

26 Agosto, 1991

UNIVERSIDAD COMPLUTENSE DE MADRID. Cursos de Verano. El Escorial.

Resumen mesa redonda organizada por el "Intergrupo Taurino" del Parlamento Europeo.

Fecha: 14 Agosto, 1991

Asistentes: Director: A. Amorós (Catedrático); A. Marleix, Presidente del Intergrupo, Eurodiputado francés; A. Navarro (Ganadero toros de lidia); P. Bofill; J. A. Escudero, todos Eurodiputados españoles.

A. Marleix abre la sesión dando cuenta del inmenso progreso que la afición a los toros está teniendo en Francia; hay muchas ciudades del Norte del país que se están sumando a las del Sur; ya la mayoría de los periódicos y cadenas de televisión incluyen espacios y reseñas sobre lo taurino.

A. Navarro: Intergroup for Animal Welfare: La semana anterior se había tratado de incluir una cláusula de defensa de los animales en el tratado de Roma, lo que sería un gran mazazo para las corridas. Tiene fondos abundantes para sus campañas. Los defensores de los animales son muy activos, les apoyan las Sociedades Protectoras de Animales y tienen mucho dinero, al menos en el extranjero (risas implicando que en España no). Los defensores de los animales son animistas (creen que los animales tienen alma, risas) lo que hace que no acepten ningún argumento como que en la ley taurina hay provisiones para la protección de los animales, que no se cumplan es otra cosa, pero deberían cumplirse.

Función del Intergrupo taurino: Ser atalaya que informe a los colegas de los temas que se tratan y del alcance de algunas preguntas que se hacen.

- Dar a conocer los aspectos positivos: a) calidad de vida del toro; b) es ley natural que todo el mundo ha de pagar un tributo por la vida y el del toro es su lidia y muerte en la plaza; c) aportaciones artísticas: Goya, Picasso, etc.; científicas como las técnicas contra la cangrena en la 2ª Guerra Mundial, aportadas por los cirujanos taurinos.; d) enraizamiento popular, muy distinto al de la caza del zorro; e) paga el 12% de IVA; e) consecuencias de su desaparición: produce un beneficio neto de 90.000 millones de pesetas, se trata de agricultura extensiva de acuerdo con las tendencias que favorece la CEE ya que las dehesas son totalmente ecológicas, sin uso de pesticidas ni fertilizantes, no se producen incendios puesto que nadie entra a recorrerlas; f) es un elemento de relación que une las culturas europeas.

De todas formas habrá que hacer concesiones: Regulación de las fiestas de los pueblos a ver si disminuye la presión social.

P. Bofill: Se pueden hacer concesiones en todo lo que trate de protección de los animales siempre que se excluyan las corridas. Además, hay que intentar que las decisiones que el P.E. tome en estos temas no tengan como objeto las manifestaciones culturales, entre las que están las corridas. La petición realizada de corridas incruentas no merece ser tenida en cuenta, sólo demuestra el total desconocimiento de los que la propusieron.

J.A. Escudero: El Intergroup for Animal Welfare es una gran amenaza y no hay que engañarse. Jurídicamente no se pueden prohibir las corridas pero hay que evitar que se plantee: despremiar una decisión así va contra la idea de que hay que dar más fuerza al Parlamento Europeo y no podemos pretender que se haga una excepción con las corridas. Se quiere que las directivas vinculen en general, pero, ¿en esto no? no se puede mantener esta postura.

La situación es alarmante. El informe Schmid puede volverse a plantear en cualquier momento y en un pleno se perdería la votación abrumadoramente. No por odio a España sino por votar contra la crueldad dado su desconocimiento del tema.

Argumentos para evitar esta prohibición y resguardar a la fiesta contra la influencia psicológica que produciría:

1º - Artísticos, Goya, Picasso... además que ya se ha eliminado todo lo malo con la protección a los caballos, etc.

2º - Los defensores de las corridas deben ser contrarios a las fiestas populares que, además, degradan al animal, deben ser anatematizadores y denunciadores de los excesos de los pueblos calificándolos de restos de costumbres bárbaras.

