



European Communities

**EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT**

# **WORKING DOCUMENTS**

English Edition

1985-86

21 October 1985

SERIES A

DOCUMENT A 2-125/85

## **REPORT**

drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation

on

I. the communication from the Commission to the Council on the review of the European Community's generalized tariff preferences scheme (COM(85) 203 final - Doc. C 2-41/85)

and

II. the proposal from the Commission to the Council fixing the Community's generalized tariff preferences scheme for 1986 (COM(85) 425 final - Doc. C 2-85/85)

Rapporteur: Mrs B. HEINRICH

WG(VS)/2339E  
Fr.-egs

PE 99.632/fin.

By letters of 3 June 1985 and 11 September 1985 the President of the Council of the European Communities consulted the European Parliament, in accordance with the EEC Treaty, with regard to the communication from the Commission to the Council (Doc. C 2-41/85) on the review of the European Community's generalized tariff preferences scheme and on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. C 2-85/85) fixing the Community's generalized tariff preferences scheme for 1986.

On 10 June and 7 October 1985 the President of the European Parliament referred these proposals to the Committee on Development and Cooperation as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy, the Committee on External Economic Relations and, in the case of the second document, the Committee on Budgets for their opinions.

At its meeting of 26 June 1985 the committee appointed Mrs HEINRICH rapporteur.

The committee considered the Commission proposals and the draft report at its meetings of 18 September 1985 and 14 and 15 October 1985. The committee has to date made no amendment to the Commission proposals. Pursuant to paragraph 7 of the motion for a resolution put to the European Parliament it is reserving judgment on the terms and within the limits therein defined.

The committee then adopted the motion for a resolution as a whole unanimously on 16 October 1985.

Present: Mrs FOCKE, chairman; Mr WURTZ, vice-chairman; Mrs HEINRICH, rapporteur; Mr BAGET-BOZZO, Mr BEYER de RYKE, Mrs CASTELLINA, Mr COHEN, Mrs DALY, Mrs DE BACKER-VAN OCKEN, Mr FELLERMAIER, Mr FRIEDRICH (deputizing for Mr Lemmer), Mr HABSBURG (deputizing for Mr Michelini), Mr C. JACKSON, Mrs LENTZ-CORNETTE (deputizing for Mrs Cassanmagnago-Cerretti), Mr LUSTER, Mrs PANTAZI, Mr PIRKL, Mrs RABBETHGE, Mr SHERLOCK (deputizing for Mr Simpson), Mr SCHWALBA-HOTH (deputizing for Mr Kuijpers), Mr SIMONS, Mr ULBURGS (deputizing for Mr Pannella), Mr VERBEEK, Mr VERGEER and Mr WAWRZIK.

The opinions of the Committees on External Economic Relations; Agriculture, Fisheries and Food; and Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy are attached. The opinion of the Committee on Budgets will be published separately.

The report was tabled on 17 October 1985.

The deadline for tabling amendments to this report will be indicated in the draft agenda for the part-session at which it will be debated.

C O N T E N T S

	<u>Page</u>
A. MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION .....	5
B. EXPLANATORY STATEMENT .....	8
OPINION of the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food .....	12
OPINION of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy .....	14
OPINION of the Committee on External Economic Relations .....	16

The Committee on Development and Cooperation hereby submits to the European Parliament the following motion for a resolution together with explanatory statement:

A

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

closing the procedure for consultation of the European Parliament on the communication from the Commission to the Council on the review of the European Community's generalized tariff preferences scheme and on the proposal from the Commission to the Council fixing the Community's generalized tariff preferences scheme for 1986

The European Parliament,

- A. having regard to the communication from the Commission to the Council (COM(85) 203 final) and the proposal from the Commission to the Council (COM(85) 425 final),
- B. having been consulted by the Council (Doc. C 2-41/85 and Doc. C 2-85/85),
- C. having regard to the report of the Committee on Development and Cooperation and the opinions of the Committee on External Economic Relations, the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy and the Committee on Budgets (Doc. A 2-125/85),
- D. having regard to the result of the vote on the Commission's proposal,
- E. recalling its previous resolutions on the generalized tariff preferences system and, in particular, those of 17 October 1980<sup>1</sup>, 15 December 1980<sup>2</sup>, 20 November 1981<sup>3</sup>, 15 October 1982<sup>4</sup>, 18 November 1983<sup>5</sup> and 16 November 1984<sup>6</sup>,
- F. whereas 1986 is the first year in which the system will be applied by the enlarged Community including Spain and Portugal,

