

Dear Tim,                    **TTIP and "ISDS-lite",    CETA and ISDS**

Your Ref (?): Adam032/41/ag

Last Friday you expressed an interest in writing to ALDE to request that they respond to criticisms of ALDE's preference for having in TTIP a new type of separate court system to settle disputes against governments by investors, named "**ISDS-lite**" by its critics, instead of going with the massive public opinion against *any* privileged alternative to existing domestic courts.

You also told us "*If ISDS is not removed or radically altered I am not voting for TTIP*".

I am thus copying below as promised, my numbered criticisms that you read last Friday, and also criticisms I respect by other people.

But first, this is the text from the European Parliament's Resolution Report on TTIP for the "ISDS-lite", which was voted for by ALDE MEPs including Catherine Bearder, together with Tory MEPs, but voted against by European Green MEPs and Labour MEPs (bar 1):

"(xv) to ensure that foreign investors are treated in a non-discriminatory fashion, while benefiting from no greater rights than domestic investors, and to replace the ISDS system with a new system for resolving disputes between investors and states which is subject to democratic principles and scrutiny, where potential cases are treated in a transparent manner by publicly appointed, independent professional judges in public hearings and which includes an appellate mechanism, where consistency of judicial decisions is ensured, the jurisdiction of courts of the EU and of the Member States is respected, and where private interests cannot undermine public policy objectives;"

At first sight this text does propose improvements on the existing ISDS process, but it still proposes a *separate* system for settling investors disputes with states, which retains some of the intrinsically unsafe problems in the existing ISDS. Thus the nick-name "ISDS-lite" is apt:

## **The "ISDS-lite" proposal – reasons why it is unacceptable**

*As read by Tim Farron MP at the surgery meeting on 4sep15:*

There is no evidence for any need for a separate legal system for transnational and foreign companies outside domestic courts in the EU or US.

Having such a separate court system for corporate privileges, whether a re-badged compromise for ISDS or not, maintains some of the known intrinsic threats of the ISDS that increase corporate power to the detriment of democracy:

1. It still gives TNC's and foreign companies the power to sue governments for compensation for claims of future profits that might be lost from changes in government policy or regulations or other democratic proposals.
2. Also the "chilling" factor on policy or regulatory proposals remains. The "assurances" in the compromise amendment against abuse of the system are far too weak and uncertain.
3. It would still be intrinsically undemocratic, in being supranational and thus unaccountable to democratic processes.

4. It would still give profits legal primacy over our public interest values and vital needs that are of more importance than profits, such as our democracy, our health and safety, our environment, climate change, biodiversity, employment rights and human rights, and our democratic rights to determine our public services. This is totally unacceptable. Public interest must have legal primacy above private profits. The words of reassurance in the amendment would be inadequate in reality.
5. It is still a court system that acts in 1 way only: investor to state, which incorporates inherent bias such as in iii above. Such a court system must be multi-way - including state to investor, public interest NGOs/groups to investor, and citizens to investor.

**Guy Taylor of Global Justice Now writes of ISDS-lite:**

- “1. It means corporations can sue governments, and governments at best can only avoid losing, rather than winning.
2. There is no discernable difference between ISDS as it exists now and this new proposal when it comes to ‘regulatory chill’ – the reluctance of governments to legislate through fear of a future court case.
3. It remains the case that corporations will have privileged access to a more favourable legal system than the rest of society. If the US and EU’s current domestic legal systems are not good enough for the likes of Veolia and Halliburton, they are surely not good enough for the rest of us.
4. A standing court, with a building and permanently employed staff will be a more expensive way (to the taxpayer, of course) of organizing a corporate court system. Austerity doesn’t exist when it comes to serving the corporations.”