3º - La defensa debe ser global, sin entrar en temas aislados, separando bien las fiestas populares.

4º - Así como la ecología está en alza también lo está la defensa de las tradiciones populares. Ni el Estado español ni el Parlamento Europeo pueden suprimir o cambiar algo que haya sido definido como tradición popular, caso de las corridas.

5º - Defensa política: Hay que evitar que el P.E. se pronuncie, no debe pronunciarse en ningún caso, porque si es en contra hay que hacerles ver que será un descrédito para el propio Parlamento porque la medida no se aplicará.

6º - El Parlamento español debe pronunciarse a favor de las corridas, con un amplio debate; si hubiera un pronunciamiento de fondo a favor, el P.E. nunca se pronunciaría en contra, no podrían ni entrar en ello.

A. Amorós: La aprobación por el Senado y el Congreso de la nueva Ley Taurina es una afirmación del valor de la fiesta y no parece que se pueda pedir más. La posible condena moral del P.E. produciría una corriente antieuropeista en España. En el siglo XVI la condena papal no sirvió para nada y se tuvo que levantar porque la rebelión era mala para la Iglesia no porque hubieran cambiado de opinión sobre las corridas. Se puede contar con que intervendría la tozudez española.

A. Navarro: Es necesario plantearse una estrategia. Se pueden desarrollar competencias del P.E. que aún no lo están, hay 11 temas pendientes que tienen las competencias establecidas, si en vez de ampliar las competencias vamos a desarrollar las que hay, la protección de los animales no se trataría en 100 años. Además, se ocupan de muchos problemas no europeos, pierden el tiempo hablando de focas, delfines, etc. su avance es extremadamente lento. Hay que oponerse a que las propuestas pro-animales figuren a nivel constitucional y hay muchas tácticas dilatorias como se vio con ocasión del informe Schmid.

P. Bofill: El pensamiento europeo evoluciona a favor de los animales, hay una nueva sensibilidad y han introducido el elemento crueldad por lo que habrá condena moral y un debate en el Parlamento español no influiría en nada.

Debería hacerse una campaña nacional de propaganda, por ejemplo, desde los Ayuntamientos, algo importante y con fuerza suficiente para contrarrestar al P.E. Es preocupante que el medio ambiente haya sido declarado más importante que el derecho de la competencia, o sea que es un tema prioritario. Si Medio Ambiente, que es el organismo competente, consigue una condena jurídica y política, incluso sólo moral, nos podría llevar a denuncias y dinámicas complicadas. También podría ocurrir que apareciese en el Acta Unica algo a favor de los animales, eso sería muy malo y debe ser evitado.

#### Conclusión:

La defensa de los animales va a más conforme progresa la culturización de los pueblos, eso no se puede negar, pero hay que desligar todo lo referente a los toros, con inteligencia, ganándose el respeto de los defensores de los animales.

La práctica agrícola comunitaria favorece las dehesas. Se subvenciona el no cultivar trigo y sí la cría de carne. A. Navarro confiesa que él recibe subvención comunitaria por las reses de lidia que cría y cuya carne va al consumo humano. El que antes hayan sido lidiadas no tiene nada que ver y además en Europa no se enteran.

Hay que conseguir que el toro sea considerado como especie autóctona ya que se protege tanto a las especies. Para ello se ha establecido un libro donde se especifica la matrícula, raza pura, autóctona, etc. de los toros. El mantenimiento de este libro ha sido delegado por el Gobierno en la Unión de Criadores de Toros de Lidia. Sólo se trata de conseguir su reconocimiento por el P.E.



