

importance of the commitments of the Republic of Lithuania to co-finance, in accordance with its ability, the closure of Units 1 and 2 of the Ignalina Nuclear Power Plant, and to address other related problems". The preamble also includes another two new aspects. One of them: "taking into consideration that the technologically feasible time period for the decommissioning of Unit 2 of the Ignalina Nuclear Power Plant could be between 2009 and 2015 and recognising a possibility of providing in the National Energy Strategy for an early closure of Unit 2 of the Ignalina Nuclear Power Plant, taking into account nuclear safety, financial and social circumstances."

Another aspect draws attention to the fact that, compared to other candidate countries, Lithuania faces an exceptional or special task; under these special circumstances, it has to deal with the heavy burden and the problem of an enormous scale. Therefore, the preamble was supplemented with the following: "... declaring that Lithuania is committed to the key provisions of the National Energy Strategy adopted on 5 October 1999 and views the closure of Units 1 and 2 of the Ignalina Nuclear Power Plant as a highly complex and unique challenge which is inevitable and will also have negative social and economic consequences for the contemporary society."

The body part of the Resolution considers the conclusions of the Legal Department and has been edited in the way that eliminates contradictions among the requirements of legal acts. Therefore, instead of commissioning and delegating to the Government, we give proposals to the Government. Both Article 1 and 2 of the body are subject to small amendments, however, Article 3 is supplemented with a proposal to the Government of the Republic of Lithuania to submit to the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania an amending provision of the National Energy Strategy to the effect that Lithuania will consider a possibility of becoming, in future, a state producing a safe nuclear energy. This provision has already been stated in the Resolution of the Seimas during the approval of the Lithuanian National Energy Strategy; moreover, it is partly stated in the Resolution under consideration submitted to the Seimas by the Government, which includes possibility of new nuclear capacities in the future. Scientists and other interested parties also express this idea, thus, we have tried to reflect it. It is not a negotiating position, it represents the task assigned to the Government to state the said position in the National Energy Strategy to be submitted by the Government.

Article 4 is also supplemented with one essential requirement, namely, that while submitting amendments to the National Energy Strategy, the Government should also submit to the Seimas a draft law on the additional employment and social guarantees for the employees of the State Enterprise "Ignalina Nuclear Power". Thus, the Committee unanimously supports this Resolution. I would like to ask Mr Saudargas to highlight the remaining aspects.

CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Mr Saudargas, the floor is yours.

A. SAUDARGAS. Mr Chairman, dear colleagues, the Chairman of the Committee has acquainted you with the essential aspects of the conclusions and the newly proposed variant of the draft that could be viewed as the improved variant of the draft submitted by the Government. In this respect, I would like to add some comments. As it has already been mentioned, this topic had been widely discussed in the European Affairs Committee, other committees, and the society at large. This issue is of national importance. Therefore, I am glad to conclude that it has not become, at least at the time of drafting this document, the object of political struggle. It rather joined all the parties and the colleagues from all the political groups for sincere work to have the Lithuanian interests defended in the best possible way. No doubt, the opinions on how to defend Lithuanian interests best also differed. Therefore, today's discussion offers a diversity of opinions, too. Nevertheless, we will jointly try to arrive at a concrete result.

I would like to pass my comments on what is written in the distributed conclusions by the Legal Department and to present my answers to these arguments, as the latter will undoubtedly be raised. What is the object of negotiations, in the end? We have to realise it very clearly that such topics as the price of electricity or the future of nuclear energy in Lithuania are not the object of ongoing negotiations at the moment. There are many other aspects. No doubt, these issues will be considered when the Government will be back in the Seimas and we will discuss the National Energy Strategy. These issues will be widely debated in relation to this document. The negotiations are in progress, they are ongoing, and to tell the truth, when it comes to the membership of the European Union of Lithuania, the Government is negotiating different chapters, including that on Energy. The Government has its mandate to negotiate (as it is noted in the conclusions by the Legal Department) on different issues, however, it has no competence enough to make decisions on all the issues. We are well aware that with our accession to the European Union we also have to make amendments to our Constitution. Undoubtedly, the Government is not competent to undertake those issues, as these fall under the competence of the Seimas. In the same way, the date of the decommissioning of the Ignalina Nuclear Power Plant (in this case we are going to talk about Unit 2, considering that the Seimas has already taken its decision with regard to Unit 1) can be set only by the Seimas following Lithuanian legislation.

That is why we currently have a discussion on how to establish the best environment for our negotiators to get the best possible result. The result is negotiations on finances. Allow me to remind you one of the figures in the National Energy Strategy, namely LTL 12 billion. We have the plant, but we do not have the money. Everything might seem to be fine, [...] but I do not want to waste time. I could remind you the whole history of negotiations, the consistent steps taken by Lithuania in negotiations with the European Union and how the country started talking about financing. At present, it seems quite satisfactory since the European Union (so far without any written papers, but in authoritative statements) has committed financing from different sources. The negotiations on financing will not be over with the completion of accession negotiations. They will continue with Lithuania's membership of the European Union. The negotiations are difficult. They are always difficult. Recording the date in a document in the form of an interval also aims to enhance Lithuanian position when Lithuania is already a member of the European Union. Thus, many say that nothing should be hidden here, that the European Union is very strong and has its firm position concerning the year 2009. If this date is finalised in the end, it is important that this is reflected in the documents of the Lithuanian Seimas. [...] has Lithuania agreed to accept this date as a compromise in exchange to financing, i.e. 2009, which, as we see, in this document is shown as the bottom margin of a technologically reasoned interval. Thus, being already a member of the European Union, Lithuania could proceed with the negotiations and try to clarify guarantees for financing in further negotiations. At the moment the European Union can provide financial guarantee only until 2006 due to fairly understandable reasons, since further budgets are not debated yet. If we now adopt a concrete date with the document of the Seimas, that would probably be hardly useful in further negotiations but rather raise political polemics in Lithuania concerning concessions by the Lithuanian negotiators of the Government etc. I think that it is not useful for Lithuania at the moment. At present, we have to strengthen our negotiating positions and, I would state it repeatedly, enhance the positions of our future negotiators when Lithuania is already a member of the European Union, and when we will have to fight for a single cent, million, and billion of additional European Union financing for the decommissioning of the Ignalina Nuclear Power Plant and coverage of other costs as a result of the decommissioning. Therefore, I would like to propose our colleagues to approve this compromise variant that we arrived at after the long discussions.

In my point of view, the first draft Resolution by the Government was not acceptable and it was not aimed at strengthening the positions of negotiators. The draft under consideration, as I see it, is rather acceptable, although it is a compromise variant, no doubt. I would also like to invite you to support the European Affairs Committee [...]

CHAIRMAN. Thank you. To present the opinion and conclusions of the Economic Affairs Committee and the Commission on the Issues of the Ignalina Nuclear Power Plant, the floor is given to Ms Prunskienė.

K.D. PRUNSKIENĖ. Dear colleagues, I would like to present the conclusions in the following way. I will now speak on behalf of the Economic Affairs Committee as the supplementary committee, and I have also registered myself to speak on behalf of the political group and my speech in this respect is to a large extent the repetition of the conclusion of the Commission, so, to avoid the repetition three or four times, I would like to limit my presentation to the proposals of the Economic Affairs Committee as a supplementary committee.

Our conclusion is [...].

CHAIRMAN. Dear speaker, would you still like to talk on behalf of the political group afterwards?

K.D. PRUNSKIENĖ. The political group supports the conclusions of the Commission on Ignalina, therefore, my conclusion would be duplicated. The Economic Affairs Committee adopted the conclusions to propose the principal committee to improve the draft Resolution (what it did, in fact), taking into account the proposals by Mr Andriukaitis and Ms Prunskienė, and those proposals were approved by the Committee. I would like to comment upon the opinion of the Committee concerning the proposals which are supported and which are not. It is a pity that we discussed the first variant by the Government. Today it has been basically changed structure and content wise; as a result, we are now debating it as improved by the European Affairs Committee. Certainly, it is not fully adequate to talk about our proposals to this variant, which was not considered in our Committee, but I would probably find no other way out.

We basically supported the structure of the preamble, which is presented as proposed by Deputy Chairman of the Seimas Mr Andriukaitis. However, the variant submitted today has a different preamble. The comment by the Committee is relevant to the variant submitted by the Government. We would like to support the structure of the preamble as offered by Mr Andriukaitis and supplement it with my amendment, i.e. a reference should also be made to the Law on the State Enterprise Ignalina Nuclear Power Plant Decommissioning Fund along to the provisions of the National Energy Strategy. The said Law specifies the sources of financing of the decommissioning. It also mandates the Government, by the way of negotiations, to define the proportions of financing committed by European Union, on the one side, and Lithuania, on the other, as well as specific costs related to the decommissioning of the Ignalina Nuclear Power Plant. I am positive (and this was approved by the Committee) that such a reference and the appeal to this Law in the preamble is as important as the recourse to the National Energy Strategy.

Moreover, the Economic Affairs Committee did not support the surplus provision which, following the proposal by Mr Andriukaitis, should be a separate article with the commitment to early decommissioning of Unit 2. This should have appeared in the National Energy Strategy and it is not necessary to have this stated in this resolution. However I have a proposal concerning the amendment to Article 2 of the draft by the Government. It was partly approved, so we wrote that

we “partly approve,” only the interval proposed for the decommissioning of Unit 2 is changed. My proposal was 2013-2014, whereas our Committee supported the variant stating no earlier than 2013. In other words, following the proposal of Mr Andriukaitis, instead of 2009-2015, we should have no earlier than 2013 written, which would combine the two proposals.

