, the new European Trade Commissioner, Cecilia Malmström visited Washington to meet with US Trade Representative Michael Froman. They discussed instituting “a fresh start to the negotiations on a EU-US Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership”.¹¹ Following the meeting, Cecilia Malmström commented:

“We had a very useful discussion, taking stock of where we are in the negotiations and pointing out the way forward. Ambassador Froman and myself are both personally involved in giving these negotiations the necessary political push. We also discussed the importance of engaging with stakeholders, in order to listen, explain and also demystify elements of this potentially very important agreement. TTIP is important not only because of what it can bring in terms of jobs and growth on both sides of the Atlantic, but also because of the possibility for us to set global standards, reconfirming our strong transatlantic partnership.”¹²

The New European Commission

During the debate about the next European Commission President, and the subsequent European Parliamentary hearings on the composition of the new European Commission, TTIP was a policy area which was widely covered.

The new European Commission President Jean-Claude Juncker highlighted reaching a reasonable and balanced trade deal with the United States as one of his ten policy priorities.

The new Trade Commissioner Cecilia Malmström addressed the issue of TTIP during her confirmation hearing in the European Parliament. She said:

“If there is an area where the next Trade Commissioner will need to be particularly vigilant, it is TTIP—it is our most demanding negotiations and is certainly the most debated by the public.”¹³

¹⁰ <http://ec.europa.eu/trade/policy/in-focus/ceta/questions-and-answers/>

¹¹ <http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/press/index.cfm?id=1216>

¹² <http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/press/index.cfm?id=1216>

¹³ <http://www.euractiv.com/sections/eu-priorities-2020/eu-trade-candidate-plays-transparency-card-gets-timid-applause-308793>

She pledged greater transparency whilst maintaining the confidentiality needed in trade negotiations. On the substance of any deal, she said she was convinced that a common approach to health, environment, labour consumer safety and financial risks can be found but stressed that “It cannot be about lowering standards, but about avoiding extra costs – the costs entailed for example in the duplication of factory inspections and unnecessary divergences of approach”.

In a speech delivered in Brussels on 18 November 2014, Cecilia Malmström pledged that any agreement would protect public services across the European Union in the same way that previous trade deals had done;

“As regards public services, caution means following the EU's standard approach to public services in trade agreements.

Because no EU trade agreement that follows that approach has ever stopped a Member State from organising its health or education system in the way it chooses.”¹⁴

Ratification

Once the negotiators have come up with an agreement, it will be the Council, together with the European Parliament, which will examine and approve or reject the final agreement. Ahead of this, the Commission will publish the draft text of the agreement stimulating a public debate about the proposed deal. According to the European Commission:

“Members of the public have several months to form an opinion regarding the outcome of the negotiations and influence the decision of the European Parliament and the Council in a democratic process. After all, no agreement can be applied without a “yes” from the Member States’ governments and from the Members of the European Parliament.”¹⁵

In addition, the House of Commons Library also suggests that member state ratification may also be likely:

“Because it is likely to contain elements that fall outside of EU competence, the agreement will also have to be separately ratified by the national parliaments of each of the EU Member States before it formally enters force. In the UK, this is done through secondary legislation; specifically, a draft Order in Council laid in Parliament, and approved by both the Commons and Lords (under the affirmative procedure), and then by the Privy Council. Under ‘provisional application’ procedures, however, if Member States agree to it (via the Council), parts of the agreement can enter force before it is ratified by national parliaments.

Any changes to EU laws, rules or regulations resulting from the Agreement would have to be separately approved by the EU's Member States in the Council, and by the European Parliament.”¹⁶

On the US side, the US Congress will be required to approve any agreement.

¹⁴ http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-14-1921_en.htm

¹⁵ http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2013/june/tradoc_151381.pdf

¹⁶ <http://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/research/briefing-papers/SN06688/the-transatlantic-trade-and-investment-partnership-ttip>

The negotiations will continue into, and possibly beyond 2015, though both sides have said they are keen to avoid the negotiations lasting several years.

