

German cabinet sets indefinite ban on imports of British beef

BONN, July 11: The German cabinet yesterday agreed to extend indefinitely an emergency import ban on British cattle, beef and beef products imposed in March because of fears of mad cow disease, the Agriculture Ministry said, reports Reuter.

A spokesman also said Germany, one of the strongest opponents of relaxing a European Union ban on British beef, had no plans to lift a ban on British bull semen despite a European Commission ruling to that effect.

The directive now put forward aims to extend the limited regulations beyond September 29 into a law with no time limit, in accordance with EU law, the ministry said in its statement.

The move fits in with a deal done at last month's EU summit in Florence, where EU members states agreed to lift the ban in stages as Britain satisfied its partners that it was taking the necessary steps to eradicate the disease. No timeframe was set.

But earlier last month the European Commission, the EU's executive body, formally

lifted a ban on three cattle by-products.

The move was intended as a first step towards lifting the overall ban, imposed because of fears that cattle might infect humans with creutzfeld-jakob disease, a deadly relative of the bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE) which has ravaged British herds.

The commission said shipments of gelatine and tallow would have to wait until it was satisfied that Britain had reformed with strict production controls.

But it said exports of British bull semen could resume as soon as EU states had been informed of the decision.

Bonn has not done this yet. Asked if it was true that Bonn had no plans to do so, the spokesman replied: "that's correct."

The import ban also applies to cattle and beef from Switzerland, the only European country apart from Britain where BSE has been found in home-reared cattle.

The extension of the import ban still has to be approved by the upper house of parliament

or Bundesrat, where the federal states are represented. But it is certain to get a majority there.

Beef crisis to cost EU \$2.1b by '96

APB says from Brussels: The crisis in the beef industry created by fears over "mad cow" disease will cost the European Union 1.5 billion ECUs (2.1 billion dollars) by the end of 1996 and is far from over. Agriculture Commissioner Franz Fischler warned yesterday.

The commission said the price of gelatine and tallow would have to wait until it was satisfied that Britain had reformed with strict production controls.

Four months into the crisis, it is clear that the fallout is not going to disappear in the immediate future," Fischler told the economic and social committee of the European Parliament.

Without additional radical and immediate action to cut beef production and boost consumption, "the situation can only deteriorate further," Fischler said.

Fischler attacked beef traders and retailers for failing to pass on the sharp fall in market prices to consumers.

Lower prices in the shops could play significant role in getting beef consumption back to pre-crisis levels, he said.

Beef consumption in the EU has fallen by 11 per cent since the British government's announcement in March of a possible link between BSE and a fatal human brain disease.

This has been reflected in a fall of between seven and 14 per cent in wholesale beef prices but this has yet to have an impact on the retail market, where prices have remained stable in most countries.

The European Commission has so far taken 120,000 tonnes of beef off the market under its intervention procedures. By the year-end, with the main slaughtering season still to come, this could rise to over 600,000 tonnes, Fischler said.

But he warned that "intervention purchases are not and never can be a substitute for the consumer." The EU no longer has the option of offloading beef stocks onto world markets because of GATT rules restricting on export subsidies.

The extension of the import ban still has to be approved by the upper house of parliament

Israel, PA agree truce in 'meat war'

GAZA CITY, July 11: Israel and the Palestinian Authority have agreed a truce in their month-long "Meat war," Palestinian sources said Wednesday, reports AFP.

Under an accord worked out by the Israeli agriculture ministry, the Jewish state finally allowed a Saudi gift of 10,500 frozen sheep into the Gaza Strip which had been blocked on the border with Egypt since June 12.

In return the Palestinian Authority (PA) agreed to lift ban on Israeli meat imports.

The agreement came after the trade war took a turn for the worse on Sunday when Israel prevented 300 tonnes of vegetable exports from leaving the Gaza Strip.

The conflict began when Israel refused to allow the frozen sheep into the Gaza Strip, citing the PA's lack of veterinary checks. The PA slapped the ban on Israeli meat imports in revenge.

Under the truce, the Palestinians have agreed to submit the frozen meat to Israeli veterinary checks. The gift came from a giant cold-store in Mecca Saudi Arabia, built to cope with the hundreds of thousands of sheep slaughtered by Muslims during the annual pilgrimage or Hajj which took place in May this year.

Palestinians said Israel's actions had been motivated more by concern for its meat imports than health worries over the frozen sheep.

The true reason is that Israel fears a reduction in its meat exports to the Palestinian territories," Palestinian agriculture ministry officials Ata Abu Kirch said Sunday.

WB to lend China up to \$9b in three years

BELJING, July 11: The World Bank announced here yesterday that it would lend China up to nine billion dollars over the next three fiscal years starting this month, says AFP.

"The World Bank's annual lending to China will stand somewhere between 2.5 and three billion dollars," said Daud Ahmad, who heads the operations unit at the bank's mission in Beijing.

