

**Valerian Stan**

**A Few Remarks Regarding the Transparency and Integrity of Public Administration in Romania**

*(The analyse has been sent, on the 1st of June 2001, to the main internal authorities and also to some of the international institutions. The media from our country has publicly ignored it, but there are dates saying that this procedure took place at the recommendation of the leading staff of the "Romanian Press Club". The text has been published in the "Romanian Magazine for Human Rights" no. 20/2001 and in the Romanian weekly "Lumea Libera" (The Free World") edited at New York.)*

**Argument**

The transparency and integrity of public administration is a major condition for Romania's passing from a totalitarian regime to democracy and prosperity and for its integration in the economic, political and security Euro-Atlantic community. There is unanimous consensus as far as this necessity is concerned in the Romanian society.]

Despite all this, the lack of transparency and the corruption in public administration have constantly affected Romania's economic, social and political developments and its relations with the European and Euro -Atlantic institutions, as well as its possibility of integration in these structures. The last years have seen a severe worsening of the situation and the most recent internal evaluations, as well as those made by international institutions come to strengthen this conclusion (1).

During June 1999—May 2001, I have been monitoring two aspects directly connected to the corruption phenomenon in Romania: I) The transparency of certain public institutions and II) The high officials and the civil servants and their private interests.

**I. Transparency of Certain Public Institutions**

During June 1999 -April 2001 I submitted to several public institutions a number of requests in accordance with the right of every person to have access to any information of public interest. My actions were legally based on the provisions stipulated in the Romanian Constitution (art 31), according to which "The right of every person to have access to any information of public interest can not be restricted." (with the exception of the cases when this would be detrimental to "the youth protection measures or public safety") and in fact they were based on the fact that the institutions to which I addressed my requests are public institutions that are in charge of the heritage and other public interests.

In 1999, I submitted to the managers of **Banca Comerciala Romana** (BCR - Romanian Commercial Bank) the request to be allowed access to the following information of public interest: the names of the high officials and civil servants who received from "Bancorex" (whose capital is public in its majority) loans under preferential terms, in comparison with those normally used by the bank (BCR, whose capital is public in its majority), is the one which took over the assets and liabilities of the former "Bancorex" after the latter was liquidated due to bankruptcy).

In the newspapers, as well as in public debates, there was a lot of information -which were not officially denied - about a large number of high officials and civil servants who had benefited from such loans and about the fact that this situation was one of the causes that led to bankruptcy. The managers of the bank refused access to the information requested, calling upon banking secrecy and the fact that according to the law, such data, if made public, would "be detrimental to the interests and reputation of the bank or its clients". This reply was in total disagreement with the provisions of the Constitution, both due to the fact that the money administered by "Bancorex" was public in its majority, as well as because the behavior of high officials and civil servants, especially when they take advantage of their situation in order to gain personal profits at the expense of public money, is undeniably a matter of public interest. Following the refusal of BCR, in 1999 I addressed myself to the governor of National Bank of România (BNR), Mr. Mugur Isarescu, from whom I received no answer (according to its own statute - Law no. 101/1998, chapter V- BNR is in charge of "bank supervision", which also means ensuring the viability and proper working of the bank system). In 1999, regarding the same refusal, I also addressed myself to president Emil Constantinescu, and in 2001, to president Ion Iliescu and Prime-Minister Adrian Nastase. In the first case, the answer was in along the same lines as that received from RCB, and in the second case there was no answer. My actions, as far as the presidents Emil Constantinescu and Ion Iliescu are concerned, were based on art.80 of Constitution, according to which "The president of România has to make sure that the Constitution is obeyed and that the public authorities carry out their activities in a proper manner."

In the year 2000 I requested the managers of the **National Bank of România** to allow me access to the following information of public interest: the sponsorships granted by the bank after 1989 (the sponsorship date, the beneficiary, the purpose of the sponsorship and its amount). The newspapers repeatedly published information -which was not officially denied - about the fact that the sponsorship amounts exceeded the legally imposed limit and that many sponsorships were made in violation of the law. The Bank denied access to the requested information, arguing that it communicates to the public by means of the materials published by the bank periodically, materials that only include "information meant to be published".

