DANIEL MV CHITIC

THE THIRD REPUBLIC

a project for the refounding of Romania

VOLUME II

THE TEXTS AND THE PATH OF REFOUNDING

"The laws of a people, its rights,
can proceed from nothing but the people itself."

M. Eminescu, 1870

CONTENTS

PROLOGUE. The questions of one who still wishes to hope 9

THE FULL TEXTS OF THE DRAFT LAWS 13

SECTION 1 — The Sovereignty Constitution — draft revision of the Constitution of Romania 13

SECTION 2 — The Sovereignty Act (version 20) — full text 25

SECTION 3 — The Solidarity Act — the taxation of large businesses and fortunes 39

SECTION 4 — The Referendum Act (amending Act 3/2000 and Act 189/1999) 62

SECTION 5 — The Act on the reform and demilitarisation of the state security bodies 64

SECTION 6 — The George Act (medical malpractice) 68

SECTION 7 — The Green Romania Act 71

SECTION 8 — Amendment of the Criminal Code 71

SECTION 9 — The Electoral Act (Act 208/2015) 73

SECTION 10 — The Offshore Act (Act 256/2018) 75

THE EXPLANATORY MEMORANDA 81

SECTION 1 — Explanatory memorandum — The Sovereignty Constitution 81

SECTION 2 — Explanatory memorandum — The Sovereignty Act 210

SECTION 3 — Explanatory memorandum — The Solidarity Act 227

SECTION 4 — Explanatory memorandum — The Referendum Act 241

SECTION 5 — Explanatory memorandum — The George Act 244

THE SOURCES OF THE IDEA OF THE THIRD REPUBLIC 247

1. 20 January 2018 — "And yet... our securitate men deserve the largest budget per head of population in NATO!" 247

2. 6 March 2018 — On the offshore resources 247

3. 21 September 2019 — "#NouaLegeOffshore — #sabotage or merely #treason?" 250

4. 21 September 2019 — "Art. 20 is amended and shall read as follows:" 254

5. 21 September 2019 — "Art. 21 is amended and shall read as follows:" 255

6. 21 September 2019 — "Art. 25, paragraph (1), letter n) is amended and shall read as follows:" 255

7. 21 September 2019 — "ANNEX no. 2 is amended and shall read as follows:" 255

8. 25 January 2021 — "The involvement of the Romanian secret services in the judiciary, in politics, in the pre..." 261

9. 2 February 2021 — On the citizens' initiative 261

10. 6 February 2021 — On the revision of the draft 261

11. 25 January 2021 — "This law enters into force on the date of its publication in the Official Gazette, any provision..." 261

12. 2 February 2021 — "The introduction into the country of waste of any kind is prohibited, whether or not it ..." 264

13. 2 February 2021 — "The adoption by Emergency Ordinance of any measures in the field of regulation..." 265

14. 18 February 2021 — On the repeal of Act 55/2020 265

15. 2 February 2021 — "The act of Undermining the national economy is criminalised and shall read as follows..." 265

16. 25 January 2021 — “This law enters into force on the date of its publication in the Official Gazette, any provision...” 266

17. 2 March 2021 — “Romania’s gold reserve is held exclusively and in its entirety at the National Bank...” 270

18. 6 February 2021 — “The marketing on the territory of Romania of any products which are inferior...” 270

19. 6 February 2021 — “Article 19 of Act no. 202/1998 on the organisation of the Official Gazette of Romania, r...” 270

20. 6 February 2021 — “This law enters into force on the date of its publication in the Official Gazette, any provision...” 270

21. 5 March 2021 — “Our friend Adrian Toni Neacșu has come up with three articles of major importance for #LegeaSuve...” 275

22. 8 March 2021 — On the guarantees of sovereignty 277

23. 10 March 2021 — “And because #LegeaSuveranității must resolve the thorny problem of the compulsory character of va...” 279

24. 12 March 2021 — “A discussion about the protest of 20 March and about #LegeaSuveranității” 279

25. 7 April 2021 — “!!!! Communiqué of the High Court / Reaction to the decision of the Constitutional Court. Urgent appeal to Parliament” 280

26. 20 April 2021 — “After discussions with hundreds of people and consultations with dozens of specialists in law and also...” 281

27. 8 March 2021 — On sovereignism and globalism 284

28. 7 May 2021 — On the alienation of the national wealth 285

29. 14 May 2021 — On medical apartheid 285

30. 17 May 2021 — On the initiative committee 285

31. 20 April 2021 — “The National Guard is established on the principle of the defence of the entire national territory a...” 285

32. 20 April 2021 — “From the date of entry into force of this law, military equipment shall be acquired...” 285

33. 24 May 2021 — On the birth of the initiative 285

34. 5 June 2021 — “Luju.ro has produced an excellent synthesis and presentation of #LegeaSuveranității” 294

35. 7 June 2021 — “I am receiving signals from the volunteers of #ArmataSuveranității that some fellow citizens are reluctant...” 297

36. 7 June 2021 — “Today I found that I am the subject of a new form of censorship: my posts cannot be ...” 297

37. 8 June 2021 — “The Constitutional Court has rejected the objection concerning the unconstitutionality of Act 55/2020!” 298

38. 10 June 2021 — “Tomorrow, 11.06.2021, we shall be in Slatina and then in Craiova, where we shall give mandates to volunteers for ...” 298

39. 16 June 2021 — “The plunder of Romania’s last remaining wealth begins!” 298

40. 24 June 2021 — “#LegeaSuvetanității has been returned by the Legislative Council. Not rejected, not given a negative opinion...” 299

41. 29 June 2021 — On the disregard of the Court’s decisions 299

42. 30 June 2021 — “As you know, #LegeaSuveranității has been returned by the Legislative Council on the ground...” 299

43. 2 July 2021 — “What if the “Great Reset” is about “BioDigital Convergence” (BioNTech)?” 300

44. 4 July 2021 — “« We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endow...” 308

45. 7 July 2021 — “#LegeaSuveranității will have a new article” 308

46. 8 July 2021 — “Following requests from many supporters and partisans of #LegiiSuveranității, I propose for ...” 309

47. 13 July 2021 — “Gauleiter Iohannis is worried about the appearance of the “false sovereignists”” 310

48. 15 July 2021 — On political sovereignism 310

49. 3 August 2021 — “#LegeaSuveranității has been supplemented and is approaching its final version, which will be red...” 311

50. 6 August 2021 — “#LegeaSuveranității will have one more article” 312

51. 9 August 2021 — “Eight months have already passed since we began work on #LegeaSuveranității! We shall soon reach the stage...” 312

52. 9 August 2021 — “I have just learned that word is going round that I am being briefed in the USA... that any CIA agent, as the saying...” 314

53. 25 August 2021 — “I have no doubt. And he is not merely one of our ordinary securitate men: he has a double command, from...” 314

54. 26 August 2021 — “On #LegeaSuveranității, the formalities at the Constitutional Court and the Legislative Council, and on the effe...” 316

55. 27 August 2021 — On the publication of the draft 316

56. 28 August 2021 — “After the “Preamble” of the Act and the sub-chapter “Description of the present situation” of the Explanatory memor...” 319

57. 29 August 2021 — “We continue the presentation with Article 2 of #LegeaSuveranității” 320

58. 30 August 2021 — On article 3 of the Act 321

59. 31 August 2021 — “#LegeaSuveranității makes it impossible to administer compulsorily any type of medicinal product...” 322

60. 1 September 2021 — “#LegeaSuveranității prohibits the marketing or the use of medicines, vaccines, ...” 323

61. 2 September 2021 — “#LegeaSuveranității makes it impossible to change the sexual identity of children and prohibits...” 324

62. 3 September 2021 — “#LegeaSuveranității prohibits and punishes every possible form of intrusion at the level of ...” 325

63. 4 September 2021 — “#LegeaSuveranității, whose article-by-article presentation we continue today, prohibits ...” 326

64. 5 September 2021 — On a project for the country 327

65. 6 September 2021 — On the protection of the child 329

66. 6 September 2021 — “For some days the whole political chessboard, from the “right” to the “left”, has had the motion on its lips...” 330

67. 7 September 2021 — “#LegeaSuveranității amends art. 211 of the Criminal Code — “Trafficking in minors” — and brings within the scope ...” 331

68. 8 September 2021 — “#LegeaSuveranității amends article 221 of the Criminal Code, with the marginal heading “Sexual corrup...” 332

69. 9 September 2021 — “#LegeaSuveranității criminalises “the act of making available to children under the age of eigh...” 333

70. 13 September 2021 — “Today we continue our presentation of #LegeaSuveranității. Today we shall present the amendment ...” 334

71. 14 September 2021 — On the liability of the public servant 335

72. 14 September 2021 — “Arafat says that the draft Emergency Ordinance concerning the ANSU and “Arafat’s army” is an attack on...” 335

73. 15 September 2021 — “#LegeaSuveranității extends the scope of the offence of Treason to any act ...” 336

74. 15 September 2021 — “Arafat, the horseman of the Plandemic Apocalypse in Romania, officially announces to us the death of democ...” 337
75. 16 September 2021 — “#LegeaSuveranității received a FAVOURABLE OPINION from the Legislative Council on 15 Septe...” 338
76. 19 September 2021 — “Dragnea announces the founding of a new party: the Alliance for the Homeland” 338
77. 22 September 2021 — On treason and the undermining of the economy 338
78. 27 September 2021 — “We are in a state of #LEGITIMĂAPĂRARE in the face of a fascistoid regime!” 340
79. 28 September 2021 — “We are lied to, terrorised, humiliated, discriminated against and divided. All of us, the 70%, we who ...” 341
80. 28 September 2021 — “Today, 28.09.2021, the committees of the Chamber of Deputies which must issue the report on ...” 343
81. 28 September 2021 — “#LegeaSuveranității has been published in Official Gazette 925/28.IX. 2021 !!!” 343
82. 29 September 2021 — “Four effective remedies against the fascist virus” 344
83. 30 September 2021 — “Many of the misfortunes that strike Romanians are caused by the way in which, gradually,...” 344
84. 28 September 2021 — “1. For 5 days we shall buy the bare minimum. THE MINIMUM! We shall hold out and we shall make savings...” 345
85. 2 October 2021 — “On the authorities’ war against us: “#NuLuămPrizonieri”” 346
86. 2 October 2021 — “#PentruNoi, #PentruCopiiiNoștri and #PentruLibertate!” 348
87. 10 October 2021 — On censorship and freedom 348
88. 16 October 2021 — “I have been unblocked by the “trainers of truth”. Twenty-four days early” 352
89. 17 October 2021 — “You can support and sign for #LegeaSuveranității at Taverna Lions in Snagov, Str Floril...” 352
90. 18 October 2021 — “The people are always right! Even if they were mistaken in the choice made... they would still be right ...” 353
91. 19 October 2021 — “The network of Romanian traders who support #LegeaSuveranității is growing! Honour to them!” 353
92. 19 October 2021 — “One of those courageous Romanian entrepreneurs who support the popular legislative initiative...” 354
93. 20 October 2021 — “Support and sign #LegeaSuveranității!” 354
94. 20 October 2021 — “Support and sign #LegeaSuveranității!” 355
95. 29 December 2021 — On the national antibodies 355
96. 20 October 2021 — “Support and sign #LegeaSuveranității!” 357
97. 15 January 2022 — On a day of sovereignty 358
98. 20 October 2021 — “Support and sign #LegeaSuveranității!” 360
99. 1 February 2022 — “68.4% of Romanians want a sovereign Romania!” 361
100. 1 February 2022 — “DOMESTIC VIOLENCE WITHIN MARRIAGES OF CONVENIENCE” 361
101. 20 February 2022 — On six months of struggle 362
102. 27 February 2022 — On signatures and Parliament 363
103. 28 February 2022 — On the registration of the draft 365
104. 1 March 2022 — “It seems I have caused serious offence with #LegeaSuveranității. That is what I shall pay for!” 365
105. 2 March 2022 — “In Parliament, battles harder than those in Kyiv are being fought to have #LegeaSuvera... withdrawn” 366

106. 2 March 2022 — “WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE ONLY DIGNIFIED ROMANIANS IN THE PSD — Dumitru Coarna, Daniel Ghiță, Cionoiu Nicușo...” 367

107. 2 March 2022 — “#LegeaSuveranității is PL-x 79/2022 (and not 83/2022, as we were initially told)!” 367

108. 3 March 2022 — “Yesterday, once the Sovereignty Act had been registered in Parliament under no. Pl-x 79/2022, we managed...” 368

109. 7 March 2022 — “From today you can ask Romanian members of parliament to adopt #LegeaSuveranității by going to ...” 369

110. 17 March 2022 — “Sovereignty, that ambivalent notion!” 369

111. 27 March 2022 — “If the plandemic propaganda has contaminated almost 100% of the world’s media, the propaganda of wa...” 370

112. 29 March 2022 — On the antidote to treason 370

113. 1 April 2022 — “The securitate man Ciolacu demands the expulsion of deputy Dumitru Coarna from ...” 373

114. 5 April 2022 — “Today #LegeaSuveranitătii was rejected in the Labour Committee of the Chamber of Deputies!” 373

115. 6 April 2022 — “The “civilians” of the Economic and Social Committee (CES) have also given a negative opinion on #LegeaSuv...” 373

116. 9 May 2022 — “I thank the friends of the Romanian people who have supported it openly and publicly from the rostrum ...” 374

117. 9 May 2022 — “Tomorrow at 11.00 #LegeaSuveranității will be voted on!” 374

118. 9 May 2022 — “Tomorrow we shall know the names and the exact number of the deputies who will have to be replaced at the next...” 375

119. 11 May 2022 — “Not a day without treason from the PSD-PNL-UDMR-USR Coalition of Treason” 375

120. 11 May 2022 — “The propaganda continues to say that Romania will receive 60% of the gas extracted...” 375

121. 11 May 2022 — “#LegeaOffShore has been amended in the Senate!” 376

122. 11 May 2022 — “«The lawyer Dan MV Chitic is banned from the Palace of Parliament», the statement of an official...” 376

123. 12 May 2022 — “Citizen Dan Chitic is persona non grata in the House of the PEOPLE” 377

124. 12 May 2022 — “Ciolacu: “It is possible that the PSD will stand together with the PNL at the 2024 elections if the nati...” 377

125. 17 May 2022 — “Our amendments to #LegeaOffshore provide for a tax on the supplementary revenues of the...” 377

126. 17 May 2022 — “The Industry and Budget-Finance committees of the Chamber of Deputies have rejected all the amendm...” 378

127. 18 May 2022 — “Here is the recording of the sitting of the Chamber of Deputies in which one of the ...was committed” 378

128. 20 May 2022 — On the country of the services 378

129. 23 May 2022 — “More and more often, the representatives of the System, from Gauleiter Iohannis to the heads of ...” 381

130. 25 May 2022 — On the end of globalisation 381

131. 30 May 2022 — “Today the senators too sit the examination of #LegeaSuveranității” 383

132. 1 June 2022 — On the laws of the Securitate 384

133. 14 June 2022 — “Turkey can manage without Exxon and without American or European corporations.” 386

134. 15 June 2022 — “Because the Securitate has been in everything and everywhere for 30 years now!” 386

135. 18 June 2022 — “Together with my friend Iulian Capsali” 388

136. 27 June 2022 — “On the necessity of over-taxing the profiteers of the energy crisis” 388

137. 29 June 2022 — “On the NECESSITY OF TAXING LARGE FORTUNES AND BUSINESSES” 389

138. 29 June 2022 — “29.06.2022, a black day: the Romanian citizen has received a heavy blow from the senators ...” 390

139. 29 June 2022 — “The sound was cut off after a few minutes.” 391

140. 30 June 2022 — “The #CoaliţiaTrădării PSD-PNL-UDMR-USR PLACES HEAVIER LEVIES ON THE SHOULDERS OF THE CITIZEN!” 391

141. 17 July 2022 — “The press is waking up and saying what I have been saying for months: #LegeaOffshore is an act of treason.” 392

142. 18 July 2022 — “1. To finalise #LegeaSolidarităţii, the draft amendment of the Fiscal Code for #Impo...” 393

143. 19 July 2022 — “I promised you a draft Act for the Taxation of Large Fortunes and Businesses” 393

144. 3 August 2022 — “And on Stupidity as the trigger of Disaster” 394

145. 10 August 2022 — “The wait is over: the Coalition is here!” 396

146. 13 August 2022 — On the men of the system 397

147. 17 September 2022 — On honour and consistency 398

148. 30 September 2022 — “The other day Rareș Bogdan appeared and told us how the gas from the Black Sea extracted by Blax...” 400

149. 5 October 2022 — On the speech of the director of the SRI 401

150. 17 October 2022 — On the rejection of the Sovereignty Act 403

151. 24 October 2022 — “Awaiting the NATO attack on the Russian troops in Ukraine launched from Romania, the fac...” 404

152. 3 November 2022 — “Ciolacu announces the taxation of big capital” 405

153. 4 November 2022 — “While the population of Romania grows poorer and is tormented by shortages, cold and inflation...” 405

154. 5 November 2022 — On the taxation of large fortunes 406

155. 14 November 2022 — “The other day the people at Hotnews took an interview with me” 407

156. 19 December 2022 — On the need for a new Constitution 408

157. 20 December 2022 — On the accusations levelled at the author 411

158. 20 December 2022 — “Because Parliament will have to decide what troops will be on the territory of Romania before ...” 414

159. 21 December 2022 — “Even the discussions around the #ConstituţiaSuveranităţii project badly frighten the #System...” 414

160. 22 December 2022 — On ROexit and the referendum 416

161. 23 December 2022 — “#ConstituţiaSuveranităţii needs your involvement!” 418

162. 29 December 2022 — “The year that begins in a few days will be a turning point, for after 2 years of pandemic ...” 419

163. 30 December 2022 — “Two days ago a piece of news of capital importance appeared, which all too few have unders...” 421

164. 4 January 2023 — “The #CoaliţiaTrădării PSD-PNL-UDMR-USR is destroying the middle class, the engine of the national economy:...” 422

165. 9 January 2023 — “«Paragraph (2) of article 19 is repealed.»” 424

166. 17 October 2022 — “«(2) No one may be subjected to torture or to any kind of punishment or inhuman treat...»” 426

167. 11 January 2023 — On political quarantine 427

168. 13 January 2023 — “The Chambers of Parliament, in joint sitting, «l) Appoint the Prosecutor General of the Prosecutor’s Offi...»” 429

169. 14 January 2023 — On the President of the System 430

170. 16 January 2023 — On the referendum and the elections 433

171. 17 January 2023 — “The largest project for the #RevizuireaConstituției initiated by civil society! The largest...” 434

172. 18 January 2023 — “You have forgotten that between 15 May 2020 and 9 March 2022, until less than a year ago...” 435

173. 19 January 2023 — “Yesterday’s scandal over the draft Ordinance regulating the identity Card...” 437

174. 20 January 2023 — On decarbonisation and the tax on the sun 438

175. 21 January 2023 — “Post scriptum: “chance” had it that precisely on that date — 10.12.2022, on that very day, exactly...” 440

176. 23 January 2023 — On the false defence of the Constitution 440

177. 24 January 2023 — “Many happy returns and every happiness!” 442

178. 26 January 2023 — On four anti-securitate measures 443

179. 27 January 2023 — On the foreign troops 446

180. 28 January 2023 — On one more attempt 448

181. 30 January 2023 — “I learned today that I have been included on another “black list” of “people and vehicles of the propaga...” 451

182. 30 January 2023 — “But only when they become victims in the battles between the securitate clans.” 451

183. 1 February 2023 — On the strengthening of Parliament 453

184. 3 February 2023 — “On the thievery of the multinationals and on the need for taxes, for solidarity and... for plagia...” 455

185. 8 February 2023 — “Today, from 18.00, we meet at the Café for the Nation in Bucharest, Str Petru Cercel NR...” 457

186. 11 February 2023 — “ATTENTION: ATTEMPT TO UNDERMINE DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS IN ROMANIA — Dic...” 458

187. 16 February 2023 — “Two days ago Diana Șoșoacă tabled in the Senate a piece of the project called #LegeaSolidarității...” 459

188. 17 February 2023 — “Today, 17.02.2023, Diana Șoșoacă tabled a second segment of #LegeaSolidarității written...” 460

189. 22 February 2023 — “On the need for normality. The protest against the works on the Bystroye Canal at ...” 461

190. 3 March 2023 — “On Monday, 6 March 2023, we meet from 14.00 in front of the Embassy of Ukraine to say clearly and...” 462

191. 11 March 2023 — “In the MSM they are beginning to speak of the large fortunes of certain top System men” 463

192. 14 March 2023 — “At the “House of the People”... come to make the last small adjustments to #LegeaSolidarității (Le...” 463

193. 14 March 2023 — “The System kills, the System destroys destinies, the System undermines the national economy, the System...” 464

194. 21 March 2023 — On moribund globalisation 465

195. 27 March 2023 — “Twenty-five years together #PentruNațiune. Together We Stand for the Nation!” 467

196. 12 April 2023 — On the lists of disinformers 468

197. 18 April 2023 — “Their latest work: PLX 145/2023, a draft law which compels the globalisation of education ...” 470

198. 9 June 2023 — “Sometimes, the fact that you do or have done what is or was right matters more than the result...” 470

199. 13 July 2023 — “Plagiarising the #LegeaSolidarității proposed by CpN: he wants to tax the multinationals and the large...” 471

200. 26 September 2023 — “Ciolacu goes to Parliament to assume responsibility for the amendment of the Fiscal Code” 471
201. 12 October 2023 — On revision and partial referendums 472
202. 26 November 2023 — “«The sovereignists want to launch the white swan into the coming electoral pond»” 473
203. 29 December 2022 — “The year that begins in a few days will be a turning point, for after 2 years of pandemic ...” 473
204. 28 January 2024 — “The steamroller of sexo-Marxism has reached the Balkans too. Greece is the first victim. Romania follows,...” 475
205. 2 February 2024 — “By way of conclusion after the launch of the “Constitution of AUR”” 476
206. 2 February 2024 — “Disinformation in prime time on Antena 3!!!” 477
207. 11 March 2024 — “We are beginning the legal procedure for the popular legislative initiatives the Constitution of Sovereignty...” 477
208. 13 March 2024 — “Today, 13.03.2024, pursuant to Act 189/1999, there were submitted to the Legislative Council for an opin...” 478
209. 13 March 2024 — “After a sitting of more than 4 hours, until close to midnight” 478
210. 12 June 2024 — On the Third Republic 479
211. 25 June 2024 — On the integrity of the person 484
212. 28 June 2024 — “Twelve days ago we launched the signature-gathering campaign for #ConstituțiaSuveranității” 484
213. 22 July 2024 — On the composition of the Superior Council of Magistracy 484
214. 26 July 2024 — On the liability of magistrates 486
215. 10 August 2024 — On changing the system 488
216. 18 August 2024 — On the Bulgarian example 489
217. 26 August 2024 — “As I promised you the other day, before entering the break in my involvement in civic life...” 491
218. 17 September 2024 — “Many said that the mass killing of the sheep of Romania was a deliberate act, unjustified...” 492
219. 10 October 2024 — On the failure of the revision 494
220. 1 November 2024 — “#LegeaGeorge, the law I announced in the summer and which I named with the name of my friend...” 495
221. 3 January 2025 — “The change we are all waiting for can only be brought about by a change of system,...” 498
222. 4 January 2025 — “We are in the midst of the personal dictatorship of the usurper Klaus Werner Iohannis, who at this m...” 499
223. 8 February 2025 — “Călin Georgescu spoke today about the turnover tax on the multinationals (in ...” 500
224. 5 March 2025 — “Trump: “I WANT PEACE!” and “The Revolution of Common Sense cannot be stopped!” — the message of normal...” 508
225. 20 May 2025 — On Us and Them 509
226. 25 June 2025 — “Today Dumitru Coarnă tabled in Parliament “THE ACT OF NATIONAL SOLIDARITY — THE ACT ON THE TAXA...” 511
227. 27 June 2025 — “#LegeaSolidarităţiiNaţionale, the Act on the taxation of large fortunes and businesses, can bring at le...” 516
228. 27 June 2025 — “I asked chat GPT what the budgetary impact of #LegeaSolidarităţiiNaţionale would be” 517
229. 11 October 2025 — On the magical society 519

PROLOGUE. The questions of one who still wishes to hope

Twenty-one questions from the signature tables and from the end of Volume I — with the answer under each and links to the documents that support it.

1. Isn't it simpler to change the people than the Constitution?

We have changed the people nine times. Each time, within six months, the new people used the same emergency ordinances, the same appointments, the same services as the old ones — because the rules reward precisely that behaviour. When you change the players nine times and the game stays the same, the problem is the rulebook. (Volume I)

The answer, in the documents: The Sovereignty Constitution

2. Who will write these laws? The same people?

The laws are already written — that is the difference from any political promise you have heard. The Sovereignty Constitution, the Sovereignty Act, Solidarity, the referendum, demilitarisation, the George Act, Green Romania, the criminal-electoral package: complete texts, with explanatory memoranda, published, some of them passed through the Legislative Council and the Official Gazette. You are not asked to believe; you are asked to read. (Volume I)

The answer, in the documents: The Sovereignty Constitution The refounding laws

3. If the threshold drops to 1%, won't Parliament fill with splinter parties and chaos?

The Netherlands has worked without a threshold for a century; Denmark with 2%. Chaos does not come from small parties in parliament, but from millions of people left without representation, who end up voting out of despair for anything at all. Broad representation brings conflict into the institutions — where it belongs — instead of leaving it in the street. (Volume I)

The answer, in the documents: The Constitution — the 1% threshold The Electoral Act

4. Won't recall be used by parties to hunt down their opponents?

Convening it requires thousands of signatures from the member's own constituency, not a party decision; the final say belongs to his own voters, at the ballot box; and it cannot be done in the last six months of the mandate. An elected representative who does his job has nothing to fear from his own voters — and if he does, that is precisely the problem we are solving. (Volume I)

The answer, in the documents: The Constitution — recall of elected officials

5. 6% for education and 9% for health — where is the money to come from?

From exactly the sources the package opens simultaneously: taxation of large turnovers (upheld by the CJEU for our neighbours), the tax on large fortunes (as in Spain, Norway, Switzerland), royalties brought up to the European level, offshore recalibrated, collection improved through transparency. Romania today collects some 13 percentage points of GDP below the European average — the refounding collects the European way in order to fund the European way. (Volume I)

The answer, in the documents: The Solidarity Act the reasons

6. Won't taxes on large fortunes drive capital away?

The states that levy such taxes — Spain, Norway, Switzerland — have not lost their investors. Capital leaves where the rules are unpredictable and justice is uncertain, not where the tax is known in advance and written into the law. And the thresholds proposed touch only fortunes above ten million euro: not the entrepreneur, but the oligarch. (Volume I)

The answer, in the documents: The Solidarity Act the reasons

7. Demilitarising the services in the middle of a war? Are you out of your minds?

Germany demilitarised its services precisely because of what militarised services had done to it; the BND and the BfV are civilian bodies, and the separation from criminal investigation (Trennungsgebot) is a lesson drawn from history. A country is not defended by services immune to control, but by an army — and by services that answer to the law. Nothing in the draft touches the army. (Volume I)

The answer, in the documents: The Demilitarisation Act the reasons

8. Won't a presumption of malpractice make doctors flee Romania?

The reversal of the burden of proof in cases of grave error is German law, § 630h of the Civil Code, and no doctor has fled Germany because of it. What drives doctors away is a system that leaves them without equipment, without staff and without protection — not a rule that protects the injured patient. (Volume I)

The answer, in the documents: The George Act the reasons

9. Doesn't banning the export of timber breach EU law?

The ban concerns unprocessed timber and is founded on the protection of the environment and of a national resource — grounds recognised by the treaties themselves. Other member states protect their strategic resources by comparable means. What we are proposing is not to leave the market, but to stop leaving the forest. (Volume I)

The answer, in the documents: The Green Romania Act

10. A referendum for every treaty — won't that block the country's functioning in the EU?

Ireland holds a mandatory referendum on every EU treaty amendment affecting its Constitution; Denmark requires five sixths of the Folketing or a referendum for any delegation of sovereignty. Neither has been expelled from Europe. What is blocked is not the country's functioning, but the transfer of powers without the people ever being asked. (Volume I)

The answer, in the documents: The Constitution — arts. 148–149 the reasons

11. Why should I believe the referendum will still count, after 2009 and 2018?

Because the draft makes the referendum binding and gives failure to enforce it a name and a penalty. Today, a referendum can be ignored at no cost; that is exactly what the text removes. A right without a sanction is a wish; with a sanction, it becomes a rule. (Volume I)

The answer, in the documents: The Referendum Act the reasons

12. And if it fails? If we gather the signatures and they bury us again?

Then it will have been documented, with the papers on the table, who buried it and how — and that, too, is a gain. But the signature campaign of the Sovereignty Act taught us the arithmetic: the energy exists at the scale of hundreds of thousands; it has merely been steered towards spectacle instead of procedure. (Volume I)

The answer, in the documents: The Referendum Act

Nine questions from the end of Volume I

13. Is this project not a disguised exit from the European Union and from NATO?

No. Not a single article proposes leaving any alliance — on the contrary, the new article 149 requires a referendum for any withdrawal, which makes leaving harder than it is today. What changes is something else: the reservation of constitutional identity, already practised by Germany, France, Italy and Denmark. Read the text and you will see for yourself.

The answer, in the documents: The Constitution — arts. 148–149 Memorandum, section 1

14. Where is the money for 6% education and 9% health?

From precisely the sources set out by the Solidarity Act: the tax on the turnover of large contributors, the tax on large fortunes, offshore taxation recalibrated. Not borrowing, not deficit — money that today leaves the country before it is taxed.

The answer, in the documents: The Solidarity Act Memorandum, section 3

15. Won’t these taxes drive investors away?

The Court of Justice of the European Union has held that differentiation by turnover is a neutral criterion, and that fiscal progressivity falls within the fiscal sovereignty of the member state. Investors leave unpredictability, not taxation written in the law.

The answer, in the documents: The Solidarity Act Memorandum, section 3

16. How can a state function without emergency ordinances?

As every other European state functions. The draft does not abolish the emergency ordinance; it disciplines it: entry into force only after being laid before Parliament, a certain time limit, and the lapse of effects if the time limit is missed. Spain validates its decree-law within thirty days and forbids whole fields to it. Government by ordinance is not a necessity — it is a habit.

The answer, in the documents: The Constitution — art. 115 Memorandum, section 1

17. Doesn’t demilitarising the services weaken us against real dangers?

The danger is not diminished by the uniform, but by competence and by control. Services that answer to no one are not stronger — they are merely unaccountable; and an unaccountable service

ends up serving itself. Civilian status, parliamentary control and separation from criminal investigation are the European rule, not an exception.

The answer, in the documents: The Demilitarisation Act Memorandum, section 2

18. Why a presumption of malpractice? Won't we end up with no doctors at all?

Because today the injured patient must prove, at his own expense and over years, what only the hospital knows. The reversal applies in cases of grave error and is the German solution; the aim is not to punish the doctor, but to end the labyrinth built to discourage the victim.

The answer, in the documents: The George Act Memorandum, section 5

19. Doesn't the ban on timber exports put us in conflict with European law?

Protecting a natural resource and the environment is a ground recognised by the treaties, and the measure applies to unprocessed timber. The conflict is not with European law, but with the interest of those who have been buying our forest by the lorry-load.

The answer, in the documents: The Green Romania Act Memorandum, section 2

20. Who guarantees that the new Constitution will not be broken like the present one?

Nobody guarantees it — but the draft does what the present one omitted: it attaches a penalty to breach. Failure to enforce the decisions of the Constitutional Court, application of provisions declared unconstitutional, and the restriction of rights by administrative act all become offences. A constitution is not defended by good intentions, but by consequences.

The answer, in the documents: The Constitution — the penalties The Criminal Code Memorandum, section 1

21. Very well, but how do I know that all this is not just words?

Because it is on this site, in full: the texts, the memoranda, the official gazettes in which they were published, and the chronology of the notes from which the idea was born, with archive addresses for every step. You are not asked to trust — you are asked to check.

The answer, in the documents: The Sovereignty Act The Sovereignty Constitution The explanatory memoranda

THE FULL TEXTS OF THE DRAFT LAWS

SECTION 1 — The Sovereignty Constitution — draft revision of the Constitution of Romania

The explanatory memorandum: Explanatory memorandum — The Sovereignty Constitution

Full translation of the draft. The Romanian text remains the authoritative one. The three passages marked with an asterisk carry a note explaining the drafting correction made in the sense of the Legislative Council's Opinion no. 364/2024.

THE THIRD REPUBLIC

"The Sovereignty Constitution" — draft revision of the

Constitution of Romania

SOLE ARTICLE → the reasons

The Constitution of Romania of 21 November 1991, republished in the Official Gazette of Romania, Part I, no. 767 of 31 October 2003, is amended and supplemented as follows:

In article 1, paragraphs (4) and (5) are amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"(4) The State is organised according to the principles of the separation, balance and loyal cooperation of the three equal powers — legislative, executive and judicial — within constitutional democracy. The legislative power is represented by Parliament, the executive power by the Government and the other specialised bodies of central public administration, and the judicial power by the High Court of Cassation and Justice and the other courts of law."

"(5) In Romania, observance of the Constitution and of its supremacy, of the laws, and likewise observance of judicial decisions and of the decisions of the Constitutional Court, is mandatory."

In article 19, paragraph (2) is repealed. → the reasons

In article 21, paragraph (3) is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"(3) The parties shall have the right to a fair trial and to the settlement of their cases within a reasonable, optimal and foreseeable time, by an independent and impartial tribunal established by law."

In article 22, paragraph (2) is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"(2) No one may be subjected to torture or to any kind of inhuman, degrading or experimental punishment or treatment."

In article 22, after paragraph (3), paragraphs (4), (5) and (6) are inserted, reading as follows: → the reasons

"(4) The biological sexual identity of the child, acquired at birth, may not be altered before the age of 18.

(5) The right of the person to self-determination and to develop freely according to his own free will, with due regard to his status as a responsible person, as attributes of human dignity, are inalienable human rights and are guaranteed and protected by the Romanian State.

(6) No authority, institution or individual may, by any technological mechanism, increase, diminish, disturb or alter the individual physical or mental integrity of a person without that person's written, express, informed and freely expressed consent or, in the case of a person under judicial interdiction or of a patient unable to express his will, without the written, express, informed and freely expressed consent of the legal representative."

In article 23, paragraph (4) is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"(4) Exceptionally and on reasoned grounds, investigation and trial in criminal proceedings shall take place with the person deprived of liberty. Pre-trial detention shall be ordered by the judge of the court competent to try the merits of the case, under the conditions of the law, only if strictly necessary for the proper conduct of the criminal proceedings and only in the course of those proceedings, after the criminal action has been set in motion."

In article 23, after paragraph (13), paragraphs (14) and (15) are added, reading as follows: → the reasons

"(14) No Romanian citizen may be placed under surveillance or monitored, nor may his conversations or communications be intercepted, without the prior authorisation of a judge given in accordance with the law, and such measures shall be carried out solely by the criminal investigation bodies. The use in proceedings of documents and recordings obtained in breach of the legal rules governing them, or produced by bodies other than the criminal investigation bodies, is prohibited.

(15) In no situation and on no ground may the existence of a collective right be invoked in order to limit individual liberty."

In article 24, after paragraph (2), paragraphs (3) to (5) are added, reading as follows: → the reasons

"(3) The right of defence may be exercised directly or through chosen counsel, without any possibility of making access to the documents of a case pending before the prosecution services or the courts conditional upon holding an authorisation or certificate issued by any public authority.

(4) It is prohibited for the criminal investigation bodies, for any court, or for any authority or institution to use classified documents or information to which a person or his chosen counsel has no access without prior authorisation, where by or on the basis of such documents any right of that person is restricted or any legitimate interest of his is affected."

(5) Throughout the criminal proceedings, the principle of equality of arms between the prosecution and the defence is guaranteed at the highest level."

In article 27, paragraph (3) is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"(3) A search shall be ordered by the judge of the court competent to try the merits of the case and shall be carried out under the conditions and in the forms provided by law, and solely for the purpose and within the limits set out in the search warrant. The information and goods sought shall be expressly identified in the search warrant, which shall be issued only on reasoned grounds and

only if the search is absolutely necessary for the discovery of the offences under investigation at the date on which authorisation is requested."

In article 28, after paragraph (1), three new paragraphs, (2), (3) and (4), are inserted as follows: → the reasons

"(2) The public authorities shall guarantee the secrecy of correspondence.

(3) The interception and recording of conversations or communications carried out by telephone or by any other electronic means of communication, ambient recording, location or tracking by GPS or by other electronic means of surveillance, the recording of images, obtaining the list of telephone calls or other similar techniques provided by law shall be ordered by the judge of rights and liberties of the court having material jurisdiction to try the merits of the case, only on well-founded grounds, if such measures are absolutely necessary in order to prove the offence in respect of which there is reasonable suspicion, and shall be carried out solely by the criminal investigation bodies."

(4) Where there is particular urgency in taking one of the measures provided for in paragraph (2), the prosecutor may, provisionally, order by ordinance, in compliance with the conditions laid down by law, that the measure be taken for a period of no more than 48 hours. Immediately after the measure has been taken, the prosecutor shall apply to the competent court, which shall rule on the measure ordered by the prosecutor and, if so requested, on its continuation. If the measure ordered by the prosecutor is set aside, the court shall order, where appropriate, the destruction of the evidence obtained, carried out by the prosecutor on the basis of a written record filed with the court."

In article 32, after paragraph (7), paragraph (8) is added, reading as follows: → the reasons

"(8) For the funding of national education, a minimum of 6% of the gross domestic product of the year concerned shall be allocated annually from the State budget and from the budgets of the local public authorities. In addition, educational units and institutions may obtain and use their own revenue autonomously."

In article 34, after paragraph (3), paragraphs (4) and (5) are added, reading as follows: → the reasons

"(4) No one may be subjected against his will to any prophylactic or medical treatment, nor to the removal or transplantation of organs. Medical treatments are possible only with written, complete and honestly informed consent.

(5) For the funding of national health care, a minimum of 9% of the gross domestic product of the year concerned shall be allocated annually from the State budget and from the budgets of the local public authorities. In addition, health units and institutions may obtain and use their own revenue autonomously."

In article 37, after paragraph (2), paragraph (3) is added, reading as follows: → the reasons

"(3) The right to stand for election of Romanian citizens who meet the conditions laid down in the preceding paragraphs may not be restricted otherwise than by a final criminal judgment."

In article 40, paragraph (3) is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"(3) The following may not belong to political parties: the judges of the Constitutional Court, the Ombudsman, national judges and prosecutors and staff assimilated to them, European magistrates, active members of the armed forces and of the intelligence services, police officers and other categories of public servants established by organic law. These professional categories may not belong to political parties and may not hold appointed or elected public office for a period of 5 years after ceasing to exercise those functions."

In article 44, after paragraph (9), paragraph (10) is added, reading as follows: → the reasons

"(10) The Romanian citizen has the right to keep, use and dispose of his property freely and unconditionally, according to his own will. The obtaining, holding and use of any currency in cash may not be limited or made conditional."

In article 48, paragraphs (1) and (2) are amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"(1) The family is founded on the freely consented marriage between two human beings of opposite sex whose sexual identity acquired at birth is unchanged, on their equality, and on the right and duty of the parents to ensure the upbringing, education and instruction of their children.

(2) The conditions for concluding, dissolving, terminating and annulling a marriage shall be established by law. The religious union between a man and a woman produces no legal effects and may be celebrated even without a civil marriage having been concluded."

Article 52 is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"(1) A person injured in one of his rights or in a legitimate interest by a public authority, by a judicial body or by a court, through an administrative act, through the failure to settle a request within the legal time limit, through acts of the prosecutor or through judicial decisions, is entitled to obtain recognition of the right or legitimate interest claimed, the annulment of the act or of the judicial decision, and compensation for the damage.

(2) The conditions and limits for the exercise of this right shall be established by organic law.

(3) The State bears patrimonial liability for damage caused by judicial errors. The liability of the State is established under the conditions of the law and does not remove the liability of magistrates who have exercised their office in bad faith or with gross negligence.

(4) The liability of magistrates for exercising their office in bad faith or with gross negligence shall be established by organic law, which must include the civil, disciplinary and criminal liability of the magistrate who caused the injury to the right or legitimate interest.

(5) The rights and liability of judges and prosecutors as they stand at the date of their admission to office may not be diminished by law subsequent to their appointment by decree of the President."

In article 62, paragraph (2) is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"(2) There shall be represented in the Parliament of Romania those citizens who have voted for a party which obtained at least 1% of the votes of the population, and independent members of parliament who obtained at least 73,000 votes for the Chamber of Deputies and 168,000 votes for the Senate. Signatures in support of the candidacies of political parties and of independent candidates may also be collected online, citizens being able to sign with any form of digital signature recognised by law."

In article 65, after letter k) of paragraph (2), a new letter l) is added, reading as follows: → the reasons

"l) It designates the Prosecutor General of the Prosecutor's Office attached to the High Court of Cassation and Justice and the Chief Prosecutors of the National Anticorruption Directorate and of the Directorate for Investigating Organised Crime and Terrorism."

In article 70, after paragraph (2), paragraph (3) is inserted, reading as follows: → the reasons

"(3) The office of deputy or senator also ceases where the holder is removed from office by a local referendum convened in the electoral constituency in which he was elected by 7,300 citizens in the case of a deputy, and by 16,800 citizens in the case of a senator. The signatures for convening the referendum may also be collected online, citizens being able to sign with any form of digital signature recognised by law. A referendum for the removal of a member of parliament may not be held in the last 6 months of the mandate. The member of parliament is removed if half plus one of those taking part in the referendum vote in favour of removal, irrespective of the participation quorum. After the Constitutional Court has established that the mandate has ceased, the vacant seat shall be filled, until the next elections, by the next candidate elected in the constituency concerned at the last elections."

In article 72, paragraph (3) is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"(3) In the case of a flagrant offence, deputies or senators may be detained and searched. The Minister of Justice shall inform the President of the Chamber without delay of the detention and of the search."

In article 74, paragraph (1) is amended and shall be worded as follows: → the reasons

"(1) Legislative initiative belongs, as the case may be, to the Government, to deputies, to senators or to at least 30,000 citizens entitled to vote. The signatures in support of citizens' legislative initiatives may also be collected online, citizens being able to sign with any form of digital signature recognised by law."

In article 75, paragraph (2) is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"(2) The first Chamber notified shall decide within 45 days. For codes and other laws of particular complexity the time limit is 60 days. Where these time limits are exceeded, the bills or legislative proposals shall be deemed rejected."

In article 82, paragraph (1) is amended and shall be worded as follows: → the reasons

"(1) The result of the elections for the office of President of Romania shall be validated by the High Court of Cassation and Justice."

Article 83 is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"(1) The mandate of the President of Romania is 4 years and is exercised from the date of the oath, which shall take place in the same calendar year as the election of Parliament.

(2) The President of Romania shall exercise his mandate until the newly elected President takes the oath, without that mandate exceeding 4 calendar years.

(3) The mandate of the President of Romania may not be extended for any reason. After the end of the President's mandate, in the event of war, disaster or impossibility of holding presidential elections, the office of interim President shall be exercised, in order, by the President of the Senate or by the President of the Chamber of Deputies, for a period of no more than 12 months, within which the new President of Romania must be elected."

In article 90, after paragraph (1), paragraphs (2) and (3) are added, reading as follows: → the reasons

"(2) No referendum of any kind may be held simultaneously with elections, whatever their nature.

(3) Consultative referendums may not be initiated on matters for which the Constitution excludes citizens' initiative or which involve procedures concluded by mandatory referendums."

In article 94, letter b) is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"b) confers the ranks of marshal, general and admiral only with the conforming opinion of the specialised committees of Parliament."

In article 97, paragraph (2) is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"(2) The President may be removed from office by a referendum convened by at least 100,000 citizens entitled to vote, who must come from at least one quarter of the counties of the country. The signatures for convening the referendum may also be collected online, citizens being able to sign with any form of digital signature recognised by law. A referendum for the removal of the President may not be held in the last 6 months of the mandate. The President is removed if half plus one of those taking part in the referendum vote in favour of removal, irrespective of the participation quorum."

In article 103, paragraph (1) is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"The President of Romania shall propose for the approval of Parliament the candidate designated for the office of Prime Minister by the party or alliance of parties holding the majority in Parliament. Should that candidate fail to obtain Parliament's vote of confidence, the President shall designate another candidate after consulting the parties represented in Parliament."

In article 108, paragraphs (2) and (3) are amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"(2) Decisions shall be issued for the organisation of the execution of laws. Government decisions may not amend or add to the content of the primary norm which orders their issuance.

(3) Ordinances shall be issued on the basis of a special enabling law, within the limits and under the conditions laid down therein, and may regulate exclusively in the field reserved to ordinary laws."

In article 115, paragraphs (3), (5) and (6) are amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"(3) Ordinances shall be submitted for the approval of Parliament, in accordance with the legislative procedure, before the expiry of the enabling period. Failure to observe the time limit entails the cessation of the effects of the ordinance. (…)

(5) An emergency ordinance shall enter into force only after being laid before the Chamber competent to be notified for debate under the emergency procedure, and after its publication in the Official Gazette of Romania. If the Chambers are not in session, they shall be convened compulsorily within 5

days of the laying or, as the case may be, of the transmission. The Chamber notified shall rule as a matter of urgency on the ordinance, within no more than 30 days of the laying, the ordinance being transmitted to the other Chamber, which shall likewise decide under the emergency procedure. An emergency ordinance containing norms of the nature of an organic law shall be approved by the majority provided for in article 76 paragraph (1). Failure to observe the time limit entails the cessation of the effects of the emergency ordinance. If, within no more than 90 days of adoption by the first Chamber notified, the decision-making Chamber has not ruled on the emergency ordinance, it shall be deemed rejected. *

(6) Emergency ordinances may not be adopted in the field of constitutional laws, may not affect the regime of the fundamental institutions of the State, the rights, liberties and duties provided for by the Constitution, or electoral rights, and may not concern measures for the forced transfer of goods into public property, nor for the abolition, alienation or concession of goods in public property."

In article 116, after paragraph (2), a new paragraph (3) is added, as follows: → the reasons

"(3) Appointed public offices, or offices and capacities filled by direct designation, for which no competition or examination is organised, may be held for a mandate of no more than 4 years, renewable once, unless another duration of the mandate or number of mandates is provided for by the Constitution."

In article 118, paragraphs (4) and (5) are amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"(4) The intelligence services and services assimilated to them shall be organised exclusively as civilian bodies, under the conditions of the law. Personnel with military status may be employed exclusively within the armed forces of the Ministry of Defence, within the structure of the Romanian Gendarmerie, within the operational anti-terrorist intervention structures of the intelligence services, and within the penitentiary system of the Ministry of Justice. The organisation of military or paramilitary activities outside a State authority is prohibited.

(5) In peacetime, foreign troops may enter, be stationed on, conduct operations on, or pass through the territory of Romania only with the prior consent of Parliament and under the conditions of the law or of the international treaties to which Romania is a party."

In article 118, after paragraph (5), paragraphs (6) and (7) are inserted, reading as follows: → the reasons

"(6) On the territory of Romania, command of the Romanian or foreign armed forces stationed under the conditions of the preceding paragraph belongs exclusively to the Romanian army. Transfer of authority over the armed forces of Romania is prohibited.

(7) In peacetime, the national defence budget may not exceed 2% of the national budget of the year concerned."

In article 119, after paragraph (1), a new paragraph (2) is inserted, as follows: → the reasons

"(2) The Supreme Council of National Defence includes, by right, the President, the Prime Minister, the presidents of the two Chambers of Parliament, the Minister of Defence, the Minister of Justice and the heads of the intelligence services. The heads of the intelligence services are designated for a period of 4 years in a joint sitting of Parliament, their mandate being renewable once for the same period."

In article 120, after paragraph (2), four new paragraphs (3) to (6) are inserted, reading as follows: → the reasons

(3) The presidents of the county councils, the mayor of the Municipality of Bucharest and of its sectors, and the mayors of municipalities, towns and communes are elected by universal, equal, direct, secret and freely expressed vote for a mandate of four years, renewable once.

(4) The candidate who has obtained, in the first round of voting, the majority of the voters' votes shall be declared elected.

(5) Where none of the candidates has obtained that majority, a second round of voting shall be organised between the first two candidates established in the order of the number of votes obtained in the first round. The candidate who has obtained the greatest number of votes shall be declared elected.

(6) The presidents of the county councils, the mayor of the Municipality of Bucharest and of its sectors, the mayors of municipalities, towns and communes, as well as county, general or local councillors may be removed from office by a referendum convened by a number of citizens equal to at least 20% of the citizens who voted for them. The signatures for convening the referendum may also be collected online, citizens being able to sign with any form of digital signature recognised by law. A referendum for the removal of local elected officials may not be held in the last 6 months of the mandate. The local elected official is removed if half plus one of those taking part in the referendum vote in favour of removal, irrespective of the participation quorum."

In article 124, paragraph (3) is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"(3) Judges shall be exclusively Romanian citizens, are independent and subject only to the law. Any administrative provision has the role of ensuring the functioning of the judicial system without affecting the adjudicating activity carried out by judges."

In article 124, after paragraph (3), two new paragraphs (4) and (5) are inserted, reading as follows: → the reasons

"(4) Judges may not be operative workers, including undercover workers, informers or collaborators of any national or international intelligence service. Judges who held such capacities before their appointment shall be removed from office.

(5) Serving judges may not be members of occult, secret or discreet associations and societies. Serving judges may be members exclusively of professional associations, and the activity carried out must concern the field of justice."

In article 125, paragraphs (1), (2) and (3) are amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"(1) Judges appointed to office are Romanian citizens and are irremovable, under the conditions of the law.

(2) Proposals for appointment, as well as the promotion, transfer and sanctioning of judges and prosecutors, fall within the competence of the Superior Council of Magistracy, under the conditions of its organic law.

(3) The office of judge is incompatible with any other public or private office, with the exception of teaching positions in higher education and teaching positions at the National Institute of Judges and Prosecutors and at the National School of Clerks."

In article 126, paragraph (3) is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"(3) The High Court of Cassation and Justice shall ensure the uniform interpretation and application of the law by the other courts of law, and also the resolution of points of law, according to its competence."

In article 132, paragraph (2) is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"(2) The office of prosecutor is incompatible with any other public or private office, with the exception of teaching positions in higher education and teaching positions at the National Institute of Judges and Prosecutors and at the National School of Clerks."

Article 133 is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"(1) The Superior Council of Magistracy is the guarantor of the independence of justice.

(2) The Superior Council of Magistracy is composed of 15 members, of whom:

a) 10 are elected in the general assemblies of judges and validated by the Senate; they are elected as follows:

— 2 from among the judges of the first-instance courts, by the judges serving in those courts;

— 3 from among the judges of the tribunals, by the judges serving in the tribunals;

— 3 from among the judges of the courts of appeal, by the judges serving in the courts of appeal;

— 2 from among the judges of the High Court of Cassation and Justice, one elected by the judges serving in the criminal section and one elected by the judges serving in the other sections;

b) 2 representatives of civil society, specialists in the field of law, enjoying a high professional and moral reputation, who have not belonged to political parties in the last 5 years, elected by the Senate; they take part only in the plenary proceedings;

c) the Minister of Justice, the President of the High Court of Cassation and Justice and the Prosecutor General of the Prosecutor's Office attached to the High Court of Cassation and Justice.

(3) The President of the Superior Council of Magistracy is elected for a mandate of one year, which may not be renewed, from among the magistrates provided for in paragraph (2) letter a), in the descending order of professional rank and of seniority.

(4) The President of the Superior Council of Magistracy is elected for a mandate of one year, which may not be renewed or extended in any way, from among the judges provided for in paragraph (2).

(5) The mandate of the members of the Superior Council of Magistracy lasts 4 years.

(6) The decisions of the Superior Council of Magistracy are taken by secret or open vote, according to the law."

Article 134 is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"(1) The Superior Council of Magistracy proposes to the President of Romania the appointment of judges and prosecutors, with the exception of trainees, under the conditions of the law, selected through the annual national competition for admission to the magistracy, organised by the National Institute of Magistracy, from among persons holding a law degree with at least 8 years' seniority in legal professions or in higher legal education.

(2) Prosecutors may not be moved or transferred to the office of judge otherwise than by passing the examination referred to in paragraph (1).

(3) Judges and prosecutors may be delegated or seconded to executive or management positions only by the Superior Council of Magistracy, through a national examination or competition organised by the National Institute of Magistracy.

(4) The Superior Council of Magistracy acts as a court of law in the field of the disciplinary liability of judges and prosecutors, according to the procedure laid down in its organic law. In such cases, the Minister of Justice, the President of the High Court of Cassation and Justice and the Prosecutor General of the Prosecutor's Office attached to the High Court of Cassation and Justice have no right to vote. *

(5) The decisions of the Superior Council of Magistracy in disciplinary matters may be challenged before the High Court of Cassation and Justice. Before the same court may be challenged the decisions of the Superior Council of Magistracy rejecting the disciplinary sanctioning of judges and prosecutors.

(6) The Superior Council of Magistracy also performs other duties established by its organic law, in fulfilment of its role as guarantor of the independence of justice.

(7) The Judicial Inspectorate carries out the preliminary investigation of judges and prosecutors and operates under the authority of the Minister of Justice, as a directorate with legal personality within the Ministry of Justice. Judicial inspectors serve in this directorate, having a legal career of at least 12 years in legal positions, including that of magistrate. Positions of judicial inspector are filled by a competition organised at national level by the National Institute of Magistracy, and the mandate of judicial inspectors lasts 6 years, renewable once for the same period. During their mandate, judicial inspectors have the same rights and obligations as judges and prosecutors, being assimilated to them according to the seniority held in the legal position. Judicial inspectors are sanctioned by the Minister of Justice, in accordance with the organic law governing the liability of magistrates."

In article 136, paragraph (4) is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"(4) Goods in public property are inalienable. Under the conditions of the organic law, they may be entrusted for administration to autonomous authorities or public institutions, or may be granted under concession or leased; likewise, they may be given for free use to institutions of public utility. The royalties due under concession contracts shall be updated to the level of the prices practised in the European Union every five years."

In article 140, paragraph (3) is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"(3) The Court of Accounts shall verify the manner of managing public resources and shall report its findings to Parliament at least once a year. The report is public."

In article 142, paragraph (3) is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"(3) Three judges are appointed by the High Court of Cassation and Justice, three by the Government, two by the Chamber of Deputies and one by the Senate."

Article 143 is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"The judges of the Constitutional Court must have higher legal training, high professional competence, at least 18 years' seniority in legal activity or in higher legal education, and must not have belonged to political parties in the five years preceding their appointment to the office of judge."

In article 146, letters a) to d) are amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"a) rules on the constitutionality of laws, before their promulgation, upon notification by the President of Romania, by one of the presidents of the two Chambers, by the Government, by the High Court of Cassation and Justice, by the Ombudsman, by at least 20 deputies or at least 10 senators, and also, ex officio, on initiatives to revise the Constitution;

b) rules on the constitutionality of treaties or other international agreements, upon notification by one of the presidents of the two Chambers, by at least 20 deputies or at least 10 senators;

c) rules on the constitutionality of the regulations of Parliament, upon notification by one of the presidents of the two Chambers, by a parliamentary group, or by at least 20 deputies or at least 10 senators;

d) decides on objections of unconstitutionality concerning laws and ordinances, raised before the courts of law or before commercial arbitration; an objection of unconstitutionality may also be raised directly by the Ombudsman or by at least 20 deputies or at least 10 senators;"

In article 146, letter f) is repealed. → the reasons

In article 147, paragraphs (3) and (4) are amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"(3) Where the constitutionality of a treaty or international agreement has been established in accordance with article 146 letter b), it may not be the subject of an objection of unconstitutionality on the same grounds of fact and of law. A treaty or international agreement found to be unconstitutional may not be ratified.

(4) The decisions of the Constitutional Court shall be published in the Official Gazette of Romania. From the date of publication, the decisions are generally binding and have effect only for the future, as well as for the entire period during which the normative act declared unconstitutional produced effects."

In article 147, after paragraph (4), two new paragraphs (5) and (6) are inserted, reading as follows: → the reasons

"(5) Failure by judges and prosecutors to observe the decisions of the Constitutional Court constitutes a disciplinary offence and is sanctioned under the conditions established by organic law."

"(6) In cases of unconstitutionality established in accordance with article 146 letters a) to d), the law or the regulation shall be sent back for re-examination. If the law is adopted in the same form by a majority of at least two thirds of the members of each Chamber, the objection of unconstitutionality is removed and promulgation becomes mandatory."

Title VI of the Constitution of Romania is amended and shall read as follows:

"Title VI — Romania's participation in international bodies and alliances

Art. 148 — The supremacy of the Constitution and of the sovereign interest of the people in the conduct of international relations → the reasons

Romania shall fulfil exactly and in good faith the commitments undertaken and the obligations incumbent upon it under the Constitutive Treaties of the international bodies and alliances which it has joined, in compliance with the Constitution of Romania and in the higher and sovereign interest of the Romanian people.

Art. 149 — Accession, ratification of instruments revising the constitutive treaties, and withdrawal of Romania from international bodies and alliances * → the reasons

(1) Romania may accede to international bodies and alliances, may ratify the instruments revising the constitutive treaties, or may withdraw from the international bodies and alliances of which it is a member, by a law adopted through the sovereign decision of the Romanian people expressed by referendum.

(2) The referendum on accession, on the ratification of instruments amending the constitutive treaties, or on withdrawal from the Bodies and Alliances of which Romania is a member may be initiated by the President of Romania at the proposal of the Government, by at least one quarter of the number of deputies or of senators, or by at least 500,000 citizens entitled to vote. The citizens exercising the right provided for in this article must come from at least half of the counties of the country, and in each of those counties or in the Municipality of Bucharest at least 20,000 signatures must be registered in support of the initiative.

(3) The bill providing for accession, for the ratification of instruments amending the constitutive treaties, or for withdrawal from the Bodies and Alliances of which Romania is a member shall be adopted by the Chamber of Deputies and by the Senate, by a majority of at least two thirds of the members of each Chamber.

(4) If no agreement is reached through the mediation procedure, the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate, in joint sitting, shall decide by the vote of at least three quarters of the number of deputies and senators.

(5) The law on accession to international bodies and alliances, on the ratification of the instruments revising their constitutive treaties, or on withdrawal from the bodies and alliances of which Romania is a member shall be adopted after its approval by referendum, organised within no more than 30 days of the adoption of the bill or of the revision proposal, and shall enter into force on the date of publication in the Official Gazette of Romania, Part I, of the decision of the Constitutional Court confirming the results of the referendum.

(6) The rejection by referendum of the ratification of instruments revising the Constitutive Treaties of the organisations and alliances to which Romania is a party has the effect of Romania's withdrawal from those international Organisations or Alliances."

In article 154, after paragraph (2), a new paragraph (3) is inserted, reading as follows: → the reasons

"(3) The provisions of paragraph (1) of article 83 shall apply from the date of entry into force of this Constitution, the mandate of the President in office ceasing on 30 November of the year in which the first parliamentary elections are held after the adoption of this Constitution."

SECTION 2 — The Sovereignty Act (version 20) — full text

The explanatory memorandum: Explanatory memorandum — The Sovereignty Act

Full translation of the draft. The Romanian text remains the authoritative one.

Draft law: "The Sovereignty Act —

The Act for the protection of the higher and sovereign interest of the Romanian people and citizen"

Starting from the constitutional principle that national sovereignty belongs to the Romanian people, and likewise from the need for greater involvement of the Romanian citizen in the decision-making and legislative process through the implementation of the principle of participatory democracy, by the exercise of the right of legislative initiative by at least 100,000 citizens entitled to vote, in compliance with art. 5 para. (1) of Act no. 24/2000 on legislative drafting rules, read together with art. 74 para. (1) of the Constitution of Romania, republished,

proceeding from the necessity of adopting a law which guarantees and strengthens the sovereignty of the Romanian State laid down in article 1 paragraph (1) of the Constitution of Romania, republished, by implementing necessary and urgent measures in various fields liable to affect national sovereignty, understood both as the right of the nation to identity and self-determination and as a state of law consistent with the constitutional order,

having regard to the need to guarantee and strengthen the fundamental rights of the citizen by establishing rules which make it impossible to limit, delay or avoid parliamentary scrutiny of normative acts providing for limitations, restrictions or conditions upon fundamental rights and freedoms, as well as the need to repeal the legal provisions in force which make such unconstitutional limitations possible,

taking into account the indications and conclusions of the European Parliament Resolution of 13 November 2020 on the impact of COVID-19 measures on democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights (2020/2790(RSP)) in the member states, Romania among them,

and also taking into account the imperative character of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Dignity of the Human Being with regard to the Application of Biology and Medicine — the Convention on Human Rights and Biomedicine, signed at Oviedo on 4 April 1997 — and of the Additional Protocol thereto on the Prohibition of Cloning Human Beings, signed at Paris on 12 January 1998, ratified by Act no. 17 of 22 February 2001, and of the Convention of 26 November 1968 on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 26 November 1968, as well as the need for the direct and immediate implementation of these conventions in national legislation,

having regard to the fact that the protection of human dignity is founded on the idea that man is an intellectual and moral being inclined to determine himself and to develop in freedom, and that the inalienable dignity of man consists precisely in the need for his status as a responsible person to be respected,

taking into account the need to strengthen the rule of law through respect for legality and constitutionality by the direct, non-discriminatory and immediate implementation of the decisions of the

Constitutional Court; having regard to the need to make the decision-making process of the administration transparent by publishing all acts of general interest and making them fully and freely available to citizens through the Official Gazette of Romania, to the guarantee of freedom of expression in the online environment, and to the need for parliamentary representation of as large a proportion as possible of Romanian citizens entitled to vote,

taking into account the disastrous ecological situation at national level, as well as the drastic diminution of the national forest stock caused by the massive and irrational deforestation and clear-felling of the last 30 years, and the need to prohibit abusive and excessive exploitation of forests with a view to rebuilding and regenerating the national forest stock, as well as the need for an immediate and total ban on the export of unprocessed timber and on the import of waste,

having regard to the obligation to preserve the national patrimony, as well as to the need to maximise, for the Romanian citizen, the profitability of exploiting the riches held in public property, with the consequence of criminalising any acts having the effect of diminishing national wealth,

having regard to the low degree of transparency of the decision-making process within the public institutions of Romania,

taking into account the need for the defence of the entire national territory by the entire people on a voluntary basis, as well as the need to acquire new, state-of-the-art military equipment directly from the manufacturer and exclusively in compliance with the national legislation governing offset in military procurement,

taking into account the decisions of the Constitutional Court on the constitutionality of certain provisions in criminal and criminal-procedural matters, and in other social fields,

having regard to the fact that the more than 100,000 citizens' signatures in favour of this legislative initiative constitute a sound argument for respecting the will of the Romanian people and its sovereignty,

The Parliament of Romania adopts this law:

Chapter I — Measures for consolidating the rule of law and protecting the higher and sovereign interest of the Romanian people and citizen

Article 1 → the reasons

Limitations of fundamental human rights and freedoms may not be established by normative administrative acts.

Article 2 → the reasons

Article 4 of Emergency Ordinance no. 1/1999 on the regime of the state of siege and the state of emergency, published in the Official Gazette no. 22 of 21 January 1999, as subsequently supplemented and amended, is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"During the state of siege or the state of emergency, the exercise of certain fundamental rights and freedoms may be restricted only to the extent required by the situation and in compliance with art. 53 of the Constitution of Romania, republished, with the exception of the human rights and fundamental freedoms provided for in art. 32 and of those enshrined in the Constitution in articles 21 — Free access to justice, 22 — The right to life and to physical and mental integrity, 23 — Individual liberty,

24 — The right of defence, 26 — Intimate, family and private life, 28 — The secrecy of correspondence, 29 — Freedom of conscience, 30 — Freedom of expression, 31 — The right to information, 34 — The right to the protection of health and 35 — The right to a healthy environment, 40 — The right of association, 42 — The prohibition of forced labour, 44 — The right to private property, 45 — Economic freedom, 46 — The right of inheritance, 47 — The standard of living."

Article 3 → the reasons

Act 55 of 15 May 2020 on certain measures for the prevention and combating of the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic, published in the Official Gazette of Romania, Part I, no. 396 of 15 May 2020, as subsequently amended and supplemented, is repealed.

Article 4 → the reasons

Act 46 of 21 January 2003 on the rights of the patient, published in the Official Gazette no. 51 of 29 January 2003, as subsequently amended and supplemented, is amended and supplemented as follows:

In article 4, after paragraph (1), a new paragraph (2) is inserted, reading as follows: → the reasons

"Medicines, sanitary materials, medical devices and other therapeutic means may be administered or applied to Romanian citizens only after obtaining in advance the patients' written agreement and consent, following prior and mandatory information given on the basis of the leaflets provided by the manufacturer of the medicines proposed, medical emergencies excepted."

After article 36^1, a new article 36^2 is inserted, reading as follows: → the reasons

"No citizen may be discriminated against, positively or negatively, as a result of accepting or refusing a treatment or a medical device."

Article 5 → the reasons

Act 95 of 14 April 2006 on the reform of the health system, republished, published in the Official Gazette no. 652 of 28 August 2015, as subsequently amended and supplemented, is amended and supplemented as follows:

(1) After article 704, a new article 704^1 is inserted, reading as follows: "(1) Medicines or medical devices for which the manufacturer offers no guarantees and no demonstrably viable remedies against adverse effects may not be marketed or used, nor may such medical treatments be applied. (2) The marketing or use of medicines, vaccines, medical devices and other pharmaceutical products for which complete clinical trials have not been carried out in accordance with the methodology laid down by law is prohibited." (2) In article 811, paragraph (1) is amended and shall read as follows: "(1) For the purposes of this chapter, advertising for medicines includes any means of information by direct contact (the 'door-to-door' system), as well as any form of promotion intended to stimulate the prescription, distribution, sale or consumption of medicines." → the reasons

Article 813 is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"(1) Any form of commercial advertising on television, radio and social networks for authorised or unauthorised medicines, vaccines, medical devices and other pharmaceutical products is prohibited. (2) The direct distribution of medicines to the population by manufacturers for promotional purposes is prohibited."

Article 6 → the reasons

Act 272 of 21 June 2004 on the protection and promotion of the rights of the child, republished, published in the Official Gazette no. 159 of 5 March 2014, as subsequently amended and supplemented, is amended and supplemented as follows:

(1) In article 9, after paragraph (1), a new paragraph (1^1) is inserted, reading as follows: "The biological sexual identity of the child, acquired at birth, may not be altered before the age of 18." (2) In article 28, after paragraph (4), a new paragraph (5) is inserted, reading as follows: "It is prohibited to make available to children under the age of eighteen any information or materials promoting departure from biological sexual identity, gender reassignment and homosexuality." (3) In article 46, paragraph (3), letter i) is amended and shall read as follows: "the systematic conduct in schools, at least once per semester, of programmes of education for life, including sexual education for children over 14, with a view to preventing the contracting of sexually transmitted diseases and of early pregnancy." → the reasons

Article 7 → the reasons

In article 64 of Act no. 287 of 17 July 2009 on the Civil Code, published in the Official Gazette no. 511 of 24 July 2009, as subsequently amended and supplemented, after paragraph (2) three new paragraphs (3) to (5) are inserted, which shall read as follows: → the reasons

"(3) No authority or individual may, by any technological mechanism, increase, diminish or disturb the individual physical or mental integrity of a person without that person's written, express, informed and freely expressed consent or, in the case of a person under judicial interdiction or of a patient unable to express his will, without the written, express, informed and freely expressed consent of the legal representative. (4) Any intrusion into or form of intervention upon neuronal connections, as well as any intrusion at the level of the brain through the use of neuro-technology, of a brain–computer interface or of any other system or device, is prohibited in the absence of the written, express, informed and freely given consent of the person, even in medical circumstances, or, in the case of a person under judicial interdiction or of a patient unable to express his will, of the legal representative. (5) The holding or use of any system or device whose purpose is to access or manipulate neuronal activity is prohibited."

Article 8 → the reasons

In article 5 of Act no. 159 of 19 July 2016 on the regime of the physical infrastructure of electronic communications networks and on measures to reduce the cost of installing electronic communications networks, published in the Official Gazette no. 559 of 25 July 2016, paragraph (2) is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"The provisions of paragraph (1) shall apply after obtaining the written agreement of all owners and/or co-owners, including as regards the right of access to spaces held in undivided ownership in blocks of flats, and likewise as regards the fixing of electronic communications networks, of the technologies and equipment used within the IT and communications infrastructures of national interest, as well as within the electronic communications networks through which electronic communications services are provided, or of elements of physical infrastructure necessary to support them, on the walls or terraces of those buildings."

Article 9 → the reasons

Act no. 286 of 17 July 2009 on the Criminal Code, published in the Official Gazette no. 510 of 24 July 2009, as subsequently amended and supplemented, is amended and supplemented as follows:

(1) After article 195, a new article 195[1] is inserted, with the marginal heading "Disturbance or alteration of physical or mental integrity", reading as follows:

"(1) Disturbing or altering the individual physical or mental integrity of a person without that person's written, express, informed and freely expressed consent shall be punished by imprisonment from 5 to 10 years and the prohibition of certain rights.

(2) Holding or using any system or device whose purpose is to access or manipulate neuronal activity, accessing or manipulating a person's neuronal activity, as well as any intervention upon neuronal connections or intrusion at the level of the brain, whether invasive or non-invasive, in the absence of the person's written, express, informed and freely expressed consent, shall be punished by imprisonment from 7 to 20 years and the prohibition of certain rights."

(2) In article 197, after paragraph (1), two new paragraphs, (2) and (3), are inserted, reading as follows:

"(2) Causing a minor who has not attained the age of 18 to alter the biological sexual identity acquired at birth shall be punished by imprisonment from 7 to 15 years.

(3) Where the act referred to in the preceding paragraph has been committed by a parent, guardian, teacher or master, or has produced physical consequences for the minor, the special limits of the penalty shall be increased by one third."

(3) In article 211, after paragraph (1), a new paragraph (1[1]) is inserted, reading as follows:

"The brokering or encouragement of adoptions by persons who are not officials of the General Directorate for Social Assistance and Child Protection or of the National Authority for the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, Children and Adoptions shall be punished by imprisonment from 7 to 15 years and the prohibition of the exercise of certain rights."

(4) In article 221, paragraph 4 is amended and shall read as follows:

"Causing, by an adult, a minor who has not attained the age of 14 to witness the commission of acts of an exhibitionist character, or shows or performances in which sexual acts of any kind are committed, as well as making available to him material of a pornographic character or with content explicitly describing sexuality, shall be punished by imprisonment from one to three years."

(5) In article 221, after paragraph (5), a new paragraph (5[1]) is inserted, reading as follows:

"Making available to children under the age of eighteen any material promoting departure from biological sexual identity, gender reassignment and homosexuality shall be punished by imprisonment from 1 to 5 years."

(6) In article 221, paragraph (6) is amended and shall read as follows:

"Attempt in respect of the offences provided for in paragraphs (1), (2), (2[1]) and (5[1]) shall be punished."

(7) Article 297 is amended and shall read as follows:

"(1) The act of a public official who, in the exercise of his duties, fails to perform an act or performs it in breach of the law with a view to obtaining an undue advantage and thereby causes damage or an injury to the rights or legitimate interests of a natural or legal person shall be punished by imprisonment from 2 to 7 years and the prohibition of the exercise of the right to hold public office.

> (2) The same penalty shall apply to the act of a public official who, in the exercise of his duties, restricts the exercise of a right of a person or creates for that person a situation of fear, social exclusion or inferiority on grounds of race, nationality, ethnic origin, language, religion, sex, sexual orientation, political affiliation, wealth, age, disability, chronic non-contagious disease or HIV/AIDS infection.
>
> (8) In article 297, after paragraph (2), a new paragraph (3) is inserted, reading as follows:
>
> "(3) The act of a public official of applying any legal rules declared unconstitutional by a Decision of the Constitutional Court of Romania shall be punished by imprisonment from 7 to 10 years."
>
> (9) In article 394, in paragraph (1), a new letter e) is inserted, reading as follows:
>
> "e) the exercise of an office of public dignity or one entailing the exercise of State authority."
>
> (10) In article 394, after paragraph (1), a new paragraph (2) is inserted, reading as follows:
>
> "Where the act referred to in paragraph 1 letter b) has caused significant damage to the national economy, the penalty shall be life imprisonment or imprisonment from 15 to 25 years and the prohibition of certain rights."
>
> (11) In article 398, after paragraph (1), a new paragraph (2) is inserted, reading as follows:
>
> "It likewise constitutes an act of High Treason, attracting the same penalty, for the President of Romania to fail to give effect to the Decisions of the Constitutional Court resolving conflicts of a constitutional nature within 10 days of the communication of the operative part."

→ the reasons

Article 10 → the reasons

Act no. 135 of 1 July 2010 on the Code of Criminal Procedure, published in the Official Gazette no. 486 of 15 July 2010, as subsequently amended and supplemented, is amended and supplemented as follows:

> (1) In article 247, paragraphs (1) and (2) are amended and shall read as follows: "(1) The judge of rights and liberties, during the criminal investigation, the preliminary chamber judge, during the preliminary chamber procedure, or the court, during the trial, may order the provisional medical committal of the suspect or defendant who is mentally ill or a chronic user of psychoactive substances, if the perpetrator's condition was determinant for the commission of the act and the measure is necessary in order to remove a concrete and present danger to public safety. (2) The measure provided for in paragraph (1) consists in the involuntary medical committal of the suspect or defendant to a specialised medical assistance unit, is taken for a period of no more than 60 days and may be extended until recovery or until the improvement which removes the state of danger."
>
> (2) In article 453, paragraph (1), after letter f) a new letter g) is inserted, reading as follows:
>
> "the decision was founded on a legal provision which was repealed or amended after the decision became final, where the criminal provisions are more favourable or the act has been decriminalised."

→ the reasons

Article 11 → the reasons

In article 18, paragraph (2) of Act no. 202 of 9 November 1998 on the organisation of the Official Gazette of Romania, republished, published in the Official Gazette no. 511 of 3 July 2017, as subsequently amended and supplemented, is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"The electronic format of the Official Gazette of Romania is available free of charge and without restriction, permanently. The free and unrestricted electronic format shall be a portable document, without watermark or inscriptions additional to the printed format; it shall become accessible to all users on the same day as publication, including for searching, saving, sharing and printing."

Article 12 → the reasons

(1) It is prohibited to delete or censor posts, information, images or personal data, and to block personal accounts on social networks, in Cloud storage environments, in the virtual environment and/or in the online environment, or on electronic devices held in personal ownership.

(2) Any breach of the provisions of paragraph (1) entails the material liability of the operators or holders of the virtual environments and social networks, of the Cloud storage environments, of the online sites or of the operating systems.

(3) Any dispute concerning the breach of the provisions of the preceding paragraphs is subject to national legislation and shall be settled by the court of first instance of the claimant's domicile.

(4) The action is exempt from stamp duty.

Article 13 → the reasons

Act no. 208 of 20 July 2015 on the election of the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies and on the organisation and functioning of the Permanent Electoral Authority, published in the Official Gazette no. 553 of 24 July 2015, as subsequently amended and supplemented, is amended and supplemented as follows:

(1) In article 92^1, paragraphs (3), (4) and (5) are repealed.

(2) In article 94, paragraph (2), letter a) is amended and shall read as follows:

"3% of the total number of validly cast votes at national level, or 10% of the total number of validly cast votes in at least 4 electoral constituencies, for all electoral competitors;"

(3) In article 94, paragraph (2), letter b) is amended and shall read as follows:

"in the case of political alliances and electoral alliances, to the 3% threshold provided for in letter a) there shall be added, for each member of the alliance, a single percentage point of the validly cast votes in all electoral constituencies, without being able to exceed 5% of those votes."

(4) Article 103^1 is amended and shall read as follows:

"(1) The Permanent Electoral Authority shall ensure the operation, at the seat of the Central Electoral Bureau, of an IT infrastructure fulfilling the following objectives:

a) it ensures the operation of the IT system for centralising the data from the minutes recording the results of the voting;

b) it ensures the real-time storage of duplicates of the databases generated by the IT system for monitoring turnout and preventing illegal voting, as well as of the logs of the machines on which it runs, in order to facilitate their analysis and transparency.

(2) The IT infrastructure provided for in paragraph (1) shall be unique and shall comprise servers, data storage systems, communications and security equipment, as well as licences and software applications, being intended exclusively for the application of the provisions of this law.

(3) The IT system for centralising the data from the minutes recording the results of the voting and the IT system for monitoring turnout and preventing illegal voting may be accessed for the real-time viewing of the data, from the seat of the Central Electoral Bureau, by the representatives of the Central Electoral Bureau and those of the Permanent Electoral Authority, on the basis of access rights established by decision of the Permanent Electoral Authority.

(4) The Permanent Electoral Authority shall provide the assistance and technical support for the operation of the equipment and software applications provided for in paragraph (2).

(5) The Permanent Electoral Authority shall provide the software applications and/or IT services to be used by the Central Electoral Bureau for centralising the data from the minutes recording the results of the voting, as well as the IT equipment necessary for the centralisation of the results of the voting by the Central Electoral Bureau. These shall operate within the IT infrastructure provided for in paragraph (1).

(6) The software applications provided for in paragraph (5) shall be certified by the Permanent Electoral Authority and made available by it to the political parties and to the organisations of citizens belonging to national minorities taking part in the elections, upon their written request.

(7) The Permanent Electoral Authority shall ensure, throughout the day of the voting and the following day, the publicity of the data concerning the number of voters who have turned out, and of the information resulting from the verification of the correlations in the minutes recording the results of the voting, obtained through the IT system for monitoring turnout and preventing illegal voting."

(5) In article 110, paragraph (1) is amended and shall read as follows:

"The Permanent Electoral Authority, with the support of the National Institute of Statistics, shall ensure the implementation and management of the IT system for monitoring turnout and preventing illegal voting, on the basis of the data and information in the Electoral Register and in the Register of polling stations."

(6) In article 110, paragraph (3) is amended and shall read as follows:

"For the implementation and operation, during the elections, of the IT system for monitoring turnout and preventing illegal voting, use shall as a rule be made of the IT infrastructure held by the central and local public administration authorities and by educational establishments."

(7) In article 110, paragraph (4) is amended and shall read as follows:

"The organisation of elections, referendums and other popular consultations, as well as the administration of the processes specific to them, including the counting of the votes, with the exception of guarding and public-order activities, shall be carried out exclusively by the electoral bureaux, namely the Central and the Local ones. Breach of this provision constitutes an offence and shall be punished by imprisonment from 7 to 10 years."

(8) In article 110, paragraph 8 is repealed.

→ the reasons

Chapter II — Ecological measures for the protection of the higher and sovereign interest of the Romanian people and citizen

Article 14 → the reasons

Act 57/2020 on the sustainable management of Romania's forests, published in the Official Gazette no. 402 of 15 May 2020, is amended as follows:

(1) Article 1 is amended and shall read as follows: "The export, within or outside the Community area, of unprocessed timber, including logs, with or without bark, round wood, sawn timber, beams or railway sleepers, is prohibited until 1 January 2121." (2) Article 4 is amended and shall read as follows: "Failure to observe the export ban on timber provided for in art. 1 shall be punished by imprisonment from 7 to 20 years and the prohibition of certain rights." → the reasons

Article 15 → the reasons

Act 46 of 19 March 2008 on the Forestry Code, published in the Official Gazette no. 611 of 12 August 2015, as subsequently amended and supplemented, is amended and supplemented as follows:

(1) In article 29, paragraph (1) is amended and shall read as follows: "Deforestation and clear-felling on the territory of Romania, including that justified by ecological reconstruction, the regeneration and tending of forests, are prohibited until 1 January 2121." (2) In article 29, paragraphs (2), (3), (4) and (5) are repealed. (3) After article 109, three new articles 109^1, 109^2 and 109^3 are inserted, reading as follows: "109^1 Causing disease in, or infesting with pests, the trees of the forest stock shall be punished by imprisonment from 7 to 20 years."; "109^2 Breach of the prohibition provided for in art. 29 of this law shall be punished by imprisonment from 7 to 20 years."; "109^3 Intentionally setting fire to the forest stock shall be punished by imprisonment from 7 to 20 years." → the reasons

Article 16 → the reasons

In article 13 of Act no. 211 of 15 November 2011 on the waste regime, republished, published in the Official Gazette no. 220 of 28 March 2014, after paragraph (1) a new paragraph (2) is inserted, reading as follows: → the reasons

"The introduction into the country of waste of any kind is prohibited."

CHAPTER III — Measures in the economic field for the protection of the higher and sovereign interest of the Romanian people and citizen

Article 17 → the reasons

From the date of entry into force of this law, the alienation of the assets of the Romanian State or of the shares held by the State in national companies and undertakings, in credit institutions, and in any other company in which the State is a shareholder, irrespective of the share of registered capital held, is prohibited until 1 January 2121.

Article 18 → the reasons

In art. 307 of Emergency Ordinance no. 57 of 3 July 2019 on the Administrative Code, published in the Official Gazette no. 555 of 5 July 2019, after paragraph (1) a new paragraph (1^1) is inserted, reading as follows:

"The minimum royalty obtained through concession may not fall below the average level of the European market."

Article 19 → the reasons

(1) In article 30 of Act no. 312 of 28 June 2004 on the Statute of the National Bank of Romania, published in the Official Gazette no. 582 of 30 June 2004, paragraph (1), letter a) is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"a) gold held in the treasury exclusively and in its entirety at the National Bank of Romania."

(2) Within no more than 180 days from the publication of this law in the Official Gazette of Romania, the National Bank of Romania shall repatriate in its entirety the gold deposited outside Romania.

(3) Failure to observe the provisions of paragraph (2) constitutes a criminal offence and shall be punished by imprisonment from 10 to 20 years and the prohibition of certain rights.

Article 20 → the reasons

(1) From the date of entry into force of this law, contracts concluded by the Romanian State are public and shall be published on the website of the contracting institution and in the Official Gazette, Part IV.

(2) Within no more than 5 days from the date of adoption of this law, all contracts concluded by the Romanian State up to that date shall be published on the website of the contracting institution and in the Official Gazette, Part IV.

Article 21 → the reasons

(1) The intentional failure of a public servant to enforce concession or privatisation contracts in accordance with their clauses, or, as the case may be, the intentional failure to bring actions for their enforcement, shall be punished by imprisonment from 10 to 20 years and the prohibition of certain rights.

(2) The negligent failure of a public servant to enforce concession or privatisation contracts in accordance with their clauses, or, as the case may be, the negligent failure to bring actions for their enforcement, shall be punished by imprisonment from 5 to 10 years and the prohibition of certain rights.

Article 22 → the reasons

(1) From the date of entry into force of this law, the marketing on the territory of Romania of any products of a quality inferior to those marketed under the same brand in the country of origin is prohibited.

(2) The marketing under the same brand of goods of differing qualities is prohibited.

(3) Breach of this legal rule constitutes a misleading commercial practice within the meaning of article 7, paragraph (2) of Act no. 363 of 21 December 2007 and entails the sanctioning of the trader with a fine of between EUR 10,000,000 and EUR 50,000,000, depending on the gravity of the act.

Chapter IV — Measures in the field of national safety and defence for the protection of the higher and sovereign interest of the Romanian people and citizen

Article 23 → the reasons

Act no. 51 of 29 July 1991 on the national security of Romania, republished, published in the Official Gazette no. 190 of 18 March 2014, as subsequently amended and supplemented, is amended as follows:

(1) In article 29, paragraphs (1) and (2) are amended and shall read as follows:

"(1) The intelligence, counter-intelligence, guard and special telecommunications services and those assimilated to them shall be organised exclusively as civilian bodies, their employees becoming, by assimilation, public servants with special status, having the right to organise themselves in trade unions and to be investigated by the corresponding civilian prosecution services.

(2) Their statute shall be governed by organic law."

(2) In article 29, after paragraph (3), a new paragraph (4) is inserted, reading as follows:

"The personnel of the Romanian Intelligence Service, of the Foreign Intelligence Service, of the Special Telecommunications Service and of the Protection and Guard Service who, at the date of retirement, held the status of permanent military personnel for a period of 15 years or more shall retain their rights until their office ceases, in whatever manner."

(3) After article 33, two new articles are inserted, art. 33^1 and art. 33^2, reading as follows:

"33^1 (1) Participation in any manner by the intelligence and counter-intelligence services and those assimilated to them in the carrying out of any acts of judicial procedure is prohibited.

(2) Influencing in any manner the prosecutor or the judge entrusted with an investigation, by any person, including by employees or collaborators of the intelligence and counter-intelligence services and those assimilated to them, constitutes an offence and shall be punished by imprisonment from 10 to 20 years and the prohibition of certain rights.

(3) Attempt shall be punished.

(4) Failure to report the interference provided for in paragraph (1) constitutes a criminal act and shall be punished by the same penalty as that provided for in paragraph (2).

33^2 (1) Participation in any manner by the intelligence and counter-intelligence services and those assimilated to them in the carrying out of any activities of a political, economic or media character is prohibited.

(2) It is prohibited for the intelligence and counter-intelligence services and those assimilated to them to hold commercial companies directly or indirectly, through their own personnel or through intermediaries, as well as to carry out commercial activities on the territory of Romania or abroad.

(3) The intelligence and counter-intelligence services and those assimilated to them may not use funds other than those provided for in the State Budget Law.

(4) Any gains obtained by the intelligence and counter-intelligence services and those assimilated to them in the context of carrying out their specific activities shall be paid into the State budget.

(5) It is prohibited for the intelligence and counter-intelligence services and those assimilated to them to establish, finance, lead or coordinate, through their own personnel or through intermediaries, non-governmental organisations.

(6) Breach of the provisions laid down in paragraphs (1) to (5) constitutes a criminal act and shall be punished by imprisonment from 10 to 20 years and the prohibition of certain rights.

(7) Attempt shall be punished.

(8) Failure to report the acts provided for in paragraphs (1) to (5) constitutes a criminal act and shall be punished by the same penalty as that provided for in paragraph (6)."

→ the reasons

Article 24 → the reasons

Act no. 14 of 24 February 1992 on the organisation and functioning of the Romanian Intelligence Service, published in the Official Gazette no. 33 of 3 March 1992, as subsequently amended, is amended as follows:

(1) In article 9, paragraph (1), letter a) is amended and shall read as follows:

"requesting and obtaining objects, documents or official information from public authorities or institutions"

(2) In article 9, paragraph (1), letter e) is repealed.

(3) In article 10, paragraph (1) is amended and shall read as follows:

"In situations constituting threats to national security, the Romanian Intelligence Service, through personnel designated for that purpose, shall carry out activities specific to the gathering of intelligence, performed in accordance with the procedure laid down in Act no. 51/1991, as subsequently amended, which shall apply accordingly."

(4) In article 27, paragraph (1) is amended and shall read as follows:

"The personnel of the Romanian Intelligence Service shall consist of civilian employees performing operational and administrative duties."

(5) In article 27, paragraph (3) is repealed.

(6) In article 29, paragraph (1) is repealed.

(7) Article 30 is repealed.

(8) Article 42 is amended and shall read as follows:

"(1) The buildings, means of transport, technical equipment and other material means for the officials of the Romanian Intelligence Service shall be provided by the Government.

(2) The funds necessary for carrying out the activity of the Romanian Intelligence Service shall be provided within the State budget, approved by Parliament.

(3) The Romanian Intelligence Service shall have its own fleet of means of transport for the central apparatus and the subordinate units, established by the equipment tables of the units approved by the Director."

→ the reasons

Article 25 → the reasons

Act no. 1 of 6 January 1998 on the organisation and functioning of the Foreign Intelligence Service, republished, published in the Official Gazette no. 511 of 18 October 2000, as subsequently amended, is amended as follows:

(1) in article 9, paragraph (1) is amended and shall read as follows:

"The Foreign Intelligence Service shall carry out its activity in accordance with the Constitution of Romania, with the laws of the country and with the decisions of the Supreme Council of National Defence."

(2) In article 10, paragraph (1) is amended and shall read as follows: "The Foreign Intelligence Service is authorised, under the conditions laid down by law, to use methods and to create and hold appropriate means for obtaining, verifying, evaluating, exploiting and storing data and information relating to national security."

(3) Article 11 is amended and shall read as follows:

"The Foreign Intelligence Service has the right, under the conditions laid down by law, to request and obtain from the Romanian public authorities data or documents necessary for the performance of its duties."

(4) Article 13 is amended and shall read as follows:

"The personnel of the Foreign Intelligence Service shall consist of civilian employees."

(5) Article 14 is amended and shall read as follows:

"Military personnel of the Foreign Intelligence Service in the reserve or retired shall have all the rights and duties provided for by the normative acts applicable to the Romanian army, as well as by the rules specific to that service."

(6) In article 21, paragraph (1^1) is repealed.

→ the reasons

Article 26 → the reasons

Act no. 92 of 24 July 1996 on the organisation and functioning of the Special Telecommunications Service, published in the Official Gazette no. 169 of 30 July 1996, is amended as follows:

(1) in article 11, paragraph (1), letter m) is amended and shall read as follows:

"shall carry out other necessary activities, such as: research and technological and IT design, personnel and training activities, transport, medical and rehabilitation assistance, and social, cultural and sporting activities for its own personnel, in accordance with the legal rules."

(2) In article 12, paragraph (1) is amended and shall read as follows:

"The personnel of the Special Telecommunications Service shall consist of civilian employees."

(3) In article 12, paragraph (2) is repealed.

(4) Article 14 is amended and shall read as follows:

"The Special Telecommunications Service shall organise its own system of instruction and of improvement of the training of civilian employees, and, on the basis of a protocol, through the specialised institutions belonging to the structures of the national defence system, through university education and, as the case may be, within specialised services and firms in the country or abroad."

→ the reasons

Article 27 → the reasons

Act no. 191 of 19 October 1998 on the organisation and functioning of the Protection and Guard Service, published in the Official Gazette no. 402 of 22 October 1998, as subsequently amended and supplemented, is amended as follows:

> (1) In article 1, paragraph (2) is amended and shall read as follows:
>
> "The Protection and Guard Service is a component part of the national defence system."
>
> (2) Article 13 is repealed.
>
> (3) In article 14, letters d) and e) are repealed.
>
> (4) In article 15, paragraph (1) is amended and shall read as follows:
>
> "The personnel of the Protection and Guard Service shall consist of civilian employees."
>
> (5) In article 15, paragraph (3) is amended and shall read as follows:
>
> "Civilian personnel performing specific duties for the carrying out of operational activities shall fall within work groups I and II."
>
> (6) In article 16, paragraphs (1) and (3) are repealed.
>
> (7) In article 19, paragraph (1) is amended and shall read as follows:
>
> "The civilian staff of the Protection and Guard Service shall come from among the graduates of military educational institutions. In the case of posts in specific fields of activity for which military educational institutions do not train the necessary specialists, those posts may be filled by persons trained by civilian educational institutions who meet the legal conditions."
>
> (8) In article 29, paragraph (1) is amended and shall read as follows:
>
> "The civilian personnel of the Protection and Guard Service shall be under an obligation to keep State secrets and official secrets, under the conditions laid down by law."

→ the reasons

Article 28 → the reasons

1. The National Guard is established on the principle of the defence of the entire national territory by the entire people on a voluntary basis.

2. Act no. 45 of 1 July 1994 — the National Defence Act of Romania, published in the Official Gazette no. 172 of 7 July 1994, as subsequently supplemented and amended, is amended and supplemented as follows:

a) Article 10 is amended and shall read as follows: "The forces intended for defence are composed of the armed forces, the national guard and the protection forces." b) Article 11 is amended and shall read as follows: "The armed forces comprise the army, the national guard, large units and units subordinated to the Ministry of the Interior and Administrative Reform, those of the State intelligence services and other defence formations organised in accordance with the law." c) After article 12, a new article 12^1 is inserted, reading as follows: "(1) The National Guard is part of the national defence system and is subordinated directly to Parliament, as the representative of the will of the people, for the safeguarding of the sovereignty, independence and unity of the State, of the territorial integrity of the country and of constitutional democracy." → the reasons

Article 29 → the reasons

From the date of entry into force of this law, military equipment shall be acquired only from its manufacturer and only under the conditions of Emergency Ordinance no. 189/2002 on compensatory operations relating to procurement contracts for defence, public order and national safety needs, published in the Official Gazette no. 942 of 23 December 2002.

Chapter V — Final and transitional provisions

Article 30 → the reasons

This law shall enter into force 3 days after the date of its publication in the Official Gazette of Romania, any provision to the contrary being repealed as from that date.

SECTION 3 — The Solidarity Act — the taxation of large businesses and fortunes

The explanatory memorandum: Explanatory memorandum — The Solidarity Act

Full translation of the draft, of its explanatory memorandum and of its annexes. The Romanian text remains the authoritative one; the formulas and tables of Annex 2 are reproduced there in their original notation.

TO,

THE STANDING BUREAU OF THE SENATE

In accordance with the provisions of art. 74 para. (1) and art. 75 of the Constitution of Romania, republished, as well as with the provisions of art. 92 para. (2) and (4) of the Regulation of the Senate, republished, we submit the legislative proposal "The Act of national solidarity and of the taxation of large businesses and fortunes", for debate and adoption.

Pursuant to art. 111 para. (1) of the Constitution of Romania, republished, we request that the Government be asked to communicate its point of view on this legislative proposal.

We likewise request that the opinions of the Legislative Council and of the Economic and Social Council be sought.

INITIATOR:

_____

EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM

Section 1 – Title of the draft normative act

"The Act of national solidarity and of the taxation of large businesses and fortunes"

Section 2 – Grounds for issuing the normative act

Description of the present situation

In recent years, as a result of the negative impact on the economy caused by the freezing of activity in numerous sectors during the pandemic, and also of the slowdown in economic growth caused by the uncertainties and fears produced by the outbreak of war on the country's borders, major budgetary imbalances have arisen, caused by the increase in budgetary expenditure incurred for the acquisition of numerous pharmaceutical products as well as for the provision of humanitarian and military support in accordance with Romania's foreign policy. The situation described has aggravated both

the budgetary problems already existing and the social problems which our country was facing at the end of 2019, which is why the State must urgently take measures to increase budgetary revenues and also to protect the persons most severely affected by social problems, namely taxpayers who have several dependants — this latter measure being also such as to encourage the birth rate, a major and priority problem of the Romanian State.

This situation calls for urgent measures to increase social solidarity between the natural and legal persons whose material position is solid and consolidated and the disadvantaged strata — the most sorely tried over the past 4 years — whose material situation continues to deteriorate. At the same time, these measures will be correlated with measures to encourage the large contributors and with certain fiscal measures designed to simplify the collection of taxes and to make it more predictable and more transparent, thus avoiding both possible abuses or acts of corruption on the part of the fiscal authorities and eliminating the possibility for large taxpayers to carry out "fiscal optimisations" disloyal to the Romanian State.

2. Envisaged changes

The Act of national solidarity and of the taxation of large businesses and fortunes brings targeted amendments to Act 227/2015 on the Fiscal Code and to Act 256/2018 on certain measures necessary for the implementation of petroleum operations by holders of petroleum agreements relating to offshore petroleum blocks, whose purpose is to increase budgetary revenues by taxing large taxpayers, legal and natural persons, at fixed percentage rates established by thresholds of revenue and, respectively, of wealth held, in order to bear the fiscal deductions granted to taxpayers who have several dependants. Thus:

I. Amendments to Act 227/2015 on the Fiscal Code:

Article 1 adds, after article 18 of the Fiscal Code, three new articles which introduce a special regime of taxation for certain categories of legal-person taxpayers whose annual revenues exceed EUR 10,000,000. To this end, after article 18 there are inserted articles 18^1, 18^2 and 18^3, which govern the regime of taxation by thresholds of turnover and by the nature of the activity of the large legal-person taxpayers of Romania. This measure is such as to encourage the activity of large taxpayers and to increase the degree of economic competitiveness. In essence, the provision introduces thresholds of taxation on turnover for large taxpayers similar to those already existing in Title III of the Fiscal Code, where the regime of taxation on turnover for Romanian micro-enterprises is governed.

Starting from the success of the regime taxing turnover at low rates — a major factor in the development of the national economy in recent years, and also a factor of attractiveness for many foreign economic operators who chose Romania precisely for this manner of taxation — the introduction, by symmetry, of the same manner of taxation for large taxpayers as well is a measure encouraging their economic development and attracting large capital and companies to our country, thus turning Romania into an important player in hosting and encouraging large businesses in Europe and in the world.

It is likewise evident that setting rates of taxation on turnover is such as to increase the predictability of fiscal rules for the economic operator and, at the same time, facilitates the establishment and payment of the taxes owed by large taxpayers to the Romanian State. This latter effect is intended to avoid the possible errors arising, under the current rules, when the taxpayer calculates taxable profit, and to limit the interaction of economic operators with the agents of the Romanian tax authority

during fiscal inspections — a fact such as to make the activity of the tax authority more efficient and to reduce the staff charged with the fiscal control of large taxpayers.

To this end, the introduction of art. 18^1 into the Fiscal Code brings three thresholds of taxation for large taxpayers:

Paragraph 1 provides for a **rate of 1%** applied to the revenues recorded in each fiscal year for "Taxpayers who have recorded revenues exceeding the equivalent in lei of EUR **10,000,000** (ten million euro)"; paragraph 2 introduces a **rate of 2%** applied to the revenues of taxpayers who have recorded revenues exceeding the equivalent in lei of EUR **100,000,000** (one hundred million euro); and paragraph 3 establishes a **rate of 3%** of the revenues of taxpayers who have recorded revenues exceeding the equivalent in lei of EUR **1,000,000,000** (one billion euro). The exchange rate for determining the equivalent in euro is that in force at the close of the financial year in which the revenues were recorded.

As may be observed, the introduction of taxation thresholds from 1% to 3% applied to the revenues of large taxpayers is similar and symmetrical to the regime of taxation of micro-enterprises, a fact such as to encourage large taxpayers too in a manner similar and symmetrical to that applied to small entrepreneurs, thus applying without discrimination one of the fiscal solutions most appreciated nationally and internationally.

Article 18^2 introduces into the Fiscal Code a first exception to the rule established in the preceding article for large taxpayers, introducing a new rate of 5% applied to the revenues recorded for large taxpayers carrying out activities in the nature of refining or marketing petroleum products and their derivatives and whose annual revenues exceed EUR 10,000,000. This increased rate is similar to the existing one governing the "Special regime for taxpayers carrying out activities in the nature of night bars, night clubs, discotheques and casinos", and takes into account, on the one hand, the exceptional situation statistically demonstrated according to which, whatever the difficulties encountered by the national economy — pandemic, state of war on the country's borders — the profitability of the companies carrying out activity in the fields mentioned above is increasing, and, on the other hand, the success and proliferation of businesses in a field of activity already taxed at 5% applied to the revenues recorded annually.

Similarly and for the same reasons, Articles 18^3–18^4 introduce into the Fiscal Code exceptions similar to that provided for in art. 18^2, for taxpayers carrying out activities in the nature of the extraction of crude oil and natural gas, and for taxpayers carrying out activities in the nature of the transport and distribution of electricity.

Likewise, art. 18^5 introduces a further exception, applied this time to taxpayers carrying out activities in the nature of financial intermediation, namely — and without limitation — activities of monetary intermediation, which include activities carried out by banks, savings banks, credit cooperatives, or activities of the credit transfer system through the post and postal activities of savings banks; the granting of credit for the purchase of housing by specialised institutions (housing banks); monetary activities by postal order (payment orders); or activities of holding companies, of mutual funds and other similar financial entities; financial leasing; or other credit activities such as financial service activities relating primarily to the taking out of loans by institutions not involved in monetary intermediation, where the granting of credit may take a variety of forms, such as loans, mortgages, credit cards and so on.

The measure, similarly to that provided for in art. 18^2, took into account the recording by these taxpayers of significant increases in revenue in periods difficult from an economic and social point of

view, together with an inexplicable simultaneous stagnation of profitability caused by rising expenditure.

All these reasons justify the introduction of a special taxation threshold of 5% of the annual revenues obtained by large taxpayers carrying out activities in the fields mentioned above, namely for large taxpayers carrying out activities in the nature of the extraction, refining or marketing of petroleum products, and for large taxpayers carrying out activities in the nature of financial intermediation and whose annual revenues exceed EUR 10,000,000.

Article 2 amends paragraph 2 of Act 227/2015 on the Fiscal Code and establishes a taxation of special pensions, introducing a rate of taxation of 90% of the monthly taxable income from that part of the pension which exceeds 11 gross minimum national wages.

In setting this rate and this taxation threshold, account was taken of the fact that under Act 153/2017 the President of Romania has a legal allowance of 12 gross minimum national wages, and of the fact that, as a matter of principle, no one should receive from the consolidated general budget of the State sums greater than those received by the highest dignitary of the Romanian State, the President of Romania.

For these reasons and starting from this principle, a rate of taxation was established *of 90% of the monthly taxable income from that part of the pension which exceeds 11 gross minimum national wages,* so that all sums deriving from pensions which exceed 11 gross minimum national wages are taxed at 90%.

Article 3 introduces a new title into the Fiscal Code: after TITLE X, TITLE X¹ is introduced, which will bear the heading "THE TAX ON LARGE FORTUNES", the provision introducing for the first time in Romania a tax owed by natural-person taxpayers holding fortunes greater than EUR 10,000,000 (ten million euro).

The provision introduces into Romanian taxation the notion of a "large fortune" for the Romanian natural-person taxpayer, the lower threshold of large fortunes being set at ten million euro, unlike that laid down in other States of the European Union where, as in the case of France, the tax on large fortunes is owed once a fortune of 1.2 million euro is exceeded.

In setting this high threshold for the taxation of large fortunes, account was taken of the need to increase the wealth of Romanian citizens and their ability to develop businesses in order to increase general well-being, and also of the obligation of those whose fortune has exceeded the threshold of EUR 10,000,000 to contribute in a special, personal and direct manner to raising the general standard of living and to the development of the country in which they live and make their profits, this special contribution being made in both a personal and a general interest.

TITLE X¹ introduces three taxation thresholds, as follows:

a solidarity tax of **1%** per year of the total value of the fortune, for natural-person taxpayers whose revenues, cumulated with the value of the gains, of the movable assets and of the buildings existing in their patrimony on 31 December of the preceding year, exceed EUR 10,000,000 (ten million euro);

a solidarity tax of **2%** per year of the total value of the fortune, for natural-person taxpayers whose revenues, cumulated with the value of the gains, of the movable assets and of the buildings existing in their patrimony on 31 December of the preceding year, exceed EUR 100,000,000 (one hundred million euro);

a solidarity tax of **3%** per year of the total value of the fortune, for natural-person taxpayers whose revenues, cumulated with the value of the gains, of the movable assets and of the buildings existing in their patrimony on 31 December of the preceding year, exceed EUR 1,000,000,000 (one billion euro);

The solidarity tax will be calculated on the entire declared fortune and will be owed at the level established by law until the fortune falls below the legally established threshold, so that no person whose fortune does not exceed EUR 10,000,000 will be taxed, whatever the fortune previously held.

For the purpose of establishing the solidarity tax owed, natural persons whose estimated fortune exceeds EUR 10,000,000 are required to draw up annually a declaration of wealth as laid down in Annex I, the annual declaration of wealth for the last fiscal year having to be submitted by 25 March inclusive of the following year.

The exchange rate for determining the equivalent in euro of the fortune is that in force at the close of the financial year in which the revenues and gains were recorded.

The solidarity tax is the means by which the holders of large fortunes show their solidarity towards their fellow citizens and, at the same time, represents the manner in which they help the development of the State which created for them the conditions for achieving significant material accumulations.

Article 4 amends the third sub-paragraph of article 77 of the Fiscal Code and extends the scope of personal deductions for taxpayers who have one or more dependants and who earn revenues between the limit laid down in paragraph 2, namely 3,600 lei, and the limit of 25,000 lei, as follows:

"(i) for taxpayers with **one dependant — 20%** of the income tax due;

(ii) for taxpayers with **two dependants — 30%** of the income tax due;

(iii) for taxpayers with **three dependants — 40%** of the income tax due;

(iv) for taxpayers with **four or more dependants — 50%** of the income tax due.

No personal deduction is granted to taxpayers with gross monthly salary revenues exceeding 25,000 lei."

The deductions are granted in respect of any kind of revenue, no longer being addressed exclusively to salary revenues, so that as wide a range of taxpayers as possible may benefit from these fiscal facilities.

The purpose of the deductions from income tax is to support taxpayers who care for several persons (children, parents, spouses) and, at the same time, to encourage active persons with average incomes to have children, the State assuming indirectly (through the personal deductions governed by this law) and directly (through the statutory child allowances) a part of the expenditure on raising children, as part of the national policy of increasing the birth rate.

The present fiscal provision is such as to encourage work and constitutes a direct measure for halting demographic decline and for encouraging the return to the country of Romanians in the diaspora.

II. Amendments to Act 256/2018 on certain measures necessary for the implementation of petroleum operations by holders of petroleum agreements relating to offshore petroleum blocks

The energy sector, and in particular that of offshore natural gas, represents a central pillar of the national economy. The present context, marked by price fluctuations and by the need to ensure

energy security, has brought into discussion the need to revise the legislative framework governing taxation in the field. To this end, the draft amendment of ACT no. 256/2018 brings a series of adjustments aimed at increasing taxation for the holders of petroleum agreements as regards the operation of offshore petroleum blocks. Increased taxation is often viewed with scepticism; in the present case, however, the arguments in favour are multiple and well founded.

In the first place, correct and efficient taxation can contribute to the State budget, thus providing additional resources which can be invested in critical infrastructure, education or health. Moreover, in a sector as profitable as that of natural gas extraction, a higher tax can discourage speculation and can encourage long-term investment, striking a balance between the profit of companies and collective well-being.

In order to understand the necessity of the draft amendment of the legislation, it is essential to understand the formula for calculating the tax on supplementary offshore revenues. This formula is adjusted according to the weighted average price of the natural gas sold (PMPC), also taking into account the consumer price index (CPI). Taxation thus adapts to market conditions, maintaining an equitable level of taxation correlated with economic realities.

This method of calculating taxes ensures a fair contribution by the petroleum companies to the national budget, without discouraging investment in exploration and development. In addition, emphasis is placed on fiscal transparency and predictability, giving operators the possibility of planning their activities over the medium and long term.

Setting out the calculation formula in detail, we observe that it is structured on three levels of natural gas prices, each with a specific manner of applying taxation. In the case of a PMPC less than or equal to 85 lei/MWh, a basic formula is used which includes the calculated supplementary revenue and the value of the deductible investments. This approach encourages the reinvestment of profits and supports the development of the sector.

In order to illustrate the way in which this mechanism works, let us consider a gas price of 85 lei/MWh or less. The tax on supplementary offshore revenues (IVST) is calculated by deducting the value of the deductible investments (VID) from the total calculated tax (IVSC). When the price rises to between 85 and 100 lei/MWh, the rate of taxation becomes progressive, reflecting a greater contribution to the State budget while still maintaining an incentive to invest.

When the weighted average price of gas exceeds the threshold of 100 lei/MWh, the calculation formula becomes still more complex, underlining the need to divide the supplementary revenues into price bands. This means that, for each price segment above 100 lei, a different rate of taxation applies, thus increasing the degree of fiscal contribution as market prices rise. This approach ensures fiscal equity and recognises market performance, while allowing the holders of petroleum agreements to benefit from a stable and predictable fiscal framework.

Likewise, the value of the deductible investments in the upstream segment is an important point, because it encourages reinvestment and the continued development of the infrastructure needed for the extraction and processing of natural gas. This policy not only stimulates economic growth but also helps to create new jobs, thus contributing to the reduction of unemployment and to long-term economic prosperity. Another crucial aspect of the draft law is the way in which it treats the cumulated values of investments. By allowing a monthly reduction of the value of the deductible investments, a mechanism is created for recognising companies' efforts to update and improve their operations. This may have a positive impact on energy efficiency and on the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, aligning the offshore energy sector with the country's sustainability and environmental objectives.

For these reasons, in the present economic and social context, global economic and ecological pressures require a re-evaluation of the way in which natural resources are exploited and, by implication, taxed. ACT no. 256/2018 on certain measures necessary for the implementation of petroleum operations by holders of petroleum agreements relating to offshore petroleum blocks lies at the centre of a heated debate, with solid arguments supporting the need to increase and to amend that taxation.

Arguments for increasing taxation:

1. Fiscal equity: One of the fundamental principles of a sound fiscal system is equity. In the case of offshore exploitation, the resources exploited are a public good, and the benefits must extend to the whole of society. By increasing taxation, the State would be able to ensure a fairer distribution of the benefits of natural gas extraction, thus contributing to the development of infrastructure, health and education.

2. Environmental sustainability: Offshore extraction activities have a significant impact on marine ecosystems. Higher taxes can discourage harmful practices and can finance environmental protection projects, partly compensating for the damage caused.

3. Investment in green technologies: Encouraging the transition towards clean energy sources is essential. Supplementary taxes on offshore exploitation can be a source of financing for the research and development of new sustainable technologies.

4. Energy security: Increasing taxes can stimulate energy efficiency and reduce dependence on imports of fossil fuels, at the same time diversifying the country's energy sources and promoting energy independence.

The amendment of ACT no. 256/2018 is an immediate necessity, given that the revision and updating of the law are required not only by the fluctuating economic and ecological context but also by the dynamics of the energy market and by technological progress. The proposed amendments aim not only at fairer and more sustainable taxation but also at increased adaptability to market conditions, so that future challenges can be met effectively. Annex – Formula for calculating the tax on supplementary offshore revenues. The calculation formula set out in the annex to the law is essential for understanding the taxation mechanism and for ensuring transparency in the application of the taxes. It establishes the way in which supplementary revenues are calculated according to fluctuations in natural gas prices.

It is a progressive system, designed to reflect both the variable costs of gas production and the volatility of prices on the international market. A direct correlation is thus ensured between the profitability of offshore exploitation and the contribution of the holders of petroleum agreements to the State budget. The detailed formula is included in the annex in order to facilitate the understanding and the calculation of the tax. It takes into account several factors, such as the weighted average price of natural gas (PMPC), the 2012 purchase price adjusted annually by the inflation index (PRC) and the volumes of gas sold (VGC). In addition, special attention is given to the deductible investments in the upstream segment (VID), which stimulate additional investment in exploration and production, essential for maintaining and increasing natural gas extraction capacity.

Technical details of the taxation of supplementary offshore revenues: in order to illustrate the application of the formula, let us assume that the weighted average price of natural gas is 90 lei/MWh. Under the formula, the supplementary revenue from offshore blocks (VS) will be calculated as the difference between PMPC and a reference price (PRC), multiplied by the volume of gas sold (VGC). The tax due (IVST) will be the result of deducting the value of the deductible investments

(VID) from the total calculated tax (IVSC). In this way the formula ensures that taxation is proportionate to the supplementary revenues generated, thus offering a fair and stimulating fiscal framework for the holders of petroleum agreements. Moreover, it ensures that any increase in profitability, owing to a rise in natural gas prices, is correspondingly reflected in contributions to the State budget.

The arguments in favour of increasing taxation and of amending ACT no. 256/2018 are multiple and varied, resting on principles of fiscal equity, ecological sustainability and the promotion of energy security. By rethinking the legislative framework and adapting the formula for calculating the tax on supplementary offshore revenues, Romania can ensure a fairer distribution of the benefits of the extraction of natural resources, protecting the environment and stimulating innovation in the field of renewable energy.

In short, the proposed amendments not only answer the immediate needs of the market and ecological requirements, but also prepare the ground for a more resilient economy, less dependent on fossil fuels. Such an approach is vital in order to navigate a changing global energy landscape and to position Romania as a responsible and progressive player on the international energy stage. In conclusion, increasing taxation and amending ACT no. 256/2018 are necessary steps for aligning national interests with global dynamics and for building a sustainable future. These changes will reflect not only Romania's commitment to the principles of equity and sustainability, but will also serve as a catalyst for innovation and progress in the energy sector. Likewise, through these adjustments, the aim is to align national legislation with the European directives and with the international agreements on combating climate change and reducing CO2 emissions. It is a step forward towards a circular economy and a more efficient use of resources, in which the impact on the environment is minimised and the economic advantages maximised.

Another important aspect of the fiscal reform is the encouragement of transparency and accountability in the petroleum industry. By establishing a clear and detailed framework for the calculation of taxes, companies are motivated to report their revenues accurately and to contribute equitably to the State budget.

This may lead to an increase in public confidence in the way natural resources are managed and in the benefits they bring to society as a whole. In addition, the proposed legislative amendments will contribute to creating a more predictable and stable business environment for investors in the energy sector. A fair and transparent fiscal regime is essential for attracting and maintaining long-term investment, elements vital to the sustainable economic development of Romania.

Not least, the role played by taxation in shaping economic behaviour must be emphasised. By adjusting taxes and duties, the State can influence the direction in which the energy industry moves, favouring innovative and ecological solutions over traditional ones which have a negative impact on the environment and on public health.

In conclusion, fiscal reform in the offshore energy sector is a necessity which cannot be postponed, representing a crucial step in aligning Romania with international standards and with the objectives of sustainable development. Increasing taxation and revising ACT no. 256/2018 are not merely opportunities to secure greater budgetary revenue, but also to promote responsible behaviour in the extractive industry, in accordance with the best global practices. The proposed legislative reform must be regarded as an investment in the future of the country, which can bring long-term benefits and can contribute to the prosperity of future generations. Through it, Romania can become an example of good practice in the management of natural resources and in the application of fiscal policies designed to support sustainable development and the protection of the environment.

Section 3 – Socio-economic impact of the draft amendment of ACT no. 227/2015 and of ACT 256/2018

1. Macroeconomic impact

The economic impact of the amendment of the fiscal legislation, namely of the Fiscal Code Act and of the Act on offshore petroleum operations: the economy of a country is directly influenced by the fiscal legislation which governs the way in which financial resources are collected and distributed. The amendments to Act 227/2015 on the Fiscal Code and to ACT no. 256/2018 will have a significant impact on the Romanian economy.

I. Amendment of the Fiscal Code Act

1. *Introduction of Art. 18^1 and 18^2:* The first significant change proposed is the introduction of article 18^1 into Act 227/2015, which provides for a special regime of taxation for taxpayers exceeding certain revenue thresholds. This measure appears to be directed at large corporations, imposing a progressive rate of taxation of 1%, 2% or 3% according to the revenues recorded. Such a progressive fiscal approach is intended to ensure a fairer contribution to the State budget on the part of top companies. Article 18^2 introduces a special fiscal regime for companies in the petroleum sector, with a rate of taxation of 5% for annual revenues greater than 10 million euro. This change could discourage tax evasion and could stimulate transparency in a sector often criticised for the lack of adequate fiscal coverage. Nevertheless, it is important to assess whether this rate of taxation will not discourage investment in a field vital to Romania's energy security.

2. *Amendments to the taxation of large pensions:* Another major amendment is the adjustment of article 101, which concerns the taxation of pensions. The new wording proposes a rate of 10% for the monthly taxable income from pensions and a rate of 90% for that part of the income which exceeds 11 gross minimum national wages. This measure has the potential to redistribute the fiscal burden, in line with the principles of fiscal equity.

3. *Introduction of the tax on large fortunes:* Another innovative aspect is the introduction of Title X^1, entitled "The tax on large fortunes", which provides for the imposition of a solidarity tax on natural persons with considerable fortunes. The rates of the tax differ according to the total value of the fortune, being set at 1%, 2% or 3% for cumulated revenues exceeding certain thresholds. This measure comes in the context of global debates on inequality of income and wealth, being a step towards a more equitable distribution of fiscal burdens. It is essential, however, to analyse the impact it will have on the mobility of capital and on investment.

4. *Adjustments to personal deductions:* Article 77 brings into discussion the adjustment of personal deductions for taxpayers with gross monthly revenues between certain thresholds. This is a measure which could encourage consumption and could have a positive effect on the economy by stimulating the purchasing power of the population. In this way, the fiscal effort of those who have family responsibilities is recognised and rewarded, offering them financial support through tax reliefs proportionate to the number of dependants.

II. Amendment of ACT no. 256/2018 on offshore petroleum operations

The amendments to Act no. 256/2018 are essential for understanding how the energy sector, and especially that of offshore petroleum operations, will evolve. In a global context in which the energy transition is becoming ever more important, fiscal rules must be balanced so as to support both environmental protection and economic competitiveness.

1. *Establishing the measures necessary for the implementation of offshore petroleum operations*

Article 1 of Act no. 256/2018 is amended so as to ensure legal clarity and to establish the measures necessary for the implementation of offshore petroleum operations. This clarification is vital in order to attract new investors and to maintain a stable and predictable regulatory framework allowing long-term investment planning.

2. *Repeal of certain provisions and harmonisation of the legislation:* By repealing letters m), n), o), p) and r) of article 2, the current legislation is simplified and harmonised with international standards. This measure could improve the perception of the Romanian business environment and could contribute to better integration into the European energy market.