# INTERGROUP ON ANIMAL WELFARE

De Europæiske Fællesskaber  
EUROPA-PARLAMENTET

Europäische Gemeinschaften  
EUROPÄISCHES PARLAMENT

Ευρωπαϊκές Κοινότητες  
ΕΥΡΩΠΑΪΚΟ ΚΟΙΝΟΒΟΥΛΙΟ

European Communities  
EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

Comunidades Europeas  
PARLAMENTO EUROPEO

Communautés Européennes  
PARLEMENT EUROPÉEN

Comunità Europee  
PARLAMENTO EUROPEO

Europese Gemeenschappen  
EUROPEES PARLEMENT

Comunidades Europeias  
PARLAMENTO EUROPEU

PRESIDENT  
Anita Pollack MEP

SENIOR VICE-PRESIDENT  
& HON. SECRETARY  
José María Gil-Robles Gil-Delegado MEP

VICE-PRESIDENTS  
Mary Banotti MEP  
Birgit Bjørnvig MEP  
Reinhold Böckler MEP  
Alain Bombard MEP  
Mauro Chiabrando MEP  
António Coimbra Martins MEP  
Jean Defraigne MEP  
Michael Elliott MEP  
Winifred Ewing MEP  
Vasco Garcia MEP  
Ludvína García Arias MEP  
Otto von Habsburg MEP  
Carmen Llorca Vilaplana MEP  
Anstrid Lulling MEP  
Thomas Maher MEP  
Cristiana Muscardini MEP  
Mihail Papayannakis MEP  
Karl Partsch MEP  
Carlos Pimenta MEP  
Jean-Pierre Raffin MEP  
Dagmar Roth-Behrendt MEP  
Mechtild Rothe MEP  
Madron Seligman MEP  
Sir Jack Stewari-Clark MEP



SECRETARIAT  
Eurogroup for Animal Welfare  
17 Square Marie Louise Bte 6  
B-1040 Brussels  
Tel: (02) 231 1388  
Fax: (02) 230 1700

Director  
David Wilkins  
MA VetMB MRCVS

Information from the Commission on subsidies for the breeding of bulls for bull-fighting. (FEOGA Grant System)

## Background

Under Agri-environment regulation approved under CAP reform, grants are paid for regional programmes coming under the general heading of extensification. The details of the programme as submitted by the Spanish government do not refer to "bull-fighting" or "fighting bulls". The money is sent to the Spanish government for distribution and even the Spanish government may not have such detailed information on regional programmes.

In effect, the rearing of bulls for bull-fighting takes place in the same farms as the rearing of bulls for meat. There are no farms specialising in bulls for bull-fighting. *No hay granjas especializadas en toros para lidia*

The larger farms choose bulls for bull-fighting from amongst the bulls reared for meat. *Las granjas grandes escogen toros para lidia de entre toros para carne*

Therefore, bulls for bull-fighting are in effect a sub-product of the main enterprise of breeding bulls for meat, which is the main profit making enterprise. Bulls are sold for bull-fighting, more for prestige than profit.

## Conclusion

1. It is very difficult for the Commission to know if the recipients of subsidies for extensive farming sell bulls for bull-fighting, and if so how many.

2. Even if the Commission knew that there were bulls being raised for bull-fighting, they could not exclude the breeder from the benefit of subsidies. They would have no legal basis for doing that.

MENTIRA

11.9.91

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introductory remarks by President (welcome to guest speakers, IGC 1996, leghold trap Regulation, slaughter of the apes) .....	p.3
2. Commission subsidies for bullfighting .....	p.3
3. Spanish fiesta at Villanueva de la Vera .....	p.6
4. Conservation of Freshwater Molluscs .....	p.8
5. The Assembly of European Regions and animal welfare .....	p.9
6. President's closing remarks .....	p.10

### 1. Introductory remarks

The President of the Intergroup, Mrs Hanja MAIJ-WEGGEN (PPE-NL), opened the 124th session of the Intergroup at 3.05 pm.

- Guest speakers Dr Elisabeth SVENDSEN (International Donkey Protection Trust), Mr Karl Heinz REGER (Journalist) and Councillor Norman BAKER were welcomed.
- The MAIJ-WEGGEN/DURY report for the IGC contained a good article on animal welfare which proposed including it as a principle in the Treaty. As Rapporteur, Mrs MAIJ-WEGGEN was pleased that it had not been weakened by amendments.
- The Pimenta Report on the leghold trap Regulation would be taken in April in the Environment Committee. Mrs MAIJ-WEGGEN urged committee members to attend this meeting on an issue of concern to the group.
- A report had been produced by the Secretariat on the destruction of the forests and slaughter of the apes and was available at the meeting. Discussion on the matter would take place at the ACP Assembly in Namibia the following week.