Approval was given to many other editorial and content-related proposals. Thus, having considered the primary variant by Mr Andriukaitis, we generally supported it, except for the terms. The whole package of our proposals was partly supported and partly not. I have already mentioned the term, which I consider to be essential. The same is relevant to the second part of Article 1 where the reference is made to the period no later than 2009, which should be no earlier than 2013, as proposed by the Committee. This would be a more favourable term for Lithuania and is based on technological, economic, social arguments which would be necessary for defining European financial support in the Government’s negotiating position on financing of specific needs listed in this Article, also from Lithuanian funds. The point is that without a reference to the fact that Lithuania will contribute to financing, we do not act in a diplomatic way, which is improper. In any case, financing has been foreseen in the Ignalina Nuclear Power Plant Decommissioning Fund, moreover, electricity rates also include the costs of participation in financing.

The Committee did not support my proposal to express a wish with respect to the Government to submit to the Seimas some aggregate analytical figures. The later will enable us to see what additional costs should be foreseen in view of the increase in electricity price and loss of export revenues with the decommissioning, since there is no intention to negotiate the compensation for those costs in negotiations with the European Union. We have to have arguments both in our discussions with people, interested parties, and Europe on what costs should be undertaken by Lithuanian economy and people. I am disappointed that my proposal was not supported but that was what happened. I believe that we could return to this issue while debating the amendments to National Energy Strategy.

Our colleague Mr Saudargas also made some proposals. Basically, the Committee supported the proposals of Mr Andriukaitis and Ms Prunskienė and proposed that the principal committee should edit the text by incorporating some of the proposals by Mr Saudargas. This has been done. Moreover, we discussed proposals by Mr Veselka. No support was given to formulate Article 1 in the way which is detailed on the proposal sheet. The beginning of the proposal is related to blaming the European Union for the political pressure concerning the “decommission nuclear energy”. We are not talking about nuclear energy as such. We focus on a concrete unit in Ignalina. Thus, a proposal was made to separate the issue of negotiations from the object. Basically, this issue is being debated during the negotiations, therefore, the proposal to separate when the issue is in progress seemed irrelevant. To sum up, the Committee did not support the proposals by Mr Veselka by voting as follows: 7 – against the proposal, 1 – in favour and 2 abstained. The Committee adopted the said conclusions which were distributed to you.

Once again, I would like to draw your attention to the fact that the Committee proposes to set the date and fix it as “no earlier than 2013”. That is an optimal term, the closest term, which was chosen by the Committee, taking into account all proposed variants. Thank you for your attention.

CHAIRMAN. Thank you Madam rapporteur. There is another supplementary National Security and Defence Committee which was also charged with submitting conclusions. Chairman of the Committee, Mr Sadeckas. I would like to invite you to the rostrum to present the conclusions.

A. SADECKAS. Thank you, Chairman of the sitting. Dear colleagues, the Committee discussed the draft Resolution and 8 voted in favour, 2 against and 2 abstained. The Committee proposed that the principal committee should improve the said draft by taking into account the comments by National Security and Defence Committee and Legal Department. The Committee proposed to place more emphasis on the issue on safety of nuclear energy in the normative part of the document and have the text of the Resolution weightier and clearer.

I would also like to add that, in my point of view, these proposals by the Committee have been taken into account and evaluated in the draft of the European Affairs Committee under consideration. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. rapporteur. We have heard the conclusions by the committees and now move to the discussion. Mr. Maldeikis, concerning the procedure. The floor is yours.

E. MALDEIKIS. Dear colleagues, the Independent Political Group requests the recess in the discussion. I would brief on the motives. Firstly, when the colleagues from the European Affairs Committee raised this question, a reference was also made that the working group had analysed and supported the issue. Very few people took part in this working group on Saturday due to very objective reasons. On Monday voting was unanimous, but probably considering only those who took part.

We would like to propose recess and the representatives of political groups should once again find agreement on the text, taking into account that this requirement was emphasised in the conclusions by the Legal Department urging to revise not only this version of the draft but also its content.

CHAIRMAN. I do understand that you request a recess until next plenary, have I got it right, until next meeting? The question is if we have time to make decisions concerning the presented motives. In any case we, by saving time, could possibly arrive at the decision at the moment. Could we still proceed with the discussion and then vote after the recess? Will Mr Maldeikis agree with this procedure? Please press the button. Do you agree? Perfect. Dear colleagues, we still have some time to listen to [...]. Shall we make a decision concerning the recess?

Dear colleagues let's register and vote if we recess, as suggested by the Independent Political Group.

74 Members of the Parliament have registered themselves. Please vote in favour of a recess until next plenary. Sorry, we are voting on a recess. 28 in favour, 36 against, 2 abstentions. One third of the participating and registered votes is enough for the recess. Dear colleagues we recess on this issue [...] No, recess until the evening plenary.

Remark on the procedure by Ms Prunskienė.

K.D. PRUNSKIENĖ. Dear colleagues, it seems, that we have not made it fully clear at what we are striving at. In order to improve the variant, we firstly have to have feedback on the new variant, which as in no other case when we debate laws, was not submitted at the reasonable time to have any feedback and any adequate proposals concerning the new draft. Our proposals are related to the old draft which is no longer debated, thus the situation is inadequate. We can hardly do anything until the afternoon. I believe that basically further debate on the Resolution could be postponed until Thursday allowing time to evaluate proposals related to the variant under consideration. We are not working properly on this very important issue [...].

CHAIRMAN. Thank you. We have understood your point. Mr Andriukaitis on the procedure.

V.P. ANDRIUKAITIS. Dear colleagues, I would like to say that our dear colleague is not fully right. The comments and proposals of Madam colleague had been discussed for the whole week. This Saturday we had a meeting of the working group of the European Affairs Committee which evaluated all the proposals and submitted them to the European Affairs Committee for evaluation. The European Affairs Committee voted on the amendments in accordance with the procedure established by the Statute. We have minutes. The comments presented by Mr. Maldeikis, Ms Prunskienė, Mr Veselka, Mr Saudargas and myself were taken into account. Today we have the only new comment by Mr Paksas presented, and it was basically discussed in the Committee, and there was a possibility of stating the position. Further debates on the comments are predetermined by voting for the amendments after the debate. We have no further amendments. The delegated representatives of all the political groups took part in the debates.

Therefore, I believe that the motives to call a recess are not based on valid arguments.

CHAIRMAN. Thank you. We have already made up our minds as to a recess, at least until the next sitting. Mr. Landsbergis, the floor is yours.

V. LANDSBERGIS. Mr. Chairman, I regret that before putting the question concerning the recess you did not propose to explain the motives. Only Mr. Maldeikis has presented them complaining that he was not present in the European Affairs Committee when this draft was approved. But he was not there because he left. He was there at the beginning but he left later. Now he is complaining that he was not there. I believe we should appreciate more seriously the huge work that has been accomplished. The document has been worked out on the basis of a very broad consensus. If an individual person or a small political group want to obstruct, there is no reason to postpone even until the afternoon. More so until... The time of the negotiators is very limited and they need the mandate. The Government is asking the mandate to be given. In this case we are acting irrationally. Probably it is worth re-voting the question of the recess if it is possible according to the procedure. If not, then let us continue after the lunch as required and adopt this resolution.

CHAIRMAN. Thank you. The request on behalf of the political group has been formulated and motives are not necessary in this case. The request has been placed and we must vote. Mr. Masiulis on the procedure.

E. MASIULIS. I believe that the Seimas has acted logically by making a recess. But certainly I would support Ms. Prunskienė that we should formulate precisely what should happen during the recess. The situation really becomes comical because the European Affairs Committee adopted one position yesterday morning, then the Prime Minister Mr. Brazauskas came to the Seimas in the afternoon, then another sort of secret meeting of the European Affairs Committee took place in the evening, and a different position was formulated. I believe this issue is very important for European integration and we really need broad political consensus, hence a political decision should be made, probably at the level of the heads of the political groups. Let us not play double-dealing. We demand and seek broad consensus for the articles of the Constitution. Decommissioning of the Ignalina Nuclear Power Plant Units is an equally important issue, but it seems we are not seeking consensus. Hence I invite the colleagues to make use of the recess for constructive work, to meet at the level of the heads of all political groups of the Seimas with the

Chairman of the Seimas at the top, and to reach a common decision for the concrete text of the resolution.

CHAIRMAN. As far as I understand Mr. Andriukaitis wishes to speak on the issue of secrecy.

V. P. ANDRIUKAITIS. Mr. Chairman, I would really like Mr. Masiulis to be specific on when the European Affairs Committee sat yesterday for the second time. I am asking this officially because the European Affairs Committee convened for the official meeting at 12.30 AM and finished it at 2.15 PM. The European Affairs Committee composed a working group from the representatives of all the political groups. The Liberal political group delegated Mr. Babravičius. I personally asked Mr. Babravičius to attend the meetings a few times. He was not present. A number of the members of the Liberal political group attended the meeting of the European Affairs committee yesterday. Meanwhile, with the quorum and all composition present in that official meeting, all official decisions were made. Hence either Mr. Masiulis must present proof that an additional meeting took place, or such statements by the member of the Seimas should be interpreted as unethical.

Another thing. I propose today once again as the Deputy Chairman of the Seimas and as the Chairman of the European Affairs Committee, addressing the heads of the political groups, to meet and present conclusions on the text as well as to have a consultation on what they wish to propose additionally that has not yet been discussed by the European Affairs Committee.

CHAIRMAN. Thank you. I understand that we wish to continue although the recess has been made. Very well then, Mr. Kubilius and then Mr. Matulevičius in the order of sequence.

A. KUBILIUS. Mr. Chairman, I see the discussions gaining heat and hence I wish to return to the very beginning and try to understand what kind of a legal document we are discussing here. Is that a normative document or a non-normative resolution, in other words, a resolution where the Seimas simply expresses its opinion, because that determines... I see that we may plunge into unmanageable discussions again and then different amendments will follow and we shall have to discuss the amendments that have not been supported by the editorial group composed by the European Affairs Committee. The procedure may get very complicated. Therefore I propose, Mr. Chairman, that you tell us strongly and stoutly that this is a non-normative document that has been fully edited and amendments are no longer accepted.

