

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT



s e s s i o n d o c u m e n t s

ENGLISH EDITION

14 October 1992

A3-0301/92

R E P O R T

of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and
Consumer Protection

on measures to regenerate and prevent the pollution of the
Baltic

Rapporteur: **Mr Karl PARTSCH**

DOC_EN\RR\215\215440.WP5

PE 200.382/fin.
Or.DE/EN

* Consultation procedure requiring a single reading
** Cooperation procedure (first reading)

**I Cooperation procedure (second reading) requiring the votes of a majority of the current Members of Parliament
*** Parliamentary assent requiring the votes of a majority of the current Members of Parliament

C O N T E N T S

	<u>Page</u>
Procedural page	3
A. MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION	4
B. EXPLANATORY STATEMENT	9
<u>Annex I:</u> Motion for a Resolution B3-1680/91	12
<u>Annex II:</u> Resolution of the International Parliamentary Conference on the Protection of the Baltic Sea	13

At the sitting of 13 December 1991, the President of Parliament announced that he had referred the motion for a resolution by Mr Köhler and others on measures to prevent the pollution of the Baltic (B3-1680/91) pursuant to Rule 63 of the Rules of Procedure, to the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Budgets for an opinion.

At its meeting of 22 January 1992, the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection decided to draw up a report and appointed Mr Partsch rapporteur.

At its meetings of 26 June and 10 October 1992 it considered the draft report.

At the latter meeting it adopted the draft legislative resolution unanimously.

The following were present for the vote: Collins, chairman; Schleicher and Amendola, vice-chairmen; Partsch, rapporteur; Alavanos, Bjornvig, Bowe, Ceci, Chanterie, Delcroix, Kuhn, Muntingh, Pimenta, Pollack, Puerta, Roth-Behrendt, Ruiz-Gimenez Aguilar, Schwartzenberg, Llewellyn Smith (for Green) and Vohrer.

The Committee on Budgets did not deliver an opinion.

The report was tabled on 14 October 1992.

The deadline for tabling amendments will appear on the draft agenda for the part-session at which the report is to be considered.

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

on measures to regenerate and prevent the pollution of the Baltic

The European Parliament,

- having regard to the motion for a resolution on measures to prevent the pollution of the Baltic (B3-1680/91) tabled by Mr Heinz Köhler and others,
 - having regard to the Helsinki Convention on the protection of the Marine Environment of the Baltic Sea Area, signed in 1974 and ratified in 1980 by the then 7 states bordering on the Baltic (Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, Finland, the German Democratic Republic, Poland, the Soviet Union and Sweden),
 - having regard to the Declaration on the Baltic made at the ministerial conference at Ronneby (Sweden), on 3 September 1990,
 - having regard to the Zierow Declaration at the Second International Conference on the Baltic of 3-9 September 1990,
 - having regard to the international parliamentary conference on the protection of the Baltic Sea held in Lübeck from 18 to 20 October 1991, at which the European Parliament was represented by a delegation, and the resolution adopted by the conference,
 - having regard to the statement on the Baltic Sea environment in 1992, adopted by the ministerial conference on the protection of the marine environment of the Baltic Sea area on 9 April 1992 in Helsinki,
 - having regard to the integrated programme for the protection of the Baltic of the Land Schleswig-Holstein (Germany),
 - having regard to the report of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection (A3-0301/92),
- A. whereas the Baltic is an enclosed sea with little exchange of water and extremely diverse biotopes, which means that it will take a very long time for pollution prevention measures to have an impact and that this process cannot be monitored precisely, given our inadequate knowledge of ecological interrelationships and interactions with pollutants of human origin,
 - B. whereas the Baltic as an ecosystem has already suffered badly as a result of human activity and existing pollution is already on a scale dangerous to the health of the citizens of the surrounding countries,
 - C. whereas in Finland there are sewage treatment works for 76% of the population, and the large industrial plants have been operating on the self-monitoring principle since the 1960s, verified by periodic unannounced spot checks and inspections,
 - D. whereas Sweden has imposed environmental protection levies since 1981 to make sure that environmental protection is attractive from the economic point of view,