The above is an extract from:

**TTIP disappointment: ISDS-lite gets the nod in Strasbourg** By [Guy Taylor](#)

<http://newint.org/blog/2015/07/08/ttip-vote-july/> article originally in GJN – Global Justice Now

- See more at: <http://newint.org/blog/2015/07/08/ttip-vote-july/#sthash.K0mdFeNi.dpuf>

**Owen Tudor here lists “ten reasons why the compromise amendment is a bad deal”:**

They are well worth reading, and I recommend ALDE respond to them too: \_

<http://touchstoneblog.org.uk/2015/07/ttip-news-10-reasons-why-the-latest-isds-compromise-is-a-bad-deal/>

I’ve appended his article below.

The writer **Glyn Moody** – who’s assessments of TTIP I much respect, adds that if there are any inadequacies in domestic laws that discriminate between foreign and domestic companies then these should be improved, not avoided by creating any separate system which is itself discriminatory in being a privilege system only available to foreign and transnational companies.

The “ISDS-lite” is of course not part of the TTIP text but is a proposal by MEPs to indicate to the EU Commission as to what they would like to be in TTIP for them to vote yes to the lot rather than no to the lot.

## CETA and ISDS

NB: the ISDS (not an “ISDS-lite”) is still within CETA.

It is a version of ISDS which was rejected by a majority of 150,000 responses from across the EU in the March-July 2014 consultation on the inclusion of the same version within TTIP (as well as CETA).

The CETA text has almost completed its “legal scrubbing” and will then be ready for ratification, having had negligible input or scrutiny by democratic processes yet.

Will ALDE and the LibDems vote CETA through with the ISDS still in place, bearing in mind that many of the big US transnational companies that could potentially sue the UK or EU could use the ISDS in CETA if there isn't one in TTIP? <http://citizen.org/documents/EU-ISDS-liability.pdf>

Tim, over 750 of your constituents have signed a petition to you **against any separate court system for foreign companies and transnational corporations**. Also over 2.5 million people EU-wide have signed a petition against such TTIP provisions.

I hope that when you have read ALDE's response to my/our criticisms, you will agree with us that there is no good reason for any separate court system for the privilege of foreign companies and transnational corporations, and that the “ISDS-lite” proposal is still unsafe, and not radically altered to your satisfaction.

Yours sincerely,

Henry Adams

Dr Henry Adams (Ecological Consultant)

Home phone: 01539 722158

Mobile:

55 Hayclose Crescent, Kendal, Cumbria, LA9 7NT

Twitter: [www.twitter.com/@henryadamsUK](http://www.twitter.com/@henryadamsUK)

My website: [www.dragonfly1.plus.com/topics.html](http://www.dragonfly1.plus.com/topics.html)

**Hidden dangers for us all in TTIP and CETA: [www.bit.ly/STOP-TTIP-South-Lakes](http://www.bit.ly/STOP-TTIP-South-Lakes) <<<<**

**And how you can try and remove them: [www.bit.ly/FTAemailMP](http://www.bit.ly/FTAemailMP) <<<<**

## Appendix:

Owen Tudor's article:

02 Jul 2015, by [Owen Tudor](#) in Touchstone [International](#)

<http://touchstoneblog.org.uk/2015/07/ttip-news-10-reasons-why-the-latest-isds-compromise-is-a-bad-deal/>

## **#TTIP news: 10 reasons why the latest #ISDS compromise is a bad deal**

Yesterday the Socialists & Democrats Group in the European Parliament voted 56-34 to endorse a compromise amendment to the Parliament's draft resolution on the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP, the EU-US trade deal), covering the controversial issue of Investor-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS).

The compromise was opposed by UK Labour MEPs, and has dismayed Green and Left MEPs too. It's not clear how many socialist MEPs will actually vote against the compromise if it is put to the Parliamentary vote next Wednesday (Labour MEPs are likely to vote against, and trade unions in other

countries are likely to be pressing the French, German, Italian and Spanish socialist MEPs too.) Right-wing anti-Europeans like UKIP will probably also oppose it.

But with the backing of the Conservatives in the ECR group, centre-right MEPs from the European People's Party and Liberal Democrats in the ALDE group, the compromise is likely to be adopted. We'll be urging Labour, Green and UKIP MEPs to stand firm, and calling on Conservatives and the single Liberal Democrat to represent the people who elected them rather than the big businesses who will be rubbing their hands with greed.