As engagement with Foreign Affairs including relations with territories outside the United Kingdom, the European Union (and their institutions) and other international organisations, and regulation of international trade are reserved under Schedule V of the Scotland Act¹⁷, neither the Scottish Parliament or the Scottish Government has a direct role to play in the negotiations or subsequent ratification of the TTIP. This was confirmed by John Swinney, the Cabinet Secretary for Finance, Constitution and Economy in evidence to the European and External Relations Committee on 5 February 2015. He told the Committee:

“At the outset, it is important to put it on the record that neither the Scottish Government nor the Scottish Parliament has any formal role in the negotiation and ratification of international trade or investment agreements such as TTIP.”¹⁸

Transparency

In November 2014, in a response to the concerns raised about transparency, the new European Trade Commissioner Cecilia Malmström promised greater levels of transparency on the TTIP negotiations. The greater levels of transparency included:

- making public more TTIP EU negotiating texts that the Commission shares with Member States and the European Parliament;
- providing access to the EU's TTIP negotiating texts to all Members of the European Parliament (MEPs), not just a select few, by extending access to EU restricted documents in a 'reading room' to those MEPs who had no access to such restricted documents so far; and;
- publishing information about who meets its political leaders and senior officials¹⁹.

On 7 January 2015, Emily O'Reilly, the European Ombudsman, issued an opinion calling for greater public access to consolidated negotiating texts in the TTIP negotiations:

“I am aware that the Commission at times needs to talk to the US confidentially to be able to negotiate effectively,” she said. “However, US resistance to publishing certain TTIP documents is not in itself sufficient to keep them from the European public. The Commission has to ensure at all times that exceptions to the EU citizens’ fundamental right to get access to documents are well-founded and fully justified.”²⁰

The ombudsman report calls for the Commission to:

1. Inform the US of the importance of making, in particular, common negotiating texts available to the EU public before the TTIP agreement is finalised.
2. Carry out an assessment as to whether a TTIP document can be made public as soon as the document in question has been finalised internally and at regular and pre-determined intervals thereafter.

¹⁷ <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1998/46/schedule/5>

¹⁸ <http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/28862.aspx?r=9772#.VNzPRNJSj3d>

¹⁹ <http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/press/index.cfm?id=1231>

²⁰ http://www.europeanvoice.com/article/eu-ombudsman-calls-for-greater-ttip-transparency/?utm_source=email&utm_medium=alert&utm_campaign=EU+ombudsman+calls+for+greater+TTIP+transparency

3. Ensure that the list of TTIP documents to be made available on its dedicated website on trade policy is comprehensive.
4. Publish on its website the many TTIP documents it has already released in response to requests for access to documents.
5. Take into account the relevant suggestions outlined in the 'public participation' section of the Ombudsman's public consultation report.
6. Extend the transparency register obligations to the levels of director, head of unit and negotiator.
7. Proactively publish meeting agendas and records of meetings it holds on TTIP with business organisations, lobby groups or NGOs.
8. Confirm that all submissions from stakeholders made to it in the context of TTIP will be published unless the sender gives good reasons for confidentiality.
9. Ensure that documents that are released to certain third party stakeholders are released to everyone

Immediately following this announcement, the Commission published a number of texts setting out EU proposals for legal text in the TTIP. According to the Trade Commissioner this is "a first in EU trade policy. The press release announcing the publication of texts set out the transparency initiatives taken by the Commission in relation to TTIP:

"The so-called 'textual proposals' published today set out the EU's specific proposals for legal text that has been tabled in the proposed TTIP. They set out actual language and binding commitments which the EU would like to see in the parts of the agreement covering regulatory and rules issues. The eight EU textual proposals cover competition, food safety and animal and plant health, customs issues, technical barriers to trade, small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), and government-to-government dispute settlement (GGDS, not to be confused with ISDS). Today, the Commission has also published TTIP position papers explaining the EU's approach on engineering, vehicles, and sustainable development, bringing the total number of position papers it has made public up to 15.

