

---

**Press release**

**Transparency means saying the things on their name**

The signatory organizations express their disagreement regarding the manner in which the Legal Commission debated the draft law concerning the National Agency for Integrity.

The signatory organizations have constantly requested for the Agency to be a powerful institution that has the power to prevent corruption by securing the public decision against any possible vicious influences. Such an institution must have the capacity to monitor and administratively sanction the conflict of interests and the incompatibilities that could affect a public decision's adopting, and to verify the evolution of the wealth of the person exerting the public power prerogatives.

By the amendments brought by the Chamber of Deputies' special commission, the institution lost the real instruments of control and has to apply a material law (the frame dispositions of the law) that is diluted and insignificant and that cancels the law's and the Agency's reason of existence itself.

The form adopted by the Legal Commission leads to an even weaker situation than that of the present regulations, which is unacceptable.

The debates, lacked by principles and outside some basic principles to guide this anticorruption public policy, were marked out by personal conflicts, protectionist tendencies that limit the control capacity over the conflicts of interests, the incompatibilities, and the politicians' wealth. These manifestations show a total lack of consideration for the interests of the citizens they represent.

The signatory organizations request to the President and to the Chamber of Deputies' Permanent Office, in each one's limits of competence:

- The publishing on the Chamber of Deputies' website of the list of amendments deposited with the initiator's name and the votes nominally submitted by the Commission members for each amendment;
- The publishing of the final vote given by the commission members to the final report;  The publishing of the commission's meetings' audio registrations or shorthand reports;  The resending of the text to be debated in the Legal Commission for the following aspects:

- The Chamber of Deputies opened debates over some provisions in which the first informed chamber should have been the Senate (see the advise of Legal Council)
- An important part of the articles as they were revised does not respect the public policy's key elements as they were present in the law promoted in the Parliament and for which the Commission was informed in the report. Thus, respecting the Parliament's right to amend draft laws initiated by the Government, we consider that it cannot be amended a normative act text in such a measure that the resulted text to represent in fact a different legislative initiative than the draft law subjected to the debate by the Permanent Office on the basis of the Government Decision of informing the Parliament.
- Organizing a public debate to which should be invited all the parliamentarian groups' leaders, the civil society, and the interested parts, in order to discuss the amendments to the law deposited by all the participants to the debate.

The signatory organizations draw attention upon the fact that Romania is still under an attentive monitoring process within the application of the EU adhesion treaty's purviews concerning the sectorial safeguard clauses. Therewith, the lack of some serious and credible purviews to contribute to preventing corruption and to secure the public medium will be of nature to influence in a direct manner Romania's capacity of attracting the European capital, even if she will be a European Union member state. The consequences will be very serious in regard to the country analyses and the country ratings given by the investment sector.

It is of the Romanian political class's duty to understand and to assume its responsibility including for the manner in which such an action will directly or implicitly affect the citizens' standard of living.

**Transparency International Romania**, Victor Alistar, Executive director

**The Open Society Foundation**, Renate Weber, Executive president

**The Center for Juridical Resources**, Georgiana Iorgulescu, Executive director

**Fundația Concept**, Radu Mateescu, Executive president

**Institutul pentru Politici Publice**, Violeta Bau, Director

**Agenția de Monitorizare a Presei**, Mircea Toma, President