


Procedure file

Basic information		
DEC - Discharge procedure	1996/2008(DEC)	Procedure completed
1992 discharge: follow-up		
Subject 8.70.03.07 Previous discharges		

Key players			
European Parliament	Committee responsible	Rapporteur	Appointed
	CONT Budgetary Control	PPE CORNELISSEN Petrus A.M.	01/01/1996

Key events			
01/01/1996	Committee referral announced in Parliament		
21/03/1996	Vote in committee		Summary
21/03/1996	Committee report tabled for plenary	A4-0086/1996	
16/04/1996	Debate in Parliament		
17/04/1996	Decision by Parliament	T4-0175/1996	Summary
17/04/1996	End of procedure in Parliament		
13/05/1996	Final act published in Official Journal		

Technical information	
Procedure reference	1996/2008(DEC)
Procedure type	DEC - Discharge procedure
Legal basis	Rules of Procedure EP 102
Stage reached in procedure	Procedure completed
Committee dossier	CONT/4/07461

Documentation gateway				
Committee report tabled for plenary, single reading		A4-0086/1996	21/03/1996	EP

		OJ C 141 13.05.1996, p. 0005			
Text adopted by Parliament, single reading		T4-0175/1996 OJ C 141 13.05.1996, p. 0086-0108	17/04/1996	EP	Summary

1992 discharge: follow-up

The rapporteur, Mr CORNELISSEN (PPE, NL) highlighted the three points in the proposal for a resolution (adopted unanimously) which made the discharge procedure for the 1992 financial year particularly difficult. He referred, inter alia, to: - Parliament's repeated demand for the Commission to recover ECU 340 million from certain Member States on the grounds of failure to apply the milk quota system correctly; - the demand that the Commission file a report by 30 June 1996 on the state of progress in enquiries being conducted in the Member States into the case of presumed fraud in the tobacco sector, together with an estimate of the probable loss to the Community budget; - the demand that all cases of presumed fraud in the Commission services be submitted to the anti-fraud unit, which must be independent of the other services and which should inform Parliament of any important facts as and when they arise.?

1992 discharge: follow-up

Adopting the report by Mr Petrus CORNELISSEN (PPE, NL), the European Parliament confirmed that the first tranche of the monies owed by three Member States for failure to apply milk quotas had been received and took note of the Commission's assurance that the quota scheme was now being applied correctly by the Member States. However, it observed that the Commission had done nothing to take account of Parliament's request concerning the recovery of ECU 340 million and regretted that the Commission had not even attempted to justify its failure to act. It therefore reiterated Parliament's request that this sum, which was disbursed in contravention of current legislation, be recovered and credited to the Community budget. Parliament considered that the milk quotas affair highlighted a fundamental shortcoming in the procedure for clearing the accounts which had not been remedied during recent reforms (facility for the Commission to apply financial corrections to Member States on the basis of factors other than an objective evaluation of non-eligible expenditure). Similarly, it noted that the milk quotas affair had highlighted the failure of the Commission's financial controller to carry out his duties correctly. It called on the Commission to ensure that the financial controller acted totally independently and to report on the state of progress in enquiries being conducted in the Member States into the presumed case of fraud in the tobacco sector. While noting a recent improvement in how the Commission dealt with cases of presumed fraud in its services, the European Parliament repeated nonetheless that it expected all these cases to be submitted to the anti-fraud unit (UCLAF), which needed to be independent of the other Commission services.?