CHAIRMAN. It is not within my power to make such a statement. Mr. Matulevičius.

A. MATULEVIČIUS. Esteemed members of the Seimas, I wish to draw your attention to what is happening here today. It resembles what happened with Mažeikiai Oil Refinery a few years ago, only happening more quietly. Today we are really burying the Ignalina Nuclear Power Plant. That is why we have all this rush, and that is why, as it turns out, it is possible for a few leading persons to meet and decide everything as happened yesterday. That is why we are not given time to think and make up our minds today. I propose not to hurry.

CHAIRMAN. Thank you. We are discussing the third issue from the reserve. We shall come back to this issue in the afternoon session as decided. The fourth issue. No, the third issue, because we have the rapporteurs. Mr. Andriukaitis, could you use the side microphone and announce the information related to the discussion of the important issue on which we are making the recess.

V. P. ANDRIUKAITIS. Colleagues, I propose that the heads of the political groups meet in the Mirror Hall at 2 PM for a consultation on all the alternatives that have been discussed and a proposal on what has been presented a new. 2 PM. Mirror Hall.

CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

E. MASIULIS. I propose that the Deputy Chairman of the Seimas Mr. Andriukaitis get agreement of the Chairman of the Seimas on this. The Chairman of the Seimas is convening a meeting of the heads of the political groups at 2 PM on the Pension Reform Law. Therefore I believe we need to set a different time.

CHAIRMAN. I get the feeling that quite a few meetings might be held at one time but we have to really try and do this because the issue is of utmost importance. I propose, colleagues, that we have individual consultations with the heads of political groups and find some other time, maybe at 2.30 PM. Let us not waste the time of the plenary. Do you agree that we move on? Mr. Landsbergis, and then Mr. Andriukaitis. They would be the last to speak.

V. LANDSBERGIS. Colleagues, as it has been decided to have consultations, I believe we really need consultations in the political groups so that they have a clear position, including one on the delay, postponement and keeping Mr. Auštrevičius with his hands tied when he has to speak about closing the energy chapter in Brussels. We may keep his hands tied for another month or so and undermine the whole process. Are we not doing this? We have a well-discussed document based on a broad consensus; hence we should not be stopping its adoption just because of one or two obstructing persons.

V. P. ANDRIUKAITIS. Mr. Chairman, colleagues, I believe that those authorised to speak about pensions may speak with the Chairman of the Seimas, while those authorised to speak about energy could have a discussion in another room. Because I believe there are sufficient people in every political group who are highly competent in a specific area. Therefore I believe 2 PM is an appropriate time and I invite all authorised representatives of the political groups for a consultation.

CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Let us discuss the third issue from the reserve.

Draft Resolution of the Seimas on the Position of Lithuania in the Negotiations with the EU in the Energy Chapter and the Amendments to the National Energy Strategy Necessary for Ensuring Successful EU Integration Process, No. IXP-1569 (*continued discussions and adoption*)

Then, next question on the agenda is Draft Resolution of the Seimas concerning Lithuania's Positions in the Negotiations with the EU on the Energy Chapter and Amendments to the National Energy Strategy Necessary to Ensure Successful the EU Integration Process. A break has been made in the debate. A meeting was held during the break. Maybe Mr Andriukaitis, Deputy Chairman of the Seimas and Chairman of the European Affairs Committee, would like to take the floor and tell us about the results of the meeting. Mr Andriukaitis.

V.P.ANDRIUKAITIS. Dear colleagues Members of the Seimas, the meeting was attended by Mr Gricius representing the Liberal Parliamentary Group, Mr Maldeikis acting on behalf of the independent parliamentary group, Mr Saudargas, representing the mixed parliamentary group, Mr Kubilius, a representative of the Conservative Parliamentary Group, and myself acting on behalf of the Social Democratic Coalition. The meeting elucidated all formal issues, it became absolutely clear that no formal procedures have been violated, no additional meetings have been held, no additional protocols or any new resolutions have been issued. We also made a statement that though we are dealing with a non-statutory act, we will have to vote after the debate... Attention, dear colleagues, I am addressing all of you. We would have to vote like we do for a non-statutory act for the proposals that have not been agreed upon by the European Affairs Committee, so that Seimas Members Prunskienė, Maldeikis, Veselka and others could table their proposals and the Seimas would have to take a decision. Therefore, I suggest that we continue the discussion now, the discussion should be finished, and then we move on to voting and adoption of the resolution.

CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Then, I give the floor to the first speaker. Seimas Member Pronckus, the floor is yours. Next Mr. Veselka.

M.PRONCKUS. Dear colleagues, I think that most Seimas members are familiar with the certificate issued by the Ministry of National Economy on the relevant issue. It says that the decommissioning of the Ignalina nuclear power plant will cost Euro 2 billion 400 million; that at the moment, there are Euro 145 million in the INPP decommissioning fund, which equals to ca 6% of the total amount indicated in the certificate; that after the INPP is closed, the necessary energy will be generated mainly by combined heat and power plants; that the closure of the Ignalina NPP will add ca 3 cents to the price of a kilowatt-hour of electricity.

Before taking any decisions, Seimas members should first think about objectiveness of the information supplied to them. Those who have tried to go deeper into this issue which is important to entire Lithuania, who listen to and read speeches of prominent energy experts on this matter will seriously doubt the objectiveness of the information presented to us. For instance, the conclusion of the Legal Department, which you have just received, mentions the total of ca Litas 40 billion. How many times is this amount different from the amount indicated by the Ministry of National Economy? The difference would be calculated not in percent, but in times. For comparison, let me

give you some ideas by Prof. Ašmantas and Prof. [...], President of the World Council of Workers of Nuclear Energy Sectors.

I quote Prof. Ašmantas: "On the shore of the Gulf of Finland, there is one of the oldest Chernobyl-type nuclear power plants in Russia, Sosnovy Bor plant. It has not been upgraded and its safety level has not been improved to the degree of the Ignalina NPP. It supplies electricity to a member of the EU - Finland, as well, 6 billion kWh annually. The West, however, does not consider this energy unclean. Logically, it is difficult to explain the contradictions between the two Lithuanian national energy strategies of 1994 and of 1999. The first strategy says that irrespective of the level of demand, the operation of both units of the INPP is expedient. The second strategy states the opposite. To satisfy the future energy demand, ca 1300-1900 new electricity plants are to be constructed in the upcoming twenty years. Some of them will be built with nuclear generation technologies. In ca 2010, the renaissance of nuclear energy will come. That is why we are urged to shut down the second unit of the INPP too, because later this would be [...] and hopeless. Statements that after the INPP is closed, the price per kilowatt hour of electricity will increase by only 3 cents are not justified and reflect only the interests of the lobby of heat power plants". Professor [...], December 1999, to the Prime Minister of Lithuania.

As a result of the closure of the Ignalina NPP and expansion of heat and power plants, your country will have to pay Euro 1.4 billion per year for pollution permits. 100 Euro per tonne of ... Dear colleagues, recently, the leadership of the Seimas initiated a debate on the responsibility of politicians. This responsibility is tightly linked to the objectiveness of the information provided to the Seimas. The information of the Ministry of National Economy sent to us is rather one-sided and subjective. On the basis of this information, I will not be able to vote for the draft resolution tabled for the discussion, and in general, I abstain from this game. Thank you.

[...]

CHAIRMAN: I give the floor to Mrs Prunskienė. Next Mr Landsbergis. We have to listen to representatives of various parliamentary groups.

K. D. PRUNSKIENĖ. Distinguished Chairman of the sitting, dear colleagues. I will speak on behalf of my parliamentary group and the Commission for the Problems of Region of the Ignalina NPP, because the parliamentary group supports proposals of the commission listed in the conclusions. Today we are discussing a new draft of the resolution; to simplify my speech I will focus on the principal issues rather than speak about the conclusion of the commission point-by-point.

Thus, a key issue is that it is necessary to indicate in this resolution the date or the timeframe for the closure of Unit 2 of the INPP. Being aware of the Government's position, I emphasise the importance of backing to the negotiators, their strength, so that the negotiators would have who to rely on while negotiating for a date more favourable than 2009. I could mention a lot of reasons why 2009 is a too early date bearing in mind the financial difficulties that Lithuania will face upon assuming this commitment quite soon as well as while implementing social programmes, developing alternative employment in other fields, ensuring social guarantees, etc. Thus, this date could be and should be much later, the date has been analysed by lots of experts, and our commission visited Vienna and worked with the IAEA a lot to evaluate various technological scenarios, co-ordinating them with different employment scenarios, and I proposed that the interval should be between 2013 and 2017. The Economics Committee supported 2013 and not earlier, the Ignalina Commission combined the proposals by Mr Maldeikis and myself and chose 2015, i.e. the middle of the interval I mentioned. This would be acceptable to us. If Lithuania fails