3. *Amendments to the fiscal regime applicable to offshore petroleum activities:* Article 18 proposes maintaining the level of royalty and the percentage rates of petroleum royalty for the holders of offshore petroleum agreements. This fiscal continuity is essential in order to maintain investor confidence and to avoid the financial destabilisation of ongoing projects. Fiscal stability is a key factor in long-term investment decisions, and this amendment respects the commitments of the Romanian State towards investors.

4. *Taxation of supplementary offshore revenues:* Article 19 introduces a system of taxation of supplementary offshore revenues, whose purpose is to increase revenues to the State budget by taxing the differences between the selling prices of natural gas and a reference price established in 2012. This system of taxation could stimulate greater transparency in the trading of natural gas and could ensure that the benefits of gas extraction are also reflected in State revenues. It must nevertheless be analysed whether this tax will affect the competitiveness of prices for final consumers and whether it will negatively influence investment decisions in the exploration and exploitation of natural gas resources.

5. *Sale of natural gas on centralised markets:* Through the amendments to article 20, an obligation is introduced for the holders of offshore petroleum agreements to sell a percentage share of 90% of the natural gas on centralised markets. This measure could contribute to greater competitiveness on the natural gas market and to a more transparent formation of prices. At the same time, it is crucial to ensure that these provisions will not lead to market distortions or to the creation of barriers to free competition.

6. Establishing a special account for investments. Article 19 paragraph (8) provides for the collection of the tax on supplementary revenues into a special account intended for the financing of natural gas infrastructure. This measure has the potential to accelerate the development of energy infrastructure and to support Romania's energy security. It is important, however, to monitor the efficiency with which these funds are used, in order to ensure that they will have a real positive impact on the economy.

7. Implementing a legal framework for the conduct of offshore petroleum operations. Article 34 introduces the possibility of concluding addenda to the petroleum agreements relating to offshore petroleum blocks, which will allow adaptation to the new legislative conditions. This represents an important step in making the existing contractual framework between the State and the petroleum companies more flexible and up to date, thus ensuring that exploration and exploitation activities can continue under optimised conditions. Conclusions: analysing the proposed amendments to the fiscal legislation, it may be observed that they seek to increase revenues to the State budget and to promote a more equitable distribution of the fiscal burden. The introduction of progressive rates of taxation for large corporations and for persons with large fortunes represents a bold step towards a fairer taxation, more oriented towards social responsibility.

11. Impact on the competitive environment and on the field of State aid

Not applicable

2. Impact on the business environment

In recent years, the development of fiscal legislation in Romania has attracted the attention of numerous actors in the business environment, both domestic and international. The amendments made to the Fiscal Code by Act 227/2015 and the related legislation are intended to adapt the fiscal framework to economic realities and to environmental requirements. We shall analyse in detail the impact of these amendments, with particular emphasis on the articles most relevant to the business environment.

I. Amendments to the Fiscal Code

1. *Special regime for large taxpayers:* The introduction of articles 18^1 and 18^2 into the Fiscal Code comes as a measure to balance the fiscal burden for taxpayers with substantial annual revenues. By applying progressive rates of taxation according to the revenue threshold, the State intends to stimulate a better distribution of the fiscal burden and, at the same time, to secure the resources needed to finance public expenditure. Thus, taxpayers exceeding the threshold of 10 million euro will pay a tax of 1%, those exceeding 100 million euro will contribute 2%, and for revenues exceeding 1 billion euro the rate of taxation is 3%. This progressive structure may have a positive impact on the business environment by encouraging the reinvestment of profits and by supporting long-term growth. At the same time, through these measures large taxpayers are made directly accountable for contributing to the State budget in proportion to the size of their revenues. This could lead to greater equity in society and to a more efficient redistribution of resources.

2. *The tax on large pensions:* The amendments to article 101 paragraph 2 of the Fiscal Code are likewise significant, imposing a tax of 10% on the monthly taxable income from pensions, while for that part of the pension exceeding 11 gross minimum national wages the rate of taxation is 90%. This is a measure aimed at adjusting the level of taxation of special pensions, a subject frequently debated in public and one which has aroused much controversy. By this amendment the legislator seeks to balance the pension system and to reduce inequalities.

3. *The tax on large fortunes:* The introduction of TITLE X^1 into the Fiscal Code, under the name "The tax on large fortunes", brings into discussion a form of progressive taxation applied to natural persons with substantial fortunes. Articles 500^1–500^5 establish rates of taxation of 1%, 2% and 3% applied progressively according to the total value of the fortune, starting from the threshold of 10 million euro. This fiscal initiative may be interpreted as a step towards ensuring greater social justice and a more equitable distribution of the fiscal burden.

On the other hand, the obligation to draw up an annual declaration of wealth for taxpayers exceeding the threshold of 10 million euro may serve as an instrument of transparency and fiscal control, contributing to the fight against tax evasion and to increasing the degree of fiscal compliance.

4. *Personal deductions:* Another significant change is the adjustment of personal deductions according to the number of dependants. This is aimed especially at families with children and seeks to reduce the fiscal burden for taxpayers with family responsibilities. The amendment of article 77 paragraph 2, third sub-paragraph, provides for progressive deductions from 20% to 50% of the income tax due, according to the number of dependants. Support for families is thus encouraged and their importance in the social structure recognised. This measure may have a positive impact on the standard of living and may stimulate demographic growth, being at the same time a step towards a more humane fiscal policy, more oriented towards the needs of citizens.

II. Amendments to Act no. 256/2018 on offshore petroleum operations

The legislation on offshore petroleum operations has likewise been the subject of significant adjustments. The amendments made by Act no. 256/2018 concern chiefly the level of royalties, the taxation of supplementary revenues and the conditions for exploiting natural resources in offshore blocks.

1. *Establishing a specific fiscal regime:* Article 18 brings clarifications as regards the application of the level of royalty and of the percentage rates of petroleum royalty for the holders of offshore petroleum agreements. Although this is a technical and complex field, the essence of the amendments consists in applying a stable fiscal regime throughout the duration of the petroleum agreements, thus offering predictability and a clearer fiscal framework for investors. This is crucial in a sector where investments are massive and the planning horizon is long-term.

2. *Deductibility of investments:* A particularly important aspect is constituted by the rules concerning deductible investments, described in article 19. It is specified there that the investments taken into account in calculating the deduction from the tax on supplementary revenues are not taken into account in the fiscal result for the purposes of profit tax. This means that investments in the upstream segment are considered non-deductible for the purpose of calculating profit tax, but may be deducted from the tax on supplementary offshore revenues. This mechanism of deductibility encourages the reinvestment of profits in exploration and exploitation activities, thus contributing to the sustainable development of the petroleum sector.

3. *The tax on supplementary offshore revenues:* Article 19 defines the tax on supplementary offshore revenues as a levy applicable to the difference between the selling price of natural gas from domestic production and a reference price established in 2012. This tax aims to capture part of the supplementary profits obtained by companies as a result of price fluctuations on the natural gas market. The percentages for calculating the tax are structured so as to reflect the differences in prices, and the deduction of investments in the upstream segment is limited to a maximum percentage, in order to ensure that the State benefits from an equitable share of the supplementary profits. This fiscal measure may have mixed effects on the energy market: on the one hand it encourages efficiency and the prudent management of resources, and on the other it may influence the investment decisions of companies in the energy sector.

4. *Sale of natural gas:* Article 20 imposes on the holders of offshore petroleum agreements the obligation to conclude contracts on centralised markets for the sale of a minimum share of 90% of the natural gas contracted. This requirement promotes transparency and competition on the natural gas market, with the potential to contribute to the stabilisation of prices and to ensure equitable access to resources for all market actors. By establishing a clear and non-discriminatory trading framework, the aim is both to protect the interests of consumers and to create a healthy competitive environment for producers.

5. *Penalties for failure to observe the provisions:* A novelty introduced by the legislative amendments is the establishment of significant penalties for failure to observe the provisions of arts. 19 and 20. Under article 25, failure to observe those obligations may attract fines of up to 30% of the turnover of the company concerned for the year in which the breach was found. This reflects a more assertive approach by the State in enforcing fiscal rules and a step towards ensuring compliance in the energy sector. Through these measures, the aim is to discourage non-compliant fiscal behaviour and to emphasise the importance of observing the legal rules.

Conclusions: The recent amendments to Romanian fiscal legislation reflect a tendency to adapt the fiscal system to current economic dynamics and to the needs of sustainable development. From the imposition of progressive rates of taxation for large taxpayers to the adjustment of the fiscal regime for offshore petroleum operations, these changes are intended to balance the fiscal burden, to

stimulate investment and to promote transparency and equity in the business environment. The impact of these amendments is complex and will manifest itself differently according to the sector of activity and the size of the economic actors.

3. Social impact of the amendments to the Fiscal Code and to the petroleum legislation in Romania

I. Amendments to the Fiscal Code

1. *Special regime for taxpayers with large revenues.* The introduction of a progressive tax for taxpayers with very large annual revenues is a bold step in the direction of fiscal equity. This measure may reduce economic disparities and may contribute to a fairer redistribution of wealth. Likewise, by increasing the contribution of the wealthiest members of society, the State can accumulate additional resources for investment in infrastructure, education and health, to the benefit of the whole population.

2. *Taxation of large pensions.* The amendment of the Fiscal Code so as to impose a rate of taxation of 10% on income from pensions and, above all, a rate of 90% for that part of the pension exceeding a certain ceiling, may be seen as a measure of social solidarity. This could help to balance the pension system and to ensure its long-term sustainability, an aspect particularly important in the present demographic context.

3. *The tax on large fortunes.* The proposal to impose a solidarity tax on large fortunes is a strong signal towards the social responsibility of those with substantial incomes and fortunes. This initiative may play an essential role in mitigating inequalities and in financing projects of public interest which contribute to the development of communities and to the reduction of poverty.

4. *Modified personal deductions.* The adjustment of personal deductions for taxpayers with medium and high incomes may encourage economic growth. Through these deductions, additional support is given to families with dependants, thus stimulating consumption and investment and having a positive impact on the economy as a whole. In addition, by limiting these deductions in respect of high incomes, it is ensured that the fiscal benefits are directed towards the segments of the population most in need of support.

II. Amendments to the petroleum legislation

1. *Establishing measures for offshore operations.* The amendments made to the law governing offshore petroleum operations bring clarity and legal stability, aspects essential for attracting investors and for developing the energy sector. These changes may lead to an increase in natural gas production and to a reduction in Romania's dependence on imports, which has a direct impact on national energy security and on prices for consumers.

2. *Taxation of supplementary offshore revenues.* The taxation of the supplementary revenues obtained by petroleum companies represents an important source of revenue for the State, which can be reinvested in infrastructure projects or in other fields vital to society. This measure ensures that the benefits of the country's natural resources are distributed equitably among all citizens.

3. *Transparency in the sale of natural gas.* The obligation to sell a percentage share of natural gas on centralised markets increases transparency and competitiveness in the sector. This may lead to better prices for consumers and to a more dynamic market, with beneficial effects on the national economy.

4. *Investment in gas infrastructure.* By channelling the supplementary offshore taxes towards the financing of gas infrastructure, the development of an efficient and modern energy system is ensured.

Improved access to natural gas can stimulate regional economic development and can reduce energy costs for consumers and undertakings, thus contributing to a rise in the standard of living.

Conclusions. The legislative amendments analysed in this memorandum reflect an approach oriented towards greater social equity and towards the accountability of those with large incomes. They also aim to increase the efficiency and performance of the energy sector, with direct benefits for the economy and for society. In a changing global economic context, these adjustments may represent important steps towards long-term stability and prosperity for Romania.

4. Environmental impact

Not applicable.

5. Other information

Not applicable.

Section 5 – Effects of this normative act upon the legislation in force

a) normative acts in force which will be amended or repealed as a result of the entry into force of the draft normative act:

There will be amended **Act no. 227/2015 on the Fiscal Code;**

There will be amended **Act 256/2018 on certain measures necessary for the implementation of petroleum operations by holders of petroleum agreements relating to offshore petroleum blocks**

In summary, Act 227/2015 has 2 articles amended, 9 articles added and 0 repealed, to which an annex is added,

while Act 256/2018 has 10 articles amended and the annex amended.

b) normative acts to be drawn up for the implementation of the new provisions: none identified.

1^1. Compatibility of the draft normative act with the legislation in the field of public procurement — Not applicable

2. Conformity of the draft normative act with Community legislation in the case of drafts transposing Community provisions — No documents in Community legislation in the field have been identified.

3. Normative measures necessary for the direct application of Community normative acts — Not applicable.

4. Judgments of the Court of Justice of the European Union — Not applicable.

5. Other normative acts and/or international documents from which commitments derive — Not applicable.

6. Other information. — Not applicable.

1. Information on the process of consultation with non-governmental organisations, research institutes and other bodies involved	Not applicable
2. Justification of the choice of the organisations consulted, and of the way in which the activity of those organisations is connected with the object of the draft normative act	Not applicable
3. Consultations organised with the local public administration authorities, where the draft normative act concerns activities of those authorities, under Government Decision no. 521/2005 on the procedure for con-	Not applicable

sulting the associative structures of the local public administration authorities in the drafting of normative acts	
4. Consultations carried out within the inter-ministerial councils, in accordance with Government Decision no. 750/2005 on the establishment of permanent inter-ministerial councils	Not applicable.
5. Information on the opinions to be given by:	The consultative opinions will be obtained after completion of the stages laid down by Act 189/1999.

a) The Legislative Council

b) The Supreme Council of National Defence

c) The Economic and Social Council

d) The Competition Council

e) The Court of Auditors.

Section 7 – Public information activities concerning the drafting and implementation of the draft normative act

1. Informing civil society of the necessity of drawing up the normative act — The draft law revising the Constitution was submitted to public debate for 18 months and is the direct result of those open consultations.

2. Informing civil society of the possible environmental impact following the implementation of the draft normative act, and of the effects on the health and safety of citizens or on biological diversity — Not applicable.

3. Other information — Not applicable

Section 8 – Implementing measures

1. Measures for putting the draft normative act into application by the central and/or local public administration authorities — the establishment of new bodies or the extension of the competences of existing institutions — Not applicable.

2. Other information — None identified

THE PARLIAMENT OF ROMANIA

SENATE — CHAMBER OF DEPUTIES

THE ACT OF NATIONAL SOLIDARITY —

THE ACT ON THE TAXATION OF LARGE BUSINESSES AND FORTUNES

DRAFT LEGISLATION AMENDING

THE FISCAL CODE

Act no. 227/2015 on the Fiscal Code, and

ACT no. 256 of 12 November 2018

on certain measures necessary for the implementation of petroleum operations by holders of petroleum agreements relating to offshore petroleum blocks

Starting from the constitutional principle that Romania is a social State (Article 1 para. 3 of the Constitution) built upon the solidarity of its citizens (Article 4 para. 1 of the Constitution),

taking into account the need to simplify and render more efficient the collection of taxes and duties, a fact such as to increase predictability and also competitiveness in the economy,

having regard to the need to encourage the birth rate and also to increase the degree of social protection which the State can grant indirectly through family members,

and likewise from the need to encourage work and to reduce the share of social assistance,

The following is adopted:

I. Amendment of Act 227/2015:

1. After article 18, articles 18^1 and 18^2 are inserted, reading as follows: → the reasons

"ART. 18^1 Special regime for taxpayers with annual revenues exceeding EUR 10,000,000

1. Taxpayers who have recorded revenues exceeding the equivalent in lei of EUR 10,000,000 are liable to pay a tax at the rate of 1% applied to the revenues recorded. The exchange rate used is that valid at the close of the financial year in which the revenues were recorded.

2. Taxpayers who have recorded revenues exceeding the equivalent in lei of EUR 100,000,000 are liable to pay a tax at the rate of 2% applied to the revenues recorded. The exchange rate used is that valid at the close of the financial year in which the revenues were recorded.

3. Taxpayers who have recorded revenues exceeding the equivalent in lei of EUR 1,000,000,000 are liable to pay a tax at the rate of 3% applied to the revenues recorded. The exchange rate used is that valid at the close of the financial year in which the revenues were recorded.

ART. 18^2 — Special regime for taxpayers carrying out activities of extraction, refining or marketing of petroleum products and their derivatives

"Taxpayers carrying out activities of extraction, refining or marketing of petroleum products and their derivatives and having annual revenues greater than EUR 10,000,000 are liable to pay a tax at the rate of 5% applied to the revenues recorded."

2. Art. 101 paragraph 2 of Act 227/2015 on the Fiscal Code is amended and shall read as follows:

"(2) The tax is calculated by applying a rate of 10% to the monthly taxable income from pensions and, respectively, a rate of 90% to the monthly taxable income from the portion of the pension exceeding 11 gross minimum wages per country."

3. After TITLE X, TITLE X^1 is introduced, bearing the heading "THE TAX ON LARGE FORTUNES", and shall read as follows:

"Article 500^1 Natural-person taxpayers whose revenues, cumulated with the value of the gains, of the movable assets and of the buildings existing in their patrimony on 31 December of the preceding year, exceed EUR 10,000,000 are liable to pay a solidarity tax amounting to 1% per year of the total value of the fortune.

Article 500^2 Natural-person taxpayers whose revenues, cumulated with the value of the gains, of the movable assets and of the buildings existing in their patrimony on 31 December of the preceding

year, exceed EUR 100,000,000 are liable to pay a solidarity tax amounting to 2% per year of the total value of the fortune.

Article 500³ Natural-person taxpayers whose revenues, cumulated with the value of the gains, of the movable assets and of the buildings existing in their patrimony on 31 December of the preceding year, exceed EUR 1,000,000,000 are liable to pay a solidarity tax amounting to 3% per year of the total value of the fortune.

Article 500⁴ The exchange rate for determining the equivalent in euro is that valid at the close of the financial year in which the revenues and gains were recorded.

Article 500⁵ 1.) Natural-person taxpayers whose revenues, cumulated with the value of the gains, of the movable and immovable assets and of the buildings existing in their patrimony on 31 December of the preceding year exceed EUR 10,000,000 shall submit a declaration of wealth.

(2) Declarations of wealth are made in writing, on the declarant's own responsibility, and comprise the rights and obligations of the declarant, of the spouse and of the dependent children, in accordance with Annex no. 1 to this law.

4. Article 77, paragraph 2, third sub-paragraph is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"For taxpayers with gross monthly revenues between 3,600 lei and 20,000 lei, the personal deduction is granted as follows:

(i) for taxpayers with one dependant — 20% of the income tax due;

(ii) for taxpayers with two dependants — 30% of the income tax due;

(iii) for taxpayers with three dependants — 40% of the income tax due;

(iv) for taxpayers with four or more dependants — 50% of the income tax due.

No personal deduction is granted to taxpayers with gross monthly salary revenues exceeding 20,000 lei."

II. Amendment of ACT no. 256/2018:

1. Article 1 is amended and supplemented and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"(1) This law establishes certain measures necessary for the implementation of petroleum operations of exploration, development and exploitation of petroleum deposits and of abandonment, as well as of the works relating to offshore petroleum blocks.

(2) Where a holder is party to a petroleum agreement covering both onshore petroleum blocks and offshore petroleum blocks, or holds the capacity of holder in respect of both categories, the provisions of this law shall apply accordingly to the offshore component.

In article 2, letters m), n), o), p) and r) are repealed. → the reasons

Article 18 is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"Art. 18. — Holders of petroleum agreements relating to offshore petroleum blocks in the course of performance at the date of entry into force of this law shall be subject, throughout their duration, to

the level of royalty, to the percentage rates of petroleum royalty and to the gross-production thresholds corresponding to those rates, as they result from this law."

In article 19, after paragraph 11, paragraph (12) is inserted: → the reasons

"(12) Investments taken into account in calculating the deduction from the tax on supplementary revenues shall not be taken into account in determining the fiscal result of the periods for which corporate income tax is paid."

Article 19 is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"Art. 19. — (1) Holders of petroleum agreements relating to offshore petroleum blocks, including their subsidiaries and/or entities belonging to the same economic interest grouping which effectively carry out such operations, are liable to pay the tax on supplementary offshore revenues.

(2) Supplementary revenue means the difference between the weighted average price of the natural gas sold from own domestic production from offshore blocks and the purchase price of natural gas from domestic production for household and non-household customers in 2012, adjusted annually by the consumer price index.

(3) The tax on supplementary offshore revenues provided for in paragraph (1) is calculated by applying one or more calculation percentages, as the case may be, to the supplementary revenues obtained from the sale of natural gas, as follows:

a) 50% of the supplementary revenue for prices up to and including 85 lei/MWh;

b) 15% of the supplementary revenues obtained from prices greater than 85 lei/MWh and less than or equal to 100 lei/MWh;

c) 30% of the supplementary revenues obtained from prices greater than 100 lei/MWh and less than or equal to 115 lei/MWh;

d) 35% of the supplementary revenues obtained from prices greater than 115 lei/MWh and less than or equal to 130 lei/MWh;

e) 40% of the supplementary revenues obtained from prices greater than 130 lei/MWh and less than or equal to 145 lei/MWh;

f) 50% of the supplementary revenues obtained from prices greater than 145 lei/MWh and less than or equal to 160 lei/MWh;

g) 55% of the supplementary revenues obtained from prices greater than 160 lei/MWh and less than or equal to 175 lei/MWh;

h) 60% of the supplementary revenues obtained from prices greater than 175 lei/MWh and less than or equal to 190 lei/MWh;

i) 70% of the supplementary revenues obtained from prices greater than 190 lei/MWh.

(4) The maximum limit of the deduction of investments in the upstream segment may not exceed 30% of the total tax on supplementary offshore revenues.

(5) The economic operators referred to in paragraph (1) shall calculate, declare and pay the supplementary offshore tax monthly, by the 25th day of the month following that for which the tax is due.

(6) The model and content of the declaration concerning the tax on supplementary offshore revenues shall be established by order of the President of the National Agency for Fiscal Administration.

(7) In so far as the application of these provisions requires the issuing of instructions concerning the tax on supplementary offshore revenues, these shall be issued by joint order of the ministers concerned.

(8) The sums owed by holders of petroleum agreements relating to offshore blocks as tax on supplementary revenues shall be collected into a special account used for financing investments of national interest.

(9) The cumulated value of investments in the upstream segment, recorded in the accounts in accordance with the legal provisions in force, from the entry into force of this law until the month of calculation, shall be taken into account for the deduction.

(10) In the event of the alienation of investments in respect of which the deduction provided for in paragraphs (3) and (4) was granted, the deduction granted shall be subtracted from the cumulated value of the investments in the upstream segment.

(11) Investments taken into account for the deduction from the tax on supplementary revenues may not be the subject of other deductions."

Article 20 is amended and supplemented and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"Art. 20. — By way of derogation from the provisions of art. 177 of the Electricity and Natural Gas Act no. 123/2012, as subsequently amended and supplemented, holders of petroleum agreements relating to offshore blocks shall pay the percentage rate provided for by this law."

Article 21 is amended and supplemented and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"Art. 21. — The percentage rate provided for in art. 20 shall remain unchanged throughout the duration of the agreements."

In Article 25, after letter m), letter n) is added, reading as follows: → the reasons

"n) failure by holders of petroleum agreements to observe the provisions of arts. 19 and 20 shall be sanctioned by a fine corresponding to 30% of the turnover of the year in which the breach was established."

Article 33 is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"Art. 33. — From the date of entry into force of this law, the provisions of Government Ordinance no. 7/2013 establishing the tax on supplementary revenues shall not apply in the case of offshore petroleum agreements."

Article 34 is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"Art. 34. — With a view to applying the provisions of arts. 18, 19 and 21, the National Agency for Mineral Resources and the holders of petroleum agreements may conclude addenda to the petroleum agreements relating to offshore petroleum blocks."

Annex no. 1

DECLARATION OF WEALTH

The undersigned, _____, personal numerical code _____, identified by identity card/passport series _____ no. _____,

being aware of the provisions of art. 326 of the Criminal Code on false statements and of art. 9 of Act 241/2005 on tax evasion,

declare on my own responsibility that, together with my family, I hold wealth which I estimate at the value of[1] _____, comprising:

I. Immovable property

1. Land

NOTE: Land situated in other countries shall also be declared.

Address or area | Category* | Year of acquisition | Surface | Share | Manner of acquisition | Holder

* The categories indicated are: (1) agricultural; (2) forest; (3) within the built-up area; (4) water surface; (5) other categories of land outside the built-up area, if in the civil circuit.

*2) Under "Holder" there shall be mentioned, in the case of own property, the name of the owner (the holder, the spouse, the child), and in the case of co-owned property, the share and the names of the co-owners.

2. Buildings

NOTE: Buildings situated in other countries shall also be declared.

Address or area | Category* | Year of acquisition | Surface | Share | Manner of acquisition | Holder

* The categories indicated are: (1) flat; (2) dwelling house; (3) holiday house; (4) commercial/ production premises.

*2) Under "Holder" there shall be mentioned, in the case of own property, the name of the owner (the holder, the spouse, the child), and in the case of co-owned property, the share and the names of the co-owners.

II. Movable property

1. Motor vehicles/cars, tractors, agricultural machinery, launches, yachts and other means of transport subject to registration according to the law

Nature | Make | Number of items | Year of manufacture | Share | Manner of acquisition | Holder

NOTE: All property owned shall be mentioned, whether or not it is situated on the territory of Romania at the time of the declaration. 2. Property in the form of precious metals, jewellery, art objects and worship objects.

Brief description | Year of acquisition | Share | Estimated value

NOTE: All property owned shall be mentioned, whether or not it is situated on the territory of Romania at the time of the declaration.

III. Financial assets

1. Bank accounts and deposits, investment funds, equivalent forms of saving and investment, including credit cards, if their aggregate value exceeds EUR 5,000

Institution administering the account and its address | Type | Currency | Year opened | Balance / current value

NOTE: Those held in banks or financial institutions abroad shall also be declared. *The categories indicated are: (1) current account or equivalent (including card); (2) bank deposit or equivalent.

2. Placements, direct investments and loans granted, if their aggregate market value exceeds EUR 5,000

Issuer / company in which the person is shareholder or associate / beneficiary of the loan | Type | Number of securities / participation share | Total current value

NOTE: Investments and holdings abroad shall also be declared.

*The categories indicated are: (1) securities held (government securities, certificates, bonds); (2) shares or social parts in commercial companies; (3) loans granted in one's own name.

3. Other income-producing net assets which, aggregated, exceed the equivalent of EUR 5,000 per year:

NOTE: Those situated abroad shall also be declared.

IV. Revenues of the declarant and of the members of his family, obtained in the last completed fiscal year

NOTE: Revenues obtained abroad shall also be declared.

Who obtained the revenue | Source of the revenue | Number of securities / participation share | Annual revenue received

Revenues from salaries

1.1. Holder

1.2. Spouse

1.3. Children

Revenues from independent activities

1.1. Holder

1.2. Spouse

1.3. Children

Revenues from the transfer of the use of goods

1.1. Holder

1.2. Spouse

1.3. Children

Revenues from investments

1.1. Holder

1.2. Spouse

1.3. Children

Revenues from pensions

1.1. Holder

1.2. Spouse

1.3. Children

Revenues from industrial activities

1.1. Holder

1.2. Spouse

1.3. Children

Revenues from agricultural activities

1.1. Holder

1.2. Spouse

1.3. Children

Revenues from games of chance

1.1. Holder

1.2. Spouse

1.3. Children

Revenues from other sources

1.1. Holder

1.2. Spouse

1.3. Children

This declaration constitutes a public act and entails liability under the criminal law for the inaccuracy or incompleteness of the data mentioned.

Date of completion .....

Signature .....

Annex no. 2

Formula for calculating the tax on supplementary offshore revenues

Depending on the level of the weighted average price of the natural gas sold from own domestic production from offshore blocks, hereinafter PMPC, the following calculation formulas shall apply:

1. if PMPC is less than or equal to 85 lei/MWh, adjusted by the CPI as the case may be, the total tax due on supplementary offshore revenues is calculated by the formula:

```
IVST = IVSC - VID
```

```
IVSC = ISO_85 = 0,50 VS_85 VS_85 = (PMPC – PRC) VGC VID = min (VI, 0,3 IVSC)*
```

where:

IVST — the total tax due on supplementary offshore revenues; IVSC — the total tax calculated on supplementary offshore revenues;

ISO_85 — the tax due on supplementary offshore revenues, calculated at a PMPC less than or equal to 85 lei/MWh;

VS_85 — the supplementary revenue from offshore blocks, calculated at a PMPC less than or equal to 85 lei/MWh;

PMPC — the weighted average price of the natural gas sold from own domestic production from offshore blocks, or the reference price, as the case may be;

PRC — the purchase price of natural gas from domestic production for household and non-household customers in 2012, namely 45.71 lei/MWh, adjusted annually by the CPI rate from 1 January 2019;

VGC — the volumes of gas from domestic production from offshore blocks sold;

CPI — the annual consumer price index of the preceding year published by the National Institute of Statistics of Romania;

VID — the value of deductible investments in the upstream segment;

VI — the cumulated value of investments in the upstream segment as provided for in art. 19 para. (9), reduced monthly by the VID value deducted;

2. Where PMPC is between 85 lei/MWh and 100 lei/MWh inclusive, adjusted by the CPI as the case may be, the total tax due on supplementary offshore revenues is calculated as follows:

```
IVST = IVSC - VID
```

```
IVSC = 0,5 (85 - PRC) VGC + ISO ISO = CI VS*
```

```
VS = (PMPC - PB) VGC*
```

```
VID = min (VI, 0,5 IVSC) unde:*
```

ISO — the supplementary offshore tax calculated on the supplementary revenues from the sale of natural gas at PMPC prices between 85 lei/MWh and 100 lei/MWh inclusive, adjusted by the CPI;

CI — the rate of taxation of the supplementary revenues from the sale of natural gas [15% — according to art. 19 para. (3) letter b)], applicable for PMPC prices between 85 lei/MWh and 100 lei/MWh inclusive;

PB — the minimum base price of the corresponding calculation interval; for PMPC prices between 85 lei/MWh and 100 lei/MWh inclusive it is 85 lei/MWh;

VS — the supplementary revenue from offshore blocks, calculated from the sale of natural gas at PMPC prices between 85 lei/MWh and 100 lei/MWh inclusive;

3. Where PMPC exceeds 100 lei/MWh, adjusted by the CPI as the case may be, the total tax due on supplementary offshore revenues is calculated as follows:

```
IVST = IVSC - VID
```

```
IVSC = 0,5 (85 - PRC) VGC + ISO VID = min (VI, 0,5 IVSC)*
```

— ISO — the sum of the supplementary offshore taxes, calculated for each price interval according to art. 19 para. (3) letters b) to i), namely:

ISO = ISO1 + ISO2 +...+ ISOi

ISOi — is calculated according to the formula in point 2, where the corresponding terms have the following meanings:

CI — the rate of taxation of the supplementary revenues from the sale of natural gas, for each corresponding price interval according to art. 19 para. (3) letters b) to i);

PB — the minimum base price of the corresponding calculation interval, adjusted annually from 1 January 2019 by the CPI;

VS — the supplementary revenue from offshore blocks, calculated for each corresponding price interval.

Example of calculation: for the sale of a volume VGC of 1 MWh at a selling price of 110 lei/MWh, the total tax due on supplementary offshore revenues is calculated by applying the formulas above:

IVST = IVSC – VID = 17,037-5,1111 = 11,9259 lei

IVSC = 0,5(85 - PRC)VGC + ISO = 0,5(85-45,71)1+5,25 = 17,037 lei

ISO = CI1 VS1 + CI2 VS2 = 0,1515 +0,510 = 5,25 lei

VID = 0,5IVSC=0,317,037=5,1111 lei unde:

CI1 = 0.15 — the rate of taxation (15%) of the supplementary offshore revenues from the sale of natural gas, applicable for prices between 85 lei/MWh and 100 lei/MWh inclusive;

CI2 = 0.3 — the rate of taxation (30%) of the supplementary offshore revenues from the sale of natural gas, applicable for prices between 100 lei/MWh and 115 lei/MWh inclusive;

VS1 = (100-85) × 1 = 15 lei — the supplementary revenue from offshore blocks, calculated as the difference between 100 lei/MWh and 85 lei/MWh;

VS2 = (110-100) × 1 = 10 lei — the supplementary revenue from offshore blocks, calculated as the difference between PMPC (110 lei/MWh in the example given) and 100 lei/MWh (the minimum base price of the interval);

President of the Senate — President of the Chamber of Deputies

[1] To be completed by Romanian citizens whose wealth is estimated at a value exceeding ten million euro.

SECTION 4 — The Referendum Act (amending Act 3/2000 and Act 189/1999)

The explanatory memorandum: Explanatory memorandum — The Referendum Act

Full translation of the draft. The Romanian text remains the authoritative one.

ACT

amending and supplementing Act no. 3/2000 on the organisation and conduct of the referendum and Act 189/1999 on the exercise of legislative initiative by citizens

The Parliament of Romania adopts this law

Art. I — Act no. 3/2000 on the organisation and conduct of the referendum, as subsequently amended and supplemented, is amended and supplemented as follows: → the reasons

1. After article 6, a new article 6^1 is inserted, reading as follows: → the reasons

"Article 6^1

(1) The initiative and the procedure for the adoption of citizens' legislative initiatives are subject to the provisions of art. 74 para. 1 of the Constitution of Romania, republished, of Act 189/1999, republished, and of this law.

(2) The organisation and conduct of the referendum on the adoption of citizens' legislative initiatives, as well as its result, are binding.

(3) The citizens' legislative initiative shall be transmitted forthwith to the Constitutional Court, which shall proceed according to law. If the citizens' legislative initiative is found to be unconstitutional, it is deemed unfinalised and is returned to the initiators, the procedure being resumed.

(4) If the Constitutional Court finds the citizens' legislative initiative to be constitutional, the draft law is published in the Official Gazette of Romania, Part I, together with the decision of the Constitutional Court. The citizens of Romania are called upon to express their will by vote in a national referendum on the adoption of the draft law, on the last Sunday of the 30-day period calculated from the date of publication of the popular legislative initiative in the Official Gazette, the Government being obliged to bring this to public knowledge forthwith through the mass media.

(5) The persons entitled to take part in the national referendum on the adoption of citizens' legislative initiatives, the manner of conducting the referendum campaign, the organisation and conduct of the referendum, the organisation and powers of the electoral bureaux, the acts constituting administrative offences and the manner of establishing and sanctioning them are those laid down in art. 4, art. 7 para. (1) and in chapters IV–VI. The result of the national referendum is established in accordance with art. 5 paras. (2) and (3) and art. 7 para. (2)."

2. In article 7, paragraph (1) is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"(1) Citizens taking part in the referendum have the right to answer 'YES' or 'NO' to the following question entered on the ballot paper: 'Do you agree with the law revising the Constitution of Romania in the form approved by Parliament?', respectively 'Do you agree with the citizens' legislative initiative published in the Official Gazette no. ...?' (the number and date of the Official Gazette in which the citizens' legislative initiative submitted to the referendum was published being completed accordingly)."

3. In article 45, paragraph (2) is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"(2) The law revising the Constitution, the citizens' legislative initiative or, as the case may be, the measure of removing the President of Romania from office enters into force on the date of publication in the Official Gazette of Romania, Part I, of the decision of the Constitutional Court confirming the results of the referendum.

4. Letter a) of paragraph 1 of Article 15 is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

a) according to this law, in the case of the referendum on the revision of the Constitution, in compliance with art. 151 para. (3) of the Constitution of Romania, republished, as well as in the case of the referendum for the adoption of citizens' legislative initiatives, in compliance with art. 74 para. 1 of the Constitution of Romania, republished.

5. In article 45, after paragraph (3), a new paragraph (4) is added, reading as follows: → the reasons

"(4) The result of the referendum of national interest convened pursuant to article 90 of the Constitution of Romania (republished) is binding upon Parliament, which must, within no more than 120 days from the date of publication of the referendum result in the Official Gazette of Romania by the Constitutional Court, adopt a law observing the will of the people expressed by referendum."

Art. II — Act no. 189 of 9 December 1999 (republished) on the exercise of legislative initiative by citizens is amended and supplemented as follows: → the reasons

1. In article 7, paragraph (5) is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"From the date of receipt of the decision of the Constitutional Court, the Chamber of Parliament seised of the legislative initiative shall notify the Central Electoral Bureau in order to commence the procedures for organising and conducting the national referendum in accordance with Act 3/2000. In the latter case, the Constitutional Court shall also rule on the constitutionality of the proposal to revise the Constitution, pursuant to art. 146 letter a) of the Constitution, republished."

President of the Senate — President of the Chamber of Deputies

SECTION 5 — The Act on the reform and demilitarisation of the state security bodies

The explanatory memorandum: Explanatory memorandum — The Sovereignty Act

Full translation of the draft. The Romanian text remains the authoritative one.

THE ACT on the reform and demilitarisation of the state bodies with powers in the field of national security

Draft legislation amending Act 51 of 29 July 1991 on the national security of Romania, Act no. 14 of 24 February 1992 on the organisation and functioning of the Romanian Intelligence Service, Act no. 1 of 6 January 1998 on the organisation and functioning of the Foreign Intelligence Service, Act no. 92 of 24 July 1996 on the organisation and functioning of the Special Telecommunications Service and Act no. 191 of 19 October 1998 on the organisation and functioning of the Protection and Guard Service

I. Act no. 51 of 29 July 1991 on the national security of Romania, republished in the Official Gazette no. 190 of 18 March 2014, as subsequently amended and supplemented, is amended as follows:

> (1) In article 29, paragraphs (1) and (2) are amended and shall read as follows:
>
> "(1) The intelligence, counter-intelligence, guard and special telecommunications services and those assimilated to them shall be organised exclusively as civilian bodies, their employees becoming, by assimilation, public servants with special status, having the right to organise themselves in trade unions and to be investigated by the corresponding civilian prosecution services.
>
> (2) Their statute shall be governed by organic law."
>
> (2) In article 29, after paragraph (3), a new paragraph (4) is inserted, reading as follows:
>
> "The personnel of the Romanian Intelligence Service, of the Foreign Intelligence Service, of the Special Telecommunications Service and of the Protection and Guard Service who, at the date of

retirement, held the status of permanent military personnel for a period of 15 years or more shall retain their rights until their office ceases, in whatever manner."

(3) After article 33, two new articles are inserted, art. 33^1 and art. 33^2, reading as follows:

"33^1 (1) Participation in any manner by the intelligence and counter-intelligence services and those assimilated to them in the carrying out of any acts of judicial procedure is prohibited.

(2) Influencing in any manner the prosecutor or the judge entrusted with an investigation, by any person, including by employees or collaborators of the intelligence and counter-intelligence services and those assimilated to them, constitutes an offence and shall be punished by imprisonment from 10 to 20 years and the prohibition of certain rights.

(3) Attempt shall be punished.

(4) Failure to report the interference provided for in paragraph (1) constitutes a criminal act and shall be punished by the same penalty as that provided for in paragraph (2).

33^2 (1) Participation in any manner by the intelligence and counter-intelligence services and those assimilated to them in the carrying out of any activities of a political, economic or media character is prohibited.

(2) It is prohibited for the intelligence and counter-intelligence services and those assimilated to them to hold commercial companies directly or indirectly, through their own personnel or through intermediaries, as well as to carry out commercial activities on the territory of Romania or abroad.

(3) The intelligence and counter-intelligence services and those assimilated to them may not use funds other than those provided for in the State Budget Law.

(4) Any gains obtained by the intelligence and counter-intelligence services and those assimilated to them in the context of carrying out their specific activities shall be paid into the State budget.

(5) It is prohibited for the intelligence and counter-intelligence services and those assimilated to them to establish, finance, lead or coordinate, through their own personnel or through intermediaries, non-governmental organisations.

(6) Breach of the provisions laid down in paragraphs (1) to (5) constitutes a criminal act and shall be punished by imprisonment from 10 to 20 years and the prohibition of certain rights.

(7) Attempt shall be punished.

(8) Failure to report the acts provided for in paragraphs (1) to (5) constitutes a criminal act and shall be punished by the same penalty as that provided for in paragraph (6)."

→ the reasons

II. Act no. 14 of 24 February 1992 on the organisation and functioning of the Romanian Intelligence Service, published in the Official Gazette no. 33 of 3 March 1992, as subsequently amended, is amended as follows:

(1) In article 9, paragraph (1), letter a) is amended and shall read as follows:

"requesting and obtaining objects, documents or official information from public authorities or institutions"

(2) In article 9, paragraph (1), letter e) is repealed.

(3) In article 10, paragraph (1) is amended and shall read as follows:

> "In situations constituting threats to national security, the Romanian Intelligence Service, through personnel designated for that purpose, shall carry out activities specific to the gathering of intelligence, performed in accordance with the procedure laid down in Act no. 51/1991, as subsequently amended, which shall apply accordingly."
>
> (4) After article 24, a new article is inserted, art. 24^1, reading as follows:
>
> "The Director of the Romanian Intelligence Service and the First Deputy Director of the Romanian Intelligence Service shall be appointed for a term of 4 years, renewable once only."
>
> (5) In article 27, paragraph (1) is amended and shall read as follows:
>
> "The personnel of the Romanian Intelligence Service shall consist of civilian employees performing operational and administrative duties."
>
> (6) In article 27, paragraph (3) is repealed.
>
> (7) In article 29, paragraph (1) is repealed.
>
> (8) Article 30 is repealed.
>
> (9) Article 42 is amended and shall read as follows:
>
> "(1) The buildings, means of transport, technical equipment and other material means for the officials of the Romanian Intelligence Service shall be provided by the Government.
>
> (2) The funds necessary for carrying out the activity of the Romanian Intelligence Service shall be provided within the State budget, approved by Parliament.
>
> (3) The Romanian Intelligence Service shall have its own fleet of means of transport for the central apparatus and the subordinate units, established by the equipment tables of the units approved by the Director."

→ the reasons

III. Act no. 1 of 6 January 1998 on the organisation and functioning of the Foreign Intelligence Service, republished in the Official Gazette no. 511 of 18 October 2000, as subsequently amended, is amended as follows:

In article 6, after paragraph (2), paragraph (3) is added, reading as follows: → the reasons

> "(3) The Director of the Foreign Intelligence Service shall be appointed for a term of 4 years, renewable once only."

In article 9, paragraph (1) is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

> "The Foreign Intelligence Service shall carry out its activity in accordance with the Constitution of Romania, with the laws of the country and with the decisions of the Supreme Council of National Defence."
>
> (2) In article 10, paragraph (1) is amended and shall read as follows: "The Foreign Intelligence Service is authorised, under the conditions laid down by law, to use methods and to create and hold appropriate means for obtaining, verifying, evaluating, exploiting and storing data and information relating to national security."
>
> (3) Article 11 is amended and shall read as follows:

> "The Foreign Intelligence Service has the right, under the conditions laid down by law, to request and obtain from the Romanian public authorities data or documents necessary for the performance of its duties."
>
> (4) Article 13 is amended and shall read as follows:
>
> "The personnel of the Foreign Intelligence Service shall consist of civilian employees."
>
> (5) Article 14 is amended and shall read as follows:
>
> "Military personnel of the Foreign Intelligence Service in the reserve or retired shall have all the rights and duties provided for by the normative acts applicable to the Romanian army, as well as by the rules specific to that service."
>
> (6) In article 21, paragraph (1^1) is repealed.

→ the reasons

IV. Act no. 92 of 24 July 1996 on the organisation and functioning of the Special Telecommunications Service, published in the Official Gazette no. 169 of 30 July 1996, is amended as follows:

In article 8, after paragraph 6, paragraph 7 is added, reading as follows: → the reasons

> "(7) The Director and the First Deputy Director of the Special Telecommunications Service shall be appointed for a term of 4 years, renewable once only."

In article 11, paragraph (1), letter m) is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

> "shall carry out other necessary activities, such as: research and technological and IT design, personnel and training activities, transport, medical and rehabilitation assistance, and social, cultural and sporting activities for its own personnel, in accordance with the legal rules."
>
> (2) In article 12, paragraph (1) is amended and shall read as follows:
>
> "The personnel of the Special Telecommunications Service shall consist of civilian employees."
>
> (3) In article 12, paragraph (2) is repealed.
>
> (4) Article 14 is amended and shall read as follows:
>
> "The Special Telecommunications Service shall organise its own system of instruction and of improvement of the training of civilian employees, and, on the basis of a protocol, through the specialised institutions belonging to the structures of the national defence system, through university education and, as the case may be, within specialised services and firms in the country or abroad."

→ the reasons

V. Act no. 191 of 19 October 1998 on the organisation and functioning of the Protection and Guard Service, published in the Official Gazette no. 402 of 22 October 1998, as subsequently amended and supplemented, is amended as follows:

> (1) In article 1, paragraph (2) is amended and shall read as follows:
>
> "The Protection and Guard Service is a component part of the national defence system."

(2) After article 9, article 9^1 is inserted, reading as follows:

"The Director and the First Deputy Director of the Protection and Guard Service shall be appointed for a term of 4 years, renewable once only.

(3) Article 13 is repealed.

(4) In article 14, letters d) and e) are repealed.

(5) In article 15, paragraph (1) is amended and shall read as follows:

"The personnel of the Protection and Guard Service shall consist of civilian employees."

(6) In article 15, paragraph (3) is amended and shall read as follows:

"Civilian personnel performing specific duties for the carrying out of operational activities shall fall within work groups I and II."

(7) In article 16, paragraphs (1) and (3) are repealed.

(8) In article 19, paragraph (1) is amended and shall read as follows:

"The civilian staff of the Protection and Guard Service shall come from among the graduates of military educational institutions. In the case of posts in specific fields of activity for which military educational institutions do not train the necessary specialists, those posts may be filled by persons trained by civilian educational institutions who meet the legal conditions."

(9) In article 29, paragraph (1) is amended and shall read as follows:

"The civilian personnel of the Protection and Guard Service shall be under an obligation to keep State secrets and official secrets, under the conditions laid down by law."

→ the reasons

SECTION 6 — The George Act (medical malpractice)

The explanatory memorandum: Explanatory memorandum — The George Act

Full translation of the draft. The Romanian text remains the authoritative one.

THE PARLIAMENT OF ROMANIA

SENATE — CHAMBER OF DEPUTIES

ACT

amending and supplementing Act no. 95/2006 on the reform of the health system and the Patients' Rights Act no. 46/2003

The Parliament of Romania adopts this law

Art. I — Act no. 95/2006 on the reform of the health system, republished in the Official Gazette of Romania, Part I, no. 652 of 28 August 2015, as subsequently amended and supplemented, is amended and supplemented as follows: → the reasons

1. In article 653, paragraph (5) is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"(5) The civil liability regulated by this law does not remove the incurring of criminal liability, where the act which caused the damage was brought about by acts or omissions committed with direct or indirect intent, or with advertent negligence, by medical personnel in breach of the laws, procedures and medical protocols, and constitutes an offence according to law."

2. In article 653, after paragraph (5), a new paragraph (6) is inserted, reading as follows: → the reasons

"(6) Malpractice is presumed where the damage to the patient appears within 72 hours of the medical or medical-pharmaceutical acts causing damage to the patient and there are reasonable suspicions that a causal link exists between the damage suffered and the medical or medical-pharmaceutical act. In such cases, the Commission for monitoring and professional competence for malpractice cases shall draw up a report within 7 days of notification and shall adopt a decision on the case within no more than 30 days of the date of notification, in accordance with the procedure laid down in article 679 et seq. of this law."

3. In article 655, after paragraph (2), three new paragraphs (3)–(5) are inserted, reading as follows: → the reasons

"(3) Public or private health units are obliged to bear in full the costs of treatment, of surgical interventions and all other medical expenses of patients who are victims of medical malpractice and who suffer side effects or infirmity for a period longer than 20 days as a result of the medical or medical-pharmaceutical acts administered by their medical personnel. The prior informed consent of the patient does not exonerate from the liability regulated by this paragraph. The liability of the public or private health units does not exonerate the medical personnel involved in the medical act, who shall be held jointly and severally liable.

(4) The Ministry of Health is obliged to bear in full the costs of treatment, of surgical interventions and all other medical expenses of patients who suffer side effects or infirmity for a period longer than 20 days as a result of the administration of the vaccines that are compulsory or recommended under the National Vaccination Programme, as well as of the other vaccines that are compulsory or recommended in endemic situations or in periods of epidemic and pandemic. The prior informed consent of the patient does not exonerate from the liability regulated by this paragraph.

(5) The provisions of paragraphs 3 and 4 of this article are applicable to all patients who suffer damage following medical or medical-pharmaceutical acts. The existence of the damage shall be established and certified at any time, upon request, by the Commission for monitoring and professional competence for malpractice cases, irrespective of the moment when the medical or medical-pharmaceutical act causing the damage was performed. The decision of the Commission is subject to the procedure laid down in article 684 of this law.

4. Article 687 is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"Art. 687

The court competent to settle the disputes provided for in this law is the tribunal — civil section — in whose territorial jurisdiction the patient victim of the alleged malpractice has his domicile, or the tribunal — civil section — in whose territorial jurisdiction the alleged act of malpractice took place."

5. After article 704, a new article 704^1 is inserted, reading as follows: → the reasons

"Art. 704[1]

(1) Medicines or medical devices for which the manufacturer offers no guarantees and no demonstrably viable remedies against adverse effects may not be marketed or used, nor may such medical treatments be applied.

(2) The marketing or use of medicines, vaccines, medical devices and other pharmaceutical products for which complete clinical trials have not been carried out in accordance with the methodology laid down by law is prohibited."

6. In article 811, paragraph (1) is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"Art. 811

(1) For the purposes of this chapter, advertising for medicines means information by direct contact (the 'door-to-door' system), as well as promotion intended to stimulate the prescription, distribution, sale or consumption of medicines; advertising for medicines shall be carried out exclusively through:

— advertising for medicines addressed to persons qualified to prescribe or distribute medicines;

— visits by medical representatives to persons qualified to prescribe medicines;

— the supply of samples."

Art. II — The Patients' Rights Act no. 46 of 21 January 2003, published in the Official Gazette of Romania, Part I, no. 51 of 29 January 2003, as subsequently amended and supplemented, is amended and supplemented as follows: → the reasons

1. Article 4 is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"(1) The patient has the right to be informed of the medical services available and of the manner of using them.

(2) Medicines, medical devices and other therapeutic means may be administered and applied to Romanian citizens only after obtaining the patients' written consent, following prior and mandatory information given on the basis of the leaflets provided by the manufacturer of the medicines proposed, medical emergencies excepted."

2. After article 36[2], a new article 36[3] is inserted, reading as follows: → the reasons

"Art. 36[3]

No citizen may be discriminated against, positively or negatively, as a result of accepting or refusing a treatment or a medical device. Discriminating against a citizen as a result of accepting or refusing a treatment or a medical device constitutes an offence and is punished in accordance with the criminal laws."

This law was adopted by the Parliament of Romania, in compliance with the provisions of art. 75 and art. 76 para. (2) of the Constitution of Romania, republished.

President of the Senate — President of the Chamber of Deputies

SECTION 7 — The Green Romania Act

The explanatory memorandum: Explanatory memorandum — The Sovereignty Act

Full translation of the draft. The Romanian text remains the authoritative one.

THE GREEN ROMANIA ACT

Draft law amending and supplementing Act 57/2020 on the sustainable management of Romania's forests, Act 46 of 19 March 2008 on the Forestry Code and Act no. 211 of 15 November 2011 on the waste regime

I. Act 57/2020 on the sustainable management of Romania's forests, published in the Official Gazette no. 402 of 15 May 2020, is amended as follows:

(1) Article 1 is amended and shall read as follows: "The export, within or outside the Community area, of unprocessed timber, including logs, with or without bark, round wood, sawn timber, beams or railway sleepers, is prohibited until 1 January 2050." (2) Article 4 is amended and shall read as follows: "Failure to observe the export ban on timber provided for in art. 1 shall be punished by imprisonment from 7 to 20 years and the prohibition of certain rights." → the reasons

II. Act 46 of 19 March 2008 on the Forestry Code, published in the Official Gazette no. 611 of 12 August 2015, as subsequently amended and supplemented, is amended and supplemented as follows:

(1) In article 29, paragraph (1) is amended and shall read as follows: "Deforestation and clear-felling on the territory of Romania, including that justified by ecological reconstruction, the regeneration and tending of forests, are prohibited until 1 January 2050." (2) In article 29, paragraphs (2), (3), (4) and (5) are repealed. (3) After article 109, three new articles are inserted, art. 109^1, 109^2 and 109^3, reading as follows: "109^1 Causing disease in, or infesting with pests, the trees of the forest stock shall be punished by imprisonment from 7 to 20 years."; "109^2 Breach of the prohibition laid down in art. 29 of this law shall be punished by imprisonment from 7 to 20 years."; "109^3 Intentionally setting fire to the trees of the forest stock shall be punished by imprisonment from 7 to 20 years.". → the reasons

III. Act no. 211 of 15 November 2011 on the waste regime, republished, published in the Official Gazette no. 220 of 28 March 2014, is amended and supplemented as follows:

(1) In article 13, after paragraph (1), a new paragraph (2) is inserted, reading as follows: "The introduction into the country of waste of any kind is prohibited." → the reasons

SECTION 8 — Amendment of the Criminal Code

The explanatory memorandum: Explanatory memorandum — The Sovereignty Act

Full translation of the draft. The Romanian text remains the authoritative one.

Draft law amending and supplementing Act no. 286/2009 on the Criminal Code

SOLE ARTICLE → the reasons

Act no. 286/2009 on the Criminal Code, published in the Official Gazette of Romania, Part I, no. 510 of 24 July 2009, as subsequently amended and supplemented, is amended and supplemented as follows:

(1) After article 195, a new article 195[1] is inserted, with the marginal heading "Disturbance or alteration of physical or mental integrity", reading as follows:

"(1) *Disturbing or altering the individual physical or mental integrity of a person without that person's written, express, informed and freely expressed consent shall be punished by imprisonment from 5 to 10 years and the prohibition of certain rights.*

(2) Holding or using any system or device whose purpose is to access or manipulate neuronal activity, accessing or manipulating a person's neuronal activity, as well as any intervention upon neuronal connections or intrusion at the level of the brain, whether invasive or non-invasive, in the absence of the person's written, express, informed and freely expressed consent, shall be punished by imprisonment from 7 to 20 years and the prohibition of certain rights."

(2) In article 197, after paragraph (1), two new paragraphs, (2) and (3), are inserted, reading as follows:

"(2) *Causing a minor who has not attained the age of 18 to alter the biological sexual identity acquired at birth shall be punished by imprisonment from 7 to 15 years.*

(3) Where the act referred to in the preceding paragraph has been committed by a parent, guardian, teacher or master, or has produced physical consequences for the minor, the special limits of the penalty shall be increased by one third."

(3) In article 211, after paragraph (1), a new paragraph (1[1]) is inserted, reading as follows:

"The brokering or encouragement of adoptions by persons who are not officials of the General Directorate for Social Assistance and Child Protection or of the National Authority for the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, Children and Adoptions shall be punished by imprisonment from 7 to 15 years and the prohibition of the exercise of certain rights."

(4) In article 221, paragraph 4 is amended and shall read as follows:

"Causing, by an adult, a minor who has not attained the age of 14 to witness the commission of acts of an exhibitionist character, or shows or performances in which sexual acts of any kind are committed, as well as making available to him material of a pornographic character or with content explicitly describing sexuality, shall be punished by imprisonment from one to three years."

(5) In article 221, after paragraph (5), a new paragraph (5[1]) is inserted, reading as follows:

"Making available to children under the age of eighteen any material promoting departure from biological sexual identity, gender reassignment and homosexuality shall be punished by imprisonment from 1 to 5 years."

(6) In article 221, paragraph (6) is amended and shall read as follows:

"Attempt in respect of the offences provided for in paragraphs (1), (2), (2[1]) and (5[1]) shall be punished."

(7) Article 297 is amended and shall read as follows:

"(1) *The act of a public official who, in the exercise of his duties, fails to perform an act or performs it in breach of the law with a view to obtaining an undue advantage and thereby causes damage or an injury to the rights or legitimate interests of a natural or legal person shall be punished by imprisonment from 2 to 7 years and the prohibition of the exercise of the right to hold public office.*

(2) The same penalty shall apply to the act of a public official who, in the exercise of his duties, restricts the exercise of a right of a person or creates for that person a situation of fear, social exclusion or inferiority on grounds of race, nationality, ethnic origin, language, religion, sex, sexual orientation, political affiliation, wealth, age, disability, chronic non-contagious disease or HIV/AIDS infection.

(8) In article 297, after paragraph (2), a new paragraph (3) is inserted, reading as follows:

"(3) *The act of a public official of applying any legal rules declared unconstitutional by a Decision of the Constitutional Court of Romania shall be punished by imprisonment from 7 to 10 years.*"

(9) After article 297, a new article 297^1 is inserted, with the marginal heading "Failure of an official to enforce concession or privatisation contracts", reading as follows:

"(1) *The failure of an official to enforce concession or privatisation contracts in accordance with their clauses, or, as the case may be, the failure to bring the actions for their enforcement, committed intentionally, shall be punished by imprisonment from 10 to 20 years and the prohibition of certain rights.*

(2) The failure of an official to enforce concession or privatisation contracts in accordance with their clauses, or, as the case may be, the failure to bring the actions for their enforcement, committed negligently, shall be punished by imprisonment from 5 to 10 years and the prohibition of certain rights."

(10) In article 394, in paragraph (1), a new letter e) is inserted, reading as follows:

"*e) the exercise of an office of public dignity or one entailing the exercise of State authority.*"

(11) In article 394, after paragraph (1), a new paragraph (2) is inserted, reading as follows:

"*Where the act referred to in paragraph 1 letter b) has caused significant damage to the national economy, the penalty shall be life imprisonment or imprisonment from 15 to 25 years and the prohibition of certain rights.*"

(12) In article 398, after paragraph (1), a new paragraph (2) is inserted, reading as follows:

"*It likewise constitutes an act of High Treason, attracting the same penalty, for the President of Romania to fail to give effect to the Decisions of the Constitutional Court resolving conflicts of a constitutional nature within 10 days of the communication of the operative part.*"

→ the reasons

SECTION 9 — The Electoral Act (Act 208/2015)

The explanatory memorandum: Explanatory memorandum — The Sovereignty Act

Full translation of the draft. The Romanian text remains the authoritative one.

Draft law amending and supplementing

Act no. 208 of 20 July 2015 on the election of the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies and on the organisation and functioning of the Permanent Electoral Authority

SOLE ARTICLE → the reasons

Act no. 208 of 20 July 2015 on the election of the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies and on the organisation and functioning of the Permanent Electoral Authority, published in the Official Gazette no. 553 of 24 July 2015, as subsequently amended and supplemented, is amended and supplemented as follows:

In article 92[1], paragraphs (3), (4) and (5) are repealed. → the reasons

(2) In article 94, paragraph (2), letter a) is amended and shall read as follows:

"1% of the total number of validly cast votes at national level, or 10% of the total number of validly cast votes in at least 4 electoral constituencies, for all electoral competitors;"

(3) In article 94, paragraph (2), letter b) is amended and shall read as follows:

"in the case of political alliances and electoral alliances, to the 1% threshold provided for in letter a) there shall be added, for each member of the alliance, a single percentage point of the validly cast votes in all electoral constituencies, without being able to exceed 5% of those votes."

(4) Article 103[1] is amended and shall read as follows:

"(1) The Permanent Electoral Authority shall ensure the operation, at the seat of the Central Electoral Bureau, of an IT infrastructure fulfilling the following objectives:

a) it ensures the operation of the IT system for centralising the data from the minutes recording the results of the voting;

b) it ensures the real-time storage of duplicates of the databases generated by the IT system for monitoring turnout and preventing illegal voting, as well as of the logs of the machines on which it runs, in order to facilitate their analysis and transparency.

(2) The IT infrastructure provided for in paragraph (1) shall be unique and shall comprise servers, data storage systems, communications and security equipment, as well as licences and software applications, being intended exclusively for the application of the provisions of this law.

(3) The IT system for centralising the data from the minutes recording the results of the voting and the IT system for monitoring turnout and preventing illegal voting may be accessed for the real-time viewing of the data, from the seat of the Central Electoral Bureau, by the representatives of the Central Electoral Bureau and those of the Permanent Electoral Authority, on the basis of access rights established by decision of the Permanent Electoral Authority.

(4) The Permanent Electoral Authority shall provide the assistance and technical support for the operation of the equipment and software applications provided for in paragraph (2).

(5) The Permanent Electoral Authority shall provide the software applications and/or IT services to be used by the Central Electoral Bureau for centralising the data from the minutes recording the results of the voting, as well as the IT equipment necessary for the centralisation of the results of the voting by the Central Electoral Bureau. These shall operate within the IT infrastructure provided for in paragraph (1).

(6) The software applications provided for in paragraph (5) shall be certified by the Permanent Electoral Authority and made available by it to the political parties and to the organisations of citizens belonging to national minorities taking part in the elections, upon their written request.

(7) The Permanent Electoral Authority shall ensure, throughout the day of the voting and the following day, the publicity of the data concerning the number of voters who have turned out, and of the information resulting from the verification of the correlations in the minutes recording the results of the voting, obtained through the IT system for monitoring turnout and preventing illegal voting."

(5) In article 110, paragraph (1) is amended and shall read as follows:

> *"The Permanent Electoral Authority, with the support of the National Institute of Statistics, shall ensure the implementation and management of the IT system for monitoring turnout and preventing illegal voting, on the basis of the data and information in the Electoral Register and in the Register of polling stations."*
>
> (6) In article 110, paragraph (3) is amended and shall read as follows:
>
> *"For the implementation and operation, during the elections, of the IT system for monitoring turnout and preventing illegal voting, use shall as a rule be made of the IT infrastructure held by the central and local public administration authorities and by educational establishments."*
>
> (7) In article 110, paragraph (4) is amended and shall read as follows:
>
> *"The organisation of elections, referendums and other popular consultations, as well as the administration of the processes specific to them, including the counting of the votes, with the exception of guarding and public-order activities, shall be carried out exclusively by the electoral bureaux, namely the Central and the Local ones. Breach of this provision constitutes an offence and shall be punished by imprisonment from 7 to 10 years."*
>
> (8) In article 110, paragraph 8 is repealed.

→ the reasons

SECTION 10 — The Offshore Act (Act 256/2018)

The explanatory memorandum: Explanatory memorandum — The Solidarity Act

What the draft provides

Amendment of the Offshore Act 256/2018: restoration of the state's fiscal instruments over Black Sea hydrocarbons, removal of the fiscal-stability clause frozen in favour of the concession holders, and royalties aligned with European levels.

Below, the **full text of the draft**, translated in its entirety. The Romanian text remains the authoritative one — the language in which the draft was drawn up, submitted and published.

The justification of this draft is to be found in the explanatory memorandum of the parent act — see here. The Facebook notes on this draft (section "The sources of the idea of the Third Republic"): no. 2; no. 3; no. 22; no. 119; no. 153; no. 223; no. 226; no. 228; among others.

LEGISLATIVE DRAFT AMENDING

THE "OFFSHORE ACT" No. 256 of 12 November 2018

on certain measures necessary for the implementation of petroleum operations by holders of petroleum agreements relating to offshore petroleum blocks

Article 1 is amended and supplemented and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"(1) This Act lays down certain measures necessary for the implementation of the petroleum operations of exploration, development and exploitation of petroleum deposits and of abandonment, as well as of the works/well works pertaining to petroleum operations, carried out by holders of petroleum agreements in respect of offshore petroleum blocks, in accordance with the provisions of the petroleum agreements concluded between the holders and the National Agency for Mineral Resources, hereinafter ANRM.

(2) Where a holder is party to a petroleum agreement relating both to petroleum blocks located onshore and to offshore petroleum blocks, or holds both a petroleum agreement or agreements relating to onshore petroleum blocks and one or more relating to offshore petroleum blocks, the provisions of this Act shall apply only to the petroleum operations carried out in respect of the offshore petroleum blocks."

In Article 2, letters m), n), o), p) and r) are repealed. → the reasons

Article 18 is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"Art. 18. – Holders of petroleum agreements relating to offshore petroleum blocks which are in course of performance on the date of entry into force of this Act shall be subject, throughout the term of those agreements, to the royalty level, the percentage royalty rates, the gross-production thresholds corresponding to those rates and the specific fiscal regime applicable to the exploration, development, exploitation and abandonment activities carried out under the laws in force on the date of entry into force of this Act."

In Article 19, after paragraph 11 a paragraph (12) is inserted: → the reasons

"(12) The investments taken into account for the deduction from the tax on additional revenues shall not be taken into account in computing the fiscal result of the periods in which corporate income tax is payable, in the sense that no tax reductions or exemptions or cost deductions shall be accepted in respect of them, they being regarded as non-deductible in computing corporate income tax."

Article 19 is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"Art. 19. – (1) Holders of petroleum agreements relating to offshore petroleum blocks, including their subsidiaries and/or entities belonging to the same economic interest grouping which effectively carry out both extraction activities and activities of selling the natural gas extracted from those blocks, shall be liable to compute, declare and pay the tax on offshore additional revenues.

(2) Additional revenue means the difference between the weighted average price of the natural gas sold from own domestic production from the offshore blocks and the purchase price of natural gas from domestic production for household and non-household customers in 2012, namely 45.71 lei/MWh, multiplied by the volumes of gas sold from domestic production from the offshore blocks.

(3) The tax on offshore additional revenues provided for in paragraph (1) shall be computed by applying one or more computation percentages, as the case may be, to the additional revenues obtained from the sale of the natural gas extracted from the offshore blocks, as determined in accordance with Annex No. 2, from which tax the value of the investments in the upstream segment shall be deducted. The tax on offshore additional revenues shall take into account the reference price established by ANRM for the computation of royalties. Transactions carried out below the reference price shall be taxed at the reference price. The tax computation percentages shall be calculated on the basis of the natural gas selling prices applied by the holders of petroleum agreements relating to offshore petroleum blocks according to the price grid below, adjusted annually as from 1 January 2019 by the annual consumer price index, as follows:

50% of the additional revenue for prices up to and including 85 lei/MWh;

b) 15% of the additional revenues obtained from the application of prices higher than 85 lei/MWh and lower than or equal to 100 lei/MWh;

c) 30% of the additional revenues obtained from the application of prices higher than 100 lei/MWh and lower than or equal to 115 lei/MWh;

d) 35% of the additional revenues obtained from the application of prices higher than 115 lei/MWh and lower than or equal to 130 lei/MWh;

e) 40% of the additional revenues obtained from the application of prices higher than 130 lei/MWh and lower than or equal to 145 lei/MWh;

f) 50% of the additional revenues obtained from the application of prices higher than 145 lei/MWh and lower than or equal to 160 lei/MWh;

g) 55% of the additional revenues obtained from the application of prices higher than 160 lei/MWh and lower than or equal to 175 lei/MWh;

h) 60% of the additional revenues obtained from the application of prices higher than 175 lei/MWh and lower than or equal to 190 lei/MWh;

1. 70% of the additional revenues obtained from the application of prices higher than 190 lei/MWh.

(4) The maximum limit of the deduction of investments in the upstream segment may not exceed 30% of the total tax on offshore additional revenues.

(5) The economic operators referred to in paragraph (1) shall compute, declare and pay the offshore additional tax monthly, by the 25th day of the month following that for which the tax is due.

(6) The form and content of the return concerning the tax on offshore additional revenues shall be established by order of the President of the National Agency for Fiscal Administration, within 30 days of the date of entry into force of this Act.

(7) In so far as the application of these provisions requires the issuance of instructions concerning the tax on offshore additional revenues, those instructions shall be issued by joint order of the Minister of Public Finance and the Minister of Energy, with the opinion of ANRM.

(8) The sums owed by the holders of petroleum agreements relating to offshore blocks as tax on additional revenues shall be collected into a special account used for financing the establishment and extension of natural gas distribution networks and of the connections to the national natural gas transmission system, as well as other investments established by Government decision. The allocation of the sums collected shall be made by Government decision. The collection of the tax on additional revenues shall be administered by the National Agency for Fiscal Administration, in accordance with Act No. 207/2015, as subsequently amended and supplemented.

(9) The cumulated value of the investments in the upstream segment, recorded in the accounts in accordance with the legal rules in force, from the entry into force of this Act until the month for which the tax on offshore additional revenues is computed, as well as the value of the investments from the work programmes carried out and approved by ANRM under the petroleum agreements, which were recorded in the accounts before the date of entry into force of this Act, shall be reduced monthly by the value of the investments in the upstream segment deducted from the tax on offshore additional revenues. The deductions shall apply until the cumulated value of the investments in the upstream segment, approved by ANRM and recorded in the accounts in accordance with the laws in force, has been reached.

(10) In the event of the disposal of investments in respect of which the deduction provided for in paragraphs (3) and (4) has been enjoyed, the deduction granted shall be subtracted from the cumulated value of the investments in the upstream segment in proportion to the ratio between the value of the investments transferred and the value of the investments recorded in the upstream segment in the reference period in which it was granted.

(11) The investments taken into account for the deduction from the tax on additional revenues may not be the subject of any other deductions."

Article 20 is amended and supplemented and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"Art. 20. – By way of derogation from the provisions of Article 177 of the Electricity and Natural Gas Act No. 123/2012, as subsequently amended and supplemented, holders of petroleum agreements relating to offshore petroleum blocks, including their subsidiaries and/or entities belonging to the same economic interest grouping, shall, as from the date of entry into force of this Act, in so far as they contract the sale of natural gas on the wholesale market in a calendar year, be under an obligation to conclude, in the calendar year in which they deliver the natural gas, contracts on the centralised markets, transparently, publicly and without discrimination, in accordance with the rules issued by the National Energy Regulatory Authority, hereinafter ANRE, for the sale of a minimum quantity of natural gas which may not be lower than that represented by a percentage of 90% of the quantity of natural gas from own production contracted for delivery in that calendar year, in the capacity of seller. The quantity of natural gas contracted on the centralised markets, transparently, publicly and without discrimination, shall be sold under a procedure approved by ANRE, so that purchasers of natural gas cannot be made subject to the condition of purchasing a minimum quantity imposed by the seller."

Article 21 is amended and supplemented and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"Art. 21. – The percentage provided for in Article 20 shall remain unchanged throughout the term of the agreements."

In Article 25, after letter m) a letter n) is added, reading as follows: → the reasons

"n) failure by the holders of petroleum agreements to comply with the provisions of Articles 19 and 20 shall be sanctioned by a fine corresponding to 30% of the turnover of the year in which the breach was established.

Article 33 is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"Art. 33. – As from the date of entry into force of this Act, offshore petroleum agreements shall not be subject to the provisions of Government Ordinance No. 7/2013 establishing the tax on the additional revenues obtained as a result of the deregulation of prices in the natural gas sector, approved with amendments by Act No. 73/2018, as subsequently amended and supplemented, nor to those of Government Ordinance No. 6/2013 establishing special measures for the taxation of the exploitation of natural resources other than natural gas, approved with amendments and additions by Act No. 261/2013, as subsequently amended."

Article 34 is amended and shall read as follows: → the reasons

"Art. 34. – With a view to the application of the provisions of Articles 18, 19 and 21, ANRM and the holders of petroleum agreements may conclude addenda to the petroleum agreements relating to offshore petroleum blocks under concession on the date of entry into force of this Act."

Annex No. 1

Formula for computing the tax on offshore additional revenues

Depending on the level of the weighted average price of the natural gas sold from own domestic production from the offshore blocks, hereinafter PMPC, the following computation formulas shall apply:

1. if PMPC is lower than or equal to 85 lei/MWh, adjusted by the CPI where applicable, the total tax on offshore additional revenues due shall be computed by the formula:

$IVST = IVSC - VID$

$IVSC = ISO_85 = 0.50 \times VS_85$ $VS_85 = (PMPC - PRC) \times VGC$ $VID = min\ (VI, 0.3 \times IVSC)$

where:

IVST – the total tax on offshore additional revenues due; IVSC – the total tax on offshore additional revenues computed;

ISO_85 – the tax on offshore additional revenues due, computed at a PMPC lower than or equal to 85 lei/MWh;

VS_85 – the additional revenue from the offshore blocks, computed at a PMPC lower than or equal to 85 lei/MWh;

PMPC – the weighted average price of the natural gas sold from own domestic production from the offshore blocks, or the reference price, as the case may be;

PRC – the purchase price of natural gas from domestic production for household and non-household customers in 2012, namely 45.71 lei/MWh, adjusted annually by the CPI rate as from 1 January 2019;

VGC – the volumes of gas from domestic production from the offshore blocks sold;

CPI – the annual consumer price index of the preceding year published by the National Institute of Statistics of Romania;

VID – the value of the deductible investments in the upstream segment;

VI – the cumulated value of the investments in the upstream segment as provided for in Article 19(9), which is reduced monthly by the VID deducted;

2. Where PMPC is between 85 lei/MWh and 100 lei/MWh inclusive, adjusted by the CPI where applicable, the total tax on offshore additional revenues due shall be computed as follows:

$IVST = IVSC - VID$

$IVSC = 0.5 \times (85 - PRC) \times VGC + ISO$ $ISO = CI \times VS$

$VS = (PMPC - PB) \times VGC$

$VID = min\ (VI, 0.5 \times IVSC)$ *where:*

ISO – the offshore additional tax computed on the additional revenues from the sale of natural gas following the application of PMPC prices between 85 lei/MWh and 100 lei/MWh inclusive, adjusted by the CPI where applicable;

CI – the rate of taxation of the additional revenues from the sale of natural gas [15% – in accordance with Article 19(3)(b)], applicable following the application of PMPC prices between 85 lei/MWh and 100 lei/MWh inclusive;

PB – the minimum base price of the corresponding computation bracket; for PMPC prices between 85 lei/MWh and 100 lei/MWh inclusive it is 85 lei/MWh;

VS – the additional revenue from the offshore blocks, computed from the sale of natural gas at PMPC prices between 85 lei/MWh and 100 lei/MWh inclusive;

3. Where PMPC exceeds 100 lei/MWh, adjusted by the CPI where applicable, the total tax on offshore additional revenues due shall be computed as follows:

IVST = IVSC - VID

IVSC = 0.5 × (85 - PRC) × VGC + ISO VID = min (VI, 0.5 × IVSC)

ISO – the sum of the offshore additional taxes computed for each price bracket in accordance with Article 19(3)(b) – (i), namely:

ISO = ISO1 + ISO2 + ... + ISOi

ISOi – computed in accordance with the formula in point 2, where the corresponding terms have the following meanings:

CI – the rate of taxation of the additional revenues from the sale of natural gas, for each corresponding price bracket in accordance with Article 19(3)(b) – (i);

PB – the minimum base price of the corresponding computation bracket, adjusted annually as from 1 January 2019 by the CPI;

VS – the additional revenue from the offshore blocks, computed for each corresponding price bracket.

Example of computation: for the sale of a volume VGC of 1 MWh at a selling price of 110 lei/MWh, the total tax on offshore additional revenues due is computed by applying the above formulas as follows:

IVST = IVSC – VID = 17.037 - 5.1111 = 11.9259 lei

IVSC = 0.5 × (85 - PRC) × VGC + ISO = 0.5 × (85 - 45.71) × 1 + 5.25 = 17.037 lei

ISO = CI1 × VS1 + CI2 × VS2 = 0.15 × 15 + 0.5 × 10 = 5.25 lei

VID = 0.5 × IVSC = 0.3 × 17.037 = 5.1111 lei where:

CI1 = 0.15 – the rate of taxation (15%) of the offshore additional revenues from the sale of natural gas applicable following the application of prices between 85 lei/MWh and 100 lei/MWh inclusive, in accordance with Article 19(3)(b);

CI2 = 0.3 – the rate of taxation (30%) of the offshore additional revenues from the sale of natural gas applicable following the application of prices between 100 lei/MWh and 115 lei/MWh inclusive, in accordance with Article 19(3)(c);

VS1 = (100 - 85) × 1 = 15 lei — the additional revenue from the offshore blocks, computed as the difference between 100 lei/MWh and 85 lei/MWh;

VS2 = (110 - 100) × 1 = 10 lei — the additional revenue from the offshore blocks, computed as the difference between PMPC (110 lei/MWh in the example given) and 100 lei/MWh (the minimum base price of the bracket);"

THE EXPLANATORY MEMORANDA

SECTION 1 — Explanatory memorandum — The Sovereignty Constitution

The full text of the draft: The Constitution of Sovereignty

Complete translation of the explanatory memorandum. The Romanian text remains authoritative.

The full text of the draft — see here. The Facebook notes on this project: no. 156; no. 160; no. 167; no. 169; no. 213; no. 214; no. 215; no. 219; among others.

EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM

Section 1 — Title of the draft normative act

"The Constitution of Sovereignty" —

Draft revision of the Constitution of Romania

Section 2 — Reason for the adoption of the normative act

Description of the current situation

In recent years, a series of norms have been adopted in Romanian legislation which contravene, either in particular respects or as a whole, the spirit and the letter of the Constitution of Romania, republished. This state of fact and of law is such as to affect gravely and directly the sovereignty of the Romanian State laid down in Article 1(1) of the Constitution — sovereignty understood both as the right of the nation to identity and self-determination and as a state of legality consistent with the constitutional order.

The response to the strain to which the Romanian State and the Romanian citizen were subjected as a result of the pandemic from March 2020 until 2022, followed by the war on the country's border from 2022 to the present, both economically and socially, has revealed a series of dysfunctions within the institutions of the Romanian State such as to affect directly, fundamentally and irreversibly the rights and freedoms of the citizen as well as national sovereignty.

In fact, this situation — which has become the "normality" of recent years, but which has certainly been encountered, if less frequently, throughout the 33 years since the adoption of the 1991 Constitution — is caused by a constitutional framework that has proved over time insufficiently clear, at times outright lacunary, and which has left room for interpretations and deviations dangerous to the rights and freedoms of the Romanian citizen, to sustainable economic and social development, and to the coherence and proper functioning of Romania's security institutions, with the result that the "spirit", if not also the letter, of the constitutional provisions in force has been infringed.

In view of the above, there follows the immediate necessity of adopting the present legislative initiative for the revision of the Constitution, in order to remedy the situation described and to re-centre the attention and the priorities of the State upon the Romanian citizen and upon the need to secure the physical, cultural and spiritual continuity of the Romanian nation — all of this leading to the building of a new constitutional order that may be called a "Third Republic", while at the same time observing the "Limits of revision" laid down by Article 152 of the Constitution.

To that end, starting from the principle that national sovereignty is the right of the people to decide their own future and to set the priorities of the State, its organisation and its functioning, as well as the right of the people to control and regulate the activity of the State — Article 2(2) of the Constitution of Romania, republished, providing that "National sovereignty belongs to the Romanian people..." — the normal and immediately necessary solution is a broad revision of the Constitution which corrects the state of fact and of law described above by laying down and establishing at constitutional level general measures having the value of constitutional principles, designed to consolidate the fundamental rights of the citizen and national sovereignty, and likewise to restore the balance of powers within the State through a redrawing and rearrangement of the specific competences of the powers and of the fundamental institutions of the Romanian State.

For all these reasons, and not least in order to restore to the citizen his fundamental rights and to the people the sovereignty guaranteed by the Constitution, certain constitutional amendments have become necessary.

1^1. In the case of drafts transposing Community legislation or creating the framework for its direct application, only the Community acts concerned are to be specified, together with their identifying particulars — No documents were identified in Community legislation in this field.

2. Envisaged changes

The amendments and additions made to the present Constitution by the draft entitled "The Constitution of Sovereignty" have as their object of regulation the consolidation and guarantee of the fundamental rights of the citizen and the restoration of sovereignty and of the rule of law, as laid down in Article 1(1) of the Constitution of Romania, having as their effect a structural rearrangement of the institutions of the Romanian State:

1. Separation and Balance of Powers within the State. Article 1(4) and (5) propose an organisation of the State founded on the principles of separation, balance and loyal cooperation between the powers of the State: legislative, executive and judicial. This is an essential premise of democratic functioning, providing a solid framework for preventing abuses of power and for ensuring effective mutual control among the branches of government. Reaffirming the binding force of the Constitution, of the laws and of judicial decisions, as well as of the decisions of the Constitutional Court, strengthens the rule of law and helps to consolidate citizens' confidence in justice and in the institutions of the State.

2. Protection of Fundamental Rights and Freedoms. Another aspect of the utmost importance is the revision of the articles that consolidate and protect the fundamental rights and freedoms of citizens. For example, the amendments proposed to Article 21(3), which guarantees the right to a fair trial, or to Article 22(2), which prohibits torture and experimental treatments, are vital for aligning Romanian legislation with international human rights standards.

3. Clarity and Precision in the Constitutional Text. The new paragraphs proposed bring greater clarity to the constitutional text — for instance by specifying the rights relating to the sexual identity of the child, the inalienable rights of the human person, or by limiting the possibility of interfering with the physical and mental integrity of the individual. These are sensitive matters in modern society and constitute a step forward in protecting individuality and human dignity in the face of emerging technologies and abusive practices.

4. Reform of Justice and Safeguarding the Independence of the Judiciary. The amendments to the articles concerning justice — such as those to Article 23, which governs the conditions of pre-trial detention, or to Articles 124, 125 and 133, which concern the independence and integrity of magis-

trates — reflect society's wish for an impartial and effective judicial system. These revisions are intended to prevent political influence and to ensure that all citizens are equal before the law.

5. Strengthening Social and Economic Rights. A series of proposed amendments concern social and economic rights, such as those relating to education and health. Article 32(8), which provides for the allocation of a minimum percentage of GDP to the financing of national education, and Article 34(4) and (5), which guarantee the financing of national health care, are measures underlining the Romanian State's commitment to improving the quality of life of its citizens. They reflect the awareness that education and health are essential pillars of a nation's development and progress.

6. Transparency in the Political System and Accountability of Elected Representatives. The revision of the articles concerning the functioning of the political system — such as Article 62 on representation in Parliament, or Article 70, which introduces the possibility of removing members of Parliament by local referendum — signals a trend towards greater transparency and accountability of elected representatives. These changes may lead to more active civic involvement in the democratic process and to a better calibration of citizens' representation within the structures of power.

7. Consolidation of the Rule of Law and of the Supremacy of the Law. The revisions proposed to the articles concerning the status of magistrates — such as Article 133, which redefines the structure and functioning of the Superior Council of Magistracy, and Article 134, which governs the procedure for appointing magistrates — promote a judicial system that is more robust and more resistant to political pressure or corruption. These are essential for guaranteeing a rule of law under which the law is applied uniformly and equitably. In conclusion, the revision of the Constitution of Romania is a process requiring judicious analysis and active participation from across the whole social and political spectrum. The proposed amendments reflect a natural evolution and an adaptation to the changes in contemporary society, with the aim of securing a solid legal framework for future generations. Through these revisions Romania can consolidate its democracy, better protect the rights and freedoms of its citizens and secure an independent and impartial justice — all of which contribute to the achievement of a more equitable and more prosperous society.

In essence, the revision of the Constitution is not only about changing certain articles, but about reaffirming the fundamental values of the Romanian State: democracy, the rule of law, respect for human rights and good governance. The novel elements introduced by the proposals for revision are consonant with democratic trends worldwide and with the European values Romania has undertaken to promote. They likewise respond to citizens' demands for greater integrity in the exercise of public office, for a fair justice system and for the protection of human rights. Incorporating these changes into the fundamental text of our nation will help consolidate the sense of trust in the institutions of the State and in the mechanisms of social and legal protection. This is essential in order to maintain social cohesion and to encourage the personal and professional development of every Romanian citizen.

The revision of the Constitution is an act of balance between tradition and innovation, between established values and the needs of a society in permanent change. Every proposal for amending the Constitution carries within it the potential for a significant transformation.

For example, the introduction of clearer provisions concerning the interception and surveillance of citizens (Article 23(14) and (15)) not only strengthens the protection of private life but also underlines the importance of transparency and of the limits imposed on the authorities in the exercise of power. This is fundamental in a healthy democracy, where the right to privacy and to the protection of personal data is essential.

At the same time, the provisions aimed at better representativeness in Parliament (Article 62) and those allowing citizens to initiate referendums for the removal of members of Parliament (Article 70) are examples of direct democratisation of the political process, giving citizens a more active role in the governance of the country.

In addition, the emphasis placed on education and health reflects a deep understanding of the fact that national well-being depends on investment in human capital. The minimum budgetary allocations established for these essential fields (Articles 32 and 34) are therefore not merely financial commitments but also moral commitments towards the future of Romanian society.

Furthermore, the revision aimed at consolidating rights concerning property (Article 44(10)) and the family (Article 48(1) and (2)) aligns with the principles of a society that respects individual freedom and traditional values, while at the same time promoting a modern and inclusive view of these fundamental institutions.

Not least, the reform of the judicial system and of the structure of the Superior Council of Magistracy (Articles 125, 132 and 133) will help increase public confidence in the capacity of the courts to administer justice independently and impartially.

These changes are essential for improving the perception of justice and for securing a legal framework that is at once firm and flexible, adapted to the realities and challenges of society. The present draft law for the revision of the Constitution points towards a Romania more mature in democratic terms — a Romania that knows and makes use of its potential, that respects its citizens and that assumes an active and responsible role on the European and international stage. It is a commitment we make not only to ourselves but also to future generations, who will benefit from an updated legal and governmental system capable of protecting their rights and securing them a dignified life.

For these reasons, the Constitution of Romania, the fundamental law of the State, has been subjected to the most extensive process of revision since its adoption in 1991. This undertaking was prompted by vigorous debates, both among specialists in constitutional law and in the public sphere, concerning the direction in which Romanian society wishes to evolve. For that reason the draft revision has brought to light a series of changes aimed at strengthening the rule of law, consolidating democratic principles and adapting legislation to the realities and challenges of the twenty-first century.

In total, amendments have been proposed to no fewer than 51 articles — more precisely, 1 paragraph repealed, 67 paragraphs amended and 30 newly introduced — which underlines the scale and complexity of the legislative undertaking.

The process of revision begins with Article 1 of the Constitution itself, paragraphs 4 and 5, which, as revised, underline the principles of the separation of powers within the State and the binding force of the Constitution and of judicial decisions. This reflects a wish to strengthen the role and independence of each power of the State — legislative, executive and judicial — and to ensure that none of them may undermine the rule of law.

The next article of interest is Article 19(2), which has been repealed. This removal simplifies and clarifies the law, eliminating redundancies and possible confusion arising from the interpretation of the constitutional text to the detriment of the Romanian citizen, who until the present revision could be extradited to third States.

Another key point is the reformulation of Article 21(3), which now guarantees the right to a fair trial and to the resolution of cases within a reasonable time by an independent and impartial court, thereby underlining the State's firm commitment to protecting the fundamental rights of its citizens.

The amendments to Article 22 are likewise significant, in particular the introduction of new paragraphs addressing such matters as the sexual identity of the child and the protection of the individual physical or mental integrity of the person. These are additions that respond to current social debates and reflect the concern to guarantee individual rights in the face of possible abuses.

Article 23, which concerns fundamental rights and freedoms in the context of criminal proceedings, has also been amended so as to restrict the use of pre-trial detention and to ensure protection against the unauthorised pursuit or monitoring of citizens. Another relevant element is the changes made to Article 24, which strengthen the right to a defence and access to the acts of the criminal investigation. These amendments address a sensitive problem in the Romanian judicial system, underlining the need for transparency and fairness in criminal proceedings. → the text of the article

Article 27, concerning searches, reconfigures the conditions under which they may be carried out, underlining the need for a well-founded search warrant and for strict observance of the purpose for which it was issued. Greater emphasis is thereby placed on protecting the private life of the individual and on limiting the State's power of arbitrary interference. → the text of the article

In the fields of education and health, Article 32 and Article 34 respectively introduce provisions on the allocation of a minimum percentage of GDP to the financing of these vital sectors, evidencing a concern for the development and consolidation of the education and health systems.

The amendments to Articles 40 and 44 concern transparency and integrity within political parties and in matters of property, precluding judges, prosecutors and other categories of public officials from belonging to political parties or from holding elected or appointed public office for a period of 5 years from the cessation of their office. This may be read as a measure to prevent conflicts of interest and to consolidate the independence of the judiciary.

Article 48, concerning the family, introduces a stricter definition of marriage, limiting it to the union between two human beings of opposite sex whose sexual identity acquired at birth is unchanged. This amendment has aroused controversy, being regarded by some as a step backwards in matters of civil rights, while the majority of Romania's population sees it as a defence of traditional values. → the text of the article

As regards justice, Article 52 has been revised and now underlines the right of a person injured by a public authority to obtain recognition of the right or legitimate interest concerned and compensation for the damage, reflecting an improvement in the mechanisms protecting citizens against abuses by the State.

Article 62 reconfigures the threshold for representation in Parliament, encouraging a more diversified political spectrum and facilitating the access of minorities and independents to the legislative process. This may have a positive impact on pluralism and representativeness within Romanian democracy. → the text of the article

The changes made to the articles concerning the judicial authority and the functioning of the Superior Council of Magistracy, such as Articles 125 and 133, concern the independence and accountability of magistrates, establishing stricter mechanisms of selection, appointment and sanction, and clarifying the role of the Council in guaranteeing the independence of justice. These amendments are intended to consolidate public confidence in the judicial system and to secure a fair and effective administration of justice.

In addition to the above, the revision of the Constitution also introduces a new Title VI — "Romania's participation in international bodies and alliances" — which lays down the procedures by which

Romania may accede to, amend the treaties of, or withdraw from international bodies and alliances, underlining the supremacy of the Constitution and of the sovereign interest of the Romanian people in these processes.

In conclusion, the draft revision of the Constitution of Romania proposes substantial amendments capable of significantly influencing the political and social structure of the country. These changes reflect an attempt to strike a balance between the need for modernisation and adaptation to the present context and the need to preserve certain traditional values. The present revision combines articles that open the way to modern principles of governance and human-rights protection with other amendments that consolidate conservative aspects of society. Every revised article and paragraph carries within it the potential to reshape Romania's future, and the decisions taken today will echo over the long term in the political, social and individual life of every citizen.

The process of constitutional revision is, in essence, a dialogue between past, present and future — a dialogue that must be open, honest and inclusive. By taking an active part in this dialogue, every citizen (among the hundreds who took part in the open debates over the past year and a half) has contributed to the shaping of a more just and more balanced Romania: a nation that respects its past, engages with its present and looks to the future with hope and confidence. The debates on the revision of the Constitution were not confined to political circles or to experts in constitutional law but took place openly, both at public meetings and online, on the principle that every voice counts and must be heard, since the decisions taken now will echo through the decades to come.

Romania stands at a point of inflection, where every decision may tip the balance between stagnation and progress. The revision of the Constitution offers us the chance to choose progress, to align ourselves with the best democratic practices and to ensure that our State will be prepared to navigate the complexities of the contemporary world. This undertaking presupposes not only legislative changes but also a cultural transformation, an openness to new forms of governance and a firm commitment to the rule of law and to social justice. The revision of the Constitution thereby strengthens our capacity to function as a society founded on respect for every individual and on the promotion of the common interest. It is a reaffirmation of the fact that in Romania every citizen counts and that his voice is fundamental in determining the course our nation will follow.

The revision of the Constitution thereby strengthens our capacity to function as a society founded on respect for every individual and on the promotion of the common interest. It is a reaffirmation of the fact that in Romania every citizen counts and that his voice is fundamental in determining the course our nation will follow.

Through the present revision of the Constitution a high standard of democratic governance is established, institutions are consolidated and the protection and observance of human rights in Romania are guaranteed.

It is a process governed by the principles of equity, justice and transparency, ensuring that every citizen feels represented and protected by the law. This constitutional revision is not merely a responsibility of the political class but also an opportunity for every citizen to contribute to the shaping of a better society. It is a call to civic action and to active participation in public life, proof that democracy is alive and that every person has a part to play in its development.

This is the true meaning of the revision of the Constitution — not a formal act, but a renewal of commitment to the principles of democracy and the rule of law, a reaffirmation of the values on which our society rests. Through revision by this popular legislative initiative, Romania makes concrete the opportunity to demonstrate its democratic maturity and to lay a new cornerstone in the building of a modern and prosperous State. These amendments constitute the means by which

democracy, sovereignty and the rule of law are consolidated in Romania. The draft revision of the Constitution starts from the rigour of the principle already stated in the present Constitution, according to which sovereignty belongs to the Romanian people, and proposes a set of amendments whose purpose is:

the strengthening and guaranteeing of the rights of the citizen (Articles 1, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 34, 44 and 48 of the Constitution will be amended and supplemented), namely:

the express mention of the equality of the three powers confers on them, in addition, a constitutional guarantee, and, at the level of cooperation among them, excludes any tendency towards a possible hierarchy between them;

the essence of the rule of law is compliance with judicial decisions; the practice of recent years and the conduct of those called upon to comply with a judicial decision have confirmed that a constitutional enshrinement of this obligation is also needed;

internationally, the expression "optimal and predictable" has been used since 2004; it is more current and more consistent with the reality of legislation, with its application and with the actual dysfunctions — namely the heavy workload, the shortage of staff and logistics, and unstable legislation;

— the prohibition of subjecting citizens to experimental medical treatments or to any medical treatment whatsoever without the written, full and honestly informed consent of the patient;

— the protection of children's sexual identity as acquired at birth;

— The warrant of pre-trial detention is issued by the judge of rights and freedoms. It is important that this measure be taken only by a judge of the court having material jurisdiction to try the merits of the case, so as to avoid the situation in which detention is ordered by a judge of another court situated within the same territorial area as the prosecutor's office making the application, while the trial is conducted by a different court (a situation existing in current judicial practice). The provisions on pre-trial detention (including those on jurisdiction) must be regulated at constitutional level, since individual liberty must be protected from arbitrariness at that level;

— The prohibition of monitoring the Romanian citizen without the prior authorisation of the court;

— Without express mention of a sanction by law, the constitutional text does not require the enactment of binding rules to prevent the possible use of unlawfully obtained evidence;

— The principle of equality of arms between prosecution and defence is a necessity, being a guarantee of the parties' right to a fair trial under Article 6 ECHR, a guarantee imposed as a mandatory requirement by the European Court in all the cases ending in the conviction of the Romanian State;

— The additional guarantee of the inviolability of the home must be taken into account, since a search is sometimes ordered by the tribunal in a case in which jurisdiction to try the merits belongs to the court of appeal;

— A practice has taken root which has wrongly become the rule, namely that of issuing authorisations at the stage of preliminary acts, whereas, in order to guarantee citizens' rights, the requirement of the commencement of the criminal investigation ought to be imposed. Not infrequently, recourse is had to special laws (the National Security Act) with more generous limits in this matter as regards the conditions of the authorisation given by the judge. In that latter case the system of random allocation — mandatory in all other cases brought before a court — is circumvented, since the judges of the High Court of Cassation and Justice who issue national-security warrants are "specially designated" judges and are not subject to the principle of random allocation;

— The strengthening and guaranteeing of the right to a defence, free from interference and conditions imposed by the State;

— The prohibition of limiting or making conditional the obtaining, holding and use of any currency in cash;

— The family founded on the freely consented marriage between two human beings of opposite sex, born male and female;

— The right of the person to self-determination and to develop in freedom according to his own free will;

— The prohibition of increasing, diminishing, disturbing or altering the individual physical or mental integrity of the person by technological means without that person's consent;

the limitation of the power and influence of the intelligence services over society (Articles 40, 116, 118 and 119 will be amended and supplemented), namely:

— members and former members of the intelligence services may not hold appointed or elected public office for a period of 5 years from the cessation of the exercise of those functions;

— The intelligence services and those assimilated to them shall be organised exclusively as civilian bodies, under the conditions laid down by law, which means the demilitarisation of the intelligence services;

— The heads of the intelligence services shall be appointed by Parliament in joint sitting of the two chambers;

the increase of Parliament's power (Articles 62, 65, 72, 74, 75, 108, 115, 118, 119 and 146 will be amended and supplemented), namely:

— The strengthening of democracy and the increase of Parliament's representativeness by imposing at constitutional level an electoral threshold of 1% for entry into Parliament;

— Parliament shall appoint the Prosecutor General and the chief prosecutors of the National Anticorruption Directorate and of the Directorate for the Investigation of Organised Crime and Terrorism;

— We are of the opinion that the final sentence concerning the revocation by the Chamber of the measure taken in the case of flagrante delicto should be removed. Interference by the Chambers, by revoking such measures in the course of criminal proceedings, infringes the principle of the separation of powers within the State and the independence of the judiciary;

— The reduction of the number of signatures required for a citizens' legislative initiative from 100,000 to 30,000;

— The abolition of the tacit adoption of laws;

— The limitation of the executive's legislative delegation;

— Parliament's exclusive right to give prior consent for foreign troops, in peacetime, to enter, be stationed in or conduct operations on the territory of Romania;

— The inclusion in the Supreme Council of National Defence of the presidents of the two Chambers of Parliament;

— The reduction of the number of members of Parliament who may refer a matter to the Constitutional Court, from 50 to 20 deputies and from 25 to 10 senators respectively;

the diminution of the President's power (Articles 83, 90, 94, 103 and 142 will be amended and supplemented), namely:

— the reduction of the President's term of office from 5 to 4 years;

— The limitation of the President's right to organise referendums;

— The President shall confer the ranks of marshal, general and admiral only with the binding opinion of the specialised committees of Parliament;

— The President shall be required to designate as candidate for the office of Prime Minister the candidate designated by the party holding the largest number of members of Parliament;

— The President shall no longer appoint judges to the Constitutional Court;

the strengthening and guaranteeing of the independence of the judiciary (Articles 124, 125, 126, 132, 133, 134, 146 and 147 will be amended and supplemented), namely:

The increase of administrative control within the courts through the enlargement of the powers of court presidents (evaluation, designation to other management positions, delegation, secondment, transfer) is a manifest danger to the independence of judges — an independence that must be guaranteed at the highest level;

The non-involvement of judges in, and their non-membership of, the secret services, as well as of occult, secret or discreet associations and societies, is mandatory;

The exclusion of the political factor — namely the President of Romania — from the appointment of judges; this mechanism must be rethought, given that the proposals for appointment belong to the guarantor of the independence of justice, that is, the Superior Council of Magistracy; for prosecutors, the proposal for appointment may be made by the Public Ministry, whose functions are currently exercised through the Prosecutor's Office attached to the High Court of Cassation and Justice;

In addition to teaching positions in higher education, the presence of judges must also be guaranteed in teaching positions at the National Institute of Magistracy (which may in future be rethought as the National Institute of Judges) and at the National School of Court Clerks. Similar additions may be made as regards the presence of prosecutors in teaching positions at the National Institute of Magistracy (which may in future be rethought as the National Institute of Prosecutors) and at the National School of Court Clerks;

The independence of justice can be guaranteed only by judges, since only they enjoy real independence. It is therefore necessary to rethink at constitutional level the authority that provides guarantees of independence to the judiciary and thus consolidates the rule of law — namely the Superior Council of Magistracy, of which prosecutors will no longer be members;

The Superior Council of Magistracy may comprise a maximum of 10 judges, each elected by the general assemblies of judges throughout the country, a circumstance capable of ensuring full representativeness of those elected (who in any event represent all judges and not only those of the court from which they come). The structure of the number of judges corresponding to each court must be rethought in relation to the number of courts and of judges existing at national level;

The duration of members' terms of office must be rethought, since the six-year period has not always produced the best results, but rather a consolidation of influence and an excess of power;

It must likewise be expressly stated at constitutional level that the term of office of the president of the Superior Council of Judges is one year, and that this term of managerial office may not be extended, renewed or subjected to any other "legal innovation";

The provision concerning the participation of the President of Romania in the sittings of the Council, introduced by the 2003 revision, must be repealed;

The procedural rules concerning the decisions given by the Superior Council of Judges must be removed and readapted as regards their legal nature and the remedy available against them;

The Constitutional Court will be able to find a treaty unconstitutional even after its ratification;

Failure by judges and prosecutors to comply with the decisions of the Constitutional Court will constitute a disciplinary offence and will be sanctioned under conditions laid down by an organic law;

the defence and increase of the national wealth (Articles 116, 136 and 140 will be amended and supplemented), namely:

— Minimum and maximum budgets established by the Constitution: 6% — education, 9% — health, 2% — defence in peacetime.

— Appointed public offices, or offices and capacities filled by direct designation, shall be held for a maximum of 2 terms of a maximum of 4 years each;

— The royalties due under concession contracts shall be updated to the level of the prices practised in the European Union every five years;

— The Court of Auditors shall audit the management of public resources and shall report its findings to Parliament at least once a year, the Report being public;

the strengthening of democracy, the guarantee of national sovereignty and the defence of the supremacy of the Constitution and of the sovereign interest of the people in the conduct of international relations (Articles 70, 97, 120, 148 and 149 will be amended and supplemented), namely:

— The possibility of removing by referendum those elected by direct vote: the President, members of Parliament, mayors and presidents of county councils;

— the fulfilment of the obligations assumed by Romania under treaties only in compliance with the Constitution of Romania and in the higher and sovereign interest of the Romanian people;

— Romania's accession to, and withdrawal from, international bodies and alliances shall take place only by a law adopted through the sovereign decision of the Romanian people expressed by referendum.

A Complete Guide to the Amendments Made to the Romanian Constitution in the Draft Revision

This is why, although the Constitution of Romania, the supreme law of the State, is the document that defines the fundamental structure of Romanian society, the principles by which it is governed and the rights of its citizens, like any living document it requires periodic updating in order to remain relevant and effective amid social, political and technological change. For these reasons, the present draft revision of the Constitution of Romania brings a series of significant changes across a wide range of fields, from the separation of powers within the State to fundamental human rights and freedoms, justice, public administration and rules in the sphere of national defence and international relations.

In total, the draft proposes the revision of 51 articles, through the addition, amendment or repeal of specific paragraphs. In order to grasp the scale and depth of these changes, we shall review each article affected, together with the paragraphs concerned, explaining at the same time their content and implications.

We begin with Article 1, which is amended in paragraphs 4 and 5, establishing the principles of separation, balance and cooperation among the powers of the State and the binding force of the Constitution and of judicial decisions.

Within Article 19, paragraph 2 is repealed, and Article 21 undergoes a change in paragraph 3, emphasising the right to a fair trial and to the resolution of cases within a reasonable time.

Article 22 is revised in paragraph 2 so as to prohibit torture and inhuman or degrading treatment, and after paragraph 3 three new paragraphs (4–6) are added protecting the biological sexual identity of the child and the individual physical or mental integrity of the person. → the text of the article

The amendments continue with Article 23, in which paragraph 4 underlines the exceptional conditions for investigating and trying a person deprived of liberty, and after paragraph 13 two further new paragraphs (14 and 15) are added governing the surveillance of citizens and the limitation of individual liberty.

Article 24 receives three new paragraphs (3–5) which secure the right to a defence free from conditions, prohibit the use of classified documents in judicial proceedings without access for the persons con-
cerned and their lawyers, and guarantee the principle of equality of arms in criminal proceedings. → the text of the article

As regards education and health, Article 32 and Article 34 respectively are supplemented with new paragraphs stipulating the percentage of GDP allocated annually to these fields and the autonomy of education and health establishments in the use of their own revenues. These additions are crucial for securing an adequate level of financing and for improving the quality of the services provided to citizens.

Other important amendments concern Article 40, where paragraph 3 lays down the prohibition on members of certain professions belonging to political parties, and

Article 44, which introduces a new paragraph (10) guaranteeing the citizen's right freely to dispose of his property. → the text of the article

In the field of justice, Article 125 underlines the irremovability of judges and the legal conditions for their appointment, promotion or sanction, and

Article 133 sets out in detail the structure and powers of the Superior Council of Magistracy, including its role as guarantor of the independence of justice. → the text of the article

Another particularly relevant aspect is the amendments to the articles governing the structure and functioning of the Constitutional Court. Thus Article 143 lays down the new conditions applicable to the judges of that court, and

Article 146 sets out in detail the powers of the Court, including ruling on the constitutionality of laws and of international treaties. These changes have a significant impact on the manner in which fundamental rights and freedoms are protected, as well as on the separation of powers within the State. → the text of the article

Article 147, for its part, defines the effects of the decisions of the Constitutional Court, while the newly added article, → the text of the article

Article 148, underlines the supremacy of the Constitution and of the sovereign interest of the people in the conduct of international relations, laying down a clear framework for accession, for the ratification of the revision of the founding treaties and for Romania's withdrawal from international bodies and alliances, all of which must be done by referendum. → the text of the article

In order better to understand the context and the necessity of these amendments, it is essential to bear in mind the developments of recent years and the way in which they have influenced the structure of Romanian society. The proposed changes reflect the wish to bring national legislation into line with international standards, to respond to citizens' needs and to consolidate the institutions of the State.

One example is the introduction of the new paragraphs in Article 22 which, besides prohibiting torture, also address contemporary problems such as the rights of persons in the context of technological advance, protecting their physical and mental integrity against possible abuses connected with the use of technology. This demonstrates an awareness of digital realities and of the impact of emerging technologies on human rights.

At the same time, the increase in budgetary allocations for education and health indicates a recognition of the importance of these sectors, vital to the sustainable development of society. By establishing minimum percentages of GDP to be invested in these fields, the draft revision seeks to secure the resources needed to improve citizens' quality of life.

On the other hand, the amendments concerning the functioning of the Constitutional Court and of the Superior Council of Magistracy serve to strengthen the independence of justice and to secure a better balance among the powers of the State. This is essential in a democracy, where compliance with the law and the guarantee of citizens' rights depend on an impartial and effective judiciary.

Likewise, the approach taken to elections and to the terms of certain public offices, such as those of mayor or president, reflects an attempt to increase the accountability of elected representatives to the electorate through the possibility of removing them by referendum. This could lead to greater civic involvement in the democratic process and to increased accountability on the part of public officials. The new legislative framework proposed by this draft revision of the Constitution undoubtedly brings profound changes to Romania's legal and institutional structure. They are intended to update and align national legislation with societal developments and international standards, to consolidate fundamental rights and freedoms and to secure a more stable balance among the powers of the State.

In conclusion, the draft revision of the Constitution of Romania represents an important step in the continuing process of perfecting the legal framework within which Romanian society functions. Through these amendments the aim is not only to consolidate the structure of the rule of law and to secure better protection for citizens, but also to adapt to the complex changes of the contemporary world.

What follows is a presentation of the amendments and additions to the constitutional provisions and of the reasons for their adoption, in the order in which they appear in the law revising the Constitution and in the constitutional text as it will stand after revision:

1. Paragraphs 4 and 5 of Article 1 shall be amended to read as follows: → the text of the article

"(4) The State is organised according to the principles of separation, balance and loyal cooperation among the three equal powers — legislative, executive and judicial — within the framework of constitutional democracy. The legislative power is represented by Parliament; the executive power is

represented by the Government and by the other specialised bodies of the central public administration; and the judicial power is represented by the High Court of Cassation and Justice and by the other courts of law."

"(5) In Romania, compliance with the Constitution and its supremacy and with the laws, as well as compliance with judicial decisions and with the decisions of the Constitutional Court, is mandatory."

The Imperative of the Balance of Powers within the State. The Constitution of Romania, adopted in 1991 and revised in 2003, was the cornerstone of post-communist democracy and of the rule of law in Romania. Article 1, which establishes the foundations of the political and State system, is the subject of a proposed revision designed to consolidate the principles of separation, balance and loyal cooperation among the powers of the State.

Article 1(4) currently reads as follows: "(4) The State is organised according to the principle of the separation and balance of powers — legislative, executive and judicial — within the framework of constitutional democracy."

The addition of the sentence "The legislative power is represented by Parliament; the executive power is represented by the Government and by the other specialised bodies of the central public administration; and the judicial power is represented by the High Court of Cassation and Justice and by the other courts of law." is intended to make explicit what each power is, thereby excluding by omission the President from among the three powers. This amendment also anticipates and specifies the manner of interpreting and applying the second sentence of Article 80(1), which provides that "The President shall exercise the function of mediation among the powers of the State, as well as between the State and society." According to the "spirit" and the "letter" of that article, the function of mediator places the President outside and above any of the three powers. For that reason, the implicit participation of the President in the activity of one or more of the powers of the State, even in the capacity of "Head of State", transforms the President from mediator, from "arbiter" between State and society and among the powers of the State, into a party involved in the "game of power" — into a player-referee and captain of one of the "teams", at present of the "executive team" — which distorts the functioning of democracy by breaking the balance among the powers of the State in favour of the executive, and also undermines the power and sovereignty of the Romanian people, since under the interpretation and application of the Constitution prevailing before the present amendment society was left without a "mediator" and "representative" before the State.

To paragraph 5, which before the amendment reads "In Romania, compliance with the Constitution and its supremacy and with the laws is mandatory", the clause "as well as compliance with judicial decisions and with the decisions of the Constitutional Court is mandatory" is added. This clarification, although it ought to have been implicit in the earlier wording of the Constitution, is necessary and must be introduced into the revised constitutional text precisely in order to give effect and concreteness to the principle of the balance of powers within the State mentioned above, and likewise to the binding force of the laws and to the supremacy of the Constitution.

Compliance with judicial decisions is the guarantee of the direct application, effectiveness and concreteness of the state of legality in a society — a state also known by the more commonly used name of "the rule of law" — which is why introducing as a constitutional principle the binding force of judicial decisions is a necessary measure.

At the same time, introducing into the Constitution the binding character of the Decisions of the Constitutional Court is the manifestation and direct application of the first part of this paragraph 5,

which states explicitly that "In Romania, compliance with the Constitution and its supremacy... is mandatory"; compliance with the decisions of the Constitutional Court is the concrete expression of the supremacy of the Constitution and the most important means of guaranteeing national sovereignty.

The amendments to Article 1 of the Constitution itself, although apparently redundant and repetitive by comparison with the earlier wording, serve to specify and reinforce the principles and rules governing the functioning of the Romanian State; these new guarantees are necessary also in the light of the deviations and dysfunctions observed over the past 33 years of application of the 1991 Constitution, the essence of the rule of law being compliance with judicial decisions. For these reasons, the express mention of the equality of the three powers confers on them, in addition, a constitutional guarantee, and, at the level of cooperation among them, excludes any tendency towards a possible hierarchy between them.

The Importance of Revising Paragraphs 4 and 5 of Article 1. The revision proposed for paragraphs 4 and 5 of

Article 1 of the Constitution of Romania is not merely a formal exercise but a necessity in the present context, in which political practices and legal interpretations have often shown the need for clarification and consolidation of the constitutional text. These amendments may serve as a mechanism for preventing conflicts of competence among the powers of the State and for ensuring its harmonious functioning.

The adoption of more explicit formulations within the Constitution is consistent with trends observed in other European States which have chosen to set out explicitly the powers of, and the relations among, the powers of the State. For example, the German Constitution, known as the Grundgesetz, clearly stipulates the role and functions of the various State bodies as well as the principle of the separation of powers, which serves as the basis for the country's institutional organisation. Such clarity helps avoid ambiguity and consolidates the rule of law by providing a well-defined framework for institutional action. Examining the revised articles of the Romanian Constitution in a comparative European context, we observe that the effort to elaborate and consolidate the principle of the separation of powers is a general trend. For example, the Constitution of France ensures a clear separation between executive and legislative functions, providing specific mechanisms for resolving the disputes that may arise between them. This approach helps maintain a stable balance and avoid overlap or conflicts of interest among the various branches of government.

In the same spirit of clarity and stability, the Constitution of Spain defines in precise terms the roles of, and relations among, Parliament, Government and the judiciary, placing particular emphasis on the independence of the judicial power as the foundation of citizens' liberties and rights. Through this structure the Spanish Constitution seeks to protect democratic principles and to secure a durable balance among the powers of the State, thereby avoiding the excessive centralisation of power or the risk of an authoritarian drift. Returning to the Romanian context, the proposed revision of Article 1 of the Constitution of Romania likewise reflects the experience accumulated and the challenges encountered in the process of consolidating democracy and the rule of law.

This legislative initiative may be regarded as a necessary step in Romania's institutional maturing and in its alignment with European democratic practice, providing a firmer basis for the functioning of institutions and for respect for fundamental rights and freedoms. Moreover, the proposed revision of paragraphs 4 and 5 is in harmony with the provisions of Article 16 concerning equality of rights. The equality of the powers of the State, as redefined, consolidates the idea of citizens' legal equality,

since it guarantees that no power may prevail over or undermine the authority of another, thereby securing an equitable legal framework for all.

In conclusion, the revision of Article 1 of the Constitution of Romania — by clarifying and reinforcing the principle of the separation of powers and by making explicit the binding force of judicial decisions and of the decisions of the Constitutional Court — constitutes an essential stage in the country's democratic evolution. This process of revision not only ensures alignment with European standards but also consolidates citizens' confidence in the mechanisms of the State, creating the conditions for effective and equitable governance. Through these changes, the Constitution of Romania will become a more adaptable and clearer instrument for defining the role of each power and for governing the relations among them, which will help prevent and resolve potential institutional conflicts. Thus not only the harmonious functioning of the State but also the protection of democratic values and of the rule of law in Romania will be secured. The revision of Article 1 is, in essence, a reaffirmation of commitment to the fundamental principles of constitutional democracy. It is not merely an adaptation to contemporary social and political realities but also a preventive measure against abusive interpretations or usurpations of power that could undermine the institutional balance established by the country's fundamental law. Reinserting and elaborating these principles in the text of the Constitution not only strengthens the democratic foundation of the Romanian State but also reiterates the commitment to the rule of law and to unrestricted respect for judicial and constitutional decisions. This provides the framework for an independent and impartial judiciary, essential to the functioning of any democratic State.

In conclusion, the revision of paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Constitution of Romania is a manifestation of political maturity and of an understanding of the need for a robust constitutional framework. It is a recognition of the fact that a strong democracy is built not only through laws but also through guaranteeing compliance with them in a spirit of loyal cooperation among all branches of power. It is at the same time a signal that the Romanian State is strengthening its foundations so as to ensure that future developments will take place within a consolidated democratic tradition respectful of the will of the citizen and of the supremacy of the law. The revision of paragraphs 4 and 5 is thus more than a mere textual update; it is an affirmation of institutional maturing and a consolidation of Romania's democratic structure, in keeping with the dynamics of society and with its citizens' aspirations for transparent and effective governance. In this process of revision Romania reaffirms its commitment to following the best European practices and standards, thereby ensuring the alignment of national legislation with the democratic principles and values underlying the European Union.

This constitutional change is, in essence, a step towards consolidating a State in which each power exercises its role independently but in a spirit of collaboration, contributing to a healthy balance and to the proper functioning of the whole political system. It will strengthen citizens' confidence in the capacity of institutions to protect their rights and freedoms and to respond adequately to their expectations. The proposed revision is therefore not merely a technical necessity but a profound commitment to the basic principles of democracy and the rule of law. Improving the clarity of the constitutional text will result in a better understanding of institutional roles and will eliminate the ambiguities that can lead to conflicts of competence or erroneous interpretations of the law. This will contribute to greater institutional stability and to the consolidation of public confidence in the integrity and effectiveness of government. In conclusion, the proposed revision of Article 1 of the Constitution of Romania is a fundamental step towards strengthening the democratic structure of the State and securing a solid balance among its powers.

2. Article 19(2) is repealed. → the text of the article

Article 19(2) currently reads as follows: "(2) By way of derogation from the provisions of paragraph (1), Romanian citizens may be extradited under the international conventions to which Romania is a party, under the conditions laid down by law and on a reciprocal basis."

The repeal of Article 19(2) removes the derogation established from the principle stated in paragraph 1 of the same article, namely that "(1) A Romanian citizen may not be extradited or expelled from Romania."

In this way the possibility of a Romanian citizen being extradited to third countries where he might be subject to criminal investigation or conviction is removed.

The principal reason for removing the possibility of extraditing a Romanian citizen to third States is the need to consolidate the Romanian citizen's right to a fair trial — a right guaranteed by Article 21(2) of the Constitution — conducted in the official language of Romania, which under Article 13 of the Constitution is Romanian, and likewise to benefit from the right to a defence granted and guaranteed by Article 24 of the Constitution.

These rights find their full exercise only where the Romanian State guarantees the Romanian citizen access to a national court, the trial being conducted in Romanian and on the basis of the only laws that the Romanian citizen is required (and presumed) to know — the laws of Romania — and, not least, in the presence of a lawyer "chosen or appointed of the court's motion" with whom he can consult in the official language of the State without the need for intermediaries such as interpreters and translators.

Not least, the great or very great distances from the Romanian citizen's home at which the countries requesting the extradition of a Romanian citizen extraditable under the present constitutional rules may lie constitute a major, often insurmountable, obstacle to the exercise of family relations, all the more so since there exists the possibility of the Romanian citizen being held in confinement for long or sometimes very long periods, which flagrantly infringes the obligation imposed by Article 26 of the Constitution for the Romanian State to protect the family life of its citizens.

The secondary reason for removing the derogation provided for in Article 19(2) of the Constitution is the need for the Romanian State to assume in full the costs of trying and, where appropriate, defending, detaining and rehabilitating the Romanian citizen — which is an essential part of the Romanian State's responsibility in its relations with its international partners, and likewise of Romania's sovereign right to try and punish, in accordance with its own laws, Romanian citizens as well as foreign citizens who commit offences on Romanian territory.