In the year 2001, I requested the managers of **CEC** to give me access to the following information of public interest: the names of the persons who, during 1997 -2000, benefited from loans granted to young families for buying or building a house (the names and professions of the persons and the value of the granted loans). The newspapers published information according to which dignitaries and public officers took advantage of their position to obtain for them and their relatives such credits, with budget-subsidized interest (the cases of President Emil Constantinescu's advisor Dorin Marian and of the Prefect of Bucharest, Ion Iordan). The management of CEC refused to grant my request, arguing that it is privately- and not state-owned. This response from CEC is obviously unsubstantiated, because: the state is the sole shareholder, the credits were subsidized from the public budget and the circumstance that dignitaries and public officers abused their positions to obtain this kind of advantage is definitely a matter of public interest. I wrote twice to president Ion Iliescu in connection with this request and the answer from the management of CEC, but without any result.

In 2000 I requested from prime-minister Mugur Isarescu to be granted access to the following information of public interest: which are the private companies (name and address) that received credits from European Union funds (through programs such as "Coherence and Regional Policy", "Development of small- and medium-sized businesses" etc); which are the companies that received credits from the loans contracted by România for investments in the private sector of manufacturing and services from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development

(IBRD) and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD). My request was left unanswered. This request was also addressed, in 2001, to prime-minister Adrian Nastase and the president of the "Ion Tiriac" Bank, Anthony van der Heijden (as a partner bank in some of the EU programs) In the first case I received no answer, and in the second case I received a phone call from a bank employee saying that I could be informed of the "aspects of principle" concerning the manner in which the credits were provided, but that she is "more than certain" that the names of the beneficiary private companies will "never" be made public. I could not obtain this kind of information from the Romanian officers of the Bucharest Delegation of the European Commission, whom I contacted. There were reports in the press and in public debates that certain dignitaries and public officers took advantage of their positions in order to obtain such credits for their businesses and the businesses of their families and relatives. An answer received on 27 April 2001 from the Minister of Development and Forecast refers to certain state-owned manufacturing, services and banking units and not as requested, privately-owned ones, with name and address, that received credits contracted by the Government from IBRD and EBRD.

**In conclusion, none of the 11 requests made over 2 years to the managements of state-owned banks (or privately-owned that also administer public money) and to high authorities of the state - received any favorable follow-up. This represents clear proof that access to information on the administration of the public money is restricted in a blatant and totally unacceptable manner, and at the same time it represents an important explanation of the high level of corruption in Romania.**

## **II. High Officials and Civil Servants and Their Private Interests**

The internal analyses, as well as those made by international organizations and the findings of certain public institutions of financial and economic control in our country show the fact that the lack of integrity manifested by the high officials and civil servants is another major cause of corruption in Romania. The integrity of politicians, high officials and civil servants is largely affected by the conflict between the public interest that they are called to serve and their personal interests.

The present legislation is lacking to a certain extent, as far as establishing the incompatibilities between public and private positions. The Constitution establishes the incompatibility between acting as Government member and holding a paid function within a commercial organization, as well as the fact that constitutional law will establish any other incompatibilities. As far as the Parliamentarians are concerned, the Constitution stipulates that constitutional law can establish such incompatibilities. According to Law no. 69/1991, the prefects and vice-prefects are not allowed to hold functions or carry out paid professional activities within regies autonommes, comercial companies or any other lucrative organizations or structures, while Law no. 188/1999 stipulates that civil servants can not hold positions within regies autonommes, commercial companies or in any other lucrative organizations and can not carry out lucrative activities in companies with private capital which are related to their public office. Given the high level of corruption in Romania, the newspapers, the non-government organizations and some political forces etc. have considered that private business and any other lucrative activities have to be strictly separated from holding public positions (2).

After 1989 many high officials and civil servants used their positions to gain personal or group benefits, consisting, for instance of:

- gaining important personal advantages at the expense of certain economic state enterprises (such a situation has been possible due to the extremely slow rate of "state" property

privatization; after ten years from the beginning of the privatizing process, approximately 70% of the "state" property has not been yet privatized)

- obtaining loans under preferential terms from public banks, from CEC or through external governmental credit lines

- holding paid positions in the management team of manufacturing, services and state bank organizations

- fiscal facilities - in certain cases, amounting to billions of lei - by gradually canceling debts

- obtaining large amounts of money from illegal sources to fund politicians and political parties (3)

- the illegal occupancy and purchase - quite often at risible prices - of houses from the state housing fund or that were abusively nationalized by the totalitarian communist regime (4).