to indicate a later interval, ladies and gentlemen, I am absolutely sure that the destiny of unit 2 will be similar to that of unit 1. If our negotiators do not state the date that is acceptable to us, realistic and reasonable, they will come home with a date imposed by the EU political will. This is evident, moreover, we managed to find out that there are no other specific arguments except for the EU political will behind 2009. Therefore, we need the date and we need to give reasons to it, it must be set with due account of Lithuanian real possibilities. I disagree with the statement that 2009, 2015 or 2017 are technologically justified periods because 2009 is a too early date. What is the meaning of technological reasonableness in such a long interval? The arguments of the IAEA experts, our analysis, the financial and social situation of Lithuania provide no basis to claim that the date of 2009 is reasonable in any terms, neither in technological, economic or social terms. I think that this is an essential thing, and today, you, my colleagues, will have to decide whether we should let the Government to negotiate at its own discretion, which means to accept the requirements of the European Union, or to help the negotiators to lean on a firmer position of the Seimas, to offer very serious arguments for them concerning deadlines, particularly costs, funding, wishes and possibilities of Lithuania, so that we could win a better option. I think that we as well as our negotiators keep forgetting that Lithuania has already assumed a commitment concerning unit 1. I would say that this is a huge sacrifice made because of the EU requirements and EU membership. In terms of unit 2, Lithuania has committed itself not to prolong, as most countries have done, its operation by doubling the lifetime of the plant, for instance, by adding some 20 or 30 years to the projected date of 2017. We are just closing it before the end of its lifetime, not to speak about its extension. So, we have to be able to put forward the arguments in the right way. Similarly, we do not think, and the Government will never state it, that Lithuania will suffer huge losses due to the costs to be paid by economic structures and growth of citizens' expenditure, and the losses are in no way reflected even in our law on the Ignalina NPP decommissioning fund. All these losses should be adequately included when supplementing the calculation of costs and providing reasons for the fixing of a more favourable deadline for Lithuania than 2009 offered by the EU. I think that several things are very influential here. First, a wish to reach an agreement very easily, so that we would be complimented on the progress achieved. Second, there are lots of interests related to the load of thermal power plants, their privatisation, improved sales of gas and other types of fuel, as well as to projects of decommissioning, labour contracts, supply, etc. which can be quite profitable. These interest groups, beyond any doubt, make a huge pressure on politicians; this is why we have so many enthusiasts supporting the EU requirements formulated unilaterally in a way unfavourable to Lithuania. Thank you for your attention. I suggest that you listen in into proposals formulated by many members of the Seimas and vote guided by your own well-balanced reasoning rather than only by the will of parties or their leaders.

CHAIRMAN. Thank you. I give the floor to Mr Landsbergis.

V.LANDSBERGIS. Dear Chairman of the sitting, dear colleagues. I had the honour and pleasure of participating in the working group that drafted the final version of the resolution. It is good that we are moving forward considering it as a reference resolution, probably we will vote and adopt it today. In essence, I agree, I took part in various discussions. [...] It is important to have a guiding document which would be a step forward for our Euronegotiators, first and foremost, to Mr Auštrevičius, in the final stage of the negotiations on the energy chapter, and to lose no time, to follow the timetable. I have a couple of comments. Let me comment only on the observations made by the Legal Department. Not that they are essential, but because Mr Maldeikis is trying hard to exaggerate them as an argument for his opposition and efforts to procrastinate the adoption of the document. In fact, the Legal Department says that we should speak not about circumstances, but about conditions, and there are a couple of places in the text that should be edited. [...]

Nonetheless, I do not think that some semantic or logic problems could prevent us from adopting this text today.

I have some comments to my colleagues who spoke before me and I think that they deal with essential things. All sorts of proposals to set some dates – 2013, 2015 or yet later, have to be visible and articulate. Is this or would that be Lithuania's refusal to play the leading role among the candidates in the accession negotiations? We might be told – OK, you wait, you have not decided yet, you are still sitting on the fence. If you have to commit yourselves to certain deadlines for the closure, and we are still making reservations, if there is funding, if that is not enough for you, if you want to move forward by making slaps in the face, then you will stop and wait and you will not be the leading candidate of the second wave. Therefore, we should really make up our minds and stop playing that there are a few defenders of Lithuania's interests, for the most important interest of Lithuania is successful progress towards the European Union rather than falling out of the process, rather than appearing somewhere among the rearguard, among those who do not suit the European Union, those who want or maybe do not want to enter the EU. Let us not give any signals. I suggest that individual Seimas members should not give any signals, too. We should also avoid intimidating people about prices, for instance, that here they will suffer huge losses and that price differences have to be considered. In our calculations we have never reached the figure of several tens of billions, which our people are intimidated with, neither have we included them into today's electricity prices. So who are we deceiving? At present, we pay a low price, and who is going to pay those several tens of billions – our children or grandchildren? Let us be fair and stop lying to our people. Populists are at a favourable situation here, but I want to warn them that this is the only name that they will ever be described with.

And Mr Veselka today compared Ignalina nuclear power plant to a meat-processing establishment, as if they are similar as they both produce something. You know, a meat-processing establishment which produces and distributes BSE that will show only 40 years later, is not the same as the thing that we have to adopt today. Comparisons like this should not be made. Or, we still hear some nuances that a better defence of Lithuania's interests is needed or something like this. What do we have to defend them against? What is there, is there any enemy threatening to attack us? We hear: dictate, demands. There are conditions, if you don't want – don't go. Let us understand a fair language. If we frighten someone... Mr Cox has already warned us when visiting us; he said: subtlety is needed, it is necessary to avoid opposition to the European Union. [...] And there are people who keep pumping that opposition. Again, let us be fair. If our common strategic goal is successful march in that direction, let us not create obstacles to ourselves, though, some people might think that it is useful to collect points before elections. Here we have to agree in a more fundamental and state-minded manner. Thank you.

[...]

E. MALDEIKIS. Good morning, colleagues. During the drafting of this document and its discussions, and in the preparation of its final draft, it seems to me, it was very clear that the entire atmosphere surrounding preparation of the document was that of fear. The fear that we will not be accepted into the European Union was accompanied by another syndrome of fear – what about the consequences for our people, economy, energy sector and our future.

Fear is a poor advisor. Indeed, when we are discussing and adopting decisions on this document, we, most probably, are guided by this feeling. Colleagues who have just spoken were saying that the most important thing for us is to negotiate as large as possible funds from the European Union for closure or somehow establish terms and conditions. I believe that during the negotiations and in the discussions on how this document reflects the process of our negotiations in energy sector,

the essential issue is achieving the most satisfactory solution. How to find the most satisfactory resolution of the Ignalina issue together with the European Union? This should be our objective both in money terms and in terms of social consequences and our strategy. To what extent does the document brings us closer to the realisation of this goal – ensuring the most satisfactory negotiations with the European Union on Ignalina issue? Let us see. Here is Article 1 which of the proposed project. The Government is granted an undefined mandate to negotiate the deadlines and financial conditions. The second item, in my opinion, contradicts the first one. The second item instructs the Government what should be its objectives. The Government is instructed to seek for financial conditions only. [The authors] could not muster up the courage to put down that it should also be negotiating other conditions. Moreover that everybody, who is drafting this document, realised that the mandate of the Government and powers entrusted to it to change the terms are not realistic, because the European Commission does not have such powers either, and any amendment of terms could be achieved only on the supreme political level. I think that this task should also be undertaken by our President, the parliamentary parties, which have their representatives in the European Parliament, our parliamentarians, the Government and Chairman of the Seimas, if such goals were really sought in practice. We are not saying a single word about this. Then. The core issue in this resolution, of course, which is in the centre of discussions at present, is the issue of deadlines. We did not have the political will to specify the deadlines not even in the part of the document which stipulates certain things. Another aspect that the discussions could take concerning the deadlines is either on a specific deadline, or an interval. The colleagues have already mentioned that an interval gives us a very strong case. I would like to challenge this approach oppose and to explain my position. An interval weakens our position. What does it reveal? In the first place, that Lithuania [...] to anyone who is not a member of the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania, to people in the European Parliament or in Brussels tells the following: that Lithuania does not even have her own experts, economists, energy specialists who could calculate what is the most satisfactory solution for Lithuania in order to justify our position, to adhere to it and to choose the path of compromises afterwards. In this case a proposal for an interval demonstrates that we are unable and not capable of identifying our strategic goals, that neither our bodies of public administration, nor the parliament is aware of objectives set for our energy sector, namely, what we are going to achieve and in which year. The task relating to the most satisfactory solution can today be addressed by any experts in any Government.

Thus, the matter pertaining to an interval or a specific deadline must be discussed. There were other proposals by our colleagues concerning the deadlines, which are supported by the Ignalina Commission and the Committee for Economics. Yes, we may discuss which deadlines are better, however, these deadlines should exist. My proposal on the year 2015 stemmed from our visit to the IAEA, the International Atomic Energy Agency. There, all the experts are saying very explicitly that 10 years is an indispensable period of time, the interval between 2005 and 2015 being the best time to shut down Units 1 and 2, and to address the technological and management-related questions, as well as the social issues.

The parties at present are saying that they will be striving to achieve long-term political agreements. Hence, we should not be considering the document through the prism of a fear syndrome. Indeed, this document, so it seems, is a document generated by a paralysed political will. Thank you for your attention.

CHAIRMAN. Thank you. I invite to the floor Mr. Kubilius. I invite Deputy Chairman Mr. Steponavičius to assume chairmanship of the sitting/session. The floor is yours.

A. KUBILIUS. Dear colleagues, I have the honour of concluding today's debates and I must say, that in my opinion the resolution in general is not really needed, because the whole Baroque-style language of the resolution serves to conceal only the fact that the Seimas has resolved to propose

to the Government to negotiate, despite the fact that the Government is entitled to negotiate. However, we are going to repeat these discussions twice, because in a month's time exactly the same discussions in the same chamber will be much more intensive after the negotiations which will be concluded by the Government. It will return with specific proposals about the changes planned in the National Energy Strategy. Well, there is nothing we can do, and since we have started, we must conclude this job, apparently, there is no way back. Although I believe that the whole matter could have been addressed differently from the very start.

I would like to say that I regret that in the discussions we have many times stumbled over issue — the dates. I support by 150 per cent Prime Minister Brazauskas who says that a few years' difference is not the essential issue in the decommissioning of Unit 2. In fact, this issue is purely emotional: how can we be making concessions to Brussels about the dates. The essential question is what sort of financial assistance we are going to receive. And a more important question is the economic question, in response to the statement by Mr. Klumbys that we are discussing political and not economic matters. The economic question is what would be the price Lithuania is going to pay for failing to agree with Brussels, since it is very obvious that in that event we will be decommissioning [the plant] ourselves and with our own money only. I believe that each of us should give very clear answers to this question for ourselves.