- E. having regard to the scandalous fact that owing to the absence of sewage purification plants, or because such plants are outdated or overloaded, raw sewage from cities in a number of countries bordering on the Baltic is reaching the Baltic, although the necessary sewerage technology exists,
- F. alarmed by reports that the former Soviet Union had recklessly dumped nuclear waste and chemical agents in the Eastern part of the Baltic and by the shortsighted and negligent handling of military equipment dumped in the Baltic Sea after the Second World War, which now poses an acute threat, as the chemical warfare agents have not been broken down in their corroding containers, as was hoped, but continue to be highly dangerous,
- G. whereas one of the main objectives of EC fisheries policy is to ensure the continual existence of the fishing industry, an aim which can only be achieved if the catch quotas established respect the biological laws governing the maintenance of fish stocks, and if fishermen comply with these quotas,
- H. whereas coordinated international cooperation between the countries with a Baltic seaboard is the only way to solve the above-mentioned problems, and whereas priority should be given to practical measures to regenerate and prevent the pollution of the Baltic and to the financial resources needed for this purpose, rather than merely setting up new bureaucratic structures,
- I. convinced that the immediate building of new sewage treatment plant, the reequipment of existing plant and other investments to reduce the discharge of pollutants and fertilizers - particularly in the countries bordering on the eastern Baltic - would be a vital step towards reducing the pollution of human origin to which the Baltic's ecosystem has long been exposed and towards perceptibly improving water quality,
- J. whereas the sum of ECU 16.5 million, which, according to estimates, will be needed for the first two years of the EC NORSPA programme ('specific environmental protection action in the coastal regions and coastal waters of the Irish Sea, the North Sea, the Baltic and the north-eastern Atlantic') is totally inadequate, given the scale of the problem and in comparison with other EC expenditure, which casts doubt on the awareness of the decision-makers of the scale of the pollution affecting marine ecosystems,
- K. whereas the European Community is to step up cooperation with the EFTA countries under the treaty on the European Economic Area (EEA),
- L. having regard to the PHARE programme, which enables the European Community to provide financial aid for environmental action in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, in particular,
- 1. Calls for the reduction, or - as far as possible - the avoidance of direct and indirect discharges of pollutants of human origin into the Baltic, through:
 - (a) use of the best available technology for water regeneration and pollution prevention (sewage purification plants, 'clean technology'),

- (b) avoiding waste as far as possible by, for instance, aiming for and accordingly promoting industrial production cycles based on the 'economy of biological cycles', which feed their 'waste products' back into the production process at another point (recycling),
 - (c) minimizing the use of raw materials and energy;
2. Calls for the reduction of discharges of fertilizer into the Baltic through the extensification of agriculture, and the reduction of NO_x emissions by means of transport policy oriented towards the environment;
 3. Calls for the immediate adoption of a 'precautionary principle', which means - among other things - that where projects to do either directly or indirectly with the marine environment are concerned, the 'pro-Baltic' option should be chosen in the event of doubt, even if this were to bring short-term economic disadvantages;
 4. Calls for the rigorous application of the 'polluter pays' principle where existing, avoidable pollution is concerned;
 5. Stresses that tourism, which represents an important long-term source of income, must take forms respecting the region, society, culture and the natural environment by the following means, inter alia:
 - (a) fostering environmental awareness among tourists and tour operators and at tourist sites,
 - (b) zoning for different purposes designating 'quiet zones' and strictly observing these distinctions,
 - (c) compulsory environmental impact assessments before, as an approval for building projects;
 6. Considers that, in order to maintain fish stocks, a joint fisheries management scheme is needed - respecting ecological factors and avoiding overfishing - so as to ensure that resources are preserved in the long term;
 7. Calls for full disclosure by the competent authorities of the facts concerning the dumping of Soviet nuclear waste in the eastern part of the Baltic and of chemical warfare agents which, as their containers corrode, represent a threat to the marine environment on an unimaginable scale, which must be dealt with as soon as possible, if a catastrophe is to be averted;
 8. Calls on the Commission, the governments of the countries bordering on the Baltic and other responsible parties to launch a joint action involving naval units from the countries bordering on the Baltic to salvage the chemical warfare agents dumped therein, and to dispose of them, using all the available know-how and making no allowance for military secrets;
 9. Proposes that an international committee of inquiry, consisting of civil and military experts, be charged with finding a long-term solution to this grave problem;