On slaughter of the apes, Mr Michael ELLIOTT (PSE-UK) asked what information had been received following the presentation and whether the company making the chevrotine cartridges had ceased to produce.

Mrs Carol McKENNA (WSPA) reported that WSPA's African director had had a meeting with the owner of the factory who had made a verbal agreement to stop producing the chevrotine bullet for a year. It was intended to set up a monitoring process to assess the effect of stopping production on the numbers of great apes killed and hunted. The quantity of bullets in stock or held by suppliers was also being taken into account and these details appeared in the report.

Mr John CORRIE (PPE-UK) confirmed that he had a reply from the Ambassador of Gabon (available at the meeting) who had asked for investigations to be made in the logging concessions where violations had been alleged. He also had the Resolution which would be put forward at the ACP/EU joint Assembly, further signatures from joint Assembly members could be added to it.

### → 2. Commission subsidies for bullfighting

Mrs MAIJ-WEGGEN handed the floor to Mr Giacomo SANTINI (UPE-I) and invited him as Rapporteur to update members on his report and give his ideas on it. Mr SANTINI told members that his report was still in the initial stages as there had only been a preliminary meeting in the Agricultural Committee. He had however tried to establish what attitude the Committee had on item 16 but was not able to state what the outcome of the discussions would be. Almost all of the 27 Regulations had been examined and Mr SANTINI stated that with regard to number 16 (beef) the Commission did not go into details of the ultimate use of the calves. There was a proposal to modify the current premium system for the male non-

castrated bull: a single payment should be made for those animals before the age of 22 months and the Commission proposed to increase the premium by 14%. The modifications as set up by the Rapporteur proposed the setting up of a single premium at 15 months for male bulls, castrated and non-castrated. Mr SANTINI said that various colleagues considered that the use of bulls for corridas was a minor problem and some Spanish colleagues had indicated that out of 1000 calves bred only 50 were destined for the bullring activity. Therefore, he commented, there was a risk of penalising the greater number of calves who would no longer receive the EP premium because of the hypothetical 50 which would be selected for the arena. In respect of the single premium at 15 months, Mr SANTINI added that work had to be carried out on two fronts, firstly with regard to the breeders who would not accept the discrimination and secondly with regard to people whose ideas were against this such as members of the group. Mr SANTINI said he would expound on the views exchanged at the meeting in the Agricultural Committee.

Mr Simon MURPHY (PSE-UK) thanked Mr SANTINI for coming and being willing to hear other proposals. He advised members that it had not been the Commission's intention at the reform of the price-packaging system in 1992 for the European tax-payer's money to be used to support bullfighting or the abuse of animals in fiestas. Commissioner FISCHLER had also confirmed his own view to Mr MURPHY that the money should not be going to farmers who bred for the bullring and believed that the proposals he had made to end the two-premium system at 10 and 22 months to one premium would exclude the bullfighters and fiesta breeders from getting tax-payers money. Mr MURPHY was however in disagreement over this point as any animal would be able to draw the subsidy regardless of its ultimate fate.

Mr MURPHY suggested that an alternative proposal be made to the Commission that the one premium should not be paid at 10 or 15 months of age but at the point of slaughter. This method would make it very difficult for bullring or fiesta breeders to receive money from the EU and tax-payer but would protect the legitimate farmer. Mr MURPHY pointed out that the system had been carried out and was possible under the existing regulations, indeed it had been used in Spain until 1993. Mr MURPHY asked the Rapporteur to look at this proposal as a Recommendation from the Parliament. He accepted the fact that although the issue might be minor in the view of some Spanish colleagues it attracted a lot of national media coverage both in Spain and the UK. He felt that if the Parliament allowed the Commission to continue with its proposals, it would be yet another reason for the deepening of the anti-European feeling and he appealed to the Rapporteur to consider the one premium system paid at the point of slaughter which was much fairer and also protected the legitimate farmers of Spain and Portugal.