Now about the document itself. And once again, I must say that in support of the Prime Minister I must repeat that I completely fail to understand why the preamble specifies the dates. References are being made to some alternative of dates from 2009 to 2015. I was saying the same things yesterday in the European Affairs Committee, however, found myself alone on this issue. It is my belief that this reference is erroneous, and my only consolation comes from the fact that the Prime Minister Brazauskas supports me. After long deliberations and after adoption of this resolution the general public will interpret it that the Seimas is giving a mandate to the negotiators to reach an agreement on closure in 2015. Whereas most probably everybody here, in the Seimas chamber, understands that negotiators will return with the same date — year 2009. And who will be the bad guy? The negotiator and Brussels will be the bad guy, but not the Seimas, which included a completely unnecessary formula. Another thing. Even if the present formula about the dates is retained, in my opinion, it contains one essential weak point.

I urge the key speaker, the principal European Affairs Committee to consider if it would not be more purposeful to refrain from indicating the date, because now (while reading the text) it seems that due to technological reasons the second unit should be closed in between 2009 and 2015. In other words, Lithuania itself should do that taking into consideration this interval of dates. This means that even without the EU support, Lithuania would have to close the second unit because of technological reasons in 2015 at the latest. Up to now, I used to think that Ignalina could be operated almost until 2030. So, if we close it in 2009, we will suffer a loss of 20 years and we ask the European Union to co-finance this. Now it will turn out that we lose only 6 years.

Therefore, I suggest that this resolution should be adopted, as any further delay would be detrimental. Anyway, we have to reconsider whether we need a reference to alternative dates in the preamble, and if we stay with them, I think it would be very good if we could return to the debate held in the European Affairs Committee by attempting to supplement this wording with a reference to the Nuclear Safety Agreement, i.e. to the analogy, as a reference has been in the Nuclear Safety Agreement concerning Unit 1. Then, maybe, it would be more understandable why we are referring to the alternative of 2009 to 2015. Thank you for your attention.

CHAIRMAN (G. STEPONAVIČIUS) Thank you. I would like to give the floor to the Rapporteur of the principal committee, Mr. Andriukaitis, so that we could move over to a debate on the proposals that had been discussed at the principal European Affairs Committee but have not received support there.

V. P. ANDRIUKAITIS Thank you, distinguished chairman, thank you colleagues. Indeed, various arguments have been presented. I think they will be repeated during a discussion on the National Energy Strategy. The European Affairs Committee is seeking a compromise, a consensus, is seeking to present Lithuania's position. I believe we should conduct this discussion in that spirit. With your permission, Mr. Chairman I would like to go straight to the conclusions of the Legal Department, with some of which it is possible to agree, whereas with others, in my view, this is not possible. I think we could agree that the word "regional" could be stricken out. In this case we could have the following wording in article 2: "for the solution of social and economic problems". It would be clear then that the talk here is about both the whole region of Visaginas and the whole of Lithuania. I would also agree that in article 2 the word "circumstances" is replaced by "related conditions". These two proposals by the Legal Department are logical and I would suggest that we adopt them.

CHAIRMAN. Excuse me, Mr. Rapporteur, perhaps we could proceed in turn, so that it is clear to everyone. Let us move in order of sequence, starting with your proposals on article 1, which the committee has not supported. Are you proposing to submit, or...

V. P. ANDRIUKAITIS. I am not proposing to submit. I suggest to retain the wording proposed by the committee.

CHAIRMAN. OK, thank you. We now go over to the proposal by Member of Seimas Ms. Prunskienė to add a certain sentence to the preamble of the draft. Would the distinguished Member of Seimas like to present the proposal?

K. D. PRUNSKIENĖ. Yes, I believe that this sentence is necessary, once the National Energy Strategy is mentioned. It is a document adopted by a decision. Whereas the funding of decommissioning of the first unit and generally...

CHAIRMAN. Please come closer to the microphone, so that everyone can hear you.

K. D. PRUNSKIENĖ. ... Funding issues are regulated by this law, which is very important bearing in mind the content of the decision. Either no document is adopted, neither a decision, nor a law, or alongside the National Energy Strategy, adopted by a decision, this law is also mentioned. I suggest we put it to a vote.

CHAIRMAN. Thank you. One for, one against. Later, distinguished Rapporteur, there will be a chance for you to speak. As to those wanting to take the floor on the voting motives while discussing this proposal by Ms. Prunskienė... Yes, Mr. Kubilius on the motives against. The floor is yours.

A. KUBILIUS. Distinguished colleagues, I am not so much against this proposal, I just see that we have digressed towards unproductive work. I would like to repeat once again that according to the Seimas Statute this document is not a normative decision but a resolution, and it is debated according to a slightly different procedure than ordinary laws or normative decisions. The European Affairs Committee has performed the function of an editorial commission and now, after

the discussions, we should make up our minds whether we adopt the decision in the form it is submitted by the European Affairs Committee, or we do not and continue the debate.

CHAIRMAN. With your permission, my comment would be that we should not be repeating what you have already repeated. I regret that the initiators of this decision have presented it in this form, I can also regret that in the committee or during the submission stage no decision has been taken to act differently. We should now proceed in accordance with what form has been selected and how all the discussion has gone. Both the conclusions of the Committee and the course of the discussion show that we had not given a mandate to the principal committee to act in the role of an editorial commission. We are therefore discussing the decision with all proposals. Although it will take time, we must discuss them. Distinguished Rapporteur, please present your comments on the proposal by Ms. Prunskienė to add a new sentence.

V. P. ANDRIUKAITIS. Esteemed colleagues, this proposal was discussed in the Committee, and I would like to draw the attention of the Seimas to the fact that the National Energy Strategy is mentioned not as a legal act but as a complex conception in which the problem of closing down of the first and second unit is discussed. Therefore the proposal to include one law does not fit in this context. In that case many laws would have to be mentioned, not only this one, but also the law on donors and other laws that would have to be mentioned. That is why the Committee proposes not to support this proposal by Ms. Prunskienė.

CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Colleagues, we will now register and vote on this proposal. 89 members of Seimas have registered. We will still have occasions to discuss many proposals. I now ask you to vote on whether to support the proposal by the member of Seimas Ms. Prunskienė. Voting in favour means we support, voting against means we disapprove.

10 in favour, 23 against, 44 abstentions. The proposal has not been approved. The member of Seimas Ms. Prunskienė has also introduced a proposal on article 1: to strike out certain words. Would you like them to be discussed?

K. D. PRUNSKIENĖ. I would agree to it if it were merged with the proposal of Mr. Maldeikis, because the essence is the deadlines. I propose the years 2013-2017, Mr. Maldeikis – the year 2015, I suggest we consolidate our positions. All the other things are important but they are also mentioned in the present variant. So I would not be against.

CHAIRMAN. Thank you. I understand that you are withdrawing the proposal in favour of Mr. Maldeikis' proposal. Thank you. Can the compromise be reflected there? Next, article 3. Are you also withdrawing your proposal on the provision of article 3?

K. D. PRUNSKIENĖ. On article 3. It would not obstruct anything and on the contrary would inform the Government in time that alongside the future National Energy Strategy, to be more exact, alongside with its amendments, it has to present information, calculations, in other words, what will be the costs to economic entities and the population because of increase in prices. We should not downplay this matter, these calculations would be very valuable also to the negotiators who would have an additional argument to the European Union when demonstrating that Lithuania is already undertaking very great commitment, a great financial and social burden. These calculations are indeed very necessary.

CHAIRMAN. Thank you, understood. This is a proposal to insert after article 2 a new article 3, in the wording as proposed by K. Prunskienė. On the motives of voting, one person has the floor to

express arguments in favour, one person – against. No one willing. Distinguished Rapporteur, your comments.

V. P. ANDRIUKAITIS. Distinguished colleagues, several variants are possible here. First, I will present the official opinion of the Committee. The Committee proposes not to support, because this provision is simply redundant, the more so that this decision does not tackle all the aspects national energy, and thinks that these demands could be submitted when the Government submits amendments to the National Energy Strategy. At that time this is necessary.

Second thing. Absolutely the same position has been delivered by the Economics Committee as the supplementary committee. But I think if Ms. Prunskienė agrees, it would be possible to propose a very simple compromise. To adopt today, while adopting this decision by the Seimas, a procedural decision that would contain a very simple assignment for the Government. This is my personal view, I can not propose it on behalf of the Committee, but I would support the proposal on a Seimas procedural decision that in submitting amendments to the National Energy Strategy, prognosticated calculations be submitted that would assess the costs of the Lithuanian state related to the decommissioning of the Ignalina Power Plant unit.

K. D. PRUNSKIENĖ. I would agree that this issue is dealt with in this way, by transferring this point into a procedural ...

CHAIRMAN. Thank you. As soon as the draft of the procedural resolution is ready, we will be able to discuss it. I understand that Ms. Prunskienė is withdrawing her proposal. Thank you for your understanding.

Further. It is proposed that certain provisions be added to article 3. Do you stick to your proposal even if the Committee does not support this?

K. D. PRUNSKIENĖ. I believe it would make sense that by the main stage in the negotiations, i.e. by the last finishing stage, amendments to the National Energy Strategy are submitted to the Seimas, so that the negotiators can refer to a position that had been submitted to the Seimas and had been approved or not approved by the latter. But having in mind the vote that has just taken place, frankly speaking, I have little hope that this will be done, therefore there will be nothing wrong if we do not vote. In other words, I would agree to withdraw the proposal for the sake of the deadline on which we are still to vote.

CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Member of Seimas Mr. Veselka. We will now deal with your proposals on the title of the decision. Please give your motives for changing the title.