To make the online documents more accessible to the non-expert, the Commission is also publishing a 'Reader's Guide', explaining what each text means. It is also issuing a glossary of terms and acronyms, and a series of factsheets setting out in plain language what is at stake in each chapter of TTIP and what the EU's aims are in each area."²¹

In addition, according to the European Commission press notices, a number of the negotiating rounds has included a day dedicated to stakeholder engagement where stakeholders made presentations to the negotiating teams.²²

Consultations

During the negotiation process, the European Commission has announced online public consultations on the inclusion of the Investor State Dispute Settlement (ISDS)²³

²¹ <http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/press/index.cfm?id=1231>

²² http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2014/october/tradoc_152859.pdf

mechanism in any deal and an SME survey to collect information regarding the trade barriers currently faced by European industries and individual companies when doing business with the US. The Investor State Dispute Settlement consultation took place between March and July 2014 and the SME survey ran from August until 15 December 2014.

Investor State Dispute Settlement

The outcome of the ISDS consultation was announced on 13 January 2015. The Commission reported that:

“The Commission received a total of nearly 150,000 replies. All replies have been taken into account on an equal basis. The vast majority, around 145,000 (or 97%), were submitted collectively through various on-line platforms containing pre-defined answers which respondents adhered to. In addition, the Commission received individual replies from more than 3,000 individual citizens and from some 450 organisations representing a wide spectrum of EU civil society (business organisations, trade unions, consumer organisations, law firms, academics, etc.).”²⁴

As a result of the consultation, the Commission concluded that:

“On this basis, without prejudice to any other issues, there are in particular four areas where further improvements should be explored:

- the protection of the right to regulate;
- the establishment and functioning of arbitral tribunals;
- the relationship between domestic judicial systems and ISDS;
- the review of ISDS decisions through an appellate mechanism.”²⁵

Public Services

During the negotiations for a TTIP deal, there have been suggestions that any deal would have implications for the delivery of public services in Scotland. A specific concern surrounded the way in which the National Health Service in Scotland might be affected by TTIP.

On 26 January 2015, the European Commissioner for Trade, Cecilia Malmström wrote to Lord Livingston, the UK Government Minister of State for Trade and Investment. The Commissioner addressed the issue of the NHS and TTIP. She wrote:

“To be clear, the effects of the EU's approach to public health services in trade agreements such as TTIP are that:

- Member States do not have to open public health services to competition from private providers, nor do they have to outsource services to private providers;

²³ ISDS is a form of resolution of disputes between foreign investors and the State that hosts their investment. ISDS allows foreign investors to initiate dispute settlement proceedings against a host State.

²⁴ http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2015/january/tradoc_153044.pdf

²⁵ http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2015/january/tradoc_153044.pdf

- Member States are free to change their policies and bring back outsourced services back into the public sector whenever they choose to do so, in a manner respecting property rights (which in any event are protected under UK law);
- It makes no difference whether a Member State already allows some services to be outsourced to private providers, or not.”

The full letter can be viewed at:

http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2014/july/tradoc_152665.pdf

The United Kingdom Government's Position

The United Kingdom Government has expressed support for a TTIP agreement and emphasised the potential economic benefits it believes could be achieved from any deal. In particular the UK Government has emphasised the outcome of the research it commissioned from the Centre for Economic Policy Research²⁶ which suggested that there could be significant gains. The report stated that:

“In the long run, UK national income could rise by between £4 billion and £10 billion annually, with the main gains being generated by the liberalisation of non-tariff barriers.”²⁷

In response to public concerns about TTIP, Vince Cable, the Secretary of State for Business, Innovation and Skills wrote to MPs on 22 September 2014.²⁸ In his letter Mr Cable reiterated the UK Government's view about the economic benefits that TTIP would bring and stated that for individuals this would mean “more jobs and reduced prices and more choice for goods and services”.

Addressing the concerns of some campaign groups who have suggested that TTIP could water down regulatory standards and environmental and labour protections, or force the privatisation of public services, the Secretary of State wrote that this was “simply not the case”. He explained:

“Although TTIP is ground-breaking in its focus on aligning regulations, mainly through mutual recognition, this is with a view to maintaining high standards, and therefore helping US and EU companies compete with global competitors. Both the EU and US have committed to maintaining standards at the highest levels, and the EU will retain the right to set regulatory standards that are higher than internationally agreed minima, for example in food. Neither negotiating side is looking to lower standards through the TTIP process. We have not authorised the EU to agree to anything in TTIP that would do that.”