**There is evidence that indicates that in many cases dignitaries obtain from such affairs income 10-20 times their salaries, amounting to hundreds of million or even billions of lei. This happens when, according to the data made public by the prime minister, as of 24 May this year 44% of the Romanian population "lives in poverty". Furthermore, the public positions that the dignitaries hold provide them with virtually complete impunity. The fact that the dignitaries take advantage of their public positions in their private dealings has the effect of imposing an "unfair competition" on the other businessmen and ultimately it vitiates the mechanisms of the free market economy. There are dignitaries who are at the same time business partners with members of the underworld, with decision makers in the local administration, with officers of the information agencies, with police officers from the economic departments etc. Although a large number of dignitaries, high-ranking public officers or their funding sources were involved in corruption deeds, none of them was held accountable (5).**

Starting with 28 March 2001 I have sent letters to several dignitaries and public officers, asking them to state whether: 1 - they were/are members of the board or shareholders in regie autonome or companies with the majority or all the capital owned by the state and 2 - whether they or their wives/husbands are administrators/associates/shareholders of companies with the majority or all the capital privately owned. **Letters were sent to a group of 166 persons** - 55 deputies, 28 senators, 14 ministers, 36 secretaries of state, 22 prefects and 11 chiefs of county police departments - **and 29 answers were received** (6).

As the small number of answers - under 20% of the total, and in case of parliament members as low as 5% - was not relevant enough, I supplemented my own data with data from the Trade Register and from the newspapers (especially nation-wide dailies "Adevarul", "Evenimentul zilei", "Jurnalul National", "Ziua", "Romania libera", "National", "Cotidianul" and the weekly "Academia Catavencu"). The press investigations were also considered in connection with certain corruption deeds where dignitaries and public officers were involved. Because of difficulties in getting the information, I had to limit my analysis on the dealings of dignitaries and public officers to parliament member (and to a lesser extent to ministers and secretaries of state). Starting with 26 April 2001, the newspaper "Adevarul" initiated and published a series of inquiry reports, by electoral section, called "Businesses of the Parliament Members"; so far it has covered only half of the electoral sections. It is impossible to obtain a complete image on the businesses of the dignitaries. There are cases when they either declare that they have no businesses and are then found in the records of the Trade Register, or they have them under the name of relatives or other persons, or, especially due to the specific business owners, the records of the Trade Register are incomplete and are not up-to-date. Dignitaries also take advantage of the fact that Law 31/1990 and its methodological norms of 1998 are incomplete in that it is not mandatory to record the

transfer of share ownership in the Trade Register. The actual income obtained from the businesses is also hard to establish. Firstly, the available data would indicate that more than half of the Romanian economy is "gray" and secondly, the financial accounting reports show cases when the dignitaries' businesses, although they have turnovers in the billions, record profits of a few million lei or even "zero profit". Not submitting financial accounting statements at all is another quite common practice. Some of the names of the dignitaries who were identified to have/have had private businesses - and in certain cases another kind of profit-making activities - are shown at notes 7 and 8.

Both during the past legislatures and now there have been many cases when highest-ranking dignitaries have developed their own businesses at the same time, and in many cases in conflict with their responsibilities and decision-making competence (a few examples at note 8).

**From what I have found it appears that some 70% of the dignitaries have private businesses. There are indications that the proportion of parliament members having private businesses is roughly equal for all the parties currently in the Parliament. The analyses and findings made so far, confirmed by this analysis, justify the conclusion that corruption among the dignitaries and the highest-ranking public officers is widely spread. The lack of transparency in the public administration and the dignitaries' and politicians' lack of integrity are the main causes of the severe corruption proliferation. Corruption seriously affects Romania's development towards democracy and prosperity and its European and Euro-Atlantic integration process.**

-----  
(1) A study of the Foundation for the Development of the Civil Society, carried out in May-June 2000, found, among other things, that "the population of Bucharest perceives corruption as a generalized phenomenon, with a share of 91,7% sensing it".