J. VESELKA. Distinguished colleagues, since the formation of the European Union is based on laws, and we here are dealing with the issue of the closure of the Ignalina Power Plant, this question should not be linked to the accession to the European Union, but rather to agreement with the European Union on one or another closure of Ignalina. That is why the title should be "On the negotiations with the European Union on the closure of the Nuclear Power Plant". We are in too much of a hurry. There should not be this hurry in this decision. That is, the negotiations should proceed with no hurry at all.

CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Does there anybody want to take the floor on the motives? Nobody. Distinguished Rapporteur, I would like to hear your comments.

V. P. ANDRIUKAITIS. Distinguished colleagues. I would just like to give you some information. It is to some extent related to the variant that had been put forward by Ms. Prunskienė but had been

rejected. The negotiations on the energy chapter started long ago. For this, the Seimas of Lithuania adopted quite a few laws, the amendments to the National Energy Strategy and all the other things, including ones related to oil industry, etc. So this has been going on for more than a year now. This is not what the negotiations are about at the moment. (*Voices in the meeting room*). Generally, Mr. Veselka's proposal is both too narrow and not precise. In this case it has nothing to do with the subject matter of this decision. The Committee proposes not to support it.

CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Colleagues, please register for voting. 89 members of the Seimas have registered. We are voting on the proposal by the member of Seimas to change the title. 10 in favour, 26 against, 38 abstentions. The proposal has not been approved. Member of Seimas Mr. Veselka has also proposed to give a different wording to article 1. Please present your proposal.

J. VESELKA. Distinguished colleagues, the main arguments used by our politicians why there should be an early closure of the Ignalina Nuclear Power Plant are that the European Union will give very great amounts of money to close down Ignalina, to build a new plant, to compensate for all the losses. It is maintained that the European Union is a sack of money of sorts and that some swap is going on. We give them the nuclear power plant and they give us a sack of money. And this money sack is larger than the benefits brought by the nuclear power plant. That is why this is a mistake and I suggest that the Government should strive to isolate the issue of closing down the power plant from the issue of accession to the European Union. Everyone who thinks that the nuclear power plant will be closed for us by the European Union should realise that the EU is based on the principles of competition; once they give the money, they want and expect some benefits and have calculations of what they want to get in return. That is why I suggest giving instructions to the Government to isolate those two issues. Accession is one thing, Ignalina is another. I therefore propose to vote on this issue because you will be tricked.

CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Nobody wants to take the floor on the motives. Your comments.

V. P. ANDRIUKAITIS. Distinguished colleagues, I would not like to repeat myself. I can just reiterate the position of the Committee that this does not comply with all the documents that characterise the negotiations with the European Union. So the Committee proposes not to support this proposal.

CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Distinguished colleagues, please express your opinion on the proposal by Mr. Veselka with regard to the wording of article 1. 9 in favour, 22 against, 37 abstentions. The proposal has not been approved. I need some clarification on article 3. Mr. Veselka, are you withdrawing your proposal?

J. VESELKA. Possibly, but there is one thing that needs to be stated clearly. I suggest that it should clearly speak about nuclear energy. It now speaks about negotiations on nuclear energy. This is not the same. For God's sake, let us vote where we need to make up our minds and where a clear decision has been made. Still, I support the idea that there is nothing to negotiate about. The basis of our energy industry will be nuclear energy even if we agree to close Ignalina down. I suggest we put this to a vote.

CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Is there anyone wishing to take the floor on the voting motives. No one. Mr Rapporteur, your comments.

V. P. ANDRIUKAITIS. Distinguished colleagues, the commentary here will be very general because there will still be an amendment by member of Seimas Mr. Paksas. This decision is meant for the negotiations and the subject matter is absolutely clear. It is not meant for the National Energy Strategy. There were opinions in the Committee that this article should be eliminated entirely because indeed this is not the subject of negotiations. In the member states of the EU the right of member states to nuclear energy is not regulated in any way. The member states enjoy this sacred right and each country takes a decision on this in accordance with its criteria, resources, and financial capacities. This is stipulated in a resolution of the European Parliament. With this article we have sought that the Government submits amendments on the National Energy Strategy; indeed the National Energy Strategy would state our possibility to have a modern nuclear energy industry in future. Such, therefore, is the compromise proposal and it is reflected in article 3 of the Seimas decision. That is why the Committee proposes not to support the wording suggested by Mr Veselka.

CHAIRMAN. Thank you. I invite you to vote on Mr. Veselka's proposal to change the wording of article 3.

The results of the voting are as follows: 18 in favour, 19 against, 30 abstentions. The proposal has not been approved. We now turn to the proposal of E. Maldeikis, member of Seimas. He, too, proposes to reformulate the title. Do you want a vote on this proposal in spite of the fact that other similar proposals have not received support?

E. MALDEIKIS. I am withdrawing my proposals both on the title and the preamble.

CHAIRMAN. But you stick to your proposals on the concrete articles?

E. MALDEIKIS. Yes.

CHAIRMAN. Thank you. We now turn to article 1. We will register when the next voting comes. Please present your proposal on article 1.

E. MALDEIKIS. In essence, as professor Prunskienė has mentioned, this proposal has to do with the deadline of not earlier than 2015. As I mentioned in my speech, the period of ten years between 2005 and 2015 is a technological optimum decision for dealing with management problems after the closure of the first unit and in the process of decommissioning of the second unit. As I have already mentioned, this interval weakens the position. I also suggest that this article does not link the financial support of the EU to the second unit before 2015 and not before the support for the first unit is secured. I have to say that the Economics Committee has supported the position of Ms. Prunskienė focussing on not earlier than 2013, whereas the Commission on Ignalina approved the date of not earlier than 2015. I call on you to support my proposal. Should this be the case, I think it would be a good thing for the Seimas, alongside the document we are discussing now, to send a letter to the members of Parliaments of European countries with an explanation of our position. Should the position stipulating the interval be retained, we would not have anything else to say. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Mr. Veselka gets the floor on the motives for voting.

J. VESELKA. Distinguished colleagues, if I knew that the Government has a backbone, this date would not be needed, but I know that the Head of the Government always does what Mr. Landsbergis presses him to do. That is why it is clear that in this situation the Government can not resist and have an opinion of its own. Therefore I would after all propose to the Seimas to set some date.

CHAIRMAN. Thank you. On motives against the proposal, the floor is given to Mr. Gricius.

A. GRICIUS. First I would like to say that we are wasting our efforts here because the Government can perform all these functions without all these long-winding speeches and the future interviews to the journalists. But this proposal by Mr. Maldeikis is, in my view, not suitable because fixing a specific date would not be entirely correct. When going to Brussels, our negotiators would be tied down to the date not earlier 2015 and, in case they fail to find an answer, they will come back after spending a day or a day and a half day there and will report to us that there is no movement forward. It looks to me therefore, that once we started discussing this so-called decision, we should not state the date.

CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Interventions on the motives are over. Distinguished colleagues, we will now register and vote on the proposal of Mr. Maldeikis. While we are in the process of registering, I would like to hear a brief comment from the Rapporteur.

V. P. ANDRIUKAITIS. Distinguished colleagues, the Committee has discussed all the alternatives, both those proposed by Mr. Maldeikis, Ms. Prunskienė, Mr. Saudargas, and myself. Also, the initial Government version has been introduced and the decision was taken to present to you this text, which had been approved by the chief negotiator, the Prime Minister, and which, clearly represents a compromise, represents a very clear position of Mr. Brazauskas and the Government that they must have free hands and be able to negotiate on all the package, without being precluded by any deadline. This has been clearly stated. I do not think there is anything else to comment on. At the same time, the position on the interval stipulated in the preamble is also a very clear statement that the Seimas will always be able to convey its position to the European Union. As to the backbone mentioned by Mr. Veselka, if my memory is not letting me down, Mr. Veselka was the Minister of Economy of the Republic of Lithuania in 1993-94. As far as I can remember, it was then that the agreement on nuclear safety was signed.

CHAIRMAN. I suggest that we concentrate on the draft decision rather than wasting time. We have just registered, so please vote on Mr. Veselka's proposal with regard to article 1 of the decision.

The results of voting: 16 in favour, 21 against, 28 abstentions. The proposal has not been approved.

Further, there is a proposal that has been approved in part. Would you agree with this, Mr. Maldeikis?

E. MALDEIKIS. Could you repeat the question, please?

CHAIRMAN. Do you agree that your proposal on article 2 has been partially taken into consideration and no longer insist on voting?

E. MALDEIKIS. Yes, I do.

CHAIRMAN. Thank you. We have been considering proposals that had been discussed by the Committee and had not received its support. We now have to consider those proposals that were received yesterday, after the Committee's deliberations were over. Since 24 hours have already passed we can now consider the proposal by members of Seimas Mr. Paksas and Mr. Žukauskas on corrections to be made in article 1. Who of the initiators is going to introduce the proposal? Mr. Paksas, the floor is yours.

R. PAKSAS. Distinguished Chairman, the proposal is linked to the forecasts of the World Energy Council that in 2020 the needs in electricity will grow by more than 80 per cent, and that in 2050 this need will have grown three times. Finally, the existence of nuclear energy in Lithuania is an alternative to the only fuel – I have in mind oil and gas. Therefore we suggest that article 2 be amended and should read as follows: “To oblige the Government of the Republic of Lithuania <...> to endeavour to ensure that Lithuania retains the capacity of building new nuclear energy facilities”. The Government would negotiate on the building of new nuclear energy capacities.

CHAIRMAN. Thanks. We need at least 10 Members of the Seimas – supporters in order to discuss the Amendment. Can we express our opinion via electronic means?

We have enough votes for the Amendment to be discussed. On the motives of voting: one - for, and one - against. A. Gricius. Yes, please.