The proponents of the compromise in the S&D group are arguing that it rules out the sort of full-blooded ISDS that led to over [140,000 critical submissions to the European Commission consultation](#), over 2.25 million signatures on a [European Citizens' Initiative](#), and opposition from trade unions, consumer groups and environmentalists. **But it leaves intact the idea that foreign investors should get a privileged route to massive compensation payments when democratically-elected governments do something that could be argued in court affects the profits of a multinational enterprise.**

The compromise amendment reads:

“to ensure that foreign investors are treated in a non-discriminatory fashion while benefitting from no greater rights than domestic investors, and to replace the ISDS-system with a new system for resolving disputes between investors and states which is subject to democratic principles and scrutiny where potential cases are treated in a transparent manner by publicly appointed, independent professional judges in public hearings and which includes an appellate mechanism, where consistency of judicial decisions is ensured, the jurisdiction of courts of the EU and of the Member States is respected and where private interests cannot undermine public policy objectives;”

Here are ten reasons why the compromise amendment is a bad deal:

1. Although this proposal addresses some of the drawbacks of ISDS, **it really isn't an alternative to ISDS**, but just a softer version, or [ISDS-lite](#). It still provides for individual foreign investors to challenge state decisions directly, with all the problems that entails such as 'regulatory chill' (when Philip Morris sued the Australian Government over plain paper packaging – a case still not concluded – the New Zealand Government shelved its plain paper packaging proposals.)
2. Leaving any form of privileged investor protection in TTIP would mean that **the threat to a publicly-run National Health Service remains**. Corporate lawyers will still be licking their lips over the possibility of suing any government brave enough to return privatised parts of the NHS to public hands. And that applies to education, water, railways and any other privatised or part-privatised public services.
3. **The compromise would provide foreign investors with compensation arrangements not available to other potential litigants** (eg workers, consumers, environmentalists). It would be like restricting access to the European Court of Justice, which also oversees trans-national conflicts, to just one class of litigants, foreign investors.
4. The **imbalance of access to justice** which is so offensive in ISDS would remain – workers would still get what they have in the EU-Canada deal (called [CETA](#)): the possibility of a strongly worded, expert report. As ever, if that's good enough for workers why should investors get more?
5. The costs involved in taking cases under this arrangement will mean it is **only really available to big companies – so small firms will be excluded**, which has led to opposition from Austrian and German small firms' organisations.
6. **The case for privileging investors like this still has not been made**. How much extra investment is likely to arise? How much has been lost as a result of *not* having ISDS in EU-US arrangements?

7. Some of the changes proposed sound good (eg “private interests cannot undermine public policy objectives;”) but how can they be guaranteed? In practice, the courts will decide how far these principles are effected (they always do) and **we can’t guarantee, once set up, that courts will do as we wish.** Corporate lawyers will get creative!

8. **There are still many reforms to ISDS that have been proposed which are not included in this proposal**, eg that costs should be borne by the unsuccessful litigant, that litigants should demonstrate *they* are upholding the law before suing governments (so there will be many cases brought by disreputable companies), that amicus curiae/third party briefs will be permitted etc.

9. **The move throws away the Parliament’s negotiating position with the European Commission far too early.** The TTIP negotiations have years to run, and opposition to ISDS will continue to build. Rather than accept a compromise investor protection system at this stage, the Parliament should hold off until popular opposition to ISDS has made all special deals for foreign investors unacceptable.

10. Finally, the compromise amendment means that **the Parliament only has the option to vote for ISDS-lite** (as set out in the current draft of the Parliament’s resolution) or ISDS-lite as in the compromise, rather than the original amendment put down by MEPs like Labour’s Jude Kirton-Darling which called for excluding ISDS from TTIP altogether.

The lengths that European Parliament politicians have gone to, responding to public concern, demonstrates how effective and influential the campaign against ISDS has become. No one in the European Parliament is now defending the sort of ISDS that has been included in the already concluded EU trade deals with Canada, Singapore and so on.