10. Calls for more rigorous food controls to prevent contaminated fish from the Baltic reaching the shops in future;
11. Calls on the governments of the countries with a Baltic seaboard to comply with these demands as soon as possible through cooperation and technology transfer;
12. Acknowledges that, while Poland, the Baltic States and the Russian Republic have recently stepped up their efforts to prevent the pollution of the Baltic, these remain inadequate;
13. Regrets, therefore, that many countries bordering on the Baltic seem to lack sufficient political will to implement with the necessary resolve existing decisions on the protection of the marine environment of the Baltic, and therefore questions the seriousness of these decisions, if they are not ratified and implemented;
14. Hopes that the countries of Eastern Europe, in achieving ecological and economic development, will draw conclusions from past errors and therefore from the very outset use technologies which save water and energy, and seek to establish ecologically sound, sustainable agriculture;
15. Warns against simply imitating economic development on the Western model as we have known it hitherto, at the expense of the environment, as this would have serious, and possibly fatal, results - the irreversible destruction of the basis of human life, that is, clean water, clean air and pollution-free soil;
16. Proposes the setting up of a 'Joint Baltic Environmental Fund' to finance pollution prevention measures, and in particular, the building of purification plant serving the Polish, Baltic State and Russian cities on the Baltic and in industrial cities on rivers flowing into the Baltic, which could build on the pioneering efforts of the Nordic countries to set up a 'Nordic Environmental Fund', and to which all countries with a Baltic seaboard and the European Community could make appropriate contributions;
17. Calls on the Commission, the Council and the governments of Finland, Sweden and Norway to make available tied, non-reimbursable funds to expedite the implementation of anti-pollution measures;
18. Calls on the Commission, with a view to the Community's a financial contribution to the prevention of pollution in the Baltic, to set up a separate budgetary heading separate from the Structural Funds, as the latter cannot be used to intervene in third countries;
19. Considers that the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, which started operations on 1 April 1991 with an initial capital of US\$ 10 billion, should make an appropriate contribution to the funding of measures to prevent the pollution of the Baltic;
20. Calls on the Council and Commission to extend the PHARE programme and to give greater support to measures to construct waste water treatment plants and sewage works;

21. Calls on the Council and Commission to adopt the resolution passed by the International Parliamentary Conference held in Lübeck from 18 to 20 October 1991 (Annex II);
22. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council, the Commission and the governments of the states bordering on the Baltic.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

I. Ecological situation

1. The Baltic is threatened both by the direct discharge of pollutants and by the polluted water courses flowing into it and air pollution. The overall situation of the Baltic, however, is even more troubled than that of - for instance - the North Sea, as the natural conditions to which the Baltic is subject are different.
2. As an enclosed sea with little interchange of water, it may be subdivided on morphological grounds into a large number of zones which differ very considerably from one another as regards salinity, general hydrography and biology.

It takes an average of 25 years for the waters of the Baltic to be renewed through interchange; however, the process takes much longer in the deep basins. As a result of geological processes, the geomorphology of the link between the Baltic and the ocean (Skagerrak/Kattegat) is subject to change. Consequently, the Baltic has already changed several times from a freshwater lake into a saltwater sea - and vice versa - which has naturally led to drastic transformations of the ecosystem. The Baltic is currently a brackish sea with rising salt levels. This has tended to stabilize its stratification into deep water with a high salt content and surface water with a low salt content, which hinders vertical interchange, particularly of oxygen. Growing oxygen depletion in deep water and the sporadic occurrence of hydrogen sulphide in the deep basins are natural consequences of this process, as indicated by sediments dating from a time long before the beginning of human influences. In addition to this geological development, climatic cycles result in different phases of water interchange, owing to changes in average wind speed and direction. The Baltic's current situation, for instance, is a result of the longest period without an influx of salt water since the beginning of records. There has been no influx of water from the Atlantic worth mentioning since 1976.