During the last year's elections, the Metro Media Transilvania Institute took an opinion poll, which showed that most of the people that had been questioned, felt that the priority of the new administration should be punishing the persons responsible for the corruption in România.

On 12 October 2000, following their own analyses, four Romanian non-governmental organizations — Transparency International Romania, the Pro Democratia Association, the Academia Catavencu Press Monitoring Agency and the Foundation for the Development of the Civil Society - adopted and publicized the text of a common statement, which, among other things, said: "Corruption is one of the most serious problems faced by Romania", "România is perceived internally and internationally as a country where public offices and dignities are being abused by their holders to obtain personal or group advantages".

In its study for 2000 on the corruption perception index, Transparency International ranked Romania 68th out of 90 countries in the order of increasing of the corruption level (Romania is rated 2.9 out of a maximum 10.0 for the country with the lowest corruption level and is in a worse situation than countries like Columbia, Kazahstan, Thailand, Belarus, Ghana, Senegal or Zimbabwe).

In its current report for 2000 regarding Romania, the European Commission stated: "Corruption continues to be a widely spread problem affecting the entire system. It not only undermines the functioning of the legal system, but it adversely affects the economy and has caused the population to lose confidence in the public authorities." In its report for 2000 regarding Romania,

the European Parliament mentioned: "Notices that despite of many initiatives from the Government, there are still many things to be done to prevent corruption, which undermines the political and administrative structures of Romania."

A study of the World Bank, published on 2 March 2001, found that the most important consequences of corruption in Romania are the drop of the population's living standard, the overnight enrichment of certain social categories at the expense of the already disfavored categories and the moral decline of society, and that 67% of the Romanians think that "all or almost all of the public officers are corrupt".

In the meeting he had on 29 January 2001 with the Romanian Minister of Defense, Ioan Mircea Pascu, the Secretary General of NATO, George Robertson, estimated that Romania's priorities in preparing for accession to the North-Atlantic Alliance should be continuing the reform process and eradicating corruption.

In its report for 2000 on the observance by România of human rights, the State Department of the United States found that journalists are being punished for criticisms regarding government corruption.

In a meeting that Nils Revelius, the Swedish Ambassador in Bucharest (his country is presiding the EU) had with Romanian Parliament members in the second half of February 2001, he mentioned that in view of its integration in the Union, the quickest steps to be taken by Romania should be against corruption.

(2) In the general elections of 1996, the alliance of parties and civic organizations CDR and its presidential candidate, Emil Constantinescu, included the separation by law of private business from the exercise of public authority positions in their program "The Contract with Romania" (after acceding to power, the commitment was abandoned).

Renate Weber, president of the Foundation for an Open Society, in "22" magazine issue 13/2001: "Parliament members have constantly had other income-producing and time-consuming activities. Extra-parliamentary activity has maintained an image in the public eye of a corrupt political class, using parliamentary dignity to obtain personal gain. It should be appropriate that the only allowed activity be academic teaching."

With the occasion of her last visit in Romania, Emma Nicholson, member of the European Parliament, referrer for Romania, stated that an aspect that concerns the European Parliament is the generalized corruption among public officers at all levels, and it is very important that the public officer have only one job, in service of the state.

On 11 February 2001, the members of the current Government announced that it was decided that government dignitaries should stop being part of the management of companies (state-owned or privately owned). However no statute to this end was adopted and such an interdiction, if it was actually set, was never and is not observed.

(3) A study carried out in May 2001 by the Pro Democrația Association showed that political parties only declare about 10% of the funds they have and use. A similar estimate - in that "party funds for the electoral campaign are 80% from illegal sources"- was made during 2000 by the former Minister of Justice, Valeriu Stoica. The Account Court, enabled by the law to make the

verifications required by it, did not do so, under the pretext that it wanted to be tactful with "sensitive matters" at party leadership level.