According to a programme agreed with China last month, the funds will be used to finance 15 or 16 projects.

The pattern of funding distribution will remain relatively unchanged, with priorities given to agriculture, transportation, energy, environmental protection and other infrastructural projects. Ahmad said.



Holding a crying baby aloft, a group of women protest the government's decision to effect a steep hike in the price of petroleum products — including cooking gas — during one of several demonstrations in New Delhi on Wednesday coinciding with the opening of parliament's second budget session. Indian parliament was rocked over the stiff increase in the price of petroleum products by country's new coalition government. — AFP/UNB photo

OECD members' aid to poorest states falls to 20-yr low in '94

Sydney, July 11: Aid contributions from 21 of the world's richest nations to some of the poorest fell in 1994 to their lowest level in 20 years, according to an international report released here yesterday, says AFP.

The reality of aid report also found much of the aid still flowing goes toward securing commercial advantage and economic advancement of donor countries rather than addressing the basic needs of the poor.

It said eight of 21 members of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) development assistance committee cut their contributions, as the share of aid to the poorest countries fell by seven per cent since 1990.

The report, the fourth study of aid funding by an international network of non-governmental organisations, was released here amid continuing controversy over Australia's decision to abolish and aid scheme which had provided soft loans tied to export contracts.

Four Asian nations — China, Indonesia, Vietnam and the Philippines — protested to Canberra about its cancellation of the development import finance facility which cost Australia one billion dollars (800 million US dollars) in export contracts to save 120 million dollars a year.

The report finds that Australia had followed the lead of 20 other industrialised nations which had reduced their aid budgets in 1994 to their lowest level in 20 years.

While Australia had increased aid in real terms in 1995/96, the aid still represented a historic low of 0.33 per cent of gross national product, compared with the United Nations' target of 0.7 per cent.

British Labour Party spokesman on development cooperation Lord Fran Judd, a former director of the aid agency Oxfam UK, rejected arguments by rich countries that they could not afford to increase or maintain aid contributions.

When these things were pioneered, when it was seen as an issue of absolute moral priority that we must be tackling these issues, we weren't as wealthy as we are today," Judd told reporters after releasing the report.

"It's not that we can't afford, we choose not to afford," he said.

He also appealed to governments not to shy away from intervening in market processes to safeguard common good and meet basic human needs.

The report, the fourth study of aid funding by an international network of non-governmental

organizations, was released here amid continuing controversy over Australia's decision to abolish and aid scheme which had provided soft loans tied to export contracts.

Four Asian nations — China, Indonesia, Vietnam and the Philippines — protested to Canberra about its cancellation of the development import finance facility which cost Australia one billion dollars (800 million US dollars) in export contracts to save 120 million dollars a year.

The report finds that Australia had followed the lead of 20 other industrialised nations which had reduced their aid budgets in 1994 to their lowest level in 20 years.

While Australia had increased aid in real terms in 1995/96, the aid still represented a historic low of 0.33 per cent of gross national

product, compared with the United Nations' target of 0.7 per cent.

British Labour Party spokesman on development cooperation Lord Fran Judd, a former director of the aid agency Oxfam UK, rejected arguments by rich countries that they could not afford to increase or maintain aid contributions.

When these things were pioneered, when it was seen as an issue of absolute moral priority that we must be tackling these issues, we weren't as wealthy as we are today," Judd told reporters after releasing the report.

"It's not that we can't afford, we choose not to afford," he said.

He also appealed to governments not to shy away from intervening in market processes to safeguard common good and meet basic human needs.

The report, the fourth study of aid funding by an international network of non-governmental

organizations, was released here amid continuing controversy over Australia's decision to abolish and aid scheme which had provided soft loans tied to export contracts.

Four Asian nations — China, Indonesia, Vietnam and the Philippines — protested to Canberra about its cancellation of the development import finance facility which cost Australia one billion dollars (800 million US dollars) in export contracts to save 120 million dollars a year.

The report finds that Australia had followed the lead of 20 other industrialised nations which had reduced their aid budgets in 1994 to their lowest level in 20 years.

While Australia had increased aid in real terms in 1995/96, the aid still represented a historic low of 0.33 per cent of gross national

product, compared with the United Nations' target of 0.7 per cent.

British Labour Party spokesman on development cooperation Lord Fran Judd, a former director of the aid agency Oxfam UK, rejected arguments by rich countries that they could not afford to increase or maintain aid contributions.

When these things were pioneered, when it was seen as an issue of absolute moral priority that we must be tackling these issues, we weren't as wealthy as we are today," Judd told reporters after releasing the report.

"It's not that we can't afford, we choose not to afford," he said.

He also appealed to governments not to shy away from intervening in market processes to safeguard common good and meet basic human needs.

The report, the fourth study of aid funding by an international network of non-governmental

organizations, was released here amid continuing controversy over Australia's decision to abolish and aid scheme which had provided soft loans tied to export contracts.