3. The Baltic then, suffers from an inherent problem, to which man-made damage is now added.

Discharges of foreign substances, particularly pollutants and fertilizers, which affect oxygen levels mean long-term, lasting changes for the Baltic. Consequently, it will take a much longer time for anti-pollution measures to have a perceptible impact than in the case of the North Sea, for example. Chemical-biological processes which reduce concentrations are more significant than water interchange.

However, the Baltic's various zones are so diverse that it is practically impossible to make generalizations that are applicable to the Baltic as a whole. There may well be positive developments in a number of zones at the same time as extremely negative developments in other areas.

II. The International legal situation

1. In 1972, the Finnish government proposed a meeting of the governmental experts of all the countries with a Baltic seaboard on the subject of 'Pollution in the Baltic'. This meeting, which took place in 1973, brought forth the Helsinki Convention, signed in 1974 by the then seven states bordering on the Baltic (Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, Finland, the German Democratic Republic, Poland, the Soviet Union and Sweden). The Helsinki Convention was ratified in all these countries and entered into force in 1980.

This convention was the first agreement on the protection of the marine environment which covers all the sources of pollution of a marine area. Its aims are:

- to preserve the ecological balance and to protect fauna and flora;
- to enable food resources in the Baltic to be exploited in a sustainable and environmentally sound way;
- to preserve coasts as recreational areas.

The corresponding measures cover the following areas;

- land-based pollution;
- pollution from ships;
- dumping of waste at sea;
- exploration and exploitation of the sea bed and its subsoil;
- combating marine pollution.

2. Three committees of experts are answerable to the Helsinki Commission:

- a scientific and technical committee,
- a shipping committee,
- a Experts working party for Cooperation in Combating Environmental Damage.

3. There are other international agreements in addition to the Helsinki Convention, some of which also cover the Baltic, such as the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (MARPOL), and the International Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping of Wastes and Other Matter (London, 1972).

4. There are more than enough resolutions proclaiming the best of intentions on protecting the marine environment. In the former Soviet Union, a special resolution on stepping up measures to combat marine pollution was passed in February 1974 (!) A further resolution on measures to protect the Baltic was added in 1976. This resolution calls on industrial establishments which discharge effluent into rivers or other waters in the Baltic catchment area to stop discharging effluent by 1985.

5. In view of the present situation, one cannot read these pious resolutions from the past without some bitterness. One wonders what the point is of in such resolutions if they are not consistently enforced. Readers who may be inclined simply to ascribe this failure to the Eastern European system should remember that similar recommendations made under the Western system, such as the recommendations of the conferences for the protection of the North Sea, have not so far been consistently enforced either. With all their

differences, the Eastern planned economy and the Western free market economy seem to be equally inadequate when it comes to implementing environmental protection measures.

One can only hope that in future, resolutions on conserving the very basis of our lives are not merely set down on paper in fine words, but actually put into practice.

