

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

Working Documents

1974-1975

12 November 1974

DOCUMENT 341/74

Report

drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture

on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 277/74) for a decision supplementing the Community programme of research into classical swine fever and African swine fever

Rapporteur: Mrs Elisabeth ORTH

By letter of 26 September 1974, the President of the Council of the European Communities requested the European Parliament, pursuant to Article 43 of the EEC Treaty, to deliver an opinion on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a decision supplementing the Community programme of research into classical swine fever and African swine fever.

The President of the European Parliament referred this proposal to the Committee on Agriculture as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Budgets for its opinion.

At its meeting of 22 and 23 October 1974, the Committee on Agriculture appointed Mrs Orth rapporteur.

It considered the Commission's proposal at its meeting of 4 and 5 November 1974 and unanimously adopted the motion for a resolution and explanatory statement.

Present: Mr Houdet, chairman; Mr Laban, vice-chairman; Mrs Orth, rapporteur, Mr Espersen (deputizing for Mr Brégégère), Mr Frehsee, Mr Früh, Mr Gibbons, Mr Howell, Mr Liogier, Lord St. Oswald, and Mr Scott-Hopkins.

The Opinion of the Committee on Budgets is attached.

C O N T E N T S

	<u>Page</u>
A. MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION	5
B. EXPLANATORY STATEMENT	6
Opinion of the Committee on Budgets	8

The Committee on Agriculture hereby submits to the European Parliament the following motion for a resolution, together with explanatory statement:

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

embodying the opinion of the European Parliament on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a decision supplementing the Community programme on research into classical swine fever and African swine fever.

The European Parliament,

- having regard to the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council¹,
 - having been consulted by the Council pursuant to Article 43 of the Treaty establishing the EEC (Doc. 277/74),
 - having regard to the report of the Committee on Agriculture and the opinion of the Committee on Budgets (Doc. 341/74),
1. Approves the Commission's proposal;
 2. Instructs its President to forward this resolution and the report of its committee to the Council and Commission of the European Communities.

¹OJ No. C.126 of 17.10.1974, p. 36

B.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

1. In its explanatory memorandum the Commission of the European Communities states that an initial programme to combat swine fever was adopted by the Council in July 1966.

This programme had two main objectives:

- the development of a differential diagnosis for the two fevers;
- study of the vaccines proposed for classical swine fever and research into a vaccine for African swine fever.

Whereas the first objective has been fully achieved, the same cannot be said of the second, since no vaccine for African swine fever has yet been discovered.

2. The Commission of the European Communities, conscious of the fact that research into the virology of swine fevers is a basic component of technical progress in pig breeding, essential for safeguarding and increasing productivity in this sector, decided to continue and intensify the activities begun in 1966.

3. It submitted to the Council, on 7 August 1972, a proposal for a decision adopting a Community research programme into classical and African swine fever.

On being consulted, the European Parliament delivered a favourable opinion on the proposal.¹

4. By decision of 28 December 1972, the Council decided to undertake this research programme for a period of four years commencing on 1 January 1973. The programme was thus launched at the time the membership of the three new Member States of the Community was being considered.

The proposed decision submitted to Parliament for its consideration aims, therefore, at associating with this programme research institutes and laboratories in the United Kingdom, Ireland and Denmark and assigning research tasks to the new contracting parties, due regard being had to their scientific and technical capabilities in the field of classical and African swine fever.

¹ See report drawn up by Mr BAAS on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture (Doc. 192/72 of 14.11.1972)

A list of the institutes and laboratories concerned and a description of the work assigned to the new partners is included in the proposal for a decision.

5. The total cost of the extension of the programme is estimated by the Commission at 1,503,696 u.a., the contribution of the co-contracting parties being set at 715,598 u.a. and the Community's contribution at 788,098 u.a.

6. The Commission of the European Communities states that, as the Community research programme is due to be concluded by 31 December 1976, it would be advisable for the present supplementary programme to end on the same date. However, work on this supplementary programme cannot start before the beginning of 1975. It will therefore be necessary to carry out in two years the same amount of scientific work initially planned to cover three years. According to the Commission, this is technically possible; total financing would simply have to be spread over two financial years instead of three.

7. The Committee on Agriculture fully agrees that prophylactic research into swine fever should be continued and that the new Member States should be associated with it.

It would, however, like to invite the Commission and Council (as it already has in the report by Mr BAAS referred to above) not to confine co-ordination activities at Community level to the swine fever sector, but rather to undertake an overall policy to combat epizootics.

In the light of these considerations, the Committee on Agriculture recommends the European Parliament to adopt the proposal for the decision under consideration.

OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON BUDGETS

Letter from the chairman of the committee to Mr HOUDET, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Paris, 5 November 1974

Dear Mr Chairman,

The Committee on Budgets was asked to deliver an opinion on:

'The proposal for a decision supplementing the Community programme of research into classical swine fever and African swine fever (Doc. 277/74)'

On 5 November, the Committee on Budgets delivered a negative opinion on this proposal for the reasons given in the attached text.

Yours sincerely,

(sgd.) Georges SPENALE

Annex

1. Introduction

This proposal supplements the Council decision of 28.12.1972 adopting a Community research programme into classical and African swine fever by associating in the existing programme research institutes and laboratories in the three new Member States.

The Commission estimates the total cost of the extension of the programme at 1,503,696 u.a.

This is calculated as follows:

- contributions of the joint contracting parties	715,598 u.a.
- Community's contributions	788,098 u.a.
broken down as follows:	
1st financial year (1974)	251,010 u.a.
2nd financial year (1975)	277,088 u.a.
3rd financial year (1976)	260,000 u.a.

2. The proposal also shows the Community's financial contribution to the various research projects broken down by year (1974-1976).

It does not, however, provide essential information which the Committee on Budgets would need to deliver an informed opinion, that is to say, the criteria and basic data which the Commission has used in fixing the above amounts.

3. The Committee on Budgets notes with regret that the Commission has failed to use the model financial schedule which it had agreed to follow in future for any proposals for Community regulations or directives with financial implications.

This model schedule includes the heading 6/3 (broken down into several sub-headings) relating to explanations concerning the total cost and the appropriations requested, as well as to the method used for calculating these appropriations.

4. Conclusions

In the absence of these essential details, the committee is unable to assess this proposal for a decision on which it must, therefore, deliver a negative opinion.

