

# EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

1999



2004

---

*Session document*

14 November 2000

B5-0871/2000

## MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

further to the Commission statement

pursuant to Rule 37(2) of the Rules of Procedure

by the following Members: Martinez, de Gaulle, Gollnisch and Lang

on behalf of the TDI Group

on banning animal meal in the European Union

**European Parliament resolution on banning animal meal in the European Union**

*The European Parliament,*

- having regard to the White Paper on food safety,
  - having regard to the setting-up by the Commission in 2002 of the European Food Authority,
  - having regard to the adverse opinion delivered on 1 October 1999 by the French Food Safety Agency (AFSSA) on the lifting of the embargo on British beef,
- A. whereas experts and scientists, particularly those in Britain, have clearly demonstrated that animal meal was responsible for the development and transmission of the pathogenic prion which causes BSE,
- B. whereas the BSE epidemic was caused by British meal manufacturers who, in the interests of competitiveness, reduced the temperature at which meal was cooked,
- C. whereas after 1989 France continued to import from Great Britain meal made from potentially contaminated meat and bones, particularly via Belgium,
- D. whereas the number of cases of BSE in France is increasing (30 in 1999, 93 so far in 2000), while animal meal for bovines has been banned since July 1990 and imports from Britain since December 1989,
- E. whereas in 1995, the year before the embargo, France imported 100 000 tons of British beef and whereas carcass waste found its way into meal,
- F. whereas so far 85 people have died in Britain of the atypical variant Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease, and 3 in France,
- G. whereas it was not until 1 October 2000 that specified risk material (SRM) was banned in the European Union, although it is highly infectious,
- H. deploring the fact that the rapid detection tests used in Switzerland and France are being extended to the whole European Union only with effect from 1 January 2001, while numerous seemingly healthy animals are entering the food chain because of the long incubation period of BSE,
- I. deploring the fact that the labelling and traceability system will be complete only in 2003, despite the risks being run by consumers and the absence of a total guarantee for farmers,
- J. whereas the quantity of animal meal in Europe exceeds 2 million tons per annum,
1. Considers that the only way of preventing fraud and accidental cross-contamination of

food is to ban animal meal for all animals (pigs, poultry and fish);

2. Calls for the use of animal meal to be banned at Community level without delay, on the basis of the precautionary principle, which is espoused by both national and Community authorities,
3. Considers that the extreme diversity of legislation on the production of animal meal and the opening of the internal market desired by supporters of a federal Europe make it necessary to ban such meal for all animals;
4. Considers that it is necessary to guarantee both the protection of consumers' health and food and the incomes of farmers who fall victim to the BSE pandemic;
5. Considers that the European Union should contribute – as it has done for Britain – to the cost of these measures, namely storage and destruction of animal meal and fat, of animal waste and by-products for use in meal, protection of the environment and naturally support for the whole beef industry;
6. Condemns the decision by the Scientific Steering Committee of September 1998 to allow feedingstuffs for ruminants to contain up to 0.50% animal meal;
7. Insists that manufacturers of compound feedingstuffs for animals should be held liable under the civil and/or criminal law in cases of damage to livestock farmers and/or consumers;
8. Observes that France is already importing nearly 70% of its oil protein requirements (sunflowers, rape, soya cake) and will, for example, import 560 000 tons of soya cake if animal meal is banned, while the Commission has considerably reduced direct aid to producers of oil crops as part of the CAP reform;
9. Wishes the oil protein crop sector to be developed, as there is an extreme deficit in this sector, particularly on land which has been set aside, which will mean renegotiating under the auspices of the WTO the Blair House Agreement of 1992 which limits the land area under vegetable protein crops in the Community;
10. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council and Commission.