The aim pursued in this way is the strengthening and guaranteeing of the rights of the citizen.

From the perspective of its relation to other articles of the Constitution, the repeal of Article 19(2) would produce greater coherence between the fundamental principles concerning citizens' rights and their application. For example, Article 22, on the right to life and to physical and mental integrity, would sit better with a legal regime that does not permit extradition, thereby reiterating the Romanian State's commitment to protecting these rights against any external threats, including judicial ones.

By comparison with other European constitutions, the repeal of this paragraph would place Romania within a group of countries that have opted to guarantee the non-extradition of their citizens as a constitutional principle. For example, the German Constitution provides in Article 16(2) that "no German may be extradited to a foreign country". That provision reflects an approach similar to the one Romania would adopt by repealing Article 19(2), placing the emphasis on national sovereignty and on the protection of citizens against foreign legal systems.

In the light of debates on national sovereignty and the globalisation of criminal justice, the repeal of paragraph 2 might be seen by some as a step back in international criminal cooperation, but it is a strengthening of national sovereignty and of the Romanian State's responsibility towards its citizens as well as towards its international partners.

3. Article 21(3) is amended to read as follows: → the text of the article

"(3) The parties shall have the right to a fair trial and to the resolution of their cases within a reasonable, optimal and predictable time, by an independent and impartial tribunal established by law."

The present wording of Article 21(3), "The parties shall have the right to a fair trial and to the resolution of their cases within a reasonable time", has been supplemented with the words "optimal and predictable, by an independent and impartial tribunal", the aim being to establish as a constitutional principle the Recommendation contained in the Framework Programme of the European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ). The Commission adopted the Framework Programme entitled "A new objective for judicial systems: the processing of each case within an optimum and foreseeable timeframe", in which it maintains that the "reasonable time" is only a condition — the "lower limit" of the right to a fair trial — and must therefore be replaced by another term, "optimal and predictable", as a more stimulating and effective standard.

The present amendment of Article 21(3) responds to the CE-CEPEJ recommendation adopted on 8 December 2006, known as the "Compendium", by which national judicial systems were recommended to establish framework timeframes for judicial proceedings in application of the new concept of an "optimal and predictable timeframe". In several European States (Finland, Slovenia, Norway) solutions have been adopted for establishing framework durations of judicial proceedings in relation to the complexity of cases, even fixing certain set periods in criminal matters and, separately, in civil matters; but no intervention was made at constitutional level, so that Romania would be the first country to implement the CE-CEPEJ recommendation at that level.

This amendment answers the rhetorical question posed by Professor Ion Deleanu at the time of the adoption of the laws amending the procedural codes: "Does the enshrinement in the law of civil procedure of the phrase 'optimal and predictable timeframe' not amount to an implicit and inadmissible revision of the constitutional provisions, which refer to a 'reasonable time'?" In this way the concept of an "optimal and predictable timeframe" — a new and more demanding variety of the "reasonable time" — is implemented at constitutional level and provides a constitutional justification for such expressions as "expeditious resolution of cases", "resolution as a matter of urgency and with priority", "short time-limit", "urgently", "forthwith" and the like.

The same article also adds the phrase "an independent and impartial tribunal established by law", the aim being to harmonise the Constitution with the provisions of the European Convention on Human Rights, Article 6 of which provides that "Everyone is entitled to a fair and public hearing within a reasonable time by an independent and impartial tribunal established by law (...)".

The European Court of Human Rights has held that the right to a fair trial is guaranteed only where the case is heard by an "independent and impartial tribunal established by law". In support of the necessity of implementing this amendment to the constitutional text, we shall mention certain points already established in the case-law of the ECtHR:

"Independence means independence vis-à-vis the other powers (executive and legislative) (Beaumartin v. France, § 38) and independence vis-à-vis the parties (Sramek v. Austria, § 42). Compliance with this requirement is assessed in particular on the basis of statutory criteria, such as the manner of appointment and the duration of the term of office of the members of the tribunal, or the existence of sufficient guarantees against outside pressure."

For the purposes of Article 6 § 1, the tribunal must be impartial. Impartiality is normally defined as the absence of prejudice or bias, and must be assessed [Micallef v. Malta (GC), §§ 93-101; Nicholas v. Cyprus, § 49]:

i. according to a subjective approach, having regard to the personal conviction and conduct of the judge — that is, whether he displayed personal bias or prejudice in the case; and also

ii. according to an objective approach, which consists in determining whether the tribunal offered, in particular through its composition, sufficient guarantees to exclude any legitimate doubt as to its impartiality.

"The Court has emphasised that appearances too may be of importance or, as the English saying goes, 'justice must not only be done, it must also be seen to be done'. In a democratic society the courts must inspire confidence in those subject to their jurisdiction. Any judge in respect of whom there may be a legitimate fear of a lack of impartiality must therefore withdraw [Micallef v. Malta (GC), § 98]. As regards an application for withdrawal, the court must respond to the arguments advanced in support of the application (Harabin v. Slovakia, § 136)."

In the light of all the case-law cited above, the constitutional text must be supplemented with the provisions laid down in the European Convention on Human Rights and consistently established in the Court's case-law, thereby instituting at constitutional level new guarantees for the exercise of the rights and freedoms of the Romanian citizen.

Article 21 of the present Constitution of Romania provides that every person may have recourse to the courts for the protection of his rights, freedoms and legitimate interests. No legal act may impede the exercise of this right. The amendment of paragraph 3 further underlines the need for accessible and effective justice, a fundamental pillar of a democratic society that respects the rights and freedoms of its citizens. Besides aligning with European standards, this revision is consistent with other articles of the Constitution of Romania. For example, Article 16 affirms the equality of citizens before the law and the public authorities, without privileges and without discrimination. A fair, optimal and predictable trial is therefore a natural extension of that equality before the law. By comparison with other European constitutions, the new text of Article 21(3) of the Constitution of Romania is in line with the principles established at European Union level. For instance, the German Constitution provides in Article 101 that "No one may be removed from the jurisdiction of his lawful judge", while Article 103 guarantees the right to a fair hearing. These provisions reflect a commitment to the principle of the rule of law and to the protection of individual rights, similar to the revision proposed for Article 21 in Romania. The revision of Article 21 and its alignment with European standards therefore not only strengthens Romania's commitment to democratic principles and the rule of law but also helps consolidate citizens' confidence in the judicial system. This is an essential reform which will also foster greater predictability in national case-law and support the efficiency of judicial proceedings, thereby reducing the excessive length of trials, a frequent problem in the Romanian judicial system. → the text of the article

In addition, bringing Article 21(3) into line with European standards will have a positive impact on the Romanian business environment, since investors and companies will benefit from greater legal certainty and a predictable legal framework. This may stimulate economic growth and improve the investment climate, thereby attracting more foreign capital and generating new employment opportunities for citizens.

The revision of Article 21 and the adoption of the concept of an "optimal and predictable timeframe" also reflect a proactive approach to managing the increased caseload of the courts. This approach can significantly reduce the number of adjourned cases and ensure that citizens do not suffer from unjustified delays. In essence, swift justice is justice closer to the ideals of fairness and efficiency that any judicial system ought to embody.

It is important to note that the proposed revision is not confined to improving the time taken to resolve cases but extends also to the quality of the judicial process as a whole. By including the requirements of independence and impartiality of the tribunal, it is guaranteed that every case will be tried on the basis of the facts and of the applicable law, without outside influence or prejudice. In this way both the integrity of the judicial process and public confidence in the justice system are secured.

In conclusion, the amendment of Article 21 of the Constitution of Romania is a crucial stage in the evolution of the justice system and of the rule of law in Romania. By implementing the notion of an "optimal and predictable timeframe", it is ensured that citizens' rights to a fair trial are observed in accordance with the highest European standards. The principles of independence and impartiality of the judiciary — elements vital to a modern and effective judicial system — are likewise consolidated.

The revision must be seen in the broader context of judicial reform and of the need to increase the transparency, efficiency and accountability of the judicial system. Such a constitutional change represents not merely an alignment with European directives but also an affirmation of Romania's commitment to democratic values and to respect for human rights.

This is not only a step forward for the Romanian judicial system but also a powerful message that Romania is dedicated to protecting and promoting the rule of law, thereby securing a stable and equitable environment for all its citizens. In the light of these considerations, the revision of Article 21 is not merely necessary but imperative for the progress of Romanian society as a whole.

In conclusion, the amendment of Article 21 of the Constitution of Romania is an essential step towards consolidating a transparent and effective justice system that is, above all, consistent with European and international fair-trial standards. This constitutional reform has the potential significantly to improve public perception of the judicial system and to increase confidence in the mechanisms of law enforcement.

In essence, through this revision Romania embarks on a path of modernising and improving justice, a central pillar in the functioning of a healthy democracy. This initiative must be accompanied by other reform measures securing the effective application of the principles enshrined in the new paragraph of Article 21. These may include investment in judicial infrastructure, continuing training for magistrates and the implementation of information technologies to make case management more efficient. In addition, it is essential to promote a culture of accountability and integrity among justice professionals, so as to guarantee that the new constitutional standards are observed with the utmost seriousness.

Ultimately, the revision of Article 21 should not be regarded as a mere act of compliance with European recommendations but as a reaffirmation of Romania's commitment to the basic principles

of justice and of the rule of law. It represents a commitment to citizens and a promise to provide them with justice that not only observes the letter of the law but is also prompt, effective and fair towards every individual.

Constitutional revision is therefore a cornerstone in the building of a judicial system capable of inspiring trust and respect, and of ensuring that the rights and freedoms of every Romanian citizen are protected and promoted in accordance with the highest international standards. It is a courageous and necessary step on the path of Romania's democratic evolution, towards a society in which justice is truly for all — justice that is not merely pronounced but applied concretely and visibly in the daily life of every citizen.

Through this revision Romania assumes the responsibility of aligning its judicial system not only with the expectations of its own citizens but also with the dynamics of legislative change worldwide, ensuring that its constitutional law keeps pace with international legal innovation. This effort will not only improve the quality of justice but will also contribute to Romania's image as a Member State of the European Union dedicated to respecting and promoting human rights and democratic values.

Finally, it must be acknowledged that the revision of Article 21 is more than a mere legal adjustment; it is a reflection of a people's aspirations towards better justice and a fairer society. It is a step forward in consolidating citizens' confidence in the institutions of the State and a signal that Romania undertakes to ensure that justice is not merely theoretical but practical and accessible to every person.

4. Article 22(2) is amended to read as follows: → the text of the article

"(2) No one may be subjected to torture or to any kind of inhuman, degrading or experimental punishment or treatment."

In a State governed by the rule of law, the constitution is the foundation on which the whole legal and social edifice is built. Like any foundation, it must be solid but also adaptable to the dynamics of the society it supports. The revision of constitutional articles is thus not merely a right but an obligation where those articles no longer correspond to the realities or aspirations of citizens. In this sense, Article 21 of the Constitution of Romania, which addresses the right to a fair trial, requires particular attention and updating to contemporary European standards.

To the present wording of Article 22(2) — "No one may be subjected to torture or to any kind of inhuman or degrading punishment or treatment." — the term "experimental" has been added, so that the prohibition of "subjecting" a person to torture, to any kind of punishment or to any "inhuman or degrading treatment" is extended also to experimental treatments.

In this way there is instituted at constitutional level the prohibition of "subjecting a person" — that is, of forcing that person against his own will — to any kind of experimental treatment. Since the constitutional text is written in simple language, capable of being understood by any speaker of Romanian, both the term "treatment" and the term "experimental" have strictly their ordinary conceptual scope, as given by the dictionary definition.

Thus the term "treatment" may be understood both as "The way of behaving towards someone; attitude, conduct towards someone" (synonyms: conduct, behaviour) — as the conceptual scope of this term was often (baselessly) restricted in the ordinary interpretation of the old constitutional text — and as "The totality of dietary, pharmaceutical, balneo-climatic and hygienic means of combating an illness", in the sense of medical care; the set of hygienic, dietary, pharmaceutical, balneal, climatic

and other means by which an illness is treated (synonyms: cure, therapy), or "A mode, method or therapeutic means used in combating illness", and also "A set of operations carried out on a material or an organism etc. in order to obtain changes of quality, form, structure etc. for industrial, economic or scientific purposes."

Likewise, the term "experimental" is understood in its ordinary sense, namely "by way of trial".

In this way there is instituted at constitutional level the categorical and unequivocal prohibition of subjecting or forcing any person to be administered any dietary, pharmaceutical, balneo-climatic or hygienic means of combating an illness, any mode, method or therapeutic means used in combating illness, or any "set of operations carried out on a material or an organism etc. in order to obtain changes of quality, form, structure etc. for industrial, economic or scientific purposes", "by way of trial" — any "dietary, pharmaceutical, balneo-climatic or hygienic means of combating an illness" that has not already been proved effective and safe in treating the illnesses for which its administration is recommended.

The measure is absolutely necessary in order to strengthen the citizen's right to life and to physical and mental integrity, in accordance with freedom of conscience. Each of these is an element indissolubly bound up with the sovereignty of the people, seen as the totality of citizens whose rights and freedoms must be guaranteed.

Paragraph (2), as now worded, categorically excludes subjecting a person to treatments that do not respect his human dignity and integrity, thereby consolidating protection against abuses that may arise from medical or scientific experiments. This amendment is in full harmony with the humanist values promoted by the European Union and with the provisions of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, Article 3 of which lays down the "Right to the integrity of the person".

According to that article, everyone has the right to respect for his or her physical and mental integrity, and in the fields of medicine and biology there must be respected, among other things, the free and informed consent of the person concerned, the prohibition of eugenic practices and the prohibition on making the human body and its parts a source of financial gain. It is important to note that the revision of Article 22 of the Constitution of Romania is also consonant with the provisions of the European Convention on Human Rights, in particular Article 3, which prohibits torture and inhuman or degrading treatment. This alignment with international standards reflects Romania's commitment to promoting and protecting human rights within its domestic legal framework, thereby consolidating its status as a member of the European and international community.

Comparing the revised text of Article 22 with those of other European constitutions, it may be observed that most Member States of the European Union include in their fundamental documents similar provisions prohibiting torture and inhuman treatment. For example, the German Constitution (Grundgesetz) affirms in Article 1 the inviolability of human dignity and emphasises that "to respect and protect it shall be the duty of all state authority". That provision is supplemented by Article 104, which prohibits inhuman or degrading treatment during detention. Similarly, the Constitution of Spain guarantees in Article 15 the right to life and prohibits torture and any form of inhuman or degrading punishment or treatment. The proposal to revise the Constitution of Romania so as to include the prohibition of experimental treatments is therefore not only a domestic necessity but also an alignment with internationally recognised and adopted human-rights standards.

This change will consolidate confidence in the justice system and will ensure that medical and scientific practices are conducted with respect for the dignity and fundamental rights of every individual.

In conclusion, the revision of Article 22 so as to make explicit the prohibition of experimental treatments is an important step in updating and adapting the Constitution of Romania to the values and principles governing modern society. It will serve not only as a guarantee of respect for individual rights but also as a platform for developing a more robust legal framework in the medical and scientific fields, ensuring that progress does not sacrifice human integrity.

By adopting such an amendment, Romania reaffirms its commitment to the protection of human rights and consolidates its position as a democratic State aligned with international values and norms in the field of fundamental rights.

5. After Article 22(3) there are inserted paragraphs 4, 5 and 6, reading as follows: → the text of the article

"(4) The biological sexual identity of the child acquired at birth may not be altered before the age of 18.

(5) The right of the person to self-determination and to develop in freedom according to his own free will and with respect for his status as a responsible person, as attributes of human dignity, are inalienable human rights and are guaranteed and protected by the Romanian State.

(6) No authority, institution or individual may, by any technological mechanism, increase, diminish, disturb or alter the individual physical or mental integrity of a person without that person's written, express, informed and freely expressed consent or, in the case of a person under judicial interdiction or of a patient unable to express his will, without the written, express, informed and freely expressed consent of the legal representative."

Article 22 of the Constitution of Romania also receives two further paragraphs intended to guarantee and reinforce the protection of the Romanian citizen's "right to life and to physical and mental integrity" in the light of the new challenges and dangers brought by the social and technological developments of recent years — developments impossible to anticipate in the years when the Constitution was adopted (1991) or revised (2003).

Thus the newly inserted paragraph 4 prohibits, up to the age of 18, any form of intervention on the body of the minor for the purpose of altering the sexual identity acquired at his birth. In adopting these amendments, account is taken both of the best interests of the child and of his right to decide and dispose of his body in full knowledge of the facts after reaching psychological maturity, so as to eliminate any premature influences on the normal physical and mental development of the Romanian citizen. Not least, account is taken of the irreversible character of any premature gender modification — modifications that will have a negative effect both on the development of the minor and, directly, on the birth rate in Romania through gender changes carried out during minority, an aspect that directly affects both the rights of the person and national sovereignty.

Thus paragraph (4) raises a sensitive and at the same time crucial subject: the biological sexual identity of the child and the prohibition of its alteration before majority. This point has profound implications for the rights of the child, continuing to balance his right to personal autonomy with his proper protection during the formative period. It is important to note that this rule is not intended to limit individual rights but rather to secure a stable framework for the harmonious development of the child, without his being subjected to pressures or decisions that could have long-term consequences for his physical and mental health. In that sense the revision must be seen as a precautionary measure protecting minors from premature decisions that could irreversibly affect the natural

course of their development. This aspect is also consistent with Article 49 of the Constitution of Romania, which provides for the special protection of children and young people, underlining the need to secure optimal conditions for their physical, intellectual and social development.

This protection is not merely a moral responsibility but also a legal one, the State having the duty to create an environment in which children can grow and develop in safety, without being exposed to the risk of taking decisions that exceed their emotional and cognitive maturity.

At the same time, the newly inserted paragraph 5 lays down "the right of the person to self-determination and to develop according to his own free will", a right born of the citizen's very status as a responsible person presumed fully capable and mentally sound.

This amendment took into account the doctrinal evolution of recent decades in the study of personal liberties, an evolution driven by the latest technological developments, which pose great challenges to man's status as a free and rational being — impeccably summarised by the German Federal Constitutional Court in the concise formulation: "The protection of human dignity rests on the idea that man is an intellectual-moral being disposed to determine himself and to develop in freedom. The inalienable dignity of man lies precisely in the necessity that his status as a responsible person be respected" (BVerfGE 45, 187 — Lebenslange Freiheitsstrafe).

In this way "free will", a fundamental principle of Christian and European thought, has been brought within the sphere of the right to mental integrity — "free will" being the principle and root of all human rights and freedom, summarised in man's freedom to choose between good and evil according to his own conscience: a universal right that contains within it the principle of all civic liberties and in particular freedom of conscience (governed by Article 29 of the Constitution), as well as freedom of expression (Article 30), individual liberty (Article 23) and freedom of movement (Article 25).

Moreover, paragraph (5) emphasises a fundamental principle — human dignity and the inalienable right of every individual to self-determination. This is an extension of Article 30, which protects freedom of expression.

By protecting the human right to self-determination, the Romanian State reaffirms its commitment to democratic values and to respect for human rights. This new paragraph reflects a modern understanding of human dignity, in which every person is regarded as capable of managing his own destiny, within a legal framework offering protection and respect for individual decisions.

As a continuation and concretisation of the principle stated in paragraph 5, the newly inserted paragraph 6 takes into account both the technological developments of recent years and the latest findings of the most advanced research laboratories in the field, all of which create the conditions for possible technological intrusions liable to disturb the physical or mental integrity of the person, which may be effected including, but not limited to, through the use of neurotechnology. In view of the potential risks posed by the absence of regulation in a field capable of having direct effects on the Romanian citizen as an individual and on communities as a whole — both of which may cause uncontrolled influences on society and hence on national sovereignty — the constitutional provision implicitly prohibits the use of any device whose purpose is to increase, diminish or disturb the individual physical or mental integrity of the person, which also entails the prohibition of accessing or manipulating neuronal activity, or of diminishing the autonomy of the will or the capacity of citizens to take decisions freely. Nevertheless, consistently with the principle laid down by Article 26(2) of the Constitution ("A natural person has the right to dispose of himself, provided he does not infringe the rights and freedoms of others, public order or morality"), the constitutional text leaves the citizen free to make use of such technological means if there is first obtained "the written,

express, informed and freely expressed consent of the person or, in the case of a person under judicial interdiction or of a patient unable to express his will, the written, express, informed and freely expressed consent of the legal representative." The anticipatory regulation of this field must be introduced at constitutional level for the preventive defence of the social values protected by the Romanian State and for the defence of the rights and of the physical and mental integrity of the Romanian citizen, as fundamental elements of national sovereignty.

Along these lines, paragraph (6) addresses a contemporary concern: the impact of technology on personal integrity. Amid rapid and often unpredictable technological advance, it is essential that legislation provide guarantees against technological abuses that could violate the physical or mental integrity of an individual. This provision is consistent with Article 26 of the Constitution, which protects the right to intimate, family and private life, thereby consolidating the legal basis for the protection of citizens against invasive techniques that could penetrate the private sphere without the express consent of the person. Comparing the revised text of Article 22 with other European constitutions, we may observe a general trend towards updating and adapting fundamental texts to the realities of the twenty-first century.

For example, the German Constitution recognises and protects gender identity but does not impose a specific age for the recognition of gender changes. The Constitution of Spain, on the other hand, treats the right to physical and moral integrity as inviolable, without referring explicitly to technologies that might affect these aspects of individual integrity.

In the context of the revision of Article 22 of the Constitution of Romania, the adoption of specific measures for the protection of children's biological sexual identity and of the physical and mental integrity of persons reflects a proactive and forward-looking approach. This undertaking is consistent with the human-rights principles promoted at European and international level and with the need to protect citizens against possible abuses arising from the improper use of new technologies. It should be noted that, although the revision of Article 22 brings necessary clarifications in the present context, it must be carried out with particular attention to the balance between the protection of minors' rights and respect for fundamental human rights.

6. Article 23(4) is amended to read as follows: → the text of the article

"(4) Exceptionally and with reasons stated, investigation and trial in criminal proceedings shall take place with the person deprived of liberty. Pre-trial detention shall be ordered by the judge of the court having jurisdiction to try the merits of the case, under the conditions laid down by law, only if it is strictly necessary for the proper conduct of the criminal proceedings and only in the course of those proceedings, after the criminal action has been set in motion."

The present wording of Article 23(4) — "Pre-trial detention shall be ordered by a judge and only in the course of criminal proceedings." — is amended so as to institute new procedural guarantees for Romanian citizens.

The first such guarantee is the stipulation of the exceptional character of the deprivation of a person's liberty: "Exceptionally and with reasons stated, investigation and trial in criminal proceedings shall take place with the person deprived of liberty." The principal aim of this amendment is the protection of the individual against arbitrary or unjustified deprivation of liberty. There is stipulated at constitutional level both the exceptional character of the measure of deprivation of liberty and the requirement that it be reasoned, which reinforces the principle of the lawfulness of deprivation of

liberty from both a procedural and a substantive point of view, thereby requiring scrupulous observance of the principle of the supremacy of law.

Another procedural guarantee instituted at constitutional level is that "Pre-trial detention shall be ordered by the judge of the court having jurisdiction to try the merits of the case", which is such as to guarantee a thorough knowledge of the case before the court and of the necessity of taking an exceptional measure in respect of the person investigated or tried.

A further condition is that pre-trial detention be ordered under the conditions laid down by law — a further reinforcement and confirmation of the principle of the lawfulness of deprivation of liberty. To satisfy the condition of lawfulness, any detention must be applied "in accordance with a procedure prescribed by law". That is why, in the case of a deprivation of liberty, it is particularly important that the general principle of legal certainty be observed. It is therefore established at constitutional level that it is essential for all the conditions of deprivation of liberty to be clearly defined in national law and for the law itself to be foreseeable in its application, so as to satisfy the requirement of "lawfulness" laid down by the Constitution — a standard requiring rules of law to be sufficiently precise to enable a person, if need be with appropriate advice, to foresee to a reasonable degree the consequences which a given course of conduct may entail in the particular circumstances of his case. Implementing at constitutional level the principle of the lawfulness of deprivation of liberty — the "quality of the law" — entails the imperative that a rule of law authorising deprivation of liberty be sufficiently accessible, clear and foreseeable in its application. The factors relevant to assessing the "quality of the law" — sometimes also called "safeguards against arbitrariness" — will include the existence of clear legal provisions for ordering detention, for extending it and for defining its duration, as well as the existence of effective remedies by which the applicant may contest the "lawfulness" and "length" of the detention, as is likewise established in the settled case-law of the European Court of Human Rights.

The last two conditions complete the series of procedural guarantees established at constitutional level, namely that the deprivation of liberty be ordered "only if it is strictly necessary for the proper conduct of the criminal proceedings and only in the course of those proceedings, after the criminal action has been set in motion" — all of which impose new standards for the application of citizens' rights both on the legislature and on the national judge.

It is essential to note that these constitutional amendments are not isolated but form part of a broader context of adaptation to the provisions and principles set out in other fundamental documents, such as the European Convention on Human Rights and the case-law of the European Court of Human Rights. In that sense, the revision of Article 23 must also be viewed in terms of alignment with European standards of human-rights protection.

Examining other European constitutions, we observe that the principle of proportionality and necessity in deprivation of liberty is a common standard. For example, the German Constitution (Grundgesetz) expressly provides that "the liberty of the individual may be restricted only pursuant to a law and only in compliance with the forms prescribed therein". Similarly, the Constitution of France stipulates that "no one may be arbitrarily detained" and that deprivation of liberty must be based on legally defined grounds and comply with established legislative procedures. These rule-of-law principles are also reflected in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, which underlines the right of every person not to be arbitrarily deprived of liberty. By comparison, the amendment proposed for Article 23 of the Constitution of Romania incorporates these fundamental values, consolidating the premises of a judicial system that respects human rights and the principle of lawfulness. Through this revision Romania takes important steps towards harmonising its legislation with European standards and practices in matters of justice and human rights.

In addition to these comparisons with the constitutions of other European States, it should be emphasised that such a constitutional rule on pre-trial detention contributes significantly to consolidating public confidence in the justice system. This is because, in accordance with international recommendations, it is recognised that deprivation of liberty must be a measure of last resort, applied only where other, less intrusive measures are insufficient to attain the legitimate aims of the criminal proceedings.

7. In Article 23, after paragraph 13 there are added paragraphs 14 and 15, reading as follows: → the text of the article

"(14) No Romanian citizen may be followed or monitored, nor may his conversations or communications be intercepted, without the prior authorisation of a judge in accordance with the law, and such measures shall be carried out only by the criminal investigation bodies. It is prohibited to use in proceedings documents and recordings obtained in breach of the legal rules governing them or made by bodies other than the criminal investigation bodies.

(15) In no situation and for no reason may the existence of a collective right be invoked in order to limit individual liberty."

Article 23 of the Constitution of Romania, headed "Individual liberty", receives 2 new paragraphs introducing additional guarantees for the protection of the individual liberty of the citizen — guarantees adapted to new technological developments and to certain deviations that have appeared in recent years at the political and social level.

Paragraph 14, newly inserted by the present revision, introduces the absolute prohibition on following or monitoring the Romanian citizen or intercepting his conversations or communications of any kind without prior authorisation by a court. This constitutes a concrete guarantee and an active and reactive means of protecting the citizen's right to intimate and private life, as governed by Article 26(1) of the Constitution — "The public authorities shall respect and protect intimate, family and private life." — while at the same time giving concrete form to the constitutional obligation of the authorities to respect and protect intimate, family and private life through an obligation to refrain from certain activities that erode civic rights and freedoms. This provision counteracts a temptation on the part of the State authorities to institute a general presumption of guilt and of social danger cast upon every citizen and upon society in general through the establishment of arrangements and the installation of integrated technical means of "preventive" mass surveillance.

In an age in which technology advances by giant strides and information travels at the speed of light, the protection of personal data and of privacy has become a burning issue on the public agenda. In that context, the revision of Article 23 of the Constitution of Romania is not merely a necessity but an obligation towards the modern citizen, who sees his right to private life threatened by technological possibilities unheard of in the past. Article 23, which deals with individual liberty and the security of the person, underpins the rule of law and guarantees that no citizen may be deprived of his liberty without observance of the legal procedures.

Paragraph 15, as laid down by the present revision, reaffirms and reinforces the individual rights of the citizen, giving them absolute priority over any supposed "collective right". This provision serves to halt any totalitarian temptation on the part of those who govern, it being historically known and acknowledged that "collective rights" were invoked by fascist and communist regimes in order to annul individual rights. This measure is all the more necessary in that "collective rights", not being regulated and exhaustively enumerated at constitutional level, cannot be set up against, or given

priority over, the body of rights and freedoms expressly provided for the individual by the Constitution. The need for immediate regulation of this assertion at constitutional level is reinforced by the increasingly frequent appearance over the past four years of the phrase "collective rights" as a justification for implementing liberticidal public policies, and serves to reinforce the principle stated in the Oviedo Convention (to which Romania is a party), according to which "The interests and welfare of the human being shall prevail over the sole interest of society or science."

For that reason the present context calls for careful analysis and for the adaptation of the constitutional provisions to the realities of national security and to the dynamics of transnational threats. The revision of Article 23 protects both the security of citizens and their inalienable rights and freedoms, requiring that no real or supposed threat to national security have the effect of undermining fundamental rights in the name of a supposed national-security interest.

It is essential to note that the addition of paragraphs 14 and 15 to Article 23 of the Constitution of Romania resonates with Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights on the right to respect for private and family life, which provides that any interference by a public authority with the exercise of these rights may be made only in accordance with the law and must be necessary in a democratic society. The proposed constitutional amendments are therefore fully consistent with the criteria of necessity, proportionality and lawfulness imposed by European human-rights standards.

Examining the revised text also by comparison with other European constitutions, we observe that many Member States of the European Union have adapted their constitutional framework to reflect these principles. For example, in Germany Article 10 of the Grundgesetz guarantees the privacy of correspondence, posts and telecommunications, underlining the need for a judicial warrant for restrictions. Similarly, Article 18 of the Constitution of Spain protects the right to personal and family privacy and to the inviolability of the home, as well as the secrecy of communications, and provides that the restriction of these rights is permitted only by judicial decision. These examples demonstrate the alignment of the proposed amendments with international standards and with established democratic practice.

The revision of Article 23 of the Constitution of Romania is not a mere legislative adjustment but a reaffirmation of Romania's commitment to democratic values and fundamental human rights. Reflecting on the experience of other European nations while integrating national specificity, this revision is a necessary step towards consolidating an authentic rule of law in which individual liberty and the protection of private life are regarded as immovable pillars of democracy.

In conclusion, the proposed revision has the potential to strike an effective balance between the State's need for security and respect for citizens' fundamental rights, constituting a landmark in Romania's legal and democratic evolution. It is a commitment to the citizen and a recognition of the evolution of society in the digital age, which calls for enhanced protection against illegitimate intrusions into private life.

Through these amendments Romania aligns itself with European and international standards, honouring the commitments assumed under the treaties and conventions to which it is a party. Moreover, these legislative changes also reflect a maturing of civil society, which is becoming ever more conscious of the importance and the fragility of civil rights in the face of technological advance and surveillance measures.

This balance between liberty and security is the key to the sustainable development of a society in which every individual feels protected and free to express his opinion, to communicate and to live without fear of unjustified surveillance. Moving beyond legal barriers and into the sphere of ethics and social morality, the revision of Article 23 also serves to educate and alert public opinion and

those in power to the importance of personal integrity and human dignity. It is a call to observe the principle that every person has the right to be left alone — a fundamental right in a society claiming to be free and democratic.

8. In Article 24, after paragraph 2 there are added paragraphs 3 to 5, reading as follows: → the text of the article

"(3) The right to a defence may be exercised directly or through a chosen defence counsel, without any possibility of making access to the documents forming part of a file pending before the prosecutor's offices and the courts conditional upon the holding of an authorisation or certificate issued by any public authority.

(4) It is prohibited for the criminal investigation bodies, for any court or for any authority or institution to use classified documents or information to which a person or his chosen lawyer does not have access, without any prior authorisation being required, where by or on the basis of such documents any right of that person is restricted or any legitimate interest of his is affected."

(5) Throughout the criminal proceedings the principle of equality of arms between prosecution and defence is guaranteed at the highest level."

The introduction of a new paragraph after Article 24(2) of the Constitution of Romania — an article headed "The right to a defence" — expressly lays down the right of every citizen to defend himself directly or through defence counsel "without any possibility of making access to the documents forming part of a file pending before the courts conditional upon the holding of an authorisation or certificate issued by any public authority".

There is thereby prohibited any justification for, or possibility of, impeding the access of the citizen concerned to the documents of a file pending before the courts; the authorities may not make the study of the documents and the mounting of an effective and concrete defence, in the manner and by the defence counsel freely chosen by the citizen who is a party to the proceedings, conditional upon the prior obtaining or holding of an authorisation or certificate issued by any public authority. This newly introduced constitutional rule will make it impossible to justify limiting or conditioning the right to a defence by reference to the nature of the information constituting the evidence in files pending before the courts, irrespective of whether, before being constituted as evidence, that information carried a particular classification or degree of secrecy. Likewise, this constitutional rule makes it impossible to classify defence counsel and lawyers according to the level of authorisation for access to classified information that they hold, which will make it impossible for the State to "select" "approved" lawyers to take part in particular cases and will strengthen the right to a defence of every citizen, whatever the nature of the case to which he is a party.

These guarantees are reinforced and confirmed by the express stipulation in the Constitution of "the principle of equality of arms between prosecution and defence at the highest level", a principle which before the present revision had no reflection at constitutional level. The right to equality of arms was first enshrined by the European Court of Human Rights in its judgment of 27 June 1968 in Neumeister, and the first finding of a violation of that right was made by the judgment of 16 July 1971 in Ringeisen v. Austria. The essence of this guarantee lies in the fact that each party is afforded a reasonable opportunity to present his case under conditions that do not place him at a substantial disadvantage vis-à-vis his opponent, so that the court must create equal, sufficient and appropriate opportunities for the use of all procedural means to support each party's position.

We observe that judicial practice and the evolution of international human-rights standards suggest that the time has come to update this constitutional text.

The proposals for revising Article 24 seek to improve access to justice and to guarantee a fair trial through three important additions.

The first addition, paragraph (3), stipulates that the right to a defence may be exercised directly or through a chosen defence counsel, without conditions relating to access to the documents of the file. This is a significant change, since it removes bureaucratic barriers capable of impeding a fair trial.

The second proposed paragraph, (4), raises the question of classified information and access to it in judicial proceedings. Prohibiting the authorities from using classified information to which the accused or his defence counsel does not have access is a crucial measure for securing transparency and a fair trial.

Finally, paragraph (5) consolidates the principle of equality of arms, thereby guaranteeing that neither party is placed at a disadvantage in the proceedings.

Examining the relation of the new paragraphs to other articles of the Constitution of Romania, we observe coherence and alignment with the general principles of the rule of law and of human-rights protection. For example, Article 21, which guarantees free access to justice and the right to a fair trial, is reinforced by these additions. Likewise, Article 53, which governs the restriction of the exercise of certain rights or freedoms, is now better balanced by Article 24(4), thereby protecting the right to a defence against possible abuses through the excessive classification of information.

The proposed revision of Article 24 must also be viewed in the international context. Comparison with other European constitutions shows that many of them contain similar provisions underlining the importance of the right to a fair trial and to an adequate defence. For example, the German Constitution (Grundgesetz) guarantees in Article 103 the right to a fair hearing, and the Constitution of Spain in Article 24 secures the right to a defence and to a public trial without undue delay.

These findings underline a common European trend towards guaranteeing fundamental rights in judicial proceedings. Moreover, these comparisons reveal a general commitment to respecting and protecting human rights as understood and applied in the case-law of the European Court of Human Rights. This alignment not only strengthens the national legal system but also consolidates Romania's position within the European community, showing an openness to democratic standards and respect for the fundamental rights of citizens. In conclusion, the revision of Article 24 of the Constitution of Romania is an imperative measure for securing a fair trial and for guaranteeing the right to a defence without unjustified restrictions. The proposed amendments reflect not only a domestic necessity but also a harmonisation with the practices and principles of European law. It is essential that Romania align itself with these standards in order to promote a transparent and equitable judicial system protecting the fundamental rights and freedoms of every citizen. In that sense the revision of Article 24 is of strategic importance, contributing to the consolidation of citizens' confidence in the justice system and to the improvement of the international perception of Romania as a Member State of the European Union respectful of the values and principles of the rule of law.

9. Article 27(3) is amended to read as follows: → the text of the article

"(3) A search shall be ordered by the judge of the court having jurisdiction to try the merits of the case and shall be carried out under the conditions and in the forms prescribed by law and only for the purpose and within the limits set out in the search warrant. The information and goods sought

shall be expressly individualised in the search warrant, which shall be issued only with reasons stated and only if the search is absolutely necessary for the detection of the offences under investigation at the date on which authorisation is sought."

The present wording of the revised constitutional text — "A search shall be ordered by a judge and shall be carried out under the conditions and in the forms prescribed by law." — has been amended and supplemented having regard to the current context of socio-political change and rapid technological development, and above all to the fact that the protection of individual rights and freedoms is a central pillar of any self-respecting democracy. Given the everyday judicial practice in which countless abuses may be encountered that have become accepted interpretations and applications of the present constitutional text, a revision of Article 27(3) of the Constitution of Romania is not merely a necessity but an obligation arising from the dynamics of modern society and from the commitment to the principles of the rule of law.

Article 27(3) of the Constitution of Romania governs a crucial aspect of human rights — the search. The present text provides: "A search shall be ordered by a judge and shall be carried out under the conditions and in the forms prescribed by law." In the light of the new challenges of the twenty-first century, however, it is imperative to examine whether this constitutional provision still suffices to secure an adequate balance between the State's need for security and respect for the inalienable rights of citizens.

One of the principal arguments in favour of revising this provision is the need to reinforce the principle of proportionality and specificity within the search procedure. In the form proposed for revision, emphasis is placed on the idea that searches must be strictly linked to the purpose and limits of the search warrant, and on the requirement that the information and goods sought be clearly individualised in the warrant.

This more detailed and circumscribed approach ensures that the fundamental rights of the persons concerned are strictly observed, thereby avoiding the abuses that can arise where legal provisions are vague or excessively general. By requiring that the search warrant be issued "only with reasons stated and only if the search is absolutely necessary", a further guarantee is provided that the actions of the authorities will always be justified and proportionate to the gravity of the offence investigated.

Moreover, the proposed revision of Article 27(3) underlines the importance of the jurisdiction of the judge who orders the search. By specifying that a search must be ordered by "the judge of the court having jurisdiction to try the merits of the case", it is ensured that the decision is taken by a body with a thorough knowledge of the details and complexity of the case. This leads to a higher level of accuracy and lawfulness in the judicial process, thereby consolidating public confidence in the justice system.

Likewise, in the digital age in which we live, the specific and detailed character of the search warrant becomes all the more relevant. Given the large volume of personal data and information stored in digital media, it is essential to ensure that searches are carried out with respect for private life and individual confidentiality. The explicit individualisation of the information and goods sought in the search warrant is therefore a crucial step in protecting these rights in the digital context.

In addition, the proposed revision brings the Constitution of Romania into line with international standards and with the judicial practice of other democratic States, where the protection of data and of private life is regarded as an essential component of the rule of law. Romania would thus demonstrate a firm commitment to democratic values and improve its standing in the international arena.

Another aspect worth considering is that the revision of this constitutional article could prevent potential human-rights violations capable of being brought before the European Court of Human Rights. It is well known that Romania has been found in breach in the past for failing to respect the right to private life on account of the improper conduct of searches. A clearer and more restrictive formulation could therefore reduce these risks and consolidate respect for human rights in national law.

On the other hand, critics may argue that the revision of Article 27(3) could limit the capacity of the authorities to act swiftly and effectively in combating crime. It is essential, however, to recognise that any security measure must operate within the limits of respect for fundamental rights. A mature democracy must find the right balance between the protection of citizens and the protection of individual liberties.

In conclusion, the revision of the text of Article 27(3) of the Constitution of Romania is a necessary step to ensure that the country's legislation keeps pace with technological and social developments

and to reflect an unchanged commitment to the protection of human rights in the information age. This revision is about finding a balance between national security and personal integrity, between the authority of the State and individual liberty. Ultimately, it is about consolidating the rule of law in a society that places ever greater hopes in fair and impartial justice.

Through this change the Constitution would become a more living document, better adapted to the complex realities of the world in which we live, and a stronger guarantor of citizens' rights. The revision of Article 27(3) is not merely a matter of legal updating but also a declaration of principle, a commitment that Romania will continue to protect the rights and freedoms of its citizens — not merely as a measure of normative updating but also as a measure consolidating public confidence in the institutions whose role is to defend justice and legality. In the end, the proposed amendment is a guarantee that human rights and the fundamental principles of democracy remain anchored in the realities of our century, securing effective protection adapted to the challenges of the time.

In conclusion, the revision of Article 27(3) of the Constitution of Romania represents a necessary development to ensure that citizens' rights are adequately protected in the face of the new challenges of society. This legal undertaking reflects a deep understanding of the need to balance judicial authority with respect for the private sphere of the individual. If adopted, the new wording of the article will represent an important step towards consolidating a judicial system that places human rights at the centre of its concerns, thereby reflecting the values of a society that wishes to progress in accordance with democratic principles and respect for human dignity.

The proposed amendments serve not only to strengthen the existing legal framework but also to provide greater clarity in the application of the law, thereby facilitating a uniform and predictable interpretation. This is essential in order to avoid arbitrariness and to ensure that every case is treated fairly and according to clear standards, thus reducing legal uncertainty and consolidating confidence in the justice system.

Ultimately, a search constitutes a significant intrusion into a person's private life, and the framework within which it is conducted must be defined as precisely as possible in order to protect against any form of abuse. The revision of Article 27(3) is therefore not merely a legal necessity but also a manifestation of social responsibility and of dedication to the fundamental values of a society that respects its citizens.

10. After Article 28(1) there are inserted three new paragraphs, namely 2, 3 and 4, as follows: → the text of the article

"(2) The public authorities shall guarantee the secrecy of correspondence.

(3) The interception and recording of conversations or communications made by telephone or by any other electronic means of communication, ambient recording, location or tracking by GPS or by other electronic means of surveillance, the recording of images, the obtaining of the list of telephone calls or other such techniques provided for by law shall be ordered by the judge of rights and freedoms of the court having material jurisdiction to try the merits of the case, only on well-founded grounds, if such measures are absolutely necessary in order to prove the offence in respect of which there is reasonable suspicion, and shall be carried out only by the criminal investigation bodies."

(4) Where there is particular urgency in taking one of the measures provided for in paragraph (2), the prosecutor may, provisionally, order by ordinance, in compliance with the conditions laid down by law, that the measure be taken for a period of not more than 48 hours. Immediately after the measure has been taken, the prosecutor shall apply to the competent court, which shall rule on the measure ordered by the prosecutor and, if so requested, on its continuation. If the measure ordered by the prosecutor is set aside, the court shall order, where appropriate, the destruction of the evidence obtained, which shall be carried out by the prosecutor on the basis of a report to be lodged with the court."

In recent years Romanian society has witnessed vigorous debates on the need to revise the Constitution, the fundamental document underlying the functioning of the entire apparatus of State. Among the many articles that might be revised, Article 28, concerning the secrecy of correspondence, has particularly caught the attention of public opinion and of legal specialists.

This section therefore sets out to explain the reasons why it is necessary to insert three new paragraphs — 2, 3 and 4 — into Article 28 of the Constitution of Romania. In the digital age in which we live, the protection of personal data and of private life has become a central concern. Electronic correspondence, telephone conversations and other forms of communication by electronic means are now fundamental to everyday life.

In that context, the proposed paragraph (2) serves to consolidate in the constitutional text the guarantee of the secrecy of correspondence, thereby providing a more robust legal framework for the protection of this fundamental right. The text as proposed brings within the protected sphere every form of correspondence, whatever the means by which it is conducted, covering all the ordinary meanings of the word as set out in the dictionary: I.1. The (regular) exchange of letters between two or more persons. ♦ The totality of the letters exchanged between two persons. ♦ The content of a letter. 2. An account of events occurring in a locality, made by the correspondent of a newspaper, a magazine, a radio or television station, etc.

Paragraph (3), for its part, responds to contemporary challenges connected with electronic surveillance and to the need to balance the right to private life against the requirements of national security and crime prevention. Paragraph 3 covers the interception and recording of conversations or communications made by telephone or by any other electronic means of communication, ambient recording, location or tracking by GPS or by other electronic means of surveillance, the recording of images, the obtaining of the list of telephone calls or other such techniques provided for by law — the phrase "by other means" giving the enumeration a non-exhaustive character and leaving it flexible in the face of future technological developments impossible to anticipate at the date of drafting this addition to the constitutional text. By providing that surveillance measures may be ordered only by the judge of rights and freedoms, strict judicial control is ensured and the abuse of such measures by the criminal investigation bodies is prevented.

Paragraph (4) introduces an emergency mechanism, recognising that in certain exceptional situations time is of the essence in preventing an offence or protecting public safety. This provision affords the prosecutor the possibility of acting swiftly, while at the same time maintaining the supremacy of judicial control, the court having the final word in validating or invalidating the measures taken. It should be noted that these proposed amendments are not without precedent. Other European States with solid democratic traditions have similar rules enabling their authorities to act effectively in combating crime while respecting the rights and freedoms of citizens.

Revising the Constitution in this sense would therefore align Romania with international standards and demonstrate the country's commitment to the protection of human rights. In conclusion, the insertion of paragraphs (2), (3) and (4) into Article 28 of the Constitution of Romania is not only necessary but imperative in the present context. These constitutional amendments will create a balance between the need to ensure the security of citizens and the need to protect individual rights and freedoms. Through this revision Romania will be able to respond adequately to the challenges of the twenty-first century, to consolidate the rule of law and to affirm its commitment to democratic values and to respect for the private life of every citizen.

Besides strengthening the national legal framework, the revision of Article 28 and the insertion of the new paragraphs will also have a positive impact internationally. Romania will be able to demonstrate that it keeps pace with technological developments and that it is capable of adapting its legislation to respond effectively to the new challenges of cybersecurity and data protection. Such a step could also increase the confidence of international partners in Romania's commitment to respecting and promoting European and international standards in the field of fundamental rights.

Redefining and adapting the Constitution to the realities of the twenty-first century is an undertaking that demands responsibility and vision. In this process we must have regard not only to the present context but also to possible future developments, so as to ensure that citizens' rights will be protected against any emerging technologies capable of endangering private life.

Finally, the revision of Article 28 and the addition of the new paragraphs constitute an opportunity to consolidate democracy and the rule of law in Romania. It is a necessary step to ensure that the country's legislation reflects and protects the fundamental values of society in the information age. Through this updating it will be guaranteed that human rights, and in particular the right to private life, are respected and firmly defended. This revision must be regarded not merely as a legal necessity but also as an ethical commitment to citizens. It is essential to understand that protecting personal data and private life does not mean preventing the authorities from fulfilling their role in preventing and combating crime, but ensuring that any measure taken to that end is proportionate, necessary and in accordance with the law.

The revision of the Constitution and, in particular, of Article 28 is evidence of the maturing of Romanian society and of its legal system. It reflects the awareness that individual rights and collective security are not antagonistic concepts but, on the contrary, can reinforce one another within a well-defined and balanced legislative framework. In that sense, the proposals to amend Article 28 are a step forward towards consolidating a society that places as much value on the safety of its citizens as on the respect for and protection of individual liberties. It is a natural development in a State governed by the rule of law, which must be prepared to respond dynamically to technological and social change.

In conclusion, the revision of the Constitution and the addition of paragraphs (2), (3) and (4) to Article 28 constitute an imperative necessity in order to secure a balance between fundamental freedoms and national security in accordance with democratic norms. This legislative updating will

reflect Romania's commitment to human rights, adapting to the realities and challenges of the digital era.

This revision is thus not a mere updating of the text but also a reaffirmation of commitment to a democratic, modern society adapted to new technologies. It is a turning point in Romania's constitutional history, which will undoubtedly mark a step forward in consolidating democracy and respect for human rights. With a Constitution revised and adapted to present requirements, Romania will take a decisive step towards securing a future in which civic rights are protected and respected, thereby consolidating confidence in the institutions of the State and in the mechanisms of legal protection. Such an initiative will contribute to strengthening the rule of law and to promoting transparent, accountable governance responsive to citizens' needs. In order better to understand the context and importance of these changes, we must look beyond the text of the law and analyse the practical impact on the daily life of each individual. In a world in which technology advances rapidly and information circulates globally at unprecedented speed, it is essential to have a legal framework that effectively protects fundamental rights. The amendments proposed to Article 28 are a response to these challenges and represent a necessary step in adapting legislation to present and future realities. They are intended to guarantee that any form of surveillance is justified, proportionate and limited by judicial safeguards, thereby ensuring that respect for private life remains a pillar of Romanian society. These provisions will help create a framework of legal certainty in which citizens can feel protected against possible abuses and in which individual liberty is not sacrificed in the name of security. By introducing clear limits and effective judicial control, the aim is to prevent any infringement of fundamental rights. Not least, it is essential to recognise that constitutional revision is a dynamic process that must reflect the evolution of society and be prepared for the challenges of the future. In that sense, the addition of paragraphs (2), (3) and (4) to Article 28 is an example of legislative progress supporting the adaptability and sustainability of the Romanian legal system in the face of technological innovation. Through this updating the aim is not only to protect individual rights but also to consolidate public confidence in the mechanisms defending those rights. It is a sign of democratic maturing and of an understanding that national security and human rights need not be in contradiction but must coexist in a balance beneficial to society.

In conclusion, the revision of Article 28 is a step forward in aligning Romania with international standards on the protection of human rights and private life. It is a measure that reaffirms the commitment to democratic values and provides additional guarantees that any action by the State in the field of surveillance is carried out in accordance with the principles of lawfulness, necessity and proportionality.

11. In Article 32, after paragraph 7 there is added paragraph 8, reading as follows: → the text of the article → the text of the article

"(8) For the financing of national education there shall be allocated annually from the State budget and from the budgets of the local public authorities a minimum of 6% of the gross domestic product of the year concerned. In addition, educational establishments and institutions may obtain and use autonomously their own revenues."

After paragraph 7 of that article we propose the addition of a new paragraph, paragraph 8, providing: "(8) For the financing of national education there shall be allocated annually from the State budget and from the budgets of the local public authorities a minimum of 6% of the gross domestic product of the year concerned. In addition, educational establishments and institutions may obtain and use autonomously their own revenues." This proposal is not a mere legislative adjustment but an

imperative measure for securing the development and modernisation of the Romanian education system.

In the present context, the insufficient financing of education has become a worrying reality, affecting the quality of teaching and limiting access to adequate educational resources. Implementing paragraph 8 would guarantee that national education benefits annually from a minimum percentage of GDP, providing a solid basis for long-term planning of investment in infrastructure, educational technology, teacher-training programmes and research initiatives.

Moreover, by granting financial autonomy to educational institutions, they would be able to manage resources more efficiently, encouraging innovation and adaptability to the specific needs of each educational context. Financial autonomy could also stimulate competitiveness and improve the quality of the educational services provided to pupils and students. It is important to emphasise that in many developed countries investment in education is regarded as a national priority, directly correlated with social and economic progress. One example is the Nordic States, which allocate a significant percentage of GDP to education and, as a result, enjoy education systems among the best in the world. Furthermore, a figure of 6% of GDP is not an arbitrary number but is recommended by UNESCO as the minimum necessary to secure quality education and to attain the sustainable development goals in the field of education. In Romania's case this figure represents not only an alignment with international standards but also a firm commitment to the future of the country's education and youth. It is essential to note that adequate financing of education contributes to reducing social disparities and to creating equal opportunities for all citizens. Without access to quality education, children and young people from disadvantaged backgrounds are deprived of the chance to fulfil their potential and to contribute effectively to the society in which they live.

Revising the Constitution so as to include paragraph 8 in Article 32 would send a powerful signal to society about the value we place on education and would lay the foundations for a positive change in institutional mentality and in political priorities. It is an investment in human capital, in innovation and in the sustainable future of Romania. In conclusion, it is imperative to recognise that education is not merely a constitutional right but also a strategic necessity for national development.

The revision of Article 32 so as to include paragraph 8 would therefore provide the framework necessary for a robust education system capable of responding to the challenges of the twenty-first century and of contributing actively to improving the quality of life in Romania.

12. In Article 34, after paragraph 3 there are added paragraphs 4 and 5, reading as follows: → the text of the article → the text of the article

"(4) No one may be subjected against his will to any prophylactic or medical treatment, nor to the removal or transplantation of organs. Medical treatments are possible only with written, full and honestly informed consent.

(5) For the financing of national health care there shall be allocated annually from the State budget and from the budgets of the local public authorities a minimum of 9% of the gross domestic product of the year concerned. In addition, health establishments and institutions may obtain and use autonomously their own revenues."

The insertion of paragraph 4 into Article 34 of the Constitution, headed "The right to the protection of health", is intended to establish at constitutional level the right of every citizen to receive or refuse certain prophylactic or medical treatments and to institute the obligation, already existing at sub-constitutional level, to administer medicines "only with written, full and honestly informed consent",

and constitutes an additional guarantee of the right of the natural person to dispose of himself, a right already guaranteed by Article 26 of the Constitution.

This new paragraph at the same time integrates at constitutional level certain principles set out in the Oviedo Convention, ratified by the Romanian State by Law No 17 of 22 February 2001.

Article 5 of the Convention provides that "An intervention in the health field may only be carried out after the person concerned has given free and informed consent to it. This person shall beforehand be given appropriate information as to the purpose and nature of the intervention as well as on its consequences and risks. The person concerned may freely withdraw consent at any time." → the text of the article

Implementing at constitutional level these principles and values, already recognised by the Romanian State, constitutes a means of reinforcing and guaranteeing them, while at the same time being the most effective means of implementing, raising awareness of and popularising rules fundamental to the protection of the right to health.

Article 34(4) serves to reinforce and to raise to the level of a constitutional norm a fundamental principle of bioethics: patient autonomy. In an age in which medical technology advances rapidly, the capacity of the individual to decide about his own body and health cannot be ignored.

This proposed amendment ensures that no person will be subjected to a medical or prophylactic treatment without his informed consent. The requirement of written, full and honestly informed consent is a pillar of modern medical ethics. It not only protects the right to autonomy but also strengthens trust between patients and health professionals.

In addition, the proposed paragraph underlines the importance of respecting the will of the individual as regards the removal and transplantation of organs — a medical procedure capable of saving lives but requiring a profoundly personal decision.

Paragraph (5), for its part, raises an often neglected but vitally important matter: the financing of the health system. By establishing a minimum threshold of 9% of the country's gross domestic product for health, a solid basis is provided for the continuing improvement of medical services.

A well-financed health system is an essential pillar of a healthy society and of the guarantee of the right to health for all citizens. In addition, the paragraph proposes a dual source of financing, combining the State budget with that of the local public authorities. This would allow better adaptation to the specific needs of each community and would ensure a more equitable distribution of resources.

Likewise, the possibility for health establishments and institutions to obtain and use autonomously their own revenues opens the way to greater flexibility and efficiency in the management of funds. Let us now focus on the impact these changes could have on society. First, with a legislative framework placing greater emphasis on informed consent, patients will enjoy greater decision-making power and will be better protected against abuses. Second, establishing a clear financial threshold for health will compel the government to prioritise this vital sector, which could lead to shorter waiting times, improved quality of medical services and greater access to new technologies and treatments. This could have a positive effect on life expectancy and on the general state of health of the population.

Likewise, adequate financing could address the problem of medical staff migration. In recent years Romania has faced a brain drain in the health field, with many doctors and nurses choosing to

practise in other countries. More generous financing could help retain these qualified professionals by improving working conditions and offering competitive salaries. Moreover, Article 34(5) could stimulate innovation and efficiency in the health sector. With the possibility of generating and using their own revenues, hospitals and clinics could invest in state-of-the-art equipment and in continuing training programmes for staff. This is crucial in order to keep pace with rapid advances in medicine and to offer patients the best treatment options available worldwide. By way of example, consider the health systems of other countries, where the financial autonomy of medical institutions has led to improved service quality and to significant innovation in the field. International experience shows that when health establishments are empowered to manage resources efficiently, the results benefit both patients and the health system as a whole.

In conclusion, the revision of Article 34 of the Constitution through the addition of paragraphs (4) and (5) represents a necessary development reflecting the present values and needs of Romanian society. These amendments would place Romania among the States that respect and promote human rights in the field of health, while at the same time securing adequate and sustainable financing of the medical system. It is a step in the right direction towards guaranteeing a healthier and more prosperous future for all citizens.

13. Article 40(3) is amended to read as follows: → the text of the article

"(3) The judges of the Constitutional Court, the Ombudsman, national judges and prosecutors and staff assimilated to them, European magistrates, active members of the armed forces and of the intelligence services, police officers and other categories of public officials established by organic law may not belong to political parties. These professional categories may not belong to political parties and may not hold appointed or elected public office for a period of 5 years from the cessation of the exercise of those functions."

The original text of Article 40(3) of the Constitution of Romania has been amended by adding to the professional categories that may not belong to political parties the members of the intelligence services. This addition is necessary because, under the present law revising the Constitution, the intelligence services have become demilitarised institutions, a situation entailing the need to supplement and amend Article 40(3) so as to name the members of the intelligence services among the categories affected by this prohibition — all the more so since in the text of the Constitution prior to revision the members of the intelligence services were included among "active members of the armed forces".

At the same time, a further amendment to Article 40(3) of the Constitution is the imposition on the professional categories mentioned above of a prohibition on "holding appointed or elected public office for a period of 5 years from the cessation of the exercise of those functions". This provision is inspired by United States legislation and is intended to make it impossible for appointed or elected politicians and officials to maintain privileged links with the structures to which they belonged, the passage of time causing the personal connections and influence that persons in the listed professional categories might retain with former colleagues and subordinates to fade.

The undertaking of revising Article 40(3) starts from the premise that at the heart of democracy lies the principle of the separation of powers, a foundation guaranteeing the balance and proper functioning of any State governed by the rule of law.

The revision of Article 40(3) of the Constitution is not a mere legislative amendment but an imperative necessity responding to the need to consolidate the independence and impartiality of certain

public offices and institutions. The necessity of revising this constitutional text has its roots in the history of problems connected with the excessive politicisation of key State functions.

The judges of the Constitutional Court, the Ombudsman, magistrates, prosecutors and other categories of public officials must be genuine guarantors of impartiality and even-handedness before the law, and their membership of political parties may cast a shadow over that fundamental obligation. In recent years we have witnessed cases in which the lines between the judicial power and the executive or legislative power have blurred, endangering the principle of the separation of powers and, by implication, democracy itself. The purpose of these prohibitions is to prevent conflicts of interest and to ensure that the decisions taken by these persons are entirely for the public good and not for the interests of a party or of groups of influence.

The amendment proposed for Article 40(3) seeks to reinforce this barrier between public officials and political parties, so as to avoid any suspicion of partiality. The prohibition on belonging to the structures of political parties for a period of five years after the cessation of public office serves to consolidate this idea, providing a temporal buffer allowing a return to a state of neutrality perceptible in society.

This revision is not without precedent. Many consolidated democracies have similar rules designed to protect the integrity and independence of State functions. For example, in countries with a long democratic tradition it is well understood that certain roles — in particular judicial ones and those connected with national defence — must remain apolitical, in order to secure citizens' confidence in their impartiality and effectiveness.

Moreover, the restriction on holding appointed or elected public office for a period of five years after leaving service is essential in order to avoid the "revolving door" phenomenon, whereby former members of the public authorities may rapidly reintegrate into politics or into other offices capable of influencing decisions and policies improperly. This measure further consolidates the wall between a career in public service and political activity, thereby ensuring that decisions are taken with the common good in mind and not with a view to personal advantage or political loyalties. In this way it is guaranteed that the expertise accumulated during the exercise of office is not used for partisan purposes but remains in the service of the State and its citizens.

It is important to note that this revision not only protects the integrity of public office but also consolidates public confidence in the institutions of the State. When public officials and magistrates are seen as standing above political battles, respect for and confidence in their decisions increase. This is essential to the functioning of a healthy democracy, in which citizens must be convinced that laws and decisions are applied equitably and objectively.

That said, the proposed revision of Article 40 may also generate controversy. Critics may argue that the restrictions imposed could limit the individual rights of public officials, including their right to freedom of association. That view, however, fails to take into account the fact that the offices covered by this revision are of particular importance to the power structure of the State and therefore require a greater degree of restriction in order to preserve the impartiality and integrity of the system.

The revision of Article 40 of the Constitution as proposed represents an important step in consolidating the principle of the separation of powers and in protecting the rule of law. Through this clear separation between a career in public service and political activity, the Romanian State can strengthen its democratic foundation and build a more transparent and accountable environment of governance.

In conclusion, the proposed revision of Article 40 of the Constitution is a necessary undertaking in order to secure the integrity and effectiveness of the institutions of the State. It marks the recognition that certain public offices must be exercised in absolute independence from any political influence. By implementing this amendment Romania aligns itself with international standards of good administrative practice and ensures that its democratic pillars are strengthened for the future.

This constitutional reform is not confined to a change of letters in the fundamental text but represents an evolution in political and administrative thinking. It underlines the commitment to sound democratic principles and to clean governance, free from partisan temptation or corruption. Through this revision a clearer and safer framework is created for those who serve the public interest, thereby helping to consolidate citizens' confidence in the institutions that shape their daily lives. It is a crucial step towards the political and institutional maturing of Romanian society, which will benefit from an administration devoted to the principles of justice and equity. In that context it is vital that the revision be understood not as a restriction but as a guarantee of the independence and neutrality essential to the proper functioning of the State.

Ultimately, this separation between the political sphere and the administrative-judicial sphere is the cornerstone of a democracy that respects itself and its citizens. It is our collective duty to ensure that the amendments to the Constitution are not merely reflections of abstract ideals but concrete transformations bringing real benefits to citizens' daily lives.

This revision helps create a society in which justice and administration are truly at the service of the individual and not at the disposal of group or political interests. In the end, the amendment of Article 40 of the Constitution is more than a legislative change. It is a commitment to a fairer, more equitable and ultimately more prosperous Romania. It is a step towards ensuring that the foundations of our democracy are not merely protected but strengthened against the challenges of the future. Such constitutional revisions are vital in a world of continual change, where institutional adaptability and resilience become the key to progress and stability.

With this proposed revision Romania reaffirms its commitment to respecting and promoting democratic values, to separating clearly the political sphere from the administrative and judicial spheres, and to ensuring that every citizen can trust in the impartiality and integrity of those holding public office. The revision of Article 40 is therefore not merely a necessity but also an opportunity to align ourselves with the highest democratic standards and to consolidate confidence in our structures of governance. It is a sign of the maturing of Romanian society and of the wish to build a future in which the basic principles of democracy are not merely respected but vigilantly defended.

14. In Article 44, after paragraph 9 there is added paragraph 10, reading as follows: → the text of the article

"(10) The Romanian citizen has the right to keep, use and dispose of his property freely and unconditionally, according to his own will. The obtaining, holding and use of any currency in cash may not be limited or made conditional."

The paragraph added to Article 44 of the Constitution of Romania, headed "The right of private property", expressly lays down the right of the Romanian citizen to keep, use and dispose of his property freely and unconditionally, excluding any legal condition or limitation in that respect.

At the same time, the paragraph added to Article 44 lays down the right of the Romanian citizen to obtain, hold and use any currency in cash — a right now made constitutional, which may not be limited or made conditional.

These provisions introduced into the revised Constitution constitute a direct application and a natural consequence of individual liberty and a means of protecting the security of the person, as governed at constitutional level by Article 23(1), which provides that "Individual liberty and the security of the person are inviolable", and are likewise a direct effect of the provision of paragraph 1 of that same Article 44, which provides that the right of property is guaranteed.

These amendments are absolutely necessary in view of certain unconstitutional and abusive initiatives seeking to limit the right to obtain, use and keep in ownership various goods and currencies.

Economic freedom is a fundamental pillar of a democratic and prosperous society. It secures not only individual well-being but also collective development. In the present context, however, marked by rapid transformation and global challenges, national legislation must be not only adaptable but also anticipatory. In that sense, the revision of Article 44 of the Constitution of Romania by the addition of a new paragraph is intended to consolidate the economic freedom of the Romanian citizen.

The present context and economic challenges: in a globalised world, where financial transactions and the movement of capital are rapid and voluminous, rules in the economic field must offer security but also flexibility.

Romania's economy, in the process of growth and integration into European and international structures, faces various challenges: from the volatility of financial markets to the need to attract foreign investment. In this landscape citizens must be able to manage their property with maximum freedom, in order to react effectively to economic dynamics.

The addition of paragraph (10) to Article 44 of the Constitution of Romania is an essential step towards consolidating economic freedom. It responds not only to the need to protect the citizen's right to dispose of his goods but also to the need to secure a stable and predictable legal framework for economic transactions. In essence, the revised text guarantees that no external factor — whether State or private — may impose arbitrary restrictions on the manner in which citizens exercise control over their own financial resources.

The addition of paragraph (10) to Article 44 of the Constitution took several arguments into account. First, this new paragraph reaffirms the principle of personal autonomy in the economic sphere, an inalienable right in a free society. Second, it secures protection against possible abuses by the State, which might seek to limit access to certain currencies or means of transacting. Third, by guaranteeing the right to use any currency in cash, paragraph (10) promotes diversity and competitiveness within the financial system. Finally, the proposed paragraph (10) may serve as a catalyst for broader economic reforms, stimulating a robust and open financial market, essential for attracting investment and for sustainable economic growth.

The inclusion of paragraph (10) in the Constitution of Romania will have a profound impact on society, promoting an economic culture founded on freedom and individual responsibility. It could reduce bureaucracy and facilitate entrepreneurial initiative, giving citizens the possibility to innovate and to participate actively in the market economy. This measure will encourage a better distribution of resources and inclusive economic growth.

Conclusions. The revision of Article 44 of the Constitution of Romania to include paragraph (10) is more than a mere legislative amendment; it is a reaffirmation of our country's commitment to the principles of economic freedom and of the rule of law. This step could profoundly transform the way citizens interact with the economy and could open the way to a more dynamic and prosperous society. Ultimately, the adoption of this paragraph will not only consolidate investor confidence and support economic development but will also secure respect for the fundamental right of every citizen

to control his own financial resources. Romania will thereby align itself with international standards of protection of property and economic freedom.

In conclusion, revising the Constitution to include paragraph (10) in Article 44 is not merely a legal necessity but also an opportunity to consolidate citizens' confidence in the economic system and to encourage active participation in the economic life of the country. It is a commitment to the future, an investment in Romania's stability and prosperity.

In this undertaking account has also been taken of the experience of other nations that have adopted similar measures protecting economic freedom, so as to ensure that Romania adopts the best international practice.

Comparing and analysing different constitutional models, we can identify the most effective strategies enabling us to attain our objectives without compromising democratic principles or financial stability. One relevant example is the Constitution of Switzerland, which offers a model of balance between the protection of private property and the public interest. By adopting a similar approach, Romania could benefit from a legal framework supporting individual initiative and securing a free and equitable market.

In conclusion, the proposed revision of Article 44 through the addition of paragraph (10) represents an opportunity to affirm Romania's firm commitment to the principles of economic freedom and democracy. This constitutional undertaking may serve as an impetus to revitalise the national economy and to consolidate citizens' confidence in the capacity and will of State institutions to protect and promote individual rights — bearing in mind that, ultimately, the right to economic freedom and control over one's own resources are essential to the dignity and prosperity of every citizen.

The revision of Article 44 so as to reflect these fundamental rights is therefore not merely a matter of domestic policy but also a powerful message to the international community about Romania's values and vision regarding economic development and respect for human rights. In conclusion, the addition of paragraph (10) to Article 44 of the Constitution of Romania represents a crucial step towards consolidating a legal framework that respects and promotes economic freedom. This constitutional amendment can give Romanian citizens the assurance that they may use their financial resources in the manner most appropriate to their needs and aspirations, without unjustified restrictions or arbitrary interference.

15. Paragraphs 1 and 2 of Article 48 are amended to read as follows: → the text of the article

"(1) The family is founded on the freely consented marriage between two human beings of opposite sex, born male and female, on their equality and on the right and duty of parents to ensure the upbringing, education and instruction of their children.

(2) The conditions for the conclusion, dissolution and nullity of marriage shall be established by law. A religious union between a man and a woman has no legal effects and may be celebrated even without a civil marriage having been concluded."

The constitutional provisions revised in Article 48(1) constitute a necessary clarification of the earlier wording of that paragraph, which provided that "The family is founded on the freely consented marriage between spouses, on their equality and on the right and duty of parents to ensure the upbringing, education and instruction of their children."

In fact, the definition of the Romanian word "soț" and of its plural "soți" displays too great a degree of generality, ranging from "A married man considered in relation to his wife" and "The two persons of opposite sex united by marriage" to "Associate, collaborator, partner, companion" or "An object which, together with another (similar) one, forms a pair"; while the verb "a soți" (to accompany) means "to ASSOCIATE, GROUP, ACCOMPANY, JOIN, UNITE" and "to associate oneself; 2 (regional) to make a partner of", only the last common meaning being "3 (regional) to marry".

In view of this linguistic reality and of the pronounced blurring and relativisation of social relations in recent times, the text has been reformulated in the revised Constitution, the word "spouses" being replaced by the phrase "two human beings of opposite sex", the constitutional text requiring that any marriage may be concluded only between human beings — as a first condition — who are of opposite sex, as a second, fundamental condition.

At the same time, having regard also to the biological and not merely social function of the family, and to its fundamental role in the transmission and continuity of the genetic and cultural heritage of the citizens on the territory of Romania, the explicit statement that the family is founded on the freely consented marriage between two human beings of opposite sex had to be supplemented and specified in the sense that they must be born male and female, rendering impossible marriage with or between persons who have changed sex.

Article 48(2) of the Constitution is amended to the effect that "A religious union between a man and a woman has no legal effects and may be celebrated even without a civil marriage having been concluded." The amendment was made because the original text of that paragraph provided that "A religious marriage may be celebrated only after the civil marriage", which conflicts with the spirit and the letter of the first three paragraphs of Article 29 of the Constitution, which provide that "(1) Freedom of thought and of opinion, as well as freedom of religious belief, may not be restricted in any form. (...) (3) Religious denominations are free and shall be organised according to their own statutes, under the conditions laid down by law. (...)" That contradiction was accentuated by making the performance of a ritual act conditional upon the prior performance of an act of civil status, which is such as to limit both freedom of thought and of opinion (the citizen being free to consider that he may marry religiously without also performing an act of civil status to that effect) and freedom of religious belief — beliefs that may be such as to exclude the intervention of the State in the personal relations between spouses. Moreover, the constitutional text of the second sentence of Article 29(1) and of Article 29(2) — "No one may be compelled to adopt an opinion or to adhere to a religious belief contrary to his convictions. (2) Freedom of conscience is guaranteed" — is contradicted by the former wording of Article 48(2), which compelled citizens to contract a civil marriage in order to be able to have a religious marriage. Not least, the earlier wording, which made the performance of an act of worship conditional upon the prior performance of an act by a State authority, stands in profound contradiction with the secular character of the Romanian State; all these infringements of and contradictions with constitutional principles, values and rights constitute the reasons why Article 48(2) had to be amended.

In conclusion, the proposal to revise paragraphs 1 and 2 of this article is testimony to the will of Romanian society to reaffirm traditional values in the legal definition of the family, in the context of an increasingly diversified social landscape. The proposed revision seeks to clarify the terms in which the family is defined and regulated within the Romanian legislative framework. Paragraph (1) underlines the heterosexual character of marriage and specifies that it is founded on the freely expressed consent between a man and a woman born as such. In addition, the amendment proposes to emphasise gender equality and parental responsibilities in the upbringing and education of

children. Paragraph (2) provides that matters relating to the conclusion, dissolution and nullity of marriage will continue to be regulated exclusively by law, and that a religious union between a man and a woman will produce no legal effects in the absence of a civil marriage. This clarification is intended to underline the separation of State and Church and the legal independence of civil marriage from religious marriage. In essence, the arguments supporting this revision rest on the wish to strengthen the notion of the traditional family and to provide a more precise legal framework for regulating family relations, it being considered essential that there be a clear and unequivocal definition of the family in the Constitution reflecting and protecting the cultural and social values specific to Romania.

16. Article 52 is amended to read as follows: → the text of the article

"(1) A person injured in one of his rights or in a legitimate interest by a public authority, by a judicial body or by a court, through an administrative act, through the failure to resolve an application within the legal time-limit, through acts of the prosecutor or through judicial decisions, is entitled to obtain recognition of the right claimed or of the legitimate interest, the annulment of the act or of the judicial decision and compensation for the damage.

(2) The conditions and limits of the exercise of this right shall be established by organic law.

(3) The State shall be liable in damages for the prejudice caused by judicial errors. The liability of the State shall be established under the conditions laid down by law and does not exclude the liability of magistrates who have exercised their office in bad faith or with gross negligence.

(4) The liability of magistrates for exercising their office in bad faith or with gross negligence shall be established by organic law, which must include the civil, disciplinary and criminal liability of the magistrate who caused the injury to the right or legitimate interest of the judge or prosecutor.

(5) The rights and liability of judges and prosecutors as at the date of their admission to office may not be diminished by law subsequent to their appointment by decree of the President."

The revision of Article 52(1), which until the revision reads "A person injured in one of his rights or in a legitimate interest by a public authority, through an administrative act or through the failure to resolve an application within the legal time-limit, is entitled to obtain recognition of the right claimed or of the legitimate interest, the annulment of the act and compensation for the damage", responds to a need to clarify and extend the rights of persons injured by the public authorities. It is vital that citizens have at their disposal effective mechanisms for defending their rights and legitimate interests. This presupposes not only the recognition and annulment of the administrative acts or judicial decisions affecting them, but also a real possibility of obtaining compensation for the damage suffered. By reformulating this paragraph and expressly naming the causes capable of harming the legitimate interests of the citizen — namely "the failure to resolve an application within the legal time-limit", "acts of the prosecutor or judicial decisions" — the conditions are created for more robust legal protection and a clear message is conveyed as to the seriousness with which the State treats individual rights.

Paragraphs 2 and 3 remain unchanged.

Paragraph (4), newly inserted into Article 52, responds to a sensitive and highly important problem: the liability of magistrates. By providing for an organic law covering the civil, disciplinary and criminal liability of magistrates, it is guaranteed that they will act with greater prudence and responsibility. It is thereby ensured that citizens' rights are protected and that any serious

misconduct or bad-faith action on the part of magistrates does not go unsanctioned. This helps increase confidence in the judicial system and consolidate the independence of justice.

The last paragraph, the newly inserted paragraph (5), addresses the protection of the status of judges and prosecutors, a key aspect in maintaining the independence and impartiality of the judicial system. By prohibiting the diminution of their rights and liability through laws subsequent to their appointment, an additional guarantee is provided that magistrates may exercise their functions without fear of arbitrary repercussions. This clause thus consolidates the principle of the separation of powers within the State and protects magistrates from external influences capable of affecting their judgments.

In conclusion, the revision of Article 52 of the Constitution is a necessary measure to ensure that the rights and legitimate interests of citizens are effectively protected. The proposed amendments bring a series of significant improvements to the existing legal framework, providing greater clarity, accountability and protection. This revision not only strengthens the legal foundation for respecting and guaranteeing individual rights but also represents a firm commitment by Romania to respect the principles of the rule of law and to align itself with international standards of justice. It is essential to bear in mind that this revision is not an end in itself but a means of building a fairer and more transparent judicial system capable of inspiring citizens' confidence. In a mature and responsible democracy, every citizen has the right to expect the State to assume responsibility for the mistakes committed by its representatives and to provide real guarantees for the protection of his rights and interests. The revision of Article 52 serves to reinforce these expectations and to confirm Romania's commitment to sound democratic principles.

The existence of a well-defined legal framework that effectively protects citizens' rights and imposes accountability on the authorities is fundamental.

Article 52, in its revised form, promises to provide that framework, thereby consolidating confidence in the institutions of the State and helping to create a society founded on respect for law and justice. Examining Romania's legal and social trajectory in recent years, it becomes evident that the revision of Article 52 is not merely an act of reform but also a symbol of the State's legal maturing. The proposed amendments reflect a deep understanding of the importance of individual rights and of the mechanisms of legal protection against abuses of any kind. Through these changes the Romanian State reaffirms its commitment to being a guarantor of justice and of respect for human dignity. → the text of the article

17. Article 62(2) is amended to read as follows: → the text of the article

"In the Parliament of Romania there shall be represented citizens who have voted for a party that has obtained at least 1% of the votes of the population, or by independent members of Parliament who have obtained at least 73,000 votes for the Chamber of Deputies and 168,000 votes for the Senate. The signatures supporting the candidacies of political parties and of independent candidates may also be collected online, citizens being able to sign with any form of digital signature recognised by law."

Article 62(2), whose former wording was "The organisations of citizens belonging to national minorities which fail to obtain in the elections the number of votes required to be represented in Parliament are entitled to one deputy seat each, under the conditions of the electoral law. The citizens of a national minority may be represented by one organisation only", has been amended in order to guarantee the representation of as large a number of citizens as possible in the Parliament of Romania. To

that end there has been established at constitutional level an electoral threshold for entry into Parliament of at least 1% for any party and of at least 73,000 votes for the Chamber of Deputies and 168,000 votes for the Senate for persons wishing to stand as independents. This measure, inspired by the arrangements in the Constitution of Italy, is such as to increase the representativeness of Romanian citizens in Parliament, as well as that of the national minorities, who will be able to send to Parliament whatever representative their members decide — one or more members of Parliament — without any further need for a "selection" carried out by the State from among the "organisations" "approved" as representing the national minorities.

This amendment will have the effect of greater democratisation and of an increase in the role and power of Parliament within the architecture of the Romanian State, starting from the observation that at the heart of parliamentary democracy lies the principle of civic representation, a pillar guaranteeing that the voice of the people is heard and respected within the structures of State power. In that context, the proposed revision of the text of Article 62 of the Constitution of Romania is a subject of the greatest interest, essential to the health and democratic evolution of Romanian society.

Under the proposed revision, a party will have to obtain at least 1% of the votes of the population in order to be represented in Parliament, while independent members will require a threshold of 73,000 votes for the Chamber of Deputies and 168,000 for the Senate. This change will substantially reshape the political landscape, giving small parties and independents a greater chance to contribute to national decisions. In order to understand the importance of this revision, we must examine the present system. At present, Romanian electoral law imposes fairly high thresholds for political parties — 5% of the votes cast — thresholds capable of discouraging political participation and diversity in Parliament.

By contrast, reducing that threshold to just 1% will encourage pluralism and provide the opportunity for less-heard voices to be represented. Starting from the premise that a diversity of opinions and the representation of as broad a spectrum of citizens' interests as possible are essential to democratic functioning, the proposed revision is a step in the right direction. The amendments to the text of the Constitution will lead to an increase in the number of parties and independents in Parliament, thereby contributing to a greater fragmentation of power and to the prevention of its accumulation in the hands of a few dominant entities.

In addition, this change recognises the importance and the role that independent members of Parliament can play in politics. A vote for an independent candidate is often a vote of confidence in an individual's capacity to represent the interests of the electorate, independently of the guidelines of a political party. The threshold proposed for independents remains sufficiently accessible to allow public figures with a solid base of supporters to enter the race for a seat in Parliament. The differentiated thresholds reflect the distinct nature of party candidacies as against independent ones and recognise the different challenges each type of candidacy involves.

Approaching the subject from the citizen's perspective, this revision of Article 62 will contribute to greater civic involvement and to increased confidence in the electoral process. In an era in which the feeling of alienation from the political class is ever more pronounced, the possibility of seeing a broader spectrum of options represented in Parliament may serve as a catalyst for electoral participation.

Likewise, permitting the online collection of signatures in support of candidacies is a step towards modernising the electoral process and adapting it to the digital age. Digitalisation has become an inevitable component of our daily lives, and our electoral policies and systems must keep pace with these changes. Digital signatures are recognised in many areas of public and private administration,

so extending them to the sphere of supporting candidacies could encourage broader civic participation, especially among young people.

Critics of this revision may argue that a Parliament with more fragmented representation could lead to political instability or to difficulties in forming the majorities needed to govern. The experience of other European democracies suggests, however, that such a system can stimulate inter-party dialogue and collaboration — aspects capable of contributing to more balanced governance and to legislation more attentive to the diverse needs of society.

Comparing with other European countries, we observe that Romania is not alone in facing the challenges of equitable representation within national parliaments. For example, in Germany the threshold for entry into the Bundestag is 5% of the votes or the winning of at least three direct mandates. In Poland the threshold for the Sejm is 5%, but for electoral coalitions it rises to 8% — as against Romania, where it may reach as much as 10% for coalitions. By contrast, countries such as the Netherlands have no electoral threshold at all, thus allowing a varied range of parties in Parliament. Such diversity may appear disadvantageous in terms of governmental stability, but on the other hand it offers a truer picture of the political spectrum and of citizens' electoral preferences.

To understand better, let us look at the Constitution of Italy, which offers an example of a mixed electoral system combining proportional with majority representation. In Italy this system allows balanced representation between large and small parties, as well as for independent candidates, thereby ensuring that all political currents are represented in Parliament. This comparison leads us to the essential question: could the Italian model serve as an inspiration for Romania? By adopting a lower threshold for entry into Parliament, close to the Italian system, Romania could favour political pluralism and reduce the concentration of power in the hands of a few dominant parties.

In conclusion, the revision of Article 62(2) of the Constitution of Romania constitutes a reform with the potential to bring fresh air into Romanian politics, promoting inclusiveness and diversity. By lowering the electoral threshold and recognising the role of independent members of Parliament, this proposed revision could not only improve representativeness in Parliament but also consolidate citizens' confidence in the country's democratic institutions. The proposed revision is therefore not merely a matter of figures and electoral thresholds but a subject touching the foundations of democracy through the prism of participation and representation. It is a call for a more flexible democracy, adapted to contemporary social dynamics and to the need to recognise political diversity. A Romania with a more diverse Parliament will contribute to consolidating democracy and to increasing citizens' involvement in political life. This constitutional reform represents an opportunity to build a political system more open and more responsive to changes in society and to the aspirations and needs of its electorate.

18. After point (k) of Article 65(2) there is added a new point, point (l), reading as follows: → the text of the article

"(l) Appoints the Prosecutor General of the Prosecutor's Office attached to the High Court of Cassation and Justice and the Chief Prosecutors of the National Anticorruption Directorate and of the Directorate for the Investigation of Organised Crime and Terrorism, for a term of four years, renewable once only."

In Article 65 of the Constitution of Romania, headed "Sittings of the Chambers", there is added after point (k) a point (l) conferring a new power on Parliament — a power that will enhance the role and importance of the "supreme representative body of the Romanian people": "Appointing the Prosec-

utor General of the Prosecutor's Office attached to the High Court of Cassation and Justice and the Chief Prosecutors of the National Anticorruption Directorate and of the Directorate for the Investigation of Organised Crime and Terrorism."

At present, Article 65 of the Constitution of Romania governs the powers of Parliament, and paragraph (2), which runs up to point (k), covers a wide range of competences. In the present socio-political context, however, the need emerges for a legislative adjustment through the addition of point (l). This amendment proposes that Parliament play a decisive role in the appointment of the Prosecutor General and of the chief prosecutors of the country's most important investigative directorates.

Conferring this power on Parliament — a power which until the present amendment was among the powers of the President under Article 94(1)(c) of the Constitution — is intended to democratise and make transparent both the competitions and the appointments to the management positions of the Prosecutor General's Office and of the Directorates within it, which constitutes a reinforcement of Parliament's supreme function within the State.

Starting from the premise that at the heart of democracy lies the principle of the separation of powers within the State — an essential pillar securing the balance and proper functioning of a society — the basis of that principle is the idea that the legislative, executive and judicial powers must function independently, each with well-defined competences and none able to intervene in the domain of another. From this perspective, the revision of Article 65 of the Constitution with a view to adding a new point (l) is of major importance for the architecture of judicial power in Romania. Article 65 of the Constitution of Romania concerns the role and powers of Parliament, the supreme body of representation of the Romanian people and the sole legislative authority of the country.

The proposed revision seeks to add a new point, (l), providing that, in joint sitting, the Chambers of Parliament "Appoint the Prosecutor General of the Prosecutor's Office attached to the High Court of Cassation and Justice and the Chief Prosecutors of the National Anticorruption Directorate and of the Directorate for the Investigation of Organised Crime and Terrorism". This amendment represents a turning point in the manner of appointment to the highest offices in Romania's criminal-investigation machinery.

First, we must understand the present context in which this proposed revision is raised. In recent years Romania has made significant progress in the fight against corruption and in consolidating the rule of law, a process supported by European and international institutions. That fight is, however, far from complete, and there are constant concerns about political influence in the appointment of high-ranking prosecutors, which may undermine the independence of the judicial system. The proposed revision seeks to create a more transparent and accountable appointment process, ensuring that the persons selected for these crucial roles in the fight against corruption are chosen on the basis of professional merit and not of political affiliation or sympathy. This could contribute to greater confidence in the justice system, essential for the consolidation of democracy. The debate on amending Article 65 forms part of a broader trend of judicial reform aimed at aligning Romanian practice with European standards. Those standards underline the need to protect the independence of prosecutors and to avoid external interference in the administration of justice. One of the strong arguments in favour of the revision is that establishing a clear legal framework for the appointment of the Prosecutor General and of the chief prosecutors of the DNA and DIICOT will reduce the risk of politicising justice. At the same time, it guarantees that these key positions are held by professionals of impeccable reputation, which is essential to the credibility and effectiveness of the judicial system.

The arguments in favour of this revision are manifold. The first and most important is the consolidation of the principle of the separation of powers within the State — legislative, executive and judicial. Through Parliament's direct involvement in the appointment of the highest prosecutors, greater independence from executive influence is secured, which is a fundamental pillar of a State governed by the rule of law. This change could reduce the risk of politicising justice, an aspect frequently criticised by European and international bodies monitoring the rule of law. A second argument concerns the accountability and transparency of the appointment process. The involvement of Parliament entails public debates, hearings and the possibility for civil society to take part in scrutinising candidates. This could lead to a more rigorous selection and a more open process, thereby increasing public confidence in the judicial system. Account must also be taken of the international context. Many Member States of the European Union have similar procedures in place, which suggests that such an appointment mechanism is compatible with democratic values and with the principles of good governance recognised at European level. This alignment with European standards is essential for securing effective cooperation and the mutual recognition of judicial decisions among Member States. A further argument arises from the need to counter the phenomenon of corruption. The Chief Prosecutors of the National Anticorruption Directorate and of the Directorate for the Investigation of Organised Crime and Terrorism are in the front line of the fight against this scourge. Ensuring that their appointment is made in a transparent and independent manner increases the effectiveness of the fight against corruption and improves the image of justice nationally and internationally.

Moreover, limiting the term of office to four years, renewable once only, is a measure that prevents stagnation and promotes dynamism within judicial institutions. This limitation could also discourage any tendency towards the long-term accumulation of power in the hands of a single individual. In conclusion, the revision of Article 65 of the Constitution through the addition of point (l) is a measure deserving serious consideration from the perspective of strengthening the rule of law and aligning with European standards. It is a necessary step to ensure that the key structures of the judicial system are led by competent persons chosen through a transparent and equitable process. It would be a powerful signal that Romania is dedicated to combating corruption and strengthening democracy. Ultimately, the proposed revision of the Constitution is not merely a matter of conforming to a European model but a demonstration of domestic political maturing. It is a moment in which political decision-makers can show that they place the public interest and the principles of legal integrity above any momentary political calculation. The revision of Article 65 is therefore not only necessary but imperative for the continued development of a robust justice system that genuinely serves the interests of the citizen and contributes to consolidating the rule of law in Romania. The initiative to revise the Constitution, and in particular Article 65, must therefore be seen as an opportunity to reform and improve judicial and oversight mechanisms in accordance with the highest democratic standards. It is not merely a matter of aligning with European directives but of assuming a firm commitment to consolidating democracy and the rule of law in Romanian society. In this process it is essential that all interested parties — politicians, members of the judiciary, legal experts and citizens — collaborate and contribute constructive arguments.

19. In Article 70, after paragraph (2) there is inserted paragraph (3), reading as follows: → the text of the article

"(3) The office of deputy or senator shall also cease where the holder is removed from office by a local referendum convened in the electoral constituency in which he was elected by a number of 7,300 citizens in the case of a deputy and of 16,800 citizens in the case of a senator. The signatures for convening the referendum may also be collected online, citizens being able to sign with any form of

digital signature recognised by law. A referendum for the removal of a member of Parliament may not be organised in the last 6 months of the term of office. The member of Parliament is removed if one half plus one of those taking part in the referendum vote in favour of removal, irrespective of the turnout quorum. After the Constitutional Court has found that the member's mandate has ceased, the vacant seat shall be filled, until the next elections are held, by the next candidate elected in the electoral constituency concerned at the last elections."

The revision of Article 70 of the Constitution of Romania through the insertion of a new paragraph enabling citizens to remove members of Parliament by local referendum is not a mere amendment but a major step in consolidating participatory democracy and securing the direct accountability of elected representatives to the electorate. The present proposal is a direct consequence of Article 2(1), which provides that "National sovereignty belongs to the Romanian people, who exercise it through their representative bodies, constituted by free, periodic and fair elections, as well as by referendum", and constitutes a direct application of the exercise of national sovereignty through referendum. At a time when political dynamics are in continual change and the voice of the citizen must be more present and democracy "more direct", revising the text of certain articles of the Constitution becomes a pressing necessity. Under the proposal, the office of deputy or senator may cease not only through resignation or incompatibility but also through the direct will of citizens expressed by referendum. This mechanism of revocation, also known as "recall", is a democratic instrument conferring on the electorate the power to withdraw the confidence granted to a member of Parliament before the end of his term. The insertion of paragraph (3) into Article 70 brings to the fore the idea of the direct accountability of representatives to those who elected them.

In order to initiate the removal referendum, a significant number of citizens must be mobilised — 7,300 in the case of a deputy and 16,800 in the case of a senator. These figures are not arbitrary; they represent a reasonable proportion of a constituency's electorate, thereby ensuring that only an undertaking with authentic popular support can take place. Such a figure represents significant participation, conferring a threshold of seriousness on the demand of the population. Where the majority of voters opt for the removal of the member of Parliament, irrespective of the quorum, the Constitutional Court will find that the mandate has ceased and the vacant seat will be filled by the next candidate on the electoral list until the next elections.

This provision introduces a new level of direct accountability of members of Parliament to their electorate. Although on paper members of Parliament are delegates of the people and ought to represent their interests, the gap between electoral promises and actual conduct can sometimes create dissatisfaction among the electorate. The proposed revision allows citizens to act directly when they feel that their representative is not discharging his mandate satisfactorily.

The rationale of this revision turns on the idea of the direct accountability of members of Parliament to the electorate. This new paragraph would enable citizens to remove a deputy or senator by local referendum, thereby giving communities the power to revoke the mandate of a member of Parliament who no longer represents the interests and will of those who elected him. This mechanism of direct control could fundamentally transform the relationship between electors and elected, securing greater accountability and transparency in the legislative process. The central point of this proposal is that, in essence, a member of Parliament must be a servant of the people and not merely a representative. He must be in permanent contact with the realities and needs of his electoral constituency. Should he or she deviate from these expectations, citizens would have a concrete instrument for expressing their dissatisfaction — the local referendum.

Such a measure may serve as a catalyst for greater civic involvement, since citizens are called upon to take an active part in the process of overseeing and evaluating the activity of members of Parliament.

Through the possibility of convening a local referendum, members of Parliament are encouraged to fulfil their electoral promises and to maintain a constant link with their electoral base, at the risk of losing their mandate in the event of poor performance or inappropriate conduct.

The revision of Article 70 and the introduction of this provision also come in the context of a global wish to renew confidence in democratic institutions. In recent years we have observed a growing trend of citizen scepticism towards the capacity of elected representatives to serve the public interest. This "recall" instrument may function as a corrective mechanism, a kind of "reset button" for the choices made by the electorate, giving people the chance to revisit their decisions when their representatives no longer meet expectations.

A thorough understanding of this mechanism also requires an analysis of the conditions of its implementation. A referendum for the removal of a member of Parliament may not be organised in the last 6 months of the term, thereby ensuring that it is not used as a political instrument in pre-electoral periods. In addition, for removal to be effective, one half plus one of those taking part in the referendum must vote in favour, thereby eliminating dependence on a turnout quorum that could impede the expression of the popular will.

The mechanism proposed in the new Article 70(3) therefore combines in a balanced way the principles of representative democracy with those of direct democracy. This approach respects national sovereignty while at the same time increasing accountability and transparency in governance. It reflects a basic principle of democracy: power derives from the will of the people. From this perspective, the new paragraph of Article 70 introduces a new level of direct accountability of members of Parliament to their electorate — accountability that is not confined to the periodic electoral ballot but may be activated at any moment during the exercise of the mandate.

This mechanism of "recall", as it is known in other legal systems, seeks to increase the accountability of elected representatives and to encourage greater congruence between the actions of members of Parliament and the will of those who voted for them.

In order better to understand the context and possible implications of this revision, it is useful to look at how other States have incorporated similar procedures into their constitutional structure. For example, in the United States of America the recall mechanism is a common feature in many of its states, allowing electors to revoke their elected officials before the expiry of their term.

In California this process was famously used when, in 2003, Governor Gray Davis was removed and replaced by Arnold Schwarzenegger. The recall procedure in the USA differs from state to state, but in essence it allows citizens to remove an official through a petition followed by a vote. By contrast, countries such as the United Kingdom have no such direct mechanism, but in 2015, through the Recall of MPs Act, they introduced the possibility of triggering a recall process where a member of Parliament is sentenced to imprisonment or suspended from the House of Commons for a period. That process is, however, much narrower and is not initiated directly by electors. In some countries, such as Lithuania and Slovakia, the constitutions allow the removal of representatives through referendums initiated by citizens. This demonstrates a recognition of the importance of direct public oversight in maintaining integrity and accountability among elected officials.

To understand this initiative better, we may look to the Swiss model of direct democracy, where citizens have considerable power over political decisions. In Switzerland, referendums and popular initiatives are ordinary instruments through which the population exercises its will. By comparison, the introduction of a similar mechanism in Romania could consolidate participatory democracy and increase the degree of civic involvement.

Moreover, this proposal is consistent with current trends towards the digitalisation and increased accessibility of democratic processes. The possibility of collecting signatures online for convening a referendum reflects an adaptation to the realities of modern society, in which technology plays an ever more important role in facilitating civic participation. In Romania, where the use of technology and of the internet is continually growing, the implementation of such an option could stimulate citizens' involvement in the democratic process. In addition, the threshold set for the number of signatures required to initiate a referendum — 7,300 for a deputy and 16,800 for a senator — ensures that only significant support from the electorate can trigger such a process. This prevents abuses and ensures that the removal of a member of Parliament is the result of an authentic collective will and not of political manoeuvring or momentary impulses. As regards the turnout quorum, the fact that removal may be effected irrespective of it, provided that the majority of those present vote in favour, underlines the intention to give citizens real power.

Returning to the proposed revision of the Constitution of Romania, the revision of Article 70 could provide a powerful instrument of civic involvement and could function as a genuine mechanism of balance in the political sphere. This possibility of removing members of Parliament by local referendum could bring about greater transparency and could ensure that political decisions are more closely aligned with the wishes of the electorate.

20. Article 72(3) is amended to read as follows: → the text of the article

"(3) In the case of flagrante delicto, deputies or senators may be detained and searched. The Minister of Justice shall inform the president of the Chamber without delay of the detention and the search."

In the dynamic context of present socio-political realities, the revision of legislative texts becomes a pressing necessity in order to secure a coherent and effective legal system. Article 72 of the Constitution of Romania, concerning the immunity of deputies and senators, is no exception to this imperative.

The starting point of the proposed revision of Article 72(3) is the principle of the equality of citizens before the law. In its present form, the paragraph confers on members of Parliament a degree of protection capable of being interpreted as a privilege incompatible with that fundamental principle. It is essential to understand that parliamentary immunity is not and must not be a shield for those who break the law.

In a robust democracy no one is above the law, including those elected to represent it. The proposed revision therefore seeks to align parliamentary immunity with the standards of justice applicable to any citizen.

The amendment proposes that, in the case of flagrante delicto, deputies and senators may be detained and searched, with immediate notification to the Minister of Justice and to the president of the Chamber concerned, the possibility for members of Parliament to revoke that measure being removed — a possibility presently afforded by the last sentence of paragraph 3: "If the Chamber notified finds that there are no grounds for detention, it shall immediately order the revocation of that measure."

This amendment could help eliminate the perception of impunity hanging over the political class and thereby increase citizens' confidence in the institutions of the State. In analysing the implications of this revision, we must weigh the individual rights and freedoms of members of Parliament against the need to secure integrity and accountability in the exercise of public office.

Parliamentary immunity was originally conceived as a guarantee against abuses of power, protecting the freedom of expression and of decision of the people's elected representatives within legislative procedures. In practice, however, inviolability may become an obstacle to the application of the law and to justice. Cases of flagrante delicto require a rapid and effective response from the judicial authorities, and the present process, which requires the approval of the Chamber to which the member of Parliament concerned belongs, may delay or even impede the administration of justice.

The proposed amendment raises not only the question of making judicial proceedings more efficient but also that of securing better transparency within the institutions of the State. By removing the step of prior approval by the Chamber for the detention of members of Parliament in cases of flagrante delicto, the capacity of the judiciary to act unimpeded and in real time is enhanced. This is a move towards a more clearly defined separation of powers within the State, in which the legislature does not intervene in the activity of the judiciary.

Likewise, the proposed revision responds to a social demand to see the law applied equally to all citizens, whatever their position or office. This step may be regarded as a natural development in the maturing of the democratic process, in which transparency and accountability become fundamental values.

In conclusion, the revision of Article 72(3) of the Constitution is a necessity in the present context, in order to align Romanian legislation with the standards of justice and equity. This legislative change may play a crucial role in restoring public confidence in the institutions of the State and in consolidating the rule of law.

By ensuring that no member of Parliament can evade the legal consequences of his actions, the integrity of the legal system is strengthened and Romania's commitment to democratic principles is reaffirmed. The revision of paragraph 3 is therefore an important step in the right direction. It is a signal that Romania undertakes continually to perfect its constitutional framework so as to reflect the realities and aspirations of its society. This constitutional amendment will not only remove an anomaly in the relationship between citizens and their representatives but will also strengthen confidence in an equitable system of government.

Finally, it must be acknowledged that any amendment to the Constitution is a grave decision and must not be taken lightly. It is the duty of members of Parliament to weigh this proposal seriously and to ensure that the changes will benefit the whole of society and not one group or another.

The revision of Article 72(3) of the Constitution is more than a mere legal adjustment; it is an affirmation of Romania's commitment to the principles of integrity and equity in serving its citizens.

This legislative development represents a step towards consolidating democracy and the rule of law, in which every individual, whatever his rank or social status, is equal before the law. As Romanian society advances, it is essential that its legislative framework progress at the same pace. The amendment proposed to Article 72(3) is an indicator of that development and of the wish to secure fair and impartial justice for all.

21. Article 74(1) is amended to read as follows: → the text of the article

"(1) The legislative initiative belongs, as the case may be, to the Government, to deputies, to senators or to a number of at least 30,000 citizens entitled to vote. The signatures in support of citizens' legislative initiatives may also be collected online, citizens being able to sign with any form of digital signature recognised by law."

The amendment of Article 74(1) (headed "Legislative initiative"), which at present reads "(1) The legislative initiative belongs, as the case may be, to the Government, to deputies, to senators or to a number of at least 100,000 citizens entitled to vote. The citizens who exercise their right of legislative initiative must come from at least a quarter of the country's counties, and in each of those counties, or in the municipality of Bucharest, at least 5,000 signatures must be registered in support of that initiative", is such as to increase democracy in Romania, to raise the degree of involvement and the confidence of Romanians in Parliament, and to enhance the influence and power of the citizen in the act of legislating in Romania. For that reason the number of citizens entitled to vote who must sign a legislative initiative has been reduced from 100,000 to 30,000, the other conditions mentioned in the previous wording of the constitutional text — all of which were such as to burden the process of popular legislation — being likewise removed.

In that spirit we must also consider the proposed revision of Article 74, which calls for equal attention. This article, concerning the legislative initiative, is a key component of the legislative process and of the functioning of participatory democracy. Article 74(1), in its present form, provides that the legislative initiative belongs to the Government, to deputies, to senators and to a number of at least 100,000 citizens entitled to vote. The proposal to amend that threshold to 30,000 citizens is a recognition of the need to facilitate civic involvement in the legislative process. By lowering the number of citizens required to propose legislative initiatives, new horizons are opened for the active participation of civil society in the mechanisms of governance.

The arguments supporting the revision are manifold and concern both the consolidation of democracy and the increased efficiency of the legislative process. The present threshold of 100,000 citizens may discourage smaller and less representative groups from initiating laws capable of benefiting local communities or specialised interest groups. Reducing it to 30,000 opens the way to a greater variety of legislative proposals, giving a vital impetus to citizens' initiatives and to the diversity of public debate.

Another important argument is that of efficiency. With a lower threshold, the collection of the required signatures becomes a more accessible task, thereby allowing draft laws to reach the parliamentary agenda more quickly. This can lead to a better adaptation of legislation to changing social and economic realities, ensuring that laws respond adequately to citizens' needs.

In addition, lowering the threshold for the legislative initiative may stimulate citizens' interest in the democratic process. People may be more inclined to take part in shaping the policies that directly affect them if they know that they have a real chance of being heard. In this way not only the quantity but also the quality of civic participation may be improved. Considering all these arguments, the revision of Article 74(1) is not merely an opportunity but a necessity in order to support more active participation by citizens in political life. This could lead to greater responsiveness on the part of the political class to citizens' demands and to a more faithful representation of the will of the people.

Likewise, permitting the online collection of signatures in support of citizens' legislative initiatives is a step towards democratising the legislative process and adapting it to the digital age. Digitalisation has become an inevitable component of our daily lives, and our policies and electoral systems must keep pace with these changes. Digital signatures are recognised in many areas of public and private administration, so extending them to the sphere of supporting initiatives could encourage broader civic participation, especially among young people.

This amendment could have a significant impact on civic participation in the legislative process and could reflect a step towards a more inclusive and accessible democracy. In order better to understand the rationale behind this proposal, it is instructive to draw a comparison with other European consti-

tutions. For example, in Germany a popular legislative initiative requires the signatures of 0.1% of the electorate in order to be considered, while in Italy 50,000 signatures or 5 regional committees of supporters are needed. In Spain, by contrast, introducing a popular legislative initiative requires 500,000 signatures, a significantly higher threshold than the Romanian proposal. This difference suggests that legislative-initiative thresholds vary widely among European States, each country adjusting to its own political and cultural context. High thresholds such as those in Spain may discourage civic participation and directly limit participatory democracy.

On the other hand, a low number of required signatures, as proposed in Romania, could facilitate citizens' involvement in the legislative process but could also jeopardise the seriousness of legislative initiatives through the possible appearance of a large number of proposals with limited support or insufficient analysis. In this varied landscape, the analysis and adjustment of the legislative-initiative threshold must take account of the delicate balance between accessibility and efficiency. The proposed amendment of the Constitution of Romania appears to seek that balance, lowering the barriers for citizens without sacrificing the integrity of the legislative process. The arguments in favour of this revision are manifold.

First, the present threshold of 100,000 signatures may be regarded as discouraging for citizens' initiatives, especially since mobilising such a large number of people is often difficult logistically and financially. Reducing the number to 30,000 could stimulate more intense activism and could give a stronger voice to smaller groups and to segments of the population that until now might have felt excluded from the law-making process.

Second, the present condition requiring the collection of signatures from at least a quarter of the country's counties may create inequalities among citizens according to their region of residence. Citizens in less populated areas, or in areas where civic involvement is lower, may thus have difficulty in making their voices heard. The proposed amendment will remedy this disadvantage, providing a more equitable representation of the population in the legislative process.

In addition, there is the argument that a lower signature threshold could encourage a greater diversity of legislative initiatives. This could lead to a broader and deeper public debate, reflecting more faithfully the concerns and needs of citizens. Diversity and pluralism of ideas are fundamental pillars of any healthy democracy, and facilitating access to the legislative process is essential to encouraging them. At the same time, it is important to emphasise that the proposal to reduce the number of required signatures does not mean diminishing the importance or seriousness of a legislative initiative. The mechanisms of filtering and debate within Parliament remain in force to ensure that only well-founded proposals of public interest advance in the legislative process.

In conclusion, the proposed amendment of Article 74 of the Constitution is an essential step towards consolidating participatory democracy. By lowering the threshold of citizens required for a legislative initiative, the direct involvement of the population in law-making is facilitated, thereby reflecting more faithfully the will of citizens and the dynamics of society.

Democracy is not static; it must evolve together with the society it serves. The revision of this constitutional article shows that Romania is prepared to take concrete steps to improve democratic processes and to respond better to the needs of its citizens. The time has come for legislative initiatives to cease being monopolised by a small number of actors and to become accessible to a broader range of the population. This would not only encourage a more constructive dialogue between citizens and the institutions of the State but would also increase the transparency and accountability of political decision-makers before the electorate.

22. Article 75(2) is amended to read as follows: → the text of the article

"(2) The first Chamber notified shall rule within 45 days. For codes and other laws of particular complexity the time-limit is 60 days. Where these time-limits are exceeded, the draft laws or legislative proposals shall be deemed to have been rejected."

The amendment to Article 75(2) of the Constitution, headed "Notification of the Chambers", removes the possibility for the first Chamber notified to "adopt tacitly" legislative texts — a possibility afforded by the earlier wording ("Where these time-limits are exceeded, the draft laws or legislative proposals shall be deemed to have been adopted."). Removing the possibility of tacit adoption increases Parliament's accountability and is intended to raise citizens' confidence in their representatives, elements absolutely necessary to confirm the enhanced role of that institution in relation to the other powers.

At the heart of the legislative mechanism of any democracy lies not only the principle of representativeness but also that of efficiency. The Constitution of Romania, the supreme law of the State, is the main pillar supporting the entire normative edifice, and legislative procedures must reflect not only the popular will but also the capacity to respond swiftly and adequately to the needs of society. Article 75 of the present Constitution, in its current form, establishes the working method of the Chambers of Parliament in the process of adopting laws in the first Chamber notified, making possible the tacit adoption, without any debate whatsoever, of laws that may be of major importance to Romanian society. Paragraph (2) is therefore of particular importance, since it defines the time-limits within which the first Chamber notified is required to rule on a legislative initiative.

In the present socio-political context, the revision of this paragraph is not merely a necessity but a pressing urgency. At present, legislative procedures can be slow and inefficient, and the time-limits laid down in Article 75(2) are often not observed, which is why many laws are adopted "tacitly" by the first Chamber notified. This generates significant delays in the legislative process, affecting the dynamics of law-making and hence the State's capacity to react to rapid changes in society. More serious still is the fact that it fundamentally undermines the basic operating principle of the Parliament of Romania: bicameralism.

Why is it so important to revise this article and, above all, the time-limits it imposes? First, we must bear in mind the accelerated pace of change that Romania faces, both domestically and in the international context. Legislation must be agile and capable of rapid adaptation in order to meet emerging challenges, whether economic crises, technological developments or challenges of a social nature.

Moreover, the revision of Article 75 could help improve the quality of parliamentary debate. By establishing clear and mandatory time-limits, members of Parliament would be encouraged to organise themselves and to discuss legislative initiatives in a more structured and effective manner. This procedural discipline could reduce the cases in which important laws are postponed indefinitely or adopted hastily, without a thorough analysis of their implications.

A frequent problem in the legislative procedure is the overlapping of time-limits and the absence of a clear mechanism for prioritising draft laws. The proposed amendment could ensure that genuinely urgent and essential laws are treated with the priority they deserve, thereby avoiding legislative blockages capable of having a negative impact on the whole country.

In addition, the extended time-limit for laws of particular complexity, such as codes, recognises the need for additional time to ensure that these vital documents are examined with the necessary care.

The consequences of failing to observe the present time-limits are minimal, and this must change. By introducing a provision under which draft laws or legislative proposals are deemed rejected where the time-limits are exceeded, a powerful incentive for legislative efficiency and accountability is created, and the principle of bicameralism in the Parliament of Romania is consolidated.

This measure could prevent situations in which projects essential to the development and welfare of society are neglected or forgotten in bureaucratic drawers. It is essential to emphasise that the revision of Article 75 must not be regarded as a mere procedural formality but as a reaffirmation of Romania's commitment to the principles of the rule of law and of effective governance.

Through this amendment it is ensured that the legislative process becomes more predictable and more transparent, increasing citizens' confidence in the institutions of the State.

In conclusion, the revision of Article 75 of the Constitution of Romania is a critical step in consolidating democracy and governmental efficiency. It will not only facilitate a swifter and more coherent legislative process but will also improve the quality of the laws adopted.

23. Article 83(1) is amended to read as follows: → the text of the article

"(1) The term of office of the President of Romania is 4 years and is exercised from the date of taking the oath, which shall take place in the same calendar year as the election of Parliament."

The amendment of Article 83(1) of the Constitution, headed "Duration of the term of office", has the effect of reducing the President's term from 5 years to 4 years, returning to the duration of the presidential term as it stood before the 2003 revision of the Constitution.

The reality of the past 20 years has shown that there is no justification for a 5-year presidential term when all other elected officials in Romania have terms of 4 years. This has led to an artificial and unjustified enhancement of the role and power of the President, and it has already been demonstrated that it has not resulted in greater stability of the institutions of the Romanian State or in greater coherence and continuity of government projects.

On the contrary, a presidential term longer than that of Parliament has often led the President to impose his will at his discretion, even where that will no longer reflected the will of the majority of voters in Romania.

Not least, the misalignment of presidential and parliamentary elections has had the effect of unjustifiably increasing the costs of the Romanian State and unjustifiably prolonging electoral periods.

The proposal comes at a time when the synchronisation of presidential and parliamentary electoral cycles has become a subject of national interest, with significant implications for political stability and the efficiency of government. In its present form, Article 83 provides that the term of office of the President of Romania is 5 years.

The proposed amendment suggests reducing that period to 4 years, with the provision that the President take the oath in the same calendar year as the election of Parliament.

This amendment would align the electoral cycles and could therefore contribute to better cohesion among the powers of the State. Why is such a change necessary? First, harmonising electoral terms could reduce periods of cohabitation — those intervals in which the President and the parliamentary majority come from opposing political camps. Such periods are often marked by conflict and deadlock in decision-making, which hampers the implementation of public policy and can lead to political instability.

Harmonising electoral terms not only eases political tension but also facilitates better collaboration among the institutions of the State. Such collaboration is essential to the progress and continued development of the nation as a whole. In addition, citizens would benefit from a unified vision and from greater coherence in the implementation of long-term national strategies. Second, revising the presidential term could lead to better democratic representation. With a synchronised electoral cycle, citizens would have the opportunity to express their views more coherently, voting in the same political context for both branches of government. This change could also help increase turnout, a vital factor in consolidating Romanian democracy. Moreover, a synchronised electoral cycle for parliamentary and presidential elections could simplify the electoral process for citizens, making it less confusing and easier to follow. At present, with elections held at different intervals, there is a tendency towards declining public interest and electoral fatigue, which is often reflected in low turnout. Through synchronisation, however, the electorate would become more motivated and more engaged in the democratic process.

Another argument in favour of revising the presidential term concerns administrative efficiency. With a 4-year term aligned to the parliamentary cycle, overlaps and transition periods between administrations could be reduced, allowing a smoother transition and greater continuity in the administration of State affairs. It would thus be possible to avoid situations in which projects important to the country's development are delayed or abandoned because of political change.

In addition, a shorter term could intensify the President's political accountability to the electorate. He would be prompted to fulfil his electoral promises within a more condensed time-frame, which could increase the efficiency of the presidential administration and make governance more accountable and more transparent in the eyes of citizens.

The revision of the presidential term may also be seen as an opportunity to modernise the Romanian political system and adapt it to the dynamics of contemporary social and political change. In a world in which the speed of change is ever more pronounced, the flexibility and adaptability of State institutions to new realities become imperative. Reducing the presidential term to 4 years, aligned with the parliamentary elections, reflects an understanding of the need to respond more promptly and more effectively to citizens' expectations.

For all these reasons, the solution adopted by the present initiative for the revision of the Constitution is a return to a 4-year term for the President of Romania — a term which must end and begin in the same year as the other mandates of Romania's elected representatives (which requires that this and the manner of its implementation be set out in the transitional provisions of the present Law).

24. In Article 90, after paragraph 1 there are added paragraphs 2 and 3, reading as follows: → the text of the article → the text of the article

"(2) No referendum of any kind may be organised simultaneously with elections, whatever their nature.

(3) Consultative referendums may not be initiated on subjects for which the Constitution excludes the citizens' initiative or which involve procedures concluded by mandatory referendums."

In Article 90 of the Constitution of Romania, headed "The referendum", after paragraph 1 (which reads "The President of Romania may, after consulting Parliament, ask the people to express their will by referendum on matters of national interest.") two new paragraphs have been added limiting the President's right to propose referendums. This addition, limiting the President's right to propose referendums, is called for in the light of the experience of the past 33 years, during which various

Presidents have abused that right in order to attain personal, electoral ends, without producing the effects declared as the aim of organising these procedures, which entail an enormous cost for the Romanian State. We recall in this respect the "Referendum on the transition to a unicameral parliament and the reduction of the number of members of Parliament" of 2009, organised by Traian Băsescu, and the referendum on justice imposed by Klaus Werner Iohannis in 2019. Both consultative referendums were organised during electoral periods and used as means of propaganda, yet remained without any concrete effect in the legal order of the Romanian State.

In order to limit the possibility of such abuses of right being committed in future by serving Presidents of Romania, the two paragraphs were introduced: the first prohibiting the organisation of referendums "simultaneously with elections, whatever their nature", and the second expressly limiting the possibility of organising referendums "on subjects for which the Constitution excludes the citizens' initiative or which involve procedures concluded by mandatory referendums" — a prohibition that was implicit in the Constitution in force before the present amendments.

In the light of the precedents mentioned above, the revision of the text of Article 90 of the Constitution becomes not merely relevant but imperative.

First, the importance of separating referendums from political elections — whether local, parliamentary or presidential — must be emphasised. The proposed paragraph (2) serves to consolidate the idea that every electoral or consultative process must be treated as of equal importance and assessed independently, without being influenced by another. Organising a referendum simultaneously with elections may mislead the electorate, dilute the messages and reduce the significance of each individual vote.

The addition of paragraph (3) is then intended to clarify and limit the fields in which the President of Romania may call consultative referendums. This brings greater clarity to the legal framework and prevents the initiation of referendums on subjects which, under the Constitution, may not be submitted to the popular will or which have already been settled by earlier referendums.

This proposal not only protects the essence of the vote previously cast by citizens but also respects the principle of the separation of powers within the State, avoiding situations in which the legislature is bypassed through popular initiatives on subjects falling within its exclusive competence.

Before going into detail, it is essential to understand the present context and why these additions are not merely convenient but necessary to the integrity of the democratic process. Romania has witnessed situations in which referendums were used for political purposes rather than as an instrument of direct consultation of the people on matters of national interest. In such circumstances, referendums may be perceived as a vehicle for the political agenda of those in power, which undermines confidence in this democratic mechanism. Establishing a clear framework in which referendums are separated from political elections therefore serves to strengthen the independence and secure the objectivity of each consultative or electoral process.

This helps prevent confusion among voters and secures a more informed participation, focused on the subjects proposed.

This framework also maintains the integrity of every vote, whether cast to elect representatives or to decide a specific question of public interest. On the other hand, limiting consultative referendum initiatives to subjects that are not excluded by the Constitution and have not already been decided by mandatory referendums is a measure that respects national sovereignty and the basic principles of the rule of law. It does not restrict the citizen's right of initiative but, on the contrary, channels it towards subjects on which public opinion can have a real and constructive impact.

Examining the history of referendums in Romania, we observe that some were organised in a manner that called their neutrality into question and highlighted the need for reform in this field. For example, referendums held simultaneously with elections have often produced controversial results, reflecting a divided participation and heightened emotional charge, which affected the objectivity of citizens' decisions.

These observations are not confined to Romania; many other democracies face similar challenges and have adopted rules to ensure that referendums remain an instrument for expressing the popular will, free from external influence and from temporal confusion with other electoral processes.

In the light of these examples, the proposed revision of Article 90 is an obligatory step towards Romania's democratic maturing. The proposed paragraphs (2) and (3) are not merely a response to the problems identified but also a forward-looking measure designed to prevent future abuses and to strengthen the democratic process. Through these amendments the Constitution of Romania would better reflect the principles of the separation of powers and of respect for the popular will expressed authentically and deliberatively.

In addition, this revision could serve as a model of good practice for other nations facing similar challenges in the management of referendums.