Unions and other campaigners will be demanding those trade deals have to be scrapped or completely rewritten, and we will be building popular opposition to special rights for foreign investors, whether they’re called ISDS or not. We’ve come a long way, and losing this skirmish doesn’t mean we can’t win this trade war.

EDRi @edri · Jul 8  
Amendment 117 to #TTIP report doesn't reject #ISDS. A "new" system? What's the difference? @Europarl\_EN: Oppose this!

ISDS	"NEW" SYSTEM
Allows investors to sue democratic governments	Allows democratic governments to be sued by investors
States cannot win, they can just avoid losing	At best, states can avoid losing, they never win
Creates a new lobbying opportunity to intimidate democratic governments	Blindly hopes that this new pressure will not undermine policy-making

**WHAT'S THE DIFFERENCE?**

76 25 View photo

EDRi is European Digital Rights

## Relevant email thread

**From:** [henryadams@dragonfly1.plus.com](mailto:henryadams@dragonfly1.plus.com)

**Sent:** Friday, July 10, 2015 4:12 PM

**To:** [Tim Farron MP](#)

**Cc:** [Catherine Bearder MEP - Brussels Office](#) ; [info@greenlibdems.org.uk](mailto:info@greenlibdems.org.uk)

**Subject:** Fw: My letter to Catherine Bearder MEP on TTIP - No to liberalization of oil and gas exports from the US

Dear Tim,

**TTIP, climate and democracy**

Your Ref: Adam032/41/ag

Many thanks Tim for your consideration to forward Catherine Bearder MEP's letter to me on the 8th July plenary vote by MEPs for a resolution report on TTIP. I very much mean that – as I know you are very otherwise-involved now.

Too right I'm "not satisfied" with the EP resolution on TTIP – that Catherine Bearder voted for! And here's why: (text copied from the resolution, my bolding)

"... to ensure that in course of the negotiations the two sides examine ways to facilitate energy exports, so that TTIP would **abolish any existing restrictions or impediments of export for fuels, including LNG and crude oil, between the two trading partners,**"...

This means: the resolution urges for the removal of US's long-standing ban on export of crude oil and its strict licencing restrictions on export of gas. These North American sources are as you both know, of **significantly higher life-cycle carbon emissions** than conventional sources, as they would include **tar sands** oil and liquefied fracked gas. US fracked gas has associated fugitive methane leakages that can increase its carbon intensity up to around that of coal, and liquefaction to LNG adds C-emissions to that.

**This would be disastrous for climate reasons**, and it's totally unnecessary.

I have already explained this repeatedly, together with rebuttals for the weak reasons given for the above (see attached letter and appended emails), yet they remain unanswered. Neither of you can say you didn't know about the above text!

I am sure that there will be at least some members of the Green Liberal Democrats who would like answers to the following questions, and more:

1. How can Catherine write that she wants "stronger environmental protections provisions", and at the same time vote for the resolution with the above text still in place – which goes in the opposite direction to what she writes!
2. Why did she not vote against the resolution, towards the resolution being re-amended without that text?
3. Does Catherine Bearder agree with the resolution text I've quoted, for liberalization of trade in oil and gas from the US, and if so why?
4. (a) Or does Catherine disagree with the text, but not so-strongly-so, that she puts her wished-for economic and geopolitical TTIP gains above the huge losses for our climate?

(b) I know from her writings that she is pushing for gains for small businesses: does she prioritise those above climate, despite the likelihood that such gains are likely to be more than offset in competitive-advantage terms by bigger gains for the TNC's, because TTIP will tip the "playing field" still further towards TNC's? (and don't forget – geopolitically: US interests are run for and by TNC's).

5. The resolution wants to "to retain the objective of dedicating a specific chapter to energy"... Would Catherine Bearder prefer (a) an 'Energy and climate' chapter to an 'energy' chapter, or much better still: a "climate and energy chapter"?