A. GRICIUS. I am indeed a supporter of nuclear energy and I hope that Lithuania will continue to be a nuclear state after the anti-nuclear-energy psychosis. But we may have to wait for the time for more than one or two years. However, the proposal by esteemed Mr. Paksas is illogical. Just listen to how it runs: to be supported by substantial long-term financial support of the European Union by envisaging the development of new power generating capacities. Well, you know, it is a childish dream to expect that Brussels is going to allocate a billion or half a billion of Ecu or Euro for us to develop our nuclear energy from anew after the Government imposes such a demand on the Government. I believe that the nuclear energy that we have will persist if we are able to attract private capital because new investors will appear, and we rather than Brussels will be able to have a new unit on our own as well as investors' funds. It is unrealistic to hope and negotiate that Brussels will give us money to have a new nuclear reactor. Therefore I am of the opinion that this wording should be included into our Resolution. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN. Dear colleagues, Mr. Gricius has misled us with his arguments. An essential point is inherent in this proposal. If anyone from outside insists on closing or destroying an economic entity otherwise, while the latter is interconnected with the whole economy of Lithuania, the proposal suggests that those who are demanding the closure should cover all the related expenses and financially develop nuclear energy or heating energy. There is one or the other. Therefore I suggest that the whole set should be voted on. The one who demands the destruction should ensure that the compensation is available, as well as a certain degree of reconstruction funds and other payments. I suggest that we should support the idea since it comprises the whole set.

CHAIRMAN: Thanks. Mr. Rapporteur, your comment.

V.P. ANDRIUKAITIS. Dear colleagues, I would like to support Mr. Gricius' ideas. European Union budget is not used for the construction of companies, it is used for the development of infrastructure and for the related problems agreed upon. I also believe that Lithuania has a chance to remain a modern state generating nuclear energy. What we need in order to do that is to connect our lines with the ones of the EU, I mean, to build a power bridge to Poland. Then Finland and Estonia should be connected, which would result in the Baltic Ring. But we should also retain the eastern ring too. We have Visaginas, the infrastructure, experts in the field, and perfect positions. Thus Lithuania may negotiate with European Union private capital investors - French, English, German, Swedish, Finnish - and to attract investment since that is a gigantic and an expensive project. It has nothing to do with the European Commission. For that reason this proposal is not acceptable. Even the wording is inappropriate. The Seimas Resolution may propose and not

instruct. It is an object of the National Energy Strategy. In conclusion, I suggest that we should not approve the proposal by Mr. Paksas and Mr. Žukauskas.

CHAIRMAN. Thank you. We are going to vote now on this proposal – to amend Article 2, proposed by Members of the Seimas Mr. Paksas and Mr. Žukauskas. (Voting).
Results: 13 in favour, 16 against, and 34 abstentions. The Resolution has not been approved.
Remark after voting.

E. MALDEIKIS. I would like to specify what Mr. Andriukaitis has just mentioned in argument against the proposal. Funds will be allocated to Bulgaria, and Bulgarians are successfully negotiating on ensuring European funds for the renovation of nuclear power plans.

V. P. ANDRIUKAITIS. May I.....

CHAIRMAN. Dear colleagues, thank you.

V. P. Andriukaitis. The European funds for insuring the safety of the Ignalina Nuclear Power Plant are being allocated. The funds are allocated to Bulgaria for the same reason.

CHAIRMAN. The last proposal is submitted by V.P. Andriukaitis and is related to a new wording of Article 3.

V. P. ANDRIUKAITIS. This is going to be a procedural decision.

CHAIRMAN. Yes that would be a procedural decision. Now we come to the final remarks by the Principle Committee.

V. P. ANDRIUKAITIS. Dear colleague, I would like to say that some remarks by the Legal Department can be taken in to account. In Article 1, the word "circumstances" can be changed by the word "conditions". In Article 2, to delete the word "district" in relation to the words "social and economic problems". The situation applies to the whole country, which comprises the district too. Other remarks are not acceptable.

CHAIRMAN. Thank you. We are now voting for the motives and we are in a deliberation stage. Mr. Landsbergis, you are for...

V. LANDSBERGIS. Dear Chairman of the meeting, dear colleagues. I call on you to support the approved and slightly amended text of the Resolution because it is very important for the activities and aspirations of our Government and the whole State. I would like to remind you that different unrealistic dates might be equalled to the rejection of a successful process of accession negotiations. And let us be frank about it. I invite you to finishing this work.

CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Mr. Veselka, Member of the Seimas, your remark on the motives of not voting?. No. Mr. Vagnorius on the motives of voting.

G. VAGNORIUS. I really believe that we do not need this Resolution. I really think that it may be even a bit harmful. Because of this Resolution, which may encourage new unrealistic commitments, Lithuania will be drawn into a deeper problem, there will be complications in the negotiations with the European Union, and I am convinced, and I believe that the majority of you are of the same opinion that it can be a hindrance to Lithuanian membership of the European

Union. We must not think that these are the final proposals by the European Commission or industrial energy groups. Point 1. Closer analysis of Point 1 shows that the Government is requested or the Government requests, I am not sure, to accept EU proposal on the terms of decommissioning of Unit 2 of the Ignalina Nuclear Power Plant. It is a bit strange that the Seimas instructs to adopt the proposals of the other negotiation party. While point 4 says that no real negotiations are needed because the Energy Strategy will be amended before summer starts, while the Government cannot negotiate and reach any financial agreements. I believe that the majority of you recognise the great mistake of 1999 autumn when irresponsible commitments were undertaken. I don't think we should repeat the same mistake in relation to Unit 2. We should not make any steps that may result in the Seimas having no other option but to decide upon the closure of Unit 1 next year. I am afraid that this may happen.

CHAIRMAN. Thank you. We have heard all the interventions on the motives of voting in the stage of discussions. I invite you to exercise the right of the members of the Seimas to registration and then to vote. Registration is in process.

81 member of the Seimas have registered.

I invite members of the Seimas to vote on whether we approve the Resolution of the Seimas, draft No. IXP-1569(2), after discussion.

50 in favour, 17 against, 8 abstentions. The resolution has been approved after the discussion.

Mr. Juršėnas will speak on the procedure.

Č. JURŠĖNAS. Mr. Chairman, colleagues. Requested by the Chairman of the Seimas, I wish to inform you that he has proposed to adopt this Resolution under the special urgency procedure, i.e. right now.

CHAIRMAN. We should make up our minds as to what the First Deputy Chairman of the Seimas Mr. Juršėnas has just said about the special urgency procedure to be applied with regard to the draft resolution. Could be adopt it by consensus, with no objection? Thank you, we have approved of it by consensus. We have decided regarding the special urgency procedure.

We are now moving on to the adoption stage. Is there anyone willing to speak on the motives of voting on the preamble? Mr. Rapporteur, I would like to ask you to take the podium in case there are questions. Is there anyone willing to speak on the preamble? No. Could we approve the preamble by consensus. No objection. Approved.

Article 1. Any objections. No objection. Approved by consensus.

Article 2. I do not see anyone willing to speak on the motives for voting. Could be approve it by consensus? No objection. Article 2 adopted by consensus.

Article 3. Nobody willing to speak on the motives for voting. Could be approve Article 3 by consensus? No objection. Article 3 adopted by consensus.

Article 4. Nobody is willing to speak on the motives for voting. Could we adopt it by consensus, if there is no objection? No objection. Article 4 adopted by consensus. Adoption by every separate article completed.

Mr. Rapporteur, do you have any comments?

V. P. ANDRIUKAITIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to read out the Procedural Resolution.

CHAIRMAN. Very well, we shall be able to decide regarding the Procedural Resolution right after the adoption, but now, having completed adoption by every separate article, we move on to the interventions on the motives of voting on the entire resolution of the Seimas. Mr. Olekas will speak on the motives of voting in favour.

J. OLEKAS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Colleagues, it has really been a pleasure to watch us adopting the Resolution of the Seimas by every separate article with no objection to either to the preamble or the individual articles of the Resolution. Therefore I invite to vote in favour of the draft resolution just as unanimously. Speaking on the essence, this resolution reflects the rather long way walked along by many governments and many majorities. Let us take a look back at the time when the first decisions were made on the security measures regarding Unit 1 and Unit 2 in order to guarantee security for the Lithuanian people even by such a drastic way as the early decommissioning of the Ignalina Nuclear Power Plant. This resolution imposes obligations on the Government to make sure that the decommissioning does not turn into a painful process and that the financial support of the European Union is used to the maximum. Therefore I invite everyone to support this draft resolution unanimously.

CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Mr. Veselka will speak on the motives of voting against.

J. VESELKA. Colleagues, to tell the truth, nobody needs this resolution because the Government has been given the mandate to negotiate. I believe the Government has presented it to just s the Seimas rejecting it. It would then have the right to say: look, the legislative power does not want to agree with what we, as the executive, have committed to. If that were the secret intention of the Government, we could understand it. But what do we do now wrong? The negotiations have until now been proceeding at the level of the executive power, and we had a possibility to rectify the situation by means of legislation. While now they have dragged us, the legislators, into the process, and we, as legislators, give them a priori promise that we will approve of whatever they negotiate. The executive power will be able to say: we have made room for you, the Seimas, to express your position in principle, and you have not used it. All is based on two wrong justifications. First is the fear that the European Union will not accept us. Wrong, because they always reiterate that we have to build market economy and democracy. This should ensure our accession, not destruction of some entity.

And the second is the happy expectation that we are going to be given money. Wrong, there will be no money. At the end of the day we are going to loose by shutting it down, therefore I propose to vote against. This Resolution will only do harm to Lithuania.

CHAIRMAN. Mr. Saudargas will speak on the motives of voting in favour.

A. SAUDARGAS. Colleagues, I propose to vote in favour of the draft resolution. I believe we have achieved great progress discussing it. The initial draft presented by the Government was certainly unacceptable. Negotiations for financial support of the European Union with regard to various projects are not an easy task. Colleagues depict our future in the European Union using various epithets and expressing various concerns. Emotions will not help here; instead we need extremely consolidated national political will to be successful in the negotiations with the European Union. I believe it is a step forward, but I do not believe it is serious national consolidation on national issues. Certain progress has been made and I propose to vote; it will then be easier for our negotiators to negotiate financing. Negotiations concern only finances; all other talks are sidelong.

CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Mr. Masiulis will speak on the motives of voting against.

E. MASIULIS. Thank you. Truly important issues are being discussed in the Seimas today. They will determine the life of the state in the near future. We can certainly express and support the approach that this draft resolution is not needed. The Government can very well negotiate with the European Union now and present the results of the negotiations to the Seimas. However, the

present draft resolution demonstrates that the ruling majority avoids specifying the dates of the decommissioning and indicating what financial support will be asked from the European Union in case of the decommissioning. All these issues are left for the decision of one person, namely, the Prime Minister Mr. Brazauskas.

In fact the Government will very soon present concrete figures to the Seimas, but these figures will undoubtedly be dictated by the European Union. All I want to say is that we should probably not try to deceive ourselves because negotiations usually follow the logic that there are two positions and the effort is made to achieve a compromise. We refrain from formulating a position as the Seimas and as a political power, but leave a mess without giving clarity to either the EU officers or even to the Lithuanian people. I believe that such a draft resolution is not necessary; it cannot be linked to the European integration matters; all that it contains is demagoguery. And one more thing. I do call the Government to come to the Seimas as soon as possible bringing a concrete position, and then the Seimas will have a possibility to express its political will – to either approve or disapprove of the governmental position regarding the dates and the amounts. I thus believe it is purely a literary work, and the Seimas should not be involved in the discussion of this resolution.

CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Mr. Kubilius will speak on the motives of voting in favour.

A. KUBILIUS. Colleagues, I intended to express the criticism on the necessity of the resolution and certain other things, but I believe that having started on this way we have to finish walking it. Hence I invite you to vote in favour of this resolution. When discussing the resolution I have particularly noted the political paradox of our life that those in power most probably understand well all the aspects of the negotiations and the real opportunities of what can be negotiated and what cannot, therefore they support such a draft resolution. The strangest thing is that those spent some time in power and went through all those negotiations (I have in mind the liberal democrats, both the former prime minister and the minister, who had to walk the long way for Unit 1 while in the Conservative Government) now so light-handedly encourage absolutely frivolous and populist behaviour.

I can only rejoice that the Lithuanian Government is composed of the Social Democrats today because it would be extremely difficult to pass such a resolution on decommissioning of Unit 2 if the Social Democrats were in the opposition and behaved like they did when discussing Unit 1. I believe these paradoxes are a temporary phenomenon and we shall grow out of them one day.

CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Ms. Prunskienė will speak on the motives of voting against.

K. D. PRUNSKIENĖ. Colleagues, this very content of the resolution that we now discuss does not really have a meaning, and passing of this resolution in fact will not help the Government achieve a more favourable position for Lithuania, including one regarding the dates, and to rely on the resolution of the Seimas. It could be a very serious argument in the negotiations. Negotiations are actually a discussion of the positions of the two negotiating parties, but not accepting the demands of one party. The fact that the resolution, its preamble, mentions the date, namely 2009, or in other words, from 2009 to 2015, means only one thing: the date of 2009 is supported and is the meeting point for the positions of the two negotiating parties, hence, this date will be accepted. I cannot imagine the negotiators arguing that this date is unacceptable to Lithuania when this resolution of the Seimas mentions it as acceptable.

Hence, now we can still appeal and hope that our negotiations maintain a tougher position and seek for better conditions, but after passing this resolution we will no longer have any reason to expect it. I personally do not have a hope that more favourable conditions will be won. And failing to formulate a tougher position, including one on the date, we weaken our position in the negotiations for the financial conditions as well. Successful negotiation of the financial conditions certainly

requires some compromise also from our side regarding the dates mentioned. I believe that it is a fundamental mistake, and this mistake may cost Lithuania dearly. I have in mind not only the dates, but also the financial conditions which are related to the dates, and we should have justified them really well. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Mr. Macaitis will speak on the motives of voting in favour.

A. MACAITIS. Thank you. Colleagues, I believe that the resolution of the Seimas presented today is still a compromise between the various parties. Let us recall our lengthy discussions at the European Affairs Committee and the numerous proposals presented and the form of the resolution that we as if finally agreed of. I understand that everybody wants his or her proposal to be accepted. Some of us must have already put on the electoral shirt and want to make a big show out of it. I understand this, but is it not ourselves and all our parties who actually supported and declared that we were heading towards Europe and thinking about NATO, thus we have to maintain this stance. Somebody for some reason does not want the date of 2009 to 2015 to be written in the preamble and believes that it is 2009. I believe we should not be holding an electoral campaign here now.

I believe that the position of the negotiators and the Prime Minister and the Government is right. It is true that probably we should not be laying all our cards on the table as to the negotiations. We have plenty of documents allowing us to negotiate and maintain certain positions. Therefore I propose to vote in favour of this draft resolution and support it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Mr. Barakauskas will speak on the motives of voting against.

D. A. BARAKAUSKAS. Mr. Chairman, colleagues, I call upon you not to support this draft resolution because this resolution is useless and it only offers additional promises of the Seimas which undermine the position of the Lithuanian negotiators in the negotiations with the European Union. The Government has all the rights (and not only rights, but also the responsibilities) already now to negotiate for Lithuania. The threat is that the Lithuanian Government will bring absolutely unclear results and notify the Seimas of them. And it will be able to justify them by the resolution we are going to pass. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN. We have heard the motives of voting. Let us register and vote on the eth resolution of the Seimas. Registration is in process.

84 members of the Seimas have registered. I invite you to vote on whether we adopt the Resolution of the Seimas, draft No. IXP-1569(2).

Results of the voting: 52 in favour, 20 against, 7 abstentions. The Resolution of the Seimas, draft No. IXP-1569, has been adopted.

Mr. Landsbergis will offer a remark after voting.

V. LANDSBERGIS. Colleagues, we have done a good job. I would only like to respond to the thoughts that this resolution does not really have a meaning because the Government can do what it has to anyway. I do not dispute those statements, but I still want to say that, had the voting been negative and had the Seimas rejected the resolution, it would have had a very strong negative meaning. In our case we must be happy it has not happened. I invite certain young politicians to think twice next time and keep in mind that we are not voting on whether somebody has pinched Mr. Brazauskas or not, but we are voting on what signal we are going to send regarding the goals of our state we are keeping to.

CHAIRMAN. Mr. Andriukaitis will offer a remark after voting.

V. P. ANDRIUKAITIS. Mr. Chairman, members of the Seimas, I would first of all like to thank the European Affairs Committee, the working group, and the colleagues who have worked very actively and accurately and who have contributed a lot to making sure that we demonstrate the national position finally. In that respect my special thanks go to Mr. Saudargas who has really contributed a lot to making certain that this position is reasoned with precision and expressed legally correctly. I also thank all other colleagues who have worked in the working group. We have achieved a good result. I believe that those who voted against because of certain motives most probably also voted sincerely and expressed their position. Those who kept in mind the discussions on the dates also had their reasons. It is good that the Seimas has presented a broader palette of arguments, provided they have really been concerned with the interests of the state. I believe we should not be afraid of the fact that some members voted against or abstained because all this is well justified and reasoned. Every position is well reasoned, except for some malevolent positions. I believe it happens in every parliament. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask you to allow me to read out the procedural resolution, which could be adopted now thus completing our work.

CHAIRMAN. I see members of the Seimas requesting it to be distributed. We shall certainly move to adoption.

V. P. ANDRIUKAITIS. Mr. Chairman, it has been distributed.

CHAIRMAN. The same text.

V. P. ANDRIUKAITIS. Just a couple of amendments.

CHAIRMAN. Mr. Andriukaitis, we shall talk about the procedural resolution when we finish the remarks.

K. D. PRUNSKIENĖ. I do not know how it happened that my strong against turned into non-voting after the discussion. You know my position. Therefore I ask the Secretariat to make note of it, because it must have been the fault of the equipment. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN. Thank you. It will be included in the Minutes. Mr. Gricius.

A. GRICIUS. Members of the Seimas, I do believe we should think really carefully about our decisions next time. I am not against this resolution. We are getting involved in the solving of the problems that burden the position of our Government in the negotiations etc. We are just wasting our time arguing about some formulations. When I look at what we have resolved, I see a simple piece of paper, which says nothing about the dates or other issues. And all those fined tuned formulations had to be taken care of long ago.

On behalf of the Liberal Party Group, I want to say that we are in favour of nuclear energy in Lithuania, provided we receive financing in the future to have a safe reactor. We are also in favour of solving the Ignalina problems. It seems to me that the Government must do its job, and we have to do ours. I see it as follows: when the Government comes back from Brussels and reports of what the final position was, what it presented, how it went, and what final response it received, then our duty will be to assess what the Government of Mr. Brazauskas has done in terms of negotiations. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN. I understand that we should have a plenary discussion because we have devoted too little time. But if we do not want to discuss this issue, let us move to the procedural resolution. Mr. Andriukaitis, I invite you to read out the draft.

V. P. ANDRIUKAITIS. Allow me to read out the Procedural Resolution that has been presented to you on the basis of my proposal. It reads as follows: „Procedural Resolution of the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania. To propose to the Government of the Republic of Lithuania to submit to the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania as early as in the second quarter of 2002, when submitting (to replace “to submit” with “when submitting”) a draft Resolution of the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania on the Amendments to the National Energy Strategy setting the terms and conditions of the decommissioning of Unit 2 of the Ignalina Nuclear Power Plant, the summarised projections of the costs for the State of Lithuania in relation to the decommissioning of the Unit of the Ignalina Nuclear Power Plant“.

CHAIRMAN. Thank you. This is the draft Procedural Resolution. Could we adopt it by consensus, with no objection? Thank you. Colleagues, we can now move on to the next item.