Romania would thus position itself as an example to be followed in the international democratic space, showing that it is capable of adjusting its constitutional framework to the requirements of the evolution of society and of the rule of law.

In conclusion, the amendments proposed to Article 90 are essential for strengthening democracy and for securing the effective and responsible participation of citizens in decision-making processes. They will guarantee that every democratic mechanism functions fairly and transparently, without being vulnerable to manipulation or confusion.

The revision of the Constitution is not merely an act of legislative improvement but also a commitment to the democratic values and principles underlying Romanian society. By adopting these new paragraphs, Romania will demonstrate that it is prepared to align itself with international democratic standards and to assume an active role in promoting a clean and effective political system. This will consolidate citizens' confidence in the institutions of the State and will improve the quality of democratic life by ensuring that every voice is heard and every vote counts. Improving the constitutional framework is a continuing process requiring vision, commitment and, above all, a deep understanding of the values guiding society. The proposals to amend Article 90 are the fruit of such an understanding and are intended to fortify those values, ensuring that the instruments of democracy remain effective and relevant.

This revision initiative is therefore a necessary development in aligning political practice with current democratic standards. It is evidence of maturity and responsibility, reflecting Romania's wish to advance and to continue developing as a stable and respected democracy.

25. Point (b) of Article 94 is amended to read as follows: → the text of the article

"(b) confers the ranks of marshal, general and admiral only with the binding opinion of the specialised committees of Parliament".

Article 94 of the Constitution, headed "Other powers" (of the President), has been amended at point (b) of its sole paragraph so as to limit the President's power to confer the ranks of "marshal, general

and admiral" at his discretion; following the proposed revision the President may confer these ranks "only with the binding opinion of the specialised committees of Parliament". → the text of the article

This amendment was made necessary by the history of the past 33 years, in which all the Presidents of Romania — all of them persons without any military qualification — have conferred at their discretion more than 1,000 such ranks, creating a camarilla of people with no competence, or with extremely limited competence, in their field of activity, who nevertheless became extremely loyal to the political figure who granted them these distinctions — a loyalty exceeding the normal limits in a democratic and functional State precisely because these distinctions are, in most cases, unwarranted.

For these reasons, in the present revised form of the Constitution the President is required to obtain "the binding opinion of the specialised committees of Parliament" before any promotion to the ranks of marshal, general and admiral, the decisive role in this procedure falling to Parliament through its specialised committees — as is likewise the case in States with a consolidated democracy such as the United States of America.

In the light of these changes, a broad debate opens on the balance of powers within the State and on the way in which they interact in decision-making. Through this new provision, Parliament assumes a more active role in the process of conferring the highest military ranks, which no longer remain at the exclusive discretion of the President.

A strong argument in favour of this revision is the need for transparency and accountability within the structures of the State. In a context in which a military rank reflects not only a recognition of competence but also of integrity and of service dedicated to the nation, it is essential that it be the result of a rigorous and objective process.

Likewise, involving the specialised committees provides a guarantee that the persons receiving these honorific titles will have the competence and experience necessary to bear them with dignity. It is a way of ensuring that military rank is not merely a reward for political loyalty but a recognition of genuine merit.

On the other hand, critics of this revision argue that it could lead to an excessive politicisation of the armed forces, in that Parliament, a political institution, would have a decisive say in the conferring of military ranks. The fear is that the committees' decisions could be influenced by the parties' political agenda rather than by the competence and individual qualities of those proposed for promotion.

As against the earlier system, in which the risk of politicisation was high because the conferring of ranks depended on a single person — the President — and not on a collegiate body such as the parliamentary committees, the revision introduces a multi-party approach, whose direct effect will be a more objective assessment of candidates for the rank of general and a reduction of partisan influence.

Moreover, the revision may help consolidate the role and image of the armed forces in society. By emphasising the requirement of professional competence and moral integrity, the standard for holding the highest military positions is raised, which may lead to greater confidence on the part of citizens in the country's defence institutions.

It should be noted that the revision does not remove the President's role in conferring ranks but balances it with an additional check, in order to secure greater rigour and transparency in the process. This balance among the powers of the State is a central pillar of modern democracies, and the revision of Article 94 of the Constitution may therefore be regarded as a step forward in consolidating that principle.

Finally, it is essential to recognise that the revision represents a step in the continuing process of reforming and modernising the institutions of the State, and also that Romania is aligning its practice with international standards, thereby improving its structure of governance and strengthening the rule of law.

In conclusion, the revision of point (b) of Article 94 of the Constitution represents an important moment in Romania's democratic evolution. It raises not only the question of the process of conferring military ranks but also the basic principles of the functioning of the State. This amendment promotes accountability, transparency and professionalism in a field essential to national security.

26. Article 97(2) is amended to read as follows: → the text of the article

"(2) The President may be removed from office by a referendum convened by a number of at least 100,000 citizens entitled to vote, who must come from at least a quarter of the country's counties. The signatures for convening the referendum may also be collected online, citizens being able to sign with any form of digital signature recognised by law. A referendum for the removal of the President may not be organised in the last 6 months of the term of office. The President is removed if one half plus one of those taking part in the referendum vote in favour of removal, irrespective of the turnout quorum."

The present proposal for revision is a direct consequence of Article 2(1), which provides that "National sovereignty belongs to the Romanian people, who exercise it through their representative bodies, constituted by free, periodic and fair elections, as well as by referendum", and constitutes a direct application of the exercise of national sovereignty through referendum. At a time when political dynamics are in continual change and the voice of the citizen must be more present and democracy "more direct", revising the text of certain articles of the Constitution becomes a pressing necessity.

To that end Article 97 of the Constitution has also been revised, its paragraph (2) proposing a democratic mechanism for balancing power through the possibility of the President being removed directly by the people. This proposed revision reflects the principle of popular sovereignty and the need to adapt constitutional instruments to current social realities. What follows sets out the reasons why we consider this revision not merely opportune but essential.

First, the present requirement that a removal referendum be initiated by Parliament may lead to the blocking of the process by political majorities, which may be tempted to protect their own interest at the expense of the national interest. By making it possible for citizens to remove the President directly, and by setting at 100,000 the number of signatures needed to trigger a referendum, this process is democratised and an adequate response is provided to situations in which the President of the country exceeds his powers or fails to discharge his constitutional duties.

This amendment in fact means greater trust placed in citizens and a recognition of their active role in overseeing the presidential mandate. More than a mere numerical change, this amendment to Article 97(2) reflects a tendency introduced by the present revision to empower citizens in major political processes.

It is a recognition of the fact that, in the information age, people are better informed and more engaged in civic life and must therefore have a greater say in the decisions that affect them directly. On the other hand, the restriction preventing a referendum for the removal of the President from being organised in the last 6 months of the term is likewise a pertinent innovation.

It prevents situations in which the removal process could be used as an electoral-campaign instrument, distracting attention from real problems and from constructive electoral debate.

Likewise, setting a threshold of one half plus one for removal, irrespective of the turnout quorum, is an essential feature aimed at making the process effective. This provision avoids situations in which a high and hard-to-reach quorum can invalidate the will of the majority of those who actually take part in the vote. This is vital in order to ensure that the decision to remove genuinely reflects the wish of the population and is not the result of low turnout, which could be influenced by various external factors.

This reconfiguration of the mechanism for removing the President by referendum consolidates the principle of the accountability of political leaders to citizens. It is a step forward towards a participatory democracy in which every vote counts and every citizen has the power directly to influence the political course of the nation.

In addition, this constitutional revision may serve as a warning to any sitting President, reminding them that they are accountable to the people and that their mandate may be revoked if they fail to keep their promises or lose their legitimacy. This mechanism may act as a factor of balance and self-regulation within the political system, helping to prevent abuses of power and to encourage ethical and transparent conduct.

At the same time, the proposed revision is consistent with fundamental democratic values and with international practice. In many consolidated democracies, citizens have similar instruments at their disposal for expressing their sovereignty and defending their rights. By aligning with these standards, Romania consolidates its status as a democratic and accountable State, reaffirming its commitment to the principles of participatory and transparent governance.

In order better to understand this proposal, it is useful to make a comparison with other constitutions around the world. For example, in the USA the impeachment of the President requires a majority vote of the House of Representatives and two-thirds of the Senate, being a strictly legislative process. In France, the removal of the President is possible only in cases of serious breach of the country's laws, and the procedure involves Parliament sitting as Congress and the Constitutional Council.

The Romanian proposal, by contrast, facilitates a more direct process of citizen involvement in the mechanism of overseeing and sanctioning the head of State, thereby reflecting current trends towards a more participatory democracy. The arguments in favour of this revision are manifold: first, the removal process becomes more accessible and more transparent for the population. A parliamentary majority — which may be influenced by political games or circumstantial alliances — is no longer required, only the direct will of citizens. This could discourage presidents from adopting authoritarian conduct or from taking decisions contrary to the interests of the people. Second, the proposed change could reduce the risk of the presidency being seen as an almost untouchable office, increasing the leader's accountability to the electorate. At the same time, by setting a threshold of at least 100,000 citizens from a quarter of the counties, abuses are avoided and it is ensured that only undertakings with substantial support can trigger a referendum.

In conclusion, the revision of Article 97(2) of the Constitution is a measure responding to the requirements of a dynamic society and an active citizenry. It is a recognition of the fact that, in a healthy democracy, ultimate power must remain in the hands of the people and that political leaders must remain in their service. This constitutional amendment proposes not merely a technical simplification but an evolution of the political system, a necessary adaptation to the present context in which civic dialogue and citizen participation are more important than ever.

From all of the above it may be inferred that the amendment of Article 97(2) is not only necessary but beneficial to the strengthening of the democratic structure of the Romanian State. The essence of democracy lies in the capacity of the system to reform itself and to adapt to the will of its citizens.

A Constitution is not a static document but a living one, which must breathe in unison with the aspirations and needs of the people it serves. Adjusting the mechanisms of check and balance, such as the one proposed for the removal of the President, is a necessary step to ensure that these aspirations are not merely heard but also fulfilled. The transformation proposed by Article 97(2) underlines the importance of the adaptability and constant evolution of the constitutional framework in the face of societal change. It is a recognition of the fact that democracy is not merely a system of government but a continuing process of perfecting and improving the relationship between State and citizens. It is therefore essential that this process of revision be inclusive and transparent, actively involving civil society, political parties, constitutional experts and, most importantly, ordinary citizens. Public debates, consultations and information campaigns should be the pillars on which this revision is built, ensuring that every voice is heard and that the final decision reflects the collective will of the nation. The revision of Article 97(2) must therefore be regarded not as a mere legislative amendment but as a cornerstone for the consolidation of participatory democracy in Romania. It symbolises the commitment to the principles of transparency, accountability and civic involvement.

Ultimately, this is a victory not only for the ordinary citizen but for the whole democratic edifice. Introducing this revision into the Constitution of Romania will open the way to other necessary reforms capable of bringing the political system still closer to citizens. It is a promise that the Romanian State is willing to evolve and to adapt to the requirements of the times in which we live — to be a modern State in which every citizen counts and has the power to change things.

The revision of Article 97(2) is therefore a necessity in an age in which democracy must manifest itself actively and perfect itself. It reflects the spirit of a responsible citizenry, eager to take part in consolidating the foundations of the rule of law and in improving governance.

In addition, the impact of technology and digitalisation in this context must not be overlooked. The possibility of collecting signatures online in order to initiate a referendum is a reflection of the digital age in which we live. This could simplify the process of civic participation and encourage greater involvement on the part of citizens, especially young people, who are more inclined to use digital tools.

In conclusion, the proposed amendment brings the concept of direct democracy to the fore and extends the scope of citizens' action in political processes. It is a step towards a more democratic Romania, in which every individual has not only the right but also the capacity to influence the decisions that shape his future. The debates that will follow around this constitutional revision will test the maturity of civic dialogue in Romania and will provide a barometer of the commitment to democratic and participatory values.

For all these reasons, the revision of Article 97(2) appears not only as a necessity but also as an opportunity to strengthen the foundations of the rule of law and to promote a form of governance that respects and values the active participation of citizens in political life. It is an open invitation to every citizen to take part in sculpting Romania's democratic future — a future in which power is truly in the hands of the people.

27. Article 103(1) is amended to read as follows: → the text of the article

"The President of Romania shall propose for the approval of Parliament the candidate designated for the office of Prime Minister by the party or alliance of parties holding the majority in Parliament. Where that candidate does not obtain Parliament's vote of confidence, the President shall designate another candidate after consulting the parties represented in Parliament."

Article 103(1), headed "Investiture", reads, until the entry into force of the present revision, as follows: "The President of Romania shall designate a candidate for the office of Prime Minister, after consulting the party holding an absolute majority in Parliament or, if there is no such majority, the parties represented in Parliament." This insufficiently clear wording left the President free to nominate prime ministers according to his own will and to an agenda that was in most cases foreign to the electorate, various Presidents appointing to the head of the executive persons from parties that had not obtained the majority of the votes of Romanian electors. In this way artificial parliamentary majorities were repeatedly imposed, resulting in disastrous governments. Not least, this lacunary wording of the constitutional text left those holding the office of President free to transform that office from one of mediator among the powers of the State and representative of the State (under Article 80 of the Constitution) into one of player within the executive power, distorting the balance among the powers of the Romanian State.

For these reasons, the present amendment of paragraph 1 requires the President to propose for the approval of Parliament "the candidate designated for the office of Prime Minister by the party or alliance of parties holding the majority in Parliament", and not a person designated at his own discretion.

Only where the person designated by the party or alliance of parties that obtained the largest number of votes fails to obtain Parliament's vote of investiture may the President propose a person chosen by him "after consulting the parties represented in Parliament".

In this way the Constitution as it will stand after revision by the present draft will restore the will of the electorate to the pre-eminent position it must have in a democracy, and the President will return to his fundamental functions: representative of the State and mediator among the powers of the State.

The proposed revision not only restores the balance of powers within the State but also consolidates the democratic principle of government, ensuring that the choice of Prime Minister reflects the will of the people expressed by the vote. This constitutional amendment is essential in order to avoid situations in which a minority party can control the government through a presidential nomination, to the detriment of the party or alliance that won the majority of the suffrage.

Democracy presupposes that decisions be taken by the majority chosen by the people, and this amendment to Article 103 serves to fortify that fundamental pillar. It is a further guarantee that the government will reflect the political orientation for which citizens voted, thereby consolidating confidence in democratic mechanisms and in the fairness of the process of forming the executive.

In addition, the revision of the text of Article 103 of the Constitution underlines the role and importance of Parliament in the process of investing the Government, thereby consolidating the principle of the separation of powers within the State and that of national sovereignty. This amendment prevents any attempt to concentrate power in the hands of a single entity or person and ensures that the executive is truly an extension of the legislative will — that is, of the popular will expressed through elected representatives.

A further argument in favour of this revision is that it prevents the formation of unstable and ephemeral governments resulting from obscure negotiations or circumstantial alliances not desired by the electorate. This amendment secures greater coherence and stability in government policy, and

political parties will have to take more seriously the platforms and promises made during the electoral campaign, given that voters will see their interests represented directly through the majority party or governing alliance.

The role and responsibility of the President in the process of designating the Prime Minister thus become clearer and more limited, contributing to a more robust and transparent democracy. This revision of Article 103 of the Constitution is also a step forward towards accountable governance, in which citizens can exercise their rights and make their voices heard more effectively and more concretely.

In conclusion, the revision of Article 103(1) is a necessity in order to align Romanian legislation with the standards of consolidated democracies, where the choice of government is transparent and directly correlated with the will of the people. This constitutional change will contribute to political stability and will reduce the possibility of political manoeuvres deviating from the clear mandate conferred by citizens through the vote. It is an essential step in ensuring that the leaders chosen and the policies implemented are genuinely in the service of the people, faithfully reflecting their political choices and securing a truly representative government.

Through this revision the foundation on which any democracy is built is strengthened: the sovereignty of the people and respect for their will. It is a natural and necessary development in the maturing of the democratic process in Romania, which will bring long-term benefits both to the quality of governance and to the consolidation of citizens' confidence in the institutions of the State. The revision of Article 103(1) is therefore not merely a requirement of the moment but an investment in Romania's democratic future, ensuring that every vote counts and that every voice is heard in political decision-making.

Finally, it is important to emphasise that this constitutional reform must not be regarded as an end in itself but as a means of attaining more effective and more legitimate governance. It must be accompanied by other measures supporting transparency, accountability and integrity in public administration. All of these, together with the revision of Article 103, will contribute to consolidating democracy and to increasing public confidence in the political system and in its representatives. The proposed change is therefore an essential step in Romania's democratic evolution — a step that will help build a fairer, more transparent and more representative society for all its citizens.

Expectations are high, and the constitutional revision under discussion is the appropriate response to citizens' demands for better governance. The time has come for the voice of the people to be not merely heard but decisive in the process of forming the government. In this way Romania can progress towards a mature democracy in which every political decision is firmly anchored in the will of citizens and in the sovereignty of the Romanian people, in the spirit of the country's fundamental law.

28. Paragraphs 2 and 3 of Article 108 are amended to read as follows: → the text of the article

"(2) Decisions shall be issued for the organisation of the execution of laws. Government decisions may not amend or add to the content of the primary rule ordering their issue.

(3) Ordinances shall be issued pursuant to a special enabling law, within the limits and under the conditions laid down therein, and may regulate exclusively in the field reserved to ordinary laws."

Paragraphs 2 and 3 of Article 108, headed "Acts of the Government", introduce necessary clarifications, reinforcing certain limitations implicit in the text prior to revision as regards the Government's

power to issue decisions and ordinances. Having regard in particular to the experience of the years 2020–2022, in which Romania was governed by the executive through Decisions and Ordinances, an important point in the present draft revision is the limitation of any possibility of governing through acts that circumvent or delay parliamentary scrutiny.

For these reasons, an important clarification and limitation has been added to the text of paragraph 2 (which before the present revision read "Decisions shall be issued for the organisation of the execution of laws."): "Government decisions may not amend or add to the content of the primary rule ordering their issue." This clarification, although apparently superfluous and implicit in a constitutional state of legality, became necessary after the experience of 2020–2021, when by Government Decisions the Government established and extended states of alert and "laid down the measures applicable throughout their duration for preventing and combating the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic" — measures restricting rights and freedoms that were nowhere mentioned in the law ordering the issue of the decision.

For the same reasons, the text of Article 108(3) (reading "Ordinances shall be issued pursuant to a special enabling law, within the limits and under the conditions laid down therein.") is likewise supplemented by the important statement that they "may regulate exclusively in the field reserved to ordinary laws".

The aim is thereby to limit the Government's ability to regulate by government ordinance in essential fields reserved to organic laws, as enumerated in Article 73(3).

The present revisions of the constitutional text are such as to protect the fundamental rights of the citizen against any possible abuse by the executive and are at the same time fundamental means of strengthening the role of Parliament as "the supreme representative body of the Romanian people and the sole legislative authority of the country", as provided in Article 61 of the Constitution.

Likewise, through the revision of Article 108 of the Constitution, a better separation of powers within the State is sought, in the spirit of democratic principles and of the rule of law. In this context it is essential to clarify the role of the Government as an executive entity, which must not arrogate to itself legislative powers that would undermine the authority of Parliament and the constitutional balance.

It is evident that in the past the excessive use of government decisions and emergency ordinances created a worrying precedent. Crisis situations or extraordinary circumstances should not become a pretext for the unjustified extension of executive power. The proposed revision of Article 108 therefore establishes a more rigorous framework and limits the use of these legislative instruments to genuinely exceptional situations, in accordance with a special enabling law and in strict compliance with the fields reserved to ordinary laws.

In addition, this revision initiative responds to the demands of civil society, which has expressed concern at possible excesses in the exercise of executive power. By implementing these amendments the aim is to increase transparency and accountability in governance and to secure more effective parliamentary scrutiny.

A further relevant aspect is that the revision of the articles mentioned may have positive effects on the quality of legislation. By limiting the Government's ability to intervene through decisions and ordinances in fields that ought to be regulated by laws adopted by Parliament, more stable and predictable legislation is promoted. The revision could thus help reduce the number of temporary rules and increase parliamentary involvement in the legislative process, while at the same time ensuring that laws reflect the will and needs of citizens.

In conclusion, the revision of Article 108(2) and (3) of the Constitution represents an important step in fortifying the rule of law and consolidating Romanian democracy. Through these amendments it is ensured that Parliament's legislative role remains paramount and that the Government acts within the limits of its executive authority, in strict conformity with the law and with the principles of the separation of powers within the State.

The proposed constitutional revision is not merely a reaction to the challenges of the past but also a prudent anticipation of the future. It reaffirms Romania's commitment to democratic values and to the protection of the rights of its citizens, ensuring that any exceptional measures remain under the strict control of the legislative framework. The revision of Article 108 is thus an act of institutional responsibility and a clear signal that the rule of law cannot be compromised, even in troubled times.

Through these changes Romania aligns itself with international standards and with good democratic practice, providing an example of constitutional maturity and of respect for the fundamental principles of a democratic State. The revision of Article 108 thereby becomes a pillar for the consolidation of an equitable legal system in which governance is carried out with full respect for the sovereignty of the people and for the rules of the rule of law.

In closing, it is imperative to recognise that this revision not only responds to a present need but also prepares the ground for a future in which government by ordinance and decision is a strictly regulated exception rather than the norm. This will contribute to greater legislative stability and to consolidating citizens' confidence in the institutions of the State.

The proposed revision has the potential to restore the balance among the powers of the State and to strengthen the mechanisms of democratic control, which are essential in a society that wishes to prosper in respect for the law and for human rights.

29. Paragraphs 3, 5 and 6 of Article 115 are amended to read as follows: → the text of the article

"(3) Ordinances shall be submitted for the approval of Parliament, in accordance with the legislative procedure, before the expiry of the enabling period. Failure to observe that period entails the cessation of the effects of the ordinance. (...)

(5) An emergency ordinance shall enter into force only after it has been submitted for debate under the emergency procedure to the Chamber having jurisdiction to be notified and after its publication in the Official Gazette of Romania. The Chambers, if not in session, shall be convened as a matter of obligation within 5 days of the submission or, as the case may be, of the referral. The Chamber notified shall rule on the ordinance as a matter of urgency, the ordinance then being sent to the other Chamber, which likewise decides under the emergency procedure. An emergency ordinance containing rules of the nature of an organic law shall be approved by the majority provided for in Article 76(1). Failure to observe the time-limit entails the cessation of the effects of the emergency ordinance. If, within no more than 90 days of its adoption by the first Chamber notified, the deciding Chamber has not ruled on the emergency ordinance, it shall be deemed rejected.

(6) Emergency ordinances may not be adopted in the field of constitutional laws, may not affect the regime of the fundamental institutions of the State, the rights, freedoms and duties laid down by the Constitution, or electoral rights, and may not concern measures for the compulsory transfer of goods into public ownership or for the winding up, alienation or concession of goods in public ownership."

The Constitution of Romania, adopted in 1991 and subsequently revised in 2003, is the legal foundation of the rule of law, being the supreme law of the country. When it comes to amending it, therefore, every article and every paragraph must be analysed with the greatest rigour and responsibility.

In that context, the proposed revision of Article 115 concerning ordinances and emergency ordinances issued by the Government entails significant changes as regards secondary legislation and parliamentary control over normative acts issued by the executive.

One of the most controversial aspects addressed by Article 115 in its present form is the process of issuing and approving emergency ordinances. These instruments, intended to enable the Government to react swiftly in situations that admit of no delay, have often been criticised as capable of being used excessively or for purposes going beyond the framework of a genuine emergency.

The proposed revision brings to light the need for stricter parliamentary control and for a clear framework limiting the risk of abuse in the use of emergency ordinances. The amendments to Article 115(3), (5) and (6) are designed to strengthen the role of Parliament and to ensure that any emergency measure adopted by the Government enters into force only after an adequate assessment and a parliamentary debate under the emergency procedure, as well as after publication in the Official Gazette. This is vital for the transparency of the legislative process and for the accountability of the executive to the elected representatives of the people.

Paragraph (3) brings to the fore the requirement that ordinances be approved by Parliament within a well-defined period. This is a guarantee that these legislative instruments are temporary and cannot replace the essential role of the permanent legislature. Where Parliament fails to rule within the period laid down, the ordinance loses its effect, which prevents possible "legislation by ordinance" for an unlimited period.

As regards paragraph (5), it reiterates the need for democratic control over emergency ordinances. In addition, setting a period of 90 days for the deciding Chamber to rule on an emergency ordinance underlines the importance of prompt and effective legislative action. That period limits the interval of legal uncertainty and ensures that the provisions of the ordinance do not become part of national legislation without adequate parliamentary scrutiny. In the absence of a decision within that interval, the emergency ordinance is deemed rejected, which represents a balance between the executive's need to act swiftly and legislative supremacy in a State governed by the rule of law.

Paragraph (6) is an additional safeguard, establishing fields in which emergency ordinances may not be adopted. By prohibiting the use of this instrument in sensitive matters, such as those relating to constitutional laws or fundamental rights, the protection of the basic structure of the State and of democratic values is secured. This avoids the risk of fundamental rights and freedoms being amended or restricted without an adequate legislative process and without a full parliamentary debate allowing citizens and the various political forces to take part in the formation of the legislative will.

In conclusion, the revision of Article 115 of the Constitution of Romania proposes a series of measures consolidating the principles of the rule of law and of democracy by: strengthening Parliament's role of control over normative acts issued by the Government, clarifying the emergency legislative procedure and limiting the fields in which emergency ordinances may be issued. These amendments contribute to a better balance of powers within the State and to guaranteeing that any governmental action is exercised in full conformity with the country's fundamental law and with the respect due to civic rights and freedoms. The revision proposed for Article 115 is consistent with European democratic trends, which emphasise the importance of the supremacy of parliamentary legislation and of limiting the executive's power to govern by decree. A healthy balance is thereby secured

between the Government's need for flexibility and responsiveness and the essential principle of the rule of law, namely that all the powers of the State are limited by law and accountable to the representatives of the people.

30. After Article 116(2) there is added a new paragraph (3), reading as follows: → the text of the article

"(3) Appointed public offices, or offices and capacities filled by direct designation for which no competition is held, may be held for a term of no more than 4 years, renewable once only, unless another duration of the term or number of terms is provided for by this Constitution."

In the present socio-political context, a lively discussion has begun to take shape around the mechanisms of appointment to public office, pointing to the need to revise the Constitution of Romania, and in particular the text of Article 116. This need for legislative updating responds to demands for transparency and efficiency in public administration and to the democratic aspirations of society.

We emphasise that Article 116 governs the legal regime of public officials, with an emphasis on the manner of appointment to and exercise of public office. In its present form, the article contains no clear limits as regards the duration of terms or the number of their renewals for appointed offices, which may generate stagnation and a lack of dynamism in the administration.

The proposed revision, expressed through the addition of paragraph (3) to Article 116, provides a solution to this problem. By introducing a term of no more than 4 years, renewable once only, the aim is to increase the accountability and performance of public officials through the perspective of a well-defined time horizon. This change could secure a better adaptation of the administration to rapid changes in society and the economy. Limiting the number of terms is consistent with democratic practice in many other countries, where executive or administrative offices are periodically subject to a process of renewal. This not only stimulates healthy competition to achieve results but also provides the opportunity to bring new perspectives and innovative ideas into the system. It can thereby help avoid the accumulation of power in the hands of a single person over a long period, which could reduce the risks of corruption and nepotism.

It should be noted that, although the limitation of terms may appear a constraint, it in fact encourages strategic planning and long-term vision. Public officials will thereby be encouraged to implement effective public policies and to attain the objectives set within a more concentrated period, thus increasing administrative output. On the other hand, critics of this revision may argue that limiting terms could lead to a loss of expertise and a deficit of continuity in public administration. They maintain that the experience accumulated by public officials over long terms is valuable and contributes to the stability and predictability of administrative processes. It is essential to recognise, however, that in a continually changing environment adaptability and innovation are equally vital. The renewal of energies and ideas can counteract the risk of stagnation and bring fresh air into the administration.

In addition, introducing a system of limited terms could encourage more qualified persons to take part in public administration, knowing that there is a clear time horizon for each role. This could increase the diversity and quality of candidates, promoting merit and competence as the principal criteria for selection to public office. In conclusion, the proposed revision of Article 116 of the Constitution of Romania through the addition of paragraph (3) represents an important step towards a more accountable and better-performing public administration. Limiting terms to a maximum of 4

years, with the possibility of a single renewal, is a measure that can help prevent stagnation in the administration and promote fresh and dynamic management.

In conclusion, revising Article 116 of the Constitution of Romania so as to include a paragraph limiting the duration of terms in appointed public office, renewable once only, is a necessary step towards a dynamic and accountable public administration. Limiting terms helps prevent the concentration of power, stimulates innovation and secures a constant updating of administrative competences. This proposed revision has the potential to transform public administration, making it more adaptable and more open to the changes occurring in society. By stimulating performance and accountability we ensure that public structures not only respond to citizens' needs but do so efficiently and transparently.

31. Paragraphs 4 and 5 of Article 118 are amended to read as follows: → the text of the article

"(4) The intelligence services and those assimilated to them shall be organised exclusively as civilian bodies, under the conditions laid down by law. The organisation of military or paramilitary activities outside a State authority is prohibited.

(5) In peacetime, foreign troops may enter, be stationed in, conduct operations on or pass through the territory of Romania only with the prior consent of Parliament and under the conditions laid down by law or by the international treaties to which Romania is a party."

Starting from the premise that democracy and national security are two fundamental pillars underlying any State governed by the rule of law, the revision of the text of Article 118 of the Constitution of Romania, concerning the organisation of the intelligence services and the status of foreign troops on national territory, becomes not merely a necessity but also a manifestation of the adaptation of legislation to contemporary security realities.

Paragraphs 4 and 5 of Article 118 are proposed to be amended so as to reflect more clearly the principles of a civilian State and to secure strengthened parliamentary control over the presence of foreign forces on the territory of Romania. Through this revision the aim is to strengthen the legal framework governing national security and to align with international standards in the field.

It is essential to understand the context and importance of Article 118 within the structure of the Constitution: before the revision this article concerned "The armed forces" — that being its marginal heading — whereas after the revision it also governs the organisation and functioning of the intelligence services and the regime of foreign troops on the country's territory. In its present form, the constitutional provisions leave room for a certain ambiguity and do not offer the guarantees necessary for effective democratic supervision of these sensitive fields.

The proposed revision of paragraph (4) brings to the fore the need for a civilian intelligence structure, thereby avoiding the militarisation of the intelligence services. This change is motivated by the global trend towards separating intelligence activities from military ones (within NATO, Romania is the only member with exclusively militarised intelligence structures), in order to secure transparency and accountability before the civil authorities and citizens.

Organising the intelligence services as an exclusively civilian system, as provided by the revised constitutional text, helps consolidate public trust and prevent the abuses that could arise in the context of structures with a military profile.

The change proposed for paragraph (5) underlines the role of Parliament as the principal guarantor of national sovereignty as regards the presence of foreign troops on the territory of Romania. This

provision consolidates the democratic principle that decisions of such gravity must be taken with full transparency and in complete agreement with the elected representatives of the people. In addition, making the stationing, operations or transit of foreign troops conditional upon the prior consent of Parliament and upon compliance with national laws or international treaties ensures rigorous oversight and conformity with Romania's international commitments. This proposed regulatory framework provides a balance between the need to secure national security and respect for the sovereignty of the State in international relations.

In a dynamic geopolitical landscape, in which cross-border threats and shifts in the balance of power are ever more frequent, it is imperative that national legislation be adaptable and provide adequate responses. At the same time, the revised text of Article 118 is consistent with democratic values and with the standards of international law. Through these changes Romania reaffirms its commitment to the principles of the rule of law and strengthens its capacity to meet present and future security challenges.

It should be noted that the revision of Article 118 is not an isolated act but forms part of a broader process of modernising the Constitution. This undertaking seeks to consolidate democratic institutions and to secure the protection of fundamental rights and freedoms in keeping with the dynamics of social and political change.

In conclusion, the revision of Article 118(4) and (5) of the Constitution of Romania is a vital stage in consolidating the legal framework for national security. It reflects a modern vision of the role of the intelligence services and of international relations, promoting a civilian, transparent and accountable approach. Through these adjustments the alignment of national legislation with international standards is secured and an effective response is given to the specific challenges of the twenty-first century.

32. After Article 118(5) there is added paragraph 6, reading as follows: → the text of the article

"(6) In peacetime, the national defence budget may not exceed 2% of the national budget of the year concerned."

In recent years, discussions on budgetary allocations for defence have become a burning subject on the political and social agenda. In the context of these debates, the proposed revision of Article 118 of the Constitution through the addition of a new paragraph limiting the national defence budget to 2% in peacetime forms part of a broader current of reassessment of military spending worldwide. The reasons are manifold and complex, beginning with the need for a balance between national security and fiscal responsibility and extending to international pressures for limiting the arms race and promoting peace. A second reason concerns the efficiency of budgetary allocations.

Imposing a ceiling of 2% of the national budget will encourage more prudent and more strategic management of resources, obliging the responsible institutions to prioritise and optimise expenditure. A further argument supporting the revision is the need to secure sufficient funds for other vital fields such as health, education and infrastructure. In a rapidly changing world, investment in these sectors may be as crucial to national security as military defence itself. We must also analyse the social impact of such a measure, since account must be taken of the influence the defence budget has on society as a whole. Financial resources are limited, and every decision on budgetary allocations directly reflects a nation's priorities. Establishing a maximum threshold for the defence budget therefore responds to a requirement of social equity, allowing funds to be redistributed to social programmes with a direct impact on citizens' quality of life. Moreover, a defence budget not exceeding 2% of the national budget will have positive effects on the country's international image, all the

more so since it falls within the contribution suggested as necessary for loyal partnership within the military alliances to which Romania belongs — which is why fears that restricting the defence budget could impede the continued development and modernisation of the armed forces, or the capacity to respond effectively to cybersecurity challenges and to other new forms of aggression, are unfounded.

Limiting military expenditure in peacetime conveys a message of peace and stability, of confidence in international security mechanisms and of commitment to resolving conflicts by diplomatic and economic means rather than by military force. In an era in which "hard power" tends to prevail over "soft power", such a policy can help consolidate the country's role on the international stage as a responsible and peaceable actor.

In conclusion, the revision of Article 118 of the Constitution so as to include a ceiling of 2% of the national budget of the year concerned for national defence in peacetime is a pertinent, useful measure whose implementation is immediately necessary.

33. After Article 119(1) there is inserted a new paragraph (2), reading as follows: → the text of the article

"(2) The Supreme Council of National Defence shall include as of right the President, the Prime Minister, the presidents of the two Chambers of Parliament, the Minister of Defence, the Minister of Justice and the heads of the intelligence services. The heads of the intelligence services shall be designated for a period of 4 years in joint sitting of Parliament."

The revision inserts a new paragraph into Article 119 of the Constitution after paragraph 1. That paragraph provides a clear and defined structure for the Supreme Council of National Defence (CSAT), including the designation of the heads of the intelligence services for a four-year term in a joint sitting of Parliament. This proposed revision has significant implications for democratic control over the intelligence services and for consolidating transparency within the mechanisms of national security.

The initiative for the revision of the Constitution starts from the observation that we live in an age in which threats to national security are ever more complex and require effective coordination among the various branches of State power. A well-defined structure of the CSAT, with members holding fixed terms, can therefore contribute to greater stability and predictability in strategic decision-making.

Likewise, Parliament's involvement in designating the heads of the intelligence services adds a further layer of supervision and accountability. This means that the decisions taken within the CSAT will reflect the representative will of citizens, translating not only into a legitimation of the leadership positions but also into a guarantee that the persons selected are the best suited to serve the national interest. The conditions are thereby created for a better alignment of the intelligence services with the principles of the rule of law and with fundamental democratic values.

In addition, establishing a fixed four-year term for the heads of the intelligence services facilitates a cycle of planning and evaluation capable of making the work of these institutions more efficient. With a clear time horizon, medium-term objectives can be set and progress towards them monitored. This not only improves the performance of the intelligence services but also secures greater transparency before the population and its elected representatives. A fixed term, as opposed to one designated ad hoc or at the discretion of a single official, encourages accountability and reduces the risk of abuses of power or of inappropriate political influence.

Critics might argue that such a change could make the structure of the CSAT rigid and could lead to a politicisation of the intelligence services. It is essential to emphasise, however, that the designation of the heads by Parliament, through a transparent and open vote, secures a democratic process of selection which not only confers legitimacy but also facilitates balance and control among the powers of the State. There must undoubtedly be adequate mechanisms of check and balance to prevent any departure from democratic norms.

In conclusion, the revision of Article 119 of the Constitution of Romania through the insertion of a new paragraph governing the composition and manner of designation of the members of the Supreme Council of National Defence is a step forward towards consolidating democracy and civic oversight of key State institutions. This constitutional amendment has the potential to secure greater coherence in national security policy, to increase effectiveness in countering threats and ultimately to protect civic values and freedoms in the face of new global challenges.

The revision of Article 119 is not merely a matter of legislative procedure but a manifestation of the collective will to adapt the structures of the State to the realities of the twenty-first century.

As we strive to consolidate our democracy and to protect the values on which our society is founded, it is essential to reflect on the way in which the structures of power and responsibility are organised and regulated. This constitutional revision is an example of how legislation can evolve to meet present needs, securing effective and accountable governance. In that context it is important to recognise the vital role of an adaptable Constitution capable of responding dynamically to social and political transformation.

The revision of Article 119 thus becomes not only an immediate necessity but also an opportunity to reaffirm our nation's commitment to the basic principles of an open and transparent society. This act of constitutional reform may serve as a catalyst for a series of institutional improvements fortifying the rule of law and promoting a public administration in the service of the citizen.

To conclude, the insertion of paragraph (2) into Article 119 of the Constitution is a significant step towards strengthening Romania's democratic foundations. In a world in which the balance of powers and civic oversight are more important than ever, this revision could become a model to follow in consolidating the independence and transparency of State institutions. By increasing Parliament's role in the process of appointing the heads of the intelligence services, it is ensured that these vital entities function in accordance with the will of the people and under the direct supervision of its representatives.

34. After Article 120(2) there are inserted four new paragraphs, (3) to (6), reading as follows: → the text of the article

(3) The presidents of county councils, the mayor of the Municipality of Bucharest and the mayors of its districts, and the mayors of municipalities, towns and communes shall be elected by universal, equal, direct, secret and freely expressed suffrage for a term of four years, renewable once only.

(4) The candidate who has obtained, in the first round of voting, the majority of the votes of the electors shall be declared elected.

(5) Where none of the candidates has obtained that majority, a second round of voting shall be organised between the first two candidates in the order of the number of votes obtained in the first round. The candidate who has obtained the greatest number of votes shall be declared elected.

(6) The presidents of county councils, the mayor of the Municipality of Bucharest and the mayors of its districts, the mayors of municipalities, towns and communes, as well as county, general and local

councillors, may be removed from office by a referendum convened by a number of citizens equal to at least 20% of the citizens who voted for them. The signatures for convening the referendum may also be collected online, citizens being able to sign with any form of digital signature recognised by law. A referendum for the removal of local elected representatives may not be organised in the last 6 months of the term of office. The local elected representative is removed if one half plus one of those taking part in the referendum vote in favour of removal, irrespective of the turnout quorum."

The revision of the Constitution of Romania is a subject of crucial importance for strengthening democracy and for aligning national legislation with European standards. In that context, the proposed revision of Article 120 raises key mechanisms concerning the election and removal of local authorities — a process that must reflect the competence, wish and choice of citizens. In order better to understand the proposed amendments, let us examine the present rules and compare them with those introduced by paragraphs (3) to (6). At present, Article 120(2) of the Constitution of Romania provides that "The Government shall appoint a prefect in each county and in the municipality of Bucharest." The prefect is the Government's representative at local level and supervises the application of laws and government ordinances. The proposals for revision introduced by paragraphs (3) to (6), by contrast, seek a deeper democratisation of the process of electing local authorities.

Let us begin with paragraph (3), which proposes that the presidents of county councils and the mayors, including the mayor of the Municipality of Bucharest and those of its districts, be elected by universal, equal, direct, secret and freely expressed suffrage. This change could secure greater legitimacy and enhanced representativeness of the will of citizens, since the present Constitution does not expressly specify the mechanism for electing these offices. Paragraph (3) also proposes limiting the possibility of re-election of presidents of county councils and mayors to a single further term. This measure could prevent the perpetuation of power in the hands of a single individual and encourages a more active circulation of the political elite. For example, in France mayors may serve an unlimited number of terms, which can lead to political stagnation. In Germany, by contrast, the mayors of large cities are often limited to a maximum of two consecutive terms, thereby promoting change and innovation in local administration.

Paragraph (4) adds an important clarification: the candidate who obtains the majority of the votes in the first round is declared elected. This means that, unlike the present system, in which election to office is possible after a single round of voting with a relative majority of votes that may represent the interests of a minority of the community, the revision would introduce a more decisive electoral process representing the will of the majority of the citizens who cast their vote. The aim of this change is to consolidate a strong and clear mandate for those who will lead the local administrations.

Paragraph (5) provides a solution for situations in which no candidate obtains a majority in the first round of voting: a second round between the two most-voted candidates. It is thereby ensured that the local elected representative will have the support of a relative majority of the electors — a fundamental principle in a representative democracy — unlike the present system, which makes no provision for a second round in local elections.

Paragraph (6) introduces the possibility of removing local authorities by referendum initiated by citizens. This proposed revision places an additional democratic instrument in the hands of the electorate, allowing them to withdraw the confidence granted if elected representatives fail to discharge their mandate satisfactorily. In contrast to the present situation, in which removal is possible only through more rigid legal or political procedures, this mechanism could increase the direct accountability of elected representatives to their electors.

In order to place these changes in a broader context, it is useful to compare them with the constitutional systems of other European countries.

For example, in France local elections are held in two rounds, similarly to the proposal in paragraph (5). In Germany, mayors and council presidents are likewise elected by direct vote of citizens, which reflects the democratic principle of direct election proposed in paragraph (3). As regards removal by referendum, this is a practice found in some countries, such as Slovenia, where electors have the right to initiate referendums for the recall of mayors. The proposals for revising Article 120 of the Constitution of Romania therefore appear to be consistent with democratic trends in other Member States of the European Union. These amendments could help consolidate the local democratic process and increase citizens' confidence in elected authorities. It is essential that any constitutional revision be examined carefully and debated transparently, so as to ensure that the changes reflect the will of the people and consolidate the rule of law.

Another aspect deserving attention is the manner of collecting the signatures needed to trigger the referendum, which represents an important step towards the real democratisation of Romanian society. With present-day technology and the trend towards digitalising processes, online methods of collecting signatures, as provided for in paragraph (6), can facilitate citizens' participation and make the process more accessible, especially for younger generations, serving for them as a catalyst for active involvement in the life of the polis.

In conclusion, the revision of Article 120 of the Constitution of Romania as proposed could represent an important step towards local governance that is more accountable and closer to citizens. By implementing this revision, Romania would align its democratic practice with that of other European States and would provide a stronger guarantee of civic involvement in local administration. At the same time, it is vital to ensure that these changes are accompanied by civic-education campaigns and by the development of a political culture promoting the active and informed participation of citizens in democratic life.

35. Article 124(3) is amended to read as follows: → the text of the article

"(3) Judges are exclusively Romanian citizens, are independent and are subject only to the law. Any administrative provision serves to ensure the functioning of the judicial system without affecting the adjudicative activity carried out by judges."

The revision of Article 124(3) of the Constitution of Romania mentioned above replaces the earlier wording "Judges are independent and are subject only to the law", which was judged too laconic in the light of developments in the sphere of justice in recent years and of the prospects of possible further developments of this essential social function. It has been amended to read: "Judges are exclusively Romanian citizens, are independent and are subject only to the law. Any administrative provision serves to ensure the functioning of the judicial system without affecting the adjudicative activity carried out by judges."

In its new wording, this paragraph underlines the consolidation of the independence of the judicial system and the need for judges to remain free from the influence of any external factors, whether political or administrative.

Why is this revision essential?

First, in the light of political developments in the structures and alliances to which Romania belongs, and anticipating the dramatic technological progress of the coming years, the revised paragraph

begins by providing that "Judges are exclusively Romanian citizens…", which makes it impossible for citizens of third countries with which we are or will be in various political, State or military alliances to accede to that office, and which likewise establishes that the judge is and will be first of all a human being and then a Romanian citizen — making it impossible to "outsource" the administration of justice to non-human entities endowed with artificial intelligence or any subsequent developments thereof.

Second, it must be understood that the independence of the judiciary is a central pillar of any consolidated democracy. Without it, the balance among the powers of the State — a principle underlying the rule of law — would be gravely affected.

The proposed revision seeks to strengthen that principle and to ensure that judges can function without external pressure, thereby guaranteeing a fair trial for all citizens. It is essential to bear in mind that, although administrative provisions are necessary for the proper functioning of the judicial system, they must be conceived and applied in a manner that does not interfere with the independence of judges and with the adjudicative process itself.

Any unjustified interference in the administration of justice not only undermines public confidence in the judicial system but may also lead to judicial errors with grave consequences for individual lives and for society as a whole.

What does the independence of judges actually mean? It means that their decisions must be taken without any form of influence, pressure or threat, whatever its source.

In addition, the independence of judges presupposes a degree of autonomy in administering the resources necessary for the proper functioning of the courts. The proposed revision therefore serves to clarify and reinforce these aspects, contributing to the consolidation of public confidence in the justice system and to the promotion of a perception of impartiality and equity. It is important to note that the amendment in question is not an isolated one but must form part of a broader context of judicial reform. Those reforms are intended to bring improvements in the efficiency, accessibility and transparency of justice, thereby contributing to the strengthening of the rule of law. At the same time, we must acknowledge the challenges facing the judicial system in a continually changing world. The revision of the constitutional text must therefore be accompanied by measures securing the adaptability and capacity of the system to respond to the new types of litigation and legal challenges of the twenty-first century.

This presupposes a rigorous view of the role of justice in society and a recognition that the revision of Article 124(3) of the Constitution is not merely a matter of textual updating but of reaffirming a commitment to the fundamental principles of justice and hence to the citizen.

In conclusion, the revision of Article 124(3) of the Constitution of Romania is not merely a legal necessity but also a democratic requirement. This undertaking is vital in order to ensure that justice in Romania remains a strong, independent institution adapted to the challenges of our time. Through this revision we assume the responsibility of protecting citizens' rights and freedoms and of maintaining their confidence in an equitable and effective judicial system.

36. After Article 124(3) there are inserted two new paragraphs, 4 and 5, reading as follows: → the text of the article

"(4) Judges may not be operational agents, including undercover agents, informants or collaborators of any national or international intelligence service. Judges who held such capacities before their appointment shall be removed from office.

(5) Serving judges may not be members of occult, secret or discreet associations and societies. Serving judges may be members exclusively of professional associations, and the activity carried out must relate to the field of justice."

The two proposed additions to the text of Article 124, paragraphs (4) and (5), seek to clarify and delimit the status of judges in relation to the intelligence services and to membership of associations or societies. → the text of the article

Paragraph (4) provides that judges may not be operational agents, undercover agents, informants or collaborators of the intelligence services, whether national or international. It further provides that judges who held such capacities before their appointment shall be removed from office.

This clarification is essential in order to avoid conflicts of interest and to ensure that decisions in justice are taken exclusively on the basis of the evidence and the law, without hidden influences or loyalties capable of affecting impartiality. It is an important step in consolidating the independence of justice and in increasing transparency in this vital field of the rule of law.

Paragraph (5) goes further in the same direction, prohibiting members of the judiciary from belonging to occult, secret or discreet associations and societies. This provision seeks to eliminate the possibility of judges' decisions being influenced by membership of such groups, which may have their own agendas and interests. By permitting membership exclusively of professional associations focused on justice, the aim is to guarantee that judges' activity is devoted entirely to public service and to the basic principles of the judicial system. The idea that judges must remain pillars of impartiality and equity, unaltered by external influences or commitments capable of impairing their independence and objectivity, is thereby consolidated.

These proposed new paragraphs clarify and reinforce the vision of the role and integrity of judges within the rule of law. They reflect a deep understanding of the consequences that conflicts of interest and inappropriate affiliations can have for the justice system. Their integration into the text of the Constitution represents a critical step towards a truly independent judiciary, protected from any potential source of corruption or illegitimate influence. These provisions are intended to eliminate any suspicion that judicial decisions could be influenced by hidden loyalties or unclear interests, thereby consolidating the principle of the separation of powers within the State and the independence of justice.

Examining other European constitutions, we observe that many of them contain articles protecting the independence of the judicial system and setting clear limits to prevent conflicts of interest and external influences on the magistracy. For example, the German Constitution (Grundgesetz) expressly provides that judges are subject only to the law, underlining their independence from any external power. Similarly, the Constitution of France guarantees judicial independence, and the members of the Superior Council of the Judiciary, responsible for the appointment and careers of judges, may not engage in political or commercial activities capable of endangering that independence.

By contrast, in some countries of Eastern Europe the relationship between the intelligence services and the judicial system has been more opaque, generating serious concerns about the independence and integrity of justice.

In that context, the introduction of provisions similar to those proposed for Article 124 of the Constitution of Romania could play an essential role in clarifying and consolidating the basic principles of an independent and impartial judicial system. It is important to note that, while constitutional revision is a complex and often controversial process, it provides an opportunity to align national legislation with internationally recognised democratic standards and practices. This step would not only consolidate the rule of law in Romania but would also help increase the confidence of international partners in the Romanian judicial system and hence in the country's political and economic stability. In conclusion, the proposal to add paragraphs (4) and (5) to Article 124 of the Constitution of Romania is a necessary measure to strengthen the independence of justice and to ensure that judges are free from any external influence capable of compromising their impartiality and fairness.

These constitutional changes will not only bring Romania into line with the best European practice but will also serve as a clear signal that the country is firmly committed to the path of judicial reform and of consolidating democracy. As Romania continues to evolve and to adapt to international standards, it is essential to ensure that its judicial system remains strong, independent and, above all, trusted in the eyes of its citizens. Revising the Constitution to reflect these fundamental principles is a vital step in that direction.

Finally, these proposed amendments not only reaffirm Romania's commitment to the principles of impartial and transparent justice but also provide a further guarantee that judges will exercise their mandate with the highest professional and ethical integrity. Their adoption will send a powerful signal, both domestically and internationally, that Romania is consolidating its rule of law and takes seriously the task of combating any form of impermissible influence within its judicial system.

The constitutional reform concerning Article 124 must therefore be viewed not only in the domestic legislative context but also in that of European and international standards in matters of justice. It will align Romania with the best global practice and would help increase its legal and democratic standing on the world stage.

It is imperative that this revision be accompanied by an open and constructive dialogue among all interested parties, including the government, the judiciary, the bar associations, non-governmental organisations and citizens. Only through effective communication and a collaborative approach can we ensure that the proposed changes are given effect in a manner that best serves the interests of justice and of the Romanian people. Public debate and transparency in the process of constitutional revision are likewise essential in order to encourage broad acceptance and support for these amendments. It is vital that citizens be informed and understand the consequences of these changes for their daily lives and for the functioning of the rule of law.

In conclusion, the revision of Article 124 of the Constitution of Romania represents a fundamental stage in the evolution of the judicial system and of democracy in our country. The amendments proposed for paragraphs (4) and (5) are not merely a response to the need for transparency and integrity in justice but also an affirmation of Romania's determination to have a robust judicial system that respects the principles of the rule of law and protects the rights of its citizens. Through this, Romania will be able to align itself with European and international standards, consolidate its democracy and secure a just and prosperous future for all its citizens.

37. Paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of Article 125 are amended to read as follows: → the text of the article

"(1) Judges appointed to office are Romanian citizens and are irremovable, under the conditions laid down by law.

(2) Proposals for appointment, as well as the promotion, transfer and sanctioning of judges and prosecutors, fall within the competence of the Superior Council of Judges, under the conditions of its organic law.

(3) The office of judge is incompatible with any other public or private office, save for teaching positions in higher education and teaching positions at the National Institute of Judges and Prosecutors and at the National School of Court Clerks."

The revision of Article 125(1), (2) and (3) of the Constitution of Romania seeks to consolidate the guarantees of independence for judges and to clarify the competences of the Superior Council of Magistracy (CSM) as regards the appointment, promotion, transfer and sanctioning of judges and prosecutors. These amendments are essential in order to secure an equitable and effective judicial system, free from external influence and from political or administrative pressure.

Paragraph (1) underlines the irremovable status of judges, which is a central pillar in protecting them against arbitrariness and interference in the judicial process. The irremovability of judges is a principle recognised internationally as fundamental to the independence of justice, allowing judges to exercise their office without fear of reprisals or of negative consequences for their careers. The revision of this paragraph is therefore intended to strengthen that guarantee and to confirm Romania's commitment to international standards in matters of justice. It could also reduce the risk of political influence in the judicial system, thereby consolidating public confidence in the impartiality and integrity of the courts.

Paragraph (2) seeks to clarify and delimit the powers of the Superior Council of Magistracy. At present the CSM plays a crucial role in securing the independence and autonomy of judges and prosecutors, but the proposals for revision are designed to crystallise these prerogatives still further. By expressly defining the competences of the CSM in the process of appointing magistrates and shaping their careers, the aim is to eliminate any doubt or ambiguity that could allow external influences over this vital process. The clarity of these provisions would serve as a protective wall against attempts to undermine judicial independence, being a sine qua non condition for an impartial and effective judicial system.

Paragraph (3) establishes the incompatibilities of the office of judge, save for certain teaching positions. This provision serves to ensure that judges devote themselves entirely to their judicial tasks, without being distracted by other professional obligations or by potential conflicts of interest. By permitting certain teaching activities, the added value brought by the experience and knowledge of magistrates in training future generations of jurists is recognised. At the same time, this exception is strictly delimited so as to avoid any confusion regarding other types of activity that could compromise the independence or impartiality of judges.

The revision of the paragraphs mentioned above is therefore an essential stage in the process of reforming and modernising the judicial system in Romania. It not only aligns national legislation with international standards but also provides a solid basis for a judicial system that may be seen as an example of integrity and efficiency. In conclusion, the proposed amendments to Article 125 reflect a deep understanding of the need to protect and consolidate the independence of justice in Romania. They are fundamental to a functioning rule of law in which every citizen can be confident that his rights and freedoms are defended by an equitable and impartial judicial system. Revising and updating these paragraphs is a step forward towards achieving a justice system that not only respects democratic principles but also actively promotes them within society.

Through this reform Romania can demonstrate its firm commitment to consolidating a rule of law in which the independence of the judicial system is guaranteed and protected from external influence. It is essential to understand that these changes are not merely a formal requirement but a real necessity responding both to citizens' expectations and to the requirements of a modern and effective judicial system consistent with the highest international standards.

In that context, a comparison with other constitutions in Europe may offer perspective on how various States approach the protection of the independence of the judicial system. For example, in Germany the principle of the irremovability of judges is firmly anchored in the Basic Law, and the Federal Judicial Council (Bundesrichterrat) has clear powers as regards the selection and promotion of magistrates. Similarly, in France the Superior Council of the Judiciary (Conseil Supérieur de la Magistrature) plays a decisive role in guaranteeing judicial independence, with precise competences in the appointment and careers of magistrates.

These systems highlight the importance of a clear and robust legislative framework in support of the independence of justice, and Romania, through the proposed revision of Article 125, is moving in the same direction. The importance of the irremovability of judges, of the role of the Superior Council of Magistracy and of the incompatibilities between public office and that of judge are all aspects contributing to the creation of an autonomous judiciary immune to external pressure. Taking into account the judicial models of Europe, it is clear that any system aiming at efficiency and fairness must found its actions on robust principles of independence. In that sense the revision of Romanian legislation is not merely opportune but necessary in order to align with the best European and international practice. As has been observed, the independence of justice is not an abstract concept but a living reality reflected in the quality of the daily life of every citizen. An independent and impartial judiciary ensures that laws are applied equitably and that individual rights and freedoms are protected against abuse. That is why the revision of Article 125(1) to (3) represents a cornerstone in the consolidation of such a judicial system. Ultimately, the adoption of these revisions will represent a major step in affirming and securing an autonomous judiciary, a key element in any mature and functioning democracy. It is a responsibility Romania bears not only towards its citizens but also in the European and international context, demonstrating its unwavering commitment to the fundamental values and principles of the rule of law. The revision of Article 125(1) to (3) thus constitutes a legislative priority and a moral imperative that ought to unite all political and social forces in a common effort. This process of reform is not merely a matter of conforming to external norms but is, in essence, a reaffirmation of national identity as a State governed by the rule of law and a confirmation of the commitment to the principles of independent, equitable and transparent justice. This entails careful supervision, effective control mechanisms and a mentality of responsibility and integrity among all judicial actors.

38. Article 126(3) is amended to read as follows: → the text of the article

"(3) The High Court of Cassation and Justice shall ensure the uniform interpretation and application of the law by the other courts, as well as the resolution of questions of law, in accordance with its jurisdiction."

The revision of this article is an act of refining the mechanisms of justice, designed to secure a functional balance among the various courts and to guarantee the citizen an equitable and predictable system of justice. The proposed amendment of Article 126(3) seeks to strengthen the role of the High Court of Cassation and Justice in securing a uniform interpretation and application of the law throughout Romania.

The aim is thereby to prevent the discrepancies and divergent interpretations that can arise in judicial practice — factors capable of leading to harmful legal uncertainty. This article of constitutional reform responds to a pressing need for coherence and predictability within Romania's justice system.

At present, Article 126(3) provides that "The High Court of Cassation and Justice is the court for appeals in the interest of the law". That wording, though valuable, leaves room for a certain ambiguity as regards the extent and limits of the High Court's competences.

The new proposal clarifies and extends those competences, conferring on the Court a more active role in unifying judicial practice through the resolution of questions of law that may be of major importance in a given field. This revision is essential for consolidating the citizen's confidence in the judicial system. A uniform interpretation of the law means predictability and equity, and these are pillars of the rule of law and of democracy. A predictable system of justice is one in which every citizen can understand his rights and anticipate the outcome of the disputes in which he is involved, thereby contributing to a fairer and more orderly society. In addition, the proposed amendment may have a positive impact in reducing the overload of the High Court of Cassation and Justice. By clarifying its competences, the congestion of its docket with cases that, although important, can be resolved at the level of the lower courts may be avoided, thereby securing better management of judicial resources.

The proposed revision is also consistent with European trends concerning the functioning of legal systems. A system in which the interpretation of the law is harmonised at national level contributes to a more stable legal environment and facilitates cross-border judicial cooperation. In the European Union, where Member States are called upon to apply common laws and principles, such coherence is all the more necessary in order to secure respect for fundamental rights and civic freedoms within an integrated legal space.

In that respect, comparison with other European constitutions may offer valuable perspectives. Taking the example of Germany, where the Bundesgerichtshof (Federal Court of Justice) functions as the court of last instance in the judicial system for civil and criminal disputes, we see a model similar to the one proposed for Romania. The German court secures the uniformity of the interpretation of laws and also the resolution of major legal questions. This approach has been recognised as effective in maintaining a cohesive body of case-law and a predictable judicial system. Similarly, the supreme court of France, the Cour de Cassation, has comparable powers, being responsible for securing the uniform application of the law throughout the country and for reviewing the decisions of the lower courts where necessary. It is a clear example of a supreme court functioning as a guarantor of coherence and consistency in the application of the law — a pillar on which the proposed amendment of Article 126 of the Constitution of Romania is likewise founded. Examining the Italian model, where the Corte di Cassazione serves a similar purpose, we see how that supreme court contributes to harmonising the interpretation of laws and to resolving complex questions of law. International models can thus provide a solid argument for the proposed reform, underlining the benefits of a well-structured judicial system with a strong supreme court.

In conclusion, the revision of Article 126 of the Constitution of Romania is a necessary step in the evolution of the national legal system, with the potential to align Romanian judicial practice with European standards and to improve significantly the efficiency and predictability of justice.

The reform of Article 126 can thus contribute decisively to consolidating public confidence in the justice system and to strengthening the rule of law in Romania. By adopting this amendment, Romania would take an important step towards achieving a judicial balance reflecting the best European practice and would promote a cohesive and equitable legal environment for all its citizens.

This will not only consolidate confidence in the judicial system but will also secure better alignment with the mechanisms of justice in the European space, contributing to a more effective and deeper judicial integration within the European Union. The time has come for Romania to take the next step in modernising and harmonising its justice system with the realities and requirements of the twenty-first century. The revision of Article 126 represents a unique opportunity to build a more accessible and more predictable system of justice — an objective that cannot be ignored in the aspiration to create a society founded on respect for the law and the protection of individual rights.

39. Article 132(2) is amended to read as follows: → the text of the article

"(2) The office of prosecutor is incompatible with any other public or private office, save for teaching positions in higher education and teaching positions at the National Institute of Judges and Prosecutors and at the National School of Court Clerks."

The revision of Article 132 of the Constitution of Romania, which governs the incompatibility of the office of prosecutor, has recently come under the eye of reform, responding to the need to align with European legislation and to new social and legal challenges. In that context, the revision of Article 132 becomes essential in order to secure an independent and effective system of justice.

The present text of Article 132(2) provides that the office of prosecutor is incompatible with any other public or private office. This provision has been interpreted restrictively, limiting the professional possibilities of prosecutors and hence the capacity of the judicial system to benefit from expertise and diversity.

The proposal to revise this paragraph relaxes those restrictions, allowing prosecutors to hold teaching positions in higher education, at the National Institute of Judges and Prosecutors and at the National School of Court Clerks. This amendment reflects an openness to greater flexibility in the careers of magistrates and a recognition of the importance of the exchange of knowledge between theory and practice.

In order better to understand the rationale behind this revision, it is useful to compare the constitutional provisions of Romania with those of other European countries. For example, the Constitutions of France and of Germany do not set out the incompatibilities of the office of prosecutor in their constitutional texts but leave that determination to secondary legislation. This affords greater flexibility and adaptability according to the needs and evolution of society. Spain, by contrast, expressly provides in its Constitution that judges and prosecutors may not exercise other public offices apart from exceptions strictly connected with the functioning of justice. This difference of approach raises important questions about the balance between the independence and the responsibilities of magistrates, and about the way in which incompatibilities are established so as to protect the integrity of the judicial system without impeding professional development and contribution to legal education.

The revision proposed for Article 132 of the Constitution of Romania finds a middle way, allowing prosecutors to share the knowledge they have accumulated and to take part in training future generations of jurists without compromising the independence of the judicial system. A strong argument in favour of this revision might be that the involvement of prosecutors in legal education helps consolidate the link between the theory and the practice of law. By passing on their practical experience, prosecutors can offer students a realistic perspective on the application of the law, an essential component in building a solid foundation within the legal professions. Moreover, the participation of

prosecutors in academic life can stimulate research and the development of new approaches in the legal field, which is of real benefit to the justice system as a whole.

In addition, this openness to the academic world can help narrow the existing gaps between legal theory and the realities of the courtroom. Prosecutors, having access to the latest research and theoretical debates, can bring practical improvements to the interpretation and application of laws. This symbiosis between legal theory and practice can lead to a better understanding of the law and to an administration of justice consonant with the dynamics of contemporary society.

By balancing professional responsibilities with the possibility of contributing to legal education, the proposed revision of Article 132 represents a step forward towards an adaptable and dynamic system of justice. Collaboration between the judicial and academic spheres can not only enrich the understanding of the law but can also create a generation of jurists better prepared for the challenges of the future.

Ultimately, the revision of Article 132 of the Constitution of Romania is an opportunity to build a judicial system that is more robust and better adapted to the complexity of the modern world. By promoting a better interconnection between legal theory and judicial practice, and by securing greater flexibility in the professional careers of magistrates, this revision can contribute to raising the quality of the administration of justice in Romania.

In conclusion, the revision of Article 132 of the Constitution of Romania through the introduction of exceptions allowing prosecutors to hold teaching positions represents a necessary step in modernising the judicial profession and aligning it with European standards.

This entails a continuing commitment to improving the quality of legal training, promoting research in the field of law and securing a productive interaction between universities and judicial institutions.

The changes made to the Constitution of Romania, including those to Article 132, reflect society's aspirations towards a stronger and more equitable rule of law. These aspirations connect with a broader vision in which justice is not merely a function of the State but a service provided to citizens, with the aim of protecting individual liberties and promoting a fairer and more prosperous society.

The revision of Article 132 is therefore more than a mere legal adjustment; it is part of a broader effort to modernise the Romanian judicial system. It is an occasion to reflect on the role magistrates play in society and to redefine what it means for them genuinely to serve the public interest. The revision of Article 132 thus represents not merely an amendment to a section of the Constitution but a reflection on the future of justice in Romania. It must be seen as an opportunity to consolidate the rule of law and to guarantee that every citizen enjoys the equitable protection of the country's laws. For all these reasons, the revision of Article 132 of the Constitution of Romania is not merely a legal necessity but also an expression of societal evolution and of the nation's aspirations to progress.

40. Article 133 is amended to read as follows: → the text of the article

"(1) The Superior Council of Magistracy is the guarantor of the independence of justice.

(2) The Superior Council of Magistracy is composed of 15 members, of whom:

(a) 10 are elected by the general assemblies of judges and validated by the Senate; they are elected as follows —

— 2 from among the judges of the courts of first instance, by the judges serving in those courts;

— 3 from among the judges of the tribunals, by the judges serving in the tribunals;

— 3 from among the judges of the courts of appeal, by the judges serving in the courts of appeal;

— 2 from among the judges of the High Court of Cassation and Justice, one elected by the judges serving in the criminal division and one elected by the judges serving in the other divisions;

(b) 2 representatives of civil society, specialists in the field of law, of high professional and moral standing, who have not belonged to political parties in the last 5 years, elected by the Senate; they take part only in the plenary proceedings;

(c) the Minister of Justice, the President of the High Court of Cassation and Justice and the Prosecutor General of the Prosecutor's Office attached to the High Court of Cassation and Justice.

(3) The President of the Superior Council of Magistracy is elected for a term of one year, which may not be renewed, from among the magistrates referred to in paragraph (2)(a), in descending order of professional rank and of seniority.

(4) The President of the Superior Council of Magistracy is elected for a term of one year, which may not be renewed or extended in any way, from among the judges referred to in paragraph (2).

(5) The term of office of the members of the Superior Council of Magistracy is 4 years.

(6) The decisions of the Superior Council of Magistracy are taken by secret or open ballot, in accordance with the law."

The proposed revision of Article 133 of the Constitution of Romania responds to the need to consolidate the independence of justice and to adapt the legislative framework to present realities and challenges. It is therefore important to analyse the reasons underlying this initiative, comparing the proposed amendments with the present text and anticipating the impact they could have on the Romanian judicial system.

Article 133 in its present form defines the Superior Council of Magistracy (CSM) as the body responsible for securing the independence of the judicial system and for overseeing the careers of magistrates. The main aspects governed by this article concern the composition of the CSM, the manner of electing its members and the duration of their terms. In its present form the CSM is composed of 19 members, with a president elected for a three-year term, which may be renewed.

The proposed revision introduces significant changes, including the removal of the 5 prosecutors and the reduction of the number of members from 19 to 15, as well as the limitation of the president's term to one year, with no possibility of renewal in any form. These amendments are intended to increase the efficiency and accountability of the CSM and to secure a balanced representation among the various levels of the judicial system and civil society. Another major change concerns the manner of electing the members of the Council.

Under the new proposal, the members are elected by the community they represent, which could contribute to greater autonomy and to a more faithful reflection of the diversity and specialisations within the judicial system. Likewise, the introduction of specialists from civil society who have had no recent political affiliations may be seen as a further guarantee of the impartiality and independence of justice.

These proposed amendments must be analysed in the broader context of developments in the judicial system and of European standards on the independence of justice. For example, the Venice Commission has repeatedly emphasised the importance of protecting the independence of the judicial system from political pressure and has recommended consolidating that principle through mechanisms of judicial self-government. Reducing political influence in the appointment of CSM members

and securing a balance among the various levels of the judicial system and civil society responds to those recommendations.

In addition, limiting the term of the president of the CSM to one year, with a prohibition on renewal on any ground, aims to prevent the long-term accumulation of power in the hands of a single person, an aspect criticised in the past by various international bodies. This may result in more frequent rotation and a more equitable distribution of responsibilities, thereby contributing to more dynamic and transparent leadership.

At the same time, the proposal to have representatives of civil society in the CSM with no recent political ties is an important step towards depoliticising justice and securing social oversight of the way it is administered. This measure can strengthen public confidence in the independence and impartiality of the judicial system.

The comparative analysis of the present text and of that proposed for the revision of Article 133 of the Constitution of Romania shows that the changes seek an adaptation to the present context, a more efficient functioning of the CSM and a consolidation of the independence of justice. It is a recognition of the fact that the dynamics of Romanian society and European norms call for a continual reassessment of the mechanisms guaranteeing the rule of law. The innovative aspects introduced by the revision are not merely a response to external criticism or recommendations but also an attempt to answer domestic needs highlighted by judicial practice. These changes can contribute to raising the quality of the administration of justice and to greater accountability on the part of those assuming key roles within the CSM.

Examining the proposed revision, we can observe an effort to align the Romanian judicial system with European standards. In conclusion, the proposed revision of Article 133 of the Constitution of Romania reflects a positive trend towards modernising the judicial system and adapting it to the standards of independence and impartiality.

One of the principal arguments for revising Article 133 is to secure better representation of judges from all levels of the courts — from the courts of first instance up to the High Court of Cassation and Justice — as well as diversity within the CSM. Whereas at present the members are appointed through various mechanisms that may be susceptible to political or other influence, the article as revised seeks a more direct and autonomous selection of representatives. This could lead to greater confidence in the judicial system, since the decisions of the CSM will more clearly reflect the will and professional interests of magistrates, without being filtered or influenced by a political agenda. It is a significant change, since it strengthens the principle of the independence of the magistracy from the other powers of the State.

Likewise, by limiting the term of the president of the CSM to just one year, with no possibility of renewal, the aim is to avoid the prolonged concentration of authority in a single pair of hands — a factor often associated with the risk of influence and abuse. The proposal thereby encourages a constant cycle of new perspectives and approaches in the leadership of the CSM, which can lead to more balanced decisions and to greater transparency in the Council's work.

The changes proposed in the context of the present Article 133 seek to bring the Romanian judicial system closer to international standards on the independence of justice and to respond to the concerns expressed both nationally and internationally.

In order to appreciate the full measure of the proposals for revision, it is instructive to compare them with the arrangements in other European countries. For example, in France the Superior Council of the Judiciary (Conseil Supérieur de la Magistrature) has similar powers and is composed both of

elected magistrates and of members appointed by the President of the Republic, the President of the National Assembly and the President of the Senate. This mixed structure provides diversified representation and seeks to balance political influence with judicial autonomy.

In Germany, the Federal Judicial Council (Bundesrichterrat) is responsible for the administration and careers of federal judges and is composed exclusively of judges elected by their peers. This system of self-government reflects a deep confidence in the capacity of the magistracy to manage its own affairs independently, without direct intervention by the political powers. The German example thus offers a valuable perspective on the importance of autonomy within the judicial system and on the ways in which it can be achieved. In Italy, the Superior Council of the Judiciary (Consiglio Superiore della Magistratura) is composed largely of magistrates elected directly by their peers, with a few extra-judicial members, including the President of the Republic and other members of Parliament. This structure combines judicial autonomy with a form of democratic supervision, seeking to maintain a balance between the independence of justice and accountability to society.

Comparing these models with the proposed revision of Article 133 of the Constitution of Romania, we may observe that there is a variety of approaches in Europe as regards the composition and functioning of superior councils of the judiciary. This demonstrates that there is no single or perfect formula but rather different solutions adapted to the context and history of each State.

In the Romanian context, the proposed revision appears to move towards a model that values judicial autonomy and the active participation of the magistracy in the self-government of the judicial system. There is an observable tendency to move away from political influence and to encourage a balance between legal expertise and democratic control.

It is essential that, while we strive to modernise and improve the judicial system, we preserve and promote the fundamental principles of the rule of law and respect national legal traditions.

The proposals for revising Article 133 are consistent with these values and contribute to a system of justice that serves the needs of society effectively and equitably.

The conclusions to be drawn from this comparative analysis are that, although every judicial system has its specific features, there is a common direction towards strengthening the independence and accountability of the magistracy. The reforms proposed in Romania follow that general trend, with particular attention given to participation and representativeness within the structures of self-government of the judicial system.

In conclusion, the proposed revision of Article 133 of the Constitution of Romania is an undertaking that contributes significantly to consolidating the independence of the judicial system.

41. Article 134 is amended to read as follows: → the text of the article

"(1) The Superior Council of Magistracy shall propose to the President of Romania the appointment of judges and prosecutors, except trainees, under the conditions laid down by law, selected through an annual national competition for admission to the magistracy organised by the National Institute of Magistracy, from among persons holding a degree in law with at least 8 years' seniority in legal professions or in higher legal education.

(2) Prosecutors may not be moved or transferred to the office of judge otherwise than by passing the examination referred to in paragraph (1).

(3) Judges and prosecutors may be delegated or seconded to executive or management positions only by the Superior Council of Magistracy, through a national examination or competition organised by the National Institute of Magistracy.

(3) The Superior Council of Magistracy shall act as a court of law in matters of the disciplinary liability of judges and prosecutors, in accordance with the procedure laid down by its organic law. In such cases the Minister of Justice, the President of the High Court of Cassation and Justice and the Prosecutor General of the Prosecutor's Office attached to the High Court of Cassation and Justice shall have no right to vote.

(4) The decisions of the Superior Council of Magistracy in disciplinary matters may be challenged before the High Court of Cassation and Justice. Decisions of the Superior Council of Magistracy dismissing the disciplinary sanctioning of judges and prosecutors may be challenged before the same court.

(5) The Superior Council of Magistracy shall also discharge such other functions as are laid down by its organic law, in fulfilment of its role as guarantor of the independence of justice.

(6) The Judicial Inspectorate shall carry out the preliminary investigation of judges and prosecutors and shall function under the authority of the Minister of Justice, as a directorate with legal personality within the Ministry of Justice. That directorate shall be staffed by judicial inspectors with a legal career of at least 12 years in legal positions, including that of magistrate. Positions of judicial inspector shall be filled through a competition organised at national level by the National Institute of Magistracy, and the term of office of judicial inspectors shall be 6 years, renewable once only for the same period. During their term of office, judicial inspectors shall have the same rights and obligations as judges and prosecutors, being assimilated to them according to the seniority held in their legal position. Judicial inspectors shall be sanctioned by the Minister of Justice, in accordance with the organic law governing the liability of magistrates."

The declared purpose of revising Article 134 is to increase the competence of judges and prosecutors, to raise citizens' confidence in justice and to adapt and modernise the judicial system in accordance with European and international standards.

(1) The proposal concerning the manner of appointing judges and prosecutors. The present text of Article 134 provides that judges and prosecutors are appointed by the President of Romania on the proposal of the Superior Council of Magistracy (CSM). The new proposal introduces a significant change: appointment will be made on the basis of an annual national competition for admission to the magistracy organised by the National Institute of Magistracy. This change could bring greater transparency and meritocracy to the justice system, ensuring that the best-prepared candidates accede to important offices. Moreover, the requirement of at least 8 years' seniority in legal professions or in higher legal education will be an effective filter guaranteeing the experience necessary to discharge with professionalism these roles essential to justice.

(2) The mobility of prosecutors. By comparison with the present rules, which allow greater flexibility in moving prosecutors, the new proposal makes any transfer conditional upon passing the examination referred to in paragraph (1). This measure is designed to ensure that prosecutors are not subject to arbitrary moves, thereby contributing to the consolidation of their independence within the judicial system. It is essential that prosecutors be protected from external influences, including political ones, so as to be able to administer justice impartially and equitably.

(3) The delegation and secondment of judges and prosecutors. The new draft revision proposes that delegation or secondment to executive or management positions be carried out exclusively by the

CSM, through examination or competition. This differs from present practice, in which these processes may be managed more directly by the judicial institutions. The provision underlines the wish to centralise and standardise the process of delegation and secondment, providing a picture of unity and coherence within the judicial system. In addition, the introduction of a national examination or competition for these positions reaffirms the commitment to the principles of meritocracy and professional competence.

(4) The role of the CSM as a court in disciplinary matters. Another significant change is that the CSM will act as a court of law for the disciplinary liability of magistrates, without the involvement of the Minister of Justice, the President of the High Court of Cassation and Justice and the Prosecutor General in the voting process. This is a clear departure from the present structure, in which these figures of authority have a right to vote in disciplinary matters. This amendment will contribute to greater independence of the disciplinary process, insulating it from potential political influence.

(5) The extension of the powers of the CSM. The proposed revision extends the powers of the CSM, providing that it also discharges such other functions as are laid down by its organic law, in fulfilment of its role as guarantor of the independence of justice. This means that the CSM will have a greater say in guaranteeing the independence of the judicial system — an orientation reflecting European trends towards consolidating the autonomy of justice vis-à-vis the other powers of the State.

(6) The Judicial Inspectorate under the authority of the Minister of Justice. The last proposed amendment provides that the Judicial Inspectorate will function under the authority of the Minister of Justice, with a clearly defined structure and mandate. This could secure more effective supervision and better control over the activity of magistrates, through a body of inspectors with experience and seniority in the legal field. It is important to note that these inspectors will have a status equivalent to that of judges and prosecutors, which underlines the responsibility and seriousness of their role in the judicial system. This provision serves to strengthen the mechanisms of control and to secure greater accountability of magistrates.

In conclusion, the proposals for revising Article 134 of the Constitution of Romania introduce significant amendments capable of having a profound impact on the country's justice system. From increased transparency and the consolidation of meritocracy to securing greater independence for magistrates and for the disciplinary process, the proposed changes reflect a wish to align the Romanian judicial system with European standards.

Finally, the amendments to Article 134 respond not only to the immediate needs of the judicial system but also anticipate future challenges, securing its flexibility, adaptability and durability in the face of changes in Romanian society and in the international context.

The revision of the Constitution, and in particular of Article 134, is not merely an opportunity to improve the functioning of justice but also a responsibility towards the principles of the rule of law. It must be guided by a broad consensus and by respect for the fundamental rights and freedoms of citizens.

Comparing with other constitutions in Europe, we observe that many Member States of the European Union have opted for judicial systems emphasising the independence of the magistracy and the transparency of appointment processes. For example, in Germany federal judges are appointed by the Federal President and a council composed of the ministers of justice of the Länder and members of the Bundestag, with the aim of balancing political influences. In France, the Superior Council of the Judiciary plays a primary role in guaranteeing the independence of justice.

It is evident that there is a variety of approaches in Europe, but all have in common a commitment to protecting the independence of the judicial system and to securing a fair and transparent appointment process for magistrates.

The comparative analysis of these European models can offer a valuable perspective in the process of constitutional revision in Romania. Taking the good practice of other States as a benchmark, Romania can adapt and refine the proposals for amending Article 134 so as to correspond not only to domestic needs but also to align its legislation with European standards and principles. It is notable that, despite the diversity of European judicial systems, all countries share the conviction that the independence of justice is a cornerstone of democracy and of the rule of law. This European consensus can serve as a solid foundation for the reforms proposed in Romania, ensuring that they will be consistent with the common values and objectives of the Member States of the European Union.

In conclusion, the revision of Article 134 of the Constitution of Romania represents an important step towards consolidating the judicial system and aligning it with international standards of independence and efficiency. The proposed changes are intended to bring significant improvements to the process of appointing, moving and holding magistrates accountable, and also to increase transparency and control as regards disciplinary liability and the functioning of the Judicial Inspectorate. Constitutional reforms are essential in order to meet contemporary challenges and to secure a strong judicial system capable of protecting the rights and freedoms of citizens against any pressure or abuse.

42. Article 136(4) is amended to read as follows: → the text of the article

"(4) Goods in public ownership are inalienable. Under the conditions laid down by organic law, they may be given into the administration of autonomous public undertakings or of public institutions, or may be concessioned or leased; they may also be given for free use to institutions of public utility. The royalties due under concession contracts shall be updated to the level of the prices practised in the European Union every five years."

Article 136 of the Constitution of Romania concerns public and private property and is a central pillar as regards the regulation of the national patrimony. Paragraph 4 of that article, in its present form, provides that goods in public ownership are inalienable, with the possibility that, under the conditions laid down by law, they may be given for the use of autonomous public undertakings, be concessioned, leased or given for free use to institutions of public utility, without however specifying a clear periodicity for updating the royalties relating to concessions. → the text of the article

The proposed revision of paragraph 4 seeks to introduce a mechanism for updating the royalties under concession contracts every five years, in line with the prices practised in the European Union, which could lead to a better reflection of the real value of the goods concessioned and to greater efficiency in the administration of State property. Comparing this proposal with the present rules, we observe that the revision could bring more clarity and predictability to the management of public property. At present, the absence of a fixed period for updating royalties can lead to situations in which the Romanian State does not obtain revenue appropriate to the market value of its goods. For example, in the case of long-term concession contracts, inflation and market fluctuations can significantly erode the value of the initial royalties. Another relevant aspect is alignment with European standards.

In the European Union, the periodic updating of royalties is a common practice, designed to secure fair competition and the optimal exploitation of public goods. Adopting such a measure in Romanian

law at constitutional level will therefore contribute to better integration into European market mechanisms and to the protection of Romania's economic interests.

In addition, the revision of Article 136(4) will secure a greater degree of transparency in public administration, an essential aspect in the fight against corruption and in increasing citizens' confidence in the institutions of the State. Transparency in the periodic review of concession contracts could discourage anti-competitive practices and could provide a clearer picture of the way in which national assets are exploited. In conclusion, the revision of Article 136(4) of the Constitution of Romania appears to be not only an alignment with European standards but also a necessary step towards better management of the national public patrimony. Such a change could bring significant economic benefits, could increase administrative efficiency and could consolidate the rule of law by increasing transparency and accountability.

In order better to understand the European context of this proposed revision, it is useful to make a comparison with other European constitutions. Looking at the constitutional models of other EU Member States, we observe that most of them have mechanisms for updating the royalties set for concessioned goods, securing an adaptation to economic dynamics and to market developments. For example, the Constitution of Germany provides that federal goods must be administered in the public interest, with the possibility of concession but with an obligation of efficient management, which implicitly presupposes the periodic review of contracts so as to reflect current market conditions.

Similarly, France has clauses in its legislation ensuring that the exploitation of natural resources or of goods of public interest is carried out in accordance with the principles of the market economy, and concession contracts are subject to periodic updating so as to ensure that the State obtains a fair and equitable return.

By contrast, in Romania the present wording of Article 136 of the Constitution provides no explicit framework for updating royalties, which can lead to the undervaluation of concessioned goods and to losses for the State budget.

In view of that context, the proposed revision of Article 136(4) is not merely welcome but necessary in order to bring Romanian legislation into step with the practice of other European States and to improve the management of national resources. Moreover, this amendment could serve as an incentive for attracting new investment, investors having a clear picture of long-term costs and of the stability of the legislative framework. This is essential in a global economic climate in which competition for capital is intense and in which the clarity and predictability of the rules can make the difference in the choice of an investment destination.

Besides the economic aspects, the revision of Article 136 also has an important social dimension. Public property, by definition, belongs to citizens, and its efficient management reflects respect for common resources. The periodic updating of concession royalties could ensure that the economic benefits are distributed more equitably, contributing to the reduction of social disparities and to the financing of essential public services.

In conclusion, the revision of Article 136(4) of the Constitution of Romania represents an opportunity to modernise the legal framework and to respond more effectively to present economic dynamics. It could be an important step towards a more transparent and more responsible management of national goods — a key element in consolidating public confidence in the institutions of the State and in promoting sustainable economic policies. The proposed revision is therefore not merely a technical adjustment but a commitment to the principles of good governance and of respect for the common

interest. It is an example of good practice for other necessary legislative amendments, contributing to the continued alignment of Romanian legislation with European standards and democratic values.

43. Article 140(3) is amended to read as follows: → the text of the article

"(3) The Court of Auditors shall audit the management of public resources and shall report its findings to Parliament at least once a year. The report is public."

The present text of Article 140(3) provides: "The Court of Auditors, exercising control over the formation, administration and use of the financial resources of the State and of the public sector, shall report to Parliament and to the Government in accordance with the law." That wording, though functional, leaves room for ambiguity and may lead to delays in communicating the results of audits, since it specifies no clear time-frame for reporting.

The proposed revision of Article 140(3) brings to the fore the obligation of the Court of Auditors to report the results of its audits to Parliament at least once a year. This amendment has the potential considerably to improve transparency in the process of supervising public finances and to secure better accountability of State institutions to citizens. Publication of the report would also facilitate more active participation by civil society and the media in monitoring public expenditure, allowing more effective social control and constant pressure on the authorities to manage the country's resources prudently.

Moreover, the proposed revision underlines the importance of the role of the Court of Auditors as an independent body capable of carrying out objective audits and of reporting without political constraint. By contrast, the present text may be interpreted as permitting a certain flexibility in the relationship between the Court of Auditors, Parliament and the Government, which may affect the independence and effectiveness of the audit.

Examining other European constitutions, we observe that in many Member States of the European Union the bodies equivalent to Romania's Court of Auditors are required to report periodically and transparently on their activities. For example, in Germany, under Article 114 of the Grundgesetz, the Federal Court of Audit reports directly to the Bundestag and the Bundesrat (the two chambers of parliament), thereby securing greater transparency and effective parliamentary control over the use of public funds. Similarly, in France the Court of Auditors (Cour des comptes) presents annual reports to Parliament and to the Constitutional Council, playing a crucial role in assessing and publishing information on public finances. These international comparisons underline the fact that mandatory annual and public reporting is a common and effective practice in securing rigorous control over public resources — a principle that the proposed revision brings into Romanian law as well.

The revision of Article 140 of the Constitution of Romania represents a necessary step towards alignment with the standards of transparency and financial accountability practised at European level. The proposed amendments provide a clearer framework for the activity of the Court of Auditors and strengthen the mechanisms of oversight of public funds, thereby contributing to the consolidation of democracy and to increased citizen confidence in the institutions of the State.

Article 140 as revised can serve as an example of good practice in the region and can mark a benchmark for reforms in the fiscal and administrative fields. By adopting these amendments Romania would demonstrate its commitment to the principles of financial integrity and could positively influence the international perception of its system of governance. → the text of the article

The revision of Article 140 is therefore not merely a matter of conforming to European standards but also an opportunity to rebuild public trust and to strengthen Romania's democratic structure. It is a key moment for consolidating the foundations of an accountable and transparent financial administration serving the interests of citizens efficiently and equitably.

The democratisation of financial information and easy public access to the reports of the Court of Auditors will play an essential role in stimulating civic participation and in holding political decision-makers to account. In that context the revision of Article 140 may be seen as an open invitation to citizens to take an active part in overseeing their funds and to contribute to cleaner and more accountable governance.

Through this proposed revision, Romania could demonstrate that it is possible to reconcile the need for flexibility and agility in the administration of resources with the requirements of rigour and transparency imposed by a modern State governed by the rule of law. It is imperative that the legislative amendments be accompanied by a real commitment to their effective implementation and to educating the public about the importance of overseeing public resources. In the context of the revision of Article 140, the way is thus opened for a constructive dialogue between the authorities and citizens — a dialogue contributing to better governance and to a fairer society.

In essence, the revision of Article 140 is not merely a matter of legislation but a reflection of the collective will to advance towards total transparency in the use of public money. It is a measure which, by aligning with the highest European standards, can inaugurate a new era of fiscal responsibility in Romania.

By adopting these changes, Romania could become a model to follow in the region, demonstrating that transparency and accountability in the management of public funds are not merely aspirations but effective realities.

In conclusion, the revision of Article 140 of the Constitution of Romania is an initiative capable of fortifying democratic institutions and of increasing efficiency in the administration of public money. It is a call to action to ensure that national resources are used in the interest of the people and that any form of mismanagement is brought to public attention and duly sanctioned. Every citizen has the right to know how public funds are spent and to have confidence in the State's mechanisms of control. The proposed revision of Article 140 can contribute to achieving this ideal and can mark an important step towards consolidating the rule of law and democracy in Romania. This constitutional revision is therefore not merely a matter of compliance with European norms but also an expression of political maturing and social progress. It reflects a deep understanding of the fact that, in a healthy democracy, every leu in the national treasury must be subject to rigorous and transparent control.

44. Article 142(3) is amended to read as follows: → the text of the article

"(3) Three judges are appointed by the High Court of Cassation and Justice, three by the Government, two by the Chamber of Deputies and one by the Senate."

Article 142 of the Constitution concerns the composition of the Constitutional Court and the manner of appointing its judges. Under the present text, the Constitutional Court is composed of nine judges appointed for a term of nine years, which may not be renewed or extended. The judges of the Constitutional Court are appointed as follows: three by the Chamber of Deputies, three by the Senate and three by the President of Romania. This structure was intended to secure a balance among the powers of the State and to guarantee the independence of the Court. → the text of the article

The proposed revision of Article 142(3) entails a significant change in the appointment of judges. Under the new formula, three judges would be appointed by the High Court of Cassation and Justice, three by the Government, two by the Chamber of Deputies and one by the Senate. This proposed reconfiguration of the appointment mechanism aims to bring a more faithful representation of the three powers of the State — legislative, executive and judicial — within the Constitutional Court.

First, the involvement of the High Court of Cassation and Justice in the process of appointing three judges may be seen as a step towards consolidating the independence and professionalism of the Constitutional Court. This change recognises the crucial role of the highest court in promoting persons of high legal competence and with relevant experience in the field of constitutional law. This could help increase the legitimacy of the decisions of the Constitutional Court and consolidate public confidence in that institution.

On the other hand, the involvement of the Government in appointing three judges and the exclusion of the President of Romania from this activity confirm and strengthen the role of the Government as the central element of the executive power, reflecting the political will of the parliamentary majority, and at the same time return the President to his role of mediator among the powers of the State rather than that of a playing "head of State" acting as an exponent of the executive.

The balance of powers within the State, a fundamental principle in any democracy, is thereby consolidated by the amendments made to the constitutional text in force.

By comparison with the present system of appointing the judges of the Constitutional Court, the revised text of the Constitution divides the responsibility among the three branches of power: legislative, executive and judicial. This balance was conceived in order to prevent the supremacy of any one of the powers and to secure mutual control.

The move from a system in which the President has a decisive role in appointing judges to one in which the High Court of Cassation and Justice and the Government are more prominent represents a change of paradigm and constitutes a consolidation of the balance of powers within the State and, above all, an increase in the independence of the Constitutional Court.

The proposed amendment must also be compared with the practice of other European States. For example, in Germany the judges of the Federal Constitutional Court are elected by the Bundestag (the lower chamber of parliament) and the Bundesrat (the representatives of the federal states), which reflects a federal structure and a balance among the various levels of government. In France, the members of the Constitutional Council are appointed by the President of the Republic, the President of the National Assembly and the President of the Senate, each having the right to designate one third of the members of the Council. This diversity of models reflects the attempt to adapt the structure of judicial appointment to the constitutional specificity and legal traditions of each State.

Analysing the proposed revision further from a comparative perspective, it may be observed that in some European countries there is a tendency to separate the powers of the State still more clearly — a model also adopted by the revised version of the Constitution. This arises from the wish to protect the independence of constitutional justice from political influence. For example, in Spain the judges of the Constitutional Tribunal are appointed by the King on the proposal of the chambers of parliament, the government and the judicial bodies, with the aim of securing representativeness and balance.

An important point in the debate on the revision of Article 142 concerns the perception of judicial independence. In the revised wording of the constitutional text, each of the three powers of the State nominates an equal number of judges, which can convey an image of neutrality and even-handedness.

It is essential that the Constitutional Court be seen as an impartial arbiter of the legality and constitutionality of normative acts, in order to preserve public confidence in the legal system. In conclusion, the revision of Article 142 of the Constitution of Romania has regard to the need to reflect contemporary realities and to consolidate the independence of the Court, while maintaining a balance among the powers of the State.

45. The sole paragraph of Article 143 is amended to read as follows: → the text of the article

"The judges of the Constitutional Court must have higher legal training, high professional competence, at least 18 years' seniority in legal practice or in higher legal education, and must not have belonged to political parties in the five years preceding their appointment as judge."

The proposed revision of the sole paragraph of Article 143 of the Constitution of Romania concerns the criteria that the judges of the Constitutional Court must meet in order to be appointed. The new wording proposes high standards of legal training and professional competence, as well as at least 18 years' experience in the legal field or in higher legal education. Moreover, prospective judges are required not to have been members of political parties in the five years preceding their appointment. This last element is added in order to secure the impartiality and independence of judges, being an essential point for the integrity of constitutional justice.

The present text of the Constitution imposes no clear restriction concerning membership of political formations prior to appointment. The comparison therefore reveals a significant step towards the depoliticisation of the Constitutional Court, aligning with the standards of European countries where such criteria are already in force.

For example, in Germany the judges of the Constitutional Court (Bundesverfassungsgericht) are selected on the basis of strict criteria of independence and professionalism, and their legal experience is essential to the exercise of the office. Likewise, in France the members of the Constitutional Council (Conseil Constitutionnel) are designated in a manner that promotes independence from political parties, with the aim of securing impartial justice of high quality.

Studying these examples, we may observe that the proposed revision of Article 143 of the Constitution of Romania moves in the right direction in order to strengthen citizens' confidence in the integrity of the Constitutional Court and to align better with the democratic practice consolidated at European level.

It is imperative to understand that the foundation of a consolidated democracy lies in impartial constitutional justice and in a legal framework that promotes competence and independence. This proposed revision therefore seeks not only to raise the standards of integrity of the judges of the Constitutional Court but also to consolidate the principles of the rule of law in Romania.

Finally, the adoption of such a revision could have a positive impact on public perception and on the functioning of constitutional justice. It could also represent a powerful signal that Romania is dedicated to improving its legal system and aligning with the highest European standards, which could increase the confidence of international partners in our country's commitment to democratic values and to the rule of law. The revision of Article 143 may therefore be seen not merely as a

necessary domestic reform but also as a strategic move in the broader European and international context.

In conclusion, the revision proposed for Article 143 of the Constitution of Romania represents a step forward towards a more robust constitutional justice better adapted to present requirements. The aim is not only alignment with European standards but also the consolidation of citizens' confidence in the mechanisms of constitutional review.

46. Points (a) to (d) of Article 146 are amended to read as follows: → the text of the article

"(a) rules on the constitutionality of laws before their promulgation, upon referral by the President of Romania, by one of the presidents of the two Chambers, by the Government, by the High Court of Cassation and Justice, by the Ombudsman, by at least 20 deputies or at least 10 senators, and also rules of its own motion on initiatives for the revision of the Constitution;

(b) rules on the constitutionality of treaties or other international agreements, upon referral by one of the presidents of the two Chambers, by at least 20 deputies or at least 10 senators;

(c) rules on the constitutionality of the standing orders of Parliament, upon referral by one of the presidents of the two Chambers, by a parliamentary group or by at least 20 deputies or at least 10 senators;

(d) decides on objections of unconstitutionality concerning laws and ordinances raised before the courts of law or before commercial arbitration bodies; an objection of unconstitutionality may also be raised directly by the Ombudsman or by at least 20 deputies or at least 10 senators;"

The amendments made to this fundamental text are not merely a matter of form but of substance, with the potential decisively to influence the way in which citizens and institutions exercise their rights and discharge their obligations. Article 146 of the Constitution of Romania defines the powers of the Constitutional Court, an institution essential to the process of overseeing compliance with the supremacy of the Constitution.

In its present form, the article lays down the mechanisms by which the Constitutional Court intervenes to secure the conformity of legal acts with the country's fundamental law. The revision of this article, in accordance with the proposals listed at (a) to (d), introduces significant amendments:

First, point (a) extends the right to refer a matter to the Constitutional Court before the promulgation of laws. By comparison with the present text, this proposal adds the Ombudsman and a reduced number of members of Parliament to the list of those who may make such a referral. This change democratises access to constitutional justice and can improve the preventive supervision of legislative acts, ensuring that the laws that come to be promulgated are fully consistent with constitutional principles and provisions. This amendment is in line with trends in other European States, where institutions similar to the Ombudsman or a reduced number of members of parliament have the capacity to refer matters to constitutional courts, reflecting a greater openness to accessible and effective judicial review.

Point (b) essentially preserves the right to refer international treaties to the Constitutional Court, maintaining the threshold of members of Parliament required to initiate constitutional review. This underlines the importance of supervising the integration of international norms into the domestic legal order, a common practice in many European jurisdictions, securing the harmonisation of national with international legislation and avoiding possible normative conflicts.

The change proposed at point (c) introduces a novelty as regards the review of the constitutionality of the standing orders of Parliament, extending the right of referral to parliamentary groups as well. This may have the effect of increasing legislative accountability and encouraging a constructive dialogue between majority and opposition in the process of adopting Parliament's internal rules. By comparison with other constitutional systems in Europe, this proposal may be seen as a step forward towards consolidating democratic principles and the rule of law.

The last amendment, at point (d), is perhaps the most significant, since it gives the Ombudsman and a reduced number of members of Parliament the possibility of raising objections of unconstitutionality directly, without waiting for them first to be dealt with by the courts. This facilitates a more rapid response in the case of laws or ordinances that might contravene the Constitution, constituting an effective preventive review. By comparison with other European States, where objections of unconstitutionality are generally dealt with in the courts, this proposal evidences a wish to consolidate the role of the Constitutional Court as guardian of the Constitution and to accelerate the process of verifying the conformity of laws.

These amendments as a whole are directed towards greater accessibility and efficiency in the review of the constitutionality of normative acts, thereby aligning with European standards on fundamental rights and the supremacy of the law. In conclusion, the revision of Article 146 of the Constitution of Romania as proposed reflects a natural and necessary development in the contemporary context, responding to the requirements of a dynamic society and of transparent and accountable governance. These proposed changes bring Romania into better alignment with European constitutional practice and can contribute to consolidating the rule of law.

47. Paragraphs (3) and (4) of Article 147 are amended to read as follows: → the text of the article

"(3) Where the constitutionality of a treaty or international agreement has been established under Article 146(b), it may not be the subject of an objection of unconstitutionality on the same grounds of fact and of law. A treaty or international agreement found to be unconstitutional may not be ratified.

(4) The decisions of the Constitutional Court shall be published in the Official Gazette of Romania. From the date of publication the decisions are generally binding and have effect only for the future, as well as for the whole period during which the normative act declared unconstitutional produced effects."

[Editorial note: the Romanian source begins this paragraph with a stray editing mark.] Article 147, which deals with the authority of the decisions of the Constitutional Court, is the subject of a proposed revision deserving particular attention. The proposed amendments raise two major points: international treaties and agreements, and the publication of the decisions of the Constitutional Court. In their present form, Article 147(3) and (4) lay down the role of the Constitutional Court in verifying the constitutionality of treaties and govern the manner of publication and the effects of the Court's decisions. The changes suggested seek to clarify and consolidate these aspects. The proposed paragraph (3) provides greater legal certainty as regards international treaties. If a treaty is declared constitutional, it may no longer be challenged subsequently on the same grounds. This revision could prevent legal deadlock and would harmonise Romanian practice with European practice, where such clauses are common. The proposed paragraph (4), for its part, emphasises the authority of the Court's decisions and their effects on the legislative and legal future. Publication in the Official Gazette confers on the decisions greater visibility and accessibility, and the statement that decisions have effect only for the future underlines the principle of the non-retroactivity of the law, aligning with international legal standards and with European constitutional practice.

Analysing paragraph (3) by comparison with the present text, we observe an attempt to eliminate procedural redundancies and to secure a better integration of international law into the national legal system. At present, even after an affirmative decision of the Constitutional Court, international treaties may still be the subject of challenges of unconstitutionality, which can lead to delays in the ratification process and to legal uncertainty unfavourable to the development of international relations. Paragraph (4), in its revised form, by contrast, consolidates the status of the Court's decisions as final and generally binding. This change reflects a firmer and clearer approach to the legal effects of the Court's rulings, eliminating any ambiguity as to their applicability and temporal scope. It is a measure capable of contributing to legal stability and to the predictability of judicial decisions — elements essential in a State governed by the rule of law. In the European context, many national constitutions already provide similar mechanisms for international treaties and for the effects of the decisions of constitutional courts. For example, in Germany the decisions of the Bundesverfassungsgericht (Federal Constitutional Court) are considered final and binding, and in France international treaties have greater authority than national laws once they are ratified and published. These comparisons highlight the fact that the proposals for revising Article 147 of the Constitution of Romania are not only relevant but also necessary in order to align Romanian legislation with European standards and practice. By adopting these amendments, Romania would follow a European trend of consolidating the rule of law and of securing greater coherence and stability in the application of domestic and international law. In view of these arguments, the revision of Article 147 presents itself not merely as a necessity but also as an opportunity for legal development. It reflects a commitment to democratic principles, respect for human rights and effective integration into the European legal space. It would also represent an important step in consolidating citizens' confidence in constitutional mechanisms and in the authority of the Constitutional Court. In conclusion, the proposals for revising Article 147 of the Constitution of Romania should be regarded as progress in the right direction. They not only respond to the present needs of Romanian society but also bring national legislation into step with European constitutional trends. This revision could serve as a model for other nations seeking to modernise their constitutional framework, underlining Romania's role as a responsible and progressive actor on the European stage. Finally, it is essential that any revision of the Constitution be preceded by a broad and open dialogue involving both specialists in constitutional law and civil society. Through that process we can ensure that the amendments made not only respect the fundamental values of democracy and the rule of law but also respond effectively and equitably to the needs and aspirations of citizens. In the light of these considerations, the revision of Article 147 represents not merely a necessary step but also a commitment to maintaining and fortifying a robust legal system capable of meeting the challenges of the twenty-first century. It is likewise crucial that the process of revision have regard not only to alignment with European standards but also to national specificities. A balanced approach will ensure that the amendments are not only compatible with international norms but also appropriate to Romania's unique context. This balance is essential so as not to lose sight of the country's legal and cultural identity in the course of European integration. Finally, the revision of Article 147 proposes a series of changes which are essentially intended to increase the efficiency and coherence of the Romanian legal system in its relationship with the mechanisms and principles of international law. This undertaking is consistent with Romania's commitment to respecting and promoting democratic values and fundamental rights, in accordance with its international commitments and the aspirations of its citizens. The proposals for revising Article 147 must therefore be assessed carefully, both in terms of compatibility with European norms and values and in the light of national specificities and needs.

48. After Article 147(4) there is inserted a new paragraph (5), reading as follows: → the text of the article

"(5) Failure by judges and prosecutors to comply with the decisions of the Constitutional Court constitutes a disciplinary offence and shall be sanctioned under conditions laid down by organic law."

Article 147 of the Constitution of Romania, which concerns the effects of the decisions of the Constitutional Court and their role in the national normative hierarchy, provides in its present form, at paragraphs (1) to (4), that the decisions of the Constitutional Court are generally binding, have effect only for the future — save for decisions on the unconstitutionality of laws before promulgation — and that texts declared unconstitutional may not be sent back for re-examination within the same legislative term.

In that context, the proposed revision and the insertion of paragraph (5) into that article serve to consolidate the authority of the Court and to secure compliance with its decisions by magistrates. The insertion of paragraph (5) would mean that failure by judges and prosecutors to comply with the decisions of the Constitutional Court would no longer be merely a breach of the basic principles of the rule of law but would become an express disciplinary offence, sanctionable under an organic law.

This could have a significant impact on judicial independence and also on the way justice is perceived by the public. By comparison with the present constitutional rules, the proposed amendment introduces a mechanism of direct liability for magistrates that does not at present exist in this form. In practice, paragraph (5) would bring a change of paradigm as regards the consequences of ignoring the rulings of the Constitutional Court.

At present, although the Court's decisions are binding, there are no provisions clearly and directly stipulating sanctions where they are not complied with by judges and prosecutors. The implementation of this new paragraph could, on the one hand, strengthen the rule of law and, on the other, generate additional pressure on magistrates, risking an effect on the independence of justice. Looking to other European constitutional systems, we observe various approaches.

For example, in Germany the decisions of the Federal Constitutional Court (Bundesverfassungsgericht) are considered final and have authority over all public authorities, and failure to comply with them may entail serious consequences. In France, the decisions of the Constitutional Council (Conseil Constitutionnel) are likewise binding on the public powers and on all administrative and judicial authorities. These systems incorporate respect for the decisions of constitutional courts as an essential part of the rule of law, and the sanctions for non-compliance are well defined.

In that sense, the proposed revision of Article 147 of the Constitution of Romania could represent a step forward towards alignment with these standards, but it is crucial to consider how the strengthening of the Court's authority is balanced against the protection of judicial independence. The position of a judge or prosecutor should be one of even-handedness, and the impartiality and autonomy of their judicial decisions are pillars of a fair and effective justice system. That said, the proposal raises the need for stricter control over the application of laws and of the Court's decisions, so as to avoid any attempt to undermine its authority.

Sanctioning non-compliance with the Court's decisions by organic law suggests a clearer and more direct procedure that will help avoid delays and ambiguities in the administration of justice. It could also serve as a warning to judges and prosecutors to treat the rulings of the Constitutional Court with the utmost seriousness. This approach could have implications for the independence of the judicial system, since it could create a precedent for possible pressure on magistrates. A delicate balance

must be maintained between the authority of the Court and judicial freedom, so as to avoid a negative influence on judicial decisions through the prism of potential sanctions. On the other hand, a strong argument in favour of the revision is that such a measure could contribute to consolidating the rule of law and to a better application of the law. Compliance with the decisions of the Constitutional Court is fundamental to the proper functioning of the rule of law, and clarifying the sanctions for failure to comply with those decisions could discourage attempts to ignore or infringe the Court's rulings, thereby consolidating respect for constitutional rules.

49. Title VI of the Constitution of Romania is amended to read as follows:

"Title VI — Romania's participation in international bodies and alliances

Article 148 — The supremacy of the Constitution and of the sovereign interest of the people in the conduct of international relations

Romania shall fulfil exactly and in good faith the commitments assumed and the obligations incumbent on it under the Founding Treaties of the international bodies and alliances it has joined, in compliance with the Constitution of Romania and in the higher and sovereign interest of the Romanian people.

Article 149 — Accession, ratification of the revision of the founding treaties and Romania's withdrawal from international bodies and alliances

(1) Romania may accede to international bodies and alliances, may ratify the revision of founding treaties or may withdraw from the international bodies and alliances of which it is a member, by a law adopted through the sovereign decision of the Romanian people expressed by referendum.

(2) The referendum on accession to, ratification of the amendment of the founding treaties of, or withdrawal from the Bodies and Alliances of which Romania is a member may be initiated by the President of Romania on the proposal of the Government, by at least a quarter of the number of deputies or senators, or by at least 500,000 citizens entitled to vote. The citizens who express and exercise the right provided for in this article must come from at least half of the country's counties, and in each of those counties or in the municipality of Bucharest at least 20,000 signatures must be registered in support of that initiative.

(3) The draft law providing for accession to, ratification of the amendment of the founding treaties of, or withdrawal from the Bodies and Alliances of which Romania is a member shall be adopted by the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate by a majority of at least two-thirds of the number of members of each Chamber.

(4) If no agreement is reached through the mediation procedure, the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate, in joint sitting, shall decide by the vote of at least three-quarters of the number of deputies and senators.

(5) The law on accession to international bodies and alliances, on ratification of the revision of their founding treaties or on withdrawal from the bodies and alliances of which Romania is a member shall be adopted after its approval by referendum, organised within no more than 30 days of the date of adoption of the draft or of the proposal for revision, and shall enter into force on the date of publication in the Official Gazette of Romania, Part I, of the decision of the Constitutional Court confirming the results of the referendum.

(6) The rejection by referendum of the ratification of the revised founding Treaties of the organisations and alliances to which Romania is a party shall have the effect of Romania's withdrawal from those international Organisations or Alliances."

The present draft revision of the Constitution entirely amends Title VI of the Constitution — Euro-Atlantic integration. This amendment in no way amounts to an intention on Romania's part to leave the system of alliances of which it is a member; it is a rewriting of rules that became obsolete once effective integration into the European Union and into the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation had taken place.

In reality, the text of the Constitution as drafted in 2003 was a declaration of intent, establishing the manner in which accession to the Euro-Atlantic bodies was to take place, as appears from the text in force until the entry into force of the present revision:

"TITLE VI — Euro-Atlantic integration

Article 148 — Integration into the European Union. (1) Romania's accession to the founding treaties of the European Union, for the purpose of transferring certain powers to the Community institutions and of exercising jointly with the other Member States the competences provided for in those treaties, shall be effected by a law adopted in joint sitting of the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate by a majority of two-thirds of the number of deputies and senators. (2) As a result of accession, the provisions of the founding treaties of the European Union, as well as the other binding Community rules, take precedence over contrary provisions of domestic law, in compliance with the provisions of the act of accession. (3) The provisions of paragraphs (1) and (2) apply mutatis mutandis to accession to the acts revising the founding treaties of the European Union. (4) Parliament, the President of Romania, the Government and the judicial authority shall guarantee the fulfilment of the obligations resulting from the act of accession and from the provisions of paragraph (2). (5) The Government shall transmit to the two Chambers of Parliament the drafts of acts of a binding nature before they are submitted for the approval of the institutions of the European Union.

Article 149 — Accession to the North Atlantic Treaty. Romania's accession to the North Atlantic Treaty shall be effected by a law adopted in joint sitting of the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate by a majority of two-thirds of the number of deputies and senators."

At present, however, being already full members of the two organisations, and the treaties already forming an integral part of domestic law by virtue of Article 11(2) of the Constitution of Romania ("Treaties ratified by Parliament in accordance with the law form part of domestic law"), these two constitutional provisions have become useless, being overtaken by the historical stage in which we find ourselves.

Nevertheless, the need for a special constitutional rule dedicated to the manner of applying the treaties to which Romania is a party remains current: a clarification is needed of the hierarchy and priority of application of Community rules where they compete with constitutional rules, as well as of the manner in which the Romanian people may decide to accede to, amend the fundamental treaties of, or leave certain organisations or bodies of which Romania is a member.

That is why it became necessary to amend in their entirety Articles 148 and 149 of the 1991 Constitution as revised in 2003.

Article 148 will bear the marginal heading "The supremacy of the Constitution and of the sovereign interest of the people in the conduct of international relations" and will read: "Romania shall fulfil exactly and in good faith the commitments assumed and the obligations incumbent on it under the Founding Treaties of the international bodies and alliances it has joined, in compliance with the Constitution of Romania and in the higher and sovereign interest of the Romanian people." This formulation gives priority to compliance with the Constitution of Romania over any treaty to which Romania is or will be a party — that being the very essence of a country's independence, as defined in Article 1 of the Constitution itself: "Romania is a national, sovereign and independent, unitary and indivisible State."

For that reason, and having regard also to the limits of revision laid down in Article 152 of the Constitution ("the national, independent, unitary and indivisible character of the Romanian State"), the independence of the State, guaranteed by the priority exercise of the rules of the Constitution, may not be the object of revision and hence of any limitation imposed by treaties to which Romania might be a party. Consequently, the "higher and sovereign interest of the Romanian people" must also be given absolute priority over any rule of a treaty to which Romania is or will be a party.

Article 149, for its part, establishes — using the principle of the symmetry of legal acts — the manner in which Romania may decide to "accede to international bodies and alliances, ratify the revision of founding treaties or withdraw from the international bodies and alliances of which it is a member", a matter not provided for in the Constitution as revised, which constitutes a major omission if not indeed a legal nonsense. That is why it is necessary to establish a clear manner in which this may be done — "by a law adopted through the sovereign decision of the Romanian people expressed by referendum".

At the same time, for reasons of symmetry with popular initiatives for the revision of the Constitution, paragraphs 2 to 5 have been inserted into Article 149, providing that "The referendum on accession to, ratification of the amendment of the founding treaties of, or withdrawal from the Bodies and Alliances of which Romania is a member may be initiated by the President of Romania on the proposal of the Government, by at least a quarter of the number of deputies or senators, or by at least 500,000 citizens entitled to vote."

Not least, Article 149(6) clearly provides that "The rejection by referendum of the ratification of the revised founding Treaties of the organisations and alliances to which Romania is a party shall have the effect of Romania's withdrawal from those international Organisations or Alliances", which allows the Romanian people, sovereignly and independently, to decide whether the amendment of the fundamental treaties of organisations of which Romania is already a member still respects the original purposes of that organisation and still respects the sovereign and higher interest of the Romanian people.

All these measures are taken having regard to, and in compliance with, the body of constitutional provisions and with the aim of protecting and guaranteeing the interest of the Romanian citizen.

In the light of this new configuration of Articles 148 and 149, it is essential to refer to similar constitutional rules in other European States in order better to understand the context in which the proposals for revision find their place. A comparison with other European constitutions will highlight the degree of flexibility or rigidity that Romania assumes in its relations with international bodies. For example, the Constitution of Germany, in Article 24, permits the transfer of sovereignty to international institutions, a principle that enabled the country's integration into European and international structures. In France, Article 53 provides that international treaties are ratified or

approved by a law, and the Constitution of Spain, in Article 93, permits the conclusion of treaties transferring competences conferred by the Constitution to an international organisation or intergovernmental institution, with the approval of an absolute majority of each Chamber of Parliament. These provisions demonstrate a greater or lesser openness to ceding parts of national sovereignty and entail different degrees of citizen participation in the decisions affecting the country's position on the international stage. By comparison, the new wording of Article 149 of the Constitution of Romania places greater emphasis on the direct consultation and approval of the people by referendum for any major change of direction in foreign policy, which reflects a tendency to consolidate sovereignty and participatory democracy. In the light of these considerations, the revision of Articles 148 and 149 of the Constitution of Romania forms part of a general trend of adapting constitutional texts to the realities and dynamics of contemporary international relations. In that sense the proposed revision helps clarify and update Romania's position in relation to the obligations and rights arising from membership of international bodies and alliances. This updating is necessary, since international relations are not static and treaties and alliances may change over time, reflecting shifts in the balance of power, in security interests or in economic priorities.

It is therefore vital that constitutional mechanisms allow a flexible adaptation to these changes without compromising the principles of national sovereignty and the supremacy of the Constitution. In conclusion, the proposals for revising Articles 148 and 149 of the Constitution of Romania bring to the fore the need for a modern approach placing emphasis on sovereignty, democracy and the capacity of the fundamental law to adapt to an evolving international context.

Within that framework the role of the citizen is essential, being called upon to participate actively and to decide on the major directions of his country's foreign policy. It is a step towards consolidating the rule of law and respect for the will of the people, aligning at the same time with global democratic trends of civic involvement and accountability in political decision-making.

The revision of constitutional articles must answer essential questions concerning the balance between national sovereignty and integration into supranational structures, and concerning the way in which citizens are active participants in these processes. Debates on this subject are not merely theoretical but are reflected in the daily life of every citizen, in the rights and obligations entailed by membership of wider communities such as the European Union. In that context the proposals for revising the Constitution of Romania are a manifestation of the evolution of legal and political thinking with respect to sovereignty and the role of States within an increasingly complex and interconnected international framework. What is sought is a balance between respect for national sovereignty and the assumption of the responsibilities arising from membership of international bodies and alliances, in a manner that reflects the interests of citizens.

In conclusion, the revision of Articles 148 and 149 as proposed represents a recognition of the need to define more clearly and to update the constitutional framework in keeping with Romania's present realities on the international stage. Future debates will be crucial in ensuring that these amendments genuinely serve the national interest, respecting the sovereignty and the will of the Romanian people while navigating the often troubled waters of international politics. It is a necessary undertaking, which must be accompanied by broad public consultation and open dialogue among all interested parties, from politicians and experts in constitutional law to ordinary citizens. For, in the end, the Constitution is the nation's identity document, and every word in it must reflect exactly the values, principles and aspirations of the people it represents. The revision of Articles 148 and 149 may thus be seen as an opportunity to reaffirm these values in the face of the challenges of the twenty-first century, ensuring that Romania maintains a position of strength and dignity in the concert of nations. It is also a moment to reassess and rebuild the mechanisms through which citizens exercise their

rights and discharge their obligations, in a world in which the boundaries between the national and the international are ever more fluid.

Finally, this constitutional revision must answer a fundamental question: how can Romania preserve its sovereignty and promote its interests in a continually changing global landscape without sacrificing democratic values and the rights of its citizens? The answer to that question will guide not only the drafting of the revised text of the Constitution but also Romania's future course in the international arena. It is essential that, within this process of revision, we have regard not only to the text of the law but also to the spirit animating those provisions. A Constitution must be a living document, corresponding both to the present needs of society and possessing the flexibility necessary to adapt to future change.

In conclusion, the revision of Articles 148 and 149 of the Constitution of Romania represents an essential step in affirming national identity and the sovereignty of the Romanian State in the present international context. This undertaking is not merely an exercise in updating a legal text but a manifestation of the nation's political and legal maturity, a reaffirmation of democratic values and a commitment to the principles of the rule of law. The revision must ensure that Romania remains a trustworthy partner within international alliances, honouring its commitments, but without renouncing the right to decide its own destiny.