In voting how she did on the resolution, and on the "ISDS-lite" amendment supporting a separate court system for TNC's and companies, Catherine sided with the Tories against the Greens, Labour, Plaid Cymru, SNP, and most of UKIP.

She also voted against the views of 2.3 million and rising, of those Europeans who signed the self-organized European Citizens Initiative to stop TTIP, and against the 700+ of your constituents Tim who in 2014 signed a petition to you **against any separate court system for foreign companies and transnational corporations**, and against the great many thousands of UK citizens – including the thousands of Catherine's own constituents, who responded likewise to the EC's "consultation" last year. In Catherine's paragraph 4 she gives her constituents a "replacement" – I'm sure they wanted **total removal** of any separate courts, not replacement with an "ISDS-lite". They won't have been fooled. The replacement is a separate court system for settling disputes between investors and states is it not? Do you think they'll accept for example an "SDIS" instead!

OK the resolution could have been worse, but it could have been better, both as I've explained above, and if MEPs had listened to their constituents instead of business lobbyists, and rejected a separate court system. Also, MEPs were denied a vote on that amendment! They voted instead for the very rubbery no-name compromise or "ISDS-lite" amendment, which retains many of the significantly dangerous and undemocratic flaws of the standard ISDS (and in the CETA ISDS) as explained here:

[www.bit.ly/TTIPvote](http://www.bit.ly/TTIPvote)

But I'll write separately on that, because I do not want to divert here from the climate questions above.

I will read Catherine's link to the Smart TTIP – to see if it answers convincingly any of my climate questions above.

I hope my questions above will help you Tim – if you want to avoid another big "climate fail" by the LibDems when you become LibDem leader.

Catherine Bearder has done a lot of good things for the environment, including during this week, but her voting on Wednesday was extremely disappointing in this and other respects – to put it mildly.

Yours sincerely,

Henry Adams - wanting to green the LibDems (if that's at all possible?)

Dr Henry Adams (Ecological Consultant)

Home phone: 01539 722158

Mobile:

55 Hayclose Crescent, Kendal, Cumbria, LA9 7NT

Twitter: [www.twitter.com/@henryadamsUK](https://www.twitter.com/@henryadamsUK)

My website: [www.dragonfly1.plus.com/topics.html](http://www.dragonfly1.plus.com/topics.html)

**Hidden dangers for us all in TTIP and CETA: [www.bit.ly/STOP-TTIP-South-Lakes](http://www.bit.ly/STOP-TTIP-South-Lakes) <<<<**

**And how you can try and remove them: [www.bit.ly/FTAemailMP](http://www.bit.ly/FTAemailMP) <<<<**

**From:** Tim Farron MP

**Sent:** Friday, July 10, 2015 10:19 AM  
**To:** henryadams@dragonfly1.plus.com  
**Subject:** Fw: TF - Ref: Adam032/41/ag

Dr. Henry Adams  
55 Hayclose Crescent  
KENDAL, CUMBRIA  
LA9 7NT

Our Ref: Adam032/41/ag  
10 July 2015

Dear Henry

Please find attached the response from Catherine Bearder MEP to the letter that I wrote on your behalf with regard to TTIP.

Although I know that you will not be satisfied with what I consider to have been a breakthrough, I hope that you will accept that this is a considerable improvement and probably as much as we can achieve under a Tory Government.

With best wishes

Yours sincerely

**TIM FARRON MP**

---

**From:** Catherine Bearder MEP <casework@bearder.eu>  
**Sent:** 08 July 2015 15:41  
**To:** Tim Farron MP  
**Subject:** RE: TF - Ref: Adam032/41/ag

Dear Tim,

Thank you for your further email about the proposed Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) being negotiated between Europe and the United States.

I am reporting back to say that earlier today, the European Parliament backed the conclusion of talks over TTIP but called for the Investor-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS) to be scrapped.

I, along with the majority of MEPs have demanded that the controversial ISDS be replaced by a transparent and accountable form of investor protection that protects the right of governments to regulate in the public interest. The Parliament's resolution also calls on negotiators to ensure that EU environmental and consumer standards are not lowered, public services such as the NHS are excluded and the transparency of the negotiations is improved.