---

<sup>1</sup> OJ No. C 291, 10.11.1980, p. 77

<sup>2</sup> OJ No. C 346, 31.12.1980, p. 19

<sup>3</sup> OJ No. C 327, 14.12.1981, p. 107

<sup>4</sup> OJ No. C 292, 8.11.1982, p. 105

<sup>5</sup> OJ No. C 342, 19.12.1983, p. 168

<sup>6</sup> OJ No. C 337, 17.12.1984, p. 419

1. Reaffirms its support for a Community system of generalized tariff preferences for the benefit of the developing countries, particularly the least advanced among them, and underlines the important role which can be played by the generalized preferences system in the context of Community development policy;
2. Emphasizes that, from the point of view of the beneficiary countries, it is important that the Community should adopt its system promptly each year, and considers it essential, therefore, that the system should be adopted in accordance with Article 113 of the EEC Treaty, which provides for majority voting;
3. Reaffirms its support for the establishment of a five-year system of generalized tariff preferences which allows all the economic operators to work within a better known and more secure framework and should thus enable better use to be made of the possibilities of the system;
4. Regrets the fact that it did not possess at a sufficiently early stage, before the expiry of the first five-year period, a more complete evaluation study on the effects of the Community system, with regard to both the beneficiary countries and the economic and social situation within the Community, its consequences for the ACP partners and its relationship with other Community policies on development aid;
5. Regrets the fact that the benefits of the generalized tariff preferences system are still confined to a small minority of countries which have already reached a more advanced level of development;
6. Reiterates its demand for measures to enable the least-developed countries to derive greater benefit from the system and calls on the Commission to draw up specific proposals on this subject;
7. Reserves its judgment on the introduction of a new form of differentiation in the scheme until it becomes clear what consequences such differentiation will have; wishes to be kept closely informed of the change in trade flows, should such differentiation be introduced;
8. Calls, however, in any event for implementation of the scheme to proceed in such a way that those beneficiary countries with relatively high indebtedness in terms of their exports may profit by the scheme to the full;
9. Calls for consideration to be given to the manner in which ecological aspects can suitably be incorporated in the differentiation;
10. Calls for an investigation of the extent to which the newly industrialized countries are themselves prepared and able to grant preferences to the poorest developing countries;
11. Reiterates its belief that the generalized preferences can be of benefit to the least-developed countries only if they apply to both processed and unprocessed agricultural products, and calls once again on the Commission to include new agricultural products in the list of preferences, including products covered by the common agricultural policy;

12. Approves in this respect the measures, although insufficient, which are proposed for agricultural products in 1986 to benefit the least-developed countries and to achieve a more balanced distribution of the advantages of the system in the interest of the countries of Latin America;
13. Points out that the advantages of the generalized system of preferences for the beneficiary countries are directly dependent on its being closely and constantly adapted to developments in the patterns of trade; is therefore in favour of the introduction of machinery to provide for a more direct link between such trends, the Community's market possibilities and the limits on preferential amounts; approves, in this respect, the proposals for 1986;
14. Calls for a series of measures to be taken, including technical measures, to increase the transparency of the day-to-day management of the system from the point of view of both the beneficiary countries and the Member States of the Community;
15. Agrees that there is a need to ensure greater security in the operation of the system with regard to the procedure for reintroducing duties; reaffirms, in this connection, its support for the setting up of a management committee while pointing out that the Commission must remain entirely responsible for the management of the system and that it will not sanction any transfer of decision-making power to a committee of the Council;
16. Draws attention once again to the need for intensive information and training programmes to enable the beneficiary countries, particularly the least developed among them, to derive the greatest possible benefit from the possibilities offered by the system;
17. Asks once again that the social partners be better informed and systematically consulted so that provision can be made for reorganization in sensitive industrial sectors to avoid any recourse to protectionist measures in the long term and so that the burden can be shared equally between all the economic and social sectors of the Community;
18. Reiterates its view that the countries benefiting from the generalized tariff preferences scheme must comply with the international minimum standards for working conditions laid down in the conventions of the International Labour Organization, and asks that the social partners be involved in the regular monitoring of this situation;
19. Calls for a review of the rules of origin to permit cumulation within regional groupings of countries;
20. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Commission and the Council.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

In recent years, the operation of the Community's generalized tariff preferences scheme has been periodically reviewed by the Committee on Development and Cooperation in connection with the establishment of the successive systems for application each year.