6. Owing to the obsolescence of industrial technology in the Eastern European countries and the fact that some of them have a higher population density, the degree of pollution is even higher than in the countries of Western Europe. This means that the immediate introduction of comparatively simple technological measures to clean up industry in the East could well have a greater positive impact on the overall environmental situation of the Baltic than the considerably more costly and technically more complex process of cleaning up industry in the West. This by no means implies that we should abandon further technological development; however, in view of the seriousness of the situation, priorities should be established, using the criteria of maximum speed and efficiency. This can only be achieved through genuine international cooperation in partnership, to speed up the allocation of financial resources with a view to carrying out measures to prevent the pollution of the Baltic. Unfortunately, lack of sufficient financial resources has so far nearly always prevented the use of the best available technology.
7. The countries of Eastern Europe are particularly hard hit by this dilemma. Poland accounts for the largest proportion - in absolute terms - of the overall pollution of the Baltic. However, the high rate of environmental damage caused by Poland may be traced, above all, to its large population and the uneconomic and obsolete industrial equipment. Poland actually accounts for less pollution per head of population than the highly industrialized Scandinavian countries. This makes it clear that the environmental problem cannot simply be resolved through industrial reequipment, but will also demand greater respect for the environment. The limits must be recognized beyond which the natural environment is unacceptable - and, ultimately, uninhabitable. Such an attitude might make it possible to avoid a repetition of the mistakes of the Western industrial countries in the economic development of the countries of Eastern Europe.

III. A topical example of the funding of water protection measures

Funds for the first two years of the NORSPA Programme total ECU 16.5 m. This sum, which is also intended to protect the Baltic, is a mere drop in the ocean.

The costs of building the first section of a purification plant in Greifswald (Germany) come to DM 41.2 m (approximately ECU 20 m).

Yet Poland alone is said to need 600 purification plants. At least 1 200 purification plants will be needed for the whole Baltic region, if the Baltic is to be saved from ecological collapse. An estimated DM 10 bn needs to be invested. The Community's contribution could take the form of interest-free loans from the EBRD (European Bank for Reconstruction and Development).

In short, the Baltic can only now be saved by immediate regeneration and anti-pollution measures.

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION (B3-1680/91 of 29 October 1991)

pursuant to Rule 63 of the Rules of Procedure

by the following Members: Heinz Köhler, Habsburg, Partsch, Lüttge, Vittinghoff, Muntingh, Fernex, Quistorp, Staes, Monnier-Besombes and Görlach
on measures to prevent the pollution of the Baltic

The European Parliament,

- A. whereas pollution of the Baltic has reached the point where it represents a health threat to the citizens of some states with Baltic seaboard,
- B. whereas because cities in some of these states have sewage purification plants that are outdated or overloaded - or else have no such plants at all - their sewage is discharged untreated into rivers flowing into the Baltic, causing marine pollution,
 1. Considers that the states with Baltic seaboard have a common responsibility to prevent the pollution of the Baltic;
 2. Recognizes that Poland, the Baltic Republics and the USSR have recently stepped up their efforts to prevent the pollution of the Baltic, but considers that still more needs to be done;
 3. Calls on the Commission and Council, in cooperation with non-member states with Baltic seaboard, to draw up an action programme to prevent pollution of the Baltic; considers that one of the main aims of this action programme should be the construction of sewage purification plants in cities situated on the Baltic coast of Poland, the Baltic republics and Russia, and in industrial cities lying on rivers flowing into the Baltic;
 4. Considers that this programme must be accompanied by an information campaign in all states with Baltic seaboard to reduce the use of fertilizers and pesticides in agriculture;
 5. Calls on the Commission and Council and the governments of Finland, Sweden and Norway to earmark non-refundable aid for this purpose;
 6. Calls on the governments of the recipient countries also to make an appropriate contribution towards financing these measures;
 7. Calls for a separate budgetary heading to be set up outside the structural funds - since these cannot be used to finance measures in third countries - to finance the Community's contribution towards preventing the pollution of the Baltic.