This vote gives the European Commission strong democratic support to conclude trade talks with the US but it requires them to take the public's concerns on board. Thousands of constituents have contacted me with their objections, amongst certain other provisions of the draft agreement. As a result, ISDS should be scrapped and replaced by a fair, transparent form of investor protection which ensures national governments have full control over the provision of public services.



I am also pleased that the EU Trade Commissioner Malmstrom has improved the transparency of the TTIP talks, publishing negotiating texts online and opening meetings to the public. Along with my colleagues in the Liberal Group in Parliament, I am now pushing for even greater transparency.

The negotiations on TTP provide an opportunity to strengthen the ties across the Atlantic. Both economically and geopolitically, I think this provides an opportunity we should not miss. As of yet, there is not a treaty text as the negotiations are still ongoing. It may take years to conclude it, this is not the time to say 'yes' or 'no' to TTIP. As your MEP, I am continuing to lobby for the kind of TTIP that we want – namely, one that delivers new jobs, but does not undermine the rule of law, the NHS or our environmental standards.

Therefore your constituent has some valid concerns about the environment, ALDE would like to see TTIP be reformed and become a 'Smart TTIP'. I would like to see TTIP agreed but with stronger environmental protections provisions. Please point your constituent towards this [link](#) about Smart TTIP, to show what we are arguing for in the European Parliament.

I hope this is helpful for you.

Best wishes,

Catherine

Catherine Bearder

Liberal Democrat member of the European Parliament for the South East of England  
Constituency Office  
27 Park End Street  
Oxford  
OX1 1HU  
+44 1865 249838  
[www.bearder.eu](http://www.bearder.eu)

---

=====

**NB:** *[this paragraph written by Henry Adams] The email thread below was **not** appended to the above letter by Catherine Bearder MEP when she emailed it to Tim Farron MP, but has been "tacked on" by me so as to keep relevant emails together as a thread to aid referencing.*

=====

---

**From:** [henryadams@dragonfly1.plus.com](mailto:henryadams@dragonfly1.plus.com)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 8, 2015 9:40 AM  
**To:** [Catherine Bearder MEP - Brussels Office](#)  
**Cc:** [catherine@bearder.eu](mailto:catherine@bearder.eu) ; [Tim Farron MP](#)  
**Subject:** Fw: My letter to Catherine Bearder MEP on TTIP - No to liberalization of oil and gas exports from the US

Dear Catherine Bearder MEP and team,

TTIP voting today:

**Please vote against text in the resolution that urges for removal of the US ban and restrictions on exporting its oil and gas (respectively).** These North American sources, which would include tar sands oil and liquefied fracked gas, have much higher life-cycle carbon emissions than conventional sources,

and if TTIP liberalizes their trade this would be a climate disaster with which the Liberal Democrats should avoid complicity.

**NB: If such text has not been removed from the resolution then please vote against *the whole resolution*.**

I know you are wanting to push for gains for UK small businesses **but these should not be at the expense of climate.**

I append some of my communications with Tim Farron and the Green Liberal Democrats on this matter, and the letter to yourself via Tim that provides further details, such as why oil and gas are not the right options now for “energy security”.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Henry Adams



**From:** [henryadams@dragonfly1.plus.com](mailto:henryadams@dragonfly1.plus.com)

**Sent:** Friday, July 3, 2015 5:33 PM

**To:** [info@greenlibdems.org.uk](mailto:info@greenlibdems.org.uk)

**Cc:** [jane.brophy@greenlibdems.org.uk](mailto:jane.brophy@greenlibdems.org.uk) ; [Tim Farron MP](#)

**Subject:** Fw: My letter to Catherine Bearder MEP on TTIP - No to liberalization of oil and gas exports from the US

Dear Green Liberal Democrats,

**TTIP, fossil fuels and CLIMATE CHANGE**

**URGENT:** Next Tuesday-Wednesday (7th & 8th July) MEPs including Catherine Bearder will be voting on a resolution/report on **TTIP**.