(4) The report of the Parliamentary Inquiry Commission, of 1995, on the assignment of housing to dignitaries and public officers and the Reports on the same subject of the Government's own Control Department from 1996 and 1997 showed 167 cases when important dignitaries and high-ranking public officers were illegally assigned housing (that they later purchased for derisory amounts). Among the persons involved in this file one could find president Ion Iliescu, prime ministers Petre Roman, Theodor Stolojan, Mugur Isarescu, Adrian Nastase. There are many cases when high-ranking government officials and their families occupied and in some cases bought at derisory prices houses that had been nationalized by the totalitarian communist regime.

(5) A study of the "Freedom House" Foundation found that although in Romania corruption is rather widely spread, "no high-ranking official was ever convicted for corruption".

(6) Letters sent and answers received:

- out of 55 deputies, only one answered: Cornel Boiangiu, PNL (negative to both questions); did not answer: PDSR - Constantin Teculescu, Ionel Marineci, Eugen Nicolicea, Viorel Gheorghiu, Adrian Casuneanu Vlad, Gheorghe Ana, Ion Florescu, Vaier Dorneanu, Valeriu Stefan Zgonea, Marin Cristea, Pavel Todoran, Ristea Priboi, Marian Balan, Viorel Hrebenciuc, Alexandru Stanescu, Filip Georgescu; PRM - Octavian Mircea Purceld, Vlad Gabriel Hogeia, Vasalie Mois, Dumitru Puzdrea, Nicolae Leonachescu, Dorin Lazar Maior, Costel Marian Ionescu, Daniel Ionescu, Ion Mocioi, Daniela Aprodu Buruiana; PD - Anca Daniela Boagiu, Paula Maria Ivanescu, Radu Minai Berceanu, Vasile Nistor, Ion Carstoiu, Cristian Sorin Dumitrescu, Liviu Gheorghe Negoita, Victor Sorin Lepsa, Vasile Bran, Bogdan Niculescu Duvaz, Alexandru Sassu; PNL - Radu Stroe, Viorel Gheorghe Coifan, Nini Sapunaru, Valeriu Gheorghe, Vasile Mandrovicaneanu, Cătălin Micula, Dinu Patriciu, Dan Radu Rusanu, Victor Paul Dobre, Anton Ionescu; UDMR - Gheorghe Tokay, Laszlo Fazakas, Laszlo Borbely, Robert Kalman Raduly, Sandor Konya Hamar, Ferencz Asztalos, Istvan Erdei Doloczi

- out of 28 senators, 3 answered - all positive at question 2 - Trita Fanita, PDSR, Viorel Marian Pana, PD and Dorel Constantin Onaca, PRM; did not answer - PDSR - Traian Novolan, Oliviu Gherman, Dan Mircea Popescu, Constantin Toma, Constantin Buza, Ilie Platica Vidovici, Doru Laurian Badulescu, Constantin Nicolescu; PRM - Vasile Horga, Carol Dina, Mihail Lupoi, Ion Carciumaru, Ilie Petrescu, Mircea Mihordea, PNL - Dan Constantinescu, Corin Penciu, Mircea Teodor Iustinian, Gheorghe Flutur; UDMR - Csaba Sogor, Denes Seres, Stefan Pete, Attila Verestoy; PD - Ion Cristolovean, Romeo Octavian Hanganu, Radu Vasile

- out of 14 ministers, 4 answered - Ioan Mircea Pascu (question 1 - no, question 2 - non-answer), Miron Mitrea (1-no, 2-yes, until 1996), Octav Cozmanca (1,2-no), Marian Sarbu (1-no, 2-non-answer); did not answer - Dan Matei Agathon, Ioan Rus, Dan Nica, Aurel Constantin Ilie, Ilie Sarbu, Serban Valeca, Silvia Ciornei, Mihai Nicolae Tanasescu, Leonard Gheorghe Cazan, Georgiu Gingaras

- out of 36 secretaries of state, 9 answered; answered no to both questions: Petre Ciotlos, Cezar Macarie, Florin Stadiu, Nicolae Marasescu, Nicolae Berechet, Pompiliu Budulan; Alin Burcea - 1-no, 2-yes; Romeo Paul Postelnicu - 1-yes until 1994, 2-no; Ion Selaru - 1-yes until September