It has therefore had the opportunity to set out in some detail its views on the various aspects of the scheme.

At the end of the first period of application, from 1971 to 1980, the Committee on Development and Cooperation welcomed the extension of the generalized preferences system for a further ten-year period, from 1981 to 1990. It also endorsed the idea of proposing a five-year scheme within this ten-year period, covering the years 1981-1985.

The subject of this report is the draft five-year scheme proposed by the Commission for the years 1986-1990, the second half of the ten-year period, which is to provide a framework for the successive annual systems.

Before examining in detail the Commission's document, mention should be made of the previous positions adopted by the European Parliament on the basis of reports by the Committee on Development and Cooperation.

1. Summary of the positions adopted by the European Parliament

In the first place, the European Parliament has consistently underlined the fact that the Community's generalized tariff preferences scheme should benefit as many developing countries as possible, giving priority to the least-developed countries.

With regard to the products covered by the system, it has frequently pointed out in recent years that the quotas for agricultural products remain inadequate despite a number of improvements.

Parliament has drawn attention to the fact that the Community preferences cannot be of use to the poorest developing countries unless they apply to both processed and unprocessed agricultural products. It has asked on a number of occasions for the list of agricultural products to be extended gradually to include products covered by the common agricultural policy. The Commission has been asked to establish a policy on trade in agricultural products which is compatible with Community development policy.

As a consequence of its wish to ensure that as many countries as possible, particularly the least-developed countries, can benefit from the Community system, the European Parliament has supported measures which differentiate to a greater extent between beneficiary countries at different levels of development. It therefore approved the proposals to apply the system on a discretionary basis according to the products concerned and the level of industrial development of the beneficiary countries.

The European Parliament has also called on the Commission to examine the extent to which the newly industrialized countries are themselves prepared and able to offer preferences to the poorest developing countries.

The European Parliament has consistently recommended that the system should be made more transparent through the provision of more information and training in all the countries concerned.

It has pointed out that the beneficiary countries must have greater protection against the sometimes sudden application of safeguard clauses. To this end, it has proposed that the social partners within the Community and in the beneficiary countries should be provided with more information and systematically consulted so that the necessary adjustments can be made in sensitive sectors to avoid, in the long term, repeated recourse to protectionist measures against the beneficiary countries and to ensure that the burden is shared equally between all the economic and social sectors of the Community.

Attention has been drawn to the advantages of the mutual exchange of information on major investment projects which enables the Community better to foresee the competition which may be created as a result of the industrialization of the Third World.

With regard to the rules of origin, the European Parliament has stated that it is in favour of allowing cumulative origin in the case of members of regional groupings.

Parliament has also stated that it is in favour of the setting up of a management committee to monitor the system but has reiterated its very firm views regarding the powers of consultative committees, according to which the Commission must remain entirely responsible for the management of the system and decision-making powers should not be transferred to committees belonging to the Council.

The European Parliament, following the initiative of the Committee on Development and Cooperation, has also been prompted to consider the question of observance of the international standards for working conditions, as laid down in the ILO conventions, in the countries benefiting from the Community system. It has expressed the view that the beneficiary countries must respect these minimum standards and that the social partners should be involved in the regular monitoring of this situation.

Lastly, the European Parliament has on a number of occasions asked the Commission to submit to it a complete evaluation report on the economic effects of the system, the components of which, including one request which has already been met, should be a study of the actual benefits of the system for the beneficiary countries, a study of the consequences of the system for industry and employment in the Community and a study of the impact on ACP exports of new competition created by the implementation of the Community system of generalized preferences.

## 2. Assessment of the Commission's proposals in the light of the positions adopted by the European Parliament

The communication from the Commission to the Council concerning the review of the European Community's generalized tariff preferences scheme may be assessed by considering in turn each of the main points raised by the European Parliament and comparing them with the proposals or observations made by the Commission.



With regard first of all to the number of countries benefiting from the system, the information supplied by the Commission shows that in 1983 the top 10 beneficiaries accounted for 65% of the trade coming within the Community system. The figure for 1979 was 71.9%<sup>1</sup>.