On the specific issue of the National Health Service, the Secretary of State wrote:

“There is a particular concern about the potential impact on the NHS. This is misplaced. There is no requirement in TTIP for the Government, or future governments, to open NHS healthcare services to further competition and private sector provision. The Government, and the European Commission, have been clear

²⁶ https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/198115/bis-13-869-economic-impact-on-uk-of-transatlantic-trade-and-investment-partnership-between-eu-and-us.pdf

²⁷ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/trade-and-investment-agreement-between-eu-and-usa-estimated-impact-on-uk>

²⁸ https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/360261/bis-14-1109-Vince-Cable-letter-dated-22-September-2014-to-All-MPs-TTIP.pdf

that the right to decide on the provision of public services will - quite rightly - continue to remain with national governments regardless of the progress of TTIP. And there will be no change to the fundamental principle that access to NHS services is based on need, not ability to pay.”

Finally, on the issue of Investor State Dispute Settlement, the Secretary of State wrote that:

“To be clear, investment protection and ISDS provisions will not prevent the UK from taking regulatory action to protect the public or the environment, nor will they force the government to change laws, open markets or privatise public services, including the NHS. These provisions – and the UK already has over 90 bilateral investment treaties in place - provide protection to investors from overseas from unfair treatment or discrimination on nationality grounds, as already occurs within the EU.”

The Scottish Government's Position

Like the UK Government, the Scottish Government has emphasised the potential benefits of TTIP. In a letter to the Convenor of the Scottish Parliament's European and External Relations Committee on 5 August 2014, the Cabinet Secretary for Finance, Employment and Sustainable Growth wrote;

“The Scottish Government believes that TTIP could deliver significant economic benefits for Scotland and has been engaging with the UK Government to maximise the benefits of TTIP for Scotland and to ensure that concerns about TTIP are addressed.”²⁹

On the specific issue of the Scottish health service, the Cabinet Secretary wrote:

“More specifically, given the vital importance of the NHS to the people of Scotland and concerns about the impact of TTIP on the NHS, the Cabinet Secretary for Health and Wellbeing will be writing to the Secretary of State for Health requiring cast-iron assurances that, whatever the approach to the provision of health services in the rest of the UK, TTIP will not affect the Scottish Government's ability to determine how NHS services are provided; that there will be no obligation to open the NHS in Scotland to private providers as is happening in England; and that decisions of the Scottish Government in respect of the NHS would not be open to potential challenge through ISDS mechanisms.”

Finally, the Cabinet Secretary addressed a number of other areas which campaign groups have voiced concerns over including the transparency of negotiations and the Investor State Dispute Settlement:

“More broadly, the Scottish Government is aware of concerns about issues such as the transparency of negotiations; Investor State Dispute Settlement and a potential lowering of consumer and environmental standards. We welcome the steps the European Commission is taking to address these concerns such as publishing negotiating positions and consulting on ISDS and note that in his statement to the European Parliament on 15 July, the President of the European Commission, Jean Claude Juncker, stated that a trade deal between the US and the EU would be a

29

http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/S4_EuropeanandExternalRelationsCommittee/General%20Documents/20140805_Cab_Sec_to_Convener_on_TTIP.pdf

central part of his programme but stressed that any deal will not "sacrifice Europe's safety, health, social and data protection standards or our cultural diversity on the altar of free trade".

On 19 November 2014, the former Cabinet Secretary for Health and Wellbeing answered a Parliamentary Question about the implications of the TTIP on the potential privatisation of the NHS. The question from Cameron Buchanan MSP and the answer are reproduced below:

Cameron Buchanan (Lothian) (Scottish Conservative and Unionist Party): To ask the Scottish Government whether it accepts the European Commission Director General for Trade's statement that "the net effect of the EU's approach is that nothing in TTIP [Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership] will lead to privatisation of the NHS". (S4O-3717)

Alex Neil: I welcome the director general's statement. However, there needs to be much greater transparency in the TTIP negotiations and until the Scottish Government and the public see the final legal text of any agreement we cannot be fully assured that such statements hold weight. We remain concerned that TTIP may threaten the public ownership of the NHS and could undermine the democratic decisions of the Scottish people. That is why the First Minister has written to the Prime Minister asking him to ensure that the NHS is clearly and fully exempted from TTIP and to address concerns about investor-state dispute mechanisms.