Mr John CORRIE (PPE-UK) commended Mr MURPHY's views as a non-farmer. He informed members that every beef animal had to have a passport within the EU and it was not possible to obtain a subsidy without that passport, if any bull destined for the bullring had the passport removed, use of the system would actually preclude it from receiving any money.

Mr Gianni TAMINO (V-I) stated that the problem had been raised in the Petitions Committee and the Committee representative had said he would look into the possibility of refraining from providing subsidies for bulls intended for the ring. It had been accepted that it was totally inadmissible that European tax-payers' money should subsidise an activity which was unlawful in most European countries. The representative had agreed that the whole issue had to be reviewed. Regarding the increasing wave of public opinion which was against this practice, Mr TAMINO said that many petitions had been received from Spain. He had been interviewed on British television on the position of the European Parliament and as public attention was sensitive to the issue Mr TAMINO felt it was necessary to find a way to ensure that the tax-payer in the EU was not defrauded, the very least would be for subsidies to be paid at the time of slaughter.

Mrs REDONDO JIMENEZ (PPE-E) strongly disclaimed the fact that the tax-payer was being cheated. She stated that the process of raising a bull was a process of selection, some farmers had only one

activity which was that of bull raising; the bulls that were not used for fighting were used for beef production therefore they fell within CAP rules. To assert that Spanish people were cheating the taxpayer because they raised fighting bulls was scandalous, she felt. She said the bulls helped to protect the environment, the areas where they were raised would be desertified if they were not there moreover these animals could eat tough plants and weeds which other species of animals were unable to do. She stressed the very small number of animals destined for the bullring, an estimate of 3000 sacrificed in relation to the 300.000 being raised, and said the cattle being raised for beef was no different from that in any other EU country. It was important, she felt, to keep considerations in proportion and avoid the danger of fueling Euro-scepticism at a very sensitive time by accepting a ban on bullfighting in her country for example. She pointed out that in Spain, Portugal and Southern France bullfighting was popular culture and said it was unacceptable to ban an essential cultural element of one of the Member States and she herself would never vote for any move to dilute national culture. Finally she declared it was important to work on animal issues which united rather than divided members.

Mrs MAIJ-WEGGEN thanked Mrs REDONDO for her view on the culture of her country which might be respected but not supported.

On the point of euro-scepticism, Mr Robert EVANS (PSE-UK) said that publicity for the fact that even the smallest amount of European tax-payers' money was being used to subsidise bullfighting would add to the existing anti-Europe feeling in the UK and many other countries. On the question of popular culture, Mr EVANS suggested that the practice was also abhorrent to many people in Spain however as it was not a popular culture in Europe, it would be totally unacceptable to receive culture money from EU funds. Mr EVANS believed that many people at the meeting and across Europe would like to see bullfighting banned outright but the debate was over the subsidy and Mr EVANS felt it was very important to fight even the smallest subsidy. Lastly on the rights of the bull it was necessary to be realistic and not to lose the purpose of the group from sight.

Mr MURPHY told members that this question was an issue in the present Austrian European election and was being used to undermine support for the EU.

Mrs MAIJ-WEGGEN expressed the opinion that she herself and many Europeans could not understand why it was fun to kill a bull in the arena, despite long tradition and popular culture it was felt to be cruel. Although many people would wish to see an end to bullfighting the move was against EU tax-payers' money going to this activity. She stressed that this was a big issue in many EU countries and she had also received numerous letters on the subject. Regarding the Santini Report it was necessary to find a positive solution such as the one suggested by Mr MURPHY to avoid enormous reaction in Europe against Spain and guard against tax-payers' money going to the breeding of fighting bulls. In the past 3 to 5 million letters had been received on the subject which indicated it was not a matter to be taken lightly.