To that end, the new text proposed for Articles 148 and 149 consolidates the role of the Romanian people as sovereign in decisions concerning international alliances and treaties, thereby ensuring that no major change can be made without the direct consent of citizens.

The proposed revision of Articles 148 and 149 of the Constitution of Romania should therefore be seen not only as a legal necessity but also as an occasion to consolidate democracy and to encourage the active participation of citizens in political life. It can thereby be ensured that the fundamental decisions affecting the national destiny are taken transparently and responsibly.

50. After Article 154(2) there is inserted a new paragraph 3, reading as follows: → the text of the article

"(3) The provisions of Article 83(1) shall apply from the date of entry into force of this Constitution, the term of office of the President in office ceasing on 30 November of the year in which the first parliamentary elections after the adoption of this Constitution are held."

The proposed revision of Article 154 of the Constitution of Romania, through the insertion of a new paragraph (3) in Title VIII, Final and transitional provisions, is a consequence of the amendment of Article 83 of the Constitution, which after revision will read: "(1) The term of office of the President of Romania is 4 years and is exercised from the date of taking the oath, which shall take place in the same calendar year as the election of Parliament."

In that context, the proposed revision of Article 154 of the Constitution introducing paragraph (3) becomes a key element in securing a smooth transition to the new structure of terms of office. This transitional rule is vital in order to ensure that the change does not create a constitutional vacuum or an imbalance within the electoral cycles. This provision guarantees that the current President will complete his term in accordance with the new rules, thereby securing an orderly transition and respect for the will of the electorate as expressed by the vote on this amendment.

It should be noted that, although the change may appear minor at first sight, it has profound implications for the way executive power is exercised in Romania. The newly inserted paragraph (3) is in

fact a bridge between the old and the new system, a guarantee that the transition will be balanced and will not adversely affect the functioning of State institutions during the period of adaptation to the new legislation.

The revision of the Constitution is a complex and significant process requiring careful analysis and broad debate in society. The proposed amendment of Article 154, in the context of the revision of Article 83, must be seen as part of a broader effort to improve the Romanian political system. A decision of such magnitude must be taken with the utmost responsibility, having regard to the common good and to the democratic future of the country.

In conclusion, the insertion of paragraph (3) into Article 154 is essential in order to ensure that the reduction of the term of office of the President of Romania from 5 to 4 years takes place without disturbing the normal functioning of institutions and without infringing the basic principles of democracy. It represents a necessary stage in aligning the electoral cycles and in increasing efficiency and cohesion in the administration of public affairs. This revision opens the way to more coherent governance and to a more effective political representation of the will of citizens.

The process of constitutional revision must be transparent, inclusive and based on a broad consensus, so as to reflect correctly the will of the people.

This change in the structure of terms of office must be communicated clearly and understood by citizens, so that they may take an active part in the democratic process. This initiative is therefore not a mere adjustment of a constitutional rule but a measure that will consolidate democracy and bring Romania closer to European standards of governance.

Section 3 — Socio-economic impact of the draft revision of the Constitution

1. Macroeconomic impact

Romania has proposed a series of constitutional amendments, each with the potential considerably to influence the country's macroeconomic landscape. What follows analyses the implications of these changes, assessing their impact on economic stability, on attractiveness to investors and on the rights and freedoms of citizens, which in turn affect the economic environment.

1. Constitutional reform and the separation of powers. The proposed amendments clarify the separation of powers within the State, which is essential to the functioning of a democracy and to securing a stable business environment. Article 1(4) and (5) consolidate the principles of separation, balance and loyal cooperation among the powers, providing a more predictable framework for the legislative process and for judicial decisions. This can increase investor confidence in the judicial system and in the State's capacity to guarantee an equitable business environment.

2. Repeal of Article 19. The repeal of Article 19(2) removes a level of legal uncertainty.

3. The right to a fair and predictable trial. The reformulation of Article 21(3) underlines the right to a fair trial and to predictable justice, elements essential to building an attractive business climate. An effective and transparent judicial system can reduce transaction costs and encourage investment, thereby contributing to long-term economic growth.

4. Protection against inhuman treatment. The amendment of Article 22(2), emphasising the prohibition of torture and of inhuman or degrading treatment, consolidates Romania's standing in matters of human rights. This can improve the country's international image and attract investment from companies that place particular emphasis on respect for human rights and on corporate social responsibility. A sustainable and ethical economy capable of attracting long-term partnerships may thereby be stimulated.

5. Rights of sexual identity and self-determination. The introduction of Article 22(4) to (6) establishes a series of principles relating to sexual identity and personal integrity, emphasising respect for the inalienable rights of the human person. These constitutional changes may have repercussions for company policy and for the working environment, encouraging diversity and inclusion. They may also be a positive signal for foreign investors who give priority to equality and non-discrimination in their corporate practice.

6. Criminal procedure and the rights of the accused. The amendment of Article 23(4) specifically concerns the conditions governing pre-trial detention. This could have a positive impact on the international perception of justice in Romania, suggesting a more balanced system, more respectful of the rights of the accused.

In economic terms, this could reduce the risks associated with investment and could encourage business initiative, since companies look for a predictable legal framework and a consolidated rule of law.

7. Surveillance of citizens and data protection. The addition of paragraphs 14 and 15 to Article 23 strengthens protection against unauthorised surveillance and unlawful interception. This change could have a positive impact on the technology industry and on digital services, creating a safer environment for the development and implementation of IT innovation. It could also attract companies developing cybersecurity and data-protection solutions, thereby contributing to the diversification of the economy and to the creation of new jobs.

8. The right to a defence and access to justice. The introduction of paragraphs 3 to 5 into Article 24 seeks to facilitate access to a defence and to procedural documents. This can positively influence the business environment by securing a more transparent and more accessible legal process for all citizens, including entrepreneurs and companies facing litigation. An open and equitable justice system is a good sign for investors, indicating a functioning rule of law.

9. Search procedures and the protection of private property. The amendments to Article 27(3), which governs the conditions and forms in which searches are carried out, constitute an additional guarantee of the protection of private property. They can consolidate the sense of legal security for business owners and can bring about an increase in private investment, with a direct impact on economic growth.

10. The secrecy of correspondence and communications. The new paragraphs inserted into Article 28 underline the guarantees concerning the secrecy of correspondence and communications, which are essential in the digital age. These amendments provide a clearer legal framework for data protection and citizens' privacy, matters of importance to companies in the technology and telecommunications

sector. This improved legal framework can contribute to the development of a robust IT sector, attracting foreign investment and stimulating innovation.

11. Education and budgetary allocations. Paragraph 8, added to Article 32, requires the allocation of a minimum percentage of GDP to education. This amendment can have a significant impact on the development of human capital and hence on the country's economic potential. Investment in education can improve the quality of the workforce and create the conditions for an economy based on knowledge and innovation.

12. National health and investment in health. Paragraphs 4 and 5, added to Article 34, establish minimum budgetary allocations for health, with the potential to improve the quality of the medical system and to make Romania more attractive to a qualified workforce and to investors who value the health and well-being of their employees. Investment in health may also lead to reduced social costs and to increased labour productivity.

13. The political neutrality of certain professional categories. The amendment of Article 40(3), imposing restrictions on membership of political parties for certain categories of official, can increase impartiality and administrative efficiency. This is particularly important for investors, since it suggests a business environment less susceptible to arbitrary political influence.

14. Protection of private property. Paragraph 10, added to Article 44, consolidates the right of private property, a central pillar of the market economy. Securing the freedom to hold, use and dispose of goods is a powerful incentive for private initiative and for investment. This measure may also prevent arbitrary State interventions in the economy, contributing to a more stable and predictable business environment.

15. The definition of the family and the legal effects of marriage. The amendments proposed to Article 48 establish new definitions of the family and of marriage in the constitutional context. These changes could have profound social implications and could influence company policy as regards employee benefits and the recognition of couples' rights. They may also affect the business environment through their impact on social rights and on consumption, depending on how families are recognised and supported by the State.

16. The liability of the authorities and access to justice. The reformed Article 52 underlines the liability of the State and of magistrates in cases of judicial error. This can increase confidence in the legal system and reduce the risk of unjust litigation for citizens and companies. The macroeconomic effect may include an improvement in the investment climate and a reduction in the costs associated with litigation.

17. Representation in Parliament. The amendment to Article 62 may change the dynamics of political representation in Parliament and may have implications for legislation in the economic field. A more representative Parliament could lead to more balanced legislation, more favourable to business development and economic growth.

18. Appointment of the Chief Prosecutors. The introduction of a new point into Article 65, laying down the procedure for appointing the Prosecutor General and the heads of important directorates,

may influence the independence of the judicial system. An independent judiciary is crucial to a healthy economic environment, providing certainty in the application of the law and protecting business interests.

19. The term of office of the President of Romania. The change to Article 83, providing for the shortening of the term of office of the President of Romania to 4 years, may bring greater alignment with the parliamentary electoral cycles, leading to greater political and hence macroeconomic stability.

20. Prohibition of organising referendums simultaneously with elections. The amendment added to Article 90 underlines the separation of electoral processes from popular consultation by referendum. This can prevent the overlapping of political agendas with citizen consultations, securing a clearer expression of the popular will on subjects of national importance, which may have a stabilising long-term effect on the economic environment.

21. The neutrality of the armed forces. The change made to point (b) of Article 94, making the conferring of military ranks conditional on the opinion of Parliament, may increase transparency and accountability within the armed forces. This can contribute to a positive image of Romania, essential in attracting foreign investment, especially in sensitive sectors such as defence and national security.

22. Removal of the President. The amendment to Article 97, facilitating the process of removing the President of Romania through a referendum initiated by citizens, may increase civic participation and may reflect a stronger direct democracy. This may be perceived as a mechanism of check and balance, giving citizens and the business environment an enhanced sense of security as regards the stability and predictability of the political environment.

23. Designation of the Prime Minister. The amended Article 103 clarifies the procedure for designating the candidate for the office of Prime Minister, which can shorten the period of political uncertainty where the government is dissolved or falls. A rapid and effective transition to a new government can minimise disruption to economic policy and can secure continuity in the investment environment.

24. Limitation of executive power in legislative matters. The changes proposed to Articles 108 and 115, restricting the Government's ability to issue decisions and ordinances without parliamentary approval, are significant for legislative stability. These amendments can reduce the risk of abrupt changes in economic policy, providing greater predictability for the business environment.

25. Limitation of terms in public office. The introduction of a new paragraph into Article 116 seeks to limit terms in appointed public office, which can lead to greater rotation and to a reduction in the possibility of accumulating influence over the long term. This can increase the dynamism and efficiency of public administration, positively influencing the economic environment by introducing new perspectives and competences into the management of public affairs.

26. Organisation of the intelligence services. The amendments to Article 118, providing for the organisation of the intelligence services exclusively as civilian bodies, can increase transparency and civilian control over them. This can improve the perception of national security and can consolidate

the confidence of international partners and investors in Romania's capacity to manage information and security risks effectively.

27. The national defence budget. Limiting the national defence budget, in accordance with the new paragraph added to Article 118, may have implications for budgetary balance and for the allocation of resources to other important sectors. This measure can contribute to a more equitable distribution of public funds and to the consolidation of other vital fields, such as education or health, with positive effects on the long-term development of the economy.

28. The role and composition of the Supreme Council of National Defence. The changes to Article 119, governing the composition of the Supreme Council of National Defence (CSAT), can secure greater representativeness and a balance among the powers of the State within the CSAT. This can guarantee better coordination of national security and defence policies, with repercussions for macroeconomic stability and security.

29. Election of local authorities and removal by referendum. The amendments to Article 120 concern the process of electing local authorities and the possibility of removing them. Greater accountability of these authorities can encourage more effective management at local level and can increase civic involvement. Citizen involvement in local governance can have positive effects on regional economic development through the adoption of public policies adapted to the needs of communities.

30. Independence of the judicial system. The amendments to Articles 124 and 133 consolidate the independence of the judicial system and prohibit the involvement of magistrates in political or intelligence activities. These amendments can strengthen confidence in the justice system and can ensure that legal decisions are taken exclusively on the basis of the law, without external influence, which is essential to a secure and predictable economic environment.

31. Appointment and sanctioning of magistrates. The reformulated Article 125 brings clarifications to the procedure for appointing and sanctioning judges and prosecutors. By securing a transparent and equitable procedure, unwarranted influences can be prevented and the uniform application of the law can be guaranteed. A fair and impartial judicial system is a key factor in attracting investment and in securing a healthy business environment.

32. The High Court of Cassation and Justice. The amendment of Article 126 underlines the role of the High Court of Cassation and Justice in securing the uniform interpretation and application of the law. This can consolidate the legal system and reduce legal uncertainty, contributing to a stable economic environment conducive to growth.

33. Incompatibility of the office of prosecutor. By adjusting Article 132, the incompatibility of the office of prosecutor with other public or private offices is clearly established, save for certain teaching positions. This clarification can help avoid conflicts of interest and secure a better focus on the essential role of prosecutors in enforcing the law. An independent and dedicated prosecution service can have a significant effect on the economic environment by combating corruption and economic crime.

34. Consolidation of the Superior Council of Magistracy. The amendments to Article 133 seek to consolidate the independence and efficiency of the Superior Council of Magistracy (CSM). Through these changes the CSM will have a stronger role in guaranteeing the independence of justice and in supervising the magistracy. This can improve general confidence in the justice system and can contribute to a business environment more attractive to investors.

35. Patrimonial liability of the State and liability of magistrates. The reformulated Article 134 emphasises the patrimonial liability of the State in cases of judicial error and establishes the civil, disciplinary and criminal liability of magistrates. This may bring about greater care in judicial proceedings and may reduce cases of malpractice in justice, thereby providing a safer environment for the conduct of economic activity.

36. Public property and its regime. The amendment to Article 136(4) concerns the inalienability of goods in public ownership and the conditions under which they may be concessioned or leased. This measure secures the protection and efficient exploitation of State patrimony, which can have a positive impact on the management of resources and can attract investment in fields strategic to the national economy.

37. The role of the Court of Auditors in the management of public resources. Article 140, in its new wording, strengthens the role of the Court of Auditors in auditing the management of public resources and in reporting its findings to Parliament. Transparency and accountability in the use of public funds are essential to combating corruption and to promoting efficient administration — aspects that indirectly influence the business environment and investment.

38. The composition of the Constitutional Court and its independence. Article 142 introduces amendments concerning the appointment of the judges of the Constitutional Court, providing a balanced distribution among the various State authorities in the appointment process. This can increase the independence of the Constitutional Court and secure greater objectivity in its decisions, which is vital for consolidating the rule of law and for protecting fundamental rights and freedoms, with direct repercussions for the business climate.

39. The professionalisation of the judges of the Constitutional Court. The reforms to Article 143 are directed towards the professionalisation of the judges of the Constitutional Court, requiring higher legal training and extensive experience in the field. This measure can contribute to greater competence and to a more coherent interpretation of the Constitution — key elements of legal predictability and stability, which are essential in a dynamic and continually evolving economic environment.

40. The role of the Constitutional Court in securing the constitutionality of laws and treaties. Article 146, through the new amendments, underlines the role of the Constitutional Court in the prior assessment of the constitutionality of laws and treaties and in resolving objections of unconstitutionality. That court thereby becomes a fundamental guarantor of the conformity of normative acts with the supreme principles of the State — a sine qua non condition for a predictable business environment and for the legal security of investments.

41. The effect of the decisions of the Constitutional Court. The amendments to Article 147 consolidate the effect of the decisions of the Constitutional Court, securing their generally binding character and

their effect for the future. This consolidated legal framework can secure compliance with the rules of the game in the economy and can prevent the retroactive application of rules — factors essential to a stable and trustworthy business environment. Favourable conditions are thereby created for sustainable economic growth and for attracting long-term investment.

42. Romania's participation in international bodies and alliances. The new provisions of Title VI emphasise the supremacy of the Constitution and of the sovereign interest of the Romanian people in the conduct of international relations. It is thereby ensured that accession, ratification of the revision of treaties or withdrawal from international bodies and alliances takes place with the express approval of the population. This measure can directly influence Romania's direction of economic development and can consolidate its position on the international stage. 43. Transition to the term of office of the President of Romania. Article 154, with its new addition, prepares the transition to a 4-year term for the President of Romania, securing alignment with the electoral cycles and greater coherence in domestic policy. This can have a beneficial impact on the continuity and stability of macroeconomic policies — important factors in maintaining an attractive investment environment and in securing economic growth.

Conclusions. In conclusion, the amendments proposed to the Constitution of Romania have significant potential to influence the macroeconomic environment through a series of interconnected mechanisms. These include the consolidation of the separation of powers, the securing of a stable and predictable legal framework, the protection of fundamental rights and freedoms, improved transparency and accountability in the management of public resources, and the consolidation of democratic institutions. All these aspects constitute the foundations of a healthy business environment conducive to investment, which in turn stimulates economic growth and sustainable development. As Romania strives to secure a robust and competitive economy, these constitutional amendments reflect a recognition of the need to modernise and adapt institutional structures in order to meet present and future challenges. The effective and good-faith implementation of these changes will be essential in ensuring that the anticipated benefits materialise as tangible advantages for citizens and for the business environment.

In a global context in which stability and predictability are highly prized, Romania thereby positions itself not only as a trustworthy partner internationally but also as an attractive destination for foreign investment. Through these reforms the country could increase its economic competitiveness and consolidate the rule of law — elements vital in an interconnected global economy.

1¹. Impact on the competitive environment and on the field of State aid

Not applicable

2. Impact on the business environment

In the present socio-economic horizon, a country's Constitution functions as a backbone for the entire body of the nation, including for the business environment, which is highly sensitive to legislative change and to the legal climate in general. The constitutional amendments covered by the present revision significantly touch a range of fields, from the structure and balance of powers within the State to fundamental rights and freedoms and to rules concerning justice and criminal proceedings.

In order better to understand the impact of these changes on the business environment, it is essential to analyse each of these amendments in turn and to anticipate their potential effects:

The amendment of Article 1(4) and (5), concerning the organisation of the State on the principles of separation, balance and cooperation among the powers of the State, could bring greater predictability to the legislative process. This would mean that laws affecting the business environment would have to be drafted more transparently and with greater involvement of all branches of power. Businesses would thereby benefit from stability and would be able to plan their economic activity over the medium and long term within a better-defined legal framework.

The amendment of Article 21(3), which guarantees the right to a fair trial, could have a significant impact on investor confidence. Securing a legal framework in which commercial disputes are resolved predictably and effectively is essential to attracting and retaining investment. The clause optimising the time-limits for resolving cases could reduce waiting times in judicial proceedings, which would mean a reduction in the costs associated with delay and better dynamics in commercial relations. Likewise, the amendment of Article 22(2) and the introduction of new paragraphs prohibiting torture and inhuman or degrading treatment strengthen respect for human rights in criminal proceedings and in conditions of detention. These changes could improve Romania's international image and could consolidate confidence in the judicial system — a crucial factor for the business environment, especially as regards relations with external partners and access to international markets.

In addition, the introduction of paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 into Article 22 consolidates the protection of individual integrity, including in the context of technological advance. Guaranteeing the right to self-determination and personal development, as well as protection against any technological mechanism capable of affecting physical or mental integrity without informed consent, underlines Romania's commitment to protecting and respecting human rights. This approach can positively influence the business climate by increasing legal certainty and data protection, thereby attracting investment in innovative and technological fields.

Another important aspect is the revision of Article 23(4), which concerns the conditions of deprivation of liberty in criminal proceedings. This amendment underlines the need for a balanced and proportionate approach to preventive measures, insisting on the idea that pre-trial detention is an exceptional measure. This can have an indirect impact on business, in that a legal environment encouraging respect for individual rights and applying preventive measures with caution is generally more attractive to business. Investors look for stability and predictability, and this amendment can help create the image of a consolidated rule of law.

The introduction of paragraphs 14 and 15 into Article 23, securing protection against being followed or monitored without the prior authorisation of a judge, adds a further level of legal security for citizens and businesses. In a context in which the protection of personal data and the confidentiality of communications are subjects of the greatest importance, these amendments can consolidate confidence in the business environment and can provide an appropriate framework for the development of the technology sector and of digital services.

On the other hand, the amendments to Article 27(3), concerning the search procedure, introduce a stricter mechanism of judicial control over that step, which could bring about greater protection of the rights and interests of economic operators. This legislative change could reduce the risks of abuse in criminal investigations and could result in a business environment perceived as safer and more predictable.

Likewise, the introduction of paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 after Article 28, concerning the secrecy of correspondence and the conditions under which communications may be intercepted, consolidates the principle of confidentiality. This is a crucial guarantee for business, providing the assurance that

sensitive information and intellectual property are effectively protected by the State. Creating an environment in which the secrecy of correspondence is strictly respected contributes to the stability and security of the business environment, facilitating the conduct of commercial activity without fears of information leaks or industrial espionage.

Further, the amendment of Article 27(3), laying down the specific conditions for issuing search warrants, brings greater legal protection for individuals and companies. By expressly individualising the information and goods sought in the warrant, abuses are avoided and private property and confidential business information are better protected. This could lead to a business climate in which legal security is improved and in which companies can concentrate on growth and innovation without unwarranted fears of arbitrary State intervention.

Likewise, the introduction of new paragraphs after Article 28, strengthening the right to a defence and prohibiting the use of classified information in criminal proceedings, could have a positive impact on the protection of the rights and interests of the business environment. These amendments underline the importance of unhindered access to justice and to a fair trial, and the need for transparency in judicial proceedings. By restricting the use of information to which the parties or their lawyers have no access, a process is secured in which all parties are treated equitably and in which decisions are based on evidence accessible to all those involved.

In the context of a globalised economy, in which businesses operate in an ever more connected and interdependent environment, these constitutional changes can influence the international perception of Romania as an investment destination. Legislation promoting transparency, the protection of fundamental rights and an effective judicial system helps create a business framework attractive to foreign investors and to international partnerships.

In particular, the amendment to Article 27 concerning searches, providing that they must be carried out within the limits and for the purposes clearly stated in the search warrant, could reduce the risk of unjustified searches at company premises. This could lessen operational disruption and could provide an increased sense of legal security for the business environment. On the other hand, the introduction of new paragraphs into Article 22, protecting personal integrity and prohibiting any form of technological manipulation without express consent, is of particular importance in the digital age. These provisions can create a legislative framework favourable to the development of the IT industry and of research in the technological field, attracting investment in cutting-edge sectors and consolidating Romania's position as a technology hub in the region. A detailed analysis of each constitutional amendment and of its potential impact on the business environment reveals that these changes are intended to bring greater clarity and legal certainty, to protect fundamental rights and to improve the efficiency and impartiality of the judicial system. These are elements essential to a healthy business environment and to attracting foreign investment — elements that contribute ultimately to economic growth and to the prosperity of society as a whole.

At the same time, the amendments proposed to Article 32 concerning the financing of national education and to Article 34 concerning the financing of national health care, through the allocation of a minimum percentage of GDP, signal a strategic investment in human capital and in health services. This could have positive repercussions for the labour market and for quality of life, attracting talent and a qualified workforce, which are essential to the development and competitiveness of the business environment. Education and health are fundamental pillars of a prosperous society and of a dynamic economy, and this commitment to investment could stimulate innovation and the creation of new business opportunities. The changes proposed to Article 40, prohibiting members of certain professional categories from belonging to political parties, can help consolidate the perception of the integrity and impartiality of State institutions. This is particularly relevant to the business

environment, where the predictability of institutional decisions and the impartiality of the authorities can determine long-term investment decisions and can influence business relations both nationally and internationally.

The amendment of Article 48, defining the family on the basis of marriage between a man and a woman, could have implications for companies' human-resources policies. This change could influence how companies approach diversity and inclusion in their internal policies and could have implications for brand image among consumers or partners who attach heightened importance to human rights and equality.

The continuing impact of the amendments to the Constitution of Romania on the business environment is closely connected with the amendments to Article 62, which concern the representation of citizens in Parliament. Reducing the threshold for parliamentary representation to 1% of the votes of the population, or the specific number of votes for independent members of Parliament, could encourage a greater diversity of opinions and interests in the legislative process. The business environment could thereby benefit from broader representation and from the opportunity to influence economic and legislative policy more effectively.

The addition of points (k) and (l) to Article 65(2), concerning the appointment of the Prosecutor General and of the chief prosecutors of important directorates, will confer on Parliament a crucial role in the process of appointing these senior figures in the justice system. This change could be perceived as a step towards greater transparency and accountability in the judicial system, which could consolidate confidence in its efficiency and impartiality. A judicial system perceived as more accountable and less susceptible to political influence can stimulate investor confidence and can improve the business environment by securing a climate of legality and fairness.

Continuing with the analysis of the amendments to Article 70, we consider that the introduction of the possibility for a deputy or senator to be removed from office by local referendum represents a significant democratic innovation capable of having a purifying effect on the political class. This change can increase the accountability of elected representatives to their electors and can help remove the barriers impeding transparency and integrity in governance. For the business environment this could mean a more stable and predictable political climate, with politicians more attentive to the needs and interests of the business community, given that they may be directly accountable to the electorate for their decisions.

The amendment of Article 72(3), governing the conditions under which deputies or senators may be detained and searched, brings important clarifications as regards parliamentary immunity. That new paragraph provides that in cases of flagrante delicto members of Parliament may be detained and searched, and that the Minister of Justice is required to inform the president of the Chamber concerned without delay. This amendment balances the need to protect the dignity of parliamentary office with that of securing the rule of law and combating impunity. In business terms, it can consolidate confidence in the integrity of the legislative system and can reduce the risk of corruption, providing a cleaner and more ethical environment for the conduct of economic activity.

The proposal to amend the legislative initiative through Article 74, reducing the number of citizens required for a legislative initiative to 30,000, can facilitate the law-making process through the direct involvement of citizens. This can lead to greater civic participation and to a legislative process more open to contributions from civil society, including from actors in the business environment. In addition, the shorter time-limits for the first Chamber to rule on draft laws, provided for by the amendments to Article 75, could make parliamentary procedures more efficient and could reduce the period of legislative uncertainty — an aspect beneficial to long-term business planning.

The change of the term of office of the President of Romania to 4 years, under Article 83, could have an impact on political and economic cycles by aligning the President's term with that of Parliament. This could lead to greater political stability and could facilitate the implementation of long-term strategies for economic development and for improving the business environment. A shorter term could also intensify political competition and could encourage leaders to implement swift and effective reforms, in keeping with the requirements and expectations of the business sector and of citizens.

The amendments to Articles 90 and 97, laying down stricter conditions for organising referendums and for removing the President, are intended to raise the threshold of civic participation and to ensure that important decisions are taken with a broad consensus. These may result in a more stable political framework and may lessen the risk of abrupt changes in national policy, which could give the business environment a predictable horizon for planning and decision-making.

In addition, the amendment of Article 103(1), laying down the procedure for designating the candidate for the office of Prime Minister, could secure a better representation of the will of the electorate in the process of government. This could lead to more effective governance and to a closer alignment of government policies with the needs and interests of the business environment, allowing better collaboration between the public and private sectors.

Analysing the amendments proposed to the articles governing the functioning of the Government and emergency ordinances, such as Articles 108 and 115, we observe an attempt to restrict the use of ordinances outside a framework strictly defined by a special enabling law, placing the emphasis on the role of Parliament in the legislative process. These changes could significantly reduce the number of emergency ordinances, conferring greater stability on the normative framework and greater predictability for the business environment, which often criticises the frequent and unforeseen changes in legislation.

In the same context, the proposal for Article 116, limiting the term of appointed public office to a maximum of 4 years with the possibility of a single renewal, underlines the wish for professionalisation and for avoiding the perpetuation of persons in public office, which could lead to greater efficiency and accountability in the public sector. This is essential to a dynamic business environment, which requires stability and a solid partnership with State institutions. The proposed constitutional changes are thus such as to offer companies a framework of enhanced predictability and competitiveness, essential to success in the global economy.

The amendment of Article 118(4) and (5) imposes a clear restriction on military and paramilitary activities outside the State framework, with direct implications for securing a peaceful and stable business environment. In addition, setting a national defence budget not exceeding 2% of the national budget, as provided by the new Article 118(6), may be seen as a guarantee of balance in State expenditure and as an indicator of national priorities as regards investment. This approach may encourage a budgetary allocation more concentrated on economic development and infrastructure — key elements in increasing the competitiveness of the business environment.

Article 119, together with its new paragraph (2), consolidates the structure of the Supreme Council of National Defence, introducing new members and laying down clear procedures for designating the heads of the intelligence services. Such a structure can increase efficiency in strategic national-security decision-making, which indirectly has a positive effect on the business environment by securing a context of stability and security. → the text of the article

Analysing the amendments made at the level of local public administration through Articles 120 and 133, we may observe an attempt at decentralisation and at increasing administrative-territorial accountability. This can lead to better management of resources and to greater autonomy in regional development, thereby offering local companies and investors opportunities for more effective

collaboration with the local authorities. For example, the possibility of removing local elected representatives by referendum, provided for in the new paragraphs of Article 120, can encourage greater transparency and can hold local leadership to account, creating an environment conducive to business development at local and regional level.

In the field of justice, the changes to Articles 124, 125 and 133, concerning the independence, irremovability and liability of magistrates and the reorganisation of the Superior Council of Magistracy, are such as to fortify confidence in the judicial system. These amendments are essential in order to secure a business environment in which rights are protected and disputes are resolved equitably and effectively.

Article 134, which addresses the role of the Superior Council of Magistracy in the process of appointing magistrates and in disciplinary liability, underlines the importance of a judicial system that is independent and accountable before the law. Bringing the process of appointing and promoting magistrates and prosecutors within the competence of the Council, with the aim of securing a high degree of professionalism and integrity, is a step forward in consolidating the rule of law and in creating a business environment in which justice is impartial and non-discriminatory. This change can have a significant impact on the domestic and international perception of the investment climate in Romania. → the text of the article

As regards the management of public property, Article 136 brings clarifications concerning the inalienability of State goods and the conditions under which they may be managed. By establishing a clear legislative framework for the administration of public goods, transparency is secured and the possibility of abuse or of unjustified alienation of State property is prevented. This is vital for the business environment, since it provides the assurance that investment in infrastructure or in other projects of public interest is carried out responsibly and in compliance with the law.

The audit exercised by the Court of Auditors, under the amendments to Article 140, can contribute to better management of public resources and to increased transparency in the use of State funds. The provision requiring the Court to report to Parliament at least once a year and the publicity of the report can encourage a more responsible approach to public spending, thereby benefiting the business environment by securing an equitable fiscal environment and by preventing the waste of public resources.

The amendments proposed for the Constitutional Court, reflected in Articles 142 and 143, seek the professionalisation and consolidation of the independence of that institution. The revision of the criteria for appointing the judges of the Constitutional Court, as well as the clarification of its prerogatives, are intended to ensure that decisions on constitutionality are taken by competent and impartial judges, which is fundamental to a stable business environment in which laws and regulations are applied consistently and equitably.

Article 146, at point (a), emphasises the role of the Constitutional Court in verifying the conformity of laws with the Constitution before their promulgation, which could prevent legal conflicts and could provide the business environment with better legislative predictability. Point (b) likewise underlines the importance of the supremacy of the Constitution in the field of international treaties,

and point (d) ensures that any objection of unconstitutionality may be analysed in detail by the Constitutional Court, contributing to a solid and coherent legal framework.

As regards Article 147, paragraphs (3) and (4) reinforce the principle that the decisions of the Constitutional Court are final and generally binding, thereby securing predictability and stability in the interpretation of laws in Romania. This is crucial for the business environment, which relies on the consistency and clarity of legislation in taking strategic decisions on investment and expansion.

The new provisions of Article 148 underline that Romania honours its international commitments, but without undermining national sovereignty or the principles of the Constitution. This balance between international responsibilities and national independence is essential to a business environment operating in a global context, providing a guarantee that external commitments will not impair domestic rights and freedoms or national economic interests.

Article 149 raises the mechanisms of accession, ratification and possible withdrawal of Romania from international bodies and alliances, establishing a democratic process by which the Romanian people may decide on these essential matters. This is an important step in consolidating sovereignty and in the direct involvement of citizens in foreign-policy decisions, which can have significant effects on the business environment. By guaranteeing a transparent and participatory process, businesses can have confidence in the stability and predictability of the political and economic framework in which they operate. → the text of the article

In conclusion, the proposals to amend the Constitution of Romania can have a profound impact on the business environment by improving legal stability and by consolidating a rule of law that respects the principles of democracy and of the market economy. The amendments are intended to increase the efficiency and transparency of legislative and judicial processes, to protect fundamental rights and to promote a competitive business environment attractive to investment. In an increasingly interconnected world, in which business is greatly influenced by legislative change and by the political climate, these constitutional changes can represent an important step towards consolidating a robust economic framework capable of supporting long-term growth and development. A Constitution adapted to present social and economic dynamics can provide the instruments necessary to navigate the specific challenges of the twenty-first century and to respond effectively to the needs of citizens and of the business community. Through these amendments Romania can assume a more active and more convincing role on the international stage, promoting an open, innovative and sustainable business environment, to the benefit of all the actors involved.

3. Social impact

In a context in which the fundamental laws of a nation are subject to revision, it is essential to understand the implications these changes may have for the social structure, for civic rights and freedoms and for the balance of powers within the State. What follows analyses each of the 50 proposed amendments to the Constitution of Romania and seeks to anticipate their effects on society:

1. The amendments to Article 1(4) and (5) introduce into the Constitution the principles of separation, balance and loyal cooperation among the three powers of the State — legislative, executive and judicial — while specifying that they are equal within constitutional democracy. This can consolidate the understanding of, and respect for, the role and functions of each power, helping to prevent abuses of power and to secure effective mutual control. By highlighting the supremacy of the Constitution and the binding force of laws and judicial decisions, the rule of law is strengthened and a culture of legality is promoted.

2. The repeal of Article 19(2) may have significant implications both for fundamental civic rights and freedoms and, as an effect, for the sense of confidence that Romanian citizens will have in their State as a result of the prohibition on extraditing citizens to third States.

Turning to Article 21(3), the amendment brings to the fore the right to a fair trial and to the resolution of cases within a reasonable time. This is a fundamental guarantee of human rights, directly influencing the credibility and effectiveness of the judicial system. Guaranteeing the independence and impartiality of the courts is essential to public confidence in justice and to the protection of citizens' fundamental rights.

Through the amendment of Article 22(2), prohibiting torture and inhuman or degrading treatment, the protection of human rights in Romania is consolidated. The adoption of such an amendment reflects the Romanian State's commitment to European and international values, contributing to the consolidation of a climate of respect for human dignity. This can have a positive impact on international relations and on citizens' perception of the rule of law.

The addition of paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 to Article 22 raises sensitive matters such as sexual identity and the physical and mental integrity of the person. By protecting biological sexual identity up to the age of 18, a legal framework is secured that respects the natural development of the child. At the same time, guaranteeing the inalienable rights of the human person and prohibiting the disturbance of individual integrity without freely expressed consent are measures underlining the importance of personal autonomy and of the protection of private life in Romanian society. These changes may generate broad public debate and could have major implications for health and education policy, as well as for legislation on the rights of minors and of persons with disabilities.

The amendment of Article 23(4), concerning the conditions of deprivation of liberty in criminal proceedings, serves to reinforce the principles of lawfulness and necessity in the application of preventive measures. This change is such as to increase confidence in the judicial system by ensuring that measures restricting liberty are applied with caution and only in justified situations, thereby avoiding arbitrary detention and respecting the presumption of innocence.

The introduction of paragraphs 14 and 15 into Article 23 has direct implications for the right to private life and for respect for individual liberty. Through these amendments, protection against unauthorised surveillance and unlawful interception is consolidated, thereby guaranteeing that citizens' rights to confidentiality of communication are respected. This will lead to greater transparency in the activities of the criminal investigation bodies and to the consolidation of public confidence in the State's mechanisms of surveillance.

The amendments to Article 24 concern the right to a defence, providing enhanced protection against the abusive use of classified information and guaranteeing the principle of equality of arms in criminal proceedings. These changes reaffirm Romania's commitment to an equitable judicial system in which every party to proceedings has access to all the means necessary to present its case. In addition, the introduction of paragraphs 3 to 5 underlines the need for non-discriminatory access to procedural documents and prohibits any form of conditioning of that right, thereby consolidating the fundamental principles of a State governed by the rule of law.

The amendment of Article 27(3), concerning the conditions under which a search may be ordered, serves to reinforce procedural guarantees and to secure respect for the rights of the persons affected by such measures. What is sought is a balance between the security needs of the State and the protection of privacy and individual rights, thereby preventing abuses and increasing citizens' confidence in the acts of justice. The express requirement that search warrants be reasoned and that

the information and goods sought be individualised is an important step in securing transparency and accountability in the exercise of judicial power.

The introduction of new paragraphs after Article 28, concerning the secrecy of correspondence and the interception of communications, underlines the wish to strengthen the protection of citizens' private life. This measure can have a significant impact on the way fundamental rights are perceived and respected in Romania, establishing a clearer and stricter framework for the authorities carrying out such surveillance activities.

In Article 32, the addition of paragraph 8 concerning the financing of national education establishes a minimum threshold of budgetary allocation, which can help improve the quality of the education system. A larger share of GDP devoted to education means significant resources for school infrastructure, for teachers' salaries and for educational programmes, with the potential to reduce educational disparities and to stimulate the intellectual development of the younger generation.

The amendments to Article 34, concerning the financing of national health care and consent to medical treatment, evidence a concern to improve the health system and to secure patient autonomy. By guaranteeing a minimum percentage of GDP for health and by making medical treatment conditional on the patient's informed consent, the foundations are laid for a more effective health system more centred on the needs of the individual.

Article 40, in its new wording, addresses important matters concerning membership of political parties by various professional categories, as well as restrictions after leaving public office. This change may be intended to increase confidence in the neutrality and impartiality of certain offices and institutions and to secure a greater degree of integrity and independence for the persons holding those offices. → the text of the article

The addition of paragraph 10 to Article 44, consolidating the right of property and the economic freedom of citizens, may have positive consequences for the business environment in Romania. By guaranteeing the right to dispose of one's own property and to use any currency in cash, the Romanian State shows a commitment to the principles of the market economy and to supporting private initiative.

The amendments proposed to Article 48, founding the family on marriage between two human beings of opposite sex whose sexual identity acquired at birth is unchanged, may generate broad social and cultural debate. These changes have the potential to influence the traditional perception of family and marriage in Romania and also to raise questions concerning the rights of sexual minorities.

Article 52, in its new drafting, underlines the liability of the State and of magistrates for judicial errors and introduces the possibility of sanctioning magistrates who have acted in bad faith or with gross negligence. This amendment has a direct impact on citizens' confidence in the judicial system, providing a clear mechanism of liability and consolidating the principle of accountability in the exercise of public office. This can lead to greater professionalisation of the magistracy and to a reduction in judicial errors, while providing injured persons with effective remedies to protect their rights.

The amendment proposed to Article 62 concerning the threshold of representativeness in the Parliament of Romania may, in the context of a multi-party political system, have the effect of greater diversity in the political sphere. Through this change, smaller parties could have a better chance of being represented in the legislature, which could lead to a more equitable representation of the diverse interests of citizens and to a more inclusive political dynamic. At the same time, this

amendment could boost civic participation and stimulate a broader political dialogue at national level.

The introduction of the new point (l) into Article 65(2), governing the appointment by Parliament of the Prosecutor General and of the chief prosecutors of important directorates, may be interpreted as a measure increasing accountability to the elected representatives of the people. This change can help consolidate parliamentary supervision of appointments to key positions in the judicial system and secure greater transparency and accountability in the appointment of top prosecutors.

The amendment of Article 83(1), providing for the shortening of the term of office of the President of Romania from 5 to 4 years, exercised from the date of taking the oath in the same calendar year as the election of Parliament, could have the effect of aligning the presidential with the parliamentary electoral cycles. This could lead to a synchronisation of political agendas and to a potential stabilisation of the electoral cycles. In addition, this amendment can improve the coherence and efficiency of the legislative process by reducing periods of cohabitation between the President and a Parliament with a different majority.

The revision of the rules on organising referendums, laid down in the additions to Article 90, may have a significant impact on the exercise of national sovereignty and on participatory democracy. By prohibiting the organisation of referendums simultaneously with elections and by clarifying the subjects that may be submitted to popular consultation, the aim is to avoid the overlapping of, or confusion between, different electoral and referendum processes. This could contribute to a better understanding of, and participation by, citizens in important national decisions, and to greater legitimacy of referendum results.

The amendment of point (b) of Article 94, making the conferring of the high ranks of marshal, general and admiral conditional on the opinion of the specialised committees of Parliament, underlines the wish to increase civilian oversight of the armed forces. This change may be interpreted as a step towards strengthening democratic control over the armed forces and as a measure ensuring that promotions to the high ranks of the army are subject to a transparent and equitable process based on merit and professional competence.

Article 97, in its new form, which facilitates the initiation of the procedure for removing the President by referendum, may be seen as an extension of the mechanisms of democratic control over the highest office in the State. By lowering the number of citizens required to initiate a removal referendum, the active participation of citizens in political life is encouraged and a direct channel is provided for expressing the popular will on matters of national importance. → the text of the article

The amendment to Article 103, concerning the procedure for designating the candidate for the office of Prime Minister, seeks to optimise the process of forming the Government. This amendment seeks to secure a closer link between the parliamentary majority and the executive, in order to facilitate stable and effective governance. It may have the effect of greater cohesion within political alliances and of a better reflection of the will of the electorate in national policy.

The amendments to Articles 108 and 115, concerning the regulation of government decisions and ordinances, are designed to consolidate the principle of the separation of powers within the State and to limit the executive's ability to issue rules without adequate parliamentary control. These amendments underline the importance of a transparent legislative process in which laws are submitted to debate and approval by the elected representatives of the people, thereby avoiding legislation by ordinance without a solid foundation in the legislative will. In addition, these changes could lead

to greater predictability, with normative acts better founded and less subject to ad hoc change, which could improve the business climate and citizens' confidence in the act of governing.

The newly added paragraph to Article 116, establishing the duration of terms in appointed public office, introduces a clear limit on the number of consecutive terms, with the aim of preventing stagnation in certain positions and of encouraging a more dynamic circulation of administrative elites. This change can contribute to greater efficiency in the administration and to avoiding the concentration of power in the hands of a small number of persons.

The amendments to Article 118, governing the organisation of the intelligence services and of those assimilated to them, reflect a concern to consolidate civilian oversight and transparency within the structures of national security. These changes seek to ensure that intelligence activities are conducted in accordance with the principles of the rule of law and that military personnel are assigned only to the structures specific to the armed forces. This could result in a better delimitation of roles within the security apparatus and a clearer definition of civilian and military responsibilities.

The addition of paragraph 6 to Article 118, establishing a ceiling for the national defence budget, may be interpreted as a measure balancing budgetary priorities, ensuring that investment in security will not adversely affect other essential fields such as education or health. This limitation to 2% of the national budget underlines a commitment to a responsible and sustainable defence policy that does not place excessive pressure on the country's financial resources.

The amendment of Article 119, including the introduction of the new paragraph (2), reflects a wish to increase the representativeness and legitimacy of the Supreme Council of National Defence (CSAT). By including additional members and establishing a clear framework for designating the heads of the intelligence services, the aim is to secure greater transparency and enhanced democratic control over institutions vital to national security. This change could lead to more effective oversight of the decisions influencing Romania's defence and security policy.

The revision of Article 120 concerning the election of local authorities and the procedure of removal by local referendum represents an attempt to bring citizens closer to the process of local governance and to provide them with a direct mechanism of response where their representatives fail to meet the community's expectations. These amendments can encourage greater civic engagement and can contribute to increasing the accountability of local elected representatives to their electors.

The amendments to Article 124, which underline the independence of judges and prohibit their association with intelligence services or occult organisations, seek to consolidate public confidence in the impartiality and integrity of the judicial system. These changes seek to ensure that judges exercise their office in full independence and free from external influences capable of compromising their even-handedness and fairness.

Article 125, in its new wording, states the irremovability of judges and sets out in detail the procedures of appointment, promotion and sanction, all of which fall within the competence of the Superior Council of Magistracy. This structure seeks greater clarity and a more rigorous framework for the career of the magistrate, strengthening judicial independence and professionalism. → the text of the article

The amendment of Article 126, concerning the role of the High Court of Cassation and Justice in securing the uniform interpretation and application of the law by the courts, is crucial to the coherence of the legal system and to avoiding contradictory interpretations of the law. This can have a positive impact on the predictability and uniformity of judicial practice and can help consolidate citizens' confidence in justice.

In the context of Article 132, which addresses the incompatibilities of the office of prosecutor, the aim is to secure a clear line between professional activity and other interests capable of affecting the objectivity and impartiality of prosecutors. This clarification is intended to guarantee a prosecution service that is upright and focused on discharging its mission of enforcing the law and conducting criminal investigations, without interference from other spheres of activity. → the text of the article

The revision of Article 133, concerning the structure and functioning of the Superior Council of Magistracy (CSM), reflects a concern to strengthen the independence of justice and to secure a transparent process for appointing and sanctioning magistrates. These amendments seek to increase the accountability and efficiency of the CSM in its role as guarantor of the independence of the judicial system. Greater involvement of civil society and a clear separation of powers within the State are also proposed, through the limitation of executive and legislative influence over the decisions of the CSM.

Article 134, in its new drafting, addresses the procedure for appointing judges and prosecutors, placing the emphasis on a rigorous and transparent selection process. By establishing an annual national competition for admission to the magistracy, the aim is to secure a high level of competence and professionalism among those who will serve in judicial office. This can positively influence the quality of the administration of justice and can increase public confidence in the capacity of judicial institutions to administer justice equitably and effectively.

The amendment of Article 136(4), concerning the inalienability of goods in public ownership, has the potential to protect national interests and to prevent unjustified or speculative privatisations. This change can have a significant impact on the national patrimony, ensuring that valuable resources and goods remain in State ownership and are used in the collective interest. By making the administration, concession or leasing of public goods conditional on compliance with a strict legal framework, better management of resources and protection against the improper use of these assets can be secured.

Article 140, in its new drafting, strengthens the role of the Court of Auditors in supervising the management of public resources, underlining the importance of transparency and fiscal responsibility. The Court's periodic and public reporting can contribute to greater awareness of how public funds are spent and can lead the authorities to act with greater prudence in administering the budget.

The amendment of Article 142, governing the composition of the Constitutional Court, is intended to secure a balance among the various powers of the State and their representatives within the Court, and to strengthen the independence of that institution, which is essential to democracy. This change seeks an equitable and diversified representation reflecting different perspectives and securing impartial and effective constitutional review.

As regards Article 143, the amendment of the conditions for appointing the judges of the Constitutional Court underlines the importance of higher legal training and of an unblemished professional and moral reputation. By prohibiting political affiliation in the five years preceding appointment, the aim is to avoid partisan influence and to secure objective and neutral constitutional adjudication. This can lead to greater confidence in the Court's decisions and to better protection of civic rights and freedoms.

The amendments proposed for Article 146, concerning the powers of the Constitutional Court in matters of constitutional review, strengthen its role as guardian of the supremacy of the Constitution.

By extending the possibilities of referral to the Court and by setting out the review procedures in detail, a clearer framework is provided for defending the constitutional order and for preventing the adoption of normative acts contrary to the fundamental principles of the rule of law.

The revision of Article 147, clarifying the effects of the decisions of the Constitutional Court, is essential in order to secure compliance with those rulings and to establish a coherent legal framework. These amendments underline that the Court's decisions are binding and of general effect, thereby contributing to the uniformity of judicial practice and to the prevention of conflicts of norms. In addition, the introduction of the new paragraph (5) establishes a clear sanction for failure to comply with the decisions of the Constitutional Court, which can lead to greater legal discipline and to the consolidation of the rule of law.

The Title VI added to the Constitution, dedicated to Romania's participation in international bodies and alliances, evidences a modern and pragmatic approach to foreign policy, based on respect for international commitments and on the protection of national interests. These amendments underline the importance of the sovereignty of the Romanian people in taking the major decisions affecting the country's status in the international arena, such as accession to or withdrawal from bodies and alliances. This can lead to a closer alignment of foreign policy with the will of citizens and to greater transparency in the process of acceding to or withdrawing from international structures, ensuring that national interests are always duly protected and promoted.

Finally, the newly inserted paragraph in Article 154, establishing the applicability of the amendments to the term of the President in office, is an example of legislative clarity and of predictability in managing the constitutional transition. This change balances the need to respect the will expressed by citizens at the last elections with the need to secure a correct and orderly application of the new constitutional provisions. A transitional framework is thereby established allowing adaptation to the new constitutional context without creating discontinuities or uncertainties in the exercise of State functions.

In conclusion, the analysis of the 50 proposed amendments to the Constitution of Romania highlights a concerted effort to update and adapt the fundamental legislative framework to the realities and needs of contemporary Romanian society. From strengthening the separation of powers within the State and consolidating civic rights and freedoms to optimising political processes and reinforcing the mechanisms of democratic control, every proposed change has the potential significantly to influence the country's social, political and legal structure. It is essential that these amendments be submitted to a broad process of public consultation in which all interested parties — citizens, State institutions, civil-society organisations and political parties — have the opportunity to express their views and to contribute to the final form of the Constitution.

4. Impact on the environment

Not applicable.

5. Other information

Not applicable.

Section 5 — Effects of the present normative act on the legislation in force

(a) normative acts in force that will be amended as a result of the entry into force of the draft normative act:

Through this draft revision of the Constitution, Romania prepares to take significant steps towards consolidating the rule of law, guaranteeing the rights and freedoms of citizens and making the mechanisms of governance more efficient. What follows reviews and analyses the changes proposed by the latest draft revision of the Constitution of Romania, underlining the impact they could have on national legislation. We shall also highlight which laws and normative acts could be amended as a result of these constitutional revisions:

1. First, the revision of Article 1(4) and (5) brings additional clarifications concerning the organisation of the State, the principles of the separation of powers and the supremacy of the Constitution. These amendments could influence the interpretation and application of normative acts governing the functioning of State institutions, such as laws on judicial organisation and laws defining the powers of Parliament, of the Government or of the High Court of Cassation and Justice.

2. The repeal of Article 19(2) has consequences for the rights of citizens, who will no longer be extraditable to third States, with effects on Law No 302 of 28 June 2004 on international judicial cooperation in criminal matters.

3. The amendment of Article 21(3), emphasising the right to a fair trial and to an optimal and predictable resolution of cases, could have a significant impact on the Code of Civil Procedure (Law 134/2010) and the Code of Criminal Procedure (Law 135/2010). It could lead to a revision of the rules on judicial procedure and to the acceleration of proceedings, with the aim of securing the efficiency of the judicial system.

4. The amendment of Article 22(2) concerning the prohibition of experimental treatments could have effects on health legislation (Law 95/2006) and on legislation concerning patients' rights (Law 46/2003), consolidating protection against abuse and establishing clearer standards for the treatment of persons.

5. The introduction of paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 after Article 22(3) marks an important stage in the recognition and protection of sexual identity and of the physical and mental integrity of the person. This could influence the Civil Code (Law 287/2009), legislation on the rights of minors (Law 272/2004) and of persons with disabilities, as well as specific laws on medical technologies and biotechnologies (Law 95/2006).

6. The amendment of Article 23(4) consolidates the rules on pre-trial detention, directly affecting the Code of Criminal Procedure (Law 135/2010) and possibly also the conditions of detention, with an impact on the rights of persons involved in criminal proceedings.

7. The addition of paragraphs 14 and 15 to Article 23 underlines the protection of private life in the context of criminal investigation and the interception of communications, with the potential to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure (Law 135/2010), the legislation on the protection of personal data (Law 506/2004) and the legislation on the surveillance and interception of communications (Government Emergency Ordinance No 111/2011 on electronic communications and Law No 198 of 6 July 2022 amending and supplementing certain normative acts in the field of electronic communications and establishing measures to facilitate the development of electronic communications networks).

8. The extension of Article 24 by paragraphs 3 to 5 reaffirms the right to a defence in criminal proceedings and the principle of equality of arms, creating pressure to adjust criminal procedure — the Code of Criminal Procedure (Law 135/2010) — and the legislation on the classification of State information (Law 182/2002).

9. The amendment of Article 27(3), concerning the conditions for carrying out searches, could require revisions of the Code of Criminal Procedure (Law 135/2010) with a view to securing a stricter legal framework for the protection of the home and of private property.

10. The introduction of the new paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 after Article 28(1), dedicated to the secrecy of correspondence and to interception, could lead to significant reforms in the legislation governing the surveillance and interception of communications (Government Emergency Ordinance No 111/2011 on electronic communications and Law No 198 of 6 July 2022 amending and supplementing certain normative acts in the field of electronic communications and establishing measures to facilitate the development of electronic communications networks), with direct implications for the fundamental rights and freedoms of citizens and also for the Code of Criminal Procedure (Law 135/2010).

11. The amendment of Article 32 through the addition of paragraph 8, concerning the financing of national education, could lead to budgetary adjustments and to amendments of the public finance laws, with the aim of securing the allocation of the established percentage of GDP to education, with direct effects on the State Budget Law.

12. The addition of paragraphs 4 and 5 to Article 34, concerning medical treatment and the financing of health care, could require amendments to health legislation (Law No 95/2006 on the reform in the field of health, patients' rights and public finances), in order to guarantee the right to informed consent and the allocation of the necessary financial resources.

13. The changes to Article 40(3), restricting membership of political parties for certain professional categories, could have an impact on the laws governing the status of magistrates (Law No 303/2022 on the status of judges and prosecutors), of public officials and of other categories of professionals (Law No 188/1999 (republished) on the Status of public officials).

14. The amendment of Article 44 by the addition of paragraph 10 concerning the right of property and the use of goods, including currency, may influence fiscal legislation (the Fiscal Code of 8 September 2015 (Law No 227/2015)) and banking legislation (Law No 312/2004 and the related financial-banking legislation), as well as the rules on transactions and the holding of financial assets.

15. The revision of Article 48 on marriage and the family, through paragraphs 1 and 2, will have a significant impact on family legislation, requiring adjustments to the Civil Code and possibly to other normative acts governing family relations, the conclusion and dissolution of marriage and the status and rights of children.

16. The reformulation of Article 52, concerning the right to a fair trial and to compensation for damage, may bring about changes in the legislation on the liability of the State and of magistrates (Law No 303/2022 on the status of judges and prosecutors), as well as in the procedures for challenging administrative acts and judicial decisions.

17. The amendments to Article 62 concerning representation in Parliament will have consequences for electoral legislation (Law 208/2015), changing the threshold of representativeness for parties and the conditions of access to Parliament for independent candidates.

18. The addition of a new point (l) to Article 65, providing for the appointment of the Prosecutor General and of the heads of the principal investigative directorates, could influence Law No 304/2022 on judicial organisation.

19. The extension of Article 70 through the introduction of paragraph (3) concerning the cessation of the mandate of deputies or senators following a local referendum would have an impact on the electoral laws (Law 208/2015) and on the rules concerning the status of members of Parliament and the procedures for their removal (Law No 96/2006 on the Status of deputies and senators).

20. The amendment of Article 72(3), concerning parliamentary immunity in cases of flagrante delicto, could have consequences for criminal legislation and for the status of deputies and senators, requiring adjustments to the rules on the procedure for lifting parliamentary immunity and the conditions in which it may be suspended (Law No 96/2006 on the Status of deputies and senators).

21. As regards Article 74(1), the amendments proposed to the legislative initiative could lead to a redefinition of the process by which citizens can contribute directly to the formation of national legislation, directly affecting the legislation on the popular legislative initiative (Law No 189/1999 on the exercise of the civic initiative by citizens).

22. Article 75(2), by amending the time-limits within which the first Chamber notified rules on draft laws, could have implications for the efficiency of the legislative process and could lead to a revision of Parliament's internal rules on legislative procedures.

23. Through the amendment of Article 83(1), redefining the term of office of the President of Romania as 4 years conditional on the date of taking the oath in the year of the parliamentary elections, a revision of the legislation on the election of the President (Law No 370/2004) is required, and the electoral laws may also be affected (Law 115/2015, as updated in 2024).

24. The addition of paragraphs 2 and 3 to Article 90, governing the organisation of referendums, could influence the legislation on procedures for consulting the population and could impose new restrictions on the timing and circumstances in which referendums may be initiated.

25. The amendment of point (b) of Article 94 consolidates Parliament's role in the process of conferring senior military ranks, which could require adjustments to military legislation and to the procedures for promotion within the military hierarchy, entailing greater transparency and parliamentary control over that process.

26. The amendment of Article 97(2), concerning the removal of the President by referendum on the initiative of citizens, could generate a need to revise the laws on the organisation and conduct of referendums (Law 3/2000) and those establishing the conditions and terms for exercising this civic right.

27. As regards Article 103(1), concerning the procedure for designating the candidate for the office of Prime Minister, the proposed amendments could influence electoral legislation and the legislation on the functioning of the Government (Law 90/2001), with possible implications for the balance of power among State institutions.

28. Article 108(2) and (3), concerning the issue of decisions and ordinances by the Government, could bring about a reassessment of the legislative framework governing secondary normative acts and could limit the executive's ability to intervene in the field of primary legislation without a clear mandate from the legislature.

29. The amendments to Article 115 concerning Government emergency ordinances and the procedure for their approval by Parliament could lead to a restriction of the use of this legislative instrument and to greater accountability of the Government to Parliament, thereby requiring a revision of the laws governing the legislative process and parliamentary control over governmental acts.

30. The introduction of Article 116(3), limiting the duration of terms in appointed public office, may have implications for the legislation on public administration and on the status of public officials (Law No 188/1999), possibly requiring revisions of the laws establishing the duration of terms and the conditions of renewal for various offices within the State.

31. The amendments to Article 118, through paragraphs 4 and 5, concerning the organisation of the intelligence services and the conditions for stationing foreign troops on Romanian territory, could lead to revisions of national security and defence legislation (Law 51/1991, Law No 14/1992, Law No 1/1998, Law No 92/1996, Law No 191/1998), including the rules on international cooperation in the military and intelligence fields.

32. The addition of paragraph 6 to Article 118, concerning the national defence budget, could entail budgetary adjustments and amendments to public finance legislation, with the aim of clearly delimiting the percentage of funds allocated to defence in relation to the national budget.

33. The introduction of paragraph (2) into Article 119, stipulating the composition of the Supreme Council of National Defence, could affect national security legislation and could require clarifications concerning the powers and the procedures for appointing the members of that council (Law 415/2002).

34. The amendments proposed for Article 120, through the introduction of paragraphs (3) to (6) concerning the election of the presidents of county councils and of mayors and the possibility of their removal by referendum, could have a profound impact on local electoral legislation (Law 155/2015), on the status of the local public administration authorities (Law 393/2004) and on the procedures for removal from office (Law 215/2001).

35. The changes to Article 124, which focus on the independence of judges, could influence the legislation on the status of the magistracy (Law 303/2002), the independence of the judicial system and the restrictions on judges' professional activities outside the judicial system. These could lead to amendments of the laws governing the careers of judges and to possible revisions of the laws on the incompatibilities and prohibitions applicable to them.

36. The introduction of paragraphs (4) and (5) into Article 124, prohibiting judges from being agents or collaborators of the intelligence services and from being members of secret associations, could have effects on national security legislation and on the normative acts governing the activity of the intelligence services and their relationship with the judicial system (all of those mentioned above).

37. The reformulation of, and the addition of new paragraphs to, Article 125, concerning the irremovability, appointment and incompatibilities of judges, entails revisions of the justice laws, in particular those concerning the status and professional career of magistrates (Law 303/2002). These changes will concern transparency and the criteria for appointment to office, as well as the clarification of the role of the Superior Council of Magistracy in the processes of appointing and sanctioning judges.

38. The amendment of Article 126(3), consolidating the role of the High Court of Cassation and Justice in securing the uniform interpretation and application of the law, will entail adjustments to judicial legislation and may influence the processes for resolving questions of law, with direct implications for the uniformity of judicial practice and for case-law.

39. The changes to Article 132 concerning the incompatibility of the office of prosecutor could require revisions of the laws on the status of prosecutors, their professional careers and the activities compatible or incompatible with membership of the Public Ministry (Law 303/2002).

40. The reform of Article 133, redefining the structure and functioning of the Superior Council of Magistracy (CSM), will have a major impact on the organic law of the CSM and may profoundly influence the way in which the independence and accountability of the magistracy are guaranteed. The amendments will also entail a possible reassessment of the role and powers of the Judicial Inspectorate.

41. Article 134, through the proposed amendments, raises the procedures for appointing judges and prosecutors and strengthens the independence of the judicial system by establishing stricter conditions for those processes. This could lead to a revision of the laws on judicial organisation (Law 303/2002) and to a reform of the processes of selection and promotion within the magistracy.

42. Through the amendment of Article 136(4), concerning the inalienability of goods in public ownership, additional restrictions may be imposed on the management of those goods, possibly affecting the legislation on privatisation and on the administration of State patrimony, as well as the rules on concessions and leases (Law No 100/2016 on works concessions and service concessions).

43. The change to Article 140(3), concerning the role of the Court of Auditors in auditing the management of public resources, could lead to greater transparency and accountability in the use of public funds, thereby requiring adjustments to financial legislation and to the rules on reporting and monitoring budgetary expenditure (Law 94/1992).

44. The amendment of Article 142(3), concerning the appointment of the judges of the Constitutional Court, could influence the process of their selection and appointment, with the potential to amend the legislation on the functioning of the Constitutional Court and on the status of constitutional judges (Law 47/1992).

45. The reformulation of the sole paragraph of Article 143, establishing the criteria for the judges of the Constitutional Court, could lead to revisions of the appointment rules and to a possible redefinition of the professional and ethical profile expected of the Court's judges (Law 47/1992).

46. The amendments proposed for points (a) to (d) of Article 146, extending the possibilities of referral to the Constitutional Court and the conditions for examining the constitutionality of laws, will require a reassessment of the mechanisms of constitutional review and of the procedures for referral to the Court. These changes will have consequences for the Court's role within the judicial system and for the balance among the powers of the State.

47. Article 147(3) and (4) consolidate the authority of the decisions of the Constitutional Court, and this will have implications for the applicability of, and compliance with, those decisions within the national legal system. This could lead to legislative clarifications concerning the effects of the Court's decisions on laws and treaties.

48. The introduction of paragraph (5) into Article 147, establishing the consequences of failure by magistrates to comply with the decisions of the Constitutional Court, will require revisions of the legislation on the disciplinary liability of judges and prosecutors and of the rules governing the sanctioning of disciplinary offences within the magistracy.

49. The amendment of Title VI of the Constitution brings to the fore the role of the people and of the referendum in the process of acceding to, ratifying amendments of the founding treaties of, or withdrawing from international bodies and alliances. These changes could require adjustments to the legislation on the national referendum (Law 3/2000) and will have an impact on the sovereignty and independence of the Romanian State in its relationship with international bodies and alliances.

50. The addition of paragraph 3 to Article 154, concerning the applicability of the amendment of the term of office of the President of Romania, will have direct implications for electoral legislation and for the continuity of the term of the President in office (Government Emergency Ordinance No 64/2019 amending and supplementing Law No 370/2004 for the election of the President of Romania and amending Law No 208/2015 on the election of the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies).

In conclusion, the draft revision of the Constitution of Romania provides for a series of significant amendments that will have a major impact on the entire national normative framework.

(b) normative acts to be drawn up in implementation of the new provisions: the same as those mentioned above.

1^1. Compatibility of the draft normative act with the legislation on public procurement — Not applicable

2. Conformity of the draft normative act with Community legislation in the case of drafts transposing Community provisions — No documents were identified in Community legislation in this field.

3. Normative measures necessary for the direct application of Community normative acts — Not applicable.

4. Judgments of the Court of Justice of the European Union — Not applicable.

5. Other normative acts and/or international documents from which commitments arise — Not applicable.

6. Other information. — Not applicable.

1. Information on the process of consultation with non-governmental organisations, research institutes and other bodies involved | Not applicable

2. Justification of the choice of the organisations consulted and of the way in which their activity is connected with the object of the draft normative act | Not applicable

3. Consultations organised with the local public administration authorities, where the draft normative act concerns activities of those authorities, under the conditions of Government Decision No 521/2005 on the procedure for consulting the associative structures of the local public administration authorities in the drafting of normative acts | Not applicable

4. Consultations conducted within the interministerial councils, in accordance with the provisions of Government Decision No 750/2005 on the establishment of permanent interministerial councils | Not applicable.

5. Information on the opinions of: | The advisory opinions will be obtained after completion of the stages provided for by Law 189/1999.

(a) the Legislative Council

(b) the Supreme Council of National Defence

(c) the Economic and Social Council

(d) the Competition Council

(e) the Court of Auditors.

Section 7 — Public information activities concerning the drafting and implementation of the draft normative act

1. Informing civil society of the necessity of drafting the normative act — The draft law for the revision of the Constitution was submitted to public debate for 18 months and is the direct result of those open consultations.

2. Informing civil society of the possible environmental impact of the implementation of the draft normative act, as well as of the effects on the health and safety of citizens or on biological diversity — Not applicable.

3. Other information — Not applicable

Section 8 — Implementation measures

1. Measures for the application of the draft normative act by the central and/or local public administration authorities — the establishment of new bodies or the extension of the competences of existing institutions — Not applicable.

2. Other information — None identified

SECTION 2 — Explanatory memorandum — The Sovereignty Act

The full text of the draft: The Sovereignty Act

Full translation of the memorandum. The Romanian text remains the authoritative one.

EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM

Section 1 — Title of the draft normative act

"The Sovereignty Act —

The Act for the protection of the higher and sovereign interest of the Romanian people and citizen"

Section 2 — Grounds for issuing the normative act

Description of the present situation

In recent years, and above all in the year and a half following the appearance of the SARS-CoV-2 virus, a series of norms have been adopted in Romanian legislation which contravene, whether individually or taken as a whole, the spirit and the letter of the Constitution of Romania, republished. This state of fact and of law is such as to affect gravely and directly the sovereignty of the Romanian State laid down in article 1 paragraph 1 of the Constitution — sovereignty understood both as the right of the nation to identity and self-determination and as a state of law consistent with the constitutional order.

The reaction to the state of stress to which the Romanian State and citizen were subjected as a result of the pandemic situation, from March 2020 to the present, both economically and socially, revealed a series of dysfunctions at the level of the institutions of the Romanian State, such as to affect national sovereignty directly, fundamentally and irreversibly.

Not least, according to the conclusions of the European Parliament Resolution of 13 November 2020 on the impact of COVID-19 measures on democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights (2020/2790(RSP)), it appears that in Romania too advantage was taken of a lacunary legislation which leaves room for derailments dangerous to the rights and liberties of the Romanian citizen, to sustainable economic and social development, and to the coherence and proper functioning of the security institutions of Romania — with the result that constitutional rights and liberties were breached.

Moreover, in adopting restrictive measures through laws and normative acts for the management of the crisis generated by the COVID-19 pandemic, the Romanian authorities never observed the principle of proportionality with the level of gravity forecast or manifested, nor the principle of the non-

discriminatory application of those restrictive measures — principles expressly laid down in article 53 paragraph (2) of the Constitution of Romania for the restriction of the exercise of rights or liberties.

In view of the foregoing, the immediate necessity of this legislative initiative for remedying the situation described follows.

The normal and immediate solution is to legislate a single regulation which corrects the state of law described above, by concentrating and implementing targeted measures intended to consolidate the national sovereignty belonging to the Romanian people. The internal and international economic, social and political developments of recent years have had the effect of markedly undermining the sovereignty of the Romanian people.

Popular sovereignty represents the right of the people to decide its own future and to determine the priorities of the State, its organisation and functioning, as well as the right of the people to control the activity of the State.

According to article 2, paragraph (2) of the Constitution of Romania, republished, "National sovereignty belongs to the Romanian people..."

Present reality shows that the rigours of the Constitution are no longer to be found in the quality of life of the citizens of Romania.

The suppression of popular sovereignty and the existing chaos in the relations between the three powers — legislative, executive and judicial — annuls the concept of constitutional democracy and contributes to invalidating the Social Contract existing between the people and its authorities.

Thus, the Romanian people can no longer dispose sovereignly of the natural, material and human resources existing on the territory of the country; the authorities impose abusive medical measures upon their own citizens; the electoral process is systematically vitiated; and the intelligence services are no longer under civilian control.

For these reasons, and not least in order to restore to the people the sovereignty guaranteed by the Constitution, certain legislative amendments have become necessary, as well as the introduction of new legal rules by which sovereignty is regulated and asserted far more explicitly.

1^1. In the case of drafts transposing Community legislation or creating the framework for its direct application, only the Community acts concerned shall be specified, together with their identification elements — No documents were identified in Community legislation in this field.

2. Envisaged changes

The Sovereignty Act has as its sole object of regulation the restoration of sovereignty and of the state of law, as laid down in article 1 paragraph 1 of the Constitution of Romania. The uniqueness of the regulation in the matter of national sovereignty takes shape through amendments to certain rules in connected fields, indispensable to the achievement of the aim pursued.

These amendments constitute the means by which sovereignty and the rule of law in Romania are consolidated. The draft legislation proceeds from the constitutional rigour according to which sovereignty belongs to the Romanian people and rests upon four pillars:

1) strengthening and guaranteeing the rights and liberties of the citizen, as well as the sovereignty and safety of the Romanian State;

2) protecting and ensuring a healthy environment permitting the normal development and life of the citizen;

3) maximising the benefits obtained by the citizen from the natural riches of the country and, in general, from the economic environment, seen as means of socio-economic development; and

4) consolidating the national defence system, a system to be made more efficient and subordinated exclusively to the will of the people, having as its sole purpose the safeguarding of the sovereignty, independence and unity of the State, of the territorial integrity of the country and of constitutional democracy, in compliance with art. 118 of the Constitution of Romania.

Chapter I adopts new rules or legislative amendments aimed at consolidating the rule of law and protecting the higher and sovereign interest of the Romanian people and citizen.

Article 1 excludes the possibility of limiting fundamental human rights and liberties by normative administrative acts, thereby restoring the supremacy of the Constitution and of the rights it establishes for the Romanian citizen, seen as the legitimate beneficiary of constitutional rights and the sole holder of national sovereignty. The possibility is thereby removed of arbitrary limitations of fundamental rights being imposed by administrative entities which have no power to legislate or to establish restrictions of rights and liberties. The aim is to consolidate the principle of the separation of powers in the State and constitutional democracy — principles according to which the Romanian State is organised under article 1 para. 4 of the Constitution. → the text of the article

Article 2 amends, in the sense described above, Emergency Ordinance 1/1999, removing the possibility of restricting the exercise of fundamental rights during the state of siege and the state of emergency. Account was taken of the fact that no situation, however exceptional, can justify the restriction of rights inherent in the human condition and in the status of citizen — a fact confirmed by the wording of art. 15 of the Constitution: "(1) Citizens enjoy the rights and liberties enshrined in the Constitution and in other laws and have the duties provided therein." Thus, the right to life and to physical and mental integrity, the right of defence, the right to free movement, the right to intimate, family and private life, the inviolability of the domicile, freedom of conscience and freedom of expression may not be limited on any ground whatever, since their restriction cannot have as its hypothetical purpose the exit from an exceptional situation, but rather the deepening of a state of abnormality. → the text of the article

In article 3, for the same reasons set out above, Act 55/2020 is repealed in its entirety, starting from the considerations expressed by the Constitutional Court in Decision 457/2020. In the reasoning of that Decision the Constitutional Court held unequivocally that to "construct" by law a new institution — the "state of alert", with a regime evidently less restrictive than the state of emergency regulated by the constituent legislature — but which permits the circumvention of the constitutional framework governing legality, the separation of powers in the State and the conditions for restricting the exercise of rights and liberties, contravenes the general requirements of the rule of law as enshrined in the Constitution of Romania. In reaching that conclusion, the Constitutional Court also held that even in a state of public emergency the fundamental principle of the rule of law must prevail; that the rule of law consists of several aspects, all of capital importance, which must be maintained in their entirety — the principle of legality, the separation of powers, the division of powers, human rights, the State monopoly on force, public and independent administration of justice, protection of private life, the right to vote, freedom of access to political power, democratic participation of citizens and their supervision of the decision-making process, transparency of

government, freedom of expression, association and assembly, the rights of minorities, and the rule of the majority in political decision-making; and that the rule of law means that governmental agencies must operate within the law and that their actions must be subject to review by independent courts, the legal security of persons being guaranteed. Not least, it is considered that there is no longer any justification for maintaining a regulation of limited applicability adopted as a result of an exceptional situation — the COVID-19 pandemic — all the more so as, at the time of formulating this legislative proposal, the World Health Organization was on the point of declaring the passage from pandemic to a controllable endemic state. Having regard to all these aspects, to the manifestly unconstitutional character of Act 55/2020, and to the need to resume, in conditions of normality, the legislative process for adopting a rule of general applicability for pandemic, endemic and epidemiological situations, the sole solution for returning to a state of legality and constitutionality — as the only ways of exercising national sovereignty — is the full repeal of Act 55/2020. → the text of the article

Article 4 amends the Patients' Rights Act 46/2003, requiring the patient's written agreement and consent to be obtained before the administration of medicines, sanitary materials, medical devices and other therapeutic means. The measure is absolutely necessary in order to strengthen the citizen's right to life and to physical and mental integrity, placed in accordance with freedom of conscience. Each of these is an element indissolubly linked to the sovereignty of the people, seen as the totality of citizens whose rights and liberties must be guaranteed. → the text of the article

For the same reason, paragraph 2 of article 4 also prohibits any discrimination, positive or negative, as a result of accepting or refusing a treatment or a medical device. Any discrimination is contrary to the Constitution, being such as to affect the rights and liberties of a part of the population.

Article 5 pursues the defence of the state of health of the Romanian people, holder of national sovereignty, by amending Act 95/2006 on the reform of the health system so as to prohibit the marketing or use of medicines, vaccines, medical devices and other pharmaceutical products for which the manufacturer offers no guarantees and no demonstrably viable remedies, or for which complete clinical trials have not been carried out. → the text of the article

Likewise, paragraph 2 repeals three sub-points of article 811 of Act 95 of 14 April 2006 which permit certain immoral forms of advertising for medicines with a direct impact upon the state of health of the Romanian people — a fact which endangers national sovereignty.

For the same reasons, paragraph 3 amends art. 813 of Act 95/2006, prohibiting any form of commercial advertising on television, radio and social networks for authorised or unauthorised medicines, vaccines, medical devices and other pharmaceutical products.

For the same considerations, the direct distribution of medicines to the population by manufacturers for promotional purposes has also been prohibited.

Article 6 amends Act 272/2004 on the protection and promotion of the rights of the child, introducing provisions on the defence of the physical and mental integrity of the minor in his capacity as a citizen holding rights. Any form of intervention upon the body of the minor aimed at altering the sexual identity acquired at birth is thus prohibited before the age of 18. At the same time, it is prohibited to make available to children any pornographic materials or materials promoting departure from gender identity, such materials being capable of causing psychological traumas which will mark the whole existence of the citizen. In adopting these amendments, regard is had both to the higher interest of the child and to his right to decide and dispose, in full knowledge, of his own body after

reaching psychological maturity, so that any premature influences upon the normal physical and mental development of the Romanian citizen may be removed. Not least, account is taken of the irreversible character of any premature gender modifications, which will have a negative effect upon the development of the minor and a direct influence upon natality in Romania — an aspect which directly affects national sovereignty. → the text of the article

Article 7 supplements article 64 of the Civil Code, establishing new guarantees concerning the individual physical or mental integrity of the person. Account was taken both of the technological developments of recent years and of the latest results of studies by the most advanced research laboratories in the field, all of which create the conditions for possible intrusions at the level of the brain through the use of neuro-technology. Having regard to the potential risks represented by the absence of regulation in a field which may have direct effects upon the Romanian citizen as an individual, and upon communities as a whole — both capable of causing uncontrolled influences upon society and hence, implicitly, upon national sovereignty — the use or holding of any device whose purpose is to access or manipulate neuronal activity, or to diminish the autonomy of the will or the capacity of citizens to take decisions freely, has been prohibited. → the text of the article

Article 8 amends paragraph 3 of art. 5 of Act 159/2016 on the regime of the physical infrastructure of electronic communications networks, granting owners and co-owners of buildings the right to use continuously, uninterruptedly and unconditionally the buildings of which they are owners or co-owners. Account was taken of the fact that permitting, without restriction and without prior authorisation, any legal entities holding electronic communications networks, or the technologies and equipment used within the IT and communications infrastructures of national interest, to install elements of physical infrastructure constitutes an unacceptable limitation of the right of property — which may amount to a grave infringement of the sovereignty of the Romanian people. → the text of the article

Article 9 amends Act no. 286/2009 — the Criminal Code, bringing the legislation in this field into line with the latest decisions of the Constitutional Court and with the legislative amendments introduced by this legislative proposal. → the text of the article

Thus, paragraph 1 introduces a new article into the Criminal Code, article 195^1, with the marginal heading "Disturbance or alteration of physical or mental integrity", criminalising breaches of the provisions of article 64 of the Civil Code as amended by this draft Act. Punishment is thus provided for "disturbing or altering the individual physical or mental integrity of a person without that person's written, express, informed and freely expressed consent", and likewise for holding or using any system or device whose purpose is to access or manipulate neuronal activity, for accessing or manipulating a person's neuronal activity, and for any intervention upon neuronal connections or intrusion at the level of the brain, whether invasive or non-invasive, in the absence of the person's written, express, informed and freely expressed consent. The provisions thus introduced into the Criminal Code are necessary for the defence of the social values protected by the civil rule and for the defence of the rights and of the physical and mental integrity of the Romanian citizen, as fundamental elements of national sovereignty.

Paragraph 2 amends Art. 197 of the Criminal Code, headed "Ill-treatment of the minor", by introducing two new paragraphs, 2 and 3. Paragraph 2 of article 197 criminalises "the act of determining a minor who has not reached the age of 18 to alter his biological sexual identity acquired at birth", whether or not the perpetrator's aim was achieved. The reason for criminalising this act lies in the

grave mental, psychological and behavioural disturbances which such an act may produce in the minor, even where the minor cannot himself decide upon the actual, physical modification of his sexual identity acquired at birth. Paragraph 3 introduces an aggravated form of the act provided for in paragraph 2, increasing by one third the penalty applied where the perpetrator is a parent, guardian, instructor or teacher, or where the act itself produced physical consequences upon the minor, irrespective of the capacity of the perpetrator.

Paragraph 3 of article 9 amends art. 211 of the Criminal Code, headed "Trafficking in minors", introducing after paragraph 1 a new paragraph (1^1) criminalising the mediation or promotion of adoptions by persons who are not officials of the General Directorate for Social Assistance and Child Protection or of the National Authority for the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, Children and Adoptions. The reason for criminalising this act was the situation of recent decades, in which the adoption of children was seen by various natural and legal persons as a veritable commercial act, thousands of children being thereby taken out of the country, losing their citizenship and no longer being capable of protection by the Romanian State — a fact which affects national sovereignty directly and gravely by diminishing the population, the holder of sovereignty.

Paragraph 4 of Article 9 amends paragraph 4 of article 221 of the Criminal Code, raising from 13 to 14 the age from which the act of determining a minor to witness exhibitionist acts, or performances in which sexual acts of any nature are committed, is punished. At the same time, the act of making available to a minor pornographic materials, or materials whose content explicitly describes sexuality, has been criminalised. Account was taken of the need to preserve the innocence and natural development of the minor in accordance with the moral norms generally accepted by society, up to an age at which the acts criminalised lose their dangerousness.

Paragraph 5 of Article 9 introduces a new paragraph into art. 221 of the Criminal Code, headed "Sexual corruption of minors", and amends paragraph 6 of the same article. Paragraph 5^1 criminalises "the act of making available to children under the age of eighteen any materials promoting departure from biological sexual identity, gender reassignment and homosexuality", having regard to the medium- and long-term effects upon the development of the minor and to the irreparable psychological traumas which it may cause — acts which directly impair the development of generations healthy and capable of fully exercising their rights and their sovereignty. Paragraph 6 is amended so as to criminalise the attempt at the act thus criminalised, having regard to the importance of the social value protected.

Paragraph 6 amends paragraph 6 of article 221 of the Criminal Code, criminalising also the attempt at the offence newly introduced at paragraph 5^1 of article 221 of the Criminal Code.

Paragraph 7 amends article 297 of the Criminal Code — Abuse of office — bringing it into line with Decisions 405/2016 and 392/2017, and criminalising in paragraph 2 the act of discriminating against any person, of "restricting the exercise of a person's right or creating for that person a situation of fear, of social exclusion or of inferiority on the ground of accepting or refusing a treatment or a medical device". The necessity of criminalising this act arises from the recurrence, in the society of recent years, of acts of negative discrimination through the restriction of constitutional rights, in breach of the rights of the patient laid down in Act no. 46 of 21 January 2003 and in the Oviedo Convention, against persons who did not accept certain medical treatments which are optional under

the legislation in force. Symmetrically, any act of discrimination as a result of accepting and undergoing medical treatments has also been criminalised.

Paragraph 8 introduces a third paragraph into article 297 of the Criminal Code — Abuse of office — criminalising any act of a public servant or of a person assimilated thereto consisting in the application of norms declared unconstitutional by the Constitutional Court. The amendment to the criminal law was made in order to strengthen respect for the rights of the Romanian citizen, and also to strengthen the force of the decisions of the Constitutional Court by criminalising any breach thereof — all having as their ultimate purpose the strengthening of the rule of law and of the constitutional regime in Romania, both regarded as the very foundation of national sovereignty.

Paragraph 9 introduces a new letter into article 394 of the Criminal Code, headed Treason — letter e) — criminalising the act of a Romanian citizen of entering into relations with a foreign power or organisation, or with agents thereof, for the purpose of suppressing or impairing the unity and indivisibility, the sovereignty or the independence of the State, through the exercise of an office of public dignity or one involving the exercise of State authority. Account was taken of the fact that the exercise of such an office by the active subject of the offence of treason — namely by a Romanian citizen who has entered into relations with a foreign power or organisation or with agents thereof for the purpose of suppressing or impairing the unity and indivisibility, the sovereignty or the independence of the State — constitutes a danger to national sovereignty and to the safety of the State. The exercise of such an office constitutes a real and imminent state of danger to the constitutional and legal order of Romania, without it being necessary that the means provided for in letters a) to d) of article 394 of the Criminal Code should exist; hence, for the defence of national sovereignty and of economic, financial, sanitary and social safety, the criminalisation of this act is necessary precisely in order to avert the consequences of the criminal actions of citizens who have entered into relations with a foreign power or organisation or with agents thereof — accession to such an office by such persons being the very aim pursued by those foreign powers and organisations. Account was likewise taken of the fact that the offence of High Treason, provided for and punished by article 398 of the Criminal Code, criminalises only acts committed by "the President of Romania or another member of the Supreme Council of National Defence", leaving outside the criminal sphere acts committed by the other persons exercising offices of public dignity or involving the exercise of State authority.

Paragraph 10 introduces a new paragraph into article 398 of the Criminal Code, headed "High treason" — paragraph 2 — establishing an aggravated form of the offence criminalised in paragraph 1, increasing the penalty limits for the act of entering into relations with a foreign power or organisation, or with agents thereof, for the purpose of suppressing or impairing the unity and indivisibility, the sovereignty or the independence of the State, through economic or political subversion or subversion of the defence capacity of the State, where that act has caused significant damage to the national economy. As the very text of paragraph 1 states, the act criminalised is such as to endanger national sovereignty, the increase in the penalty limits for grave consequences being intended as a means of dissuasion, all the more so since the perpetrators may be persons holding important positions within the Romanian State.

Paragraph 11 introduces a new paragraph into article 398 of the Criminal Code, headed "High treason", bringing within the sphere of high treason also the act of the President of failing to give effect to the decisions of the Constitutional Court settling conflicts of a constitutional nature within 10 days of the communication of the operative part. The necessity of criminalising this act lies in the importance

of the value protected — namely the immediate implementation of the decisions of the Constitutional Court — as well as in the absence of any means of coercion or of any sanction for a President who breaches the constitutional order and ignores the judgments interpreting the Constitution, such acts being capable of fundamentally affecting national sovereignty.

Article 10 amends two articles of Act 135/2010, the Code of Criminal Procedure. → the text of the article

Paragraph 1 amends Article 247 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, establishing by law the need for a connection between the criminal act committed and the state of mental health of the perpetrator. In this way, the measure of provisional medical committal may be taken only if the perpetrator's condition was determinant for the commission of the act and the measure is necessary in order to remove a concrete and present danger to public safety. The need for the legislative amendment arose from the increasing incidence of interpretations, by the criminal courts, extending their powers into the civil sphere in cases where, although there is no connection between the perpetrator's state of health and the act allegedly committed, safety measures were taken during the criminal investigation, disregarding the general legal framework laid down by the Civil Code applicable in the matter.

Paragraph 2 of article 10 introduces a new letter g) into paragraph 1 of art. 453 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, adding as a new ground for revision the situation in which "the judgment was founded upon a legal provision which was repealed or amended after the judgment became final, where the criminal provisions are more favourable or the act has been decriminalised." Account is taken of the fact that the decriminalisation of an act and more favourable criminal rules reflect an expression and an effect of the way in which certain acts are perceived by society, which is why their decriminalisation is the direct effect of the exercise of the sovereign right of the people to legislate in criminal matters. Consequently, decriminalisation or more favourable criminal rules must produce their effects upon all members of society, irrespective of whether, at the date of the legislative change, they have been finally convicted under a criminal rule that has become obsolete — the judgment itself becoming obsolete and contrary to the legal and constitutional order. Not least, account was taken of the fact that revision may be sought at any time, even after the death of the convicted person, by his heirs, which makes it possible to remedy historical judicial errors and abuses committed under the communist or fascist regimes.

Article 11 amends article 18 para. 2 of Act no. 202 of 9 November 1998 (republished) on the organisation of the Official Gazette of Romania, the legislative amendment establishing free and uninterrupted access of Romanian citizens to the Official Gazette and to all documents of public interest communicated through it. The amendment was made following the finding that knowledge of the law and of official acts by their addressees is necessary, as an obligation correlative to the citizen's duty to know the law, the link established between State and citizen through the law and through knowledge of it being a fundamental element of national sovereignty. → the text of the article

Article 12 governs the relationship between the Romanian citizen and the entities which hold or operate social networks or other virtual environments, Cloud storage environments, online sites or operating systems, the defence of the rights of the Romanian citizen being one of the attributes of the sovereignty of a State. The aim is to protect the right to one's image, to free expression, and to defend the intellectual property rights of the Romanian citizen in relation to any legal entities, whether or not established in Romania, bringing jurisdiction over possible disputes to the national courts. This

measure seeks to bring under Romanian jurisdiction any acts or facts committed in the online environment. Not least, the provision brings national legislation into line with the recommendation of the European Parliament, which emphasised that responsibility for ensuring compliance with the law must rest with the public authorities and that, ultimately, decisions should belong to an independent judicial system and not to a private commercial entity. → the text of the article

Article 13 amends Act no. 208 of 20 July 2015 on the election of the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies, establishing reductions of the electoral threshold for better parliamentary representation of Romanian citizens. Paragraph 1 repeals paragraphs 3 to 5 of article 92^1, by which, under Act 202/2020, the Special Telecommunications Service acquired extended powers within the electoral process. Similarly, paragraph 4 repeals the amendments made by that same Act 202/2020 to paragraph 103^1, all references to the Special Telecommunications Service and the powers conferred upon it within the electoral process being removed. In paragraphs 5 to 8 the same amendments were made, repealing and amending any legal provisions involving that same Service in the electoral process. The legislative amendments seek to make the electoral process transparent and to remove from it a secret service (militarised at the present date), the measures being necessary in order to return the electoral process in Romania to the civilian sphere, as is the case in all the countries of the European Union. → the text of the article

Paragraphs 2 and 3 amend article 94 of Act 208/2015 by lowering the electoral threshold established for parties and electoral alliances for entry into Parliament — from 5% to 3% for parties and, in the case of electoral alliances, from an increase of 3 percentage points for each member party to 1%, but not more than 5% of the votes cast. It is considered that the benefits of political stability brought by raising the electoral threshold, to the detriment of the representation of political options, have not had the expected effect, the economic and social state of Romania today being the proof of the failure of that manner of representing Romanian citizens. It was considered that, as between political stability and the parliamentary representation of as broad a segment of the population as possible, national sovereignty is more correctly and faithfully expressed by a broad representativeness of Parliament, as a direct application of article 2 paragraph 1 of the Constitution: "(1) National sovereignty belongs to the Romanian people, who exercise it through their representative bodies, constituted by free, periodic and fair elections, as well as by referendum" — the fact that the Constitution speaks of "representativeness" and not of "stability" being the constitutional foundation of the amendment of the electoral threshold.

Chapter II adopts legislative amendments aimed at protecting the environment, seen as a means of sustainable development, and at protecting the higher and sovereign interest of the Romanian people and citizen.

Article 14 amends Act 57/2020 on the sustainable management of Romania's forests, prohibiting the export, within or outside the Community area, of unprocessed timber, including logs, with or without bark, round wood, sawn timber, beams or railway sleepers, until 1 January 2121. This temporary prohibition is necessary in order to counteract the effects of the massive exports of recent years, which have caused extensive deforestation with disastrous effects upon the environment and neighbouring human communities — floods, landslides, irreversible harm to flora and fauna. The gravity of the situation requires the criminalisation of breaches of the export prohibitions. → the text of the article

In article 15, articles 29 and 108 of Act 46 of 19 March 2008 — the Forestry Code — are amended,

prohibiting, for the same reasons as those set out above, all deforestation and clear-felling on the territory of Romania, including that justified by ecological reconstruction, the regeneration and tending of forests, until 1 January 2121.

Likewise, the act of causing disease in, or infesting with pests, the trees of the forest stock, as well as the breach of the prohibition laid down in art. 29 of the Forestry Code, have been criminalised, all being such as to affect directly the sustainable development of the Romanian nation and the sovereignty of the people.

Article 16 amends article 13 of Act no. 211/2011 on the waste regime, adding paragraph 2, which establishes a total prohibition of any imports of waste of any kind, as the only means of protecting the sovereign interest of the Romanian people. → the text of the article

Chapter III adopts new rules and measures in the economic field for the protection of the interests of the State and of the Romanian citizen.

Article 17 establishes the prohibition of alienating the assets held by the State in national companies and undertakings, in credit institutions, and in any other economic entity in which the State is a shareholder. Just as Act 173/2020, subsequently amended, provided for the prohibition of alienating State assets for a period of two years, it is considered necessary: 1) to establish the prohibition of alienating the shares held by the State in national companies and undertakings, in credit institutions and in any other company in which the State is a shareholder; and 2) to suspend those already commenced, for a period of 100 years, until 1 January 2121, the operations concerning the alienation of the assets or shares of the State, irrespective of the share of capital held. In adopting this measure, regard is had to the protection of the interests of the Romanian State, avoiding the risk of patrimonial losses in the event of alienation of assets held in various national economic entities, in a period of economic instability and structural change. The aim is likewise the conservation of the State's assets with a view to transmitting them to the following generations and ensuring economic stability permitting the development of human capital. → the text of the article

Article 18 supplements article 307 of the Administrative Code of 3 July 2019 with a new paragraph establishing that the minimum level of the royalty obtained from the concession of goods in public property may not fall below the level of the European Economic Area market and must be proportionate to the benefits obtained from the exploitation of the good by the concessionaire and to the market value of the good concerned. The aim is to make more efficient and more profitable the exploitation of Romania's natural resources and to increase budgetary revenues as means of consolidating national sovereignty. → the text of the article

Article 19, in paragraph 1, amends art. 30 para. 1 letter a) of Act no. 312 of 28 June 2004 on the Statute of the National Bank of Romania and establishes the obligation for the National Bank to keep the gold reserves held in the treasury exclusively and entirely on the territory of Romania. The possibility, provided for in the present form of the law, of depositing the gold of the National Bank's treasury abroad is thereby repealed. Paragraph 2 establishes a time limit of 180 days for the full repatriation of the gold deposited outside Romania, and paragraph 3 criminalises the failure to observe the two preceding paragraphs, providing a penalty of up to 20 years' imprisonment. The measures are intended to ensure the economic and financial stability of Romania through permanent, uninterrupted and unconditional access to its own gold reserves — measures necessary given the marked instability

of financial markets and the risk of an imminent global economic crisis. At the same time, the effective holding and treasuring of one's own reserves of precious metals is a way of asserting, and a guarantee for preserving, national sovereignty. → the text of the article

Article 20 establishes the obligation of full transparency of the contracts concluded with the Romanian State and requires that all such contracts be published in the Official Gazette, Part IV, and on the websites of the contracting institutions. Transparency in the public sector as regards contracts concluded with the Romanian State is an essential element in ensuring a functioning democracy, especially in exceptional circumstances, which may be fertile ground for acts of corruption or circumventions of the law. Likewise, the institutions of the State must not make information accessible only upon request, but must publish contracts of public interest by virtue of this legal provision. → the text of the article

Article 21 criminalises two acts of omission committed by public servants. Paragraph 1 criminalises the intentional omission of a public servant to enforce privatisation or concession contracts in accordance with their clauses, and likewise the omission to bring the legal actions for their enforcement, such acts being punished by imprisonment from 10 to 20 years. Account was taken of the intentional passivity of certain high-ranking public servants in enforcing, or bringing the legal actions required by, the non-performance or partial or defective performance of contracts concluded by various Romanian or foreign entities with the Romanian State. Paragraph 2 establishes a penalty reduced by half for the same acts where committed negligently. In establishing this regulation, account was taken of the situation in which many privatisation or concession contracts were manifestly performed partially or defectively, with clauses whose breach became notorious, in the face of which the authorities of the Romanian State remained passive. The intention is to compel the accountability of the Romanian official in fulfilling his duties in defence of public property, as a means of defending the national patrimony and sovereignty. → the text of the article

Article 22 imposes the prohibition of marketing on the territory of Romania products of a quality inferior to those marketed under the same brand in the country of origin. All citizens of the European Union deserve equal treatment as regards the food and non-food products marketed on the single market, and this article is intended to eliminate the unfair practice in this field, so that the Romanian consumer may no longer be misled abusively and unlawfully. The practice of many foreign producers is well known: selling products of differing quality under the same brand and in the same packaging, some containing a smaller quantity of the main ingredient, others containing ingredients of a quality inferior to that used for producing the original product. → the text of the article

Chapter IV of the Sovereignty Act, entitled "Measures in the field of national safety and defence for the protection of the higher and sovereign interest of the Romanian people and citizen", provides a series of urgent and necessary measures for strengthening the safety of the Romanian citizen and defending national sovereignty.

Article 23 amends Act 51/1991 on national security — a law predating Romania's accession to NATO, which contains a series of provisions of Soviet origin, such as those providing for the militarisation of the secret services. → the text of the article

In order to harmonise national legislation with that of Romania's NATO and European Union allies, the total demilitarisation of the intelligence, counter-intelligence, guard and special telecommunications services and of those assimilated to them was ordered.

In the same sense, any participation whatever of the intelligence, counter-intelligence and assimilated services in the performance of judicial procedural acts has been prohibited, as has the influencing in any way of the prosecutor or judge charged with an investigation. Any act contrary to the provisions of the law, as amended, has been criminalised, attracting a penalty of between 10 and 20 years.

Likewise for the same reasons, and having regard to the imperative need to prohibit any interference by the intelligence, counter-intelligence and assimilated services in public life outside their sector of activity, as well as to the need to return to a fair competitive framework for the business environment in Romania, any participation whatever of those services in political or economic activities has been prohibited, as has the holding of commercial companies directly or indirectly, through their own personnel or through interposed persons, and the carrying out of commercial activities on the territory of Romania or abroad by the intelligence, counter-intelligence and assimilated services.

The measures amending the provisions of laws fundamental to national safety were taken because the very word "secrecy" is repugnant in a free and open society; and we are as a people inherently and historically opposed to secret societies, to secret oaths and to secret proceedings. This is the substance of the warning given by John F. Kennedy in his address "The President and the Press" (1961), which the initiators of this draft take as their guide.

Article 24 amends Act no. 14 of 24 February 1992 (updated) on the organisation and functioning of the Romanian Intelligence Service and brings it into line with the provisions of Act 51/1991, as amended.

Article 25 amends Act no. 1 of 6 January 1998 (republished) on the organisation and functioning of the Foreign Intelligence Service and brings it into line with the provisions of Act 51/1991, as amended.

Article 26 amends Act no. 92 of 24 July 1996 on the organisation and functioning of the Special Telecommunications Service and brings it into line with the provisions of Act 51/1991, as amended.

Article 27 amends Act no. 191 of 19 October 1998 on the organisation and functioning of the Protection and Guard Service and brings it into line with the provisions of Act 51/1991, as amended.

Article 28 establishes the National Guard on the principle of the defence of the entire national territory by the entire people on a voluntary basis. The National Guard is an integral part of the national defence system, being subordinated directly to Parliament and composed of volunteers from among the civilian population over the age of 18. → the text of the article

The National Guard is established out of the need to involve the Romanian citizen in the permanent defence of the democracy, integrity and sovereignty of Romania, in conditions marked by the professionalisation of the army, by the decrease in the number of professional soldiers and by the involvement of the army in theatres of operations thousands of kilometres from the country's borders. For these reasons, the periodic military training of the volunteer Romanian citizen who is not a professional soldier, and the possibility of having a number of citizens permanently in a state of vigilance,

is such as to strengthen the defence capacity of the country, constituting an additional guarantee for national sovereignty.

Article 29 introduces the obligation to acquire new military equipment directly from the manufacturer, in compliance with the offset legislation in force, namely Emergency Ordinance 189/2002. This measure became necessary following the acquisition by the Romanian State, in recent years, of obsolete and useless military equipment at exorbitant prices — a fact which is such as to endanger national safety and sovereignty. → the text of the article

Chapter V — Final and transitional provisions — lays down the moment and manner of entry into force of the law.

Article 30 lays down the moment of entry into force of the law and the automatic repeal of any contrary legal provision. → the text of the article

Section 3 — Socio-economic impact of the draft normative act

1. Macroeconomic impact — No

1¹. Impact on the competitive environment and on the field of State aid — Not applicable

2. Impact on the business environment — Not applicable

3. Social impact — Not applicable

4. Environmental impact — Not applicable

5. Other information — Not applicable

Section 4 — Financial impact upon the general consolidated budget, both in the short term, for the current year, and in the long term (5 years).

— thousand lei —

Indicators | Current year | The following 4 years | Average over 5 years

1. Changes in budgetary revenues, plus/minus, of which:

a) State budget, of which:

(i) corporate income tax

(ii) income tax

b) local budgets:

(i) corporate income tax

c) State social insurance budget:

(i) insurance contributions

2. Changes in budgetary expenditure, plus/minus, of which:

a) State budget, of which:

(i) personnel expenditure

(ii) goods and services

b) local budgets

(i) personnel expenditure

(ii) goods and services

c) State social insurance budget:

(i) personnel expenditure

(ii) goods and services

3. Financial impact, plus/minus, of which:

a) State budget

(i) personnel expenditure

b) local budgets

4. Proposals for covering the increase in budgetary expenditure

5. Proposals for compensating the reduction in budgetary revenues

6. Detailed calculations substantiating the changes in budgetary revenues and/or expenditure — We do not have sufficient data.

7. Other information — Any additional budgetary expenditure connected with the application of the provisions of this act.

Section 5 — Effects of this normative act upon the legislation in force

a) normative acts in force which will be amended or repealed as a result of the entry into force of the draft normative act:

Act no. 55/2020 on certain measures for the prevention and combating of the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic, as subsequently amended and supplemented, will be repealed.

Act no. 46/2003 on the rights of the patient will be amended by adding a second paragraph to article 4 and by introducing a new article, 36^2. (2 amendments in the text of the law)

Art. 4 of Emergency Ordinance no. 1/1999 on the regime of the state of siege and the state of emergency will be amended. (1 amendment in the text of the law)

Act no. 95/2006 on the reform of the health system will be amended by introducing a new article, art. 704^1, by removing sub-points 5, 6 and 7 of art. 811 para. (1) and by amending art. 813.

Art. 17 of Act no. 148/2020 on advertising will be amended. (1 amendment in the text of the law)

Act no. 286/2009 — the Criminal Code — will be amended (9 amendments in the text of the law)

a new article is introduced after art. 195 — article 195^1

art. 197 will be amended by introducing two new paragraphs;

art. 211 will be amended by introducing a new paragraph $(1)^1$

art. 221 will be amended by amending paragraph 4, introducing a new paragraph $(5)^1$ after para. (5) and amending paragraph (6);

Paragraphs 1 and 2 of art. 297 will be amended and a new paragraph (3) will be added after para. (2);

in art. 394 a new letter e) is introduced in paragraph 1, and paragraph 2 is introduced;

paragraph 2 is introduced into art. 398;

Act no. 135/2010 — the Code of Criminal Procedure — will be amended (2 amendments in the text of the law)

paragraphs 1 and 2 of art. 247 will be amended;

a new letter is introduced into para. (1) of art. 453;

Art. 18 para. (2) of Act no. 202/1998 on the organisation of the Official Gazette of Romania will be amended. (1 amendment in the text of the law)

Act no. 208/2015 on the election of the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies, as well as on the organisation and functioning of the Permanent Electoral Authority, will be amended and supplemented (12 amendments), namely:

amendment of art. 94 para. (2) letters a) and b);

para. (8) of art. 110 is repealed, para. (4) of art. 102^1 is repealed, art. 103^1 is repealed;

art. 110 paragraphs (1), (3) and (4) are amended;

paragraphs (3), (4) and (5) of art. 92^1 of Act no. 202/2020 amending and supplementing certain normative acts in electoral matters are repealed;

Articles 1 and 4 of Act no. 57/2020 on the sustainable management of Romania's forests will be amended; (2 amendments in the text of the law)

Act no. 46/2008 — the Forestry Code — will be amended and supplemented (7 amendments in the text of the law)

Art. 29 will be amended;

Paragraphs (2)–(5) of art. 29 are repealed;

Three new articles are introduced after art. 109 — 109^1, 109^2 and 109^3;

Art. 13 of Act no. 211/2011 on the waste regime will be amended by introducing a new paragraph (2); (1 amendment in the text of the law)

Emergency Ordinance no. 57/2019 — the Administrative Code — will be amended: in art. 307 a new paragraph is introduced after para. (1) — para. $(1)^1$; (1 amendment in the text of the law)

Art. 30 para. (1) letter a) of Act no. 312/2004 on the Statute of the National Bank of Romania will be amended; (1 amendment in the text of the law)

Act no. 51/1991 on the national security of Romania will be amended (5 amendments in the text of the law), namely:

amendment of paragraphs (1) and (2) of art. 29;

a new paragraph (4) is introduced into art. 29;

a new article is introduced after art. 33 — art. 33^1;

a new article is introduced after art. 33^1 — art. 33^2;

Act no. 14/1992 on the organisation and functioning of the Romanian Intelligence Service will be amended (8 amendments in the text of the law), namely:

amendment of article 9 letter a), art. 10 para. (1), art. 27 para. (1) and art. 42;

art. 9 letter e) is repealed; para. (3) of art. 27, para. (1) of art. 29 and art. 30 are repealed;

Act no. 1/1998 on the organisation and functioning of the Foreign Intelligence Service will be amended (6 amendments in the text of the law), namely:

art. 9 para. (1), art. 10 para. (1), art. 11, art. 13 and art. 14 will be amended;

para. $(1)^1$ of art. 21 is repealed;

Act no. 92/1996 on the organisation and functioning of the Special Telecommunications Service will be amended (4 amendments in the text of the law), namely:

art. 11 para. (1) letter m), art. 12 para. (1) and art. 14 will be amended;

para. (2) of art. 12 is repealed;

Act no. 191/1998 on the organisation and functioning of the Protection and Guard Service will be amended (10 amendments in the text of the law), namely:

art. 1 para. (2), art. 15 paras. (1) and (3), art. 19 para. (1), art. 29 para. (1) will be amended;

art. 13, art. 14 letters d) and e), art. 16 paras. (1) and (3) are repealed

Arts. 10 and 11 of Act no. 45/1994 — the National Defence Act of Romania — will be amended, and a new article — art. 12^1 — will be introduced after art. 12; (3 amendments in the text of the law)

In summary: 1 law repealed, 19 laws and ordinances amended, 82 articles amended, added or repealed, and 17 newly introduced legal provisions.

b) normative acts to be drawn up following the implementation of the new provisions:

General legislation applicable in pandemic, endemic and epidemic situations.

Legislation regulating the status of public servant with special status for the military employees of the intelligence, counter-intelligence, guard and special telecommunications services and of those assimilated to them.

The law on the organisation and functioning of the National Guard.

1^1. Compatibility of the draft normative act with the legislation in the field of public procurement — Not applicable

2. Conformity of the draft normative act with Community legislation in the case of drafts transposing Community provisions — No documents were identified in Community legislation in this field.

3. Normative measures necessary for the direct application of Community normative acts — Not applicable.

4. Judgments of the Court of Justice of the European Union — Not applicable.

5. Other normative acts and/or international documents from which commitments arise — Not applicable.

6. Other information. — Not applicable.

Section 6 — Consultations carried out with a view to drawing up the draft normative act

1. Information concerning the process of consultation with non-governmental organisations, research institutes and other bodies involved

2. Justification of the choice of the organisations consulted, and of the manner in which the activity of those organisations is connected with the subject of the draft normative act

3. Consultations organised with the local public administration authorities, where the draft normative act concerns activities of those authorities, under the conditions of Government Decision no. 521/2005

4. Consultations held within the interministerial councils, in accordance with Government Decision no. 750/2005 on the establishment of permanent interministerial councils

5. Information concerning the opinions issued by:

a) the Legislative Council

b) the Supreme Council of National Defence

c) the Economic and Social Council

d) the Competition Council

e) the Court of Accounts.

Section 7 — Public information activities concerning the drafting and implementation of the draft normative act

1. Informing civil society of the necessity of drawing up the normative act

2. Informing civil society of the possible environmental impact of the implementation of the draft normative act, as well as of the effects on the health and safety of citizens or on biological diversity

3. Other information

Section 8 — Implementing measures

1. Measures for putting the draft normative act into application by the central and/or local public administration authorities — the establishment of new bodies or the extension of the powers of existing institutions

2. Other information

SECTION 3 — Explanatory memorandum — The Solidarity Act

The full text of the draft: The Solidarity Act — the taxation of large businesses and fortunes

Full translation of the memorandum. The Romanian text remains the authoritative one.

EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM

Section 1 – Title of the draft normative act

"The Act of national solidarity and of the taxation of large businesses and fortunes"

Section 2 – Grounds for issuing the normative act

Description of the present situation

In recent years, as a result of the negative impact on the economy caused by the freezing of activity in numerous sectors during the pandemic, and also of the slowdown in economic growth caused by the uncertainties and fears produced by the outbreak of war on the country's borders, major budgetary imbalances have arisen, caused by the increase in budgetary expenditure incurred for the acquisition of numerous pharmaceutical products as well as for the provision of humanitarian and military support in accordance with Romania's foreign policy. The situation described has aggravated both the budgetary problems already existing and the social problems which our country was facing at the end of 2019, which is why the State must urgently take measures to increase budgetary revenues and also to protect the persons most severely affected by social problems, namely taxpayers who have several dependants — this latter measure being also such as to encourage the birth rate, a major and priority problem of the Romanian State.

This situation calls for urgent measures to increase social solidarity between the natural and legal persons whose material position is solid and consolidated and the disadvantaged strata — the most sorely tried over the past 4 years — whose material situation continues to deteriorate. At the same time, these measures will be correlated with measures to encourage the large contributors and with certain fiscal measures designed to simplify the collection of taxes and to make it more predictable and more transparent, thus avoiding both possible abuses or acts of corruption on the part of the fiscal authorities and eliminating the possibility for large taxpayers to carry out "fiscal optimisations" disloyal to the Romanian State.

2. Envisaged changes

The Act of national solidarity and of the taxation of large businesses and fortunes brings targeted amendments to Act 227/2015 on the Fiscal Code and to Act 256/2018 on certain measures necessary for the implementation of petroleum operations by holders of petroleum agreements relating to

offshore petroleum blocks, whose purpose is to increase budgetary revenues by taxing large taxpayers, legal and natural persons, at fixed percentage rates established by thresholds of revenue and, respectively, of wealth held, in order to bear the fiscal deductions granted to taxpayers who have several dependants. Thus:

I. Amendments to Act 227/2015 on the Fiscal Code:

→ the text of the article **Article 1** adds, after article 18 of the Fiscal Code, three new articles which introduce a special regime of taxation for certain categories of legal-person taxpayers whose annual revenues exceed EUR 10,000,000. To this end, after article 18 there are inserted articles 18^1, 18^2 and 18^3, which govern the regime of taxation by thresholds of turnover and by the nature of the activity of the large legal-person taxpayers of Romania. This measure is such as to encourage the activity of large taxpayers and to increase the degree of economic competitiveness. In essence, the provision introduces thresholds of taxation on turnover for large taxpayers similar to those already existing in Title III of the Fiscal Code, where the regime of taxation on turnover for Romanian micro-enterprises is governed.

Starting from the success of the regime taxing turnover at low rates — a major factor in the development of the national economy in recent years, and also a factor of attractiveness for many foreign economic operators who chose Romania precisely for this manner of taxation — the introduction, by symmetry, of the same manner of taxation for large taxpayers as well is a measure encouraging their economic development and attracting large capital and companies to our country, thus turning Romania into an important player in hosting and encouraging large businesses in Europe and in the world.

It is likewise evident that setting rates of taxation on turnover is such as to increase the predictability of fiscal rules for the economic operator and, at the same time, facilitates the establishment and payment of the taxes owed by large taxpayers to the Romanian State. This latter effect is intended to avoid the possible errors arising, under the current rules, when the taxpayer calculates taxable profit, and to limit the interaction of economic operators with the agents of the Romanian tax authority during fiscal inspections — a fact such as to make the activity of the tax authority more efficient and to reduce the staff charged with the fiscal control of large taxpayers.

To this end, the introduction of art. 18^1 into the Fiscal Code brings three thresholds of taxation for large taxpayers:

Paragraph 1 provides for a **rate of 1%** applied to the revenues recorded in each fiscal year for "Taxpayers who have recorded revenues exceeding the equivalent in lei of EUR **10,000,000** (ten million euro)"; paragraph 2 introduces a **rate of 2%** applied to the revenues of taxpayers who have recorded revenues exceeding the equivalent in lei of EUR **100,000,000** (one hundred million euro); and paragraph 3 establishes a **rate of 3%** of the revenues of taxpayers who have recorded revenues exceeding the equivalent in lei of EUR **1,000,000,000** (one billion euro). The exchange rate for determining the equivalent in euro is that in force at the close of the financial year in which the revenues were recorded.

As may be observed, the introduction of taxation thresholds from 1% to 3% applied to the revenues of large taxpayers is similar and symmetrical to the regime of taxation of micro-enterprises, a fact such as to encourage large taxpayers too in a manner similar and symmetrical to that applied to small entrepreneurs, thus applying without discrimination one of the fiscal solutions most appreciated nationally and internationally.

→ the text of the article Article 18^2 introduces into the Fiscal Code a first exception to the rule established in the preceding article for large taxpayers, introducing a new rate of 5% applied to the revenues recorded for large taxpayers carrying out activities in the nature of refining or marketing petroleum products and their derivatives and whose annual revenues exceed EUR 10,000,000. This increased rate is similar to the existing one governing the "Special regime for taxpayers carrying out activities in the nature of night bars, night clubs, discotheques and casinos", and takes into account, on the one hand, the exceptional situation statistically demonstrated according to which, whatever the difficulties encountered by the national economy — pandemic, state of war on the country's borders — the profitability of the companies carrying out activity in the fields mentioned above is increasing, and, on the other hand, the success and proliferation of businesses in a field of activity already taxed at 5% applied to the revenues recorded annually.

Similarly and for the same reasons, Articles 18^3–18^4 introduce into the Fiscal Code exceptions similar to that provided for in art. 18^2, for taxpayers carrying out activities in the nature of the extraction of crude oil and natural gas, and for taxpayers carrying out activities in the nature of the transport and distribution of electricity.

Likewise, art. 18^5 introduces a further exception, applied this time to taxpayers carrying out activities in the nature of financial intermediation, namely — and without limitation — activities of monetary intermediation, which include activities carried out by banks, savings banks, credit cooperatives, or activities of the credit transfer system through the post and postal activities of savings banks; the granting of credit for the purchase of housing by specialised institutions (housing banks); monetary activities by postal order (payment orders); or activities of holding companies, of mutual funds and other similar financial entities; financial leasing; or other credit activities such as financial service activities relating primarily to the taking out of loans by institutions not involved in monetary intermediation, where the granting of credit may take a variety of forms, such as loans, mortgages, credit cards and so on.

The measure, similarly to that provided for in art. 18^2, took into account the recording by these taxpayers of significant increases in revenue in periods difficult from an economic and social point of view, together with an inexplicable simultaneous stagnation of profitability caused by rising expenditure.

All these reasons justify the introduction of a special taxation threshold of 5% of the annual revenues obtained by large taxpayers carrying out activities in the fields mentioned above, namely for large taxpayers carrying out activities in the nature of the extraction, refining or marketing of petroleum products, and for large taxpayers carrying out activities in the nature of financial intermediation and whose annual revenues exceed EUR 10,000,000.

→ the text of the article **Article 2** amends paragraph 2 of Act 227/2015 on the Fiscal Code and establishes a taxation of special pensions, introducing a rate of taxation of 90% of the monthly taxable income from that part of the pension which exceeds 11 gross minimum national wages.

In setting this rate and this taxation threshold, account was taken of the fact that under Act 153/2017 the President of Romania has a legal allowance of 12 gross minimum national wages, and of the fact that, as a matter of principle, no one should receive from the consolidated general budget of the State sums greater than those received by the highest dignitary of the Romanian State, the President of Romania.

For these reasons and starting from this principle, a rate of taxation was established *of 90% of the monthly taxable income from that part of the pension which exceeds 11 gross minimum national wages,* so that all sums deriving from pensions which exceed 11 gross minimum national wages are taxed at 90%.

→ the text of the article **Article 3** introduces a new title into the Fiscal Code: after TITLE X, TITLE X¹ is introduced, which will bear the heading "THE TAX ON LARGE FORTUNES", the provision introducing for the first time in Romania a tax owed by natural-person taxpayers holding fortunes greater than EUR 10,000,000 (ten million euro).

The provision introduces into Romanian taxation the notion of a "large fortune" for the Romanian natural-person taxpayer, the lower threshold of large fortunes being set at ten million euro, unlike that laid down in other States of the European Union where, as in the case of France, the tax on large fortunes is owed once a fortune of 1.2 million euro is exceeded.

In setting this high threshold for the taxation of large fortunes, account was taken of the need to increase the wealth of Romanian citizens and their ability to develop businesses in order to increase general well-being, and also of the obligation of those whose fortune has exceeded the threshold of EUR 10,000,000 to contribute in a special, personal and direct manner to raising the general standard of living and to the development of the country in which they live and make their profits, this special contribution being made in both a personal and a general interest.

TITLE X¹ introduces three taxation thresholds, as follows:

a solidarity tax of **1%** per year of the total value of the fortune, for natural-person taxpayers whose revenues, cumulated with the value of the gains, of the movable assets and of the buildings existing in their patrimony on 31 December of the preceding year, exceed EUR 10,000,000 (ten million euro);

a solidarity tax of **2%** per year of the total value of the fortune, for natural-person taxpayers whose revenues, cumulated with the value of the gains, of the movable assets and of the buildings existing in their patrimony on 31 December of the preceding year, exceed EUR 100,000,000 (one hundred million euro);

a solidarity tax of **3%** per year of the total value of the fortune, for natural-person taxpayers whose revenues, cumulated with the value of the gains, of the movable assets and of the buildings existing in their patrimony on 31 December of the preceding year, exceed EUR 1,000,000,000 (one billion euro);

The solidarity tax will be calculated on the entire declared fortune and will be owed at the level established by law until the fortune falls below the legally established threshold, so that no person whose fortune does not exceed EUR 10,000,000 will be taxed, whatever the fortune previously held.

For the purpose of establishing the solidarity tax owed, natural persons whose estimated fortune exceeds EUR 10,000,000 are required to draw up annually a declaration of wealth as laid down in Annex I, the annual declaration of wealth for the last fiscal year having to be submitted by 25 March inclusive of the following year.

The exchange rate for determining the equivalent in euro of the fortune is that in force at the close of the financial year in which the revenues and gains were recorded.

The solidarity tax is the means by which the holders of large fortunes show their solidarity towards their fellow citizens and, at the same time, represents the manner in which they help the development of the State which created for them the conditions for achieving significant material accumulations.

→ the text of the article **Article 4** amends the third sub-paragraph of article 77 of the Fiscal Code and extends the scope of personal deductions for taxpayers who have one or more dependants and who earn revenues between the limit laid down in paragraph 2, namely 3,600 lei, and the limit of 25,000 lei, as follows:

"(i) for taxpayers with **one dependant — 20%** of the income tax due;

(ii) for taxpayers with **two dependants — 30%** of the income tax due;

(iii) for taxpayers with **three dependants — 40%** of the income tax due;

(iv) for taxpayers with **four or more dependants — 50%** of the income tax due.