22 Oct. 1991

**RESOLUTION
of the
International Parliamentary Conference
on the Protection of the Baltic Sea
from 18-20 October 1991 in Lübeck**

The parliamentary delegates from

the Kingdom of Denmark,
the Republic of Estonia,
the Republic of Finland,
the Republic of Iceland,
the Republic of Latvia,
the Republic of Lithuania,
the Kingdom of Norway,
the Republic of Poland,
the Kingdom of Sweden,
the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic,
the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics,
the Russian Federation,
the Federal Republic of Germany,
the European Parliament and
the Council of Europe,

as participants at the International Parliamentary Conference on the Protection of the Baltic Sea from 18-20 October 1991 in Lübeck,

having discussed in depth the ecological situation of the Baltic Sea;

determined to ensure that the Parliaments and Governments further intensify their efforts to protect the marine environment of the Baltic Sea;

concerned about the continuing excessive contamination of the Baltic Sea with nutrients and harmful substances, which is increasing at an alarming rate, leading inevitably to the destruction of the natural ecological equilibrium with permanent and irreversible consequences;

in particular concerned about the fact that the concentrations of nitrogen and phosphorus compounds have doubled and tripled over the last two to three decades, and about the spreading eutrophication thus caused;

being aware that the problems of radioactive substances in the Baltic Sea and parts of its drainage area are disturbing and poorly documented;

recognising that the efforts undertaken thus far have indeed attained partial successes, but that the urgently needed reversal of the trend has not been achieved;

aware that only speedy and unswerving joint action throughout the entire drainage area of the Baltic Sea is capable of producing success;

stressing that ecological development should be aligned with economic development, and that sustainable development is the pattern to be followed both in the Baltic Sea drainage area and globally;

convinced that the end of the ideological division of Europe and the adoption by the States of Eastern Europe of social and ecological market economies will make it easier to overcome the environmental gradient in the Baltic Sea;

stressing that the existing problems can only be solved by broadly based, concerted action by all of the countries, governmental and non-governmental associations, and relevant international financial institutions that bear responsibility for protecting the environment;

welcoming the substantial financial and technical support that has already been provided by the European Community and the international financial institutions;

aware of the valuable work that has already been done within the scope of the Helsinki Convention;

aware in particular of the decisions made at the 9th session of the Helsinki Commission, which took place in February 1988 at the ministerial level, the recommendations by the Nordic Council's international Conference on Pollution of the Seas in 1989, and of the meeting of the Heads of Government that was held in Ronneby, Sweden in September 1990;

noting that, although the objectives expressed in the 1988 Ministers' Declaration of the Helsinki Commission and in the Baltic Sea Declaration made in Ronneby in 1990 are extremely ambitious, they merely constitute the starting point for future endeavours that go even further;

conscious that protection of the Baltic Sea is not just the responsibility of the Governments, but also and very directly that of the elected Parliaments, and that consequently all national Parliaments of the States bordering on the Baltic Sea and of other affected States must recognise the whole drama of the situation of the Baltic Sea; and furthermore that the experience gained so far has shown that new political priorities for protecting the waters of the Baltic Sea are indispensable;

welcoming the interim report on the progress made in the work of the HELCOM ad hoc high-level Task Force, based on the Baltic Sea Declaration in Ronneby and aiming to provide a concrete and action-orientated joint comprehensive programme to restore the Baltic Sea to a sound ecological balance; noting furthermore that implementation of the key elements of

the programme should have begun by 1993 and that the joint action plan will contain a list of priority actions needed to reverse the eutrophication of the Baltic Sea, to identify the problem areas and "hot spots", and to suggest the procedure for financing the most urgent measures to reduce pollution;

declare herewith that they are firmly resolved:

1. to advocate, at both national and international level, a drastic reduction of the present levels of nutrients and harmful substances flowing into the Baltic Sea from its entire drainage area, and to provide determined support for the attainment of the goals defined in the Ministers' Declaration of the Helsinki Commission and in the Baltic Sea Declaration of Ronneby; unfortunately, on the whole the very ambitious words of the Ministers and Governments have been followed by too little action;
2. to call upon the World Bank, the Nordic Investment Bank, the European Investment Bank and the European Bank for Re-Construction and Development to provide the preferential loans required for investment in new and clean industrial facilities and water treatment plants;
3. to urge at national level that the necessary decisions be taken and the prerequisites met for implementation without delay of the Joint Comprehensive Programme of the HELCOM ad hoc high-level Task Force that is currently being elaborated; and to ensure that everything possible is indeed done to reduce by 1995 the quantities of harmful substances released into the environment (toxic substances, persistent substances and substances that bioaccumulate, heavy metals and nutrients) by 50% compared with the reference year 1987;
4. to call upon the Governments to submit a joint report as early as the end of 1993 on the extent to which the priority measures proposed in the Joint Comprehensive Programme of the HELCOM ad hoc high-level Task Force have been initiated and on which further steps are necessary in order to ensure their implementation, and on those that have already been taken;
5. above and beyond the Joint Comprehensive Programme of the HELCOM ad hoc high-level Task Force, to advocate strict compliance with the individual