2000, 2-no; did not answer: Dumitru Bulumete, Ton Taban, Ionel Flesariu, Tudor Florescu, Sorin Bota, Sergiu Sechelariu, Ion Semeianu, Lucian Biro, Gheorghe Paslaru, Sin Gheorghe, Ovidiu Natea, Iulian Iancu, Robert Moucha, Mihai Berinde, Gheorghe Oana, Gheorghe Gherghina, Ion Ilie, Ioan Jeleu, Petru Lificiu, Nicu Tanase, Alexandru Farcas, Pavel Abraham, Aurel Sorin Encutescu, Gheorghe Matache, Mihai David, Ioan Cindrea, Ion Giurescu

- out of 22 prefects, 4 answered: Grigore Rus (County BN) and Aurel Tarau (BH), no to both questions; Corneliu Rusu Banu (IS) 1-yes until January 2001, 2-no; Costica Macaleti (BT) 1-no, 2-non-answer; did not answer: Otilian Neagoe (BV), Cătălin Mardare (BC), Mircea Lup (SB), Vasile Ion (BZ), Mircea Pepelea (VL), Ioan Tibulca (VS), Ioan Vargau (TL), Teodor Nitulescu (TR), Ioan Cusnir (SV), Ioan Toganel (MS), Dumitru Tataru (IF), Marian Bălan (IL), Ovidiu Marciu (GR), Cornel Mondea (DJ), Vasile Soporan (CJ), Viorel Popescu (BR), Constantin Tamaga (AG), Ioan Rus (AB)

- out of 11 chiefs of county police departments, 8 answered, all no to both questions: Damian Miclea (County PH), Aurica Bordea (CS), Lucia Iamandi (GL), Ulica Ioan (AR), Jipa Traian (CT), Vasile Muresan (MM), Dibus Ioan Petru (VN), Tudor Danut (CL); did not answer: Mihail Spiridon (NT), Doru Dumitrescu (MH), Petru Cotolan (HD). The chief of the General Police Department, general Florin Sandu, refused to answer my written request of 27 March 2001 to make available to me a list of the chiefs of county police departments.

(7) Parliament members: PDSR - Viorel Hrebenciuc, Ilie Platica Vidovici, Doru Ioan Taracila, Constantin Nicolescu, Ion Seche, Ioan Stan, Florentin Sandu, Traian Novolan, Viorel Balcan, Traian Dobre, Culita Tarata, Gheorghe Dragu, Gheorghe Dutu, Constantin Nita, Nelu Pujina, Viorel Stefan, Vintila Matei, Gheorghe Ana, Florin Iordache, Mihai Tudose, Aurelia Vasile, Ovidiu Branzan, Fevronia Stoica, Bucur Dionisie, Cristian Nechifor, Ion Harsu, Melu Voinea, Iosif Armas, Emilian Prichici, Constantin Toma, Oliviu Gherman, Pavel Tarpescu, Ioan Timis, Ion Scarlat Iriza, Catalin Popescu, Marian Ianculescu, Gheorghe Popescu, Ristea Priboi, Ion Stefan, Florea Voinea, Paul Tiberiu Neamtu, Carmen Dumitru, Petru Andea, Dan Verbina, Gheorghe Suditu, Eugen Arnautu, Marcu Gheorghe

Parliament members - PRM - Dumitru Puzdrea, Dumitru Petru Pop, Nicolae Patru, Corneliu Vadim Tudor, Dorin Lazar Maior, Carol Dina, Ioan Belu, Gheorghe Zlavog, Dumitru Dragomir, Anghel Stanciu, Ion Mocioi, Mircea Purceld, Vasile Horga, Gheorghe Pribeanu, Costel Marian Ionescu, Ludovic Mardari, Gheorghe Dumitru Moisescu, Ion Pastiu, Vasile Mois, Nicolae Cret, Mircea Bucur, Nicolae Enescu, Doru Dumitru Palade, Nicolae Florescu, Ionel Alexandru

Parliament members - PNL - Dinu Patriciu, Dorin Grigore Popescu, Dan Constantinescu, Catalin Micula, Cornel Popa, Paul Pacuraru, Victor Babiuc, Valeriu Stoica, Calin Popescu Tariceanu, Nini Sapunaru, Victor Paul Dobre, Andrei Ioan Chiliman, Valeriu Gheorghe, Ovidiu Draganescu, Nicolae Stirbet, Herman Fabini, Radu Alexandru Feldman

