


Procedure file

Basic information		
DEC - Discharge procedure	1995/2002(DEC)	Procedure completed
1993 discharge: Parliament budget		
Subject 8.70.03.07 Previous discharges		

Key players			
European Parliament	Committee responsible	Rapporteur	Appointed
	CONT Budgetary Control		14/11/1994
		RDE PASTY Jean-Claude	
Council of the European Union	Council configuration	Meeting	Date
	Economic and Financial Affairs ECOFIN	1835	20/03/1995

Key events			
01/01/1995	Committee referral announced in Parliament		
26/09/1995	Vote in committee		Summary
26/09/1995	Committee report tabled for plenary	A4-0224/1995	
12/10/1995	Debate in Parliament		
12/10/1995	Decision by Parliament	T4-0465/1995	Summary
12/10/1995	Decision by Parliament	T4-0464/1995	
12/10/1995	End of procedure in Parliament		
30/10/1995	Final act published in Official Journal		

Technical information	
Procedure reference	1995/2002(DEC)
Procedure type	DEC - Discharge procedure
Legal basis	Rules of Procedure EP 100
Stage reached in procedure	Procedure completed
Committee dossier	CONT/4/06360

Documentation gateway

Committee report tabled for plenary, single reading		A4-0224/1995 OJ C 287 30.10.1995, p. 0005	26/09/1995	EP	
Motion for a resolution		B4-1203/1995 OJ C 287 30.10.1995, p. 0147	12/10/1995	EP	
Text adopted by Parliament, single reading		T4-0465/1995 OJ C 287 30.10.1995, p. 0151-0192	12/10/1995	EP	Summary
Text adopted by Parliament, topical subjects		T4-0464/1995 OJ C 287 30.10.1995, p. 0150-0190	12/10/1995	EP	

1993 discharge: Parliament budget

The committee approved the report by Jean-Claude PASTY granting discharge for the implementation of the European Parliament budget for the 1993 financial year (EP 212.095/rev.). Adoption of the report had been delayed in order to allow the committee to effect a more in-depth audit of the building transactions of the European Parliament in Brussels. In its decision, the committee granted the secretary-general of the European Parliament discharge for the implementation of the budget for the 1993 financial year. Mr PASTY stated in his report that it would be it would be arbitrary and unfair to dissociate the responsibilities of the administration of the European Parliament from those of the political institutions and reiterated that the contract to construct the New Hemicycle in Brussels had been signed by the president of the European Parliament with authorization from the Bureau and the working party in charge of Parliament's buildings policy. The committee expected the Belgian government to honour its commitments by the end of the year with regard to the land above Leopold station and its "viabilization". In fact, the Belgian government had undertaken in a letter from its prime minister at the time to grant the European Parliament the same facilities as those granted to other European institutions in Brussels (Council and Commission). This undertaking had always been interpreted by Parliament to mean the free conveyance of the land on which building D3 had been constructed to house the meeting rooms and offices of the MEPs. The Belgian government had also undertaken to build access roads to the European Parliament buildings. The committee unanimously rejected two proposed credit transfers by the Commission in connection with expenditure under the EAGGF-Guarantee section: - one to strengthen article B1-114 (cotton) by 38 million ecus and item B1-1400 (linen textile production aid) by 7 million ecus from item B1-1011 (technical expenses for public cereal storage) and - one to transfer 80 million ecus from item B1-2114 (depreciation of beef stock) to chapter B1-18 (other sectors or vegetable products), article B1-189 (miscellaneous). The committee justified its decision by criticizing the Commission for the poor quality of its estimates of agricultural production on which the amending and supplementary budget had been based (1/95). It also criticized the Commission for its inadequate and contradictory justifications. The committee also stressed that the above lines for the proposed transfers related to mixed expenditure, i.e. compulsory and non-compulsory, and therefore came under the joint jurisdiction of the Council and Parliament. The committee proposed organizing a trilogue so that the two arms of the budgetary authority could jointly examine the merits of the demand and the amount of the appropriations in question. It should be noted that, when it adopted the 1995 budget, the European Parliament questioned the classification of agricultural expenditure by tabling amendments. The European Parliament took the view that a major portion of the lines relating to the EAGGF-Guarantee section referred to mixed expenditure, i.e. included both compulsory and non-compulsory expenditure. The Council contested this interpretation by the European Parliament, confirmed by President H?NSCH when the 1995 budget was signed, and started proceedings challenging this classification before the Court of Justice. The Court is expected to return a verdict towards the end of the year.?

1993 discharge: Parliament budget

The European Parliament adopted the report by Mr Jean-Claude PASTY (UPE, F) granting discharge for the implementation of the European Parliament budget for the 1993 financial year. At the same time, Parliament made a number of comments on: - the management of building projects in Brussels: Parliament noted that it would be arbitrary and unfair to dissociate the responsibilities of the administration of the European Parliament from those of the political institutions and therefore called on its Committee on Budgetary Control to draft a detailed report on all aspects of the investments costs for building D1 in the New Hemicycle in Brussels and prepare draft revised internal rules in connection with responsibility and financial commitment in the implementation of appropriations on the basis of proposals by the administration of the European Parliament. It reiterated that the contract to construct the New Hemicycle in Brussels had been signed by the president of the European Parliament with authorization from the Bureau and the working party in charge of Parliament's buildings policy. Parliament expected the Belgian government to honour its commitments by the end of the year with regard to the land above Leopold station and its "viabilization". In fact, the Belgian government had undertaken in a letter from its prime minister at the time to grant the European Parliament the same facilities as those granted to other European institutions in Brussels (Council and Commission). This undertaking had always been interpreted by Parliament to mean the free conveyance of the land on which building D3 had been constructed to house the meeting rooms and offices of the MEPs. The Belgian government had also undertaken to build access roads to the European Parliament buildings. It also called for Parliament to apply current provisions governing public procurement and property contracts with the utmost care (especially the rules adopted by the Bureau on 10 February 1988) and to ensure that any undertaking by the European Parliament in relation to buildings obtained budgetary authorization and commitment appropriations first; - the sum for settlement entered on the balance sheet for the 1982 financial year (delegates' fund): the difference of 4,136,125 Belgian francs between the fund and the accounts should be settled once the commercial court in Luxembourg had passed judgment; - certain files relating to the 1993 financial year: mainly the fact that the canteen, bar, restaurant and central purchasing sector were under generalized indirect management and subject to new invitations to tender. It regretted in this respect that the recommendations of the report on inventory procedures drafted by a private company would not be implemented until 1997.?