Commenting that it was not easy to find a solution to such conflicting views, on the one hand considerations of culture and economic activity of a country, on the other those of a moral nature, Mr SANTINI said that the granting of a premium on slaughter would be acceptable on moral grounds but not economically because the breeders relied on the premium to pay for the expenses involved in the raising of the bulls. Regarding payment of the single premium at 15 months, certain countries (France) had asked for it to be paid earlier when it was not known what the animals would be used for. The task was to reconcile motivations dictated by culture with arguments of an economic nature which came up in the Agriculture Committee. Mr SANTINI proposed that an Amendment be put forward which he would submit to the Agriculture Committee to establish a quota system whereby Spanish breeders stated how many animals would be sent for slaughter and how many would be used in corridas. The corrida bulls would not receive the premium and Mr SANTINI pointed out that this was not a serious economic problem as those bulls would bring in more money than the premium. Mr SANTINI felt this was a move to reconcile

Mr MURPHY's request for a single premium at the time of slaughter with the French breeders who were asking for the premium at the age of 4 months. Lastly Mr SANTINI told members that the welfare of calves was soon to be considered and he was open to proposals and discussion regarding rearing in boxes, the size of the boxes etc. He believed in finding the middle way, avoiding euro-scepticism but also euro-indifference to these considerations and he was convinced that the technical and moral side could be reconciled.

Mrs MAIJ-WEGGEN thought that Mr SANTINI's suggestion could be helpful.

Mrs Carmen DIEZ de RIVERA (PSE-E) ascertained the nature of the debate and then confirmed that the question did not relate to bullfighting but to subsidies given to any type of stock rearing. In her opinion bullfighting did not come into question however if any subsidy did go to bullfighting it was a wrongful use of the monies involved, the subsidies granted by the Commission were destined for a certain purpose and it had already been stated that these should not be given to bull-rearing farms that serve the bullring. She felt it was necessary to check past records and to stop confusing the two different subjects.

Mrs MAIJ-WEGGEN agreed with Mrs DIEZ de RIVERA that discussion on bullfighting should be avoided because the issue was that of subsidies and if this could not be solved there would be a second big debate on bullfighting. It was therefore essential for the Rapporteur, along with colleagues, to find a solution on subsidies. Mrs MAIJ-WEGGEN thought Mr SANTINI's proposal was acceptable if it could be implemented from an administrative point of view and added that it was general agreement that subsidies were not needed for arena bulls.

Mr SANTINI confirmed that he had been asked to reconcile on the one side breeders and those who did not want to differentiate between beef bulls and bulls for the arena and on the other side those who do not wish to finance arena bulls in any way. If the proportion of bulls raised for the arenas was correct, Mr SANTINI thought the breeders might be prepared to forgo the subsidy and the beef breeding farmers would not be penalised. He was prepared to work on that solution along with the Intergroup.

Finally Mrs DIEZ de RIVERA stressed a point of common knowledge that a farm raising bulls for the bullring was quite different from a non-fighting bull farm.

Mrs MAIJ-WEGGEN thanked Mr SANTINI for his contribution on the topic which would give rise to further discussion within the Intergroup. She then passed on to the next item on the Agenda.

### → 3. Spanish Fiesta at Villanueva de la Vera

Mrs MAIJ-WEGGEN handed the floor to Mr Bryan CASSIDY (PPE-UK) to introduce the next speaker. Thanking her, Mr CASSIDY informed members that Mrs June EVERS was a trustee of the International Donkey Protection Trust and that Dr Elisabeth SVENDSEN had founded the donkey sanctuary, operating principally in Devon and Dorset, in 1969. In 1976 the International Donkey Protection Trust had been founded and together with the sanctuary employed 172 people in the UK and 288 people worldwide. As a point of interest Mr CASSIDY told members that the average age of a donkey in the UK was 37 years whereas in Ethiopia it was 9 and in Mexico 16 therefore there was also a humanitarian and aid aspect in helping the donkeys to live longer in poorer countries.

Dr Elisabeth SVENDSEN had however come to talk specifically about the Fiesta at Villanueva de la Vera and Mrs MAIJ-WEGGEN handed her the floor.