Parliament members - PD - Radu Berceanu, Alecu Sandu, Adriean Videanu, Ioan Oltean, Romeo Octavian Hanganu, Simona Marinescu, Bogdan Niculescu Duvaz, Vasile Mandroviceanu, Vasile Bran, Vasile Nistor, Gheorghe Barbu, Nicolae Nan, Gheorghe Albu

Parliament members - UDMR - Verestoy Attila, Szabo Karoly Ferenc, Gyorgy Frunda, Marko Bela, Francisc Pecs, Tiberiu Toro



Trade Register units provided all the information requested, with the exception of the unit from Bacau County, regarding Prime-Minister Adrian Nastase, Minister of Tourism Dan Matei Agathon and the secretary of state from the Ministry of Public Works, Transports and Housing Sergiu Sechelariu, brother of the mayor of Bacau. The Chamber of Commerce of Botosani could not specify whether Prime-Minister Adrian Nastase is shareholders at a company in Botosani County or not.

(8) The former Minister of Transports, Traian Basescu, together with his wife, involved in at least 4 businesses; he had businesses, by his 2 personal companies, as administrator with full powers and associate, interfering with the area in which he had responsibilities as a minister - land, sea and air transport, maintenance, repairing and dismantling of ships and recovery of recyclable metallic waste and scraps; as a public dignitary he received credits for his businesses under preferential terms, amounting to hundreds of thousands of dollars, obtained by the Government from external sources for the development of small- and medium-sized businesses; he used the protocol villa -nationalized building assigned by the Government as personal housing - as an office for his companies.

- the former Minister of Defense, Victor Babiuc, with his wife - involved in at least 7 businesses; one of his companies received fiscal facilities for a debt of about 10 billion lei to the public budget; for another of his companies he obtained, from the public patrimony, under illegal terms, with a resolution of the Government he was a member of, a building for the headquarters

- the former Minister of Finance, Traian Decebal Remes obtained illegally offices for his wife's companies; he covered, as Minister of Finance, a tax evasion of approximately 13 billion lei for his relatives' companies, companies for which, before being a minister, he used to keep the accounting books for a while

- the current Minister of Industry Dan Ioan Popescu recently made an investment of 12 billion lei in his own businesses, an amount equivalent to his salary as a minister for more than 50 years

- the current Chairman of the Senate, Nicolae Vacaroiu - as a vice-chairman and, later, as chairman of the senate, was also manager of a bank with a capital of several billion lei (he abandoned this position following repeated criticisms from the press). The bank is owned by the controversial businessman Sorin Ovidiu Vantu and was established after he collected a few hundreds of billions lei from the National Investment Fund, shortly after its collapse. Currently, the Chairman of the Senate is a shareholder of this bank. The positions held by the Chairman of the Senate (and vice-president of the governing party) in this bank could be one of the explanations for the fact that PDSR is making, through its current Government, diligences to compensate the NIF victims that it did not make in other similar cases - "Caritas", SAFI etc.

- the current Minister of Development and Forecast, Gheorghe Romeo Leonard Cazan is an administrator in 3 companies; all 3 companies (two in Arges County and one in Dambovitza County, counties with a great lumbering potential) specialize in wood processing and trading

- the current Minister of Interior, Ioan Rus, was, during the period 1993-2000, the General Manager of the Transilvanian representative office of Mercedes-Benz, a capacity that was legally incompatible with that of the prefect, which he held concurrently

- the former secretary of state at the Ministry of Finance, Dan Radu Rusanu - sole associate, administrator and shareholder in 5 companies

- other cases: the secretary of state at the Ministry of Tourism Alin Burcea (has businesses in the area of this ministry), the former Minister of Justice Valeriu Stoica, the former secretary of state at the Minister of Justice Flavius Baias, the former secretary of state at the Ministry of Waters, Forests and Environment Protection Anton Vlad, the former advisors of president Emil Constantinescu - Iustin Tanase, Dan Capatana

- no responsibility was assigned to any of the dignitaries in connection with which inquiries were conducted; no measures were taken against any of the tens of dignitaries and high-ranking public officers involved in corruption scandals, none of them was removed from office and none of them resigned.