Giving evidence to the European and External Relations Committee on 5 February 2015, John Swinney, the Cabinet Secretary for Finance, Constitution and Economy summarised the Scottish Government's view of TTIP:

"The committee has a note from my officials that summarises the latest statistics from the global connections survey on Scotland's exports to the United States. With £3.9 billion-worth of exports in 2013, it is clear that the US is Scotland's single most important export market outwith the European Union. It is also worth noting that, with 580 companies employing some 98,000 people, the US is our largest inward investor.

TTIP provides an opportunity to build on that relationship. It could provide market access for Scottish goods and services and reduce non-tariff barriers. If that delivers growth and jobs for Scotland, it should be welcomed. However, we have to bear it in mind that, as the committee has explored, the liberalisation of markets does not always mean that business activity is convenient for our side of the argument. It can open up our markets here in the same way as it opens up markets to which we hope to gain access.

That takes me to my second point. It is important that markets are not opened up in a way that compromises public services or the Government's responsibility for them. In the past six months, the Scottish Government has pressed the United Kingdom Government and the European Commission to ensure that TTIP does not affect the Scottish Government's and Parliament's ability to determine how and by whom the national health service and other publicly funded services are provided. We have written to the UK Government and the Commission and we have raised the issue at the joint ministerial committee. Most recently, the First Minister discussed the issue with the Prime Minister when they met in December.

Over the past few months, a number of reassurances have been given on the extent of protection for areas of the Scottish Government's activities, in which the Government would be able to determine how and by whom services are delivered. Reassurances have been given, but it remains the case that, until we see the details of the agreement, we will not know whether those reassurances have any validity at all. I still take the view that the best way to allay our concerns and those of the public is, first, to have an explicit exemption for the national health service in the agreement and, secondly, to have absolute clarity that, although the UK is the member state, any decisions that it takes in the context of TTIP—such as opening up the NHS in England to more private providers—in no way interfere with the Scottish Government's and Parliament's devolved responsibilities.

Investor-state dispute settlement is another issue on which we have expressed concerns to the UK Government. We are concerned that ISDS might restrict the rights of Governments to regulate in the public interest. I know that the committee has discussed that concern, too. The European Commission was right to consult on the issue, but it clearly has some way to go in the coming months to convince people here and across Europe that ISDS is in the public's interest. The four questions that the Commission has identified and which Mr Houben highlighted to the committee appear to home in on the right issues. I welcome Trade Commissioner Malmström's statement that the Commission

“would never even consider an agreement which would ... limit ... governments' right to regulate.”

On that issue and on the national health service issue, although assurances are being given, we will have final clarity only when we see the detail of the agreement that is negotiated.

The Scottish Government believes in free and open trade, but we must take the greatest care to ensure that the issues about which the public are rightly concerned are dealt with. Our ability to regulate and our ability to determine how the national health service should operate in our country should in no way be compromised by such agreements.”³⁰

Parliamentary Engagement

The House of Lords European Union Committee published a report³¹ on TTIP on 13 May 2014. The report examined the likelihood of a successful deal being reached, examined the UK Government's approach to TTIP, and explored concerns about the possible adverse effects of TTIP.

The House of Commons Business, Innovation and Skills Committee is currently undertaking an inquiry into the impact of TTIP on the UK economy. The inquiry webpage is: <http://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/commons-select/business-innovation-and-skills/news/oral-ev-ttip-04/>.

Iain McIver
SPICe Research

³⁰ <http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/28862.aspx?r=9772#.VNzPRNJSj3d>

³¹ <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld201314/ldselect/lddeucom/179/179.pdf>