recommendations of the Helsinki Commission and other relevant international bodies, such as the IMO and the ICES;

6.

to support a revision of the Helsinki Convention on Protection of the Marine Environment of the Baltic Sea, with the following goals:

- extension of the area covered by the Convention to include internal waters (fjords, bays, lagoons);
- measures to reduce pollution throughout the drainage area of the Baltic Sea, especially in rivers and lakes;
- establishment of the precautionary principle, i.e. the taking of effective measures to prevent any possibly injurious effects of biological or chemical substances, also in cases in which no definitively substantiated scientific evidence has been brought forward to demonstrate a causal relationship between releases of these substances and harmful effects;
- an obligation to utilise clean technology for reducing effluents of hazardous substances (e.g. from the chemicals, fertiliser, chemical pulp, paper, sugar and starch industries);
- intensified measures to reduce the influx of diffuse pollutants;
- to guarantee that the basic undertakings entered into under the terms of the Convention are binding;
- the obligation to permit the scientists working within the scope of international cooperation to conduct research in territorial waters and river systems, and to grant them access to relevant data on water bodies (international monitoring system) for the purpose of establishing a common data base;
- greater transparency, by exchanging information on, for example, water quality, emissions, and discharge permits; that means steps to ensure the use of equivalent and thus comparable data-capture systems to monitor certain pollutant releases in all of the States bordering on the Baltic Sea; harmonisation of notification procedures and coordinated exchange of scientific research results;
- to endeavour to perform environmental impact assessments before deciding upon any major construction projects affecting the Baltic Sea;

- to grant the States bordering the Baltic Sea the right to be party to transfrontier environmental impact assessments;
- strengthening of the Convention secretariat;
- a guarantee that the environmental and other non-governmental organisations have the right to be consulted on decisions under the Convention;
- inclusion of nature conservation, in particular for protection of natural wetlands and to preserve species diversity (e.g. grey seals, baltic cod, mussels and seaweed);

7.

to enable newly independent States on the Baltic Sea to accede to the Helsinki Convention at the earliest possible date;

8.

to urge the States bordering the Baltic Sea to promote on a priority basis the construction of new municipal and regional waste water treatment plants and the renovation of existing ones, by means of tax measures enacted specifically for this purpose and other special programmes designed to take effect quickly; and to take steps to ensure that as many households as possible are connected to central sewer systems. The longer-term goal must be to equip water treatment plants with biological and chemical purification stages as well;

9.

to call upon the Governments of the States bordering the Baltic Sea and the above-mentioned financial institutions to take advantage of the process of economic renewal in Poland, the new German *Länder* in the drainage area, the Baltic republics and the greater St. Petersburg area to promote new production facilities characterised by very low pollutant emissions, low waste generation, and energy savings consistent with what is achievable with the best available technology, with the aim of creating new employment opportunities in an environmentally friendly manner;

10.

to establish a basis for financing the necessary measures by applying the polluter pays principle everywhere; water prices and wastewater charges are particularly well-suited for this purpose. Efforts should be made to introduce - if necessary, gradually - coast covering charges;

11.

to urge the Governments and the above-mentioned financial institutions to establish priorities in those areas where the environmental problems are most urgent; the granting of national and international financial assistance should be systematically orientated towards optimising the cost/benefit ratio;

12.

to appeal to the Ministers of Agriculture of the States bordering the Baltic Sea and within the drainage area of the Baltic Sea to act to ensure that the input of nutrients into the Baltic Sea from agricultural activities is permanently reduced, and to report to the respective national Parliaments on the programmes and measures implemented to this end and their success.

