

# Food additives other than colours and sweeteners

1996/0166(COD) - 22/10/1997

The rapporteur regretted that the Commission had not seized the opportunity to respond to the demands of consumers who were calling for a reduction in these products (additives) whose usefulness was often not established. Commissioner de Silguy asserted that the proposal was based on the principle that additives should be authorised only if they posed no risk to health and were technically justified. He then said that the Commission could not accept Amendments Nos 1, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 16, 18, 19, 26 and 43 as they did not take sufficient account of the technological needs which existed in certain Member States. The Commission was also unable to accept Amendments Nos 30, 31 and 38 as it was in the interest of consumers that these products could not be authorised for final consumption. The Commission also did not favour the adoption of Amendments Nos 2, 3, 4 and 42 because they introduced labelling requirements which added to the framework directive on the labelling of foodstuffs. However, it did accept Amendment No 12 incorporated in Amendment No 10 and Amendments Nos 13, 14, 32 and 36 concerning the use of additives in cases where technological needs had been demonstrated. Amendments Nos 20, 21, 23, 25 and 35 also responded to the technological need to produce food for young babies and children in good health. However, the Commission was not able to verify the necessity for additives in the uses mentioned in Amendments Nos 15, 17, 39, 40 and 41. In line with the opinion of the Scientific Committee on Food, Mr de Silguy said that Amendment No 33 was preferred over Amendment No 22 and, for the same reason, Amendment No 34 was better than Amendment No 24. To conclude, the Commission did not intend to take over many of Parliament's amendments.