In order to give a better idea of the economic importance of the advantages offered by the system, mention should be made of some statistics supplied by the Commission. The total value of the imports benefiting from the system in 1983 was 9 300 million ECU while the total value of imports from outside the Community was 328 400 million ECU. This gives an indication of the significance of the system for the Community. To illustrate the importance of the system for the beneficiary countries, on the other hand, it should be pointed out that the total value of their exports to the Community was 87 400 million ECU, 55 900 million ECU of which was accounted for by exports subject to zero duty under the Common Customs Tariff.

It may therefore be concluded from these figures that in 1983 the value of the imports benefiting from the system represented just over 10% of the total volume of Community imports from the beneficiary countries and that, if the volume of imports which are in any case exempt from positive duties is disregarded, the volume of imports benefiting from the system represents 30% of all the imports from the beneficiary countries which would be subject to customs duties were it not for the system.

The Commission document does not contain any specific or new proposals concerning the category of the least-developed countries.

As far as the products covered by the system are concerned, the Commission does not make any specific proposals concerning agricultural products other than asserting that the Community should concentrate on an 'improvement' of the benefits granted and take into account the interests of the least-developed countries. The Commission appears, however, to exclude any possibility of a revision of the system extending to the agricultural products covered by the common agricultural policy in the Community.

The most original feature of the document is the proposal concerning a new stage in differentiation between supplier countries on a product-by-product basis. The Commission proposes that, on the basis of objective criteria and subject to a final decision left to its own judgement, it should have the possibility of excluding from the system specific products from specific countries. This measure would be accompanied by both quantitative and qualitative complementary measures to improve the conditions of access for other products and other suppliers.

The Commission does not, however, make any comment on whether it would be appropriate or possible to prompt the most advanced countries to grant certain tariff preferences to the poorest countries.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Annex 4, Table 3 of the Commission document - COM(85) 203 final

With regard to the transparency of the system and its security in relation to the reintroduction of duties, the Commission proposes certain improvements in procedures for the exchange of information with the beneficiary countries and between the Commission and the Member States. It also proposes the setting up of a management committee within which 'decisions would be taken according to the usual procedures in management committees'. Mention should be made here, once again, of the European Parliament's unequivocal views on the role and powers of consultative committees, which should act only in an advisory capacity. The Commission's comments are not explicit on this point.

The Commission document makes no mention whatsoever of the role which consultation with the social partners in the beneficiary countries and the Community could play in preventing situations of conflict.

Nor is there any reference either to the need to ensure that the main international standards for working conditions laid down in the ILO conventions are more widely respected in the beneficiary countries or to the role which consultation with the social partners could play in this area.

Lastly, it should be pointed out that while the Commission document contains a series of annexes which describe systems of tariff preferences in certain other countries and provide information on the Community system and statistics concerning some of the beneficiary countries, this information is not equivalent to the studies which have been called for in the past by the European Parliament. No mention whatsoever is made of the effects of the system on the economy of the Community and on its relations with the ACP partners.

OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, FISHERIES AND FOOD

Letter from the chairman of the committee to Mrs FOCKE, chairman of the  
Committee on Development and Cooperation

---

Brussels, 18 September 1985

Subject: Communication from the Commission to the Council on the review  
of the European Community's generalized tariff preferences scheme  
(COM(85) 425 final)  
Proposal from the Commission to the Council fixing the Community's  
generalized tariff preferences scheme for 1986 (COM(85) 425 final)

Dear Mrs Focke,

The Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food considered the  
Commission documents referred to above at its meeting of 18 September 1985.

The communication deals with the fixing of a framework for the operation  
of the scheme during the period from 1986 to 1990.

The committee has noted that the Commission's objectives are in  
accordance with the views expressed in earlier opinions, namely that  
administrative formalities should be simplified and the list of beneficiaries  
reviewed so that as far as possible, priority is given to the least favoured  
countries.

From a geographical point of view, the benefits are unequally distributed,  
seeing that 62.3% of agricultural products imported under the system come from  
Asia and only 36.7% from Latin America. The Commission's intention is to  
review the list on a case-by-case basis to see which countries have reached  
a stage of development where they no longer need the system's help in  
maintaining their position on the European market and, without reducing the  
preferences overall, to replace those countries by countries (especially in  
Latin America) that have not yet reached that stage of development.

The Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food endorses this approach  
which has already been implemented in the proposal for fixing the GSP for 1986.  
Account has also been taken therein of the accession of Spain and Portugal,  
with the preferential limits for the five products subject to quota having  
been recalculated.

Yours sincerely,

(sgd) T. TOLMAN

The following took part in the vote: Mr Tolman, chairman; Mr Mouchel, vice-chairman; Mr Borgo, Mr Clinton, Mr Dalsass, Mrs Ewing (deputizing for Mr MacSharry), Mr Fanton, Mr Filinis (deputizing for Mr Amadou), Mr Gatti, Mr Howell (deputizing for Mr Battersby), Mrs Jepsen, Mr Lagakos (deputizing for Mr Sutra de Germa), Mr Romeo, Mr Sakellariou (deputizing for Mr Wettig) and Mr Thareau.

OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC AND MONETARY AFFAIRS  
AND INDUSTRIAL POLICY

Letter from the Chairman of the Committee to Mrs Katharina FOCKE,  
Chairman of the Committee on Development and Cooperation

---

subject: Review of the European Community's Generalized Preference  
Scheme (COM (85) 203 fin)

Fixing the Community's generalized tariff preferences scheme  
for 1986 (COM (85) 425 fin) (Doc. 2-85/85)

Dear Mrs Focke,

At its meeting on 24-26 September 1985 the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy examined the Commission's conclusions in its recent review of the workings of the Community's GSP Scheme, and also the Commission's proposals for 1986 incorporating the new principles suggested as a result of the review. The Committee offers the following comments:

- (i) The Committee agrees with the Commission's main premise that differentiation in the treatment of the most competitive developing countries and the poorer ones should be made even sharper. GSP benefit could be cut off on a selective product/supplier basis in those cases where the original objectives of the GSP have been obtained. At the same time, access could be liberalized for less competitive suppliers, and on other products so that the total value of the Community's GSP offer is at least maintained in real terms.

In its previous opinion on this matter, the Committee pointed out that it was absolutely essential that the organization of the GSP should be based, among other things, on a careful consideration of the degree of competitiveness both in the relevant industrial sector in the third country and that of Community industry<sup>1</sup>. In this regard it draws attention to its request for the Commission<sup>2</sup> to prepare, as soon as possible, a report on the economic impacts of the GSP, since indications contained in the Commission document are of a general nature and further clarification is needed. The principles set out by the Commission are

---

<sup>1</sup>Opinion of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy on the GSP for 1984, paragraph 4 (Doc. 1-1007/83)

<sup>2</sup>Paragraph 6 in the above mentioned opinion

excellent ones, but it is vital for the Parliament to be able to monitor whether the actual practice is living up to those objectives, that the GSP is really ensuring that the poorest countries are helped most, and that Community industry is not unnecessarily damaged by a failure to take new international commercial realities sufficiently into account.

- (ii) The Committee also agrees that a review of the method of calculating the preferential limits for sensitive industrial products is urgently required and should take account of actual commercial trends.
- (iii) The Committee regrets, however that the Commission does not refer to one particular criterion which the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy has mentioned on previous occasions as being essential : the need for the countries concerned to take account of the recommendations made by the Commission on working conditions.
- (iv) The Committee further believes, unlike the Commission in its answer to the written question by Mr A. Pearce<sup>1</sup>, that the problem of access for Community goods to the markets of beneficiary countries should also be taken into consideration. Indeed, as is rightly emphasized in the Commission document, the GSP should be regarded as an integral part of the Community's trade policy.
- (v) The Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy supports the decision to improve the security offered to beneficiaries and the issuing of data on the way in which the system is administered. It therefore welcomes the proposals for tighter procedures as regards the reintroduction of customs duties.
- (vi) The Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy notes the Commission's intention to review the rules on ascertaining the origin of products, in particular to encourage cooperation between developing countries within regional groupings (cumulation rules) and cooperation between European companies and beneficiary countries (concept of donor - country content). The Commission should submit the results of this review to the European Parliament as soon as possible.