When I last looked at the report it contained text disastrous for climate as it urged for removal of the US ban and restrictions for export of oil and gas (respectively). It is unclear at present whether that text has since been removed (unlikely), or whether it's up for potential removal by a vote on an amendment.

Please urge Catherine Bearder MEP to vote against the report/resolution on TTIP on Wednesday if it still contains this text, and forward the attached pdf to her with your comments (hopefully endorsements). I have met and emailed Tim Farron MP on this matter (see below) over a fortnight ago to put him in the picture.

**It would be disastrous for the climate-credibility of the LibDems and the GreenLibDems if Catherine Bearder overlooks this anti-climate text and helps vote through the resolution-report with the text still in place. This is why I hope you agree that it is an urgent priority that she is made fully aware of this pitfall.**

I have for many years done my best to brief Tim Farron on climate-related matters and it would be a huge disappointment if the LibDems, including the GreenLibDems are party, intentionally or otherwise, to promoting trade and thus extraction and burning of the higher life-cycle oil and gas from North America (includes tar sands oil as well as liquefied fracked gas).

Yours sincerely,

Dr Henry Adams , Kendal

(scroll down for my contact details)

**From:** [henryadams@dragonfly1.plus.com](mailto:henryadams@dragonfly1.plus.com)

**Sent:** Monday, June 15, 2015 4:58 PM

**To:** [Tim Farron MP](#)

**Subject:** My letter to Catherine Bearder MEP on TTIP - No to liberalization of oil and gas exports from the US

Dear Tim,

**My letter to Catherine Bearder MEP on TTIP – NO to liberalization of oil and gas exports from the US**

Thank you for a useful surgery meeting this morning on the threats to climate within the report of recommendations by the European Parliament's International Trade Committee (INTA).

I now attach my letter to Catherine Bearder on TTIP – asking for her to persuade ALDE to push for deletion of climate-threatening text from the INTA report, especially that which urges for removal of existing barriers to export of crude oil and fracked gas (as LPG) from US. Such “feedstocks” have higher life-cycle carbon emissions than existing UK imports from elsewhere.

I would be grateful if you could forward the letter to Catherine Bearder and ask her if she agrees with my assessments, and if so, whether she is pushing for ALDE to support amendments to the INTA report which will 1. remove the climate-threatening text and 2. insert text that will explicitly protect regulations present and future on climate such as EU's Fuel Quality Directive (which is now in a diluted and ineffective state thanks to the oil industry pressures associated with TTIP and CETA negotiations). Also whether she would vote against any INTA or other recommendations for TTIP if they include such climate-threatening pro-fossil-fuel text.

I will also be writing an assessment on the proposals she favours for a replacement for the ISDS – which she writes on here:

[http://www.bearder.eu/update\\_ttip\\_catherine\\_bearder](http://www.bearder.eu/update_ttip_catherine_bearder)

But will write separately on that, as there is enough complexity for one letter in the one attached!

Lastly, I mentioned I was disappointed that Catherine Bearder voted against MEPs having the programmed debate on TTIP last week when in plenary session. I felt that was a lost opportunity for some democratic involvement in TTIP when it is kept so minimal, especially as compared with the very much larger input from big business lobbying groups and TNC's.

I would be grateful to know how she responds.

Yours sincerely,

Henry Adams

Dr Henry Adams (Ecological Consultant)

Home phone: 01539 722158

55 Hayclose Crescent, Kendal, Cumbria, LA9 7NT

Twitter: [www.twitter.com/@henryadamsUK](http://www.twitter.com/@henryadamsUK) My website: [www.dragonfly1.plus.com/topics.html](http://www.dragonfly1.plus.com/topics.html)

**Hidden dangers for us all in TTIP and CETA: [www.bit.ly/STOP-TTIP-South-Lakes](http://www.bit.ly/STOP-TTIP-South-Lakes) <<<<**