No personal deduction is granted to taxpayers with gross monthly salary revenues exceeding 25,000 lei."

The deductions are granted in respect of any kind of revenue, no longer being addressed exclusively to salary revenues, so that as wide a range of taxpayers as possible may benefit from these fiscal facilities.

The purpose of the deductions from income tax is to support taxpayers who care for several persons (children, parents, spouses) and, at the same time, to encourage active persons with average incomes to have children, the State assuming indirectly (through the personal deductions governed by this law) and directly (through the statutory child allowances) a part of the expenditure on raising children, as part of the national policy of increasing the birth rate.

The present fiscal provision is such as to encourage work and constitutes a direct measure for halting demographic decline and for encouraging the return to the country of Romanians in the diaspora.

II. Amendments to Act 256/2018 on certain measures necessary for the implementation of petroleum operations by holders of petroleum agreements relating to offshore petroleum blocks

The energy sector, and in particular that of offshore natural gas, represents a central pillar of the national economy. The present context, marked by price fluctuations and by the need to ensure energy security, has brought into discussion the need to revise the legislative framework governing taxation in the field. To this end, the draft amendment of ACT no. 256/2018 brings a series of adjustments aimed at increasing taxation for the holders of petroleum agreements as regards the operation of offshore petroleum blocks. Increased taxation is often viewed with scepticism; in the present case, however, the arguments in favour are multiple and well founded.

In the first place, correct and efficient taxation can contribute to the State budget, thus providing additional resources which can be invested in critical infrastructure, education or health. Moreover, in a sector as profitable as that of natural gas extraction, a higher tax can discourage speculation and can encourage long-term investment, striking a balance between the profit of companies and collective well-being.

In order to understand the necessity of the draft amendment of the legislation, it is essential to understand the formula for calculating the tax on supplementary offshore revenues. This formula is adjusted according to the weighted average price of the natural gas sold (PMPC), also taking into account the consumer price index (CPI). Taxation thus adapts to market conditions, maintaining an equitable level of taxation correlated with economic realities.

This method of calculating taxes ensures a fair contribution by the petroleum companies to the national budget, without discouraging investment in exploration and development. In addition,

emphasis is placed on fiscal transparency and predictability, giving operators the possibility of planning their activities over the medium and long term.

Setting out the calculation formula in detail, we observe that it is structured on three levels of natural gas prices, each with a specific manner of applying taxation. In the case of a PMPC less than or equal to 85 lei/MWh, a basic formula is used which includes the calculated supplementary revenue and the value of the deductible investments. This approach encourages the reinvestment of profits and supports the development of the sector.

In order to illustrate the way in which this mechanism works, let us consider a gas price of 85 lei/MWh or less. The tax on supplementary offshore revenues (IVST) is calculated by deducting the value of the deductible investments (VID) from the total calculated tax (IVSC). When the price rises to between 85 and 100 lei/MWh, the rate of taxation becomes progressive, reflecting a greater contribution to the State budget while still maintaining an incentive to invest.

When the weighted average price of gas exceeds the threshold of 100 lei/MWh, the calculation formula becomes still more complex, underlining the need to divide the supplementary revenues into price bands. This means that, for each price segment above 100 lei, a different rate of taxation applies, thus increasing the degree of fiscal contribution as market prices rise. This approach ensures fiscal equity and recognises market performance, while allowing the holders of petroleum agreements to benefit from a stable and predictable fiscal framework.

Likewise, the value of the deductible investments in the upstream segment is an important point, because it encourages reinvestment and the continued development of the infrastructure needed for the extraction and processing of natural gas. This policy not only stimulates economic growth but also helps to create new jobs, thus contributing to the reduction of unemployment and to long-term economic prosperity. Another crucial aspect of the draft law is the way in which it treats the cumulated values of investments. By allowing a monthly reduction of the value of the deductible investments, a mechanism is created for recognising companies' efforts to update and improve their operations. This may have a positive impact on energy efficiency and on the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, aligning the offshore energy sector with the country's sustainability and environmental objectives.

For these reasons, in the present economic and social context, global economic and ecological pressures require a re-evaluation of the way in which natural resources are exploited and, by implication, taxed. ACT no. 256/2018 on certain measures necessary for the implementation of petroleum operations by holders of petroleum agreements relating to offshore petroleum blocks lies at the centre of a heated debate, with solid arguments supporting the need to increase and to amend that taxation.

Arguments for increasing taxation:

1. Fiscal equity: One of the fundamental principles of a sound fiscal system is equity. In the case of offshore exploitation, the resources exploited are a public good, and the benefits must extend to the whole of society. By increasing taxation, the State would be able to ensure a fairer distribution of the benefits of natural gas extraction, thus contributing to the development of infrastructure, health and education.

2. Environmental sustainability: Offshore extraction activities have a significant impact on marine ecosystems. Higher taxes can discourage harmful practices and can finance environmental protection projects, partly compensating for the damage caused.

3. Investment in green technologies: Encouraging the transition towards clean energy sources is essential. Supplementary taxes on offshore exploitation can be a source of financing for the research and development of new sustainable technologies.

4. Energy security: Increasing taxes can stimulate energy efficiency and reduce dependence on imports of fossil fuels, at the same time diversifying the country's energy sources and promoting energy independence.

The amendment of ACT no. 256/2018 is an immediate necessity, given that the revision and updating of the law are required not only by the fluctuating economic and ecological context but also by the dynamics of the energy market and by technological progress. The proposed amendments aim not only at fairer and more sustainable taxation but also at increased adaptability to market conditions, so that future challenges can be met effectively. Annex – Formula for calculating the tax on supplementary offshore revenues. The calculation formula set out in the annex to the law is essential for understanding the taxation mechanism and for ensuring transparency in the application of the taxes. It establishes the way in which supplementary revenues are calculated according to fluctuations in natural gas prices.

It is a progressive system, designed to reflect both the variable costs of gas production and the volatility of prices on the international market. A direct correlation is thus ensured between the profitability of offshore exploitation and the contribution of the holders of petroleum agreements to the State budget. The detailed formula is included in the annex in order to facilitate the understanding and the calculation of the tax. It takes into account several factors, such as the weighted average price of natural gas (PMPC), the 2012 purchase price adjusted annually by the inflation index (PRC) and the volumes of gas sold (VGC). In addition, special attention is given to the deductible investments in the upstream segment (VID), which stimulate additional investment in exploration and production, essential for maintaining and increasing natural gas extraction capacity.

Technical details of the taxation of supplementary offshore revenues: in order to illustrate the application of the formula, let us assume that the weighted average price of natural gas is 90 lei/MWh. Under the formula, the supplementary revenue from offshore blocks (VS) will be calculated as the difference between PMPC and a reference price (PRC), multiplied by the volume of gas sold (VGC). The tax due (IVST) will be the result of deducting the value of the deductible investments (VID) from the total calculated tax (IVSC). In this way the formula ensures that taxation is proportionate to the supplementary revenues generated, thus offering a fair and stimulating fiscal framework for the holders of petroleum agreements. Moreover, it ensures that any increase in profitability, owing to a rise in natural gas prices, is correspondingly reflected in contributions to the State budget.

The arguments in favour of increasing taxation and of amending ACT no. 256/2018 are multiple and varied, resting on principles of fiscal equity, ecological sustainability and the promotion of energy security. By rethinking the legislative framework and adapting the formula for calculating the tax on supplementary offshore revenues, Romania can ensure a fairer distribution of the benefits of the extraction of natural resources, protecting the environment and stimulating innovation in the field of renewable energy.

In short, the proposed amendments not only answer the immediate needs of the market and ecological requirements, but also prepare the ground for a more resilient economy, less dependent on fossil fuels. Such an approach is vital in order to navigate a changing global energy landscape and to position Romania as a responsible and progressive player on the international energy stage. In conclusion, increasing taxation and amending ACT no. 256/2018 are necessary steps for aligning national interests with global dynamics and for building a sustainable future. These changes will

reflect not only Romania's commitment to the principles of equity and sustainability, but will also serve as a catalyst for innovation and progress in the energy sector. Likewise, through these adjustments, the aim is to align national legislation with the European directives and with the international agreements on combating climate change and reducing CO2 emissions. It is a step forward towards a circular economy and a more efficient use of resources, in which the impact on the environment is minimised and the economic advantages maximised.

Another important aspect of the fiscal reform is the encouragement of transparency and accountability in the petroleum industry. By establishing a clear and detailed framework for the calculation of taxes, companies are motivated to report their revenues accurately and to contribute equitably to the State budget.

This may lead to an increase in public confidence in the way natural resources are managed and in the benefits they bring to society as a whole. In addition, the proposed legislative amendments will contribute to creating a more predictable and stable business environment for investors in the energy sector. A fair and transparent fiscal regime is essential for attracting and maintaining long-term investment, elements vital to the sustainable economic development of Romania.

Not least, the role played by taxation in shaping economic behaviour must be emphasised. By adjusting taxes and duties, the State can influence the direction in which the energy industry moves, favouring innovative and ecological solutions over traditional ones which have a negative impact on the environment and on public health.

In conclusion, fiscal reform in the offshore energy sector is a necessity which cannot be postponed, representing a crucial step in aligning Romania with international standards and with the objectives of sustainable development. Increasing taxation and revising ACT no. 256/2018 are not merely opportunities to secure greater budgetary revenue, but also to promote responsible behaviour in the extractive industry, in accordance with the best global practices. The proposed legislative reform must be regarded as an investment in the future of the country, which can bring long-term benefits and can contribute to the prosperity of future generations. Through it, Romania can become an example of good practice in the management of natural resources and in the application of fiscal policies designed to support sustainable development and the protection of the environment.

Finally, it is essential to take account of the voice of the communities affected by extraction activities and of their involvement in the decision-making process. Thus, increased taxation and the amendment of the legislation must be accompanied by measures ensuring social equity and preventing any negative impact on local communities. Special attention must be given to compensation and benefits for the areas affected by the exploitation of resources, so that they benefit directly from the economic activities carried out within their territory.

Section 3 – Socio-economic impact of the draft amendment of ACT no. 227/2015 and of ACT 256/2018

1. Macroeconomic impact

The economic impact of the amendment of the fiscal legislation, namely of the Fiscal Code Act and of the Act on offshore petroleum operations: the economy of a country is directly influenced by the fiscal legislation which governs the way in which financial resources are collected and distributed. The amendments to Act 227/2015 on the Fiscal Code and to ACT no. 256/2018 will have a significant impact on the Romanian economy.

I. Amendment of the Fiscal Code Act

1. *Introduction of Art. 18¹ and 18²:* The first significant change proposed is the introduction of article 18¹ into Act 227/2015, which provides for a special regime of taxation for taxpayers exceeding certain revenue thresholds. This measure appears to be directed at large corporations, imposing a progressive rate of taxation of 1%, 2% or 3% according to the revenues recorded. Such a progressive fiscal approach is intended to ensure a fairer contribution to the State budget on the part of top companies. Article 18² introduces a special fiscal regime for companies in the petroleum sector, with a rate of taxation of 5% for annual revenues greater than 10 million euro. This change could discourage tax evasion and could stimulate transparency in a sector often criticised for the lack of adequate fiscal coverage. Nevertheless, it is important to assess whether this rate of taxation will not discourage investment in a field vital to Romania's energy security.

2. *Amendments to the taxation of large pensions:* Another major amendment is the adjustment of article 101, which concerns the taxation of pensions. The new wording proposes a rate of 10% for the monthly taxable income from pensions and a rate of 90% for that part of the income which exceeds 11 gross minimum national wages. This measure has the potential to redistribute the fiscal burden, in line with the principles of fiscal equity.

3. *Introduction of the tax on large fortunes:* Another innovative aspect is the introduction of Title X¹, entitled "The tax on large fortunes", which provides for the imposition of a solidarity tax on natural persons with considerable fortunes. The rates of the tax differ according to the total value of the fortune, being set at 1%, 2% or 3% for cumulated revenues exceeding certain thresholds. This measure comes in the context of global debates on inequality of income and wealth, being a step towards a more equitable distribution of fiscal burdens. It is essential, however, to analyse the impact it will have on the mobility of capital and on investment.

4. *Adjustments to personal deductions:* Article 77 brings into discussion the adjustment of personal deductions for taxpayers with gross monthly revenues between certain thresholds. This is a measure which could encourage consumption and could have a positive effect on the economy by stimulating the purchasing power of the population. In this way, the fiscal effort of those who have family responsibilities is recognised and rewarded, offering them financial support through tax reliefs proportionate to the number of dependants.

II. Amendment of ACT no. 256/2018 on offshore petroleum operations

The amendments to Act no. 256/2018 are essential for understanding how the energy sector, and especially that of offshore petroleum operations, will evolve. In a global context in which the energy transition is becoming ever more important, fiscal rules must be balanced so as to support both environmental protection and economic competitiveness.

1. *Establishing the measures necessary for the implementation of offshore petroleum operations*

Article 1 of Act no. 256/2018 is amended so as to ensure legal clarity and to establish the measures necessary for the implementation of offshore petroleum operations. This clarification is vital in order to attract new investors and to maintain a stable and predictable regulatory framework allowing long-term investment planning.

2. *Repeal of certain provisions and harmonisation of the legislation:* By repealing letters m), n), o), p) and r) of article 2, the current legislation is simplified and harmonised with international standards. This measure could improve the perception of the Romanian business environment and could contribute to better integration into the European energy market.

3. *Amendments to the fiscal regime applicable to offshore petroleum activities:* Article 18 proposes maintaining the level of royalty and the percentage rates of petroleum royalty for the holders of offshore

petroleum agreements. This fiscal continuity is essential in order to maintain investor confidence and to avoid the financial destabilisation of ongoing projects. Fiscal stability is a key factor in long-term investment decisions, and this amendment respects the commitments of the Romanian State towards investors.

4. *Taxation of supplementary offshore revenues:* Article 19 introduces a system of taxation of supplementary offshore revenues, whose purpose is to increase revenues to the State budget by taxing the differences between the selling prices of natural gas and a reference price established in 2012. This system of taxation could stimulate greater transparency in the trading of natural gas and could ensure that the benefits of gas extraction are also reflected in State revenues. It must nevertheless be analysed whether this tax will affect the competitiveness of prices for final consumers and whether it will negatively influence investment decisions in the exploration and exploitation of natural gas resources.

5. *Sale of natural gas on centralised markets:* Through the amendments to article 20, an obligation is introduced for the holders of offshore petroleum agreements to sell a percentage share of 90% of the natural gas on centralised markets. This measure could contribute to greater competitiveness on the natural gas market and to a more transparent formation of prices. At the same time, it is crucial to ensure that these provisions will not lead to market distortions or to the creation of barriers to free competition.

6. Establishing a special account for investments. Article 19 paragraph (8) provides for the collection of the tax on supplementary revenues into a special account intended for the financing of natural gas infrastructure. This measure has the potential to accelerate the development of energy infrastructure and to support Romania's energy security. It is important, however, to monitor the efficiency with which these funds are used, in order to ensure that they will have a real positive impact on the economy.

7. Implementing a legal framework for the conduct of offshore petroleum operations. Article 34 introduces the possibility of concluding addenda to the petroleum agreements relating to offshore petroleum blocks, which will allow adaptation to the new legislative conditions. This represents an important step in making the existing contractual framework between the State and the petroleum companies more flexible and up to date, thus ensuring that exploration and exploitation activities can continue under optimised conditions. Conclusions: analysing the proposed amendments to the fiscal legislation, it may be observed that they seek to increase revenues to the State budget and to promote a more equitable distribution of the fiscal burden. The introduction of progressive rates of taxation for large corporations and for persons with large fortunes represents a bold step towards a fairer taxation, more oriented towards social responsibility.

11. Impact on the competitive environment and on the field of State aid

Not applicable

2. Impact on the business environment

In recent years, the development of fiscal legislation in Romania has attracted the attention of numerous actors in the business environment, both domestic and international. The amendments made to the Fiscal Code by Act 227/2015 and the related legislation are intended to adapt the fiscal framework to economic realities and to environmental requirements. We shall analyse in detail the impact of these amendments, with particular emphasis on the articles most relevant to the business environment.

I. Amendments to the Fiscal Code

1. *Special regime for large taxpayers:* The introduction of articles 18^1 and 18^2 into the Fiscal Code comes as a measure to balance the fiscal burden for taxpayers with substantial annual revenues. By applying progressive rates of taxation according to the revenue threshold, the State intends to stimulate a better distribution of the fiscal burden and, at the same time, to secure the resources needed to finance public expenditure. Thus, taxpayers exceeding the threshold of 10 million euro will pay a tax of 1%, those exceeding 100 million euro will contribute 2%, and for revenues exceeding 1 billion euro the rate of taxation is 3%. This progressive structure may have a positive impact on the business environment by encouraging the reinvestment of profits and by supporting long-term growth. At the same time, through these measures large taxpayers are made directly accountable for contributing to the State budget in proportion to the size of their revenues. This could lead to greater equity in society and to a more efficient redistribution of resources.

2. *The tax on large pensions:* The amendments to article 101 paragraph 2 of the Fiscal Code are likewise significant, imposing a tax of 10% on the monthly taxable income from pensions, while for that part of the pension exceeding 11 gross minimum national wages the rate of taxation is 90%. This is a measure aimed at adjusting the level of taxation of special pensions, a subject frequently debated in public and one which has aroused much controversy. By this amendment the legislator seeks to balance the pension system and to reduce inequalities.

3. *The tax on large fortunes:* The introduction of TITLE X^1 into the Fiscal Code, under the name "The tax on large fortunes", brings into discussion a form of progressive taxation applied to natural persons with substantial fortunes. Articles 500^1–500^5 establish rates of taxation of 1%, 2% and 3% applied progressively according to the total value of the fortune, starting from the threshold of 10 million euro. This fiscal initiative may be interpreted as a step towards ensuring greater social justice and a more equitable distribution of the fiscal burden.

On the other hand, the obligation to draw up an annual declaration of wealth for taxpayers exceeding the threshold of 10 million euro may serve as an instrument of transparency and fiscal control, contributing to the fight against tax evasion and to increasing the degree of fiscal compliance.

4. *Personal deductions:* Another significant change is the adjustment of personal deductions according to the number of dependants. This is aimed especially at families with children and seeks to reduce the fiscal burden for taxpayers with family responsibilities. The amendment of article 77 paragraph 2, third sub-paragraph, provides for progressive deductions from 20% to 50% of the income tax due, according to the number of dependants. Support for families is thus encouraged and their importance in the social structure recognised. This measure may have a positive impact on the standard of living and may stimulate demographic growth, being at the same time a step towards a more humane fiscal policy, more oriented towards the needs of citizens.

II. Amendments to Act no. 256/2018 on offshore petroleum operations

The legislation on offshore petroleum operations has likewise been the subject of significant adjustments. The amendments made by Act no. 256/2018 concern chiefly the level of royalties, the taxation of supplementary revenues and the conditions for exploiting natural resources in offshore blocks.

1. *Establishing a specific fiscal regime:* Article 18 brings clarifications as regards the application of the level of royalty and of the percentage rates of petroleum royalty for the holders of offshore petroleum agreements. Although this is a technical and complex field, the essence of the amendments consists in applying a stable fiscal regime throughout the duration of the petroleum agreements, thus offering predictability and a clearer fiscal framework for investors. This is crucial in a sector where investments are massive and the planning horizon is long-term.

2. *Deductibility of investments:* A particularly important aspect is constituted by the rules concerning deductible investments, described in article 19. It is specified there that the investments taken into account in calculating the deduction from the tax on supplementary revenues are not taken into account in the fiscal result for the purposes of profit tax. This means that investments in the upstream segment are considered non-deductible for the purpose of calculating profit tax, but may be deducted from the tax on supplementary offshore revenues. This mechanism of deductibility encourages the reinvestment of profits in exploration and exploitation activities, thus contributing to the sustainable development of the petroleum sector.

3. *The tax on supplementary offshore revenues:* Article 19 defines the tax on supplementary offshore revenues as a levy applicable to the difference between the selling price of natural gas from domestic production and a reference price established in 2012. This tax aims to capture part of the supplementary profits obtained by companies as a result of price fluctuations on the natural gas market. The percentages for calculating the tax are structured so as to reflect the differences in prices, and the deduction of investments in the upstream segment is limited to a maximum percentage, in order to ensure that the State benefits from an equitable share of the supplementary profits. This fiscal measure may have mixed effects on the energy market: on the one hand it encourages efficiency and the prudent management of resources, and on the other it may influence the investment decisions of companies in the energy sector.

4. *Sale of natural gas:* Article 20 imposes on the holders of offshore petroleum agreements the obligation to conclude contracts on centralised markets for the sale of a minimum share of 90% of the natural gas contracted. This requirement promotes transparency and competition on the natural gas market, with the potential to contribute to the stabilisation of prices and to ensure equitable access to resources for all market actors. By establishing a clear and non-discriminatory trading framework, the aim is both to protect the interests of consumers and to create a healthy competitive environment for producers.

5. *Penalties for failure to observe the provisions:* A novelty introduced by the legislative amendments is the establishment of significant penalties for failure to observe the provisions of arts. 19 and 20. Under article 25, failure to observe those obligations may attract fines of up to 30% of the turnover of the company concerned for the year in which the breach was found. This reflects a more assertive approach by the State in enforcing fiscal rules and a step towards ensuring compliance in the energy sector. Through these measures, the aim is to discourage non-compliant fiscal behaviour and to emphasise the importance of observing the legal rules.

Conclusions: The recent amendments to Romanian fiscal legislation reflect a tendency to adapt the fiscal system to current economic dynamics and to the needs of sustainable development. From the imposition of progressive rates of taxation for large taxpayers to the adjustment of the fiscal regime for offshore petroleum operations, these changes are intended to balance the fiscal burden, to stimulate investment and to promote transparency and equity in the business environment. The impact of these amendments is complex and will manifest itself differently according to the sector of activity and the size of the economic actors.

3. Social impact of the amendments to the Fiscal Code and to the petroleum legislation in Romania

I. Amendments to the Fiscal Code

1. *Special regime for taxpayers with large revenues.* The introduction of a progressive tax for taxpayers with very large annual revenues is a bold step in the direction of fiscal equity. This measure may reduce economic disparities and may contribute to a fairer redistribution of wealth. Likewise, by

increasing the contribution of the wealthiest members of society, the State can accumulate additional resources for investment in infrastructure, education and health, to the benefit of the whole population.

2. *Taxation of large pensions.* The amendment of the Fiscal Code so as to impose a rate of taxation of 10% on income from pensions and, above all, a rate of 90% for that part of the pension exceeding a certain ceiling, may be seen as a measure of social solidarity. This could help to balance the pension system and to ensure its long-term sustainability, an aspect particularly important in the present demographic context.

3. *The tax on large fortunes.* The proposal to impose a solidarity tax on large fortunes is a strong signal towards the social responsibility of those with substantial incomes and fortunes. This initiative may play an essential role in mitigating inequalities and in financing projects of public interest which contribute to the development of communities and to the reduction of poverty.

4. *Modified personal deductions.* The adjustment of personal deductions for taxpayers with medium and high incomes may encourage economic growth. Through these deductions, additional support is given to families with dependants, thus stimulating consumption and investment and having a positive impact on the economy as a whole. In addition, by limiting these deductions in respect of high incomes, it is ensured that the fiscal benefits are directed towards the segments of the population most in need of support.

II. Amendments to the petroleum legislation

1. *Establishing measures for offshore operations.* The amendments made to the law governing offshore petroleum operations bring clarity and legal stability, aspects essential for attracting investors and for developing the energy sector. These changes may lead to an increase in natural gas production and to a reduction in Romania's dependence on imports, which has a direct impact on national energy security and on prices for consumers.

2. *Taxation of supplementary offshore revenues.* The taxation of the supplementary revenues obtained by petroleum companies represents an important source of revenue for the State, which can be reinvested in infrastructure projects or in other fields vital to society. This measure ensures that the benefits of the country's natural resources are distributed equitably among all citizens.

3. *Transparency in the sale of natural gas.* The obligation to sell a percentage share of natural gas on centralised markets increases transparency and competitiveness in the sector. This may lead to better prices for consumers and to a more dynamic market, with beneficial effects on the national economy.

4. *Investment in gas infrastructure.* By channelling the supplementary offshore taxes towards the financing of gas infrastructure, the development of an efficient and modern energy system is ensured. Improved access to natural gas can stimulate regional economic development and can reduce energy costs for consumers and undertakings, thus contributing to a rise in the standard of living.

Conclusions. The legislative amendments analysed in this memorandum reflect an approach oriented towards greater social equity and towards the accountability of those with large incomes. They also aim to increase the efficiency and performance of the energy sector, with direct benefits for the economy and for society. In a changing global economic context, these adjustments may represent important steps towards long-term stability and prosperity for Romania.

4. Environmental impact

Not applicable.

5. Other information

Not applicable.

Section 5 – Effects of this normative act upon the legislation in force

a) normative acts in force which will be amended or repealed as a result of the entry into force of the draft normative act:

There will be amended **Act no. 227/2015 on the Fiscal Code;**

There will be amended **Act 256/2018 on certain measures necessary for the implementation of petroleum operations by holders of petroleum agreements relating to offshore petroleum blocks**

In summary, Act 227/2015 has 2 articles amended, 9 articles added and 0 repealed, to which an annex is added,

while Act 256/2018 has 10 articles amended and the annex amended.

b) normative acts to be drawn up for the implementation of the new provisions: none identified.

1^1. Compatibility of the draft normative act with the legislation in the field of public procurement — Not applicable

2. Conformity of the draft normative act with Community legislation in the case of drafts transposing Community provisions — No documents in Community legislation in the field have been identified.

3. Normative measures necessary for the direct application of Community normative acts — Not applicable.

4. Judgments of the Court of Justice of the European Union — Not applicable.

5. Other normative acts and/or international documents from which commitments derive — Not applicable.

6. Other information. — Not applicable.

1. Information on the process of consultation with non-governmental organisations, research institutes and other bodies involved	Not applicable
2. Justification of the choice of the organisations consulted, and of the way in which the activity of those organisations is connected with the object of the draft normative act	Not applicable
3. Consultations organised with the local public administration authorities, where the draft normative act concerns activities of those authorities, under Government Decision no. 521/2005 on the procedure for consulting the associative structures of the local public administration authorities in the drafting of normative acts	Not applicable
4. Consultations carried out within the inter-ministerial councils, in accordance with Government Decision no. 750/2005 on the establishment of permanent inter-ministerial councils	Not applicable.
5. Information on the opinions to be given by:	The consultative opinions will be obtained after completion of the stages laid down by Act 189/1999.
a) The Legislative Council	

b) The Supreme Council of National Defence

c) The Economic and Social Council

d) The Competition Council

e) The Court of Auditors.

Section 7 – Public information activities concerning the drafting and implementation of the draft normative act

1. Informing civil society of the necessity of drawing up the normative act — The draft law revising the Constitution was submitted to public debate for 18 months and is the direct result of those open consultations.

2. Informing civil society of the possible environmental impact following the implementation of the draft normative act, and of the effects on the health and safety of citizens or on biological diversity — Not applicable.

3. Other information — Not applicable

Section 8 – Implementing measures

1. Measures for putting the draft normative act into application by the central and/or local public administration authorities — the establishment of new bodies or the extension of the competences of existing institutions — Not applicable.

2. Other information — None identified

SECTION 4 — Explanatory memorandum — The Referendum Act

The full text of the draft: The Referendum Act (amending Act 3/2000 and Act 189/1999)

Full translation of the memorandum. The Romanian text remains the authoritative one.

TO,

THE STANDING BUREAU OF THE SENATE

In accordance with the provisions of art. 74 para. (1) and art. 75 of the Constitution of Romania, republished, as well as with art. 92 para. (2) and (4) of the Regulation of the Senate, republished, we submit for debate and adoption the legislative proposal entitled “Act on the organisation and conduct of the referendum”.

Pursuant to art. 111 para. (1) of the Constitution of Romania, republished, we request that the Government be asked to communicate its point of view on this legislative proposal.

We likewise request that the opinions of the Legislative Council and of the Economic and Social Council be sought.

INITIATOR:

EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM

Constitutional basis: this draft law finds its foundation in Article 2 of the Constitution of Romania, which enshrines the principle of national sovereignty: “National sovereignty belongs to the Romanian people, who exercise it through their representative bodies, constituted by free, periodic and fair elections, as well as by referendum.” The Romanian people, as the sole holder of sovereignty,

therefore has the right to exercise its will not only through elected representatives, but also directly, through democratic mechanisms such as the referendum and the citizens' legislative initiative.

I. Relation to the principle of national sovereignty. 1. Strengthening the role of the referendum. The amendments proposed to Act no. 3/2000 (Art. I, points 1–5) seek to clarify and guarantee the binding character of the referendum on citizens' legislative initiatives. Thus, once an initiative has been validated by the Constitutional Court, the organisation of the referendum becomes a legal obligation (Art. $6^1(2)$), and its result is binding upon Parliament (Art. 45(4)). This ensures respect for the will of the population, in keeping with the role of the referendum as a direct expression of sovereignty. 2. Efficiency of the citizens' legislative procedures. By introducing Art. $6^1(3)$–(5), a clear procedural framework is laid down for the examination of the constitutionality of citizens' initiatives. The Constitutional Court becomes the central actor in the validation of proposals, preventing the adoption of laws contrary to the Constitution. The publication of initiatives in the Official Gazette (Art. $6^1(4)$) and the Government's obligation to inform the public ensure transparency and equal access of citizens to essential information. 3. Binding character of the referendum result for Parliament. The addition of Art. 45(4) to Act no. 3/2000 introduces a strict time limit of 120 days within which Parliament must adopt laws conforming to the will expressed in the referendum. This mechanism counters the waste of public resources and avoids unjustified delays, strengthening citizens' confidence in the usefulness of civic participation. II. Harmonisation with the provisions of the Constitution. 1. Strengthening and observance of the provisions of art. 74 para. (1) of the Constitution. The amendments to Act no. 189/1999 (Art. II) synchronise the procedures of the citizens' legislative initiative with the constitutional requirements. Through the immediate notification of the Central Electoral Bureau (Art. 7(5) as amended), observance is ensured of the principle that "legislative initiative belongs to ... citizens" (art. 74), eliminating the possibility of an arbitrary blocking of the process. 2. Correlation with the role of the Constitutional Court. The review of constitutionality (Art. $6^1(3)$) ensures that citizens' initiatives do not infringe the fundamental principles of the Constitution, thus observing the limits laid down by art. 152 para. (1) (the prohibition of revisions affecting constitutional identity). III. Response to social needs. 1. Empowerment of citizens. The draft answers an ever more pressing social demand for direct involvement in political life. By clarifying the procedures and making the referendum result binding, citizens become active partners in the legislative process, not mere consultees. 2. Prevention of abuses. The provisions on the sanctioning of contraventions (Art. $6^1(5)$) and the obligation to publicise the campaign (Art. 7(1) as amended) reduce the risk of manipulation or disinformation in electoral periods. IV. Technical corrections and legislative coherence. 1. Updating of the wording. The adaptation of the text of the ballot paper (Art. 7(1) as amended) so as to include explicit references to the citizens' legislative initiative ensures coherence with the new procedures. 2. Unification of terms. The removal of ambiguities concerning the entry into force of laws (Art. 45(2)) and the inclusion of a clear time limit for Parliament (Art. 45(4)) increase the predictability of the legal system.

Necessity of the amendments:

The present laws (Act 3/2000 and Act 189/1999) govern the procedures for the referendum and the citizens' legislative initiative, but display gaps which limit the effectiveness of these democratic instruments. For example:

1. Lack of clarity as to the binding character of the referendum result for the adoption of citizens' initiatives.

2. Incomplete procedures for the validation and implementation of popular legislative initiatives.

3. Absence of clear time limits for Parliament as regards observance of the will expressed by referendum.

Objectives of the draft:

1. Strengthening the role of the referendum as a direct instrument of popular sovereignty.

2. Ensuring the transparency and efficiency of the procedures relating to the citizens' legislative initiative.

3. Harmonising the legislation with the provisions of the Constitution, in particular with Art. 74 para. 1 (legislative initiative).

The main amendments and their justification:

1. Introduction of Article 6^1 into Act 3/2000

— (1)–(4): the obligation to transmit citizens' initiatives to the Constitutional Court for verification of conformity with the Constitution is laid down. This ensures respect for the supremacy of the Constitution (Art. 1 para. 5 of the Constitution).

— (5): the procedures for organising the referendum are clarified, including publication of the draft in the Official Gazette and the informing of citizens. This mechanism strengthens transparency and access to information, essential for the correct exercise of democratic rights.

2. Amendment of Article 7 para. (1) of Act 3/2000

— A clear and specific question concerning the citizens' legislative initiative is introduced on the ballot paper. This removes ambiguities and ensures an informed vote, in keeping with the principle of freedom of expression of the will (Art. 36 of the Constitution).

3. Binding character of the referendum result for Parliament (Art. 45 para. (4))

— A time limit of 120 days is established within which Parliament must adopt legislation in accordance with the will expressed in the referendum. This counters the risk of legislative inertia and confirms the binding character of popular sovereignty (Art. 2 of the Constitution).

— The addition of Art. 45(4) to Act no. 3/2000 introduces a strict 120-day time limit for Parliament to adopt laws conforming to the will expressed in the referendum. This mechanism counters the waste of public resources and avoids unjustified postponements, strengthening citizens' confidence in the usefulness of civic participation.

4. Amendment of Act 189/1999

— The procedures for the citizens' legislative initiative and for the organisation of the referendum are synchronised, ensuring coherence with Art. 74 para. 1 of the Constitution, which guarantees the right of citizens to propose laws.

In the light of the aspects and arguments set out above, I ask you to note that this legislative intervention is necessary in order to strengthen the sovereignty of the Romanian people and the transparency of the act of legislating, and to support its adoption.

This draft law seeks to revive the instruments of direct democracy provided for by the Constitution, transforming the referendum and the citizens' legislative initiative from merely formal mechanisms into real pillars of national sovereignty. By guaranteeing transparency, binding force and constitutional review, the role of citizens as the primary source of State power is strengthened, in the spirit of art. 2 of the Constitution.

Through these amendments, the draft law achieves a legislative harmonisation with constitutional principles, strengthening the mechanisms by which the people exercises its sovereignty. It ensures that citizens' initiatives are treated with the same degree of seriousness as those proposed by Parliament or by the Government, and that the result of the referendum becomes a binding and effective legal act. Participatory democracy is thereby strengthened, and the rule of law affirms its commitment to the supremacy of the Constitution and of the will of the citizens.

The approval of this law will strengthen citizens' trust in institutions and will stimulate active civic participation.

We state that, by the letter of submission, the Government was requested, pursuant to art. 111 para. (1) of the Constitution of Romania, republished, to communicate its point of view on this legislative proposal.

INITIATOR:

THE PARLIAMENT OF ROMANIA

SENATE — CHAMBER OF DEPUTIES

SECTION 5 — Explanatory memorandum — The George Act

The full text of the draft: The George Act (medical malpractice)

Full translation of the memorandum. The Romanian text remains the authoritative one.

TO,

THE STANDING BUREAU OF THE SENATE

In accordance with the provisions of art. 74 para. (1) and art. 75 of the Constitution of Romania, republished, as well as with art. 92 para. (2) and (4) of the Regulation of the Senate, republished, we submit for debate and adoption the legislative proposal entitled "Act amending and supplementing Act no. 95/2006 on the reform of the health system and the Patients' Rights Act no. 46/2003".

Pursuant to art. 111 para. (1) of the Constitution of Romania, republished, we request that the Government be asked to communicate its point of view on this legislative proposal.

We likewise request that the opinions of the Legislative Council and of the Economic and Social Council be sought.

INITIATOR:

EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM

At present, medical liability and the rights of the patient are governed by Act no. 95/2006 and by Act no. 46/2003 respectively, which provide a complex legislative framework for these subjects, sensitive in Romanian society.

In the context of the growing number of cases of medical malpractice and of the difficulties caused by the administration of treatments and medical devices without genuinely complete information being given to the patient, a clear regulation of responsibilities in the health sector is necessary, with a view to protecting patients and increasing transparency in this field.

It has thus been found that the present provisions are insufficient to cover all the aspects arising from civil and criminal liability in cases of malpractice, as well as the questions concerning the marketing and use of medicines and medical devices, which makes the amendment of the legislation necessary.

To this end, we set out briefly a series of critical problems faced by patients who consider themselves injured or wronged:

Lack of clarity as regards medical liability: cases of malpractice are difficult to prove, which leads to a large number of unresolved cases or of outcomes unsatisfactory for patients;

Lack of transparency in the doctor–patient relationship: patients are not always fully and correctly informed of the risks of treatments, and informed consent is perceived rather as a formality;

Lack of strict regulation of medical products: products are marketed and used which do not meet rigorous safety standards and which endanger the health of patients;

Discrimination against patients on the basis of accepting or refusing a treatment — a phenomenon requiring intervention in order to ensure equal treatment of all citizens.

This legislative proposal seeks to resolve the problems set out above, as follows:

Clarifying civil and criminal liability in cases of malpractice, including by establishing a presumption of malpractice where the damage appears within 72 hours of the medical or medical-pharmaceutical acts. Patients' access to swift and equitable remedies in the event of damage is thereby facilitated;

Establishing the obligation of public or private health units to bear the costs where patients suffer long-term side effects as a result of medical acts. The obligation of the Ministry of Health to bear the damage caused by the adverse effects of compulsory or recommended vaccines is likewise established;

Regulating the marketing and use of medicines and medical devices, so as to prohibit the marketing or use of medicines, vaccines, medical devices and other pharmaceutical products for which complete clinical trials have not been carried out.

Among the principal effects which this legislative proposal will have upon the legislation in the field of health are:

Increased trust in the medical system: by providing a legal framework which clearly holds health units and medical personnel to account, patients will have greater confidence in the safety of the treatments offered;

A reduction in the number of malpractice cases: presuming malpractice in certain conditions and clearly regulating responsibilities will discourage negligent or intentional acts liable to endanger patients' lives;

Improved access to justice for patients: by amending the procedures for establishing malpractice and the rules on the jurisdiction of the courts, injured patients will be able to obtain equitable legal remedies more swiftly;

Protection of public health by prohibiting the use of unsafe medical products lacking adequate clinical trials, which will prevent possible risks to patients' health.

In the light of the aspects and arguments set out above, I ask you to note that this legislative intervention is necessary in order to improve the protection of patients and to increase transparency and responsibility in the health sector, in accordance with present needs and with citizens' expectations of the public health system in Romania, and to support its adoption.

We state that, by the letter of submission, the Government was requested, pursuant to art. 111 para. (1) of the Constitution of Romania, republished, to communicate its point of view on this legislative proposal.

INITIATOR:

THE SOURCES OF THE IDEA OF THE THIRD REPUBLIC

All 229 public notes of the chapter "De lege ferenda" from the manuscript "Notes at the end of a world" — the complete public chronology of the idea of the Third Republic, from March 2018 to October 2025. The fifty-seven pieces retained in the printed edition carry the titles of that edition; the others are given by their opening words. Each note keeps the archive address of the original post. Written and published in Romanian, the notes are given here in full English translation. The Romanian original remains the authentic text and is preserved unaltered on the Romanian page, as evidence of priority and authorship. Click a title to read.

The notes below are the full English translation. The Romanian original is on the Romanian page.

1. 20 January 2018 — "And yet... our securitate men deserve the largest budget per head of population in NATO!"

And yet... our securitate men deserve the largest budget per head of population in NATO!

To manage to bring out, in rain and snow, so many people who do not know what they are protesting about... that is a feat! It is called mass manipulation... and it is a subject of study at their "academy". So yes, the securitate men are worth their money!

Or perhaps I am mistaken... and all these citizens have read the legislative proposals, have carried out thorough studies in comparative law and have reached the conclusion that the proposals *de lege ferenda* are rubbish and protect the corrupt! Which would mean that we have a people "cultured in the head", and therefore that our minuscule education budget is more than sufficient for so clever a nation!

Either way, the conclusion that imposes itself is that, all in all, things are fine: the money from the budget goes where it should! Let us rejoice, say I.

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQEbz-t0nIJlbogxJOPey3m-EbCMIyZVSGmDxAJ4GAuj6c8MddvWeg-s9wuD_wkUgqKRmh8z-9VoRU_G4Gk0mRTHl20xTybYwHwupYgMZ-q4Xv1j4RLDFEiNKCPLi8TZRO84Qb7dRZ-kHnrvpzbaFLxpGsO6wwunDAHtOdtKUMdKrt6obOou6CqsUD-fjH0vvQayRFAw-Kocz6qLpa00XgFyDDuhg&s=518⟩

2. 6 March 2018 — On the offshore resources

On the offshore project: the full text of the draft — see the page The Offshore Act.

Quite so... who still cares about Romania?

Not those in power, but certainly not the "opposition" either! Not the man who habitually looks on with "attention and concern". Not the "system", brimming with services and Anti-corruption men. Not a press with its mouth watering for #rezist and #josciumarośie...

We still care... but we truly do not count.

http://romanialibera.ro/opinii/cui-ii-mai-pasa-de-romania-713872

On Sunday, 04.03.2018, I posted on Facebook: "The Romanian State is surrendering to the corporations an attribute of its sovereignty — that of legislating and of deciding in the matter of provisions concerning direct taxation!

In recent days I have heard several times on television that the ambassador of the USA, Hans Klemm, in the midst of the scandal of the abuses of the DNA and of the removal of LCK, held discussions at the Government and with Liviu Dragnea "on subjects other than those of justice". Strange, I said to myself... If it is not politics... then it is money. Always! Then I remembered that representatives of the OMV concern had a meeting with the President at the very beginning of this year, on which occasion the Presidential Administration informed us that "the general director of OMV also underlined the need for predictability of the fiscal and legislative framework, which must support the performance of companies and the development of a stable and competitive business environment. As regards the partnership between OMV-Petrom and Exxon-Mobil for the exploitation of the Neptun Deep block, it continues to represent a major interest, both for the Romanian State and for the investors". But why so much agitation?

This unfolding of events, somewhat precipitate in a field so little volatile, made me wonder whether there is not under discussion, right now, without our knowing it, how much accrues to Romania from its resources of hydrocarbons and offshore gas (beyond the shore) in the Black Sea. Or indeed whether anything will accrue to it at all... In a way, what is under discussion is the very fate of Romania and of our people for the next 5 or 6 decades, since it is indirectly a question of the schools, the hospitals and the motorways which could be built with money coming from the taxation of the extraction of our resources, of all of us, so long as art. 136 of the Constitution provides that "the riches of public interest of the subsoil, the airspace, the waters with usable energy potential of national interest, the beaches, the territorial sea, the natural resources of the economic zone and of the continental shelf, and other goods established by organic law form the exclusive object of public property".

I searched... And I found. And that by searching for the term "offshore" on the portal of the Chamber of Deputies and of the Senate of Romania.

The subject of the struggles is the legislative proposal L408/2017 — "Act on certain measures necessary for the implementation of petroleum operations by holders of petroleum agreements relating to offshore petroleum blocks".

And what I found after a short search in public sources, on the internet, is astounding. I shall set out the events chronologically first of all:

On 16 August 2017 there appeared on the Government's site (http://sgg.gov.ro/new/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/Legea-offshore-varian... the above-mentioned legislative proposal, a proposal which had 25 articles organised in 5 chapters and one annex. The draft law provides a series of rules concerning the authorisations necessary for works on marine wells, the competent authorities, various procedures and a long series of provisions derogating from the ordinary rules of law in the field of private property, of the environment and other such "trifles" which nobody usually takes any notice of.

On 11 October 2017, Prime Minister Mihai Tudose adopted a Decision sending the said draft law to Parliament for adoption, so that on 26 October 2017 the said draft law was submitted to the Senate of Romania by the general secretary of the Government — Roxana Cezarina Bănică (all the documents may be examined at https://www.senat.ro/legis/lista.aspx?nr_cls=L408&an_cls=2017).

What is interesting is that the draft law which reached Parliament has one chapter more than the one published on the Government's site, a chapter entitled "Financial and fiscal provisions". And there lies the rub...

Let us take one by one the thorniest problems of this legislative proposal:

Art. 18 provides first of all that "holders of petroleum agreements relating to offshore petroleum blocks in the course of performance at the date of entry into force of this law shall benefit, throughout the duration of those agreements, from the level of royalty, the percentage rates of petroleum royalty, the thresholds of gross production corresponding to those rates and the fiscal rules existing at the date of entry into force of this law". In other words, for as long as there remains a drop of oil and/or gas in the block they are exploiting, the American and Austrian corporations mentioned above (Exxon Mobil and OMV), and the Russian corporation LukOil too, will enjoy the level of royalties and taxes established at the level of the year 2018, it being known that at this moment we have royalties and taxes at derisory levels compared with all the oil- and gas-producing countries of the EU.

Take the royalty on gas, which in Romania in 2018 is set at the level of the gas price of the year 2012, the State collecting a royalty of on average 7% (between 3.5% and 13.5% calculated on a price not updated for 6 years, namely 45.71 lei/MWh). And that while, as we speak, the producers sell the gas at the "market price", namely at 89 lei/MWh! Now, the market price being twice the "reference" price, it follows that, at this date, Romania obtains a royalty of between 1.75% and 6.75% (on average 3% of the price of the gas extracted from our own soil — a royalty which will fall in percentage terms unceasingly, together with the more than probable rise in the price of gas on the free market in the future), while the Dutch (who, unfortunately, do not give lessons from their embassy in this field too) take approximately 40%... of the extraction! Do you wish to estimate the losses of the Romanian State? You must bear in mind that the most pessimistic estimates show that in the "Neptun" block alone there might be 84 billion cubic metres of gas... of that quantity of gas, had we been Dutch, we should have received approximately 40%, but, being merely Romanians, we obtain on average 3%! It is simple, is it not?

In other words, the Romanian State surrenders to the corporations an attribute of its sovereignty, that of legislating and of deciding in the matter of provisions concerning direct taxation, it being known that at EU level the fiscal rules concerning direct taxes are established by each Member State according to its need for resources.

Moreover, the same article 18 also provides that, "from the date of entry into force of this law, the provisions of Government Ordinance 7/2013 establishing the tax on the supplementary revenues obtained as a result of the deregulation of prices in the natural gas sector (...) shall not apply to holders of petroleum agreements relating to offshore petroleum blocks in the course of performance at the date of entry into force of this law". This latter ordinance, from which an exception is sought, is one of the few legislative measures apt to bring an advantage to the Romanian State, providing as it does: "(1) Economic operators, including their subsidiaries and/or economic operators belonging to the same economic interest grouping, which effectively carry out both extraction activities and activities of selling the natural gas extracted from Romania on the national territory, in the territorial sea, in the contiguous zone and/or the exclusive economic zone of Romania in the Black Sea, are obliged to calculate, declare and pay the tax on the supplementary revenues obtained as a result of the deregulation of prices in the natural gas sector, a tax established under the conditions of this ordinance. (2) The tax provided for in paragraph (1) is 60% of the supplementary revenues, as determined in accordance with the annex forming an integral part of this ordinance, from which are deducted the royalties corresponding to those revenues, as well as the investments in the upstream

segment". In other words, the corporations which extract the Romanian deposits from the continental shelf of the Black Sea will not only be shielded from any future change in the fiscal rules, but for the present too only the favourable ones are applicable to them.

And as if that were not enough, in art. 19 we find in the legislative proposal the following statement: "Where the holders of petroleum agreements relating to offshore petroleum blocks in the course of performance at the date of entry into force of this law are obliged to pay any sums levied by the public authorities in addition to the sums which would have been owed in accordance with this law, they shall be entitled to a full tax credit calculated annually for the additional sums paid; the tax credit shall be granted in the form of a right of restitution at the level of the expenses or costs which the holder bears through the payment of the additional sums provided for in this paragraph"!!! In terms we can all understand: the law which is to enter into force in the absence of a fierce public reaction is to produce retroactive effects, those fiscal provisions being applied to the petroleum corporations from the beginning of their activity, and the sums already paid by way of taxes becoming "fiscal claims with a right of restitution, within the meaning of Act 207/2015", which means that in the coming years these companies will have nothing whatever to pay to the Romanian State… indeed they will even be able to ask to be refunded the sums already paid by way of taxes under laws which were and are in force, but which will have been rendered lifeless before the petroleum colossi.

Now, if we really insist, we may also try to calculate how much tax we shall have to "refund" to the corporations, bearing in mind that offshore gas production was 686,250 thousand cubic metres (12.64% of Romania's total gas production at this moment) in the first half of 2017, and that offshore crude production was 122,496 tonnes in the first six months of last year…

This draft law was adopted by the Senate of Romania on 12 February 2018. In this form…

It will shortly reach the agenda of the Chamber of Deputies, the decision-making chamber. Shortly!

With one last effort of naivety I sit and ask myself: does #corupțiaucide — corruption kills — apply also when the beneficiaries are corporations and embassies?

(On the offshore project: the full text of the draft — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQHV6r6jXtLPzo0yTH3YNxqpgR9uoi3H75s_-D6mHAaZg-ZgatRO0-Y63B7LLH7RNE9xipqE3eE4-OVEQWYR9AAGVxZKaX4ARaE8gBTj5LKLlwA6th6XMbt-4AhiVmtf2tBWfYpl-HGukwmzlWo2I4UNlKey1G14Za8OQlbEols7tHsXZjwpHNO52MpAzvqh4muDHit58dhgFj1WI65c-sD6BL3o&s=518⟩

---

3. 21 September 2019 — "#NouaLegeOffshore — #sabotage or merely #treason?"

#NouaLegeOffshore — #sabotage or merely #treason?

The PSD and Dăncilă — the victims or the accomplices of Iohannis?

Exactly one month after the orders received by Klaus Werner Iohannis from Trump (I know, the politically correct thing would have been to say "from the discussions held by the two Presidents in Washington" — only we no longer have time for transparent hypocrisies!) on the subject of "American investment in energy in Romania", behold, the PSD government appears to have complied with the directives transmitted via Cotroceni and has pulled from under the table a set of amendments to the Offshore Act, amendments which not even Tudose, at Exxon Mobil's dictation, could have written better or more favourably for the exploiters. In practice, the PSD has capitulated on the chapter of #Resources! And has surrendered everything.

The new version of the Offshore Act is scandalous and represents, beyond any doubt, a veritable act of national treason. There is no doubt here! Romania will lose at least 20 billion euro. In fact, the Romanian citizen will lose even the little that remained to him after the Offshore Act in the Dragnea version. In the days to come we shall take up again, step by step, the demonstration concerning each article that is to be amended, and we shall see the absolutely disastrous effects of these legislative changes, catalogued by the worms of the bought press as a "new chance for the gas of the Black Sea"...

Until then I return with the same legitimate questions I asked a year ago: who profits from this law, and why does the Romanian State, the State which ought to represent us and defend our rights and interests as citizens, legislate strictly to its own detriment and that of its citizens, and solely in favour of foreign companies?

And, in the end, WHY AND BY WHAT RIGHT DO THE REPRESENTATIVES OF ROMANIA RENOUNCE THE PROPERTY OF ROMANIAN CITIZENS — for the new version of the Offshore Act does nothing other than expropriate the Romanian people of its resources in favour of the exploiters of our riches?

What is more, through the new Offshore Act the Romanian legislator (?!?) is about to renounce voluntarily (?!?) and for ever an exclusive attribute of its sovereignty: the right to regulate taxation in the field of the exploitation of the gas of the Black Sea, setting out in detail over almost a page what the Parliament of Romania will never again be able to change in the interest of the Romanian people... that is to say NOTHING, EVER!!!

The staging of this treason was carefully directed. Only the other day certain pedantic scoundrels appeared under the emblem of the Romanian Academy, thereby defiling an institution that is a symbol of Romania, and presented a survey telling us that over 75.6% of Romanians want the exploitation of the gas of the Black Sea. The survey omitted, however, to ask the Romanian citizen whether he agrees to surrender, free of charge and for ever, the gas that will be extracted from the Black Sea! Perhaps because this survey was carried out by INSCOP ("by chance" a polling house owned by Remus Ștefureac, adviser and close associate of George Maior — former head of the SRI and current ambassador to the USA) at the order of the abject collaborators of the Ion I. C. Brătianu Institute of Political Sciences and International Relations...

For one thing is certain: Romania will touch nothing, absolutely nothing of its resources for as long as

"Art. 20^1. Holders of petroleum agreements relating to offshore petroleum blocks:

* have the right freely to market the hydrocarbons produced from the offshore petroleum blocks, at the prices and in the quantities determined by them and by the use of any procedures chosen by the holder for selecting purchasers and for concluding contracts with them, whatever the identity or location of the purchaser, in accordance with the EU principles of the free market;

* may not be made subject to restrictions concerning the price, the marketing and/or the sale of hydrocarbons, save for the binding legal provisions of the European Union or those imposed by this law;"

All the above is as clear as daylight.

Only one thing I still do not understand: is someone inside the PSD deliberately trying to sabotage Viorica Dăncilă right now, before the start of the presidential campaign? And if so, who? For the discussions concerning the workplace of Mrs Dăncilă's husband within OMV will immediately return to the fore... and with such a subject offered to her political adversaries (themselves ever ready

for such perfidies), the second round moves away from candidate Dăncilă as our hopes move away from us that we shall ever be able to enjoy what is ours.

Or perhaps Viorica Dăncilă simply gave in to the blackmail of Klaus Werner Iohannis and accepted the terms of Romania's capitulation before Donald Trump and Exxon Mobil, "discussed" by the President a few weeks ago in Washington?

In the end, Mrs Dăncilă, I do not even care whether you are the victim of blackmail or an accomplice in treason... Treason remains Treason! Whether you commit it of your own initiative or out of weakness or under blackmail! And history does not forgive traitors!

I say to you only this: 20 billion euro is far too high a price for an aeroplane ticket to Washington!

Post scriptum. Two questions have given me no peace this weekend:

Are there still journalists in the Romanian press, or only collaborators? And...

Did Dragnea really go to prison for nothing?

I attach below the proposed amendments to the offshore law... or how abjection and treason can be contained and summarised in a few words:

"Draft law amending and supplementing

Act no. 256/2018 on certain measures necessary for the implementation of petroleum operations by holders of petroleum agreements relating to offshore petroleum blocks, and the Petroleum Act no. 238/2004

Act no. 256/2018 on certain measures necessary for the implementation of petroleum operations by holders of petroleum agreements relating to offshore petroleum blocks

1. In art. 2 paragraph (1), after letter l) two new letters are inserted, letters m) and n), reading as follows:

Art. 2. — (1) For the purposes of this law, the terms and expressions below have the following meanings:

the specific fiscal regime applicable to activities of exploration, development, exploitation and abandonment covers the following:

the tax on supplementary offshore revenues provided for in art. 19;

the basis of calculation of the profit tax applicable to activities concerning natural resources, provided for in Act no. 227/2015 on the Fiscal Code, as subsequently amended and supplemented, applicable at the date of entry into force of this law;

any tax, duty or contribution including, but not limited to, profit tax, income tax, withholding tax, turnover tax and/or tax on property, on assets, on buildings or on land, applicable at the date of entry into force of this law, specifically to the petroleum sector;

a change of the royalty regime and of the fiscal regime — provided for in art. 21 — comprises the following:

the introduction of new royalties, contributions, duties and taxes, including but not limited to profit tax, income tax, withholding tax, turnover tax and/or tax on property, on assets, on buildings or on land, applicable specifically or disproportionately to the petroleum sector. In this sense, the taxes, duties and contributions applicable specifically or disproportionately to the petroleum sector comprise: taxes, duties and contributions applicable to a limited number of sectors of activity, such as

the energy sector or the extractive sector, or those applicable to a limited number of economic operators, defined on the basis of limiting criteria, such as turnover or the level of profit.

the increase of the percentage rates of petroleum royalty or the modification of the thresholds of gross production corresponding to those rates, stipulated in each petroleum agreement at the date of entry into force of this law, or the modification of the bases of taxation or of the method of calculating the petroleum royalties owed for petroleum operations of exploitation of petroleum from petroleum deposits, governed by the Petroleum Act no. 238/2004 as subsequently amended and supplemented at the date of entry into force of this law;

the increase of the rates, the modification of the bases of taxation or of the method of calculation of any of the taxes, duties and contributions applicable at the date of entry into force of this law to the petroleum sector;

the introduction of new taxes, duties, contributions or tariffs applicable to the assets specific to the petroleum operations carried out by holders of petroleum agreements, such as: wells, marine platforms, pipelines, stations for the treatment, measurement, receipt and delivery of petroleum.

2. Art. 18 is amended and shall read as follows:

To holders of petroleum agreements relating to offshore petroleum blocks in the course of performance at the date of entry into force of this law there shall apply, throughout the duration of those agreements, the level of royalty, the percentage rates of petroleum royalty, the thresholds of gross production corresponding to those rates and the specific fiscal regime applicable to activities of exploration, development, exploitation and abandonment, existing at the date of entry into force of this law.

3. Art. 19 is amended and shall read as follows:

Holders of petroleum agreements relating to offshore petroleum blocks, including their subsidiaries and/or those belonging to the same economic interest grouping, which effectively carry out both extraction activities and activities of selling the natural gas extracted from those blocks, are obliged to calculate, declare and pay the tax on supplementary offshore revenues.

Supplementary revenue means the difference between the weighted average price of the natural gas sold from their own domestic production from the offshore blocks, exclusive of the costs of transport, storage and other logistical costs, and the price of 100 lei/MWh, multiplied by the volumes of gas sold from domestic production from the offshore blocks.

The tax on supplementary offshore revenues provided for in paragraph (1) is calculated by applying one or more calculation percentages, as the case may be, to the supplementary revenues obtained from the sale of the natural gas extracted from the offshore blocks, as determined in accordance with annex no. 2, a tax from which is deducted the value of the investments in the upstream segment. The percentages for calculating the tax are determined on the basis of the selling prices of natural gas charged by the holders of petroleum agreements relating to offshore petroleum blocks according to the price grid below, adjusted annually from 1 January 2020 by the annual consumer price index, as follows:

30% of the supplementary revenues obtained from charging prices greater than 100 lei/MWh and less than or equal to 115 lei/MWh;

35% of the supplementary revenues obtained from charging prices greater than 115 lei/MWh and less than or equal to 130 lei/MWh;

40% of the supplementary revenues obtained from charging prices greater than 130 lei/MWh and less than or equal to 145 lei/MWh;

50% of the supplementary revenues obtained from charging prices greater than 145 lei/MWh and less than or equal to 160 lei/MWh;

55% of the supplementary revenues obtained from charging prices greater than 160 lei/MWh and less than or equal to 175 lei/MWh;

60% of the supplementary revenues obtained from charging prices greater than 175 lei/MWh and less than or equal to 190 lei/MWh;

70% of the supplementary revenues obtained from charging prices greater than 190 lei/MWh.

The maximum limit of the deduction of investments in the upstream segment may not exceed 60% of the total tax on supplementary offshore revenues.

The economic operators referred to in paragraph (1) shall calculate, declare and pay the supplementary offshore tax monthly, by the 25th of the month following that for which the tax is owed.

The model and content of the declaration concerning the tax on supplementary offshore revenues shall be established by order of the president of the National Agency for Fiscal Administration, within 30 days of the date of entry into force of this law.

In so far as the application of these provisions requires the issuing of instructions concerning the tax on supplementary offshore revenues, these shall be issued by joint order of the minister of public finance and the minister of energy, with the opinion of the ANRM.

The sums owed by holders of petroleum agreements relating to offshore blocks by way of tax on supplementary revenues shall be collected into a special account used for financing the establishment and extension of the natural gas distribution networks and of the connections to the national natural gas transmission system, as well as other investments established by Government decision. The allocation of the sums collected shall be made by Government decision. The collection of the tax on supplementary revenues shall be administered by the National Agency for Fiscal Administration, in accordance with Act no. 207/2015, as subsequently amended and supplemented.

The cumulated value of the investments in the upstream segment, recorded in the accounts in accordance with the legal rules in force, from the entry into force of this law until the month for which the tax on supplementary offshore revenues is calculated, and the value of the investments recorded in the accounts up to the date of entry into force of this law, shall be reduced monthly by the value of the investments in the upstream segment deducted from the tax on supplementary offshore revenues. The deductions shall apply until the cumulated value of the investments in the upstream segment, recorded in the accounts in accordance with the laws in force, is reached.

In the event of the alienation of the investments in respect of which the deduction provided for in paragraphs (3) and (4) was obtained, the deduction granted shall be subtracted from the cumulated value of the investments in the upstream segment in proportion to the ratio between the value of the investments transferred and the value of the investments recorded in the upstream segment in the reference period in which it was granted.

---

4. 21 September 2019 — "Art. 20 is amended and shall read as follows:"

Art. 20 is amended and shall have the following content:

Art. 20^1. Holders of petroleum agreements relating to offshore petroleum blocks:

* have the right freely to market the hydrocarbons produced from the offshore petroleum blocks, at the prices and in the quantities determined by them and by the use of any procedures chosen by the holder for selecting purchasers and for concluding contracts with them, whatever the identity or location of the purchaser, in accordance with the EU principles of the free market;

* may not be made subject to restrictions concerning the price, the marketing and/or the sale of hydrocarbons, save for the binding legal provisions of the European Union or those imposed by this law;

* shall be exempted from the provisions of Emergency Ordinance 114/2018 and Emergency Ordinance 19/2019.

By way of derogation from the provisions of the Electricity and Natural Gas Act no. 123/2012, as subsequently amended and supplemented, holders of petroleum agreements relating to offshore petroleum blocks, including their subsidiaries and/or those belonging to the same economic interest grouping, from the date of entry into force of this law until 31 December 2021, in so far as they contract the sale of natural gas on the wholesale market, are obliged to offer, in the calendar year in which they deliver the natural gas, on the centralised markets, transparently, publicly and without discrimination, on the basis of standardised annual, quarterly and monthly products and in accordance with a pre-established timetable in conformity with the rules issued by the National Energy Regulatory Authority (hereinafter ANRE), a quantity of natural gas which may not exceed that represented by a percentage share of 20% of the quantity of natural gas from their own production delivered on the wholesale market, in that calendar year, in the capacity of seller.

---

5. 21 September 2019 — "Art. 21 is amended and shall read as follows:"

Art. 21 is amended and shall read as follows:

The royalty regime and the specific fiscal regime provided for in art. 18 and art. 19 shall not be modified, in whatever form, in favour of or to the detriment of the holders of the agreements, throughout the duration of those agreements.

The percentage share provided for in art. 20^2 shall remain unchanged throughout the duration of the agreements.

---

6. 21 September 2019 — "Art. 25, paragraph (1), letter n) is amended and shall read as follows:"

Art. 25, paragraph (1), letter n) is amended and shall read as follows:

failure by the holders of petroleum agreements to observe the provisions of art. 20^2, punishable by a fine of between 100,000 and 10,000,000 lei.

---

7. 21 September 2019 — "ANNEX no. 2 is amended and shall read as follows:"

ANNEX no. 2 is amended and shall read as follows:

ANNEX no. 2 — Formula for calculating the tax on supplementary offshore revenues

Depending on the level of the weighted average price of the natural gas sold from own domestic production from the offshore blocks, hereinafter PMPC, the following calculation formulae apply:

1. Where PMPC is between 100 lei/MWh and 115 lei/MWh inclusive, adjusted by the CPI, the total tax owed on supplementary offshore revenues is calculated as follows:

IVST — the total tax owed on supplementary offshore revenues;

ISO — the supplementary offshore tax calculated on the supplementary revenues from the sale of natural gas following the charging of PMPC prices between 100 lei/MWh and 115 lei/MWh inclusive, adjusted by the CPI, as the case may be;

CI — the rate of taxation of the supplementary revenues from the sale of natural gas [30% — under art. 19 para. (3) letter (a)], applicable following the charging of PMPC prices between 100 lei/MWh and 115 lei/MWh inclusive, adjusted annually by the CPI rate from 1 January 2020;

VS — the supplementary revenue from the offshore blocks, calculated from the sale of natural gas at PMPC prices between 100 lei/MWh and 115 lei/MWh inclusive;

PMPC — the weighted average price of the natural gas sold from own domestic production from the offshore blocks;

PB — the minimum base price of the corresponding calculation interval; for PMPC prices between 100 lei/MWh and 115 lei/MWh inclusive it is 100 lei/MWh, adjusted annually by the CPI rate from 1 January 2020;

VGC — the volumes of gas from domestic production from the offshore blocks sold;

CPI — the annual consumer price index of the preceding year published by the National Institute of Statistics of Romania;

VID — the value of the deductible investments in the upstream segment;

VI — the cumulated value of the investments in the upstream segment as provided for in art. 19 para. (9), which is reduced monthly by the VID value deducted;

2. Where PMPC exceeds 115 lei/MWh, adjusted by the CPI, the total tax owed on supplementary offshore revenues is calculated as follows:

ISO — the sum of the supplementary offshore taxes, calculated for each price interval under art. 19 para. (3) letters (a) to (g), namely:

ISOi is calculated according to the formula in point 2, where the corresponding terms have the following meanings:

CI — the rate of taxation of the supplementary revenues from the sale of natural gas, for each corresponding price interval under art. 19 para. (3) letters (a) to (g);

PB — the minimum base price of the corresponding calculation interval, adjusted annually from 1 January 2020 by the CPI;

VS — the supplementary revenue from the offshore blocks, calculated for each corresponding price interval.

Example of calculation: for the sale of a volume VGC of 1 MWh at a selling price of 120 lei/MWh, the total tax owed on supplementary offshore revenues is calculated by applying the above formulae as follows:

IVST = ISO - VID = 6.25 – 3.75 = 2.5 lei

ISO = CI1 * VS1 + CI2 * VS2 = 0.30×15 + 0.35×5 = 6.25 lei

CI1 = 0.30 — the rate of taxation (30%) of the supplementary offshore revenues from the sale of natural gas applicable following the charging of prices between 100 lei/MWh and 115 lei/MWh inclusive, under art. 19 para. (3) letter a), adjusted annually by the CPI rate from 1 January 2020;

CI2 = 0.35 — the rate of taxation (35%) of the supplementary offshore revenues from the sale of natural gas applicable following the charging of prices between 115 lei/MWh and 130 lei/MWh inclusive, under art. 19 para. (3) letter b), adjusted annually by the CPI rate from 1 January 2020;

VS1 = (115 - 100)×1 = 15 lei, the supplementary revenue from the offshore blocks, calculated as the difference between 115 lei/MWh and 100 lei/MWh, adjusted annually by the CPI rate from 1 January 2020;

VS2 = (120 - 115)×1 = 5 lei, the supplementary revenue from the offshore blocks, calculated as the difference between PMPC (120 lei/MWh in the given example) and 115 lei/MWh (the minimum base price of the interval), adjusted annually by the CPI rate from 1 January 2020.

1. Art. 49 paragraph (4) of Act 238/2004 is amended and shall have the following content:

The calculation of the value of the petroleum royalty owed to the State budget by the holders of development-exploitation and exploitation petroleum agreements is made on the basis of the sale and purchase prices, exclusive of the costs of transport, storage and other logistical costs. In so far as the petroleum does not form the object of a sale and purchase transaction in the month of production, the calculation of the value of the petroleum royalty governed by this law is made on the basis of reference prices established by the competent authority, observing the following principles:

for crude oil and condensate, the reference prices shall be based on the price of Brent crude for the reference period in respect of which the holders of concession contracts/petroleum agreements owe the petroleum royalty, taking into account price adjustments for the differences in quality between the grades of crude produced in Romania and Brent crude, and for the costs of transporting the grades of crude produced in Romania from the measuring points for determining gross petroleum production to the nearest market where those grades of crude may be traded; those costs shall be defined by the methodology for calculating the reference price, which shall be established by order issued by the president of the competent authority under this law.

for natural gas, the reference price shall be based on the weighted average price of all the sale and purchase transactions for the sale of natural gas reported to the ANRE by the holders of petroleum agreements for the reference period; from the reported price there shall be deducted the costs of transport, storage and other costs defined in the methodology for calculating the reference price, which shall be established by order issued by the president of the competent authority under this law, as well as value added tax and any other duties, taxes or contributions.

for the quantities of petroleum used for the technological consumption of the holders of petroleum agreements, including the quantities necessary for carrying out activities assimilated to those of exploitation, the reference price shall include a reduction as against the reference price determined for the remaining quantities of petroleum. That reduction factor shall be defined by the methodology for calculating the reference price, which shall be established by order issued by the president of the competent authority under this law.

The reference prices shall be established by order issued by the president of the competent authority and shall be published monthly by the competent authority."

(On the offshore project: the full text of the draft — see page 000.)

4. We live in Revolutionary times. Revolutionary without inverted commas, revolutionary in the strict sense of the word, a Revolution which has already given birth to a "New Normality" and to a "new man".

For if you look in the Dictionary you will find that the first definition of the word "REVOLUTION, revolutions, n. I. 1." is "A fundamental change in the values, the political institutions, the social structure, the leaders and the ideologies of a society", and only the second sense is the usual, popular one — as the Romanian dictionary itself considers it — to which we have grown accustomed, namely "2. (Pop.) Uprising, revolt".

So, in order to summarise and clarify the conceptual scope of the word Revolution, we must come to understand that it is not defined, and does not have as its principal characteristic, either the author or the principal actor of it — such as a particular political grouping or even the people as a whole — and still less the manner in which the actors manifest themselves: violent, bloody or velvet.

The only thing that defines a revolution is the radical change it brings about in society. Nothing else.

Now, what we lived through in 2020 was, beyond any doubt, a Revolution in the true sense of the word, and the times we are living in we may label, without fear of error, as truly Revolutionary.

Never in so short an interval have so many radical changes occurred at global level. Never have the limitations of fundamental rights and freedoms been so radical and so evident — from the limitation of religious freedom and freedom of conscience to the limitation of the right to FREE expression, of freedom of movement, of assembly, of association! And above all the limitation of the right to think! Never until now has the population of the whole world "acquiesced" so quickly and so completely in the coercive measures to which it was subjected.

In a single year — in fact in some 10 months — the world changed dramatically, so that the pre-Revolutionary world now seems utopian, as if taken from a story. But most important of all is that man has changed radically and abruptly, which is an achievement that no earlier Revolution managed so well.

Why? Because the Great Global Revolution has something which the earlier revolutions did not have, namely a single command centre at global level and a weapon of ideological and informational mass extermination of opponents, of counter-revolutionaries: the Mass Media and the Internet!

The above statement concerning the "weapons" of the Great Global Revolution is irrefutably proved by your own experience and interaction with the Mass Media and the "social" networks, in which you have been able to observe not only that the diversity of opinions seems to have disappeared, but also that any opinion contrary to the interests of the Revolution is branded and fought with revolutionary fury and exterminated, publicly executed on the scaffold to the cheers of fanaticised crowds.

As for the single command of the Great Global Revolution, it is transparently assumed by the World Economic Forum, and the Revolution led by this Revolutionary Forum even has a name:

Everything is apparently transparent, in plain sight, the aims and the means of this Revolution being set out without circumlocution on the Forum's own site (https://www.weforum.org/great-reset/):

"It is urgent that stakeholders at global level cooperate in managing simultaneously the direct consequences of the COVID-19 crisis. To improve the state of the world, the World Economic Forum is launching the Great Reset initiative.

The Covid-19 crisis and the political, economic and social disruptions it has caused are fundamentally changing the traditional context for decision-making. The inconsistencies, inadequacies and contradictions of several systems — from health and finance to energy and education — are more exposed than ever amid a global context of concern for lives, livelihoods and the planet. Leaders find themselves at a historic crossroads, managing short-term pressures against medium- and long-term uncertainties.

As we enter a unique window of opportunity to shape the recovery, this initiative will offer insights to help inform all those who determine the future state of global relations, the direction of national economies, the priorities of societies, the nature of business models and the management of a global commons. Drawing on the vision and the vast expertise of the leaders engaged in the Forum's communities, the Great Reset initiative has a set of dimensions for building a new social contract that honours the dignity of every human being."

We are already living in the full "New Normality"!

Say "Farewell" to the normality you knew.

Yes! The world has already changed. And it will change further, that is clear! Which is normal, you will tell me, since that is what has happened "since the world began"…

Yes, only that what distinguishes the Great Global Revolution called "The GREAT RESET" is the speed of the changes and the DIRECTION of the developments to come.

The limitation of rights and freedoms? Censorship? A single state ideology? Control of the population? Anti-traditional and anti-religious hatred? Control of the economy by the multinationals?

Clearly, all these are already known, we are already living them! These were foreseeable and predictable before the outbreak of the revolution; only we did not know how they would proceed to tighten the screw still further.

Now we know. But we do not know — and I do not think we want to know — what is being prepared for us in the second wave of revolution. For the implementation and consolidation of "revolutionary values" always costs far more than the revolution itself. History confirms this every time.

What will happen to all of us? I do not know. Very probably what they want. What will happen to us, the anti-revolutionaries, the reactionaries and the subversives who attack the noble ideals of the Global Revolution? That too I do not know. I expect the worst. And that first of all from the population seized by revolutionary ardour…

Since I do not wish to spoil for you the beginning of this second Revolutionary Year, or year 1 After the Great Reset, I shall urge you to one thing only: DO NOT BE AFRAID!

However few and however weak we may be, it is certain that we are on the right side of the barricade! Perhaps not of history… but,

"For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father" (Romans 8:15).

5. THE SOVEREIGNTY ACT — a law which must be adopted urgently: NOW OR NEVER!

Romania has reached a crucial moment in its history, in which the active and direct involvement of the citizen is needed for the defence of his legitimate rights and interests. That is, if we wish still to be a country, a people, tomorrow!

Certainly, neither the progressive and colonialist Government of Romania nor Parliament in its present composition will do anything to defend us from the wave of globalisation and of the new normality.

That is why we, the citizens, must do what our representatives have not done these last 30 years, out of incompetence, out of fear or out of villainy: defend the sovereignty and independence of Romania by forcing the adoption of laws written exclusively in the higher and sovereign interest of the Romanian citizen.

For we, "ordinary citizens", have the right to propose to Parliament the adoption of the laws we need. Did you know that? And not only through "our representatives", but even directly, immediately!

Yes, the Constitution gives us the right to have legislative initiative, to "force" Parliament to adopt certain laws.

That is why we shall have to begin to make use of the constitutional mechanisms at our disposal and, under article 74 of the Constitution, to use our right of legislative initiative, proposing to the legislature the laws which the citizens of Romania really need.

For this we need at least 100,000 citizens with the right to vote, coming from at least a quarter of the counties of the country.

In reality we shall have to gather several hundreds of thousands, even millions of signatures, in order to force the hand of the present majority to adopt our legislative initiatives.

I bring to your attention and to discussion a first legislative proposal which could and indeed should come from us, from the people: the Sovereignty Act.

The Act for the protection of the higher and sovereign interest of the Romanian people and citizen

1. Clear-felling of forest stands on the territory of Romania is prohibited until the year 2040.

2. The alienation of the assets of the Romanian State shall be effected only following the adoption by Parliament, by a qualified majority, of an organic law to that effect.

3. The concession of national resources shall be effected only following the adoption by Parliament, by a qualified majority, of an organic law to that effect for each concessioned area separately.

4. The exploitation of the resources of the Romanian State concessioned up to this date is suspended until the adoption by Parliament, by a qualified majority, of an organic law to that effect for each concessioned area separately.

5. The limitation of the constitutional rights of Romanian citizens provided for by the Constitution may be effected only by the legislature, through an organic law adopted by Parliament by a qualified majority.

6. Articles of law declared unconstitutional by the Constitutional Court are considered repealed by operation of law under this article from the 46th day after the publication of the Constitutional Court's Decision in the Official Gazette, where the legislature does not bring the legal provision into accord with the Court's decision.

7. Medical treatments may be administered to Romanian citizens only after obtaining beforehand the agreement and written consent of the patients, following prior and obligatory information given on the basis of the leaflets supplied by the manufacturer of the medicines proposed, medical emergencies excepted.

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQHM5DIZ7bI2iuWT7BHHkeYNHiykvlwJ6Ra89g_IyoIJu1Wz2eMpGen4got_cGQjvyPHzbf4-yC-PRjYKKiCm9lE3hTQyFhE9bVYQ5t4NwQIm6xWDy0qbHg3pGqIovDQdYpFkbwoSboF2cCCiJOLY5Jk7us_vL4DgAnEgNksk-NcWdjpGPGeNyXXQXcdL9–c2DTrpI-oSTd6W_KlwTbqYqh7K4qw&s=518⟩

8. 25 January 2021 — "The involvement of the Romanian secret services in the judiciary, in politics, in the pre..."

The involvement of the secret services of Romania in the judiciary, in politics, in the press and in business on the territory of Romania is prohibited. The unmasking of natural or legal persons who breach this legal provision is exempted from the application of art. ... of Act 51/1991. Breach of this legal provision constitutes abuse of office, and failure to report a possible breach of this rule constitutes complicity in abuse of office, as that offence is defined and punished by the provisions of art. 297 of the Criminal Code.

9. 2 February 2021 — On the citizens' initiative

The acquisition of military equipment from foreign manufacturers which do not provide offset production in Romania of at least 40% of the value of the contract is prohibited.

10. 6 February 2021 — On the revision of the draft

On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see the page The Sovereignty Act.

Any form of censorship or limitation of the right of Romanian citizens to free expression on social networks and/or in the online environment is prohibited. Breach of this legal rule renders the provider of online services liable to a fine of between €10,000,000 and €50,000,000, according to the gravity of the act.

11. 25 January 2021 — "This law enters into force on the date of its publication in the Official Gazette, any provision..."

This law enters into force on the date of its publication in the Official Gazette, any provision to the contrary being repealed by operation of law from that date.

Of course, the text can and must be discussed and improved, brought to the form and standards required by Act 24/2000.

But I hope it may be a good beginning, a useful basis for a public and constructive debate which will in the end lead (I hope not so distant an end) to the gathering of signatures for submitting this Act to the Parliament of Romania for adoption.

Personally, together with #CoaliţiaPentruNaţiune and with any other political force interested in the adoption of this law, I shall do everything in my power to defend the legitimate rights and interests of this people.

I await your opinions and, of course, your support!

6. "Romanians can take their fate into their own hands and can make use of a constitutional provision which allows them to draft their own laws, without depending any longer on the mercy of the inertia shown by members of parliament. And such a normative act, which will be called the Sovereignty Act, will have the role of genuinely protecting the Romanian economy. The man who launched

the proposal on Monday, 25 January 2021, is the lawyer Dan Chitic (photo), who started from art. 74 paras. 1 and 2 of the fundamental law.

Those passages of the Constitution give citizens the right to draft legislative proposals themselves, and then to send them to Parliament.

We reproduce the constitutional provisions to that effect:

"(1) Legislative initiative belongs, as the case may be, to the Government, to deputies, to senators or to a number of at least 100,000 citizens with the right to vote. Citizens exercising their right of legislative initiative must come from at least a quarter of the counties of the country, and in each of those counties, and in the municipality of Bucharest, at least 5,000 signatures must be registered in support of that initiative.

Fiscal matters, those of an international character, amnesty and pardon may not form the object of the citizens' legislative initiative".

Returning to Dan Chitic's proposal: it concerns first of all the prohibition of deforestation until the year 2040 and the requirement that the alienation of the State's assets and the concession of resources be effected only by organic laws adopted by a qualified majority. That means two thirds of the votes of all members of parliament, as Chitic explained for Lumea Justiției. Moreover, this qualified majority will also be necessary for the adoption of the organic laws needed to restrict the exercise of certain rights and freedoms, any other course being excluded by the Sovereignty Act. Still in the field of rights and freedoms, Chitic's law would provide for stinging fines, of up to 50 million euro, for anyone indulging in censorship on the Internet.

The same normative act will prohibit the administration of medical treatments without the written and informed consent of patients, save in medical emergencies.

Another provision will eliminate the possibility of the secret services becoming involved in the judiciary, in politics, in the press and in business on the territory of Romania. In the field of defence, the Sovereignty Act will limit the acquisition of military equipment to foreign manufacturers which provide offset production in Romania of at least 40% of the value of the contract.

Before we present to you the proposal published by Dan Chitic on Facebook, we mention that the lawyer explained for Lumea Justiției that it is not necessary that a single law should result in the end, since it may equally be a package of laws of sovereignty. "In any case: what is important is that these draft laws of sovereignty should be the result of extensive debates with specialists in all the fields concerned", Chitic emphasised.

We reproduce the lawyer's entire post: https://www.facebook.com/1645845977/posts/10216808395955981/?d=n"

More at https://m.luju.ro/legea-suveranitatii-avocatul-dan-chitic-propune-un-a…

7. "Romania can regain its dignity, through a law which could make history if it enters into force.

It is the so-called "Sovereignty Act", proposed by the lawyer Dan Chitic (photo) on Monday, 25 January 2021.

The law, which will have the role of genuinely protecting the Romanian economy, concerns 11 fields. Principally, it is a matter of prohibiting deforestation until the year 2040 and of the requirement that the alienation of the State's assets and the concession of resources be effected only by organic laws adopted by a qualified majority. We refer to two thirds of the votes of all members of parliament, as Chitic explained for Lumea Banilor.

Moreover, this qualified majority will also be necessary for the adoption of the organic laws needed to restrict the exercise of certain rights and freedoms, any other course being excluded by the Sovereignty Act. Still in the field of rights and freedoms, Chitic's law would provide for stinging fines, of up to 50 million euro, for anyone indulging in censorship on the Internet.

The same normative act will prohibit the administration of medical treatments without the written and informed consent of patients, save in medical emergencies.

Another provision will eliminate the possibility of the secret services becoming involved in the judiciary, in politics, in the press and in business on the territory of Romania. In the field of defence, the Sovereignty Act will limit the acquisition of military equipment to foreign manufacturers which provide offset production in Romania of at least 40% of the value of the contract."

More at: https://luba.ro/romania-isi-poate-recapata-demnitatea-propunere-de-leg...

8. I told you yesterday that we no longer have a choice, that we no longer have hope, that the system has seized everything!

Yes, the System has seized everything, it has won the match. And not since yesterday or today, but for a very long time.

Today the System, the globalist securitate men, have only the supreme arrogance to show it, to proclaim their victory without reserve. And that, I say, is our chance, for it is an immense mistake on the part of the system's men, akin to despising an opponent who is on the ropes.

When you no longer have any rational chance, you become lucid in your despair and you realise that you have nothing left to lose. There comes that lucidity I spoke of yesterday, which makes me understand that the way out must be invented, that the walls must be broken down with the fury and the despair of one who has nothing left to lose!

And then you are capable of anything... You overcome your fear, you overcome all your complexes, even the instinct of self-preservation... and you look your adversary in the eye with the doggedness of one on the threshold of death, with the lucidity of the condemned man and, with the strength of the drowning, you throw yourself upon him.

Only then do you realise that behind the beast which wants to destroy you lies the decision of 0.1 per cent of the population, put into effect by another 1% through the fists and truncheons of at most 3%, and that the beast is cheered on from the "stands" by at most 30% of us, the more credulous and more inept, who applaud our crushing as a victory of their own — they themselves the slaves of the 1%.

The beast is in fact a decrepit and perverse dwarf which became a beast in our eyes only because we allowed it, because we entered into its game, because we allowed it to control our minds and our souls in exchange for the illusion of happiness brought by comfort.

If we understand this, we shall succeed in changing the course of history!

The responsibility of our generation is immense, for we are the very last generation that can still stop the decrepit and perverse dwarf from becoming truly an unbeatable beast. In only 10 to 15 years the proportion of the beast's supporters will exceed 50%... and that through their "education", or rather through the effective absence of education and their politically correct indoctrination.

We are the last generation still to have the memory of true landmarks, of immutable values, of predecessors who were real men, not machines, not spectres online. The man of tomorrow's world, a world definitively ruled by the 0.1% through Artificial Intelligence, will be too short-sighted

intellectually and too impotent morally still to seek the Truth, still to try to oppose the Abomination of Desolation.

That is why it is our duty to oppose the New Normality and its masters and adherents. At any price!

We must show that we still have the power of number, of force and of the courage given by the awareness that we are on the side of the Truth!

And this force we must exert vigorously where it hurts them most: in the legislative field. We must resume our right to decide for ourselves. For when they no longer give us alternatives, the alternative must be created by us!

That is why the other day I proposed to you a first popular legislative initiative. Not with the pitchfork or the axe, nor with muscles or fists shall we regain our freedom... for in any case we Romanians have never been good at that — and last night's protest proves it!

Freedom, if we are still to be worthy of it, we shall regain only with the pen and the spirit!

#VreauSăCred — I want to believe — that we shall begin to write our own laws!

9. "A citizens' initiative launched a few days ago has produced immense interest among Romanians. It is the "Sovereignty Act", proposed by the lawyer Dan Chitic (photo). A law which will have the role of genuinely protecting the Romanian economy (click here to read).

Nevertheless, for the law to become reality, the initiative must gather 100,000 signatures from Romanians, after which it is to be sent to Parliament for adoption. Until then, the lawyer Dan Chitic has made new additions to the "Sovereignty Act", following the suggestions received from Romanians.

Among the additions made, and made public by Chitic on Facebook, is that concerning the prohibition of the introduction into the country of waste of any kind (an extremely important provision, given that Romania has become the rubbish dump of Europe), and also that establishing that the undermining of the national economy is punished by up to 25 years' imprisonment.

We present the announcement of the lawyer Dan Chitic concerning the new form of the "Sovereignty Act":

"As you know, a week ago I publicly launched the draft of the 'Sovereignty Act', the first popular legislative initiative framed under art. 74 para. 1 of the Constitution.

Following your requests, those of the persons interested in this legislative project which can save this nation from disaster, I have added a further 5 articles to our draft law, namely:

11. Any form of commercial advertising on television, radio and on social networks for medicines, vaccines and other pharmaceutical products is prohibited, with the exception of cosmetic and natural products.

archive of the post (https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQ-Fac_-2wr7ShRQgpCDimbdhCwcrvIR7jcGzf_uXwtYXxZxPCWnhFKKTNGdqdawkuGIQEoztxVZlbZZlYCN5eHRoSZsA45B-c6wH7MU_SDDWvKZx-dDL8XhP-Wan2GqaV0cO_PtmDi9ACVvhEN2UrTLF12AtGs6iep12bHoOjCHf68nKQSnm9DVeIdoKQWDluF4RFwwi15488GdTMrnVIaPtK4lg&s=518)

---

12. 2 February 2021 — "The introduction into the country of waste of any kind is prohibited, whether or not it ..."

The introduction into the country of waste of any kind is prohibited, whether it originates within the Community area or outside it.

13. 2 February 2021 — "The adoption by Emergency Ordinance of any measures in the field of regulation..."

The adoption by Emergency Ordinance of any measures in the field reserved exclusively to organic laws under art. 73 para. 3 of the Constitution is prohibited, as is the amendment or repeal by Emergency Ordinance of any provisions laid down in organic laws.

14. 18 February 2021 — On the repeal of Act 55/2020

On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see the page The Sovereignty Act.

As from the date of adoption of this Act, total or partial failure to observe the conditions and obligations stipulated as incumbent upon the purchaser entails the nullity by operation of law of the privatisation contract. The action for a declaration of nullity may be brought by any Romanian citizen and is exempt from stamp duty.

15. 2 February 2021 — "The act of Undermining the national economy is criminalised and shall read as follows..."

The act of Undermining the national economy is criminalised and shall read as follows: 'The act of using one of the entities referred to in art. 176 of the Criminal Code, or of impeding its normal activity, if the act is such as to undermine the national economy, shall be punished by imprisonment from 5 to 20 years and the prohibition of certain rights. If the act provided for in the preceding paragraph has caused significant damage to the national economy, the penalty is life imprisonment or imprisonment from 15 to 25 years and the prohibition of certain rights'.

At present, the text proposed for the Sovereignty Act is the following:

'Draft legislation: the Sovereignty Act, or the Act for the protection of the higher and sovereign interest of the Romanian people and citizen

1. Clear-felling of forest stands on the territory of Romania is prohibited until the year 2040.

2. The alienation of the assets of the Romanian State shall be effected only following the adoption by Parliament, by a qualified majority, of an organic law to that effect.

3. The concession of national resources shall be effected only following the adoption by Parliament, by a qualified majority, of an organic law to that effect for each concessioned area separately.

4. The exploitation of the resources of the Romanian State concessioned up to this date is suspended until the adoption by Parliament, by a qualified majority, of an organic law to that effect for each concessioned area separately.

5. The limitation of the constitutional rights of Romanian citizens provided for by the Constitution may be effected only by the legislature, through an organic law adopted by Parliament by a qualified majority.

6. Articles of law declared unconstitutional by the Constitutional Court are considered repealed by operation of law under this article from the 46th day after the publication of the Court's Decision in the Official Gazette, where the legislature does not bring the legal provision into accord with the Court's decision.

7. Medical treatments may be administered to Romanian citizens only after obtaining beforehand the agreement and written consent of the patients, following prior and obligatory information given on the basis of the leaflets supplied by the manufacturer of the medicines proposed, medical emergencies excepted.

8. The involvement of the secret services of Romania in the judiciary, in politics, in the press and in business on the territory of Romania is prohibited. The unmasking of natural or legal persons who breach this legal provision is exempted from the application of art. ... of Act 51/1991. Breach of this legal provision constitutes abuse of office, and failure to report a possible breach of this rule constitutes complicity in abuse of office, as that offence is defined and punished by the provisions of art. 297 of the Criminal Code.

9. The acquisition of military equipment from foreign manufacturers which do not provide offset production in Romania of at least 40% of the value of the contract is prohibited.

10. Any form of censorship or limitation of the right of Romanian citizens to free expression on social networks and/or in the online environment is prohibited. Breach of this legal rule renders the provider of online services liable to a fine of between €10,000,000 and €50,000,000, according to the gravity of the act.

11. Any form of commercial advertising on television, radio and on social networks for medicines, vaccines and other pharmaceutical products is prohibited, with the exception of cosmetic and natural products.

12. The introduction into the country of waste of any kind is prohibited, whether it originates within the Community area or outside it.

13. The adoption by Emergency Ordinance of any measures in the field reserved exclusively to organic laws under art. 73 para. 3 of the Constitution is prohibited, as is the amendment or repeal by Emergency Ordinance of any provisions laid down in organic laws.

14. As from the date of adoption of this Act, total or partial failure to observe the conditions and obligations stipulated as incumbent upon the purchaser entails the nullity by operation of law of the privatisation contract. The action for a declaration of nullity may be brought by any Romanian citizen and is exempt from stamp duty.

15. The act of Undermining the national economy is criminalised and shall read as follows: 'The act of using one of the entities referred to in art. 176 of the Criminal Code, or of impeding its normal activity, if the act is such as to undermine the national economy, shall be punished by imprisonment from 5 to 20 years and the prohibition of certain rights. If the act provided for in the preceding paragraph has caused significant damage to the national economy, the penalty is life imprisonment or imprisonment from 15 to 25 years and the prohibition of certain rights'.

---

16. 25 January 2021 — "This law enters into force on the date of its publication in the Official Gazette, any provision..."

This law enters into force on the date of its publication in the Official Gazette, any provision to the contrary being repealed by operation of law from that date.'

Persons wishing to take part in the gathering of signatures (which will begin in a few weeks) are awaited on Telegram at https://t.me/Legeasuveranității"."

The whole article at https://luba.ro/legea-suveranitatii-modificari-de-ultima-ora-subminare...

Volunteers are asked to enrol here:

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSfE-RY2nEZZXd-SP34eDQ1D3bd9BG...

10. The Sovereignty Act has been revised and supplemented

Following the discussions held with you, the supporters of this popular legislative initiative, I have made the following changes and additions:

In article 1, following your requests, I have changed the date until which the clear-felling of forest stands is prohibited from the year 2040 to the year 2100.

In article 2 I have added the prohibition of listing on the stock exchange the shares held by the Romanian State without the approval of a qualified majority of Parliament, specifying also that this qualified majority means two thirds of the total number of members of parliament. The same clarification as to the meaning of the term qualified majority I have made in article 3 as well.

In article 7, which originally read "Medical treatments may be administered to Romanian citizens only after obtaining beforehand the agreement and written consent of the patients, following prior and obligatory information given on the basis of the leaflets supplied by the manufacturer of the medicines proposed, medical emergencies excepted", there has also been added the provision that "No citizen may be discriminated against, positively or negatively, as a result of accepting or refusing a medical treatment."

In article 13 I have added that the engagement of the Government's responsibility in the field reserved to organic laws is also prohibited, so that the article now reads: "The adoption, by Emergency Ordinance or by the engagement of the Government's responsibility, of any measures in the field reserved exclusively to organic laws under art. 73 para. 3 of the Constitution is prohibited, as is the amendment or repeal, by Emergency Ordinance or by the engagement of the Government's responsibility, of any provisions laid down in organic laws."

Four further articles have been added to the Sovereignty Act, namely:

Article 16. Art. 297 para. 2 of the Criminal Code is amended as follows: "(2) The same penalty shall apply to the act of a public servant who, in the exercise of his official duties, restricts the exercise of a person's right or creates for that person a situation of inferiority on grounds of race, nationality, ethnic origin, language, religion, sex, sexual orientation, political affiliation, wealth, age, disability, ACCEPTANCE OR REFUSAL OF A MEDICAL TREATMENT, non-contagious chronic illness, or HIV/AIDS infection."

Article 17. Romania's gold reserve is held exclusively and in its entirety at the National Bank of Romania. The authorities are obliged, within no more than 180 days from the publication of this Act in the Official Gazette of Romania, to repatriate in its entirety the gold held outside Romania.

Article 18. The marketing on the territory of Romania of any products which are inferior in quality to similar products sold in any other State of the European Union is prohibited. Breach of this legal rule constitutes a misleading commercial practice within the meaning of art. 7 para. 2 of Act 363/2007 of 21 December 2007 and renders the manufacturer and the trader jointly and severally liable to a fine of between €10,000,000 and €50,000,000, according to the gravity of the act.

Article 19. Article 19 of Act no. 202/1998 on the organisation of the Official Gazette of Romania, republished in the Official Gazette of Romania, Part I, no. 206 of 11 April 2013, as subsequently amended, is amended and shall read as follows: "Art. 19 The Autonomous Authority 'Monitorul Oficial' shall produce an electronic product containing the acts published and the legislation as updated and consolidated, which may be accessed permanently and free of charge on the internet."

With your permission we shall close the discussions concerning the content of the law — a Law which has already become extremely extensive: 20 articles — and in the days to come we shall concentrate exclusively on the form of the Law and on satisfying the requirements of legislative technique.

I too, like many others, should have wished us to be able to make proposals in other fields as well, such as the fiscal one; but the Constitution and the laws in force do not permit us to do so from the position of ordinary citizens. For other amendments and legislative initiatives we should have to reach Parliament! And not just anyhow… but with a comfortable majority too, which at this moment belongs to the realm of utopia.

I thank you for your involvement in the debates concerning this Sovereignty Act, a law which came naturally from the real holder of Romania's Sovereignty: from you, from the Romanian citizen.

In the days to come we shall have to organise ourselves in order to gather the signatures needed so that this law cannot be ignored by the members of parliament controlled by the system. And no, we shall have to gather not merely 100,000 signatures, as the Constitution requires, but hundreds of thousands or millions of signatures, so that our draft Law becomes Law by the force of popular support and in spite of the obstacles that will be placed in our way by the system and by the securitate men of the old or the new rite.

I leave you below the full text of the Sovereignty Act in its revised and supplemented (but not yet final!) form, as well as a link to the enrolment form for volunteers for the gathering of signatures!

"Draft legislation: the Sovereignty Act, or the Act for the protection of the higher and sovereign interest of the Romanian people and citizen

1. Clear-felling of forest stands on the territory of Romania is prohibited until the year 2100.

2. The alienation of the assets of the Romanian State, and the listing on the stock exchange of the shares held by the Romanian State, shall be effected only following the adoption by Parliament, by a qualified majority of two thirds of the members of Parliament, of an organic law to that effect.

3. The concession of national resources shall be effected only following the adoption by Parliament, by a qualified majority of two thirds of the members of Parliament, of an organic law to that effect for each concessioned area separately.

4. The exploitation of the resources of the Romanian State concessioned up to this date is suspended until the adoption by Parliament, by a qualified majority, of an organic law to that effect for each concessioned area separately.

5. The limitation of the constitutional rights of Romanian citizens provided for by the Constitution may be effected only by the legislature, through an organic law adopted by Parliament by a qualified majority of two thirds of the members of Parliament.

6. Articles of law declared unconstitutional by the Constitutional Court are considered repealed by operation of law under this article from the 46th day after the publication of the Court's Decision in the Official Gazette, where the legislature does not bring the legal provision into accord with the Court's decision.

7. Medical treatments may be administered to Romanian citizens only after obtaining beforehand the agreement and written consent of the patients, following prior and obligatory information given on the basis of the leaflets supplied by the manufacturer of the medicines proposed, medical emergencies excepted. No citizen may be discriminated against, positively or negatively, as a result of accepting or refusing a medical treatment.

8. The involvement of the secret services of Romania in the judiciary, in politics, in the press and in business on the territory of Romania is prohibited. The unmasking of natural or legal persons who breach this legal provision is exempted from the application of art. 12 para. 2 of Act 51/1991. Breach of this legal provision constitutes abuse of office, and failure to report a possible breach of this rule constitutes complicity in abuse of office, as that offence is defined and punished by the provisions of art. 297 of the Criminal Code.

9. The acquisition of military equipment from foreign manufacturers which do not provide offset production in Romania of at least 40% of the value of the contract is prohibited.

10. Any form of censorship or limitation of the right of Romanian citizens to free expression on social networks and/or in the online environment is prohibited. Breach of this legal rule renders the provider of online services liable to a fine of between €10,000,000 and €50,000,000, according to the gravity of the act.

11. Any form of commercial advertising on television, radio and on social networks for medicines, vaccines and other pharmaceutical products is prohibited, with the exception of cosmetic and natural products.

12. The introduction into the country of waste of any kind is prohibited, whether it originates within the Community area or outside it.

13. The adoption, by Emergency Ordinance or by the engagement of the Government's responsibility, of any measures in the field reserved exclusively to organic laws under art. 73 para. 3 of the Constitution is prohibited, as is the amendment or repeal, by Emergency Ordinance or by the engagement of the Government's responsibility, of any provisions laid down in organic laws.

14. As from the date of adoption of this Act, total or partial failure to observe the conditions and obligations stipulated as incumbent upon the purchaser entails the nullity by operation of law of the privatisation contract. The action for a declaration of nullity may be brought by any Romanian citizen and is exempt from stamp duty.

15. The act of Undermining the national economy is criminalised and shall read as follows: "The act of using one of the legal entities referred to in art. 176 of the Criminal Code, or of impeding its normal activity, if the act is such as to undermine the national economy, shall be punished by imprisonment from 5 to 20 years and the prohibition of certain rights. If the act provided for in the preceding paragraph has caused significant damage to the national economy, the penalty is life imprisonment or imprisonment from 15 to 25 years and the prohibition of certain rights.

16. Art. 297 para. 2 of the Criminal Code is amended as follows: "(2) The same penalty shall apply to the act of a public servant who, in the exercise of his official duties, restricts the exercise of a person's right or creates for that person a situation of inferiority on grounds of race, nationality, ethnic origin, language, religion, sex, sexual orientation, political affiliation, wealth, age, disability, acceptance or refusal of a medical treatment, non-contagious chronic illness, or HIV/AIDS infection."

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQESWg9XJfh3Mpy-TClfX1UD_V9QbNPEsaqFMqjUbLMVflcfwKpd_ubggBt9owakB5lFWhroJxOOiTxovDtVFjYjqJxi6OEMhzHylNKUJyRy-vJLXHa-rO0Yf0wpPyx5PlOgmP-xEHwTb4lUmDifLc9AEeLl-BVoAP3FN6kiWNA_Wigl354vca5h1nQ9lfS24GDrgSuT4CybNVKZS1p-Y1oy7tRI&s=518⟩

17. 2 March 2021 — "Romania's gold reserve is held exclusively and in its entirety at the National Bank..."

Romania's gold reserve is held exclusively and in its entirety at the National Bank of Romania. The authorities are obliged, within no more than 180 days from the publication of this Act in the Official Gazette of Romania, to repatriate in its entirety the gold held outside Romania.

18. 6 February 2021 — "The marketing on the territory of Romania of any products which are inferior..."

The marketing on the territory of Romania of any products which are inferior in quality to similar products sold in any other State of the European Union is prohibited. Breach of this legal rule constitutes a misleading commercial practice within the meaning of art. 7 para. 2 of Act 363/2007 of 21 December 2007 and renders the manufacturer and the trader jointly and severally liable to a fine of between €10,000,000 and €50,000,000, according to the gravity of the act.

19. 6 February 2021 — "Article 19 of Act no. 202/1998 on the organisation of the Official Gazette of Romania, r..."

Article 19 of Act no. 202/1998 on the organisation of the Official Gazette of Romania, republished in the Official Gazette of Romania, Part I, no. 206 of 11 April 2013, as subsequently amended, is amended and shall read as follows: "Art. 19 The Autonomous Authority 'Monitorul Oficial' shall produce an electronic product containing the acts published and the legislation as updated and consolidated, which may be accessed permanently and free of charge on the internet."

20. 6 February 2021 — "This law enters into force on the date of its publication in the Official Gazette, any provision..."

This law enters into force on the date of its publication in the Official Gazette, any provision to the contrary being repealed by operation of law from that date."

To enrol as a volunteer of the Sovereignty Act, go to:

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSfE-RY2nEZZXd-SP34eDQ1D3bd9BG...

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

11. My dear friends, I must confess that I no longer understand anything! Please enlighten me.

My posts produce effects I no longer understand.

Some of them — sometimes simple statements or observations, at other times laments from the edge of the depression that assails me in this end of a world — gather thousands of likes and shares.

Other posts, in which I try to come with solutions, with concrete proposals as an answer to the problems arising from the posts mentioned above... are lucky to get a few hundred likes, and that over several days.

Not to mention that in both kinds of post, in the comments, I find people who evidently think alike (for that is why we are virtual friends), but who fall to quarrelling and end by setting off veritable little virtual conflagrations!

Tell me: am I wrong, and if so, where am I wrong? If not, whence comes this spirit of negation and division which grinds down both us and the society in which we live?

Post scriptum: this post is the ideal example of what I said above: 70 likes in 9 minutes, while in the same time the previous post, with the Sovereignty Act... I do not understand!

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

12. Today I had the pleasure of an interesting and fruitful discussion with His Excellency Alfredo Alfonso TORREALBA, ambassador of the Republic of Venezuela in Bucharest.

It seems that word of the #LegeaSuveranității has been heard across seas and countries, as far as the other side of the world!

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

13. An untreated cold passes in a week, and in 7 days with treatment. So says the popular saying.

On the same model, pandemics too: without a vaccine they pass in 2 years, with a vaccine in 24 months...

The proof? What the officials tell us: that the Covid pandemic will end in 2023! That is, a little more than 24 months from its spread, from its "pandemisation".

So the idea is this: we must have "60% of the population immunised within a year and the infection maintained at a minimum level. From 60% upwards, above 70% and better, collective immunity begins to become functional." So say the "specialists" in 2020. But that is exactly what the specialists had found as early as 1920...

Do you happen to know of any vaccine whatever against the Spanish flu virus? I do not...

And that Pandemic of 1918–1920 ended without vaccination... in about 2 years!

In other words the Covid pandemic will come to an end somewhere in the middle of 2022... with or without a vaccine. For the Spanish flu pandemic of 1918 also died out in 2 years! Also after two "humps"... but after 50 million deaths, that is, over 3% of the world's population at the time!

Our contemporary pandemic has caused in one year "only" 2.2 million victims, that is 0.03% of the world's population. Probably we shall have as many victims again and shall reach towards 0.05%, let us say 0.06% of the world's population.

This is not cynicism, but simply pragmatism and social realism! Is it worth sacrificing the rights of the other 99.95% for 0.05% of the population?

What is certain is that a year from now we shall have escaped this scourge! With or without a vaccine!

But it is not at all certain that we shall also escape the dictatorship occasioned by the plandemic!

Let us return to pandemics: "Specialists agree that the end of the pandemic occurred in 1920, when society managed to develop so-called 'herd immunity', even though the virus never disappeared entirely.

'Traces of the same virus have been found in other influenza viruses. The Spanish flu continued to appear, to mutate and to acquire the genetic material of other viruses', says Dr Benito Almirante, head of the infectious diseases unit at the Vall d'Hebron hospital in Barcelona.

For example, the flu of 2009 had the genetic elements of earlier viruses, so that older people were better protected than the young.

The same happened with the Spanish flu, those over 30 having greater chances of survival. Most probably the situation is due to the fact that the generation over 30 had been through the so-called Russian flu of 1889 and 1890." So wrote Ziarul Financiar last year — https://www.google.ro/amp/s/m.zf.ro/amp/business-international/cum-s-a...

In this context, is it worth being vaccinated?

To take that decision, inform yourselves from the only official and credible source, the leaflet of the manufacturer of the Comirnaty vaccine, Pfizer, at https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/product-information/comirnaty-e... .

I, as I have told you, shall be vaccinated (possibly) only after December 2023, when the vaccine comes out of clinical trials.

But by then I am sure the plandemic will already have been over... for a year!

But until we decide what to do about the vaccine, we have the duty to defend our rights and our sovereignty!

Post scriptum via Aurelian Popa: "And of those 2 million deaths, 20% belong to the USA, which holds 4% of the total population.

50% of those deaths were 'reported' in 4 or 5 countries.

80% of the deaths in the USA are concentrated in 5 or 6 states, the richest ones.

14. Taking note of the unanimity of PNL-USR-PLUS-UDMR-PSD-AUR unleashed in Parliament by PLX 31/2021, namely by the Act approving Emergency Ordinance 192/2020 amending and supplementing Act 55/2020 on certain measures for preventing and combating the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic,

I believe it necessary to introduce into the Sovereignty Act a twenty-first article:

"Act 55/2020 on certain measures for preventing and combating the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic is repealed."

Act 55/2020, by which the "state of alert" was regulated, is a law which, taken as a whole, is unconstitutional — for reasons debated at length in the spring of 2020 — since it institutes measures restricting the fundamental rights of the Romanian citizen, for which reason

ACT 55/2020 MUST BE REPEALED IN ITS ENTIRETY!

THE REPEAL OF ACT 55/2020 IS THE ONLY LEGAL PATH TO RECOVERING NORMALITY!

Post scriptum: I recall that article 1 of Emergency Ordinance 192/2020 amending and supplementing "Act no. 55/2020 on certain measures for preventing and combating the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic, published in the Official Gazette of Romania, Part I, no. 396 of 15 May 2020, as subsequently amended and supplemented,

is amended and supplemented as follows:

1. In article 13, letter a) is amended and shall read as follows:

the obligation to wear a protective mask in public spaces, commercial spaces, means of public transport and at the workplace;"

Any vote given to PLX 31/2021 is a veritable act of treason!

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSfE-RY2nEZZXd-SP34eDQ1D3bd9BG...

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

15. The Sovereignty Act has reached prime-time television

Victor Ciutacu announced that next week we shall discuss this subject in more concrete terms.

I leave you below the latest version of the part concerning the economic measures necessary for regaining national sovereignty.

Next week I hope that the part concerning rights and freedoms will also be closer to its final version.

Draft legislation v. 2: the Sovereignty Act, or the Act for the protection of the higher and sovereign interest of the Romanian people and citizen

1. Clear-felling of forest stands on the territory of Romania is prohibited until 1 January 2100.

2. The alienation of the assets of the Romanian State, or of the shares held by the State in national companies and undertakings, in credit institutions, and in any other company in which the State is a shareholder, whatever the share of the registered capital held, is prohibited until 1 January 2100.

3. Until 1 January 2050, the listing on the stock exchange of the shares held by the Romanian State shall be approved exclusively by a Law adopted by a majority of two thirds of the members of each Chamber of Parliament.

4. Until 1 January 2100, the concession of national natural resources shall be approved exclusively by a Law adopted by a majority of two thirds of the members of each Chamber of Parliament. No concession contracts may be approved in which the Royalties due to the Romanian State fall below the level of the European market.

5. Romania's gold reserve is held exclusively and in its entirety at the National Bank of Romania. Within no more than 180 days from the publication of this Act in the Official Gazette of Romania, the National Bank of Romania shall repatriate in its entirety the gold held outside Romania.

6. The introduction into the country of waste of any kind is prohibited, whether it originates within the area of the European Union or outside it.

7. The marketing on the territory of Romania of any products of a quality inferior to those marketed under the same brand in the country of origin is prohibited. The marketing under the same brand of goods of differing qualities is prohibited. Breach of this legal rule constitutes a misleading commercial practice within the meaning of art. 7 para. 2 of Act 363/2007 of 21 December 2007 and renders the trader liable to a fine of between €10,000,000 and €50,000,000, according to the gravity of the act.

8. The acquisition of military equipment from foreign manufacturers which do not provide offset production in Romania of at least 40% of the value of the contract is prohibited.

9. The failure to enforce concession contracts in accordance with their clauses, or, as the case may be, to bring actions for their enforcement, committed in bad faith, entails the criminal liability of the perpetrator, punishable by imprisonment from 5 to 20 years and the prohibition of certain rights.

10. The act of Undermining the national economy is criminalised and shall read as follows: "The act of using one of the legal entities referred to in art. 176 of the Criminal Code, or of impeding its

normal activity, if the act is such as to undermine the national economy, shall be punished by imprisonment from 5 to 20 years and the prohibition of certain rights. If the act provided for in the preceding paragraph has caused significant damage to the national economy, the penalty is life imprisonment or imprisonment from 15 to 25 years and the prohibition of certain rights.

Everything now depends on us, on each one of us!

Enrol as volunteers in the #ArmataSuveranității at:

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSfE-RY2nEZZXd-SP34eDQ1D3bd9BG...

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

16. 1. "Clear-felling of forest stands on the territory of Romania and the export of unprocessed timber (logs, sawn timber, beams or railway sleepers) is prohibited until 1 January 2100.

Failure to observe paragraph one, and any act committed with the intention of contaminating, infecting, infesting or poisoning the forest stock and the trees on the territory of Romania, entails the criminal liability of the perpetrator and is punished by imprisonment from 5 to 20 years and the prohibition of certain rights."

Enrol as volunteers in the #ArmataSuveranității at

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSfE-RY2nEZZXd-SP34eDQ1D3bd9BG...

(On the Green Romania Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000.)

17. 114 years since the beginning of the uprising of 1907.

Then, as now, the majority of Romanians worked in serf-like conditions on properties owned or managed by foreigners — properties which were nothing other than lands that had belonged to their forefathers and ancestors.

Then, hunger and despair forced them to face the liberal government, the army it sent, and death itself, crying out.

Today, 114 years later, again a liberal government — the #GuvernulMorții, the government that kills our brothers and our parents in hospitals, that treats us as serfs and that sells everything, leaving us poor and without hope — forces us to revolt and to cry out:

Today, however, you will not have to go out bare-chested and barefoot, armed only with pitchforks and scythes, before an army with cannon and rifles.

Enrol as volunteers in the #ArmataSuveranității at

Post scriptum: the irony of history has it that today the monument to the peasants killed in 1907 stands in Buzău exactly in front of the headquarters of the PNL — the heirs, crossed with Marxists, of the murderous Liberals of 1907!

Probably mere cynicism. Or stupidity — both of them slogans and principles of today's "liberals"!

18. "Until 1 January 2121, the concession of national natural resources shall be approved exclusively by organic Law.

No concession contracts may be approved in which the Royalties due to the Romanian State fall below the average level of the European market."

Enrol as volunteers in the #ArmataSuveranității at

19. I am glad to announce that maestro Adrian Toni Neacșu has joined the working group on the #LegeaSuveranității, a group which also includes other illustrious professors and practitioners of the law, and not only of the law.

His contribution will be decisive for the success of our project, I am convinced!

I renew the invitation to join this effort of legislating by way of the popular initiative, addressed to all specialists who still believe in the principles set out in #Articolul1 of the #Constituție:

"(1) Romania is a national, sovereign and independent, unitary and indivisible State.

The form of government of the Romanian State is the republic.

Romania is a State governed by the rule of law, democratic and social, in which human dignity, the rights and freedoms of citizens, the free development of the human personality, justice and political pluralism are supreme values, in the spirit of the democratic traditions of the Romanian people and of the ideals of the Revolution of December 1989, and are guaranteed.

The State is organised according to the principle of the separation and balance of powers — legislative, executive and judicial — within constitutional democracy.

In Romania, observance of the Constitution, of its supremacy and of the laws is obligatory."

Enrol as volunteers in the #ArmataSuveranității at

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

20. "Romania's gold reserve is held exclusively and in its entirety at the National Bank of Romania.

Within no more than 180 days from the publication of this Act in the Official Gazette of Romania, the National Bank of Romania shall repatriate in its entirety the gold held outside Romania."

Enrol as volunteers in the #ArmataSuveranității at

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQFpfn4qqTIu3xxMkCxTKn8fV_Af2kugEcO8ZBYfpacivlZQ-xzi5MtpX7w79fQRVm6n7cr4fGQznH6m-QTDHrU5ZBZJeuyWlWO-k41kjyWAuiQcJ5LXG4hurRPyaR11xWuT8SYN6BAwbbYzcs5giGZiEB6IIZEyZpQfkPnsyPhSnMKgGF6dHdatDVfqkFz9029fSlTq681DGuB1bpb3NIrN-NZDQ&s=518⟩

---

21. 5 March 2021 — "Our friend Adrian Toni Neacșu has come up with three articles of major importance for #LegeaSuve..."

Our friend Adrian Toni Neacșu has come up with three articles of major importance for the #LegeaSuveranității, articles essential for the defence of the citizen's rights and for strengthening the prestige and independence of the Judiciary:

Art. 25. Act no. 304/2004 on the organisation of the judiciary, published in the Official Gazette of Romania, no. 827 of 13 September 2005, as subsequently supplemented and amended, is amended as follows: "In article 16, paragraph 3 is amended and shall have the following content: The deliberation and the delivery of the judgment shall take place within a period fixed by the panel, but no later than 30 days from the closing of the hearings, which may be extended in exceptional situations by a maximum of 30 days at a time, on not more than two occasions."

Art. 26. Act no. 135/2010 on the Code of Criminal Procedure, published in the Official Gazette of Romania no. 486 of 15 July 2010, as subsequently amended and supplemented, is amended as follows: In article 391, paragraph 1 is amended and shall have the following content:

The deliberation and the delivery of the judgment shall take place within a period fixed by the panel, but no later than 30 days from the closing of the hearings.

2. In article 391, paragraph 2 is amended and shall have the following content:

In exceptional situations where, having regard to the complexity of the case, the deliberation and the delivery cannot take place within the period provided for in paragraph 1, the court may postpone the delivery by a maximum of 30 days at a time, on not more than two occasions.

3. In article 405, paragraph 3 is amended and shall have the following content:

The president of the panel shall deliver the operative part of the minute.

4. In article 406, paragraph 1 is amended and shall have the following content:

The judgment shall be drafted within the period fixed for its delivery.

5. In article 407, paragraph 1 is amended and shall have the following content:

After delivery, the judgment shall be communicated to the prosecutor, to the parties, to the injured person and, where the defendant is under arrest, to the administration of the place of detention, with a view to the exercise of the remedy. Where the defendant, the civil party or the injured person does not understand Romanian, a copy of the judgment shall be communicated to that person in a language which he understands. After the judgment has been drafted, it shall be communicated to them in its entirety.

Art. 27. Act no. 134/2010 on the Code of Civil Procedure, published in the Official Gazette of Romania no. 247 of 10 April 2015, as subsequently amended and supplemented, is amended as follows: In article 395, paragraph 1 is amended and shall have the following content:

After the closing of the hearings, the panel shall deliberate in secret upon the judgment it is to deliver, within the period fixed for the delivery of the judgment.

2. Article 396 is amended and shall have the following content:

In exceptional situations where, having regard to the complexity of the case, the delivery cannot take place within the period provided for in art. 402 para. 1, the court may postpone the delivery by a maximum of 30 days at a time, on not more than two occasions.

In the case of the postponement provided for in paragraph (1), the president, upon announcing the date to which the delivery has been postponed, may decide that the judgment shall be delivered by placing the solution at the disposal of the parties through the registry of the court.

If the delivery has been postponed, the judgment may not be delivered before the date fixed for that purpose.

3. Article 402 is amended and shall have the following content:

Para. 1. The delivery of the judgment shall take place within a period fixed by the panel and announced in the sitting, but no later than 30 days from the closing of the hearings.

Para. 2. The judgment may be delivered in public session, at the place where the hearings were held, by the president or by a judge, member of the panel, who shall read the minute, indicating also the remedy which may be used against the judgment; or it may be delivered by placing the judgment at the disposal of the parties by the registry of the court.

4. In article 426, paragraph 5 is amended and shall have the following content:

The judgment shall be drafted and signed within the period fixed for its delivery. The separate opinion of the judge left in the minority and, where appropriate, the concurring opinion shall be drafted and signed within the same period.