This letter should be considered as the opinion of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy<sup>2</sup>.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Barry SEAL

---

<sup>1</sup>No. 1322/84 in OJ No. C 115, 9.5.1985, p.7

<sup>2</sup>The following took part in the vote: Beazley (vice-chairman), Beumer, Bonaccini, Chanterie (replacing Abélin), Frañz, De Gucht, Herman, Patterson, Ms Quin, Wagner, von Wogau

OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXTERNAL ECONOMIC RELATIONS

Letter from the Chairman of the Committee on External Economic Relations  
to Mrs Katharina Focke, Chairman of the Committee on Development and Cooperation

---

Subject: Generalized tariff preferences scheme  
(COM (85) 203 final - Doc. C 2-41/85)

2 July 1985

Dear Madam Chairman,

The Committee on External Economic Relations considered the above proposal from the Commission at its meeting of 25 and 26 June 1985.

The Committee agreed unanimously to express its favourable opinion on this proposal and instructed me to convey this opinion to you in the form of a letter.

Yours sincerely,

(sgd) Dame Shelagh ROBERTS

The following took part in the vote: Mr Hindley (acting chairman), Mr Amadei (deputizing for Mr Massari), Mr de Camaret, Mr de Winter, Mr Kilby, Mr Lemmer (deputizing for Mr Mühlen), Mr Moorhouse, Mr Pranchere (deputizing for Mr Galluzzi), Mr Rossetti (deputizing for Mr Castellina), Mrs van Rooy, Mr Seeler, Mr Toussant, Mr Zahorka, Mr Zarges and Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul

OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXTERNAL ECONOMIC RELATIONS

Letter from the Chairman of the Committee to Mrs Katharina Focke,  
Chairman of the Committee on Development and Cooperation

---

Subject: Generalised Tariff Preference Scheme  
(COM (85) 425 final) (Doc. 2-85/85)

1 October 1985

Dear Madame Chairman,

The Committee on External Economic Relations considered the above proposal from the Commission at its meeting of 25 September 1985.

The Committee agreed unanimously to express their favourable opinion on this proposal and instructed me to convey this opinion to you in the form of a letter.

Yours sincerely,

pp Dame Shelagh ROBERTS

The following took part in the vote: Dame Shelagh ROBERTS, Chairman; Mr HINDLEY, Vice-chairman; Mr van AERSEN, vice-chairman, Messrs BRINCKMEIER, de CAMARET, COSTANZO, FORD, GALUZZI, KILBI, MORRHOUSE, MOTCHANE, Mme NIELSEN (deputizing for Mr CHINAUD), Mme PANTAZI (deputizing for Mr MASSARI), Mme van ROOY, Mr ROSSETTI (deputizing for Mr REICHLIN), Mr SEELER, Mr TOUSSAINT, Mr TZOUNIS, Mme WIECZOREK-ZEUL, Mr ZAHORKA.





European Communities

**EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT**

# **WORKING DOCUMENTS**

English Edition

1985-86

24 October 1985

SERIES A

DOCUMENT A 2-125/85/ANNEX

ANNEX

to the report by Mrs HEINRICH  
drawn up on behalf of the Committee on  
Development and Cooperation

0

0 0

OPINION

of the Committee on Budgets

PE 99.632/fin./Ann.

Letter from the chairman of the committee to Mrs FOCKE, chairman of the Committee on Development and Cooperation

Strasbourg, 23 October 1985

Subject: Opinion of the Committee on Budgets on the proposal fixing the Community's generalized tariff preference scheme for 1986 (Doc. C - 2-85/85 - COM(85) 425)

Dear Madam Chairman,

The Committee on Budgets considered the above proposal at its meeting of 21 October 1985.

The Committee on Budgets expressed its regret that the Commission had failed to attach a financial statement to the proposal. It intends to reconsider the financial consequences of this proposal during the budgetary procedure.

Subject to this observation the Committee on Budgets gave a favourable opinion.

Yours sincerely,

(sgd) Jean-Pierre COT

Present : Mr COT, chairman, Mr RYAN, first vice-chairman, Sir James SCOTT-HOPKINS, second vice-chairman, Mrs BARBARELLA, third vice-chairman, Mr BARDONG, Mr CHRISTODOULOU, Mr CORNELISSEN, Mr CURRY, Mr DE VRIES (deputizing for Mr ROSSI), Mr DI BARTOLOMEI, Mr DIMITRIADIS (deputizing for Mr DEPREZ), Mr LANGES, Mr NORMANTON, Mr PASTY, Mrs SCRIVENER and Mr VON DER VRING.