In particular, it is essential to significantly reduce releases of the principal pollutants that are adversely affecting the environment, such as the nitrogen and phosphate compounds responsible for eutrophication of the water bodies and a broad range of persistent bioaccumulating pesticides (agents used to treat crop plants) and chemical agents used to control biological processes. In particular, this includes the obligation to use fertilizers only as dictated by actual needs. Environmentally harmful crop-treatment agents must be replaced by less harmful ones.

Within the immediate drainage area of the Baltic Sea, appropriate measures are:

- halting of all agricultural activities on land immediately adjacent to the shore so as to enhance its filtering function;
- limiting the use of chemical fertilisers by increasing the utilisation and efficiency of animal manure as well as means of
 - appropriate application procedures in the fields,
 - adequate storage capacities for manure, and
 - restricting the permissible chemical fertilisers;
- taking decisions on maximum livestock densities based on, for instance, soil conditions;
- in particularly sensitive areas, e.g. wetland areas and coastal areas, a shift from intensive to extensive agriculture should be promoted in order to reduce the use of fertilisers and pesticides;

13. to take all necessary steps to prevent air pollution and to implement appropriate measures to reduce emissions of harmful substances and nutrients (especially nitrogen oxides, ammonia, sulphur dioxide, dust and lead) from the transport and industrial sectors and agriculture;
14. appeal to the national authorities to also consider potential future pollution problems associated with shut-down industrial facilities and dumping sites for chemical waste. In addition, actions to reduce the use of hazardous chemicals in industry and products should be promoted;
15. to reduce the extent of pollution caused by accidents at sea by issuing a new directive requiring tank ships to be built with double hulls, double sides and double bottoms, and by limiting the size of the tanks, thus minimising the impact of tanker accidents; furthermore to advocate the introduction of an improved system of sea traffic regulation in order to prevent accidents at sea; appropriate initiatives within the framework of the IMO should be supported and energetically implemented by the States bordering the Baltic Sea;
16. to minimise the risks associated with nuclear reactors and nuclear weapons, as well as with dumping and deposition of radioactive waste, by adopting and enforcing the most stringent safeguards; and to support the request made by the Baltic States that an appropriate institute inspect nuclear installations and nuclear waste in the former military facilities and military bases of the Soviet Union along the eastern coast of the Baltic Sea;
17. to perform scientific and technical checks to ascertain whether the growing hazards posed by corrosion and drifting of sunken ammunition from World War II - in particular, chemical weapons - can be contained and eliminated without causing any harm;
18. to advocate that lasting action be initiated without delay to perform environmental clean-ups, rehabilitation and/or restoration to their natural state of the coastal areas that were formerly used for military purposes;
19. to urge the Governments to reduce as far as possible the military operations and/or maneuvers still taking place in coastal areas;

20. to initiate research programmes to illuminate cause-and-effect relationships. Furthermore, the widespread use of monitoring programmes should be encouraged so as to obtain documented evidence of the effects of past action;
21. to urge that the assistance provided by the international banks be continued beyond 1991, after adoption of the Joint Comprehensive Programme now being prepared by the HELCOM ad hoc high-level Task Force;
22. to deal in the national Parliaments with the alarming ecological situation and endeavour to make all members of these Parliaments aware of it, and to assess the results of this Conference in the national Parliaments; to energetically continue international cooperation among parliamentarians, for the additional purpose of controlling the work of governmental and non-governmental institutions and organisations;
23. by means of a broad public discussion of the situation of the Baltic Sea, which is growing steadily more alarming, and of the urgently needed actions to achieve ecological recovery there, to inform and alert all affected and involved parties; and
24. to regularly convene International Parliamentary Conferences on Protection of the Baltic Sea at intervals of three to four years.