5. In article 427, paragraph 1 is amended and shall have the following content:

The judgment shall be communicated of the court's own motion to the parties, in copy, even if it is final. The communication shall be made immediately after delivery.

Articles 25–27 of the #LegeaSuveranității

Enrol as volunteers in the #ArmataSuveranității at

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQEuR8ycnPsXNnfoUUKJn1PcDKmY8rtoXK4qJoLSVD6pc6AjzChF6CyCuFZhO39UgLT-di47K_JQbtRJrcHfvZfOakRGAGd-t3oIFHx-kzHP1R2dLE7WNoCI9Ug9OMBxmCsiiimleeYFgBjp_u7lEf9umEAkSW80JQwy_gBGv7mYswErfzxdMQBcRgnhcqmnWlZBRvmig-ob-H6QrHct_NPI8wRC4&s=518⟩

---

22. 8 March 2021 — On the guarantees of sovereignty

On the Green Romania Act: the full text of the draft — see the page The Green Romania Act.

Sorin Roșca Stănescu, on the #LegeaSuveranității

And why not? Is it enough for sovereignty to be provided for in the Constitution? Is it enough for dignitaries to be obliged to swear that they will respect the sovereignty of the Romanian State? Is it enough for us to belong to the most powerful political and military alliance in the world for our sovereignty to be guaranteed? It has proved not to be. Perhaps no one comes to seize our sovereignty by force. Perhaps no one forces us at gunpoint to give up attributes of sovereignty. But what happens if we do it ourselves, as has happened before in history? Perhaps, from this point of view, a special law of sovereignty is needed. But who is to make it?

The lawyer Dan Chitic is sceptical as to the consistency and the strength of the political will which might be shown to that effect at the level of the parties or of Parliament. He believes that the citizens themselves ought to demand it. Using the provisions of article 74 of the Constitution. Under that article, a citizens' initiative benefiting from the adherence of a minimum of 100,000 persons, adherence expressed under certain conditions, would be the most appropriate course to follow. Is it possible?

I believe that only through the forceful expression of the adherence of a very large number of citizens can a legislative solution of this kind be imposed upon members of parliament from the various parties. I believe that only under a formidable pressure, expressed unequivocally by a far greater number of citizens than that minimum of 100,000 provided for by the Constitution, will the parliamentary groups and the members of parliament themselves be constrained to vote such a law in a proportion of at least two thirds of their total number. Once again I insist: the pressure must be truly formidable.

And here is why. A law of national sovereignty injures the interests of all those who stand to profit, and do profit, from the restriction or even the amputation of the sovereign attributes of the State. For instance, if you stop forest clearances entirely for a period of several years, out of a desire to let the forest stock recover, or if you merely stop the exports of raw timber, you injure the interests of many commercial companies, some of which — such as Schweighofer — have an enormous power over the

authorities of the States they come from, or even over the authorities of the Romanian State. And, by implication, their influence is exercised over certain members of parliament as well.

Do you still remember the whole madness generated by the irresponsible environmental permit that was granted for the launching of the cyanide exploitation of the Roșia Montană block? At that time there were quite a number of members of parliament, and even a prime minister in the person of Victor Ponta, who pronounced themselves openly in favour of the exploitation. And, with Ponta's help, there is currently pending a case against the Romanian State, from which damages of billions of dollars are being claimed. With great difficulty, at the very limit, Parliament then managed to impose its will and even to conduct a wide-ranging inquiry, from which there resulted heads of accusation, placed with all the supporting documentation at the disposal of the Prosecutor General's Office. Which Prosecutor General's Office thereafter reacted in no way whatever in defence of the interests of the Romanian State.

Or does anyone still remember the attempt I made, as a senator, proposing a draft law by which the secret services would be forbidden to own commercial companies or NGOs? I was literally trampled underfoot both from left to right and from right to left. A sign that the interests of the secret services are exercised forcefully whenever necessary, even through certain members of parliament.

More recently a terrible battle was fought, again in the Parliament of Romania, over the offshore law. A battle lost by the Romanian State. And, as anyone may observe, the foreign companies which are to exploit for their own benefit the vast deposits of natural gas on the continental shelf of the Black Sea already advertise from morning till night on the national television channels — a lying advertisement, telling us that Romania will thereby become energy-independent. But we are not told how. Since the Romanian State will not receive free of charge, in the form of a share of the product obtained, so much as a single cubic metre of natural gas.

But as for the European waste mafia, with its enormous interests in Romania, which it is gradually turning into a rubbish dump of Europe, what can we say? What can we say other than that such operations cannot be carried out without the complicity of many authorities of the so-called sovereign State, which in their turn delegate part of their tasks to irresponsible members of parliament?

The examples can unfortunately be continued. But I stop here, offering you two links which, if you follow them, will let you learn more about this initiative — an initiative which, in my opinion, grows by the day and brings us the hope that it may awaken enough Romanians, far more than 100,000, for the law of sovereignty ever to come to be voted in the Parliament of Romania. For the time being, it is time for a responsible debate, and it is time for the citizens themselves to propose those fields and those rules which cannot be absent from a normative act capable of protecting not only our identity but also our sovereignty.

https://m.luju.ro/legea-suveranitatii-avocatul-dan-chitic-propune-un-a…

https://ro.sputnik.md/analytics/20210126/33376744/Dan-Chitic-a-declana…

https://uzp.org.ro/44766/legea-suveranitatii-modificari-de-ultima-ora-…

http://www.corectnews.com/politics/o-lege-suveranit-ii-na-ionale

Enrol as volunteers in the #ArmataSuveranității at

(On the Green Romania Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQEspkMoEiK-g04ReHdwHFIxXPGmUVQvdUZuxkHA1s8chXkmw7fuaOqbgZFTxP-kIa_T-

fRLM_Lz7uaItrmtXBbRZ185rHP2nhvfokXKPncoz6GI-aFjW5kb_4OWPzbY9xNIUnmnyYCP_3698Oa2zJo61q9cziAZK_BDjYZcRgbHLd3v38mVdywFtWofBRYUqjJCdgUHFjgqFDuSFzszCnCuEeuRnU&s=518)

23. 10 March 2021 — "And because #LegeaSuveranității must resolve the thorny problem of the compulsory character of va..."

And because the #LegeaSuveranității must resolve the thorny problem of compulsory vaccination and also of the discriminations caused by accepting or not accepting certain medical treatments, here are the articles of Law which bring the antidote against medical abuse and medical dictatorship:

"12. Medical treatments may be administered to Romanian citizens only after obtaining beforehand the agreement and written consent of the patients, following prior and obligatory information given on the basis of the leaflets supplied by the manufacturer of the medicines proposed, medical emergencies excepted. No citizen may be discriminated against, positively or negatively, as a result of accepting or refusing a medical treatment.

13. No medicines may be marketed and no medical treatments applied for which the manufacturer does not offer guarantees against adverse effects.

14. The marketing of medicines, vaccines, medical devices and other pharmaceutical products for which complete clinical trials have not been carried out in accordance with the methodology established by organic Law is prohibited.

15. Art. 297 para. 2 of the Criminal Code is amended as follows: "(2) The same penalty shall apply to the act of a public servant who, in the exercise of his official duties, restricts the exercise of a person's right or creates for that person a situation of inferiority on grounds of race, nationality, ethnic origin, language, religion, sex, sexual orientation, political affiliation, wealth, age, disability, ACCEPTANCE OR REFUSAL OF A MEDICAL TREATMENT, non-contagious chronic illness, or HIV/AIDS, Covid-19 infection or the like."

16. Any form of commercial advertising on television, radio and on social networks for medicines, vaccines, medical devices and other pharmaceutical products is prohibited, with the exception of cosmetic and natural products."

Of course, if, in breach of the Constitution and of the Oviedo Convention, the Iohannis regime adopts any Law of compulsory vaccination, in whatever form, WE SHALL REPEAL IT EXPRESSLY!

Articles 12–16 of the Sovereignty Act

Enrol as volunteers in the #ArmataSuveranității at

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post (https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQEsCUlf7kqgWmFVH29a9d23OSk-n8CiCwq78zJyOQh5e9Xm-v5_vXExrQ_eo7KPNFGMbgN5xyEuJrOAby36MmB6RUeP4q8FP0MU3Mbw915iJFSpAMzTlGQywSKnro_ouQI91Z3NXqBCvgtMBadBJx_gvZ9COcPz_8qdYiHjrtVVZ0H0jhZbJJ6oaRdnAs439URvbBjiR_k87Ik1Cl4ypRf6OWc0&s=518)

24. 12 March 2021 — "A discussion about the protest of 20 March and about #LegeaSuveranității"

A discussion about the protest of 20 March and about the #LegeaSuveranității

Forgive the tiredness: the discussion took place after a long day in which I had to travel to Tulcea, plead, and travel back — a town in which I am beginning to feel at home.

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQHelpe1nNobPFXRvY44QflSTDJgCHkMrPVU9O2xP-wL0-9ccUDw-FD-3hnm1bacszIEX6mM0RqtgyZmJ4YT3y9-Foy8T_gryhyqrETX2ZnqM-5vcJdNL_5VtLoAybs8LvQq87lKOP_io_9rYYLjZRAo2SNImU6XlR4TOuhlOkkL5lhNM0XEfn3gjhqkHMhLMzf8yQVXIXHiELyg93W_I–QmK87DU&s=518⟩

---

25. 7 April 2021 — "!!!! Communiqué of the High Court / Reaction to the decision of the Constitutional Court. Urgent appeal to Parliament"

!!!! Communiqué of the High Court of Cassation and Justice / Reaction to the decision of the Constitutional Court. Urgent appeal to Parliament

"The High Court of Cassation and Justice takes note of the fact that, in its sitting of 7 April 2021, the Constitutional Court upheld the objection of unconstitutionality and found that the provisions of art. 400 para. (1), art. 405 para. (3) and art. 406 paras. (1) and (2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure are unconstitutional. The constitutional jurisdiction held, in essence, that "it is necessary that the judicial decision be drafted and reasoned, in fact and in law, on the date of its delivery", thereby invalidating the present legislative solution, which provides for the reasoning of the judicial decision within 30 days of delivery (a period which may be successively extended up to a total of 90 days under the conditions of Act no. 304/2004).

Under the provisions of art. 147 para. (4) of the Constitution of Romania, the decisions of the Constitutional Court are generally binding and have effect only for the future, from the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

Consequently, from the point of view of the proper conduct of the activity of the supreme court and of all the courts of law — having regard to the large number of criminal cases pending, to the essential social importance of the criminal trial, by which the rule of law is defended and the life, the physical and mental integrity, the liberty and the other rights of citizens, and indeed the functioning of the State governed by the rule of law, are protected; taking into consideration the major negative implications which the prolongation of criminal trials may generate (in conditions of a potential legislative "vacuum"), including as regards the limitation periods of criminal liability — the High Court of Cassation and Justice firmly requests the most rapid possible intervention of the Legislature in order to bring the provisions of the Code of Criminal Procedure into accord with the provisions of the Constitution.

The speed of the Legislature's intervention is all the more necessary since, from the moment of the publication of the Constitutional Court's decision in the Official Gazette, the above-mentioned legal provisions will be suspended by operation of law and, after 45 days, will definitively cease to have legal effect, under the conditions of art. 147 para. (1) of the Constitution of Romania.

From the point of view of the High Court of Cassation and Justice, the new legislative solution to be drawn up must ensure respect for the fundamental rights of all persons involved in judicial proceedings, in accordance with the decision of the Constitutional Court, but at the same time it must be a realistic one and must take into consideration the present situation of the judicial system — in

particular the overload and the shortage of resources with which it has long continued to be confronted.

The High Court of Cassation and Justice declares its full readiness to place its expertise at the disposal of the process of debating and drawing up an appropriate legislative solution, one which will allow real and effective progress as regards the defence of citizens' rights and, in equal measure, the conduct of the criminal trial with speed and quality, with a view to ensuring the proper functioning of justice as a public service.

The President of the High Court of Cassation and Justice, Judge Corina Alina Corbu"

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQHxP5hkeS_7GHHNpNfjiUiSpjZtw8lhHuav-rI3X_mSR7hihKNS7SeqTfU56fLWpOdp-fQ_TsirhvxHEUna7lXsgQbLd9O6jWoGSw3g5zhsWWISLtJk-ZSvMsq7UNzfjqcHELibufjXhplfFEJ3Ar81fu4Fj-5WQcbI_ng4rd8EOV1dbUyt6aY2-qN9JMS8ivyEFCCrMFzb-Qn7P-W7xkLpQIibk&s=518⟩

---

26. 20 April 2021 — "After discussions with hundreds of people and consultations with dozens of specialists in law and also..."

After discussions with hundreds of people and consultations with dozens of specialists in law and with dozens of others involved in the life of the city, I have the joy of bringing to your notice the latest version of the Sovereignty Act — the 10th and probably the last, to which we shall now add only the explanatory memorandum and some minor changes.

Draft legislation v. 10: the Sovereignty Act, or the Act for the protection of the higher and sovereign interest of the Romanian people and citizen

Chapter I — Ecological measures for the protection of the higher and sovereign interest of the Romanian people and citizen

1. Article 29 of Act 46 of 19 March 2008 — the Forestry Code — is amended and shall read as follows: "Deforestation and clear-felling on the territory of Romania, including that justified by ecological reconstruction, the regeneration and tending of forests, are prohibited until 1 January 2121." Paragraphs 2 to 5 of article 29 of Act 46 of 19 March 2008 — the Forestry Code — are repealed.

2. In para. (1) of art. 108 of Act no. 46 of 19 March 2008 — the Forestry Code — two new letters are added, letters e) and f), reading as follows: "e) by imprisonment from 7 to 20 years, the act of causing disease in or infesting with pests the trees of the forest stock; f) by imprisonment from 7 to 20 years, the breach of the prohibition laid down in art. 29 of this law."

3. From the date of entry into force of this law, the export of unprocessed timber, including logs, with or without bark, sawn timber, beams or railway sleepers, is prohibited until 1 January 2121. Failure to observe the prohibition on exporting timber is punished by imprisonment from 7 to 20 years and the prohibition of certain rights.

4. Article 13 of Act no. 211/2011 on the waste regime is amended by the addition of paragraph 2, which shall read: "The introduction into the country of waste of any kind is prohibited."

CHAPTER II — Measures in the economic field for the protection of the higher and sovereign interest of the Romanian people and citizen

5. From the date of entry into force of this law, the alienation of the assets of the Romanian State, or of the shares held by the State in national companies and undertakings, in credit institutions, and in any other company in which the State is a shareholder, whatever the share of the registered capital held, is prohibited until 1 January 2121.

6. From the date of entry into force of this law, the concession of goods forming the public property of the State shall be approved by Parliament.

7. In art. 307 of the Administrative Code of 03.07.2019, after para. (1) a new paragraph is added, para. (1^1), reading as follows: "The minimum royalty obtained through concession may not fall below the average level of the European market."

8. Romania's gold reserve is held exclusively and in its entirety at the National Bank of Romania. Within no more than 180 days from the publication of this Act in the Official Gazette of Romania, the National Bank of Romania shall repatriate in its entirety the gold held outside Romania.

9. From the date of entry into force of this law, contracts concluded by the Romanian State are public and shall be published on the website of the contracting institution and in the Official Gazette, Part IV. Within no more than 5 days from the date of adoption of this law, all contracts concluded by the Romanian State up to that date shall be published on the website of the contracting institution and in the Official Gazette, Part IV.

10. The intentional failure of a public servant to enforce concession or privatisation contracts in accordance with their clauses, or, as the case may be, to bring actions for their enforcement, is punished by imprisonment from 10 to 20 years and the prohibition of certain rights. The negligent failure of a public servant to enforce concession or privatisation contracts in accordance with their clauses, or, as the case may be, to bring actions for their enforcement, is punished by imprisonment from 5 to 10 years and the prohibition of certain rights.

11. After paragraph 1 of art. 394 of the Criminal Code a new paragraph is inserted, paragraph 2, reading as follows: "If the act provided for in paragraph 1 letter b has caused significant damage to the national economy, the penalty is life imprisonment or imprisonment from 15 to 25 years and the prohibition of certain rights."

12. From the date of entry into force of this law, the marketing on the territory of Romania of any products of a quality inferior to those marketed under the same brand in the country of origin is prohibited. The marketing under the same brand of goods of differing qualities is prohibited. Breach of this legal rule constitutes a misleading commercial practice within the meaning of art. 7 para. 2 of Act 363/2007 of 21 December 2007 and renders the trader liable to a fine of between €10,000,000 and €50,000,000, according to the gravity of the act.

Chapter III — Measures for strengthening the rule of law and protecting the higher and sovereign interest of the Romanian people and citizen

13. Limitations of fundamental human rights and freedoms may not be established by Emergency Ordinance or by normative administrative acts.

14. Act 55/2020 on certain measures for preventing and combating the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic is repealed.

15. Medical treatments and devices may be administered or applied to Romanian citizens only after obtaining beforehand the agreement and the informed, written consent of the patients or of their legal representatives, following prior and obligatory information given orally and on the basis of the leaflets and documentation supplied by the manufacturer of the medicines or devices proposed, with the exception of medical emergencies which place the patient's life in danger and require immediate treatment. No citizen may be discriminated against, positively or negatively, as a result of accepting or refusing a medical treatment or device.

16. No medicines or medical devices may be marketed and no medical treatments applied for which the manufacturer does not offer guarantees and does not assume full responsibility for the adverse reactions and/or effects, drug interactions, short- and long-term effects, effects on pregnancy, breastfeeding and fertility, and does not offer demonstrably viable remedies and/or solutions against them, as well as compensation. Likewise, the marketing of medicines, vaccines, medical devices and other pharmaceutical products for which complete clinical trials have not been carried out and for which there are no national authorisations in accordance with the methodology established by Law is prohibited.

17. Any form of commercial advertising on television, radio and on social networks for authorised or unauthorised medicines, vaccines, medical devices and other pharmaceutical products is prohibited.

18. Art. 297 of the Criminal Code — Abuse of office — is amended as follows: 1. Para. 1 is amended and shall read: "The act of a public servant who, in the exercise of his official duties, fails to perform an act or performs it in breach of the law with a view to obtaining an undue benefit and thereby causes damage or an injury to the rights or legitimate interests of a natural or legal person, is punished by imprisonment from 2 to 7 years and the prohibition of the right to hold public office." 2. Paragraph 2 is amended and shall read: "(2) The same penalty shall apply to the act of a public servant who, in the exercise of his official duties, restricts the exercise of a person's right or creates for that person a situation of inferiority on grounds of race, nationality, ethnic origin, language, religion, sex, sexual orientation, political affiliation, wealth, age, disability, acceptance or refusal of a medical treatment or device, non-contagious chronic illness, or HIV/AIDS, Covid-19 infection or the like." 3. The act of a public servant of applying any legal rules declared unconstitutional by Decision of the Constitutional Court is punished by imprisonment from 7 to 10 years.

19. Article 247 of the Code of Criminal Procedure is amended and shall read as follows: "(1) The judge of rights and liberties, during the criminal investigation, the preliminary chamber judge, during the preliminary chamber procedure, or the court, during the trial, may order the provisional medical committal of the suspect or defendant who is mentally ill or a chronic user of psychoactive substances, if the perpetrator's condition was determinant for the commission of the act and the measure is necessary in order to remove a concrete and present danger to public safety. (2) The measure provided for in paragraph (1) consists in the involuntary medical committal of the suspect or defendant to a specialised medical assistance unit, is taken for a period of no more than 60 days and may be extended until recovery or until the improvement which removes the state of danger that determined the taking of the measure.

20. Article 18 para. 2 of ACT no. 202 of 9 November 1998 (republished) on the organisation of the Official Gazette of Romania is amended and shall read: "The electronic format of the Official Gazette of Romania is available free of charge and freely, permanently. The free and open electronic format is a portable document, without watermark or additional inscriptions as compared with the printed format; it becomes accessible to all users on the same day as publication, including for searching, saving, sharing and printing."

21. It is prohibited to delete posts and to block accounts — save for those which constitute breaches of the legal provisions in force — on social networks and/or in the online environment (whether by account administrators or by any other entities). Any breach of the provisions of paragraph 1 entails the material liability of the social network or of the website. Any dispute concerning the activity of social networks or of public websites shall be resolved by the court of first instance of the claimant's domicile. The action is exempt from stamp duty.

Chapter IV — Measures in the field of national safety and defence for the protection of the higher and sovereign interest of the Romanian people and citizen

22. The intelligence, counter-intelligence, guard and special telecommunications services and those assimilated to them are organised exclusively in a civilian system, their employees becoming by assimilation public servants with a special status, having the right to organise in trade unions and to be investigated by the corresponding civil prosecutor's offices. Their status is governed by organic law. (Accordingly, the employees of those institutions shall not have military ranks or their equivalent, and hierarchical relations shall not be organised according to military rules.)

23. The participation in any manner of the intelligence, counter-intelligence and assimilated services in the carrying out of any judicial procedural acts, with the exception of those concerning acts of espionage or terrorism, is prohibited. Influencing in any manner the prosecutor or the judge entrusted with an investigation, by any person, including from within the secret services, constitutes an offence and is punished by imprisonment from 10 to 20 years. The attempt is punishable. Failure to report the intervention referred to in paragraph 1 constitutes an offence and is punished by the same penalty.

24. The participation in any manner of the intelligence, counter-intelligence and assimilated services in the carrying out of any activities of a political, economic or media character is prohibited. The holding of commercial companies, directly or indirectly, through their own personnel or through intermediaries, or the carrying out of commercial activities on the territory of Romania or abroad by the intelligence services, is prohibited. The intelligence and counter-intelligence services may not use funds other than those provided for in the State Budget Act. Any gains obtained by those services in the context of their specific activities shall be paid into the State budget. Likewise prohibited are civil society organisations initiated or led, directly or through intermediaries, by the secret services, and the financing of any NGO whatsoever. Breach of the provisions of paragraphs 1 to 4 constitutes a criminal act and is punished by imprisonment from 10 to 20 years.

25. Article 110 para. 1 of ACT no. 208 of 20 July 2015 on the election of the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies, and on the organisation and functioning of the Permanent Electoral Authority, is amended and shall read: "The Permanent Electoral Authority, with the support of the National Institute of Statistics, shall ensure the implementation and management of the IT System for monitoring turnout and preventing illegal voting, on the basis of the data and information in the Electoral Register and the Register of polling stations."

26. Article 110 para. 3 of ACT no. 208 of 20 July 2015 on the election of the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies, and on the organisation and functioning of the Permanent Electoral Authority, is amended and shall read: "For the implementation and functioning during elections of the IT System for monitoring turnout and preventing illegal voting there shall be used, as a rule, the IT infrastructure held by the central and local public administration authorities and by educational establishments."

---

27. 8 March 2021 — On sovereignism and globalism

On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see the page The Sovereignty Act.

Article 110 para. 4 of ACT no. 208 of 20 July 2015 on the election of the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies, and on the organisation and functioning of the Permanent Electoral Authority, is amended and shall read as follows: "The organisation of elections, referendums and other popular consultations, and the administration of the processes specific to them, including the counting of votes — with the exception of guard and public-order activities — shall be carried out exclusively by the

Electoral Bureaux, namely the Central and the Local ones. Breach of this provision constitutes an offence and is punished by imprisonment from 7 to 10 years."

28. 7 May 2021 — On the alienation of the national wealth

On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see the page The Sovereignty Act.

From the date of entry into force of this law, the following legal provisions are repealed: para. 8 of art. 110, para. 4 of art. 102^1, para. 8 of art. 110 of ACT no. 208 of 20 July 2015, art. 103^1, paras. 3, 4 and 5 of art. 92^1 of Act 202 of 16 September 2020 amending and supplementing certain normative acts in electoral matters.

29. 14 May 2021 — On medical apartheid

On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see the page The Sovereignty Act.

In article 398 of the Criminal Code, paragraph 2 is inserted, reading as follows: "There likewise constitutes an act of High treason, attracting the same penalty, the Refusal of the President of Romania to give effect to the Decisions of the Constitutional Court resolving conflicts of a constitutional nature, within 10 days of the communication of the operative part."

30. 17 May 2021 — On the initiative committee

On the Referendum Act: the full text of the draft — see the page The Referendum Act.

In para. 1 of art. 453 of the Code of Criminal Procedure a new letter is inserted, letter g), reading as follows: "the decision was founded on a legal provision which was repealed or amended after the decision became final, where the criminal provisions are more favourable or the act has been decriminalised."

31. 20 April 2021 — "The National Guard is established on the principle of the defence of the entire national territory a..."

The National Guard is established on the principle of the defence of the entire national territory by the entire people, on a voluntary basis. Any Romanian citizen aged between 18 and 55 may be a volunteer in the National Guard. The organisation, functioning and financing of the National Guard, and the regime of training and of the holding of weapons by the Members of the National Guard, shall be established by organic Law.

32. 20 April 2021 — "From the date of entry into force of this law, military equipment shall be acquired..."

From the date of entry into force of this law, military equipment shall be acquired only from its manufacturer and only under the conditions of Emergency Ordinance no. 189/2002.

Chapter V — Final and transitional provisions

33. 24 May 2021 — On the birth of the initiative

On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see the page The Sovereignty Act.

This law enters into force on the date of its publication in the Official Gazette, any provision to the contrary being repealed by operation of law from that date.

Those who wish may take part in the signature-gathering campaign at http://VremSuveranitate.ro/

(On the Green Romania Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000.)

27. Sorin Roșca Stănescu on the #LegeaSuveranității

"The recent movement in France, initiated by reservists but also by serving officers and strongly supported by Mrs Marine Le Pen's party, obliges us not only to reflect but also to hold as serious a debate as possible. Is sovereignism an extremist movement? Entirely? Partly? And if so, from what point onwards?

Is globalism a dangerous tendency for States and for the citizens of those States? And, if so, from what point? I feel obliged to answer this challenge. All the more so since a home-grown sovereignism is taking shape. One which opposes the globalist tendencies, themselves more and more pronounced in Romania.

I admit the theme is extremely difficult. Because we approach it from inside the European Union. After all, what is the European Union? A form of globalism. Even if a partial one. Properly speaking, the European Union is, historically, the latest association of States which, in the name of collective power, have decided to cede — to a greater or lesser degree, but to cede nevertheless — attributes of sovereignty. From this point of view it is the first significant experiment in globalisation at world level, after the successive failures of the Macedonian Empire, of the Roman Empire, of the Third Reich, and of the camp built by Stalin after the Second World War. In fact it is the first time since the republic of the city-states of ancient Greece that States associate of their own free will, forced by no one, in order to create by degrees a larger State, with peoples of the most varied origin, tradition, cultural and civilisational level, economic level, and with different religions too. And in certain cases even hostile to one another. Well, the question must be put, and we are obliged to answer it: to what extent, in order to build and consolidate this European construction, are the States prepared to renounce their sovereignty? And, from that point of view, let us see to what extent sovereignism may be taxed with extremism.

Bearing in mind the particularities of the European Union, we may assert, without risk of error, that many of the features attributed in other States to the concept of patriotism are, in the European Union, often perceived and treated as extremism. Because, from a certain point onwards, patriotism inevitably turns into sovereignism. And, likewise from a certain point onwards, sovereignism brakes globalism, which lies at the basis of the formation of the European Union. That is why, by no means accidentally, we have seen, heard and read in recent years accusations ever more frequently launched against European personalities, movements and parties, to the effect that they are, or have, extremist tendencies.

There exists an extremely fragile balance between European globalism and European sovereignism. Partial globalism — if such a thing may be said — bounded by the frontiers of the European Union, is indispensable to the functioning and then to the osmosis of this conglomerate of States. Sovereignism in its turn, which is an expression of patriotism, of healthy nationalism — both of them high moral values — is perfectly justified and absolutely necessary, if it manifests itself within certain limits. What are the limits? In a generic sense, they are circumscribed by the idea that, in collaboration with the other European States, each should manifest the will, and have the capacity and the possibility, to affirm and give effect to its national interest. More bluntly: in the name of the collective interest, in the name of EU values so often invoked, it is inadmissible that, in ceding sovereignty, a people

should cede its national riches in favour of another people or of other peoples dominant within this association of States. And national wealth is extremely diverse. It means, in Romania's case, deposits of precious metals, deposits of hydrocarbons, deposits of salt, forests, arable land, labour force, a market, culture, language, a specific art, and so forth. This globalised mini-planet called the European Union could be all the richer the more each individual State can affirm those values of its own, and could be all the poorer the more some of those States sacrifice on the altar of globalisation more sovereignty than is necessary.

From the perspective sketched above, I perceive with sorrow and with stupefaction how a series of expressions or words with a great emotional charge are ever more intensely mutilated, perverted and condemned. Thus nationalism in the European Union is ever more often taxed with extremism. Or even with neo-fascism. Patriotism is identified by the neo-Marxists with the far right. Parties which support sovereignism suffer ever more visibly attempts to eliminate them, by outlawing them and excluding them from the democratic game.

I try to be as precise as possible, although the space of this editorial does not allow me to treat this vast theme with the precision of a surgeon. I shall therefore offer the reader an abrupt explanation. The most radical party in Romania's recent history, the Greater Romania Party, led by Corneliu Vadim Tudor, had extremist tendencies and accents, but it was not an extremist party. It was a nationalist party which, unfortunately, sometimes — especially in relation to Hungarians, to Roma and, in the early period, to Jews — displayed racist tendencies. Nevertheless, broadly speaking, the Greater Romania Party kept within the limits imposed by the democratic game.

The weak States of the European Union — those which came more recently and are still marked by the long period in which they could not practise democracy but only dictatorship — are often on the way to being perceived by the powerful EU States, with their consolidated economies, as prey. As territories and populations just right for conquest by a peaceful offensive, but one no less perverse than a military offensive. That is why, by no means accidentally, in these States — and I hasten to give two examples, Poland and Hungary — sovereignist tendencies manifest themselves ever more markedly. For their peoples, these tendencies are beneficial. For the dominant nations at EU level, these tendencies are maleficent. And that is why they are combated. And that is why, in this crucible of the European Union, there is not only unity in diversity but also battles, sometimes merciless, between the integrating tendencies and the sovereignist values, perceived by some as disintegrating.

The theme is highly topical for Romania. For I observe how, day by day, out of several parties and organisations of civil society, a great movement and perhaps a great political formation of the sovereignist type is beginning to agglutinate. The signal is given by a legislative initiative entitled the Sovereignty Act which, after being submitted to public debate, will be signed by citizens and placed, in accordance with the Constitution, as an initiative belonging to them, on Parliament's table. It will be a good occasion for the globalists to bring accusations of extremist nationalism against this movement, and for its adherents to accuse the neo-Marxists who presently dominate Romanian politics of a form of globalism which sacrifices, or even crucifies, the national interest. In so far as both sides keep within the limits imposed by dialogue, by a confrontation of ideas and tendencies, this new ideological front will prove constructive in the medium and long term."

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

28. Iohannis's traitorous governor is selling off for nothing the country's resources and the assets of the national companies. Right now!

We have the duty to stop them before it is too late! We owe it to our children, to our children's children!

Here is what the Sovereignty Act provides; here is how the Law can stop them:

CHAPTER II — Measures in the economic field for the protection of the higher and sovereign interest of the Romanian people and citizen

5. From the date of entry into force of this law, the alienation of the assets of the Romanian State, or of the shares held by the State in national companies and undertakings, in credit institutions, and in any other company in which the State is a shareholder, whatever the share of the registered capital held, is prohibited until 1 January 2121.

6. From the date of entry into force of this law, the concession of goods forming the public property of the State shall be approved by Parliament.

7. In art. 307 of the Administrative Code of 03.07.2019, after para. (1) a new paragraph is added, para. (1^1), reading as follows: "The minimum royalty obtained through concession may not fall below the average level of the European market."

8. Romania's gold reserve is held exclusively and in its entirety at the National Bank of Romania. Within no more than 180 days from the publication of this Act in the Official Gazette of Romania, the National Bank of Romania shall repatriate in its entirety the gold held outside Romania.

9. From the date of entry into force of this law, contracts concluded by the Romanian State are public and shall be published on the website of the contracting institution and in the Official Gazette, Part IV. Within no more than 5 days from the date of adoption of this law, all contracts concluded by the Romanian State up to that date shall be published on the website of the contracting institution and in the Official Gazette, Part IV.

10. The intentional failure of a public servant to enforce concession or privatisation contracts in accordance with their clauses, or, as the case may be, to bring actions for their enforcement, is punished by imprisonment from 10 to 20 years and the prohibition of certain rights. The negligent failure of a public servant to enforce concession or privatisation contracts in accordance with their clauses, or, as the case may be, to bring actions for their enforcement, is punished by imprisonment from 5 to 10 years and the prohibition of certain rights.

11. After paragraph 1 of art. 394 of the Criminal Code a new paragraph is inserted, paragraph 2, reading as follows: "If the act provided for in paragraph 1 letter b has caused significant damage to the national economy, the penalty is life imprisonment or imprisonment from 15 to 25 years and the prohibition of certain rights."

Enrol as volunteers at http://VremSuveranitate.ro/

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

29. On Medical Apartheid, version 2.0

I have nothing against "rewarding" the vaccinated. And that although it is a practice which contradicts and annuls the informed consent of the person about to be vaccinated... for what informed consent can there still be where "consent" is abolished by greed, by the desire to obtain something. Moreover, the "incentive" to be vaccinated cannot be equivalent to objective information, since evidently the "incentive" affects one's judgment: it is a form of bribe to make you get vaccinated.

But all these considerations hold only where the "rewarding of the vaccinated" consists in private parties (and not the State, out of public money) offering sweets, free trips to the Moon, anything at all... or even the organisation of a lottery of the vaccinated, as was organised by the enlightened President Biden of the great friendly and non-neighbouring people across the pond — for, on the other hand, what could be more ironic and at the same time more cynical than to organise a lottery for those who have already voluntarily entered the lottery of vaccination: you do not know whether you escape the disease, you do not know whether you will have adverse effects, but perhaps you have a chance of becoming the richest of the vaccinated… or of the cemetery.

In short, any "rewarding" we can understand and even accept, so long as we know the desperation of officials to fulfil the plan of jabs imposed by Big Pharma… but not by "offering" rights which already belong to the jabbed and the unjabbed alike, rights which no one and nothing could take away in order to "give back" only to the well-behaved, only to the obedient.

In other words, no one — neither the State nor private parties — may make the exercise of fundamental civic rights conditional upon the administration of a medical treatment! That is not a "reward": it is simply discrimination directed against those who have not been vaccinated — let that be clear!

Let us now take a clear example of discrimination: the "Dinner with fools" to which only the vaccinated were invited by the progressive director of the National Theatre in the capital, Caramitru.

Why is it discrimination? Because access to a public institution, financed from the budget by the vaccinated and the unvaccinated alike, is made conditional upon the administration of a medical treatment. That is discrimination. Had Ion Caramitru paid out of his generous income obtained from the State for tickets and offered them only to the vaccinated — that would not have been discrimination. That would have been a "reward", and even that would have been at the limit of the law... but very well, it would have been a reward. The moment, however, that you, the director of a public institution financed on a pharaonic scale from the State budget, forbid access to a performance in the NATIONAL Theatre to the 80% of the NATION who have not been vaccinated… THAT IS DISCRIMINATION. And he will have to pay for it! And he will pay for it.

Graver still is when the governor himself limits fundamental rights for the 80% unvaccinated, "rewarding" the 20% with rights… which they already had and which had been taken from them by the very people who "reward" them.

This discrimination against the majority is a veritable medical apartheid, an illegal and abusive segregation founded on medical grounds. A segregation, a medical apartheid, which will become institutionalised through the appearance of the "vaccination certificate" — the "passport" of the politically correct obedient!

That is what tomorrow's protest, on 15 May 2021, will be about, and I call on you to take part in it, young and old, in every town and hamlet of this country!

The prohibition of such practices is also the subject of the #LegeaSuveranității, which I invite you to support by enrolling as a volunteer in the #ArmataSuveranității at http://VremSuveranitate.ro/ .

For do not forget: no one gives you anything unless you ask loudly and firmly!

No one opens the gate of freedom to you unless you knock at it insistently!

The drop of freedom we have obtained, we obtained with effort, with struggle…

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

30. The time has come for the #LegeaSuveranității!

The time has come to begin the procedure laid down by Act 189/1999 on the exercise of legislative initiative by citizens.

The first step is to set up an Initiative Committee which will take upon itself the promotion of the legislative project.

I invite you to join this Committee!

On 24.05.2021 at 12.00 we shall meet in Cișmigiu Park, from where we shall go to the notary's office to sign this document.

I invite those who wish to join this Initiative Committee to send a photograph of their identity card to the e-mail of the Notarial Office: andrei.anghel.spn@gmail.com .

In the e-mail, please state in the subject line "FOR THE SOVEREIGNTY ACT" and mention whom you propose as president of the Initiative Committee.

We particularly need the presence of supporters from outside Bucharest, whom we thank in advance for the effort of travelling to the south of the country, to the heart of Bucharest.

Please send your identity card ONLY if you are certain that you will be able to be present on Monday, 24 May 2021, at 12.00 in Cișmigiu Park, at the entrance in front of the Bucharest City Hall.

We leave you below the text of the law which lays down the manner of constituting the Initiative Committee, and a link to the full text of the law:

The promotion of the citizens' legislative initiative shall be ensured by an initiative committee made up of at least 10 citizens with the right to vote.

Persons elected to office by universal suffrage, members of the Government, persons appointed to office by the prime minister, or persons who may not, under the law, belong to political parties, may not be part of the initiative committee.

The constitution of the initiative committee shall be effected by a declaration authenticated before a public notary, containing the purpose of the initiative, the surnames, forenames, status as electors and domiciles of the members, as well as the declaration that they do not infringe the provisions of para. (2). Liability for the content of the declaration is that provided by law for official documents.

The initiative committee represents the citizens who support the legislative proposal, after they have signed the lists of supporters provided for in this law. The composition of the initiative committee shall be brought to public notice, together with the legislative proposal forming the object of the initiative, by publication in the Official Gazette of Romania, Part I. Publication is exempt from any charge.

The initiative committee shall ensure the registration of the legislative proposal with the competent Chamber of Parliament, within no more than 6 months from the date of its publication. After the expiry of that period, the legislative proposal may be presented only as a new legislative initiative, under the conditions of this law.

The initiative committee shall designate from among its members, by a majority of votes, a president to resolve operational matters and to represent the committee in its relations with the central and local public authorities."

http://legislatie.just.ro/Public/DetaliiDocument/20219

(On the Referendum Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

31. We are approaching the moment of regaining Sovereignty!

The #LegeaSuveranității also has an "Explanatory memorandum". Here it is:

"Starting from the constitutional principle that national Sovereignty belongs to the Romanian people, and also from the need for increased involvement of the Romanian citizen in the decision-making and legislative process through the implementation of the principle of participatory democracy by the exercise of the right of legislative initiative by at least 100,000 citizens with the right to vote, in observance of art. 74 para. 1 of the Constitution,

Having regard to the need to guarantee and strengthen the fundamental rights of the citizen by instituting rules which make impossible the limitation, delay or avoidance of parliamentary scrutiny of normative acts providing for limitations, restrictions or conditions upon fundamental rights and freedoms, and to the need to repeal the legal provisions in force which make such unconstitutional limitations possible,

Taking into account the imperative character of the Oviedo and Nuremberg Conventions, international conventions to which Romania is a party, and the need for the direct and immediate implementation of those conventions in national legislation, with the effect of explicitly and indiscriminately prohibiting the compulsory administration of any medical treatments and/or devices, and of prohibiting any form of discrimination as a result of accepting or refusing any medical treatments or devices,

Having regard to the fact that the protection of human dignity is founded on the idea that man is an intellectual and moral being inclined to determine himself and to develop in freedom, and also that the inalienable dignity of man consists precisely in the necessity that his status as a responsible person be respected,

Taking into consideration the need to strengthen the rule of law through the observance of legality and constitutionality by the direct, non-discriminatory and immediate implementation of the decisions of the Constitutional Court,

Having regard to the need to render transparent the decision-making process of the administration by publishing all acts of general interest and making them fully and freely available through the Official Gazette of Romania, to the need to guarantee freedom of expression in the online environment, and to the need for parliamentary representation of as large a proportion as possible of Romanian citizens with the right to vote,

Taking into consideration the disastrous ecological situation at national level, and the drastic diminution of the national forest stock caused by the massive and irrational deforestation and clear-felling of the last 30 years, and the need to prohibit the abusive and excessive exploitation of forests with a view to the reconstruction and regeneration of the national forest stock, and the need for the immediate and total prohibition of the export of unprocessed timber and of the import of waste,

Taking into account the obligation to preserve the national patrimony and the need to maximise the profitability of the exploitation of the riches held in public ownership for the benefit of the Romanian citizen, with the consequence of criminalising any acts having the effect of diminishing the national wealth,

Having regard to the low degree of transparency of the decision-making process within public institutions in Romania, and to the imperative necessity of prohibiting any kind of interference by the intelligence, counter-intelligence and assimilated services in public life outside their sector of activity,

Taking into consideration the need for the defence of the entire national territory by the entire people on a voluntary basis, and the need to acquire new, latest-generation military equipment directly from the manufacturer and exclusively in observance of the national legislation governing Offset in the field of military procurement,

Taking into account the decisions of the Constitutional Court on the constitutionality of certain provisions in criminal and criminal-procedural matters, and in other social fields as well,

We hope in this way that the more than 100,000 signatures in favour of our initiative will constitute a viable argument for reconsidering the will of the Romanian people and its sovereignty.

The Parliament of Romania, following the popular legislative initiative, adopts this law:" (there follows the text of the Sovereignty Act).

On Monday, 24.05.2021 at 12.00, we meet in Cișmigiu Park (the entrance in front of the Bucharest City Hall) to join the Initiative Committee and thus become initiators of the Sovereignty Act.

Enrol in the #ArmataSuveranității at http://VremSuveranitate.ro/

(On the Green Romania Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000.)

32. The bottling factory of Medical Apartheid: Romapartheid Group

You know that I am a fierce defender of Romanian economic interests and a consistent promoter of the principle that Romanian entrepreneurs and commercial companies should take precedence over foreign ones.

And above all not through the acceptance of abuses and discriminations coming from Romanian employers!

Yesterday I received from a virtual friend a disturbing piece of information:

The Romaqua company is discriminating against its employees on grounds of an "anti-vaccination attitude" and is blackmailing them with the prospect of losing their jobs if they do not agree to be vaccinated; in an e-mail received by the employees they are told:

"In the event of restructuring, the unvaccinated have priority"!!!

As for the unvaccinated, Romaqua has established a veritable presumption of illness in their regard, obliging them to present every Monday a PCR test (paid for out of their own funds, of course) on entering the premises. To the porter!

I leave below the photographs received from the Romaqua employee, whose identity I shall obviously not disclose.

I remind those in Romaqua's management, and all employees in Romania subjected to the same kind of blackmail, that the Patients' Rights Act 51/2003 expressly provides in articles 21 and 22 that:

All information concerning the patient's condition, the results of the investigations, the diagnosis, the prognosis, the treatment and the personal data are confidential, even after his death.

Information of a confidential character may be furnished only where the patient gives his explicit consent or where the law expressly requires it."

So neither the porter, nor the boss, nor the director, nor even the owner may require you, the employees, to present test records or results of any kind.

It is your right to keep the confidentiality of your medical investigations.

Evidently, these dictatorial excesses and veritable discriminations, worthy of a fascistoid regime of Medical Apartheid, can be sanctioned in civil and even in criminal law.

Of course, the employees who are "restructured" will be able to win before the labour courts.

That is why the sanction must be prompt and clear on the part of consumers, who can immediately "fine" the abuses of those at Romaqua.

I for one shall no longer buy any product of Romaqua Group Borsec, although I am a fan of Borsec water. I say it with regret.

And I shall not buy any Romaqua product until the company publicly renounces the blackmail and the discrimination of its employees on medical grounds.

And because such acts must be severely punished, I have proposed through the #LegeaSuveranității the criminalisation of any abuse of office, of any discrimination based on medical grounds:

" "(2) The same penalty shall apply to the act of a public servant who, in the exercise of his official duties, restricts the exercise of a person's right or creates for that person a situation of inferiority on grounds of race, nationality, ethnic origin, language, religion, sex, sexual orientation, political affiliation, wealth, age, disability,

acceptance or refusal of a medical treatment or device,

non-contagious chronic illness, or HIV/AIDS, Covid-19 infection or the like."

So I urge you to enrol in the #ArmataSuveranității at http://VremSuveranitate and to

Not buy Romaqua Group Borsec products until they officially and publicly renounce the policy of discrimination on medical grounds:

Post scriptum: "no employee may be made subject by the employer to a condition of being vaccinated against COVID-19; vaccination is a preventive medical act based on the person's consent; the imposition of vaccination against COVID by the employer we consider to be outside the legal framework", answered the Ministry of Health to the question put to it by the Ombudsman!

I attach below the official reply of the Ministry of Health, a reply which I invite you to print and to submit to employers who blackmail and abuse you!

Record the conversations held with them on the subject of compulsory vaccination!

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

33. Today, 24 May 2021, we took one more step towards regaining our dignity

Today the Initiative Committee for the #LegeaSuveranității was constituted!

Dozens of people, from many towns of the country — from Timișoara, Cluj, Brașov, Piatra Neamț, Galați, Tulcea, Constanța, Craiova and Ploiești, and from many others — signed before the Public Notary the official birth certificate of the Sovereignty Act.

I thank them all very much for their effort, for the trust and the Hope they have invested in this draft law.

Alongside them there also signed Iulian Capsali, Aurelian Popa and Bogdan Alexandru Duca, who was also the first to recount this event which I hope will truly become historic.

I thank them too in particular, but above all Mr Ilie Șerbănescu and Mr Sorin Roșca Stănescu, who gave weight to our undertaking.

All of us, as members of the Initiative Committee, have empowered the more than 800 volunteers to gather signatures for this popular legislative initiative.

The next step is the submission of the draft law to the Legislative Council and its publication in the Official Gazette. Then the gathering of signatures will begin.

Not least, I thank those many specialists who worked directly and effectively on this draft law and who chose to remain anonymous.

#LuptaAcumÎncepe — the struggle now begins — for the regaining of our sovereignty!

I invite you by this means too to enrol in the #ArmataSuveranității at http://VremSuveranitate.ro !

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQGevvdlhNMnPtSUwoXY1xQCLy5A8ZFUT6UixfCLZowzu9Oa-CO1fE8L_5AT4oVDT4yPxmY7F4lDpOF3RO3uwQLwyazEkWxamF0rgYIzbO6V8g7JoZ0q8fnvc_l1Z-uhDElyZUjMT7bo6uKFNkNPWG4pHxRlIX3BjcsmJ7nDxkMSAIPgkrn-Wi2uisUQGM0TcNE1sgadwcRPeOmj4rU-e8MCAyOo&s=518⟩

---

34. 5 June 2021 — “Luju.ro has produced an excellent synthesis and presentation of #LegeaSuveranității”

Luju.ro has produced an excellent synthesis and presentation of the #LegeaSuveranității

“Anyone who compels Romanians to be vaccinated, by discriminating against those who refuse to be injected, could be liable to imprisonment from 2 to 7 years, like any other person found guilty of abuse of office under article 297 of the Criminal Code. This provision is contained in the draft Sovereignty Act, which the lawyer Dan Chitic (photo 1) submitted to the Legislative Council on Friday, 4 June 2021. The above limits of the penalty are increased by one third if the public servant has obtained for himself or for another an undue benefit, under art. 13/2 of Act no. 78/2000 on the prevention, detection and punishment of acts of corruption.

Lumea Justiției has written repeatedly about the legislative initiative, but this time we present the form which will enter Parliament once maestro Chitic has gathered the at least 100,000 signatures required by the Constitution (art. 74 para. 1):

“Legislative initiative belongs, as the case may be, to the Government, to deputies, to senators or to a number of at least 100,000 citizens with the right to vote. Citizens exercising their right of legislative initiative must come from at least a quarter of the counties of the country, and in each of those counties, and in the municipality of Bucharest, at least 5,000 signatures must be registered in support of that initiative”.

Moreover: the Sovereignty Act repeals in its entirety Act no. 55/2020 (on certain measures for preventing and combating the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic), which allowed the authorities to indulge in the well-known abuses of the past year.

Besides the prohibition of discrimination according to vaccination or non-vaccination, the law removes the secret services not only from criminal files (with the exception of those concerning

terrorism and espionage) but also from the press, from NGOs and from the business world, the normative act forbidding the intelligence services to hold, directly or through intermediaries, companies and non-governmental organisations, or to operate within mass-media institutions. Another secret service concerned is the Special Telecommunications Service (STS), which the legislative project removes from the procedure for organising and conducting elections.

Still in the criminal field, we mention that the President of Romania will be liable to be accused of high treason if he refuses to apply the decisions of the Constitutional Court of Romania in the matter of resolving legal conflicts of a constitutional nature. We mention that art. 398 of the Criminal Code punishes high treason with imprisonment from 15 to 25 years.

An end to endless confinement in psychiatric institutions

Before we turn to the economic part of the law, we highlight the fact that it introduces real protection for Romanians abusively committed. As Lumea Justiției explained in detail in the article concerning the case of Câți Barzecu of Constanța (click here to read), the present Code of Criminal Procedure offers no effective guarantees in this respect, which is why any Romanian upon whom a prosecutor has fixed his eye (or who, generally, has become inconvenient for the regime) can very easily be committed by force to an asylum and forgotten there.

That is why the Sovereignty Act makes forced confinement in psychiatric institutions subject to judicial review, as in the case of judicial supervision or of other preventive measures.

Protecting Romania's economic sovereignty

Equally important are the passages in which the Sovereignty Act deals with the protection of Romania's economic interests. First, the draft normative act prohibits privatisations and deforestation until 1 January 2121. Second, it obliges the National Bank of Romania to repatriate the country's gold reserve, currently in London.

At the same time, the legislative initiative requires that the royalties for the exploitation of natural resources be fixed at a level which may not be lower than the average of the European market.

We mention that the lawyer Dan Chitic has for the moment declined to disclose all the persons who contributed to the writing of the draft, but there has already been a public acknowledgment to that effect on the part of the lawyer Adrian Toni Neacșu (photo 2).

We also state that anyone wishing to gather signatures for the legislative initiative may enrol as a volunteer by going to the site Vremsuveranitate.ro.

As we said, here are the explanatory memorandum and the text of the draft (see facsimile and video):

"Draft legislation: 'The Sovereignty Act — the Act for the protection of the higher and sovereign interest of the Romanian people and citizen'

Starting from the constitutional principle that national Sovereignty belongs to the Romanian people, and also from the need for increased involvement of the Romanian citizen in the decision-making and legislative process through the implementation of the principle of participatory democracy by the exercise of the right of legislative initiative by at least 100,000 citizens with the right to vote, in observance of art. 74 para. 1 of the Constitution,

Having regard to the need to guarantee and strengthen the fundamental rights of the citizen by instituting rules which make impossible the limitation, delay or avoidance of parliamentary scrutiny of normative acts providing for limitations, restrictions or conditions upon fundamental rights and

freedoms, and to the need to repeal the legal provisions in force which make such unconstitutional limitations possible,

Taking into account the imperative character of the Oviedo and Nuremberg Conventions, international conventions to which Romania is a party, and the need for the direct and immediate implementation of those conventions in national legislation, with the effect of explicitly and indiscriminately prohibiting the compulsory administration of any medical treatments and/or devices, and of prohibiting any form of discrimination as a result of accepting or refusing any medical treatments and/or devices,

Having regard to the fact that the protection of human dignity is founded on the idea that man is an intellectual and moral being inclined to determine himself and to develop in freedom, and also that the inalienable dignity of man consists precisely in the necessity that his status as a responsible person be respected,

Taking into consideration the need to strengthen the rule of law through the observance of legality and constitutionality by the direct, non-discriminatory and immediate implementation of the decisions of the Constitutional Court,

Having regard to the need to render transparent the decision-making process of the administration by publishing all acts of general interest and making them fully and freely available through the Official Gazette of Romania, to the need to guarantee freedom of expression in the online environment, and to the need for parliamentary representation of as large a proportion as possible of Romanian citizens with the right to vote,

Taking into consideration the disastrous ecological situation at national level, and the drastic diminution of the national forest stock caused by the massive and irrational deforestation and clear-felling of the last 30 years, and the need to prohibit the abusive and excessive exploitation of forests with a view to the reconstruction and regeneration of the national forest stock, and the need for the immediate and total prohibition of the export of unprocessed timber and of the import of waste,

Taking into account the obligation to preserve the national patrimony and the need to maximise the profitability of the exploitation of the riches held in public ownership for the benefit of the Romanian citizen, with the consequence of criminalising any acts having the effect of diminishing the national wealth,

Having regard to the low degree of transparency of the decision-making process within public institutions in Romania, and to the imperative necessity of prohibiting any kind of interference by the intelligence, counter-intelligence and assimilated services in public life outside their sector of activity,

Taking into consideration the need for the defence of the entire national territory by the entire people on a voluntary basis, and the need to acquire new, latest-generation military equipment directly from the manufacturer and exclusively in observance of the national legislation governing Offset in the field of military procurement,

Taking into account the decisions of the Constitutional Court on the constitutionality of certain provisions in criminal and criminal-procedural matters, and in other social fields as well,

Having regard to the fact that the more than 100,000 signatures in favour of this popular legislative initiative constitute a viable argument for reconsidering the will of the Romanian people and its sovereignty,

The Parliament of Romania, following the popular legislative initiative, adopts this law."

The whole article at https://m.luju.ro/puscarie-pentru-discriminarea-nevaccinatilor-avocatu...

(On the Green Romania Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQG5ZjtMvv-xFYabypZzL8VlsWKynWHxLcPxrsK25XsgrBH4hHgBIX6te5rnic7jsa5SrGzO5Q1osG6GhUOWR-QtaYZwj16BqxWHYL4XZ2ag-KfE01r-pgNmSVsjqa1PrzhlzK8RKb0ezsl9mp7CzmvttBilt8n6eYtFPuClETpy0_9b_Zz0xgwCczznna43_7B9MwX6eGi49CmsrzAFlPREWX1c&s=518⟩

---

35. 7 June 2021 — "I am receiving signals from the volunteers of #ArmataSuveranității that some fellow citizens are reluctant..."

I am receiving signals from the volunteers of the #ArmataSuveranității that some fellow citizens are reluctant to sign for the #LegeaSuveranității on the ground that this Law would be the equivalent of a "small revolution"... and that they are afraid to take part in such a thing!

It is not a "small revolution"... it is a Revolution! A real one. It is a true War of independence.

Our heroism, the only sacrifice we have to make... is to put a signature on a sheet of paper.

Our parents and grandparents gave their lives for their country and for their children.

https://www.luju.ro/puscarie-pentru-discriminarea-nevaccinatilor-avoca...

Post scriptum: the "conspiracy theorists" and the deniers of the dictatorship are awaited at http://VremSuveranitate.ro/ !

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQHMDSMJgjQfjPKGxhMGXOmNu55Zx4ndCwIz0kLprb-zFg-90RQmIURYmZA3s4mtAirfUGMTTPjUjyAAlqC-sclM_MPg-wNWpa5BX7ODuEbqCChsPddX4SdkHpwoncrFru0CIMFsbacgPr8ozU2-Yvo9w5BSFEMluycIFk4HNP6pHpz40QQVG2W11gZbNIs8HmUgimpqBJxK0-vokI266LI03Utqg&s=518⟩

---

36. 7 June 2021 — "Today I found that I am the subject of a new form of censorship: my posts cannot be ..."

Today I found that I am the subject of a new form of censorship: my posts cannot be "shared": on a post with over 1,700 "likes"... only 16 "shares".

In the comments my friends noticed the problem.

Might it be because the #LegeaSuveranității must be braked?

Or perhaps because the Truth about the plandemic is inconvenient?

I already knew that my posts are "hidden" from your sight. But now I find that even those who see them cannot share them.

What is certain is that the "velvet fist" of censorship is working.

Therefore I ask you, where you cannot share my posts, to resort to the "copy/paste" method!

What matters is that the message should reach as many as possible!

I also ask you to follow my public page at https://www.facebook.com/danmvchitic .

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQG_tUlWvT2bGQu2y4ynUgcHNVb64BGSucbfiHNqeHKVrrIGN-lJC1Bq95x_q2uHrNQMlOy_d6lsYVWWPE9x1xqnPR1eOMbYsgMoqi629MudDa7RpyGn9A5jFohsDOUeVFLy18mRdNLGguK1Po8mNt5LEEebq7UbT7T9dgIye-HQ6WcVwOjkmqBx-S1PM4NoLK_Vn2LbPd_ThfltiL98Wp4T1Wk&s=518⟩

37. 8 June 2021 — "The Constitutional Court has rejected the objection concerning the unconstitutionality of Act 55/2020!"

The Constitutional Court has rejected the objection concerning the unconstitutionality of Act 55/2020!

The #UltimaȘansă — the last chance — of democracy in Romania is the #LegeaSuveranității:

"(...) Article 2. Act 55/2020 on certain measures for preventing and combating the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic is repealed. (...)"

Enrol as volunteers in the #ArmataSuveranității at http://VremSuveranitate.ro/

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQEt2KntSiQBON5p-MiES_UGL_QwYZS-Mwsmnx__x5QDABzqTuRWBTtrZuLfc_yuEa0IoJH_QEIB3ig5JDQuJcA8QyirJdcEKyoEY1PpfwQEpRXR0rnm1Wu_KYKvPQXehmvgLocCPX7gLt0X63NL0g1cQC35u66F4ZlJtowtmqTP1NZk6nRKwSnU6Du8aTmYbtH7drpVIMWd_Cx5RfPHkKy_dD5P4&s=518⟩

38. 10 June 2021 — "Tomorrow, 11.06.2021, we shall be in Slatina and then in Craiova, where we shall give mandates to volunteers for ..."

Tomorrow, 11.06.2021, we shall be in Slatina and then in Craiova, where we shall give mandates to volunteers for the gathering of signatures for the #LegeaSuveranității.

At about 14.00 we shall be in front of the Prefecture in Slatina, and at about 16.00 we shall meet in Craiova at 23 Eroilor Street.

Until then, do not miss the chance to enrol in the #ArmataSuveranității at http://VremSuveranitate.ro/ .

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQFI4ymxa1zJyHM9da2tMejneH_OSKIqjlJ_OXAU1QFpUhWemA7oW5c98_295YvfLf9IyYd2nJpcxTFNSWzWIP-AiPoYOIKOAKEc1F7Lp8WMGlF749_H4ba2hvKsXaPIEsvbovw_OSZcAWzAXzTLrbx8QicqJQm9t3t4ERaGvl9XsVXrKhhiNOWJeBAQN7J_W2Itz_wUIl-D5rkOvQ5NE-Hc3qpM&s=518⟩

39. 16 June 2021 — "The plunder of Romania's last remaining wealth begins!"

The plunder of Romania's last remaining wealth begins!

The fact that Exxon Mobil is beginning exploitation calls into question the taking over of Exxon Mobil's shares in the Neptun Deep exploitation, although on 31 March Romgaz submitted an offer to take over ExxonMobil's participation in the Neptun Deep block.

And all this while the anti-national power announces to us that "there will be a parliamentary initiative of the coalition to amend the Offshore Act", the minister of energy Popescu, answering a question put by the representative of the Black Sea investors, saying that "I want a consensus wider than the consensus within the coalition, and I am convinced that we shall have colleagues in parliament outside the coalition who will vote with us for the amendment of the law. Have a little more patience"!

https://m.ziuaconstanta.ro/stiri/actualitate/exxonmobil-a-depus-docume...

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQFvG-MEgmMyv5z_QRBkFOGssKS4TL7J4wT4nr53yCySjGli1OFq6cyJ2EnmoziXT4sw4jVm0UKaC8s0aggekouvbOoeSjIFW1i7mvwn4fmuwQsy_vhZUuVGchGeYIQtV0bDsg5kX6vfCkmmdEyXlTlFwfqHy2TcP2_Zec4QZeezR-1Z2YRUXwJB22_-zP1GsWwjVtc6_XYZ90g7ZloDUaKxvh4Q&s=518⟩

---

40. 24 June 2021 — "#LegeaSuvetanității has been returned by the Legislative Council. Not rejected, not given a negative opinion..."

The #LegeaSuvetanității has been returned by the Legislative Council. Not rejected, not given a negative opinion, but effectively returned, in its materiality, to the sender: all 8 pages, together with the Declaration constituting the Initiative Group and the Empowerment.

Evidently, the Council's "solution" is unlawful, this manner of "disposal" not being provided for by Act 189/1999.

We knew they would do everything in their power to stop us.

But not before we supplement the legislative proposal with provisions which will outlaw every form of sexual proselytising, as the Hungarians have done.

(On the Referendum Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQEmDR-RFvriduKD5ljUJB-a6sKocpzYwW4u6LcDlhM0M6mQBg7V8LFoZzpOOh6vzrcjr87Mv6pKjSNurEvn-MES7K7UIm9CbtYiOFVxwir8Y1hvp3xlaezmiJDnA1WsKl1LLUzzpC92ezw4q70fpdCsb71iJbiNRWObleXiGwQUONAtrRJQDMPHd1lRd9ELjaQOAhVy078ik4jceR-tvRqfYdmK0&s=518⟩

---

41. 29 June 2021 — On the disregard of the Court's decisions

On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see the page The Sovereignty Act.

"3. After paragraph (2) [of article 297 of the Criminal Code — Abuse of office — our note] a new paragraph is added, which shall read: "(3) The act of a public servant of applying any legal rules declared unconstitutional by Decision of the Constitutional Court of Romania is punished by imprisonment from 7 to 10 years."

Paragraph 3 of article 16 of the #LegeaSuveranității punishes the failure to observe the Decisions of the Constitutional Court by any person assimilated to public servants.

If the legislative project "The Sovereignty Act" had already been law, the Ombudsman would have been immediately restored to office.

Enrol as volunteers in the #ArmataSuveranității at http://VremSuveranitate.ro/

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQGaSWeJ4lU05cnydICKXWssQXjhJB9G6fhjP16-9_E4gYWIpDYziHkaxWv7kbljL-_-d2kfCxUKGDsfNeQbbAQK-V7e45-tecJx5CYu3xdX1FKwmZaEZbzudagub7yfLKR84tYvKQVYdquK6oQSOxEodFbU9P_5OhzRTYhwzn2QTBmmFnDCEPxj3FE5r306ni3EA_xnHzZaxeZnrrgzcV-_fz-M&s=518⟩

---

42. 30 June 2021 — "As you know, #LegeaSuveranității has been returned by the Legislative Council on the ground..."

As you know, the #LegeaSuveranității has been returned by the Legislative Council on grounds of failure to observe certain formal requirements.

And that because we have the opportunity to add several further essential provisions, some inspired by our Hungarian neighbours.

Here is the text of a new article amending Act 272 of 21 June 2004 (republished) on the protection and promotion of the rights of the child:

"Act 272 of 21 June 2004 (republished) on the protection and promotion of the rights of the child, as subsequently amended and supplemented, is amended and supplemented as follows:

Following your suggestions, I have amended the text of point 1, making it clearer and even stricter than the Hungarian law:

1. After para. 1 of art. 9 of Act 272 of 21 June 2004, paragraph 1^1 is added, reading as follows: "The physical sexual identity of the child acquired at birth may not be changed before the age of 18."

2. Article 46 paragraph 3 letter i of Act 272 of 21 June 2004 is amended and shall read as follows: "i) the systematic conduct in schools, at least once per semester, of programmes of education for life, including sexual education for children over 14, with a view to preventing the contraction of sexually transmitted diseases and the pregnancy of minors;"

3. In article 46 paragraph 3 of Act 272 of 21 June 2004 there is added letter k), reading as follows: "k) the prohibition of making available to children under the age of eighteen pornographic content and content which depicts sexuality or promotes departure from gender identity, gender reassignment and homosexuality."

If you agree, enrol in the #ArmataSuveranității at http://VremSuveranitate.ro/ !

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQETsLm5PlwPqoERBKt2bhejtf2svG6gB3Gzv506BRYGc9VcwqJ5V7kb62lHAwxbz2I260DB-plqUsIL-CaE_6MrMIsxdfC45H32OJ9PJMXYUk-MaKlUC_YLCdSFpqm5QbgWcgXrorlwX74csRm1Zf5lCFS7XjFq-5Y0YU47tiRZHCPB4mEY77KgopiFZmtLQX7c0q1w5SJmMv1Y3QbuDwrkP18EE&s=518⟩

---

43. 2 July 2021 — "What if the "Great Reset" is about "BioDigital Convergence" (BioNTech)?"

What if the "Great Reset" is about "BioDigital Convergence" (BioNTech)?

Today I shall bring to your attention a subject which I believe ought to enter everyone's attention at once and become immediately the principal subject of debate in society. Not only in Romanian society, but in human society as a whole.

It is the subject which can elucidate the "Why?" of the global madness of the past year and a half.

It is perhaps the "missing link" between all the absolute novelties which have come upon us in the recent period: the pandemic, vaccination, the rapid roll-out of 5G, the new normality... the Great Re-set.

I know, however, that in launching this subject of discussion, both I and those who will discuss it are taking major risks, the first of which is being discredited and made ridiculous through accusations ranging from conspiracy theory to madness. The gravity and importance of the subject nevertheless demand that any risk be assumed, for what is at stake is the human being itself. Thus, after long discussions with my friend Radu Golban, who also supplied me with a great part of the documents, I have decided to set aside all minimal prudence and to bring this subject to your attention.

All the documents which I shall place at your disposal, and which I ask you to read with the greatest attention, are either official documents or studies of prestigious institutions and universities. I ask by this means my friends Vasile Astărăstoae, Răzvan Constantinescu, Adrian Severin, Gheorghe Iancu, Teodoru Ghiondea, Radu Iliescu, but above all the members of the Romanian Academy and the fathers and brethren of the Holy Synod, to go through the materials below and to understand! And let the most courageous also express their informed opinions.

Here is how "BioDigital Convergence" is presented on an official site of the Canadian government (https://horizons.gc.că/en/2020/02/11/exploring-biodigital-convergence/...

"In the coming years, biodigital technologies could be woven into our lives as digital technologies are now. Biological and digital systems are converging and could change the way we work, live and even evolve as a species. More than a technological change, this biodigital convergence may transform the way we understand ourselves and cause us to redefine what we consider human or natural.

Biodigital convergence may have a profound impact on our economy, our ecosystems and our society. Being prepared to support it, while managing the risks with care and sensitivity, will shape the way we navigate social and ethical considerations and will guide the conversations on policy and governance."

BioDigital Convergence has, however, been spoken of openly for a very long time. Spoken of openly, but in closed circles. The most extensive study now made public dates from 2002 and can be found in President Obama's White House archive (https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/os... and speaks of "Converging Technologies", which it defines as the synergistic combination of four major "NBIC" (nano-bio-info-cogno) provinces of science and technology, each of which is currently progressing at a rapid rate: (a) nanoscience and nanotechnology; (b) biotechnology and biomedicine, including genetic engineering; (c) information technology, including advanced computing and communications; (d) cognitive science, including cognitive neuroscience.

As early as 2002 the White House was speaking of "The Potential for Gene Therapy as a Validation / Delivery Platform"... does that sound familiar? It spoke of "Deep learning" (the knowledge taught will be based on concepts offered by the nano, bio, information and cognitive sciences, and those concepts will be introduced early in the K-12 teaching process. High-quality science education will be made available to the majority of students), and indeed of the fact that "Visual communication could complement verbal communication, sometimes replacing spoken language when speed is a priority or enhancing speech when needed to exploit maximum mental capabilities (Horn 2002; Hewlett Packard 2002)."

All the materials below place us before an evident fact: the Great Reset has already taken place. In 2020. And the year 2021 is the first year of the new normality, the first year of the implementation of the technologies of "BioDigital Convergence".

That is why immediate and concerted action is necessary.

That is why it becomes necessary to introduce a new category of rights: "Neuronal rights" — the right to have your thoughts under your exclusive control — rights which we shall have to include in the new form of the #LegeaSuveranității.

I know, it sounds like madness. Until you read the official materials below.

After you have gone through them you will discover that we live in a reality beyond any dystopia ever imagined.

To convince you, I shall begin today to give you quotations from the materials which you yourselves will be able to study.

I begin with the introductory part of the Document entitled "Converging Technologies for Improving Human Performance: NANOTECHNOLOGY, BIOTECHNOLOGY, INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND COGNITIVE SCIENCE", the 480-page document I spoke of from President Obama's archive — an introductory part which tells us, in summary, that this BioDigital Convergence is "the Solution to all humanity's problems".

Translator's note: the passage which follows is rendered from the author's Romanian version; the original English document is at the link given above.

In the early decades of the 21st century, concentrated efforts can unify science based on the unity of nature, thereby advancing the combination of nanotechnology, biotechnology, information technology and new technologies based on cognitive science. With proper attention to ethical issues and societal needs, converging technologies could achieve a tremendous improvement in human abilities, societal outcomes, the productivity of the nation and the quality of life. This is a broad, cross-cutting, emerging and timely opportunity, of interest to individuals, to society and to humanity in the long term.

The expression "converging technologies" refers to the synergistic combination of four major "NBIC" (nano-bio-info-cogno) provinces of science and technology, each of which is currently progressing at a rapid rate: (a) nanoscience and nanotechnology; (b) biotechnology and biomedicine, including genetic engineering; (c) information technology, including advanced computing and communications; (d) cognitive science, including cognitive neuroscience.

A timely and broad opportunity. The convergence of diverse technologies is based on material unity at the nanoscale and on technological integration from that scale. The basic building blocks of matter which are fundamental to all the sciences originate at the nanoscale. Revolutionary advances at the interfaces between previously separate fields of science and technology are ready to create key transformative tools for the NBIC technologies. Developments in systems approaches, mathematics and computation, together with NBIC, allow us for the first time to understand the natural world, human society and scientific research as closely linked complex hierarchical systems. At this moment in the evolution of technical achievement, it becomes possible to improve human performance through the integration of technologies.

Examples of rewards may include improved efficiency of work and learning, enhanced individual sensory and cognitive capacities, revolutionary changes in health care, improved creativity both individual and collective, highly efficient communication techniques including brain-to-brain interaction, perfected human-machine interfaces including neuromorphic engineering, sustainable and "intelligent" environments including neuro-ergonomics, enhanced human capabilities for defence purposes, the achievement of sustainable development using NBIC tools, and the amelioration of the physical and cognitive decline common to the ageing mind.

The participants in the workshop foresee important discoveries in the fields related to NBIC in the next 10 to 20 years. Fundamental research requires approximately the same interval to produce significant applications. Now is the moment to anticipate the research problems and to plan a research and development approach which will give optimal results.

This report addresses key questions: what are the implications of the unification of the sciences and of converging technologies? How will current scientific knowledge and technologies evolve, and what emerging developments are envisaged? What visionary ideas can guide research so as to obtain broad benefits for humanity? What are the most urgent research and education issues? How can we

develop a transformative national strategy to enhance individual capabilities and the resulting society as a whole? What should be done to obtain the best results in the next 10 to 20 years?

This report sets out several long-term implications of the convergence of technologies in key fields of human activity, including work, learning, ageing, group interaction and human evolution. If we take the right decisions and investments today, many of these visions could be realised within 20 years. Advancing simultaneously along many of these paths could bring about an age of innovation and prosperity which would be a turning point in the evolution of human society. The right of each person to use new knowledge and technologies to attain personal objectives, as well as the right to privacy and choice, lie at the basis of the developments envisaged.

This report is based on exploratory research already initiated in representative research organisations and on the views of leading scientists and engineers using research data.

Strategies for transformation. It is essential to prepare key organisations and societal activities for the changes made possible by the convergence of technologies. Activities which accelerate convergence in order to improve human performance must be enhanced, including focused research and development, increased technological synergy from the nanoscale, the development of interfaces between the sciences and technologies, and a holistic approach to monitoring the resulting evolution of society. The aim is to offer individuals and groups a wide range of attractive choices, while preserving fundamental values such as privacy, safety and moral responsibility. Education and training at all levels should use converging science and technology and should prepare people to take advantage of them. We must experiment with innovative ideas to motivate multidisciplinary research and development, while finding ways of addressing ethical, legal and moral concerns. In many fields of application, such as medical technology and health care, it is necessary to accelerate the advances which would take advantage of converging technologies.

Towards the Unification of Science and Converging Technologies. It will be necessary to evolve a hierarchical architecture for the integration of the natural and human sciences across several scales, dimensions and modalities of data. Half a millennium ago, the leaders of the Renaissance were simultaneously masters of several fields. Today, however, specialisation has divided the arts and engineering, and no one can master more than a small fragment of human creativity. The sciences have reached a watershed at which they must unite if they are to continue to advance rapidly. The convergence of the sciences may initiate a new renaissance, embodying a holistic vision of technology based on transformative tools, the mathematics of complex systems and a unified understanding of cause and effect in the physical world from the nanoscale to the planetary scale.

Major themes. Scientific leaders and decision-makers from various fields prepared written statements for a workshop in December 2001, assessing the potential impact of NBIC technologies on the improvement of human capabilities at the microscopic, individual, group and societal levels. During the workshop, the participants examined the vast potential in six different areas of relevance:

• The general potential of converging technologies. Representatives of governmental agencies and of the private sector set themselves the mission of exploring the potential of converging technologies and the research needs for improving human performance, as well as the general potential for revolutionary changes in the economy and in society. They identified the synergistic development of technologies based on nano, bio, information and cognition as a remarkable opportunity at the interface and frontier of the sciences and engineering in the coming decades, and proposed new visions of what it is possible to achieve.

Expanding human cognition and communication. The highest priority was given to “The Human Cognome Project”, a multidisciplinary effort to understand the structure, the functions and the

potential improvements of the human mind. Other priority areas are: personal sensory interfaces; community enriched by humanised technology; learning how to learn; and improved tools for creativity.

Improving human health and physical capabilities. Six priority areas were identified: nano-bio processors for the research and development of treatments, including those resulting from bioinformatics, genomics and proteomics; implants based on nanotechnology and regenerative biosystems as substitutes for human organs or for monitoring physiological well-being; nanoscale devices and comparable discrete instruments for medical intervention; multi-modality platforms for increasing sensory capabilities, especially for persons with visual and hearing impairments; brain-to-brain and brain-to-machine interfaces; and virtual environments for training, design and forms of work unlimited by distance or by the physical scale on which it is performed.

Improving group and societal outcomes. An NBIC system called "The Communicator" would remove the barriers to communication caused by physical disabilities, linguistic differences, geographical distances and variations in knowledge, thereby greatly increasing the effectiveness of cooperation in schools, corporations, governmental agencies and throughout the world. Other areas of focus are the improvement of group creativity and productivity, cognitive engineering and developments relating to the networked society. A key priority will be revolutionary new products and services based on the integration of the four technologies from the nanoscale.

National security. Given the radical change in conflict in this new century, seven opportunities for strengthening national defence offered by technological convergence deserve high priority: data linkage and the anticipation of threats; uninhabited combat vehicles; education and training for war fighters; responses to chemical, biological, radiological and explosive threats; war-fighting systems; non-drug treatments to enhance human performance; and applications of human-machine interfaces.

Unification of science and education. To face future challenges, science education needs a radical transformation from elementary school through postgraduate training. The convergence of previously separate scientific disciplines and engineering fields cannot occur without the emergence of new kinds of people who understand several fields in depth and can work intelligently to integrate them.

New programmes, new concepts to ensure intellectual coherence, and new forms of educational institutions will be needed.

Beyond the 20-year time frame, or outside the present limits of high technology, convergence may have significant impacts in fields such as: the efficiency of work, the human body and mind throughout the life cycle, communication and education, mental health, aeronautics and space flight, food and agriculture, sustainable and intelligent environments, self-presentation and fashion, and the transformation of civilisation.

The recommendations of this report are far-reaching and fundamental, urging the transformation of science, engineering and technology at their very roots. The new developments will be revolutionary and must be governed by respect for human well-being and dignity. This report establishes objectives for societal and educational transformation. Building on the suggestions developed in the five topical groups and on the ideas in the more than 50 individual contributions, the workshop recommended a national priority area in research and development on converging technologies focused on improving human performance. The opportunity is broad, lasting and of general interest.

Individuals. Scientists and engineers at every career level should acquire skills in at least one NBIC area and in the neighbouring disciplines, collaborate with colleagues in other fields, and take risks in launching innovative projects which could advance NBIC.

Academia. Educational institutions at all levels should undertake major curricular and organisational reforms in order to restructure the teaching and research of science and engineering, so that previously separate disciplines may converge around common principles in order to train the technical workforce of the future.

The private sector. Manufacturing, biotechnology, information and medical-service companies will need to develop partnerships of unrivalled scope in order to exploit the enormous opportunities in technological convergence, investing in production facilities based on entirely new principles, materials, devices and systems, with increased emphasis on human development.

Government. The federal government should establish a national research and development area on converging technologies focused on improving human performance. Governmental organisations at all levels should provide leadership in creating the NBIC infrastructure and in coordinating the activity of other institutions, and must accelerate convergence by supporting new multidisciplinary scientific efforts, while sustaining the traditional disciplines which are essential to success. Ethical, legal, moral, economic, environmental, workforce-development and other social implications must be addressed from the outset, involving leading NBIC scientists and engineers, social scientists and a broad coalition of professional and civic organisations. Research on societal implications must be funded, and the risk of potential unwanted side effects must be monitored by a governmental organisation in order to anticipate and take corrective measures. Tools should be developed to anticipate scenarios for future development and application technology.

Professional societies. The scientific and engineering communities should create new means of interdisciplinary training and communication, reduce the barriers which prevent people from working across disciplines, aggressively highlight the opportunities of convergence within their conferences, develop links with a variety of other technical and medical organisations, and address the ethical issues connected with technological developments.

Other organisations. Non-governmental organisations representing potential user groups should contribute to the design and testing of converging technologies, in order to maximise the benefits for their diverse constituencies. Private research foundations should invest in NBIC research in those fields which are consistent with their unique missions. The press should increase high-quality coverage of science and technology, on the basis of the new converging paradigm, in order to inform citizens so that they may participate wisely in debates on ethical issues, such as the unexpected effects on inequality, policies on diversity and the implications of the transformation of human capabilities.

A great opportunity is created by the convergence of the sciences and technologies, beginning with integration from the nanoscale and having immense individual, societal and historical implications for human development. The participants in the meetings which prepared this report recommend a national priority area of research and development on converging technologies focused on improving human performance. This would be an appropriate framework for a coherent, long-term strategy in research and education. Science and technology will increasingly dominate the world as population, the exploitation of resources and the potential for social conflict grow. The success of this priority area of converging technologies is therefore essential for the future of humanity.

https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/os...

Here are the terms by which readers may search within the document:

“education” 63, 166, 432, “instant learning” 183

“virus” 126, 127, 128, 130, 213, 215, 334

What is important is to understand what NBICS (nano – bio – info – cogno – socio) means. I have listed only a few of the interesting pages.

Each should deepen the study according to his own interest.

Biodigital Philosophy, Technological Convergence, and Postdigital Knowledge Ecologies | Springer-Link

Term to search for: “5G” (written without a space)

Magnetogenetics: Your Brain on Magnets — Neurothetical

https://horizons.gc.că/en/2020/02/11/exploring-biodigital-convergence/

http://www.buffalo.edu/news/releases/2011/09/12926.html

https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlelanding/2017/SC/C7SC01462G#!div… (see table 2)

https://www.theguardian.com/science/neurophilosophy/2016/mar/24/magnet…

https://www.nature.com/articles/s41423-021-00643-6

https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0006349519300190

https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-018-27087-9

https://elifesciences.org/articles/27069

https://www.nature.com/articles/s41591-021-01351-4

https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5470037/

https://www.healio.com/news/ophthalmology/20201116/optogenetics-gene-t…

https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Optogenetic-approaches-to-vision…

https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2095927316302407

https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4397176/

https://www.bbc.com/news/science-environment-20513292

(PDF) Hacking a Brain for Contemptuous Interests: Ethical Risks of Advancing Neuroscience Techniques for Mind Control (researchgate.net)

A Possible Inductive Mechanism for Magnetogenetics | bioRxiv

A spike-ferritin nanoparticle vaccine induces robust innate immune activity and drives polyfunctional SARS-CoV-2-specific T cells | bioRxiv

Biodigital Philosophy, Technological Convergence, and Postdigital Knowledge Ecologies | Springer-Link

Can Magnetism Help Us Control the Brain, Remotely? - University at Buffalo

Engineered Ferritin for Magnetogenetic Manipulation of Proteins and Organelles Inside Living Cells - PubMed (nih.gov)

Ethical brain stimulation—Neuroethics of deep brain stimulation in research and clinical practice | Request PDF (researchgate.net)

Genetically engineered 'Magneto' protein remotely controls brain and behaviour | Science | The Guardian

Lipid Oxidation Induced by RF Waves and Mediated by Ferritin Iron Causes Activation of Ferritin-Tagged Ion Channels - ScienceDirect

Magnetic control of cellular processes using biofunctional nanoparticles - Chemical Science (RSC Publishing)

Magnetic Entropy as a Proposed Gating Mechanism for Magnetogenetic Ion Channels - ScienceDirect

Magnetic fields for modulating the nervous system: Physics Today: Vol 74, No 2 (scitation.org)

Magnetic nanoparticle therapy for Parkinson's disease | Results In Brief | CORDIS | European Commission (europa.eu)

Magneto Protein Could Help Magnets Control Brain Circuitry | Inside Science

Magneto: remote control over neuronal activity and behaviour (uzh.ch)

Magnetogenetics Controls the Brain and Behavior of Zebrafish and Mice (epigenie.com)

Magnetogenetics: A New Technique for Controlling Mouse Behavior (conductscience.com)

Magnetogenetics: Your Brain on Magnets — Neurothetical

Magnetothermal genetic deep brain stimulation of motor behaviors in awake, freely moving mice | eLife (elifesciences.org)

Manipulating neurons with magnetogenetics | Nature Methods

Nanoparticle-based local translation reveals mRNA as a translation-coupled scaffold with anchoring function (nih.gov)

http://ndl.ethernet.edu.et/bitstream/123456789/75096/1/214.pdf

Sub-second multi-channel magnetic control of select neural circuits in behaving flies | bioRxiv

Viana_whole_thesis_ex_pub_mat.pdf (utas.edu.au)

Wireless control of cellular function by activation of a novel protein responsive to electromagnetic fields | Scientific Reports (nature.com)

https://www.france24.com/en/live-news/20210504-mindblowing-advances-in…

https://thecanadian.news/2021/04/29/chile-wants-to-include-neuro-right…

https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fnins.2019.00112/full

https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fnins.2019.00112/full

https://stop5g.cz/us/magneto-genetics-vaccines-artificial-protein-swit…

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQEDpvQmab86hMgEV6vmNWj92d6dTz5fKHgS_5IduIyaNf4TS–iOb2xz3HLr6n32KCSDlsJ1abodrFnCpA2t-WHBmwYar2m3zFGU-Po0xhiSZKnGfeiIM3AzL_SOTYohVUmEwNZ5zxXKK8Ih95eYn_jphPopTh-VLADrbiSpnAcRBIVoWjtWn9PmON2Ae9c77oUhdID45-Sy4SuUlDe-SaKELw5k&s=518⟩

44. 4 July 2021 — "« We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endow..."

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. — That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, — That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness."

Today we celebrate the Declaration of Independence of the USA.

Respecting and admiring the model of the Declaration of Independence of 4 July 1776, I invoke by this means the right of the Romanian people to declare its independence from all the neo-colonial suzerain powers which undermine the independence and sovereignty of this nation.

Yes, I believe in the American model (from this point of view)!

I want us to become independent again, as the American people did on 4 July 1776.

That is why I also initiated the #LegeaSuveranității, the first step towards regaining our independence and Sovereignty!

The aspiration to independence and sovereignty is a natural, innate right of every people, however large or small that nation may be!

Join the #ArmataSuveranității by enrolling at http://VremSuveranitate.ro/ !

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQF9yHrokS070Yfs3s31SrC2e-AzglhOf0g9VCIFvC7t5hk2GytpfeSp2N8sSQCJBgY-jOhVKYMv_EuTCpehsMLItP3Ks2sISXNWwr46UZPRkgy5yoX5vmljHm5pOF0hku9sVbhoQ6Rd_L1qsWr64N-k-xc53SffY9G05TeeJlOQaQMg-ZP09OkJbsdPQO0Bofyt6UCbEcb44wtUqPDzjDJS0bix4&s=518⟩

45. 7 July 2021 — "#LegeaSuveranității will have a new article"

The #LegeaSuveranității will have a new article

"Article 64 of the Civil Code is amended by the addition of paragraphs 3, 4 and 5, which shall read as follows:

"(3) No authority or individual may, by any technological mechanism, increase, diminish or disturb the individual physical or mental integrity of a person without the express, informed and freely expressed consent of that person.

Any intrusion into or form of intervention upon neuronal connections, as well as any intrusion at the level of the brain through the use of neuro-technology, of a brain–computer interface or of any other system or device, is prohibited in the absence of the express, informed and freely given consent of the person, even in medical circumstances.

Any system or device — whether neuro-technology, a brain–computer interface or another — whose purpose is to access or manipulate neuronal activity, in an invasive or non-invasive manner, is

prohibited if it may affect the psychological and psychic continuity of the person, or if it diminishes or harms the autonomy of their will or their capacity to take decisions freely."

This addition to the law was prompted by the appearance of several studies and discussions in academic circles, and also by the existence of a similar initiative in the Senate of Chile.

I leave below a few links which offer solid arguments in favour of the necessity of introducing into Romanian legislation clear rules in a field which has long ceased to be a science-fiction subject.

https://www.senado.cl/neuroderechos-aprueban-ideas-matrices-destacando...

https://prensa.presidencia.cl/discurso.aspx?id=164419

https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=wCkFBHwjjpg

https://www.weforum.org/people/sebastian-pinera-echenique

https://www.theguardian.com/science/neurophilosophy/2016/mar/24/magnet...

The Sovereignty Act opens new horizons and new fields of law, being the first legislative project in Europe which lays the foundations of the first rules in the field of "neuronal law", thus becoming an example for the countries of the "old continent".

Yes, for once in our history, we are the first in the world!

If you wish to become a volunteer in the #ArmataSuveranității, enrol at http://VremSuveranitate.ro/ !

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQHUWlJnULmHqyPDZHFtcTWPd_OG7bU3dlu9ov399jZHNy1ELfXNSTTkVlQm4l6vx8jzL2VWkx96jcMbxHfZks0p5ztjqMTueVTMo2ALCoxWlM3-BoOK2a1-3Lvyh5XCfJGW7tWkOa-DhZD_dwXgNIW-dRLZCWk2JNKEvKQNMjT4DaF7dlR4KUrbfzpjEsHYTJKJ9xLiqAiUMlNL99-w3_YCdVJ8&s=518⟩

---

46. 8 July 2021 — "Following requests from many supporters and partisans of #LegiiSuveranității, I propose for ..."

Following requests from many supporters and partisans of the #LegiiSuveranității, I propose for your attention a new article:

"After article 9 of Act no. 163 of 11 June 2021 on the adoption of certain measures concerning IT and communications infrastructures of national interest and the conditions for implementing 5G networks, article 9^1 is inserted, reading as follows:

"The technologies and equipment used within IT and communications infrastructures of national interest, and within the electronic communications networks through which 5G electronic communications services are provided, may be installed on buildings in private ownership only after obtaining the agreement of the owner, or, in the case of multi-dwelling buildings, after obtaining the agreement of all the owners and/or co-owners."

I await your views and opinions on the necessity and appropriateness of introducing this new article into the #LegeaSuveranității!

If you wish to become volunteers in the #ArmataSuveranității, go to the page http://VremSuveranitate.ro/ !

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQFL33y5TaWJdwgx-DuVWt-78kqNVbNd572dDtWMSW4ZDmeugyhmgM7WpjggZfLRhqOmDZB3LUFnMRMRs1-aJH1SlD_JngQEXk6zXPhW7BJZIehEmzgFqgss2ECN8HOcnRfoWeC7EVX_A_mUNXygYtQI3e_bqG9f1kNbANJqB0UKa6RHhOlh6XPKG0u6T9xYTgJTTvhJ0cZq0tMh0NHh1NBDMX78&s=518⟩

---

47. 13 July 2021 — "Gauleiter Iohannis is worried about the appearance of the "false sovereignists""

Gauleiter Iohannis is worried about the appearance of the "false sovereignists"

We thank Mr Iohannis for being concerned about the "false sovereignists".

Romanians must not lose sight of the true concept of sovereignty, embodied in art. 1 para. 1 of the Constitution of Romania: "Romania is a national, sovereign and independent, unitary and indivisible State."

True sovereignists write laws in the sovereign and higher interest of the Romanian people; they fight for the dignity and the prosperity of the Romanian citizen.

Moreover, we also agree with Mr Iohannis's statement that "the 'vaccination' (editor's note: for a State governed by the rule of law) of a society can be achieved only through education."

Indeed, Romanian society must be vaccinated against globalism and servility.

The immunisation of society against globalism and against the plundering of Romania by foreigners will be achieved through the adoption by Parliament of the Sovereignty Act.

The #LegeaSuveranității offers Romania antibodies against the felling of the forests by the Austrians, against the plundering of the country's resources by the French and the Germans, and against the export of added value by the multinationals to tax havens.

We thank the good patriot Iohannis for drawing Romanians' attention to the true dangers and for inviting the Romanian people to be vaccinated against servility.

We invite Romanians to defend their country too, by supporting the #LegeaSuveranității initiative at http://VremSuveranitate.ro/

https://www.stiripesurse.ro/video-klaus-iohannis-o-societate-in-adormi...

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQGLXbk0FdBmFKhsi8P2eRDIbhcUGWKkDNxQaCp_ttBIS8Y88t-AcpstQApx9ncbbhNprml1RAm3PHghS-mZyYsVKyjl6Xt__4IqiTI5-wV1EhvhXLLN82j03NW8MzUXmvvP_fF_joR16u4nvegfcZj1jYMMztYmNRUHKQL65_fKzgXLH9j6awnAQvF-vd6Pe9xs6UgG7am6HK3fohPN4cK-u0XsU&s=518⟩

---

48. 15 July 2021 — On political sovereignism

On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see the page The Sovereignty Act.

From a legal point of view, a great injustice has been partly righted — an abuse of the "State of attention!".

From a political point of view, Dragnea was the first politician to support sovereignism publicly and consistently. A pity that he did not go all the way.

Therefore, from a twofold perspective, Dragnea's release gives me joy.

I now expect that, without half measures, Liviu Dragnea will publicly support the #LegeaSuveranității, the embodiment and the keystone of the sovereignist project.

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQFZmp4jTBEQqNZaGJOmFZmM_6jPRdBhVtuBPiUMRkttrmf0UOlikzOD1ZSUhDgCvXXJ-5Ks-qQmI7-JoOFM72Yp3MZM2OybcrSk4VqRRZbN9lDTUzVLySvKoNFkhldSinxUVtte-CtbZIrsmlX5KERjMKJL_t0XS4VLJkqj-BINZdeUYUa6hORb-laaBpzON5FZ8_AZth77yhhUnmUXyPBcuBd4o&s=518⟩

---

49. 3 August 2021 — "#LegeaSuveranității has been supplemented and is approaching its final version, which will be red..."

The #LegeaSuveranității has been supplemented and is approaching its final version, which will be resubmitted to the Legislative Council.

I present below the latest amendments which the Law will bring to the Criminal Code.

"After art. 195 of the Criminal Code, art. 195^1 is inserted, with the marginal heading "Disturbance or modification of physical or mental integrity", which shall read as follows:

"1. Disturbing or modifying the individual physical or mental integrity of a person without that person's express, informed and freely expressed consent is punished by imprisonment from 5 to 10 years.

2. The same penalty shall apply to the act of accessing or manipulating a person's neuronal activity, as well as any intervention upon neuronal connections or intrusion at the level of the brain, in an invasive or non-invasive manner, in the absence of the person's express, informed and freely expressed consent."

Art. 197 of the Criminal Code, with the marginal heading "Ill-treatment of a minor", is amended as follows:

1. After paragraph 1, paragraph 2 is inserted, reading as follows: "The act of inducing a minor who has not reached the age of 18 to change the biological sexual identity acquired at birth is punished by imprisonment from 5 to 10 years.

2. After paragraph 2, paragraph 3 is inserted, reading as follows: "If the act provided for in the preceding paragraph has produced physical consequences upon the minor, the special limits of the penalty are increased by one third."

Art. 221 of the Criminal Code, with the marginal heading "Sexual corruption of minors", is amended as follows:

1. After paragraph 5, paragraph 5^1 is inserted, reading as follows: "(1) The act of making available to children under the age of eighteen any materials of pornographic content which promote departure from gender identity, gender reassignment and homosexuality is punished by imprisonment from 6 months to 3 years.

2. Paragraph 6 is amended and shall read as follows: "(6) The attempt at the offences provided for in paras. (1), (2), (2^1) and (5^1) is punishable."

I await your opinions, and also the copying of these proposals by the parliamentary parties and by our members of parliament.

Yes, this post constitutes an incitement to plagiarism for any Romanian politician.

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQH-I82hXuzx3lr5zlwag3AXdo5sMax1bci4fmBMFdkN6eS-OihQouq6xTYeYCUmeaM5aSyzhokMeHYDgZocAg-zzBo23mSDWp8Fee9p3p6bI2xUIKje-v12mM_z4Y9eqX9prD9bSSk6LVbXHsVcRbb_iGzia0GUxud-_hqPBN-ilNprRGtxULCzOnX45uk9vZbjy0smLMBbQDrOer0xD6xNgOq8&s=518⟩

---

50. 6 August 2021 — "#LegeaSuveranității will have one more article"

The #LegeaSuveranității will have one more article

"After paragraph 1 of article 211 of the Criminal Code, with the marginal heading "Trafficking in minors", article 1^1 is inserted, which shall read as follows:

"The brokering or encouragement of adoptions by persons outside the General Directorate for Social Assistance and Child Protection or the National Authority for the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, Children and Adoptions is punished by imprisonment from 3 to 10 years and the prohibition of the exercise of certain rights."

This last amendment came at the suggestion of a friend who sent me the press article below.

I realised that he is perfectly right: immense fortunes are being made, and have been made, from the sale of Romania's children, from speculating on the extreme poverty of young parents and on the despair of those who want children and cannot have them.

From such speculation in Romanian infants — most of them seen merely as goods fit for export — some have made mountains of money, many houses; some have even become presidents.

The Sovereignty Act must put an end to the squalor of the speculators in lives and in children!

The Sovereignty Act must defend tomorrow's holders of Sovereignty: today's children.

If you too support the same ideas and principles, enrol in the #ArmataSuveranității and become volunteers by signing up at http::://VremSuveranitate.ro

https://www.libertatea.ro/stiri/vanzarea-unui-copil-nu-constituie-in-r...&utm_medium=social&utm_campaign=libertatea-page-post

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQHuJAvjBrtzoQLGjO7z7LdSCMHgGMj1j6AkqCe1VeMfHcZyWZk7DHOYqG2SI1j1YvEUPKhEp-RwjtaAtaX_Ij92bFdbpwlcCDniZ8xochF8Lxcc4y2XSFeed7AKUGTIi68V1XtfOL-vcKl8uQrnB6HBytjR8iftrPHpaY-D1cA_6jRTmNy3tPxTnHPJFJbeBogxkGlPpidbVtmqqNy9gIUPxrHYM&s=518⟩

---

51. 9 August 2021 — "Eight months have already passed since we began work on #LegeaSuveranității! We shall soon reach the stage..."

Eight months have already passed since we began work on the #LegeaSuveranității! Soon we shall reach the stage of publication in the Official Gazette.

Meanwhile the Sovereignty Act is beginning to produce its effects, even before it has reached Parliament.

For the first time in the last 30 years, the word "SOVEREIGNTY" is being used in Romania in the public space!

More and more public figures dare to utter this word, which until the beginning of this year was considered either too "abstract" or downright politically incorrect.

Even some politicians have taken courage and introduced this word into their vocabulary. I have heard Adrian Năstase say SOVEREIGNTY several times; even Ludovic Orban used it in a context connected with their internal competition. Not to mention that even Ciolacu has taken courage and come out from under the bed with SOVEREIGNTY in his mouth.

I hope that more and more politicians will say SOVEREIGNTY. And that they will believe what they say. I hope that the appearance of this notion in public discourse will have as its effect a regaining of the Sovereignty lost over the last 30 years, a period in which politicians were afraid even to think it, let alone pronounce it.

And that is not the only "precocious" effect of the Sovereignty Act. Since this citizens' legislative initiative has been spoken of, more and more members of parliament are struck by inspiration and speak of all sorts of legislative initiatives. Which is extraordinary!

Simion's golden ones speak of an initiative concerning a moratorium on the felling of forests and of the intention to copy the Hungarian law against transgender propaganda. Certainly, these "initiatives" were already to be found in the Sovereignty Act when the inspiration came to the members of parliament mentioned above, but never mind. Not only does plagiarism in this matter not disturb me, but I implore them to copy the text exactly, so that these initiatives have a chance of passing.

Likewise, Senator Șoșoacă has a legislative initiative called the anti-Romanianism initiative. I do not know what it concerns, for I have not seen the text of the law proposed, just as I have not seen the texts of the laws "written" by Simion's boys. But never mind. The intention to legislate is correct and legitimate for a member of parliament. That is precisely why they are sent to Parliament: to make laws… even at the verbal level it is good that the intention to legislate is expressed, the intention not to let the structures of the System write all our laws for us.

Yes, my dear friends, I am proud of this first success of ours, of those of us who have been working for eight months on the draft Sovereignty Act!

SOVEREIGNTY has returned to the dictionary of Romanian politicians. I hope that soon it will also enter their agenda — their real agenda, not their declared one.

And members of parliament are beginning to compete in inspiration and productivity in the field of legislative initiatives.

We, however, must go #PânăLaCapăt — all the way!

And the end of our road will not be there and then, when the law reaches Parliament, nor even when and if it is voted by the present Parliament.

The final destination is the Sovereignty of Romania, the dignity and the prosperity of this people.

That is why I invite you to join the #ArmataSuveranității and to enrol as a volunteer at http://Vrem-Suveranitate.ro/

Post scriptum: I cannot remember… have I already written the word SOVEREIGNTY in this post?

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQHB1j6WSzvjI3gOvZusr86aSEOY5R4xiE4p8JgGrJIcnil-boGTpGh-cll0_a_exDZ4n2FbfbdwKDiiQZwFOqrtP4pawrHXQhjOhaQddWbXxbTIEvIco3L7tKFmsGlkII7TiR5jwPA4EAzR-BR1CPkDeOHsqUrbjCR0o4ybVxCDaoMUM-G0szdS4EpZCk-GUTElxL7U1lIft6JxlcqdiWC1uoSkc&s=518⟩

52. 9 August 2021 — "I have just learned that word is going round that I am being briefed in the USA... that any CIA agent, as the saying..."

I have just learned that word is going round that I am supposedly being briefed in the USA… like any CIA agent, as the saying goes.

Apparently I am not alone, but accompanied by the Mossad agent Diplan, with whom I work under cover.

In order to try to deny this information — evidently true — I shall have to call upon the ultra-secret teleportation device of my colleagues at the CIA… so within the next hour I shall be in the centre of Bucharest. If anyone wants me to bring something from the States, I await a message in the comments.

Bear in mind that I also have to pack, and we agents have a great deal of equipment, so: only small things — a chocolate bar, a can of cola, no more.

I leave you below the photograph from the briefing centre where I am working on the explanatory memorandum for the #LegeaSuveranității, together with certain grey eminences.

Lord… how hard it is to be a secret agent these days!

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQFcsI-0U9sHi7miF05o5UC–NzTv5_-smcHM6-FOipS6O49575pE2JF_v3g1hjb1YP97ota9rL_jp1eS4ABPUmujyBMuPMsv_-0oA7xl0rAPpujHLUyWvD-abXDKFUJ-1KyPF03EKK88XfxcVx0JZz-fkKKys1JFuwug98XI-HzRt91Ez52to-0f_2triCKIE9lHYzMnXnOIj1o-neG4t6jSHa20&s=518⟩

53. 25 August 2021 — "I have no doubt. And he is not merely one of our ordinary securitate men: he has a double command, from..."

I have no doubt. And he is not merely one of our ordinary securitate men: he has a double command — from here and from across the pond.

Everything, absolutely everything in his curriculum vitae, his colourless personality and mediocre intellect, all the support he enjoys from the highest spheres despite his dusty and proven criminal past, all his anti-national actions — from the speculative attack on the Leu a few years ago to the doubling of Romania's external debt within a few months — strengthens my conviction that this collaborator is not like any other collaborator in our politics... there is something "special" about this one.

In the short term I do not know… probably we should take to the streets in force, for the opposition is impotent and the disaster is imminent.

In the long term, however, we must not allow such a thing to happen again; we must no longer permit agents of foreign powers to reach positions of public dignity or public authority.

By criminalising the act, by bringing it within the sphere of the criminal law, by qualifying it as TREASON.

That is why, in the latest version of the Sovereignty Act, art. 394 of the Criminal Code has been amended and the reach of the criminal law has been extended to this act and to this category of perpetrators.

Here is how art. 9 para. 9 of the #LegeaSuveranității reads:

"In article 394, paragraph (1), a new letter is inserted, letter e), reading as follows:

"e) the exercise of a function of public dignity or one which entails the exercise of State authority."

In the Explanatory memorandum of the Sovereignty Act I also set out the reasons why such an amendment is imperatively necessary:

"Paragraph 9 introduces a new letter into article 394 of the Criminal Code, with the marginal heading Treason — letter e — which criminalises the act of a Romanian citizen of entering into contact with a foreign power or organisation, or with agents thereof, for the purpose of suppressing or impairing the unity and indivisibility, the sovereignty or the independence of the State, through the exercise of a function of public dignity or one which entails the exercise of State authority. Account was taken of the fact that the exercise of a function of public dignity, or of a function entailing the exercise of State authority, by the active subject of the offence of treason — namely by the Romanian citizen who has entered into contact with a foreign power or organisation, or with agents thereof, for the purpose of suppressing or impairing the unity and indivisibility, the sovereignty or the independence of the State — constitutes a danger to national sovereignty and to the security of the State. The exercise of such a function of public dignity, or of one entailing the exercise of State authority, constitutes a state of real and imminent danger to the constitutional and legal order in Romania, without there being any need for the existence of the means provided for in letters a to d of article 394 of the Criminal Code; for which reason, in defence of national sovereignty and of economic, financial, health and social security, it is necessary to criminalise this act precisely in order to avoid the consequences of the criminal actions of citizens who have entered into contact with a foreign power or organisation, or with agents thereof — the accession of such persons to such a function being the very aim pursued by the foreign powers and organisations or by their agents. Account was likewise taken of the fact that the offence of High treason, provided for and punished by article 398 of the Criminal Code, criminalises only acts committed by "the President of Romania or by another member of the Supreme Council of National Defence", leaving outside the criminal sphere the acts committed by the other persons who exercise functions of public dignity or functions entailing the exercise of State authority."

Moreover, if the legislative amendment takes place during Cîțu's term of office, the newly criminalised act could produce its effects in his regard as well... and he would risk a penalty of 10 to 20 years' imprisonment. It is true that he already has a little practice... 2 days are a good beginning for 20 years!

If you agree with this initiative, enrol as volunteers in the #ArmataSuveranității at http://VremSuveranitate.ro/

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQEo4hlUO-lxA6z__UwNozJIv08gleNaOB8GRKVjYhgR-VMwcJuJNj9MNs0fJcPmtieEzUY0izMKmSrXOmPqt-b1UDzGdz75yMwh0nmLx_T1Jjtohle_fMYddhuF8VDHENy0dmE2X2fvqE_O6eiTsHimru9ao-0in-vhhdGpmBEYxj1kfnc52cvRxKEiO0XqGvjuCTUsm8MFURwF68WCImkWg-Wdk&s=518⟩

54. 26 August 2021 — "On #LegeaSuveranității, the formalities at the Constitutional Court and the Legislative Council, and on the effe..."

On the #LegeaSuveranității, the formalities at the Constitutional Court and the Legislative Council, and on the precocious effects of the Sovereignty Act: after 30 years almost the entire political class is speaking of Sovereignty and, likewise after 30 years, more and more popular legislative initiatives have appeared; the people is speaking of its power to legislate.

If we also succeed in getting it through Parliament, we shall have the first true Romanian Revolution.

Support the Sovereignty Act and become a volunteer at http://VremSuveranitate.ro/ !

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQGnNlJhLtI6wIvsKTP0pIKmAF5onJRUAlqmYGPggDL7p-bEYW_jRu-9fW_azrYoVlZWUP1NKPbMUdUOfzRSDFOuC2FX5j_GQYlGexU6xenEP8RWcZXYuWSgjvzBsD3-tuWnzYfak8B7T9IHMR9LR0G8vWSFwXKsU1lS-c_1VroJp3b7B-WY58SaOSsSl7IN1rYFZOYR2yx9oBfvLwZLqUW7cVU6I&s=518⟩

55. 27 August 2021 — On the publication of the draft

On the Green Romania Act: the full text of the draft — see the page The Green Romania Act.

From today I shall publish here fragments from the #LegeaSuveranității and from its Explanatory memorandum.

After 8 months of consultations and joint work on this draft law, after 20 versions and dozens of hours of discussions, this is the result of our labour:

The Act for the protection of the higher and sovereign interest of the Romanian people and citizen"

Starting from the constitutional principle that national sovereignty belongs to the Romanian people, and also from the need for increased involvement of the Romanian citizen in the decision-making and legislative process through the implementation of the principle of participatory democracy, by the exercise of the right of legislative initiative by at least 100,000 citizens with the right to vote, in observance of art. 5 para. (1) of Act no. 24/2000 on the norms of legislative technique for the drafting of normative acts, read together with the provisions of art. 74 paragraph (1) of the Constitution of Romania, republished,

proceeding from the necessity of adopting a law which guarantees and strengthens the sovereignty of the Romanian State, governed by article 1 paragraph (1) of the Constitution of Romania, republished, through the implementation of necessary and urgent measures in various fields which are such as to affect national sovereignty, understood both as the right of the nation to identity and self-determination and as a state of law conforming to the constitutional order,

having regard to the need to guarantee and strengthen the fundamental rights of the citizen by instituting rules which make impossible the limitation, delay or avoidance of parliamentary scrutiny of normative acts providing for limitations, restrictions or conditions upon fundamental rights and freedoms, and to the need to repeal the legal provisions in force which make such unconstitutional limitations possible,

taking into account the indications and conclusions of the Resolution of the European Parliament of 13 November 2020 on the impact of COVID-19 measures on democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights (2020/2790(RSP)) in the Member States, among them Romania,

and also taking into account the imperative character of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Dignity of the Human Being with regard to the Application of Biology and Medicine — the Convention on Human Rights and Biomedicine, signed at Oviedo on 4 April 1997 — and of the Additional Protocol to the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Dignity of the Human Being with regard to the Application of Biology and Medicine, on the Prohibition of Cloning Human Beings, signed at Paris on 12 January 1998, ratified by Act no. 17 of 22 February 2001, and of the Convention of 26 November 1968 on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 26 November 1968, and of the need for the direct and immediate implementation of those conventions in national legislation, with the effect of explicitly and indiscriminately prohibiting the compulsory administration of any medical treatments and/or devices, and of prohibiting any form of discrimination as a result of accepting or refusing any medical treatments and/or devices,

having regard to the fact that the protection of human dignity is founded on the idea that man is an intellectual and moral being inclined to determine himself and to develop in freedom, and also that the inalienable dignity of man consists precisely in the necessity that his status as a responsible person be respected,

taking into consideration the need to strengthen the rule of law through the observance of legality and constitutionality by the direct, non-discriminatory and immediate implementation of the decisions of the Constitutional Court; having regard to the need to render transparent the decision-making process of the administration by publishing all acts of general interest and making them fully and freely available to citizens through the care of the Official Gazette of Romania, to the need to guarantee freedom of expression in the online environment, and to the need for parliamentary representation of as large a proportion as possible of Romanian citizens with the right to vote,

taking into consideration the disastrous ecological situation at national level, and the drastic diminution of the national forest stock caused by the massive and irrational deforestation and clear-felling of the last 30 years, and the need to prohibit the abusive and excessive exploitation of forests with a view to the reconstruction and regeneration of the national forest stock, and the need for the immediate and total prohibition of the export of unprocessed timber and of the import of waste,

taking into account the obligation to preserve the national patrimony and the need to maximise the profitability of the exploitation of the riches held in public ownership for the benefit of the Romanian citizen, with the consequence of criminalising any acts having the effect of diminishing the national wealth,

having regard to the low degree of transparency of the decision-making process within public institutions in Romania,

taking into consideration the need for the defence of the entire national territory by the entire people on a voluntary basis, and the need to acquire new, latest-generation military equipment directly from the manufacturer and exclusively in observance of the national legislation governing Offset in the field of military procurement,

taking into account the decisions of the Constitutional Court on the constitutionality of certain provisions in criminal and criminal-procedural matters, and in other social fields as well,

having regard to the fact that the more than 100,000 citizens' signatures in favour of this legislative initiative constitute a viable argument for respecting the will of the Romanian people and its sovereignty,

The Parliament of Romania adopts this law:

Section 1 — Title of the draft normative act

The Act for the protection of the higher and sovereign interest of the Romanian people and citizen"

Section 2 — Grounds for issuing the normative act

In recent years, and particularly in the last year and a half following the appearance of the SARS-CoV-2 virus, a series of rules have been adopted in Romanian legislation which contravene, either individually or as a whole, the spirit and the letter of the Constitution of Romania, republished. This state of fact and of law is such as to affect gravely and directly the sovereignty of the Romanian State, governed by article 1, paragraph 1 of the Constitution, sovereignty being understood both as the right of the nation to identity and self-determination and as a state of law conforming to the constitutional order.

The reaction to the situation of stress to which the Romanian State and the Romanian citizen have been subjected as a result of the appearance of the pandemic state, from March 2020 to the present, both economically and socially, has revealed a series of dysfunctions at the level of the institutions of the Romanian State such as to affect directly, fundamentally and irreversibly national sovereignty.

Not least, it follows from the conclusions of the Resolution of the European Parliament of 13 November 2020 on the impact of COVID-19 measures on democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights (2020/2790(RSP)) that in Romania too advantage was taken of lacunary legislation which leaves room for excesses dangerous to the rights and freedoms of the Romanian citizen, to sustainable economic and social development, and also to the coherence and correct functioning of the security institutions of Romania — a matter which has resulted in the infringement of constitutional rights and freedoms.

Moreover, in adopting restrictive measures by laws and normative acts for the management of the crisis generated by the COVID-19 pandemic, the authorities in Romania never observed the principle of proportionality with the forecast or manifest level of gravity of the crisis, nor the principle of the non-discriminatory application of those restrictive measures — principles expressly governed by article 53 paragraph (2) of the Constitution of Romania for the restriction of the exercise of certain rights or freedoms.

Having regard to the above, the immediate necessity of this legislative initiative follows, with a view to remedying the situation described.

The normal and immediate solution is the enactment of a single regulation to correct the state of law described above, by concentrating and implementing targeted measures intended to consolidate the national sovereignty belonging to the Romanian people. The internal and international economic, social and political developments of recent years have had as their effect the pronounced undermining of the sovereignty of the Romanian people.

Popular sovereignty represents the right of the people to decide its own future and to establish the priorities of the State, its organisation and functioning, as well as the right of the people to supervise the activity of the State.

Under article 2, paragraph (2) of the Constitution of Romania, republished, "National sovereignty belongs to the Romanian people…"

Present-day reality demonstrates that the rigours of the Constitution are no longer to be found in the quality of life of Romania's citizens.

The suppression of popular sovereignty and the existing chaos in the relations between the three powers — legislative, executive and judicial — annul the concept of constitutional democracy and contribute to the invalidation of the Social Contract existing between the people and its authorities.

Thus, the Romanian people can no longer dispose sovereignly of the natural, material and human resources existing on the territory of the country; the authorities institute abusive medical measures against their own citizens; the electoral process is systematically defrauded; and the intelligence services are no longer in the service of the Romanian people.

For these reasons, and not least in order to restore to the people the sovereignty guaranteed by the Constitution, certain legislative amendments have become necessary, as well as the introduction of new legal rules whereby sovereignty is governed and imposed much more explicitly.

The Sovereignty Act has as its sole object of regulation the restoration of sovereignty and of the rule of law, as provided for by article 1 paragraph 1 of the Constitution of Romania. The uniqueness of the regulation in the matter of national sovereignty takes concrete form through amendments to rules in connected matters, indispensable to the achievement of the aim pursued.

These amendments constitute the means by which sovereignty and the rule of law in Romania are consolidated. The legislative project proceeds from the constitutional rigour that sovereignty belongs to the Romanian people and that it rests upon four pillars:

1) strengthening and guaranteeing the rights and freedoms of the citizen, and the sovereignty and security of the Romanian State;

2) protecting and ensuring a healthy environment allowing the development and the normal life of the citizen;

3) maximising the benefits obtained by the citizen from the natural riches of the country and, generally, from the economic environment, seen as means of socio-economic development; and

4) consolidating the national defence system, a system which is to be made more efficient and subordinated exclusively to the will of the people, having as its sole purpose the guaranteeing of the sovereignty, independence and unity of the State, of the territorial integrity of the country and of constitutional democracy, in observance of the provisions of art. 118 of the Constitution of Romania.

If you agree with the principles promoted by the Sovereignty Act, enrol as a volunteer in the #ArmataSuveranității at http://VremSuveranitate.ro/ !

(On the Green Romania Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQELbCqXKvzAz4Oh1EaEIPCCrwp61mOjaz9rDUOqq10g9Esl0gQRbppSeOoue-wo02H3CPzL6Y-B1uhI_ZD6SknGFlxcogoAA1wH_qGSkON5xpWOGwZ6SP4HpnvrDSaXkv5qeLKWN7QBstzu1Df3nIS1Rf2PzNCsGXN90gHQJvWGHGXAm0UNjOUiBWkfMCl5uRaXCBw6eKNe9BeooUMLfvI-lzrs&s=518⟩

---

56. 28 August 2021 — “After the “Preamble” of the Act and the sub-chapter “Description of the present situation” of the Explanatory memor...”

After the “Preamble” of the Law and the sub-chapter “Description of the present situation” of the Explanatory memorandum to the #LegeaSuveranității, from today we shall set out one article (or, in some cases, one paragraph) at a time from our legislative project.

Limitations of fundamental human rights and freedoms may not be established by normative administrative acts.”

“Chapter I adopts new rules or legislative amendments aimed at consolidating the rule of law and protecting the higher and sovereign interest of the Romanian people and citizen.

Article 1 excludes the possibility of limiting fundamental human rights and freedoms by normative administrative acts, thereby restoring the supremacy of the Constitution and of the rights established by it for the Romanian citizen, seen as the legitimate beneficiary of constitutional rights and the sole holder of national sovereignty. In this way the possibility is eliminated of arbitrary limitations of fundamental rights being instituted by administrative entities which have no right to legislate or to establish restrictions of rights and freedoms. The aim pursued is the consolidation of the principle of the separation of powers in the State and of constitutional democracy, principles according to which the Romanian State is organised under article 1 para. 4 of the Constitution.”

Of course, we could also have said that the reaffirmation of this Constitutional principle has as its purpose the restoration of normality in the midst of a period of Constitutional aberration and absurdity, in which by Government Decisions — normative administrative acts, and therefore of infra-legal status — limitations of fundamental rights of the citizen are established.

But we did not go into further detail in the Explanatory memorandum… it would have been superfluous even for a primary-school pupil.

Of course, these Government Decisions are issued on the basis of a law which is itself unconstitutional — Act 55/2020. A law which will have the fate it deserves, and which you will discover in only two days.

Until then, if you agree with the principles promoted by the Sovereignty Act, enrol as a volunteer in the #ArmataSuveranității at http://VremSuveranitate.ro/ !

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQGzbOxhud-PoCKH_MHZ8ZmUtWnH8Idwmv0aNDQDUotVyB5CeEWa5IYRmr6k0kgeHZzAave3hWV5504TjEFe69PiHDDzTyNgA0GxQ4pcH4ZspWRlgXF4gZ-N-5kDtMQc8oifK-oxhWL9Xcf-FiTDRd2SosUhV2MvNrfaxLzXDFX_EoyucUGbYQ7K5GjlztfRwj-TnAhvIC9CPnLfw469kQ77t2wlI&s=518⟩

---

57. 29 August 2021 — “We continue the presentation with Article 2 of #LegeaSuveranității”

We continue the presentation with Article 2 of the #LegeaSuveranității

Article 4 of Emergency Ordinance no. 1/1999 on the regime of the state of siege and the state of emergency, published in the Official Gazette no. 22 of 21 January 1999, as subsequently supplemented and amended, is amended and shall read as follows:

“During the state of siege or the state of emergency, the exercise of certain fundamental rights and freedoms may be restricted only in so far as the situation requires it and in observance of art. 53 of the Constitution of Romania, republished, with the exception of the human rights and fundamental freedoms provided for in art. 32, and of those laid down in the Constitution in articles 21 — Free access to justice, 22 — The right to life and to physical and mental integrity, 23 — Individual liberty, 24 — The right to defence, 26 — Intimate, family and private life, 28 — The secrecy of correspondence, 29 — Freedom of conscience, 30 — Freedom of expression, 31 — The right to information, 34 — The right to the protection of health and 35 — The right to a healthy environment, 40 — The right of association, 42 — The prohibition of forced labour, 44 — The right of private property, 45 — Economic freedom, 46 — The right of inheritance, 47 — The standard of living, 48 — The family, 49

— The protection of children and young people, 50 — The protection of persons with disabilities, 51 — The right of petition."