Four Asian nations — China, Indonesia, Vietnam and the Philippines — protested to Canberra about its cancellation of the development import finance facility which cost Australia one billion dollars (800 million US dollars) in export contracts to save 120 million dollars a year.

The report finds that Australia had followed the lead of 20 other industrialised nations which had reduced their aid budgets in 1994 to their lowest level in 20 years.

While Australia had increased aid in real terms in 1995/96, the aid still represented a historic low of 0.33 per cent of gross national

product, compared with the United Nations' target of 0.7 per cent.

British Labour Party spokesman on development cooperation Lord Fran Judd, a former director of the aid agency Oxfam UK, rejected arguments by rich countries that they could not afford to increase or maintain aid contributions.

When these things were pioneered, when it was seen as an issue of absolute moral priority that we must be tackling these issues, we weren't as wealthy as we are today," Judd told reporters after releasing the report.

"It's not that we can't afford, we choose not to afford," he said.

He also appealed to governments not to shy away from intervening in market processes to safeguard common good and meet basic human needs.

The report, the fourth study of aid funding by an international network of non-governmental

organizations, was released here amid continuing controversy over Australia's decision to abolish and aid scheme which had provided soft loans tied to export contracts.

Four Asian nations — China, Indonesia, Vietnam and the Philippines — protested to Canberra about its cancellation of the development import finance facility which cost Australia one billion dollars (800 million US dollars) in export contracts to save 120 million dollars a year.

The report finds that Australia had followed the lead of 20 other industrialised nations which had reduced their aid budgets in 1994 to their lowest level in 20 years.

While Australia had increased aid in real terms in 1995/96, the aid still represented a historic low of 0.33 per cent of gross national

product, compared with the United Nations' target of 0.7 per cent.

British Labour Party spokesman on development cooperation Lord Fran Judd, a former director of the aid agency Oxfam UK, rejected arguments by rich countries that they could not afford to increase or maintain aid contributions.

When these things were pioneered, when it was seen as an issue of absolute moral priority that we must be tackling these issues, we weren't as wealthy as we are today," Judd told reporters after releasing the report.

"It's not that we can't afford, we choose not to afford," he said.

He also appealed to governments not to shy away from intervening in market processes to safeguard common good and meet basic human needs.

The report, the fourth study of aid funding by an international network of non-governmental

organizations, was released here amid continuing controversy over Australia's decision to abolish and aid scheme which had provided soft loans tied to export contracts.

Four Asian nations — China, Indonesia, Vietnam and the Philippines — protested to Canberra about its cancellation of the development import finance facility which cost Australia one billion dollars (800 million US dollars) in export contracts to save 120 million dollars a year.

The report finds that Australia had followed the lead of 20 other industrialised nations which had reduced their aid budgets in 1994 to their lowest level in 20 years.

While Australia had increased aid in real terms in 1995/96, the aid still represented a historic low of 0.33 per cent of gross national

product, compared with the United Nations' target of 0.7 per cent.

British Labour Party spokesman on development cooperation Lord Fran Judd, a former director of the aid agency Oxfam UK, rejected arguments by rich countries that they could not afford to increase or maintain aid contributions.

When these things were pioneered, when it was seen as an issue of absolute moral priority that we must be tackling these issues, we weren't as wealthy as we are today," Judd told reporters after releasing the report.

"It's not that we can't afford, we choose not to afford," he said.

He also appealed to governments not to shy away from intervening in market processes to safeguard common good and meet basic human needs.

The report, the fourth study of aid funding by an international network of non-governmental

organizations, was released here amid continuing controversy over Australia's decision to abolish and aid scheme which had provided soft loans tied to export contracts.

Four Asian nations — China, Indonesia, Vietnam and the Philippines — protested to Canberra about its cancellation of the development import finance facility which cost Australia one billion dollars (800 million US dollars) in export contracts to save 120 million dollars a year.

The report finds that Australia had followed the lead of 20 other industrialised nations which had reduced their aid budgets in 1994 to their lowest level in 20 years.

While Australia had increased aid in real terms in 1995/96, the aid still represented a historic low of 0.33 per cent of gross national

product, compared with the United Nations' target of 0.7 per cent.

British Labour Party spokesman on development cooperation Lord Fran Judd, a former director of the aid agency Oxfam UK, rejected arguments by rich countries that they could not afford to increase or maintain aid contributions.

When these things were pioneered, when it was seen as an issue of absolute moral priority that we must be tackling these issues, we weren't as wealthy as we are today," Judd told reporters after releasing the report.

"It's not that we can't afford, we choose not to afford," he said.

He also appealed to governments not to shy away from intervening in market processes to safeguard common good and meet basic human needs.

The report, the fourth study of aid funding by an international network of non-governmental

organizations, was released here amid continuing controversy over Australia's decision to abolish and aid scheme which had provided soft loans tied to export contracts