"Article 2 amends, in the sense described above, Emergency Ordinance 1/1999, eliminating the possibility of restricting the exercise of fundamental rights during the state of siege and the state of emergency. Account was taken of the fact that no situation, however exceptional, can justify the restriction of rights inherent in the human condition and in the status of citizen — a fact confirmed by the wording of art. 15 of the Constitution: "(1) Citizens enjoy the rights and freedoms enshrined in the Constitution and in other laws, and have the obligations laid down therein." Thus, the Right to life and to physical and mental integrity, the Right to defence, the Right to free movement, the Right to intimate, family and private life, to the Inviolability of the home, to freedom of conscience or to freedom of expression cannot be limited on any ground whatever, since their restriction could not have as its hypothetical outcome an exit from an exceptional situation, but rather the deepening of a state of abnormality."

If you agree with the principles promoted by the Sovereignty Act, enrol as a volunteer in the #ArmataSuveranității at http://VremSuveranitate.ro/ !

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQHNgj54Sy-a4ze_CpOCCRCES2mohdXSHP2GhQdc263UbveEv3Rcy8BARz9cFwZ5xAPRTHMfCT1qzxsyLcOQZQgcDbb8Bz3EbPY9Xi0bU2oifjUEiPFL5qBWCCTnGDxaB-Y6M2EOeGHxNPDH-nJFP8m43nUo159Ffu9QvvdUVQZdeORAL9nbUXjqgFf-xwYZMP014Iw2-MaA_oQhU1szB7OsARpKY&s=518⟩

---

58. 30 August 2021 — On article 3 of the Act

On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see the page The Sovereignty Act.

Article 3 of the #LegeaSuveranității is clear, simple and unequivocal

Act 55 of 15 May 2020 on certain measures for preventing and combating the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic, published in the Official Gazette of Romania, Part I, no. 396 of 15 May 2020, as subsequently amended and supplemented, is repealed"

In article 3, for the same reasons set out above, Act 55/2020 is repealed in its entirety, on the basis of the considerations set out by the Constitutional Court in Decision 457/2020. In the reasoning of that Decision the Constitutional Court held unequivocally that "To 'construct' by law a new institution — the 'state of alert', with a regime evidently less restrictive than the state of emergency governed by the constituent legislature — but one which permits the circumvention of the constitutional framework governing legality, the separation of powers in the State, and the conditions for restricting the exercise of certain rights and freedoms, is contrary to the general requirements of the State governed by the rule of law, as enshrined in the Constitution of Romania." In reaching that conclusion, the Constitutional Court also held that "even in a state of public emergency, the fundamental principle of the rule of law must prevail. The rule of law consists of several aspects which are all of capital importance and must be maintained in their entirety. Those elements are the principle of legality, the separation of powers, the division of powers, human rights, the State monopoly on force, public and independent administration of justice, protection of privacy, the right to vote, freedom of access to political power, democratic participation of citizens and their supervision of the decision-making process, decision-making, transparency of government, freedom of expression, association and assembly, the rights of minorities, and the majority rule in political decision-making. The rule of law means that governmental agencies must operate within the law and their actions must be subject to

review by independent courts. The legal certainty of individuals must be guaranteed." Not least, account is taken of the fact that it is no longer justified to maintain a regulation of limited applicability arising from an exceptional situation — the coronavirus COVID-19 pandemic — all the more so since, at the time of the formulation of this legislative proposal, the World Health Organization is on the point of declaring the transition from pandemic to a controllable endemic state. Having regard to all these aspects — the manifestly unconstitutional character of Act 55/2020, all of them produced by the state of pressure created by the pandemic situation in which that legal provision was adopted, and also the need to resume, under conditions of normality, the legislative process for the adoption of a rule of general applicability for pandemic, endemic and epidemiological situations — the sole solution for a return to a state of legality and constitutionality, as the only modes of exercising national sovereignty, is the repeal in its entirety of Act 55/2020.

If you agree with the principles promoted by the Sovereignty Act, enrol as a volunteer in the #ArmataSuveranității at http://VremSuveranitate.ro/ !

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQHt5WZYGPncVuY-i8Bs-2uzS99Qm7vsG2CZMiBYmSULrr5rGbmM0MIqCy1Okgd6K3p1_h5sqVclRsGA84nJ3q40wo_9982af-uZXpI5bl3mgbV3q4zngeoGc1WUyC0RLaCa6XcQwuj8dbXIbsAlGk-wI9LryK4Z4fpiwsXZEoHMocXShj0bHMD0Lr_WMEVQ0LxaxTP8zYVCVuQo9G7YVgjDnPCdg&s=518⟩

59. 31 August 2021 — "#LegeaSuveranității makes it impossible to administer compulsorily any type of medicinal product..."

The #LegeaSuveranității makes it impossible to administer compulsorily any type of medicine, sanitary material, medical device or any other therapeutic means, and prohibits any form of positive or negative discrimination "as a result of accepting or refusing a medical treatment or device."

Act 46 of 21 January 2003 on the rights of the patient, published in the Official Gazette no. 51 of 29 January 2003, as subsequently amended and supplemented, is amended and supplemented as follows:

In article 4, after paragraph (1), a new paragraph is inserted, para. (2), reading as follows:

"Medicines, sanitary materials, medical devices and other therapeutic means may be administered or applied to Romanian citizens only after obtaining beforehand the agreement and written consent of the patients, following prior and obligatory information given on the basis of the leaflets supplied by the manufacturer of the medicines proposed, medical emergencies excepted."

After article 36^1, a new article is inserted, art. 36^2, reading as follows:

"No citizen may be discriminated against, positively or negatively, as a result of accepting or refusing a medical treatment or device."

"Article 4 amends the Patients' Rights Act 46/2003, requiring the agreement and written consent of the patient to be obtained before the administration of medicines, sanitary materials, medical devices and other therapeutic means. The measure is absolutely necessary for strengthening the citizen's right to life and to physical and mental integrity, brought into accord with freedom of conscience. Each of these is an element indissolubly linked to the sovereignty of the people, seen as the totality of citizens whose rights and freedoms must be guaranteed.

For the same reason, in paragraph 2 of article 4 there is also prohibited any discrimination, positive or negative, as a result of accepting or refusing a medical treatment or device. Any discrimination is

contrary to the Constitution, being such as to affect the rights and freedoms of a part of the people — a fact which directly affects not only the right of the citizen as an individual but the very sovereignty of the Romanian State, through the discrimination against and the limitation of the rights of a part of society."

If you agree with the principles promoted by the Sovereignty Act, enrol as a volunteer in the #ArmataSuveranității at http://VremSuveranitate.ro/ !

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQG8meXkDA2DvT44j-SGwYZU0Vi9NISj6Z-jHDiTUv0V1qP62VieSTHBaPgCIE8zJsbheSrVCW18-ZcsEfnMIV-iI0lSmjmkioc-uDSO2w5LqwfGzapLRR6OEViZx8hmsk63GsVJsHg0H_IJe6UAbq6io2U3VPLoU2nhzh3EukPqOXj2e3E7Huh25D2CsSrZNBB9ZUqETY232uDjFygz3bOfeuI&s=518⟩

---

60. 1 September 2021 — "#LegeaSuveranității prohibits the marketing or the use of medicines, vaccines, ..."

The #LegeaSuveranității prohibits the marketing or use of medicines, vaccines, medical devices and other pharmaceutical products for which the manufacturer does not offer guarantees and demonstrably viable remedies, or for which complete clinical trials have not been carried out; it eliminates advertising for medicines and prohibits the offering of advantages (the bribing) of doctors by the manufacturers of medicines:

Act 95 of 14 April 2006 on the reform of the health system, republished, published in the Official Gazette no. 652 of 28 August 2015, as subsequently amended and supplemented, is amended and supplemented as follows:

After article 704, a new article is inserted, art. 704^1, reading as follows:

"(1) No medicines or medical devices may be marketed or used, and no medical treatments applied, for which the manufacturer does not offer guarantees and demonstrably viable remedies against adverse effects.

The marketing or use of medicines, vaccines, medical devices and other pharmaceutical products for which complete clinical trials have not been carried out in accordance with the methodology established by Law is prohibited."

In article 811, paragraph (1) is amended and shall read as follows:

"(1) For the purposes of this chapter, advertising for medicines includes any form of information by direct contact (the "door-to-door" system), as well as any form of promotion intended to encourage the prescription, distribution, sale or consumption of medicines; advertising for medicines shall include in particular:

- advertising for medicines directed at persons qualified to prescribe or distribute medicines;

- visits by medical representatives to persons qualified to prescribe medicines;

Article 813 is amended and shall read as follows:

"(1) Any form of commercial advertising on television, radio and on social networks for authorised or unauthorised medicines, vaccines, medical devices and other pharmaceutical products is prohibited.

The direct distribution of medicines to the population by manufacturers for promotional purposes is prohibited.

Article 5 seeks to defend the state of health of the Romanian people, holder of national sovereignty, amendments being made to Act 95/2006 on the reform of the health system whereby the marketing or use of medicines, vaccines, medical devices and other pharmaceutical products is prohibited where the manufacturer does not offer guarantees and demonstrably viable remedies, or where complete clinical trials have not been carried out.

Likewise, in paragraph 2, three sub-points of article 811 of Act 95 of 14 April 2006 are repealed which permit certain immoral forms of advertising for medicines with a direct impact on the state of health of the Romanian people — a fact which endangers national sovereignty. For that reason, sub-points 5, 6 and 7 of article 811 of Act 95 of 14 April 2006, reading as follows, have also been removed: "- encouraging the prescription or distribution of medicines by offering, promising or granting advantages in money or in kind, save in cases where these are of symbolic value; - sponsoring promotional meetings attended by persons qualified to prescribe or distribute medicines; - sponsoring scientific congresses attended by persons qualified to prescribe or distribute medicines and, in particular, paying the travel and accommodation expenses occasioned by them."

For the same reasons, in paragraph 3, art. 813 of Act 95/2006 has been amended, prohibiting any form of commercial advertising on television, radio and on social networks for authorised or unauthorised medicines, vaccines, medical devices and other pharmaceutical products.

For the same considerations, the direct distribution of medicines to the population by manufacturers for promotional purposes has also been prohibited.

If you agree with the principles promoted by the Sovereignty Act, enrol as a volunteer in the #ArmataSuveranității at http://VremSuveranitate.ro/ !

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQH4CmJle1zsEI3fi80E8Wj-iVLrH3V5A4D27RwnAV-MnFEZ_7X_AJeVE28YFT5Fxs9c89-mKy614mafOVoheoN-HFA_tkBQvcB21FI6PCz1LjmhyB_WKbdBW0DzzZZSvlf8EzoWQNxJDs4d6PIZmtvWr_yi7PUpKvlUoTlMTcLioA-4Hxn8yG2_iWNnzldKcxvRyhPPQj7YCktP39NzZNVDf020&s=518⟩

---

61. 2 September 2021 — "#LegeaSuveranității makes it impossible to change the sexual identity of children and prohibits..."

The #LegeaSuveranității makes it impossible to change the sexual identity of children and prohibits propaganda which promotes departure from biological sexual identity, gender reassignment and homosexuality.

Act 272 of 21 June 2004 on the protection and promotion of the rights of the child, republished, published in the Official Gazette no. 159 of 5 March 2014, as subsequently amended and supplemented, is amended and supplemented as follows:

In article 9, after paragraph (1), a new paragraph is inserted, para. (1^1), reading as follows:

"The biological sexual identity of the child acquired at birth may not be changed before the age of 18."

In article 28, after paragraph (4), a new paragraph is inserted, para. (5), reading as follows:

"It is prohibited to make available to children under the age of eighteen any information or materials which promote departure from biological sexual identity, gender reassignment and homosexuality."

In article 46, paragraph (3), letter i) is amended and shall read as follows:

"the systematic conduct in schools, at least once per semester, of programmes of education for life, including sexual education for children over 14, with a view to preventing the contraction of sexually transmitted diseases and the pregnancy of minors;"

Article 6 amends Act 272/2004 on the protection and promotion of the rights of the child, introducing provisions concerning the defence of the physical and mental integrity of the minor, in his capacity as a citizen holding rights. Thus, until the age of 18, any form of intervention upon the body of the minor for the purpose of changing the sexual identity acquired at birth is prohibited. At the same time it is prohibited to make available to children any materials of a pornographic character or which promote departure from gender identity, such materials being capable of causing psychological traumas which will mark the citizen's entire existence. In adopting these amendments, account is taken both of the higher interest of the child and of his right to decide and dispose of his own body in full knowledge of the facts after the moment of attaining psychological maturity, so that any premature influences upon the normal physical and mental development of the Romanian citizen are removed. Not least, account is taken of the irreversible character of any premature gender modifications — modifications which will have a negative effect both upon the development of the minor and, directly, upon the birth rate in Romania, an aspect which directly influences national sovereignty."

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQEOgHazgjLrVDtU5sZL8MCGfkbQB-FCohy0t78H-2TS3TuLzndbSP69U6v8QYopfNki936m1BSZm2K57n-y2j-pOir5Eu7NnGT2-_q4PpF0R8yRo32Qy_7DodKGAKRT2q4rD3VTpbVAaPgObMmCdpkUSfbUJpWL4kgDbLn3DlbLSz869mbN_d41iMj7Q4VSpiWn8SbdpxvAE2eDnyhIa4y1mF-w&s=518⟩

---

62. 3 September 2021 — "#LegeaSuveranității prohibits and punishes every possible form of intrusion at the level of ..."

The #LegeaSuveranității prohibits and punishes every possible form of intrusion at the level of the brain through the use of neuro-technology, instituting new guarantees concerning the individual physical and mental integrity of the person.

This regulation is a world first, being the first express and explicit rule seeking to protect and to secure respect for the "neuronal rights" of the person; a similar regulation is to be found only on the agenda of the Senate of Chile, but has not been adopted up to this moment.

Not least, it must be said that in the greatest universities of the world the studies and discussions on the subject of the discipline called "neuronal law", and of "neuronal rights", are advanced, the existence of rules instituting guarantees at this level being regarded as a necessity and an urgency in relation to the speed of technological development and to the discussions concerning the imminence of the implementation of what is called "biodigital convergence" or NBICS (NANOTECHNOLOGY, BIOTECHNOLOGY, INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND COGNITIVE SCIENCE).

More details about NBICS and the reason why we considered the adoption of a regulation in this field to be urgent may be found at https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/os...

Having regard to all the above, and starting from the principle that "good watch wards off ill fortune", at the suggestion of my friend Radu Golban I have proposed the following text of law — a text which, as you will see in the coming days, is supplemented in the Sovereignty Act by a criminal provision which criminalises the act of infringing the neuronal rights of any person:

In article 64 of Act no. 287 of 17 July 2009 on the Civil Code, published in the Official Gazette no. 511 of 24 July 2009, as subsequently amended and supplemented, after paragraph (2) three new paragraphs are inserted, paras. (3) to (5), which shall read as follows:

"(3) No authority or individual may, by any technological mechanism, increase, diminish or disturb the individual physical or mental integrity of a person without that person's written, express, informed and freely expressed consent or, in the case of a person under judicial interdiction or of a patient unable to express his will, without the written, express, informed and freely expressed consent of the legal representative.

Any intrusion into or form of intervention upon neuronal connections, as well as any intrusion at the level of the brain through the use of neuro-technology, of a brain–computer interface or of any other system or device, is prohibited in the absence of the written, express, informed and freely given consent of the person, even in medical circumstances, or, in the case of a person under judicial interdiction or of a patient unable to express his will, of the legal representative.

The use or holding of any system or device — whether neuro-technology, a brain–computer interface or another — whose purpose is to access or manipulate neuronal activity, in an invasive or non-invasive manner, is prohibited if it may affect the psychological and psychic continuity of the person, or if it diminishes or harms the autonomy of their will or their capacity to take decisions freely."

Article 7 supplements article 64 of the Civil Code, instituting new guarantees concerning the individual physical or mental integrity of the person. Account was taken both of the technological developments of recent years and of the latest results of the studies of the most advanced research laboratories in the field, all of which create the conditions for possible intrusions at the level of the brain through the use of neuro-technology. Having regard to the potential risks represented by the absence of regulation in a field which may have direct effects upon the Romanian citizen as an individual, and upon collectivities as a whole — both of which may cause uncontrolled influences upon society and therefore, by implication, upon national sovereignty — the use or holding of any device whose purpose is to access or manipulate neuronal activity, or to diminish the autonomy of the will or the capacity of citizens to take decisions freely, has been prohibited."

If you agree with the principles promoted by the Sovereignty Act, enrol as a volunteer in the #ArmataSuveranității at http://VremSuveranitate.ro/ !

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQGXt_k-Cz0ML2zbicj-Bj0VMI0FDd7A9vlBZMu7n-_LkL0CWJQlxf9jUKywK9L_xyAhCVFeUvj-_ycfJ-yZNTP_MZhym0a1nFtMrQLia1EqUNcTjgF8KKlfJGdB987edGLF1kK5srHv696d-EvErbWN2wZflpQFCQlkNkg5BUk1I-ahXG69-52zO1O479IyBtPktwRmauelCCkP0gGE4mFI9XSk&s=518⟩

---

63. 4 September 2021 — "#LegeaSuveranității, whose article-by-article presentation we continue today, prohibits ..."

The #LegeaSuveranității, whose article-by-article presentation we continue today, prohibits access by any legal entity holding electronic communications networks, or technologies and equipment used within IT infrastructures, to the private property of Romanian citizens without the prior written agreement of all the owners and/or co-owners in residential buildings.

I know: it is something normal and self-evident, only that at present things are not so... And the Sovereignty Act sets out first of all to re-establish normality and common sense in Romania.

In article 5 of Act no. 159 of 19 July 2016 on the regime of the physical infrastructure of electronic communications networks and on establishing certain measures for reducing the cost of installing electronic communications networks, published in the Official Gazette no. 559 of 25 July 2016, paragraph (2) is amended and shall read as follows:

"The provisions of para. (1) shall apply after obtaining the written agreement of all the owners and/or co-owners, also in the case of the right of access to spaces held in undivided ownership in blocks of flats, including as regards the fixing of electronic communications networks, of the technologies and equipment used within IT and communications infrastructures of national interest, and within the electronic communications networks through which electronic communications services are provided, or of elements of physical infrastructure necessary to support them, on the walls or terraces of those buildings."

Article 8 amends paragraph 3 of art. 5 of Act 159/2016 on the regime of the physical infrastructure of electronic communications networks and on establishing certain measures for reducing the cost of installing electronic communications networks, granting owners and co-owners of buildings the right to use continuously, uninterruptedly and unconditionally the buildings of which they are owners or co-owners. Account was taken of the fact that allowing, without restriction and without prior authorisation, any legal entity holding electronic communications networks, or technologies and equipment used within IT and communications infrastructures of national interest, and within the electronic communications networks through which electronic communications services are provided, or elements of physical infrastructure necessary to support them, constitutes an unacceptable limitation of the right of property — a fact which may constitute a grave infringement of the sovereignty of the Romanian people."

If you agree with the principles promoted by the Sovereignty Act, enrol as a volunteer in the #ArmataSuveranității at http://VremSuveranitate.ro/ !

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQHLBYKA4-YonFW1LxJ4mgcDFqvfJ8Al2gWccdfjCtsooha2Pe4P2qU09ptZ9XbxbEy79u2-LYz_a_pyXNXKpoaJRaYYgb9Hnx_UCc–fdoqa5rK4-zIDh-CphR0t_u_Wda4crwICNIG_YbcWhVCxiPrh7vEgtDaCxxlQDe_vEYbbU99XJIfwLkGXXcxv5kz8np1GNc0yUIm1bhVpOHBOkbbc4Y8U&s=518⟩

---

64. 5 September 2021 — On a project for the country

On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see the page The Sovereignty Act.

While our members of parliament are on holiday or occupied with scandals, deals and shady arrangements; while the country sinks into disaster, terror and dictatorship under the governorship of Iohannis, we, the citizens of this country, are obliged to look for viable solutions, for real solutions. We have no choice!

That is why I shall continue to present to you, article by article, the #LegeaSuveranității — a draft law as large as a project for the country.

A draft law and a project for the country in which I believe, and which I sincerely believe to be more than necessary: it is the only solution!

From today we shall speak of the amendments which article 9 of the Law brings to the Criminal Code, each paragraph of article 9 adding or amending one article in the Criminal Code. Article 9 has 11 paragraphs, the Sovereignty Act thus making 11 amendments in the Criminal Code alone — al-

though, as you will see, certain acts have also been criminalised in other articles of the Law, through amendments and additions to non-criminal rules or to special laws, such as the Forestry Code or the national-security Acts, for example.

Thus, paragraph 1 of article 9 of the Sovereignty Act comes to complete the amendments made by the Law to article 64 of the Civil Code — amendments of which we spoke a few days ago, which governed what we have called "the neuronal rights of the person", rights which would have remained incompletely governed in the absence of the criminalisation of the acts which infringe them.

Thus, paragraph 1 of article 9 introduces a new article into the Criminal Code, article 195^1, with the marginal heading "Disturbance or modification of physical or mental integrity" — a criminal provision which, like the civil rule it defends and completes, is unique in the world at this moment:

Act no. 286 of 17 July 2009 on the Criminal Code, published in the Official Gazette no. 510 of 24 July 2009, as subsequently amended and supplemented, is amended and supplemented as follows:

After article 195, a new article is inserted, art. 195^1, with the marginal heading "Disturbance or modification of physical or mental integrity", reading as follows:

"(1) Disturbing or modifying the individual physical or mental integrity of a person without that person's written, express, informed and freely expressed consent is punished by imprisonment from 5 to 10 years and the prohibition of certain rights.

The act of holding or using any system or device whose purpose is to access or manipulate neuronal activity, of accessing or manipulating a person's neuronal activity, as well as any intervention upon neuronal connections or intrusion at the level of the brain, in an invasive or non-invasive manner, in the absence of the person's written, express, informed and freely expressed consent, is punished by imprisonment from 7 to 20 years and the prohibition of certain rights.

Article 9 amends Act no. 286/2009 — the Criminal Code — bringing the legislation in this matter into accord with the latest judgments of the Constitutional Court and with the legislative amendments introduced by this legislative proposal.

Thus, paragraph 1 introduces a new article into the Criminal Code, article 195^1, with the marginal heading "Disturbance or modification of physical or mental integrity", criminalising acts which infringe the provisions of article 64 of the Civil Code, as amended by this draft Law. Thus there has been made punishable the "Disturbance or modification of the individual physical or mental integrity of a person without that person's written, express, informed and freely expressed consent", and also the act of "holding or using any system or device whose purpose is to access or manipulate neuronal activity, of accessing or manipulating a person's neuronal activity, as well as any intervention upon neuronal connections or intrusion at the level of the brain, in an invasive or non-invasive manner, in the absence of the person's written, express, informed and freely expressed consent". The legal provisions thus introduced into the Criminal Code are necessary for the defence of the social values protected by the civil rule and for the defence of the rights and of the physical and mental integrity of the Romanian citizen, as fundamental elements of national sovereignty. (…)"

If you agree with the principles promoted by the Sovereignty Act, enrol as a volunteer in the #ArmataSuveranității at http://VremSuveranitate.ro/ !

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQE6Kzzd6_YHGJQiL0UBTRWb-JTtR2Rjtehr0sDP3MO4QdUCvXToeo1l8oMcOmM2kUxPig98dzuzKPuXjH-zqQxjZndxKFLIU0arQyAy-G546ATHqYB_9pgQEw3gv7XF_HCfesbVVARN3go3jAiqpQinBlqXJXrEicl6FPotYEVeNG3z5Xd7s2AHhU0R90hpwpOTbtUM8FUUbKekSm0OJg7SpXHQ&s=518⟩

65. 6 September 2021 — On the protection of the child

On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see the page The Sovereignty Act.

The #LegeaSuveranității criminalises, and punishes with up to 20 years' imprisonment, the act of inducing a minor who has not reached the age of 18 to change the biological sexual identity acquired at birth.

Bringing within the criminal sphere the act of infringing the provisions of Act 272/2004 on the protection and promotion of the rights of the child — as amended by art. 6 of the Sovereignty Act (an article which you will find in my earlier posts) — is the only manner in which the grave mental, psychological and behavioural disturbances which such an act may have upon the minor can be avoided. In this way, unlike the legislative "model" proposed by the Hungarian conservative government, which leaves unpunished the act of "perverting" the minor, the Sovereignty Act will concretely and effectively protect the higher interest of the child and the physical and mental health of the Romanian people.

Act no. 286 of 17 July 2009 on the Criminal Code, published in the Official Gazette no. 510 of 24 July 2009, as subsequently amended and supplemented, is amended and supplemented as follows: (...)

In article 197, after paragraph (1), two new paragraphs are inserted, paras. (2) and (3), reading as follows:

"(2) The act of inducing a minor who has not reached the age of 18 to change the biological sexual identity acquired at birth is punished by imprisonment from 7 to 15 years.

If the act provided for in the preceding paragraph was committed by a parent, guardian, teacher or professor, or produced physical consequences upon the minor, the special limits of the penalty are increased by one third.

"Article 9 amends Act no. 286/2009 — the Criminal Code — bringing the legislation in this matter into accord with the latest judgments of the Constitutional Court and with the legislative amendments introduced by this legislative proposal.

Paragraph 2 amends Art. 197 of the Criminal Code, with the marginal heading "Ill-treatment of a minor", introducing two new paragraphs, namely paragraphs 2 and 3. Paragraph 2 of article 197 criminalises "the act of inducing a minor who has not reached the age of 18 to change the biological sexual identity acquired at birth", whether or not it had the outcome pursued by the perpetrator. The reason for criminalising this act lies in the grave mental, psychological and behavioural disturbances which such an act may have upon the minor, even though the minor cannot decide alone upon the actual, physical modification of the sexual identity acquired at birth. Paragraph 3 introduces an aggravating circumstance in respect of the act provided for in paragraph 2, as introduced by this draft law, increasing by one third the penalty applied to the perpetrator if he has the status of parent, guardian, teacher or professor, or if the act itself produced physical consequences upon the minor, whatever the status of the perpetrator.

If you agree with the principles promoted by the Sovereignty Act, enrol as a volunteer in the #ArmataSuveranității at http://VremSuveranitate.ro/ !

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQHzDlaIWUyTfi55sSfMm3MsoYd-tP-QQtbUKry7ZlGdpkYkKVP18W49V6tvGyM-h7vimofQo9v_9x8edQuaP2LreH41H3A_NjaU7W5ImbPzCuUC8mv0MoUCwAL4Fj43lF7XYlgwqxi47zVAZNKr63x-qDEnOvZ-OyQ3rCA8T7pL2wIklj4Aco8KaqXxmqrm-cnD9XkkULv-yS6b5zv-C5EDYg2qg&s=518⟩

66. 6 September 2021 — “For some days the whole political chessboard, from the “right” to the “left”, has had the motion on its lips...”

For some days the whole political chessboard, from the “right” to the “left”, has had the motion on its lips

The opponents of the motion — that is, the supporters of the convict — say, broadly, that the motion is bad, irresponsible, a generator of instability, and that Cîțu is, overall, good and not bad.

The supporters of the motion, the adversaries of the convict (some of them only declaratively), say that the motion is the only chance, that only thus shall we be rid of the jailbird. They say that Cîțu is bad and not good. And they are right.

Only that the “motioneers”, like the tipsy citizen in the play, cannot agree which motion to vote for. As in “whom do I vote for?”...

What is clear is that the motioneers are right to want to send Cuie Mîțu into the overflowing rubbish bin of the history of Romania’s governments.

Only, or rather above all only, that no one proposes anything concrete by way of an alternative, nothing to save us from disaster.

Only “down with Cîțu”, which, however correct it may be, is absolutely insufficient. Mere footwork... a clumsy dance, without any outcome for us, for those of us who pay dearly for this cheap spectacle, badly acted, full of discords and stammering... and without stakes for us, for the “ordinary citizens”.

Some, like the USR+, merely want a larger share of the cake of power. Others, the PSD or AUR, dream only of reaching the cake by way of the long-dreamed-of early elections.

Nothing for us. Not even declaratively. Have you heard anything about the citizen from any politician whatever?

No! What remains to us are the bills that bankrupt us, the medical dictatorship, our children terrorised and unschooled... and above all the enslaving bill of a villainous, anti-national governance. A governance which will continue whichever of the present political actors reaches the cake of government, the post of Kapo over the camp that Romania has become.

To me it is clear that we must have the courage to take our destiny into our own hands.

To have the courage to write the laws which the present politicians will not, and/or have no time to, write.

That is why I believe, and want to believe to the very end, in the #LegeaSuveranității.

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQH_gU6uz9-wdznSpCqRo-jsOrC2rqQM83MNOWWDeI8Bd-Vh_X3cxQ1gCrtGmwi6ASqQdu01nCTNLILNufB8s_2TYHe-qaTgral1y-A4GkEo64Cb1dqT_CrzDw4ykMHGkPHkBz8Yc9_u_tsSCuoFh05A91hrFRrWvxeqlpOkQaNtkNybGYQvZBJYLdoAyXciIQQTyJgSAgrB6dQbb_-RzDvciH-Dc&s=518⟩

67. 7 September 2021 — "#LegeaSuveranității amends art. 211 of the Criminal Code — "Trafficking in minors" — and brings within the scope ..."

The #LegeaSuveranității amends art. 211 of the Criminal Code — "Trafficking in minors" — and brings within the criminal sphere the act of brokering or encouraging the adoption of children by any person who is not a public servant and whose official duties do not include the adoption of minors.

That, because for too long the children of Romania have been merchandise!

Because many have made fortunes from this occupation, which has become a mega-business; some have even become Presidents...

Because the future of Romania is not for sale.

Act no. 286 of 17 July 2009 on the Criminal Code, published in the Official Gazette no. 510 of 24 July 2009, as subsequently amended and supplemented, is amended and supplemented as follows: (...)

In article 211, after paragraph (1), a new paragraph is inserted, para. (1^1), reading as follows:

"The brokering or encouragement of adoptions by persons who do not have the status of officials within the General Directorate for Social Assistance and Child Protection or the National Authority for the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, Children and Adoptions is punished by imprisonment from 7 to 15 years and the prohibition of the exercise of certain rights. (...)"

"Article 9 amends Act no. 286/2009 — the Criminal Code — bringing the legislation in this matter into accord with the latest judgments of the Constitutional Court and with the legislative amendments introduced by this legislative proposal. (...)

Paragraph 3 of article 9 amends art. 211 of the Criminal Code, with the marginal heading "Trafficking in minors", introducing after paragraph 1 a new paragraph, (1^1), criminalising the brokering or encouragement of adoptions by persons who do not have the status of officials of the General Directorate for Social Assistance and Child Protection or of the National Authority for the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, Children and Adoptions. As a reason for criminalising this act, account was taken of the situation of recent decades, in which the adoption of children has been seen by various natural and legal persons as a veritable act of commerce, thousands of children having thus been taken out of the country, losing their citizenship and no longer being capable of protection by the Romanian State — a fact which directly and gravely affects national sovereignty through the diminution of the population, the holder of sovereignty."

If you agree with the principles promoted by the Sovereignty Act, enrol as a volunteer in the #ArmataSuveranității at http://VremSuveranitate.ro/ !

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQGR2Uu7Pz0h–Ie4RQgBN7kf5qb82dStVfAeqm-nrHZvLT9CGB_FPrAw8O7C0UfdUFCeAaMtxpUb9Zu2mpbLCxeiUqzeT3IwWZIgP_OgZJ8iRAsvZ8vULqzoqOL6o2PvZQ1nh5E9QYkGCnq68ygStdmtoDbsurih9JWhEqfrZwxLpSwxc0YleAc1spSsozzLlQ7rjCb-S_KC56LojVJ6P441ljk&s=518⟩

68. 8 September 2021 — "#LegeaSuveranității amends article 221 of the Criminal Code, with the marginal heading "Sexual corrup..."

The #LegeaSuveranității amends article 221 of the Criminal Code, with the marginal heading "Sexual corruption of minors", criminalising the act of making available to minors under 14 any materials which explicitly depict sexuality.

By this amendment I have sought to criminalise any acts which, under the pretext of "sexual education", destroy childhood and pervert the minds and souls of our children.

This action comes as a response to the concerted actions of the "progressives", by which an attempt is made to sexualise childhood and, by implication, to present homosexual relations and the "ideology" of fluid gender from the tenderest ages.

Act no. 286 of 17 July 2009 on the Criminal Code, published in the Official Gazette no. 510 of 24 July 2009, as subsequently amended and supplemented, is amended and supplemented as follows: (...)

In article 221, paragraph 4 is amended and shall read as follows:

"The inducing by an adult of a minor who has not reached the age of 14 to witness the commission of acts of an exhibitionist character, or performances or representations in which sexual acts of any nature are committed, and the making available to that minor of materials of a pornographic character or of content which explicitly depicts sexuality, are punished by imprisonment from one year to three years. (...)"

Article 9 amends Act no. 286/2009 — the Criminal Code — bringing the legislation in this matter into accord with the latest judgments of the Constitutional Court and with the legislative amendments introduced by this legislative proposal. (...)

Paragraph 4 of Article 9 amends paragraph 4 of article 221 of the Criminal Code, raising from 13 to 14 the age below which the act of inducing a minor to witness the commission of acts of an exhibitionist character, or performances or representations in which sexual acts of any nature are committed, is punished. At the same time, the act of making available to a minor materials of a pornographic character or of content which explicitly depicts sexuality has also been criminalised. Account was taken of the need to preserve the innocence and the natural development of the minor in accordance with the moral norms generally accepted by society, up to an age at which the criminalised acts lose their dangerousness and are no longer such as to affect the psychological development of the minor. There has likewise been brought within the criminal sphere the act of making available to a minor any materials of a pornographic character or of content which explicitly depicts sexuality, having regard to the higher interest of the minor and to the negative impact upon the psyche of minors and upon their development of pornographic materials, or of content explicitly depicting sexuality, at tender ages. (...)"

If you agree with the principles promoted by the Sovereignty Act, enrol as a volunteer in the #ArmataSuveranității at http://VremSuveranitate.ro/ !

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQGkWfRYTm6wH1PH37-hdVyelaAmXBevAvbcUogea0pULF1_1DOZ3TA3cIBQ-7IiTpPBUs_-Hm8Bx3sJIss-GpFt12WQ5lqfzQ9e2Rdr1C0o1qp0JQRd3qFBewxQFyId-j3YVt0_2I9LPB6JJNYQo6VO8j6KKzxSzHezEXNfZ5C1okrNyIlkfBC1PY9EXhHpISPhqfJQTJbQI5dMXYTB4NwJnUFw4&s=518⟩

69. 9 September 2021 — "#LegeaSuveranității criminalises "the act of making available to children under the age of eigh..."

The #LegeaSuveranității criminalises "the act of making available to children under the age of eighteen any materials which promote departure from biological sexual identity, gender reassignment and homosexuality."

Bringing this act within the criminal sphere is necessary in order to give concreteness and effectiveness to the amendment made by the Sovereignty Act to article 8 of Act 272 of 21 June 2004 on the protection and promotion of the rights of the child.

The amendment made to article 221 of the Criminal Code, with the marginal heading "Sexual corruption of minors", I considered necessary having regard to the medium- and long-term effects of the criminalised act upon the development of the minor and to the irreparable psychological traumas it may cause him — acts which directly impair the development of generations that are healthy and capable of fully exercising their rights and their sovereignty.

Act no. 286 of 17 July 2009 on the Criminal Code, published in the Official Gazette no. 510 of 24 July 2009, as subsequently amended and supplemented, is amended and supplemented as follows: (...)

"(5) In article 221, after paragraph (5), a new paragraph is inserted, para. (5^1), reading as follows:

"The act of making available to children under the age of eighteen any materials which promote departure from biological sexual identity, gender reassignment and homosexuality is punished by imprisonment from 1 year to 5 years."

In article 221, paragraph (6) is amended and shall read as follows:

"The attempt at the offences provided for in paras. (1), (2), (2^1) and (5^1) is punishable."

Paragraph 5 of Article 9 of the Sovereignty Act introduces a new paragraph into art. 221 of the Criminal Code, with the marginal heading "Sexual corruption of minors", and amends paragraph 6 of the same article. Paragraph 5^1 criminalises "the act of making available to children under the age of eighteen any materials which promote departure from biological sexual identity, gender reassignment and homosexuality", having regard to the medium- and long-term effects upon the development of the minor and to the irreparable psychological traumas it may cause him — acts which directly impair the development of generations that are healthy and capable of fully exercising their rights and their sovereignty. Paragraph 6 is amended so as to criminalise the attempt at the criminalised act, having regard to the importance of the social value protected and to the gravity of impairing the development of the minor.

Paragraph 6 amends paragraph 6 of article 221 of the Criminal Code, criminalising also the attempt at the offence newly introduced in paragraph 5^1 of article 221 of the Criminal Code."

If you agree with the principles promoted by the Sovereignty Act, enrol as a volunteer in the #ArmataSuveranității at http://VremSuveranitate.ro/ !

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQEXnumInyjjUlV4ICTH56EX1MGQCLW-KtWpDpzAUwvsFeAydMW82CqYlJLaUa7T3QfSBeY1B3ISoqfIH-nqcdy79lq4sa1k4QFGy373t-PR7Ag_4MsHLaqKxVJXfyUEtQJOu_sRLa3cQOANBeWHcutUy6KbMk3IIPFKnYzp60FnWR7486E201reGzygwnBqwRkiO5Wc1JHGxf9vhLFRTy0L6dW6o&s=518⟩

70. 13 September 2021 — "Today we continue our presentation of #LegeaSuveranității. Today we shall present the amendment ..."

Today we continue our presentation of the #LegeaSuveranității. Today we shall present the legislative amendment which must necessarily be adopted in order that any form of discrimination as a result of accepting or refusing a medical treatment or device may be prohibited and punished.

In other words, the Sovereignty Act brings within the criminal sphere, and punishes, any person who restricts the exercise of a person's right or creates for that person a situation of fear, of social exclusion or of inferiority on the ground of refusing the vaccine, punishing any act of discrimination whose passive subjects (victims) are persons who refuse or do not wish to be vaccinated.

In order to attain our aim, we have amended the text of article 297, with the marginal heading "Abuse of office", as follows:

Act no. 286 of 17 July 2009 on the Criminal Code, published in the Official Gazette no. 510 of 24 July 2009, as subsequently amended and supplemented, is amended and supplemented as follows: (...)

Article 297 is amended and shall read as follows:

"(1) The act of a public servant who, in the exercise of his official duties, fails to perform an act or performs it in breach of the law with a view to obtaining an undue benefit and thereby causes damage or an injury to the rights or legitimate interests of a natural or legal person, is punished by imprisonment from 2 to 7 years and the prohibition of the right to hold public office.

The same penalty shall apply to the act of a public servant who, in the exercise of his official duties, restricts the exercise of a person's right or creates for that person a situation of fear, of social exclusion or of inferiority on grounds of race, nationality, ethnic origin, language, religion, sex, sexual orientation, political affiliation, wealth, age, disability, acceptance or refusal of a medical treatment or device, non-contagious chronic illness, or HIV/AIDS, Covid-19 infection or the like."

"Article 9 amends Act no. 286/2009 — the Criminal Code — bringing the legislation in this matter into accord with the latest judgments of the Constitutional Court and with the legislative amendments introduced by this legislative proposal. (...)

Paragraph 7 amends article 297 of the Criminal Code — Abuse of office — bringing it into accord with Decisions 405/2016 and 392/2017, while at the same time criminalising in paragraph 2 the act of discriminating against any person, of "restricting the exercise of a person's right or creating for that person a situation of fear, of social exclusion or of inferiority on the ground of acceptance or refusal of a medical treatment or device". The need to criminalise this act arises from the recurrence in society in recent years of acts of negative discrimination through the restriction of Constitutional rights, in breach of the rights of the patient provided for in Act no. 46 of 21 January 2003 and in the Oviedo Convention, in respect of persons who have not accepted certain medical treatments which are optional under the legislation in force. Symmetrically, any act of discrimination as a result of accepting and undergoing certain medical treatments has also been criminalised."

If you agree with the principles promoted by the Sovereignty Act, enrol as a volunteer in the #ArmataSuveranității at http://VremSuveranitate.ro/ !

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQH4E3BB_WQehouaG7JZTR3pn5SZ7CHlotebyBe1ctVGrOj428PhTagUrV4zbVu6ODyWZLpbCrRXjlPUI_9bp2ZOcA5OblASmc0EW-51-4SuLudOInEj3GVCX4idc_kQAc-HKOmyqUF6dO_j5ISDSwfhp8CpBf2ktJRrbXoC25-2_6JPw6-8wXJP8NAYvhM3Eal0BGjINtwNRxwYajmMNZjsw4k&s=518⟩

71. 14 September 2021 — On the liability of the public servant

On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see the page The Sovereignty Act.

The #LegeaSuveranității punishes the act of a public servant of applying any legal rules declared unconstitutional by Decision of the Constitutional Court of Romania. Of course, the amendment made by article 9 paragraph 8 of the Sovereignty Act to art. 297 of the Criminal Code — "Abuse of office" — is addressed principally to prosecutors and judges who deliberately ignore and fail to observe the Decisions of the Constitutional Court, this amendment being the only way of compelling the authorities and the magistrates to observe strictly the Decisions of that Court.

Act no. 286 of 17 July 2009 on the Criminal Code, published in the Official Gazette no. 510 of 24 July 2009, as subsequently amended and supplemented, is amended and supplemented as follows: (...)

In article 297, after paragraph (2), a new paragraph is inserted, para. (3), reading as follows:

"(3) The act of a public servant of applying any legal rules declared unconstitutional by Decision of the Constitutional Court of Romania is punished by imprisonment from 7 to 10 years."

"Article 9 amends Act no. 286/2009 — the Criminal Code — bringing the legislation in this matter into accord with the latest judgments of the Constitutional Court and with the legislative amendments introduced by this legislative proposal. (...)

Paragraph 8 introduces a third paragraph into article 297 of the Criminal Code — Abuse of office — in which there has been criminalised any act of a public servant, or of a person assimilated thereto, of applying rules declared unconstitutional by the Constitutional Court. The amendment to the text of the criminal law was made with the purpose of strengthening respect for the rights of the Romanian citizen, and also of strengthening the force of the Decisions of the Constitutional Court by criminalising any act infringing them — all having as their ultimate purpose the strengthening of the rule of law and of the Constitutional regime in Romania, both of which are considered to be the very foundation of national sovereignty."

If you agree with the principles promoted by the Sovereignty Act, enrol as a volunteer in the #ArmataSuveranității at http://VremSuveranitate.ro/ !

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQGHhPI5qDswv5qbm6mIDcK-7HevT9_7tp5eHOQ8nVr5hKkZVziHsjRHrbk4F9Xw27EyxSeuCcGzbp4T85s6G5_RmiVBA2iQdRsn6BL45OOh1zLOIBymlvslwrmMczQ6tFZAfUdBQTzsoFWfdEiIqzB-VLoEi4iyhkolew2-rU-zd734x_9TAxgh7jmLAF896qHiXW1h3qhspMH4NjuNBU9jRA9c&s=518⟩

72. 14 September 2021 — "Arafat says that the draft Emergency Ordinance concerning the ANSU and "Arafat's army" is an attack on..."

Arafat says that the draft Emergency Ordinance concerning the ANSU and "Arafat's army" is an attack upon him and upon the "System".

QED: Arafat is part of the "System"! Probably he is even one of the System's chiefs.

For the rest, it is allegedly “fake news”, although the text has existed since 2019 (Arafat dixit!), and although it is written by persons who know how a law is drafted in observance of Act 24/2000 on the norms of legislative technique for the drafting of normative acts. With the Constitution they are not so skilled… but what does the Constitution matter in a dictatorship — even a medical one?

For the rest, the medico-Nazis support compulsory vaccination, it being “a fairly real option”!!!

We have only two solutions left: the #LegeaSuveranității and the pitchfork & the axe!

Post scriptum: judging by the way the discussions are going and by the way the propagandists of the medical dictatorship refer to “anti-vaxxers” and to the danger they supposedly represent, it is very probable that we shall soon see the anti-system “voices” not merely censored on Facebook but thrust into re-education in the cellars of the System.

And do not forget: until I am placed in some re-education programme, during the period of enforced silence imposed by Sugar-Mountain’s censors, you can read me uncensored at https://t.me/DanM-VChiticNecenzurat

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQF1n8SUojbrK7TizErZ-dm-cIb8_VPN9fc2cLnfjQai_r2BaWz2xEsfg9oTFDRxitado9WiHBRJ4A3RSXXU_H9JGnHFJ7onsw9eAQoQcakWQwV5bGdezYdDsskx_Tv8_viIbdCLlzfNXWg9loMsDlUnzxhzFPX7Za4EOtvFKSXUICIi4vw-7g7EnpVfeIvWL1kRJMWpicJ4vT7UC4JX5N1MHY6U&s=518⟩

---

73. 15 September 2021 — “#LegeaSuveranității extends the scope of the offence of Treason to any act ...”

The #LegeaSuveranității extends the scope of the offence of Treason to any act of exercising a function of public dignity, or one entailing the exercise of State authority, by a Romanian citizen who has entered into contact with a foreign power or organisation or with agents thereof.

In this way an attempt is made to cover an inexplicable “omission” of the present criminal code, which does not punish persons who have links with, or who have been instrumentalised by, foreign powers and who reach public office or public dignities. What, one wonders, brought about this “omission”?

This amendment came about as a result of the suspicions hanging over Prime Sinister Cîțu, according to which he would be an agent of a foreign power — an act which, if true, would remain unpunished under the present Criminal Code. But not if the Sovereignty Act is swiftly adopted!

Shall we speak of Iohannis as well? Better not… not now, not here.

Here are the reasons which underlay the decision to make the following amendment to the Criminal Code:

Act no. 286 of 17 July 2009 on the Criminal Code, published in the Official Gazette no. 510 of 24 July 2009, as subsequently amended and supplemented, is amended and supplemented as follows: (…)

In article 394, paragraph (1), a new letter is inserted, letter e), reading as follows:

“e) the exercise of a function of public dignity or one which entails the exercise of State authority.”

“Article 9 amends Act no. 286/2009 — the Criminal Code — bringing the legislation in this matter into accord with the latest judgments of the Constitutional Court and with the legislative amendments introduced by this legislative proposal. (…)

Paragraph 9 introduces a new letter into article 394 of the Criminal Code, with the marginal heading Treason — letter e — which criminalises the act of a Romanian citizen of entering into contact with a foreign power or organisation, or with agents thereof, for the purpose of suppressing or impairing the unity and indivisibility, the sovereignty or the independence of the State, through the exercise of a function of public dignity or one which entails the exercise of State authority. Account was taken of the fact that the exercise of a function of public dignity, or of a function entailing the exercise of State authority, by the active subject of the offence of treason — namely by the Romanian citizen who has entered into contact with a foreign power or organisation, or with agents thereof, for the purpose of suppressing or impairing the unity and indivisibility, the sovereignty or the independence of the State — constitutes a danger to national sovereignty and to the security of the State. The exercise of such a function of public dignity, or of one entailing the exercise of State authority, constitutes a state of real and imminent danger to the constitutional and legal order in Romania, without there being any need for the existence of the means provided for in letters a to d of article 394 of the Criminal Code; for which reason, in defence of national sovereignty and of economic, financial, health and social security, it is necessary to criminalise this act precisely in order to avoid the consequences of the criminal actions of citizens who have entered into contact with a foreign power or organisation, or with agents thereof — the accession of such persons to such a function being the very aim pursued by the foreign powers and organisations or by their agents. Account was likewise taken of the fact that the offence of High treason, provided for and punished by article 398 of the Criminal Code, criminalises only acts committed by "the President of Romania or by another member of the Supreme Council of National Defence", leaving outside the criminal sphere the acts committed by the other persons who exercise functions of public dignity or functions entailing the exercise of State authority."

If you agree with the principles promoted by the Sovereignty Act, enrol as a volunteer in the #ArmataSuveranității at http://VremSuveranitate.ro/ !

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQHkOhVO8BE0pLTmokr62p0ZBY0EgmsXvgTVw39jpG51S4D52W2qGx4t6gJxT0THOfSPWIDBcubbMoBL-JI-Alj4XP_eBf6E6V_DiOWcDE1GM5hFWVHOAUzvLrg_9U0O1hVsTV6jHXeDHyvUsKxpV9_HMbRwTp8DoJOKk_Xzu1Ub_rMPggtD3YYD4Zml98f3lIEo85_k2USxQ0-9oTuNz2VotEYg&s=518⟩

---

74. 15 September 2021 — "Arafat, the horseman of the Plandemic Apocalypse in Romania, officially announces to us the death of democ..."

Arafat, the horseman of the Plandemic Apocalypse in Romania, officially announces to us the death of democracy and of civic rights on 15 September itself — the international day of the late democracy.

The "normality" of medical dictatorship and of transhumanism.

For us, the old ones who are still human beings, it has become clear:

Before the pitchforks and the axes, one last attempt is still needed:

The #LegeaSuveranității — the last chance to escape medical dictatorship, to save ourselves from the "Great Reset"!

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQHRDyw0JRNX0vyEu6SpzpLLt69SGVVvMHwF-Z60KzZKacCxTMB6FHzJ0JFMLrjlfRuenLy-h0pZ_zz8XDsxuogAIm2SeDhyLlaBHq0X3KwJSlEnfMIPTSpJ8bquhnM_SaB6GONcpFaD_NVdfBfGcCkl_cWe4RiHAWHosIHzyNxh7cFq2d5MnrOoytzSdG–GoC2ZglCY1rx0_JgVGPyrmVITLls&s=518⟩

75. 16 September 2021 — "#LegeaSuveranității received a FAVOURABLE OPINION from the Legislative Council on 15 Septe..."

The #LegeaSuveranității received a FAVOURABLE OPINION from the Legislative Council on 15 September 2021, on the International Day of Democracy!

THE TRUE DEMOCRATIC REVOLUTION IN ROMANIA BEGINS!

PREPARE YOURSELVES: from next week the process of gathering signatures begins!

We have only 3 months to gather at least 150,000 signatures, for we need at least 50% more signatures in order to overcome the foreseeable sabotage of the system!

Volunteers are asked to make ready!

Those wishing to sign are asked to get in touch with the volunteers.

If you support and agree with the principles promoted by the Sovereignty Act, enrol as a volunteer in the #ArmataSuveranității at http://VremSuveranitate.ro/ !

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQG56j0dY_8KCawo_mXb8WPcVwl2Fl3Ni3AbsFVFXVwMuM5pCppsaXiedK7sH-jQ5D3tlPreZECf-d8n6h2PN5f8ht1-ZJ3eW4FJYri7K8Y16LAUsYFQOZVEmR46twhhjx9rw4wUnwd80Awp2xq-tjl8xHlp19yqM7_7gxL2DkFUBFN_0qzKMbxSFWBPp4_YeTkRaLye_jNGaBCo9G8y4DRPQq_c&s=518⟩

76. 19 September 2021 — "Dragnea announces the founding of a new party: the Alliance for the Homeland"

Dragnea announces the founding of a new party: the Alliance for the Homeland

Certainly, it resembles the name of our party, the Coalition for the Nation.

Unfortunately, however, Dragnea said nothing about the #LegeaSuveranității, the popular legislative initiative of which he knew, having had the text of the Law for several weeks.

Dragnea said he had made several mistakes. He is right! To err, it is said, is human…

The trouble is that he perseveres in his mistakes.

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQFmzv1rj7_vJUt1UU6rNlg8QKvPQt72imadLIngQA59BcAXd93UlO5z-N4GngkcWcZX4sKvQeN0F2qx1KEYYG-Wa9H8OLURv_MpXDpCWLQDq1KwnxC_GXoO1Dfn0kEhoWBwAS6lXTakG_AGrO5g1NCN5b57A0Cj-cp4SgI7VjGe3HmX2mM-BCHyv1C0T9XcM-fG4tJUFw1P_XT6uAdOh7soHGj_s&s=518⟩

77. 22 September 2021 — On treason and the undermining of the economy

On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see the page The Sovereignty Act.

The #LegeaSuveranității re-criminalises the "undermining of the national economy" by bringing it within the offence of "Treason" (art. 394 of the Criminal Code) and brings within the sphere of "High treason" (art. 398 of the Criminal Code) the act of the President of Romania of failing to give effect, within 10 days, to the Decisions of the Constitutional Court resolving conflicts of a constitutional nature.

Act no. 286 of 17 July 2009 on the Criminal Code, published in the Official Gazette no. 510 of 24 July 2009, as subsequently amended and supplemented, is amended and supplemented as follows: (...)

In article 394, after paragraph (1), a new paragraph is inserted, para. (2), reading as follows:

"If the act provided for in paragraph 1 letter b has caused significant damage to the national economy, the penalty is life imprisonment or imprisonment from 15 to 25 years and the prohibition of certain rights."

In article 398, after paragraph (1), a new paragraph is inserted, para. (2), reading as follows:

"There likewise constitutes an act of High treason, attracting the same penalty, the failure of the President of Romania to give effect to the Decisions of the Constitutional Court resolving conflicts of a constitutional nature, within 10 days of the communication of the operative part."

"Article 9 amends Act no. 286/2009 — the Criminal Code — bringing the legislation in this matter into accord with the latest judgments of the Constitutional Court and with the legislative amendments introduced by this legislative proposal. (...)

Paragraph 9 introduces a new letter into article 394 of the Criminal Code, with the marginal heading Treason — letter e — which criminalises the act of a Romanian citizen of entering into contact with a foreign power or organisation, or with agents thereof, for the purpose of suppressing or impairing the unity and indivisibility, the sovereignty or the independence of the State, through the exercise of a function of public dignity or one which entails the exercise of State authority. Account was taken of the fact that the exercise of a function of public dignity, or of a function entailing the exercise of State authority, by the active subject of the offence of treason — namely by the Romanian citizen who has entered into contact with a foreign power or organisation, or with agents thereof, for the purpose of suppressing or impairing the unity and indivisibility, the sovereignty or the independence of the State — constitutes a danger to national sovereignty and to the security of the State. The exercise of such a function of public dignity, or of one entailing the exercise of State authority, constitutes a state of real and imminent danger to the constitutional and legal order in Romania, without there being any need for the existence of the means provided for in letters a to d of article 394 of the Criminal Code; for which reason, in defence of national sovereignty and of economic, financial, health and social security, it is necessary to criminalise this act precisely in order to avoid the consequences of the criminal actions of citizens who have entered into contact with a foreign power or organisation, or with agents thereof — the accession of such persons to such a function being the very aim pursued by the foreign powers and organisations or by their agents. Account was likewise taken of the fact that the offence of High treason, provided for and punished by article 398 of the Criminal Code, criminalises only acts committed by "the President of Romania or by another member of the Supreme Council of National Defence", leaving outside the criminal sphere the acts committed by the other persons who exercise functions of public dignity or functions entailing the exercise of State authority.

Paragraph 10 introduces a new paragraph into article 398 of the Criminal Code, with the marginal heading "High treason" — paragraph 2 — which institutes an aggravating circumstance in respect of the offence criminalised in paragraph 1, increasing the limits of the penalty for the act of entering

into contact with a foreign power or organisation, or with agents thereof, for the purpose of suppressing or impairing the unity and indivisibility, the sovereignty or the independence of the State, through economic or political undermining or the undermining of the defence capacity of the State, if that act has caused significant damage to the national economy. As the text of paragraph 1 itself states, the criminalised act is such as to endanger national sovereignty; the increase of the limits of the penalty for the grave consequences of the act has the purpose of serving as a means of dissuasion for the perpetrators, all the more so since the perpetrators may be persons holding important positions within the Romanian State.

Paragraph 11 introduces a new paragraph into article 398 of the Criminal Code, with the marginal heading "High treason" — a paragraph which brings within the sphere of high treason also the act of the President of failing to give effect to the Decisions of the Constitutional Court resolving conflicts of a constitutional nature, within 10 days of the communication of the operative part. The need to criminalise this act lies in the importance of the value protected, namely the importance of the immediate implementation of the provisions of the Decisions of the Constitutional Court, and in the absence of any means of coercion or of any sanction against a President who infringes the Constitutional order and ignores the judgments by which the Constitution is interpreted with a view to giving effect to the fundamental act — such acts being such as to affect national sovereignty in a fundamental manner."

If you agree with the principles promoted by the Sovereignty Act, enrol as a volunteer in the #ArmataSuveranității at http://VremSuveranitate.ro/ !

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQErDW5rBA9v7NrsvxvNTagKv1HL0ZonLVKHoh4GgPeLeM-Fjy2HEozK0zuAP2S66RyjB3OwpPMBTsbS_07nF6sqwR1fqzuD9k58FvAngxaObjlO2kzvAQB2OEZv_7WSmhgUHVihaLg1ylox6FxQMmHJlHzhmGWOkEVABSu1eBk5VHKe6U31-xTQnzFQQyGiTB5QfQZi4W6HwT6gxGhivbhbXp7M&s=518⟩

---

78. 27 September 2021 — "We are in a state of #LEGITIMĂAPĂRARE in the face of a fascistoid regime!"

We are in a state of #LEGITIMĂAPĂRARE — legitimate self-defence — in the face of a fascistoid regime!

The "Green Certificate", and by implication compulsory vaccination, are the limits beyond which we can NO LONGER allow this traitorous and anti-national government to go!!

We must defend ourselves against the dictatorial State and the multinationals which are suffocating us!

1. From this month we shall NO LONGER PAY THE UTILITY BILLS!

Neither the State nor the companies can do anything to us!

Under Emergency Ordinance no. 70/2020, the operators of the electricity and natural gas transmission and distribution networks, and those of the water and sewerage systems, have no right to disconnect any customer from the networks for the duration of the state of alert; the same obligation is imposed on sanitation operators.

Either they take us out of the state of emergency, or they take measures to reduce the cost of the bills!

Although I propose that we #NuPlătim — that we do not pay — until they renounce both the state of alert and the absurd prices for a country in which gas is extracted and which is a major producer of electricity!

2. Every day, from 18.00, WE SWITCH OFF THE ELECTRICITY AND THE GAS COMPLETELY, FOR AT LEAST ONE HOUR!

The National distribution System will strongly feel these sudden falls in consumption... and the oppressive System will have to give way!

3. We do not buy (or buy as little as possible) from the large shop chains!

4. We do not take away and do not order home, through delivery riders or the like, from restaurants which impose green certificates and which restrict the access of the unvaccinated!

7. We do not accept to be divided: we shall NEVER ENTER INTO CONFLICT WITH VACCINATED OR UNVACCINATED PERSONS as a result of the choice they have made!

THE FASCISTOID and DICTATORIAL STATE OF THE IOHANNIS REGIME!

The next move, should the governors "not understand" the message:

The withdrawal in cash of all the sums of money which we, the unvaccinated, hold in banks! Much or little, all the money will have to be withdrawn!

In any case there are already rumours that within 6 months you will enjoy online banking and access to your own money only if you have a green certificate, only if you have been vaxxed.

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQGo0kQDpYDIh-EBpV2AEQEtimL-grHE_sQgHowMchMJfS2ZAZLIxcUp_Hr2Ph1LNFFC5gNk0bVUir97xTceQ_85Q-CT4tm2HfZCWHIT1Mfz0V66fnB7zqDXKNqKnEQ2pQDRC40Res-JtJ3x44xXVaDsDJT-9w1ruYAF1D1ZNNWTc1WtGy2FMFke5pUWOmbJlTELyoL0_6WcHjsG3WZJg7h5e7ih8&s=518⟩

---

79. 28 September 2021 — "We are lied to, terrorised, humiliated, discriminated against and divided. All of us, the 70%, we who ..."

We are lied to, terrorised, humiliated, discriminated against and divided. All of us, the 70%, we the many!

We discuss and argue as though we still had to convince ourselves of the obvious.

We beg for our legitimate and lawful rights, although we know we shall not be heard: they care neither for us nor for our constitutional rights and freedoms.

They do not care about the Constitution... they care only about power... and money!

1. For 5 days we shall buy the bare minimum. THE MINIMUM! We shall hold out and we shall also make savings, so necessary in the terrible months to come.

2. When we buy, we buy only from small shops, not from the multinational chains, not from the malls!

3. We shall save our money. In cash! Not by keeping it in banks owned by foreign capital. We shall need savings, we shall need cash!

4. We do not buy food from those in the hospitality trade who support the #CertificatulVerde; we boycott those who humiliate us and abusively discriminate against us — us, who until yesterday were their customers, the supporters of their businesses!

5. We do not order food from restaurants which discriminate against us!

6. We do not pay the utility bills until 1 November 2021: they cannot cut off our supply until that date!

7. Every day at 18.00 we switch off the lights completely for at least 45 minutes in our homes, at the fuse box! In this way the National electricity distribution system will be subjected to enormous stress, and they will be forced to listen to us. And to reduce the price of utilities.

8. We go out in force to protest, in every town, in the central squares!

9. We shall not accept to be divided! We shall not quarrel with our neighbour on grounds of vaccination or non-vaccination! We avoid personal conflicts: our only enemy is the dictatorial State!

10. We support and sign the #LegeaSuveranității. Soon it will be published in the Official Gazette and the signature-gathering campaign will begin.

Limiting our purchases will reduce the volume of VAT collected by the State — the State's most important budgetary revenue!

It is a lawful form of #GrevăFiscală, a tax strike; a form without risk, but one which will put pressure on the State. We shall strike them where it hurts most: in the money!

Buying from small shops will give a breath of air to small Romanian traders and will strike at the multinationals!

The money saved and kept in cash will also put pressure on the banking system, which behaves like a clan of lawful usurers. The time will come when we shall also withdraw our savings from the banks...

We shall not buy from, nor order from, restaurants which support the discriminatory measures: thus they will be forced to reject the measures of medical apartheid.

Not paying the bills over the next 2 months will force the suppliers to look for ways of reducing the cost of electricity, heating and gas.

Switching off the current completely will put pressure on the National energy system, which will force the authorities to lend an ear to the voice of the people.

We go out to protest! Like the Italians, the French, the Australians, the Spaniards, the Swiss, the Americans... like all the oppressed of this world!

Refusing to enter into disputes with fellow citizens who hold other convictions will prevent the emergence of conflicts between the vaccinated and the unvaccinated, as happened in Paris or in Thessaloniki.

We support and sign the Sovereignty Act, the only lawful way of bringing justice, dignity and prosperity to Romania. Faced with a political class that is inept and incapable, infiltrated by traitors and securitate men, the Romanian people — the sole holder of national Sovereignty — must take its fate into its own hands and write its own laws.

As I told you yesterday, we are in a state of #LegitimăApărare in the face of a fascistoid regime!

The "Green Certificate", and by implication compulsory vaccination, are the limits beyond which we can NO LONGER allow this traitorous and anti-national government to go!!

We must defend ourselves against the dictatorial State and the multinationals which are suffocating us!

THE FASCISTOID and DICTATORIAL STATE OF THE IOHANNIS REGIME!

The photographs are taken from my friend Catalin Beciu.

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQHtR0Zmz7vrj83Iq1f-1WI38z7ovCSbAZ-d6KG4YOVfvMloRfrzxWJLTdgFGutR7UhIT6LQ9IqYXQOM331H-w3FStwqCmgbsXvHluWBJ9Ny03tmZWuhv-MOsoqgU9_8b5H_Q8vg2k8FiKIZu7_Ixae2AExnIFvcFLDwvLbhn44oDDRVixtS4ybVHHxlj8_LmdvqEvPcxMHe5nvxRXh95fDQFDlo8&s=518⟩

---

80. 28 September 2021 — "Today, 28.09.2021, the committees of the Chamber of Deputies which must issue the report on ..."

"Today, 28.09.2021, the committees of the Chamber of Deputies which must issue the report on draft law Pl-x no. 393/2021, introducing the green certificate as a condition for exercising any right, are sitting.

Since its voting under the urgency procedure has been approved, it is possible that they will place it on the agenda.

Send them e-mails requesting that, as regards draft law Pl-x no. 393/2021:

1. You request the urgent organisation of a public debate in which all interested persons may take part.

2. The debate is to be organised physically and is also to allow online participation for persons who cannot attend in person.

3. The time for debate is to be sufficient to allow all participants to speak.

If the PNL was able to hold a Congress with 5,000 people, a public debate can also be organised on a draft law which concerns the entire population.

The e-mail addresses to which the requests are to be sent:

psd@cdep.ro, pnl@cdep.ro, usrplus@cdep.ro, aur@cdep.ro, udmr@cdep.ro, minorități@cdep.ro, nelu.tătaru@cdep.ro, sebastian.suciu@cdep.ro, adrian.wiener@cdep.ro, constantin.sovaiala@cdep.ro, avocat@sovaiala.ro, mfifor@yahoo.com, nicolae.georgescu@cdep.ro, sabin.sarmas@cdep.ro, monica.berescu@cdep.ro, bogdan.ivangruia@gmail.com, alexandru.kocsis@cdep.ro, alexandru.kocsis@gmail.com, ibram.iusein@cdep.ro, cătălin.tenita@cdep.ro, maya.teodoroiu@cdep.ro, simona.bucuraoprescu@cdep.ro, gabriel.avramescu@cdep.ro, angelica.fador@cdep.ro, denes.seres@cdep.ro, bogdan.toader@cdep.ro, mihai.badea@cdep.ro, ioan.cupsa@cdep.ro, silviu.dehelean@cdep.ro, contact@silviudehelean.ro, nicușor.halici@cdep.ro

DO NOT SIT AND WAIT FOR IT TO FALL FROM THE SKY!"

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQHLG3NwIlNcA3Wht-CGIoEClbJLRd2NeMNe4QcLYz2469YTSP2cfHSpssI9LZtB-fuxY_g6KgyhwENuirsgL09fvkry5HYLmIONka8zzszAa28heMiYQCaqv-xXCkvMsZyl_KgHj5ws0OcgmbAx1T9BwRamZvAkXQM88lj6LpgjfD-GGbdLDV5N2tV8AOEwk9gPvHB-vWHU0c6n9u-91XFYlqkD4&s=518⟩

---

81. 28 September 2021 — "#LegeaSuveranității has been published in Official Gazette 925/28.IX.2021 !!!"

The #LegeaSuveranității has been published in Official Gazette 925/28.IX.2021 !!!

You can find it from page 8 onwards at https://www.monitoruloficial.ro/Monitorul-Oficial–PI–925–2021.html

From today the gathering of signatures for our Law, the People's Law, begins!

The signature-gathering form will be found only on the page https://vremsuveranitate.ro/, where you can also enrol as volunteers in the #ArmataSuveranității!

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQGji2DsF6dYN4kLcYCPMqka6zTnPhsulQDoe7MtNl6JVFMhMKHiZldrefE-fQ4VU_PdbQANNo9p7TydYxkZX8Pfz0s20YTzVnaMIxG3-T-066n6w2_ID17QgYSFQ1XPb3DNcNejcfx2bpEkBnApwe4GLmcO713R8pR32DC6hgkwhMyaLy6HRASIkhG6rKJfwWp1pHmhDw7GtdOO2SXqV_thNVBY&s=518⟩

---

82. 29 September 2021 — "Four effective remedies against the fascist virus"

Four effective remedies against the fascist virus

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQGJFzhc9Koh8HUkfDZUXnaW-CO2m0xS_y3MWPZ0tUU1LG2T2FfXKIGcPZBF-3oJ-6tg_EIsiNml4P-3kIrR43UDnK5HKGT4xn0ow39rwceuESw0mrB-QJ2lx5vU3uDGTAlb29oMM0BkXMKDV2DhQH-d2BMIJ5ZZg0z9X2tM3EhgLzWiQDEZ2wEwjg7tud237scp6qoLoJ_WlsLZracxqxpPdzDmg&s=518⟩

---

83. 30 September 2021 — "Many of the misfortunes that strike Romanians are caused by the way in which, gradually,..."

"Many of the misfortunes that strike Romanians are caused by the way in which, gradually, out of thoughtlessness or out of ill will, the officers of the State have renounced sovereignty — without asking us, but in our name. That is how the forests go to the dogs. And the riches of the subsoil. And the gas of the Black Sea. And the labour force. The only guarantee we can have of a change for the better is the regaining of sovereignty. That objective is, quite literally, in your hands. Sign for sovereignty!

Of course, we are part of the European Union. But we know very well that we are not treated as equals. Rather as a poor relation. Although we are among the richest States of Europe. The solidarity of this organisation is in competition with the natural tendency of the stronger States to take advantage of the weakness of the others. In order to attain their objectives, countries like Romania are induced to renounce, one by one, attributes of sovereignty. In the name of globalism. As though globalisation itself — a process which can no longer be stopped — were in competition with the right of States to administer and organise themselves as they see fit, while of course observing the commitments and rules they have assumed. What we are witnessing, in fact, throughout Europe is a disguised plunder. The plundering, on a scale hitherto unheard of, of rich States such as Romania.

This process could not have existed without the guilty complicity of the traitors of the nation perched in decision-making offices. What better explanation can be given? Why does the Parliament of Romania not put a stop to this infernal mechanism, by which the country is plundered more thoroughly, more systematically and more mercilessly than it ever was under Ottoman or Habsburg domination? Why does the president elected by the citizens — whatever his name may be — not step forward like a man, chest out, to oppose this process, at the end of which an entire nation surrenders and dies? Why do the senior representatives of the secret services give every sign of working for the benefit of powers against which they ought to be protecting us? How is it that, in only 30 years, our generation has managed to abandon the battlefield for which our ancestors shed their blood, leaving

it to fate or, rather, handing it over turnkey to those whose only objective is to squeeze the riches of this land for their own benefit?

The history of this capitulation cannot, of course, be written in a few words. And it is more complex than it seems. We cannot simply accuse our European partners of acting to drain the energies of this country, incapable of defending itself. The European States are themselves confronted with an enormous challenge: the ever-growing pressure of the multinationals, which are gradually and successfully substituting themselves for State entities. This process tends to become general. Only that the powerful States of Europe know how to defend their sovereignty. They know how to protect their interests. They know how to put a brake on the multinationals when necessary. Such is not the case of Romania.

For all these reasons, to which many others could be added, a few persons — myself among them — are launching, using a constitutional provision and beginning this very day, a citizens' initiative at national level. The Constitution allows us to do this: to draft a normative act, to ask our compatriots for signatures and to oblige the Parliament of Romania to debate and adopt it. And, naturally, we have entitled this citizens' initiative "the Sovereignty Act". It is a draft normative act which, if adopted, will protect us in the long term from most of the acts of plunder to which Romania is presently subjected. It guarantees us stability. Durability. Independence. The freedom to take cardinal decisions in our own interest. It defends and protects our riches. It allows us to turn them to account for our own benefit and not for the benefit of others. Sign this citizens' initiative; oblige Parliament thereby to take the law into debate and to vote it; put pressure by your signature on the president of Romania to promulgate "the Sovereignty Act".

The Legislative Council has analysed the provisions of this draft normative act, has found that they observe the spirit and the letter of the Constitution, and has given it the green light for the whole process to be carried out — beginning with the gathering of signatures and ending with the adoption of the new law in Parliament. Today the primary documents were published in the Official Gazette. In every town in Romania, groups of citizens supporting this initiative begin this very day to appeal to you to sign in favour of "the Sovereignty Act". The sooner we gather your signatures, the sooner we centralise the forms arriving from all over the country, the sooner shall we have "the Sovereignty Act" debated, voted and promulgated. It will be an instrument which all parties and all rulers will be obliged to take into account. An instrument which will keep the economic assassins at a distance. And, why not, an instrument with whose help we shall be able to tell the difference, when we elect our new leaders, between the bad and the good. Between traitors and patriots. Sign, and give the green light to this patriotic initiative."

Article written by Sorin Roșca Stănescu, which may be read in full at: http://www.corectnews.com/politics/semna-i-pentru-suveranitate

archive of the post (https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQE9mQTw2LmrYmG5YO6-8-_N9MteaoIPQC170IGp9EXl5ULjFWy4Q-q89gixl9O54K-pAy_KXPS6p2dxinWmKwevvEth3YO_jMND0oXN6FxrSQh7qGyM-j56pkzAq35fCebiGDNkyCUSwnpdlYlx8BzzXbNBPFhtdkQyAOFKHgy9ZO5w9rMsN96to4G5MuKUAj1J3u-oSs2zt_swkw8pVR0ABUHGg&s=518)

---

84. 28 September 2021 — "1. For 5 days we shall buy the bare minimum. THE MINIMUM! We shall hold out and we shall make savings..."

1. For 5 days we shall buy the bare minimum. THE MINIMUM! We shall hold out and we shall also make savings, so necessary in the terrible months to come.

2. When we buy, we buy only from small shops, not from the multinational chains, not from the malls!

3. We shall save our money. In cash! Not by keeping it in banks owned by foreign capital.

4. We do not buy food from those in the hospitality trade who support the #CertificatulVerde!

5. We do not order food from restaurants which discriminate against us!

6. We do not pay the utility bills until 1 November 2021: they cannot cut off our supply until that date!

7. Every day at 18.00 we switch off the lights completely in our homes, at the fuse box! In this way the National electricity distribution system will be subjected to enormous stress, and they will be forced to listen to us. And to reduce the price of utilities.

8. We go out in force to protest, in every town, in the central squares!

9. We shall not accept to be divided! We shall not quarrel with our neighbour on grounds of vaccination or non-vaccination! We avoid personal conflicts: our only enemy is the dictatorial State!

10. We support and sign the #LegeaSuveranității.

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQFotxHFnZqhYgW14M97lO4b9ptGEmN3cO4KQ7H8oZX62JXy-Ho73BXN_Z_QDs6xvdiT3aAlNNmbERQAR7XAuP5a68T_LIrghnjFrt4KV2IrDRO6T-9WzJLJo0r3NxVqMiIG8Sms98Bu2pPkOcEQmm1b40JxsJU216e8-k459A9QKaQA_GnIG3n69eYa0LchEniJWoLlQzKEpKs6TsklMUKN8an_y&s=518⟩

---

85. 2 October 2021 — "On the authorities' war against us: "#NuLuămPrizonieri""

On the authorities' war against us: "#NuLuămPrizonieri" — we take no prisoners

From tomorrow we go into Lockdown again. Nothing seems to have any logic: contradictory medical measures, states of quasi-normality alternating with lockdowns worthy of Nazi ghettos. Nothing seems to make any sense… and yet!

There is a logic in all of it: it is the logic of war!

It is extremely clear to me at this moment that the "authorities" consider themselves to be in a state of war with their own populations. And the strategists of this War also have strategies which they apply in the war against us: they are the classic strategies of war.

One of the oldest strategies of war is that of harrying the enemy, of continually taking him by surprise.

The succession of periods of "normality" and periods of lockdown, though devoid of any logic or medical sense, is not made in our favour, to give us periods of "respite"… By no means!

The alternation of open and closed has only the purpose of weakening and wearing down the resistance of their adversary, that is to say ours. This alternation has the same effect that successive freezing and thawing has upon the hardest materials: first cracks appear and in the end they give way, they crumble.

"Feign a surprise attack and observe their discipline. Order a sudden attack and observe their doubts. Make a hasty attack" (quotation from the Methods of Sima Yi)

Although it seems paradoxical, in this veritable war a state of permanent lockdown would have been more favourable to us than to them: first we would have discovered methods of evading it, then of undermining it. Moreover, a state of constant pressure upon the population would invariably have

led to the accumulation of that tension and, in the end, to an explosion of such proportions as would have blown away those who wish to keep us under the lid.

But as it is, when freedom is doled out to you in portions, followed by seclusion, this game of coming and going between extremes has as its purpose the controlled release of pressure while keeping the population in tension… and at the same time eroding its resistance.

"Raise deception to the rank of an art", said Sun Tzu in The Art of War, and Sima Yi said:

"Thwart their strategy. Seize their thoughts. Take advantage of their fears…

Endanger them in order to observe their fears."

Hence the strategic importance of the principal weapon of the "authorities", of our only enemy in this war: PROPAGANDA.

Hence the importance of frightening us, of maintaining a state of permanent terror!

"A lie repeated a thousand times remains a lie, but a lie repeated a million times becomes truth." So said Joseph Goebbels.

False information is no longer accidental. It has become the rule, to the point that truth has begun to be catalogued as falsehood.

Official lies have been raised to the rank of dogmas, of "indisputable realities"; those who issue them are infallible, and the "official truths" must be accepted unconditionally: they must be believed!

The "State dogmas" (covidian and vaxxinist) must be believed and followed without a murmur…

Observance of official decrees and decisions has become an act of faith.

Hence the division between believers and unbelievers, between the faithful and the infidels.

But this too is a strategy of war…

"Force them to contradict one another", said the Chinese — that is to say, DIVIDE ET IMPERA!

The division of the population into vaxxed and unvaxxed, between the fearful and the unafraid, between the "prudent" and the "imprudent", between the submissive and the insubordinate… the hatred and the distrust between the two parts of society: all these are the paths of their success in limiting the rights of all alike, their victory over all of us, whatever our "beliefs".

And the final argument that we are facing a war: the assault of the "authorities" upon our children in the schools and in the media!

The winning of our children, their persuasion and education in the spirit of the "official dogmas", will be the sign that the "authorities" have won the war — even though we may still be fighting!

The war for the "Great Reset" is being fought in the minds and hearts of our children!

Did not the propagandist Prelipceanu say that "school ought to rid children of their parents"?

Well, that must not happen!

We must refuse to let the minds and souls of our children be conquered by the institutionalised lie of the "New Normality"!

We must understand that we are in the midst of a war and that the "authorities" "take no prisoners". Now we can also understand the true meaning of the photograph of the present prime minister with the inscription: "#NuLuămPrizonieri".

That is why it is essential to accept reality and to enter into the logic of this manifest war.

Do not forget: in love and war all is permitted!

That is why I have proposed to you a strategy which the adversary least expects: #Boicot and the #LegeaSuveranității!

For the element of surprise is the key to success!

1. Take part in the protests in force! All of you, go out today into Piața Victoriei and Piața Universității!

2. Do not submit to the unconstitutional restrictions!

3. Do not let yourselves be divided; do not enter into sterile polemics with those who believe the official dogmas — you will not convince them, they will convince themselves!

4. Do not accept to be discriminated against! And above all:

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQG6EkyZ-NAb_m1nEsli704GjevshUA0rNrHXRUq6S1eaPc_g3VW7Fre8nwSpleowXp1G7H7ZpkU-Oe5c-Sf_MzQeWEq40C7hQNUXmLFbIhtHQ-0pG8oRw9BjjVQ0qFRWlgme8qYUR7EyJUUMtCCvFr4fQ74VH4wxY3zKQkDBeCuXS-CNq0tMp4wUom1PLdxOy9fe2J9EH9lTbIQky-h9JBm-MaGW1&s=518⟩

---

86. 2 October 2021 — "#PentruNoi, #PentruCopiiiNoștri and #PentruLibertate!"

#PentruNoi, #PentruCopiiiNoștri and #PentruLibertate!

Sign and gather signatures for the #LegeaSuveranității!

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQFHNX6VUN6cvUoxePPWEHvI1rojkZQYXhQO4Y1OLplqjqXtV2msdF1NPloWWD0SpECHS71ZX-c1Sh6L2q2X7_ry-jKzwi5mCmHB82qsxnXTYYd4L_v-mTfy3HqqAk5ToYSfy1TuatUBXP-kKTQnv_KUPFHEseag7_xfPGaqeKSTISfAAmIvIdDxmslEGqbrDTCDp6twPctSlirHHfl4Sg0pa7F3cB&s=518⟩

---

87. 10 October 2021 — On censorship and freedom

On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see the page The Sovereignty Act.

#Libertate! I say it directly, while I still can here, and I urge you, first of all, to fight for your Freedom: go out into the street! And, as usual, I urge you to #Boicot! For…

I do not know how others are… how they can say almost anything, at any time; but I, more and more often and with less and less appearance of justification, am blocked on Facebook!

A conditional freedom and, evidently, under surveillance.

For the post of 2 October (a partial screenshot of which I leave below) I received a week of virtual imprisonment. And a further 3 MONTHS' ban on going live (3 months which come after another month and a half of ban)… that is, exactly as long as the campaign for gathering signatures for the #LegeaSuveranității will last… a coincidence, of course!

I do not know what I say that is so bad for them, but what is certain is that they do not like at all what I say, or how I say it.

And that legitimises our undertaking all the more!

I shall not stop: I shall go on telling that truth which hurts them!

What matters is that for the moment we are together. I could comment neither on Cîțu's reduction to dust (may he at least like what he has become!), nor on the little Facebook apocalypse... but we have done the work:

The Sovereignty Act is more and more present in the consciousness of the Romanian. Sign it!

And I nearly "forgot"... on Thursday, together with 42 other citizens, I submitted to the NATIONAL AUTHORITY FOR CITIZENSHIP an application FOR THE WITHDRAWAL OF ROMANIAN CITIZENSHIP from the said Raed Arafat.

under the provisions of art. 32 para. (1) read together with art. 25 para. (1) letter d), final sentence, of Act no. 21/1991, republished and as subsequently amended, we submit the following

NOTIFICATION FOR THE WITHDRAWAL OF ROMANIAN CITIZENSHIP

from the said Raed Arafat, currently holding the office of Secretary of State and Head of the Department for Emergency Situations (DSU) within the Ministry of the Interior,

for the intentional infringement of the provisions of art. 20 para. (5) of Act no. 21/1991, republished and as subsequently amended, read together with art. 16 paras. (1) to (3) and art. 53 of the Constitution of Romania, for the following reasons

In fact, on 04.10.2021, the said Raed Arafat, in his capacity as "Commander of the action", issued Order no. 9490 on the institution of certain measures necessary at the level of public health units with beds for combating the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, whereby he ordered the suspension, at the level of hospital units throughout the country, of admissions for a period of 30 days for surgical interventions and for other treatments and medical investigations, with the exception of emergencies, pregnant women requiring obligatory check-ups, patients with chronic oncological conditions and patients requiring dialysis procedures.

In that context, the said Raed Arafat stated at a press conference that he had been told — without specifying by whom — that the Order in question need not be published in the Official Gazette, and then acknowledged that the document does not observe the Constitution: "It is an order which is already published on all the media sites and everywhere. It is not among the orders which we were told must be published in the Official Gazette. Besides, it is an order of management and triage in a disaster situation and, I am very sorry, if disaster medicine is not in accordance with the Constitution, I, as a doctor, until I am told to stop BECAUSE OF THE CONSTITUTION, must respect the saving of life and the principles I have learned in this field."

It is worth mentioning that Raed Arafat's statements also came in reply to the declarations of the Ombudsman, Renate Weber, who acted of her own motion, stating in a press release that the right of citizens to medical assistance in health units cannot be restricted, given that for them there exists no option other than to undergo consultations and medical procedures in the private sector. Moreover, the Ombudsman stated that where the suspension of admissions for surgical interventions is effected by an administrative act (an order) issued by an administrative body without legal personality (the Department for Emergency Situations), or by order of the minister of health, this is unconstitutional and therefore unlawful, in so far as it permits the ordering of measures restricting the exercise of the right of persons to benefit from medical assistance in State health units.

In the face of this situation, it is evident that the said Raed Arafat, by issuing Order no. 9490/04.10.2021 and by the statement he made, consciously and deliberately — that is, intentionally — infringed the following provisions of the Constitution of Romania:

"In Romania, observance of the Constitution, of its supremacy and of the laws is obligatory." — art. 1 para. (5);

"(1) National sovereignty belongs to the Romanian people, who exercise it through their representative bodies, constituted by free, periodic and fair elections, and by referendum. (2) No group and no person may exercise sovereignty in their own name." — art. 2 paras. (1) and (2);

"(1) Citizens enjoy the rights and freedoms enshrined in the Constitution and in other laws, and have the obligations laid down therein. (2) No one is above the law." — art. 16 paras. (1) and (2);

"(1) The right to life and the right to the physical and mental integrity of the person are guaranteed. (2) No one may be subjected to torture or to any kind of inhuman or degrading punishment or treatment." — art. 22 paras. (1) and (2);

"Individual liberty and the security of the person are inviolable." — art. 23 para. (1);

"The right to free movement, within the country and abroad, is guaranteed. The law establishes the conditions for the exercise of this right." — art. 25 para. (1);

"(1) The public authorities respect and protect intimate, family and private life. (2) A natural person has the right to dispose of himself, provided he does not infringe the rights and freedoms of others, public order or good morals." — art. 26;

"(1) The right to the protection of health is guaranteed. (2) The State is obliged to take measures to ensure public hygiene and health." — art. 34 paras. (1) and (2);

"(1) The exercise of certain rights or freedoms may be restricted only by law and only if necessary, as the case may be, for: the defence of national security, of public order, health or morals, of the rights and freedoms of citizens; the conduct of criminal investigations; the prevention of the consequences of a natural calamity, of a disaster or of a particularly serious catastrophe. (2) The restriction may be ordered only if it is necessary in a democratic society. The measure must be proportionate to the situation which gave rise to it, must be applied without discrimination and without impairing the existence of the right or the freedom." — art. 53.

In the light of these provisions of our fundamental Law, we, the undersigned, ask you to assess the intrinsic content of the manifestly unconstitutional measures adopted by the said Raed Arafat through the above-mentioned Order, and the content of the defiant statement given to the press concerning the Constitution, as incontestable proof of the fact that, 23 years after acquiring Romanian citizenship, the said Raed Arafat:

has no link with and no belonging to the Romanian State, as Romanian citizenship is defined by art. 1 para. (1) of Act no. 21/1991, republished and as subsequently amended;

undertakes and supports actions against the legal order and national security through his conduct, actions and attitude — a matter which contravenes another condition essential to the granting of Romanian citizenship, namely that provided for in art. 8 para. (1) letter b) of the aforementioned law;

although he knows the Constitution of Romania — a condition essential to the granting of Romanian citizenship to a foreign citizen, provided for in art. 8 para. (1) letter g) of the same law — he defies and deliberately infringes it;

has infringed the oath he swore in solemn sitting under art. 20 para. (5) of the aforementioned law, on the occasion of receiving Romanian citizenship, namely:

"I swear to be devoted to the homeland and to the Romanian people, to defend the national rights and interests, to observe the Constitution and the laws of Romania.";

has infringed the provisions of art. 35 of the same law: "Persons to whom Romanian citizenship has been granted in accordance with the law have all the rights and freedoms, and the obligations, provided for by the Constitution and by the laws of the country for Romanian citizens";

believes himself to be above the Constitution of Romania.

From a reading of the legal texts mentioned, we conclude that the retention of Romanian citizenship by persons who acquired it upon application is indissolubly linked to the fulfilment of the same conditions laid down by law for its granting, namely observance of the Constitution and of the laws of the country.

We ask you to take note of the fact that, by his attitude, actions and statements in his capacity as Secretary of State and Head of the Department for Emergency Situations (DSU) within the Ministry of the Interior, the said Raed Arafat endangers national security, indubitably inciting disobedience to the constitutional and legal provisions of the Romanian State, the provisions of art. 25 para. (1) letter d) of Act no. 21/1991, republished and as subsequently amended, being applicable.

Under art. 25 para. (1) letter d) of Act no. 21/1991, republished and as subsequently amended, "Romanian citizenship may be withdrawn from a person who (...) d) (...) has committed other acts which endanger national security."

Thus, we the undersigned consider inadmissible and downright unpardonable defiance the manner in which the said Raed Arafat spoke at the press conference of 6 October 2021 about the fundamental Law in relation to emergency medicine, and also his repeated infringement of the provisions of the Constitution through the successive acts issued by him since the beginning of the pandemic — such as the recent Order no. 9490/04.10.2021, which he did not even publish in the Official Gazette because he was not told that he had to, even though he too must know and observe the laws of this country, all the more so in his capacity as Secretary of State and Head of the Department for Emergency Situations (DSU) within the Ministry of the Interior.

We draw attention to the fact that the deliberate defiance and infringement of the Constitution by the said Raed Arafat must be assessed in relation to his office as Secretary of State and Head of the Department for Emergency Situations (DSU) within the Ministry of the Interior, and not in relation to the status of an ordinary citizen, since it is in that first-rank capacity which he occupies in the architecture of the Romanian State that he persistently and repeatedly disobeys the Constitution and the laws of the country (including the provisions of Act no. 21/1991, republished and as subsequently amended, referred to in the present notification).

Now, by his attitude, actions and statements in his capacity as Secretary of State and Head of the Department for Emergency Situations (DSU) within the Ministry of the Interior, the said Raed Arafat indubitably incites disobedience to the constitutional and legal provisions of the Romanian State, thereby endangering national security.

In conclusion, we the undersigned have submitted this notification under the provisions of art. 32 para. (1), which confers upon any person who has knowledge of the existence of a ground for the withdrawal of Romanian citizenship the right to notify the Citizenship Commission within the National Authority for Citizenship; by which we respectfully ask you, on the basis of art. 14 para. (1),

to proceed to verify and establish the fulfilment of the conditions laid down by law for the issuing of the order withdrawing Romanian citizenship from the said Raed Arafat, having regard to the applicability in this case of the provisions of art. 25 para. (1) letter d), final sentence.

We reserve the right to return with clarifications and additions to this notification up to the date which you will set for the examination of this notification for the withdrawal of Romanian citizenship from the said Raed Arafat.

the statement of the said Raed Arafat of 6 October at the press conference held after the Government sitting, when he replied to the Ombudsman concerning the Order suspending non-urgent admissions and surgical interventions and concerning its legal aspects;

Order no. 9490/04.10.2021 — unpublished in the Official Gazette.

The application was signed by Zară Ovidiu-Dumitru, Av. Deseagă Cristian-Alexandru, Popa Ioan-Aurelian, av. Dume Alexandra-Mihaela, Av. Cerva Nadia-Cosmina, Roșca-Stănescu Sorin-Ștefan, Voiculeț Iulian-Nicolae-Mihail, Ionescu Mihai, Golban Radu-Eugen, Ștef Mihai-Adrian, Iancu Liliana-Florina, Alecu Mariana, Cochină Luchian-Florin, Șerb Horațiu-Alexandru, Maior Florina, Mirea Călin-Eusebiu, Popa Dan Petre, Negrotă Angela, Capsali Pericle-Iulian, Dume Cătălin-Daniel, Vasile-Stoicescu Bogdan, Vîrlan Irina-Elena, Constantin Simona, Modoran Gabriela, Radu Ancuța-Valentina, Constantin Mircea-Tudor, Văleanu Ana, Belean Adrian, Lăzărescu Cătălina, Susanu Ana-Claudia, Lăzărescu Ion-Laurențiu, Duță Eugen, Joseanu Ciprian-Flaviu, Stan Mihaela-Carleta, Stanciu Florența, Căpitan Florina-Constanța, Neacșu Costel-Adrian, Duca Bogdan-Alexandru, Bibby Angela-Iuliana, Av. Andrei Stefan Mitrea, Av. VÂJDEA LIVIU DANIEL and, last on the list, the undersigned.

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQHzxl-yreOhSrymLn0zlojdPvtmcMLJNnVWXDhc1KXiEDbn3Vrwn57Kw6LOeaTPfrAeiaR_lyijx44hK1-FRsSIICTesvqskm-b692SULqMAuZgP9qyf4ibIhioCmnmlvDDbH9vXAb2B0xwstvS1C5eWKvTz1mp9GnHYmGq1qSY9So7HvQECJVneHbn2LPFYq7XSyIGhLZMs0hpvk7k1oTEZ-iVp&s=518⟩

---

88. 16 October 2021 — “I have been unblocked by the “trainers of truth”. Twenty-four days early”

I have been unblocked by the “trainers of truth”. Twenty-four days early

An occasion on which I urge you to support and to sign the #LegeaSuveranității!

Look for a volunteer at https://vremsuveranitate.ro/voluntari/

Become volunteers at https://vremsuveranitate.ro/inscriere/

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQFwYfC4jNXHpy5EcXZPOdcEZD-rGsx2tkk4CF06sl16qN0-jgh1KFduixibc4AO0k1ARXJFXckBp89PfnKEEsMB-WLH8vSSzjoa7Pq56GQN-chhty28ZBuL7Y3ggQ0lR37hF4plegV-a_NO8f_LPpEm612pNEqi2ISUYgJvnN9CNwtSllxZxHpgcqKZu6X5-Vo50DL_P1VkGfL4FA-6a8KOQM71n&s=518⟩

---

89. 17 October 2021 — “You can support and sign for #LegeaSuveranității at Taverna Lions in Snagov, Str Floril...”

You can support and sign for the #LegeaSuveranității at Taverna Lions in Snagov, 34 Florilor Street

Courageous Romanian entrepreneurs, such as Luca Cristian, support the undertaking and have become volunteers and ambassadors of the Sovereignty Act!

If you have commercial PREMISES and wish to become Ambassadors and Volunteers of the Sovereignty Act, please contact me!

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQHDjRJ9kKCOzpN0BmjV_fu1-uBep1I928dA3x9b6zV0Z-dhmI9tjf8J9h6zpUr8H8n-Nf9_jpQzKH-0Xn0ov9OyJrR2oGaQy6B3oxGO01I680BydYcMPFf7mUNupUvZsh_9y_AWB3OyZJqHaUBP7REcLqRH4tonZD9ZyW04Iqbe3dPDsaEXerA2UZvczSB6A3LkkSTgMEsoZ9b1OYyy3JTjv4m6f&s=518⟩

---

90. 18 October 2021 — "The people are always right! Even if they were mistaken in the choice made... they would still be right ..."

The people are always right! Even if they were mistaken in the choice made… they are still right: vox populi, vox Dei!

The order in which a political class and a government disregard the Will of 70% of the population of their own country is called TYRANNY!

A press which takes part in the tyranny is not a press: it is merely an organ of propaganda. It is merely an organ of terror and repression! It is a Disgrace!

Concretely: if the people have chosen not to be vaccinated — whether or not they made the right choice — the political class must find solutions in relation to the decision of the people, not in relation to the convictions of the political class.

Therefore the democratic solution is not the discrimination against and the blackmailing of the 70%, but the finding of alternative solutions in relation and in response to the decision of the people!

We, the people, are obliged to oblige them to respect us and our decisions too — we who sent them into Parliament and into the Government, at our own expense, to represent us, not to impose upon us solutions foreign to our will.

We, the people, are the legitimate Holders of Sovereignty; in the present circumstances, we are obliged to write our own laws!

That is why we support and sign the #LegeaSuveranității!

Look for a volunteer at https://vremsuveranitate.ro/voluntari/

Become a volunteer at https://vremsuveranitate.ro/inscriere/

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQFDH1q2EHKdy88mNfkyH9YOUxHsOUSBwuJEfALq_l6lWgDlqTyCnDyGoj-E57ybQFjdYpJLoYIjK65nYrmX-TxglhT9PMKnwziHGbJPkp7NNpBdo0gCBpNXVJQlm558x0zVNXik4y6cBwpPo9_nGBN0z1dq1c8R5AKJ2G2cXtjQg2zgHuDOEEiZnSQbXwLi0PqZtC07AiJyY8ReR1OYfXXA-TFPK&s=518⟩

---

91. 19 October 2021 — "The network of Romanian traders who support #LegeaSuveranității is growing! Honour to them!"

The network of Romanian traders who support the #LegeaSuveranității is growing! Honour to them!

Today, Acte auto Udriște — the firm where I take out my insurance every time — has joined this chain.

Those wishing to sign for the Sovereignty Act may come from today to 1 Logofăt Udriște Street, Sector 3, Bucharest,

where they may also take out their insurance or have the documents drawn up for registering their cars:

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQEmNWarPm-HxuBpp8Pgc-rVOuVXK7HOoOBH0RUYpEYxSe0RFytEyrE5DVHZkPpyauQKajNxtJSaoHqDefI-aQfkZ8X7XalBC6zd2xh5iqkOPkZhEfOJP5V6VehSn_gKgvM_BMfDmmP9Aa1kKd-YYERFsya3SVuGzXDNk3YpJHoXslRkBry0Ml9o4YhgsvEI7sBupOS747XW5fxrx9nRF-Nm-lI5xw&s=518⟩

---

92. 19 October 2021 — "One of those courageous Romanian entrepreneurs who support the popular legislative initiative..."

One of those courageous Romanian entrepreneurs who support the popular legislative initiative #LegeaSuveranității, and who has become a volunteer and ambassador of the Sovereignty Act, has already been fined...

Luca Cristian was fined because Taverna Lions does not discriminate against its customers.

A few days after it had become an Embassy of the Sovereignty Act... by chance, of course!

We shall buy more from Taverna Lions in order to help him pay the fine!

Solidarity... that is our weapon against them! That is our secret weapon against abuse and discrimination!

Go, buy the best Pizzas in the area, support and sign for the #LegeaSuveranității at Taverna Lions in Snagov, 34 Florilor Street.

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQFCbIAq2EO-wov3vfqC_pXir7YVEJlqIEU9YQf2YX0U0oNZqJoQ56Q6qM2BmxhBMZYQsCCC1LAmOGLd9FKDctJZ5166Rxec00hFHYkIBRCJfqFu-Ff6X72JdInC_IKjVKSnTOSnQ3z7E4BcdzNn94fS1vtgSxbistdKpWG7TEMfKsRXg_1-xD0uWvq7h4cIKtDSy40g6ROb-VSIk4KjTnCMUjzFZ&s=518⟩

---

93. 20 October 2021 — "Support and sign #LegeaSuveranității!"

Support and sign the #LegeaSuveranității!

Look for a volunteer at https://vremsuveranitate.ro/voluntari/

Become a volunteer at https://vremsuveranitate.ro/inscriere/

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQH4bntrL42wTdmB-VF_YnLDAyNJ6f5QwhHeJQzcjB3AHd2D0KSpGjLIsGLvBmUQ0rqahTGuKWHBx97Yn-vJnsgkzqv9yZ2WNJiRfTsfWCp097wNvta0BcQVPmhn0SuyC-jALkod_KScO_4zdJdOCovQNCoLWbEyyEeEFKZOPFBwOOHHVoOd2sch9aOXs4qXjaazw1XMGprjCfti1jKXlksfEJMQvo&s=518⟩

94. 20 October 2021 — "Support and sign #LegeaSuveranității!"

Support and sign the #LegeaSuveranității!

BODO of "Proconsul" supports and signs the Sovereignty Act.

Download, print and sign, together with your friends and the members of your family, the forms which you will find at the following addresses:

https://vremsuveranitate.ro/autovoluntar/ and

Document kit for supporters of the Sovereignty Act at https://vremsuveranitate.ro/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Kit-documente-p…

Then send them to the Address: Bucharest, P-ța Romană, Bulevardul Magheru, no. 32-34, bl. B, sc. B, floor 3, ap. 14, Sector 1, Romania.

Or look for a volunteer at https://vremsuveranitate.ro/voluntari/

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archive of the post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/l/?l=AQGz1CED9-eqxmc5vY7gVFRRFqLSlNvbaX8iLfFcrhUaD-we0I4FqtC_SAeXuhQ2kSZNEmZgvbqPUc7xOnEULRp2eChlEPTkpNH67khqHSpWR0mLJjTg4KrspsmOZIcYal4uYJX9YrU_CQMEI0sTbGc2VW1smRzoYV3nbxexQPHYjRoDY-aBBUN92VIZKn0_rJ95OM-qEGCdZkcmbkMJHbTgAoPD9&s=518⟩

95. 29 December 2021 — On the national antibodies

On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see the page The Sovereignty Act.

On national antibodies and globalist pathogens

The comparison between the social body and the human body is as old as the world.

That is why today I shall not speak about medicine, viruses or medical treatments — subjects on which many will hasten to say that I have neither the competence nor the standing to express myself — but shall speak to you only about the social body in which I myself am a humble and insignificant limb.

And I shall speak to you about the greatest and most agreeable surprise life has offered me: the resilience, the conservatism and the exceptional quality of the people to which I belong. And I say it without exaltation, without falling into the trap of mythologising our history or glorifying our culture — both absolutely remarkable, but nowhere near the measure of the deeds of valour and of the intellectual and moral stature we have proved on a mass scale over the last two years.

In the brief analysis I shall attempt to sketch, we must start from one observation: if the year 2020 was an altogether "special" year, in the worst possible sense, through the appearance of the pandemic and of dictatorial measures on a global scale, the year 2021 was an altogether "exceptional" year through the imposition of vaccination worldwide and through the establishment, on a planetary scale, of a medical apartheid. The restriction of the right to work, to move about and to speak freely became "politically correct" practices across the planet. It should be noted that although we have had incomparably more lethal epidemics throughout the history of mankind, NEVER — I underline it once more, NEVER — have such measures been taken. Whence the reasonable suspicion (for Romanians, accustomed to the traps of history) that something else is at work here.

Until now the Romanians have passed impeccably, exemplarily, through these two great examinations of universal history. In 2020, after the first two weeks of shock and horror caused by the tanks in the streets and by institutionalised media terror, the Romanians began to do what they know best: to slip between abuses and stupidity, to dodge the blunt edges of anti-democratic laws, to make fun of the pandemic and of the arafats, to talk in corners. Timidly, to demonstrate as well. Timidly, but enough for the government not to dare tighten the screw too hard. The same in 2021: once the jabbing campaign had begun, the Romanians adapted — many were "vaccinated" beside the arm, others "fell ill" for the nth time, but most of them refused! They did not "swallow it", as the saying goes, they did not take the covidist propaganda, the covidist hectoring. And it has been proved that they were right: we are the people in Europe (and probably among the very few in the world!) least injected and least infected at this date. And that proves courage and intelligence. To succeed in opposing the global derangement with the doggedness and at the same time the lightness and elegance with which the Romanians have done it — that proves native intellectual excellence.

Once again, I am in no way exaggerating, and this finding of the intellectual excellence of the Romanian people is given by the fact that we Romanians, in our immense majority, wherever in the world we may find ourselves, have reacted in the same way: we have firmly rejected — and with good reason, as will be proved more and more with every day that passes — the covidist propaganda. Wherever in the world we may be, in our majority we have reacted the same: from the United States to Vietnam, from England to Italy, from Sweden to Australia... whatever the methods of propaganda, of terror or of state blackmail, everywhere we have remained just as reticent and just as resistant to lies and indoctrination.

For yes, these much-blamed generations — of the "decreed" children, of the "pro generation", even of the "snowflake generation" — without distinction, all the post-December generations have shown an incredible resistance to the CoVidist-Globalist derangement and blackmail. I have seen firm "denialist" attitudes and irremediably "conspiracist" opinions from venerable people of 70 and over to youngsters still on the university benches, from university professors to unskilled workers, from doctors of medicine to authorities in economics or poets and artists. All of them, whatever their age or their training, whatever their condition or social status — the majority of Romanians display a common sense and a sense of direction that is almost "instinctive", and which constitutes the argument and the proof of our survival as a people throughout history.

Our social body is fighting, really fighting, even if perhaps not visibly, perhaps not manifestly and explicitly as many of us would have wished, but it is fighting with effective means against the pathogens which have infested the leadership of our country. Often hidden beneath the mask of indifference, the passivity and the absence of reaction to covidist propaganda and to state terror, the tacit and implicit refusal to submit — demonstrated beyond any possibility of denial by the lowest rate of injection in Europe — these too are a proof of the excellence of our people.

And because, even so, we could not have resisted this long without a coherent and valid immune system, I must recall those who have constituted genuine national antibodies against the pathogens which have infested the leadership of our country. For it must be said that, in spite of the generalised securist metastasis and of the globalist viruses imposed from outside at the head of Romania for decades on end, we are still resisting as a people. And we are resisting BECAUSE of them, because of our "antibodies"!

They are many, some known, others unknown! But all of them having, in their place, their decisive role in maintaining this state of resistance in the face of the globalist and anti-traditional plague. The only thing I feared when I began to write was where to begin the enumeration, for each of those below ought to and could be in first place...

Shall I begin with the judges of the Constitutional Court who dismantled, as far as it was possible, the dictatorial legislative measures? And who, a few days ago, replied with dignity and courage to the self-appointed chiefs at the EU and the CJEU, telling them that Romania still has a Constitution… that it is still sovereign? I know only that I must thank them for existing!

Or shall I begin with the Ombudsman who, being a lady and in spite of her frail state of health, fought fearlessly like a true knight of justice in defence of her people. I thank her for being!

Or shall I begin with those few people in the press who, marginalised as they were, went on telling the truth at any price? I thank them for being as they are!

Or shall I begin with the judges of the Courts of Appeal who struck down the abusive Government Decisions? I thank them and I ask them to go on being as they are!

Or perhaps I ought to have begun with the hierarchs, the abbots and the priests who constitute the armature of this immune system — impeccable, upright and coherent with the fibre of the Romanian people whatever the leadership of the Church may say and however it may say it. I admit that probably the most beautiful surprise and the greatest joy for me was to discover the Church as I wished to find it in these days of trial: the Church standing clearly apart from the submission and the capitulation of the other sister Churches, whether we speak of the Russian or the Greek one, or whether we compare it to the absolutely conformist-globalist attitude of the Catholic Church. I thank them and I pray the Lord to give them according to their heart and their courage!

Shall I begin with the doctors who assisted the sick and supplied them with medicines forbidden by officialdom? Or who agreed to "vaccinate beside the arm" those who did not wish to do it but who were compelled to have administered to them medical treatments not "freely consented to". I thank them, and may God reward them a thousandfold!

Or… in fact, no. Now I know that I ought to have begun with you, the reader of these lines, the one who went out into the street, to every protest, at every risk, bearing enormous fines! The one who enrolled in the "Army of Sovereignty" and who gathered signatures for the #SovereigntyAct in the cold, in every condition! Or who, even remaining only online, was not afraid to tell the truth, to unmask the abjection, to expose yourself publicly under your real name as a sentinel of your people. It is with you that I ought to have begun, with those who, though "anonymous" and without any kind of protection offered either by a "guild" or by fame, have not ceased to fight for your right and the right of those around you to be HUMAN BEINGS, FREE HUMAN BEINGS! I thank you for being, and I hope that God will grant you the victory you deserve!

To all these "national antibodies" I say one single thing: I am proud to be your compatriot and your contemporary.

With such an "immune system" we shall yet witness, as a people, the fall of a few empires and the scattering of many follies and derangements!

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQFqZhMAHIetVuyec26G0orCTr1LmCh9ydkoN104VBg6WQ0UezcYnDyDR675NdaFlvUWvgBbjXLAbJQ8B1nV1PVtS-RkpsNmMx_3sYq-Q2l_QZhlVDItOoDbbZkiM5ZWsz08mZjRxKwHUXFDZppchmwXE270_uOK5ckQNt-NfjjJi_MgdTl8jTtLhrBzud7lvx3yPNZMyWRVNW4EEQer4AX65Ie5U&s=518⟩

---

96. 20 October 2021 — "Support and sign #LegeaSuveranității!"

Support and sign the #LegeaSuveranității!

Carmen Tănase supports and signs the Sovereignty Act.

Download, print and sign, together with the members of your family, the forms which you will find at the following address:

https://vremsuveranitate.ro/autovoluntar/ and

https://vremsuveranitate.ro/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Kit-documente-p...

Then send them to the Address: Bucharest, P-ța Romană, Bulevardul Magheru, no. 32-34, bl. B, sc. B, floor 3, ap. 14, Sector 1, Romania.

Or look for a volunteer at https://vremsuveranitate.ro/voluntari/

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQFk6suQtaE7-jgOEBPyN6v0UmEMJ4d9ZGQA_rvRB39QR6tqp7Dz2N_CNOraTqgkMI9xq5olBTNB9rkPAYzH-ljrVs1Tb-wqlPTFLlvv8rwR51IuUVl50jYtSGher1245fl-b8Nq_e8GWPIb8ZPPX8kegAN8AWSaZlPV2VLjpMgIYpQKhksuYmnCVrFQXkqLZaNfFmHuQPqjhLbYj8F37uLKH9W4&s=518⟩

---

97. 15 January 2022 — On a day of sovereignty

On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see the page The Sovereignty Act.

And what if 15 January, the Day of Romanian Culture, what if Eminescu's day were to become, from this year on, THE DAY OF NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY?

We have many National Holidays: Days of Independence, of the Great and of the Little Union... nearly all of them days which invariably celebrate the influence and the effects of the policies of the great powers upon our national history! I shall not go into detail... you know them!

Why then should we not also have a Day of Sovereignty?

And if we were to declare a Day of Sovereignty... when should it be celebrated?

Why 15 January? Because the essence and the continuity of a people are its culture, its faith and its language. Nothing can be done against a people that has a cultural and a cultic identity! Any addition is like oil poured into a glass of water. It is added, but it does not mix. Because Eminescu was, and would still be today, a sovereigntist! Because Eminescu is the symbol of Romanian sovereigntism!

That is why the chief adversary of the globalists and the federalists, the first guardian of Romania and of Romanianness, is Romanian tradition — a tradition which gathers into one sheaf the language, the faith, the culture and the customs. In a word, Romanianness, such as it may still be defined in these days... And the enemy of the globalists is Eminescu himself — symbol of the Romanian language and of Romanianness — and the Romanian language itself: subjects and matters marginalised, systematically removed from the school curricula. Which will soon become "taboo".

That is why it is no accident that the first institutions attacked by the artisans of the Great Reset were the school and the Church. Why? Because there lies the foundation of any people. Because it is there that language, culture and cult are transmitted — the defining elements of a people! That is why, over the last two years, the most affected, through direct measures apparently impossible to understand and without any medical justification, have been the school and the Church. All of it was thrown online, into the "virtual"...

children who have forgotten how to socialise, who no longer know how to relate to one another using a language spoken fluently and coherently, who are no longer in contact with the minimal elements

of culture which they used to receive from a school already systematically battered over the last twenty years.

The faithful, who have lost the habit of the direct and unmediated connection — unmediated by a screen — with the grace you find only in the Real Presence of the spirit in the non-time of the cult, of the rite. Only in the consecrated place, only in church.

When in history have you ever heard of both schools and places of worship being closed everywhere and at the same time in the world? When? I will tell you! Never! Not during the Second World War, not during the First World War... or during the Great Plague of the fourteenth century, or Caragea's Plague (1812–1814), and not during the Spanish Flu either (1918–1920)! And do you believe this is by chance?

The measure of purchasing aberrant quantities of experimental medicines by the Romanian state and the de facto obligation to administer them to all citizens and children under the sanction of being stripped of their fundamental rights... that too is the work of the "wise men" of the Great Reset, imposed by the federalist globalists at the helm of the EU. From these measures, unprecedented in history, to the segregation of over 50% of the population of Romania there was but one step. Social division, the programmatic and dogmatised hatred which the vaccinated were incited to bear against the unvaccinated... that too is an element of denationalisation, a policy directed against the nation which moves in exactly the same direction.

Nor is the banning, through imported laws, of the most ordinary customs — the raising and slaughtering of pigs, the prohibition or limitation of certain agricultural crops, the domestic making of drinks or foods. All of it has not merely the sense of the seizure by multinational distribution chains of every "consumer", wherever he may be, but the very eradication of a way of life... perhaps considered by some simple or rudimentary, perhaps even barbarous... but it is ours! It is the basis of what we have been and of what we still are.

Shall we add the fury and the rapacity with which our resources are taken from us, whether human resources or those of the earth? The way in which we are compelled to pay others enslaving bills for what we ourselves draw out of our own soil and our own waters — whether we speak of oil, gas, water or electricity? The way in which, while the Germans reopen coal-fired power stations, we are compelled to close ours down... in order to "save the planet"?

And because none of this can be turned into an obligation except through Law, those who would be our masters in the New Normality demand of us, with the cudgel of the CJEU, that we give up our Constitution and our Laws in favour of those imported directly from Brussels.

Now, to give up the Constitution and the sovereign attribute of national law-making means to give up sovereignty itself, to give up the status of a nation.

Eminescu wrote: "The condition of life of a law, the guarantee of its stability, is that it be a result, a faithful expression of the needs of a people, and it is precisely for this reason that the right to formulate those needs in articles and paragraphs belongs, according to the spirit of our time, to the peoples. A people — whatever it may be — has the right to give laws to its own needs and to the transactions which necessarily result from those needs, to the reciprocity of its relations; in a word: the laws of a people, its rights, can proceed from nothing but itself. / Another element, foreign to it, essentially different from its own, can impose nothing upon it; and if it does impose something, then it is only through the superiority — worthy of recognition — of its individuality, as, for example, the French imposed upon the Romanians. It is a peaceful influence, which the passive party receives with joy, with a contempt of its own, without judging that from this misfortune may be born for it." (THE

EQUILIBRIUM — extract from the article published in "Federațiunea", 22 April / 4 May and 29 April / 11 May 1870; trans. by the author.)

Perhaps it is no accident either that the Sovereignty Act, the most important undertaking in the expression of national sovereignty of the last thirty-two years, was born a year ago also in the neighbourhood of Eminescu's day! Indeed

That is why I believe that from this year on Eminescu's Day, the Day of Romanian Culture, must become THE DAY OF ROMANIA'S SOVEREIGNTY!

It is the day from which we must begin to have the courage to say THUS FAR! IT IS TOO MUCH!

It is the moment from which #RoExit is no longer merely a question but becomes an option! And the continuation in this direction by the slave-masters who style themselves our "representatives" and "leaders" will make the "RoExit" option become an obligation.

That is why I call upon all those who do not accept the New Normality imposed by the masters of the Great Reset in Brussels, all those who wish to defend the values and the identity of our people, our culture and our traditions, to sign the #SovereigntyAct and to join the Coalition for the Nation.

"Împărați pe care lumea nu putea să-i mai încapă / Au venit și-n țara noastră de-au cerut pământ și apă — / Și nu voi ca să mă laud, nici că voi să te-nspăimânt, / Cum veniră, se făcură toți o apă ș-un pământ." (Mihai Eminescu, *Scrisoarea III*. In the author's literal rendering: "Emperors whom the world itself could no longer contain / came also into our country and demanded earth and water — / and I do not wish to boast, nor do I wish to frighten you: / as they came, so they all became one water and one earth.")

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQEe67-Nt7JOWszTkCOd5lfD2jWNZ5nY9Qo9175rqXmcISKFwMCkA4t4nG9Aw8JSJyw3jEDQvQDKq3k1BaP1CyHVY8O-COMB7qxC2_t3sGbE4rSGGlqCcFC6u_XQHazTGvKVzmjCn6Q-uql-epC-DNBxNYR4ZfHxgkegdEHdLjABg9dcyA6JMxBkzRQXG7NtzIXx7QsKAVs-bRbhK9yGQvldY5Dc&s=518⟩

---

98. 20 October 2021 — "Support and sign #LegeaSuveranității!"

Support and sign the #LegeaSuveranității!

Sorin Roșca Stănescu supports and signs the Sovereignty Act.

Download, print and sign, together with the members of your family, the forms which you will find at the following address:

https://vremsuveranitate.ro/autovoluntar/ and

https://vremsuveranitate.ro/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Kit-documente-p…

Then send them to the Address: Bucharest, P-ța Romană, Bulevardul Magheru, no. 32-34, bl. B, sc. B, floor 3, ap. 14, Sector 1, Romania.

Or look for a volunteer at https://vremsuveranitate.ro/voluntari/

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQHFHixPVG4FWcUfwoMc8dy6tZtCchI8bTnKXkh18d-fZz_22kbVzGt6AwFuO6XIxQA719cdMOz0IL7I7VvdlSMlIJtDlPKM78iyOqYO63pUGzIm-WN__ckxIFpinyF7lYjAu-3XjKx0urYW0iwbES3SPfneIWjbM20JUIsI8awVNkMp_BUPxtj3wArfZU-v2k7W4VN2ZG9lR0LSBdZVykOKCjagc&s=518⟩

99. 1 February 2022 — "68.4% of Romanians want a sovereign Romania!"

68.4% of Romanians want a sovereign Romania!

I say it is enormous: 1 Romanian in 4 wants out of the EU! And that although 99.99% of the political class and of the media are in thrall to the EU.

Although nobody (until a few days ago) dared so much as to pronounce the word RoExit: it was blasphemy…

Three years ago I was the first "madman" who dared to ask: RoExit???

Now, a quarter of Romanians have answered me YES!

And we have not even begun to discuss it at leisure…

I think the panic is great… this poll, made up as it is, shows that the Romanians have woken up:

"If 25% of Romanians are in favour of RoExit, 68.4% consider that Romania's national interests must take priority over the interests of the EU and are, implicitly, in favour of a sovereigntist policy."

Within a few years we shall be the majority, I assure you!

Post scriptum: and this after only one year since the discussion around and about the #Sovereignty-Act was launched… a discussion hidden by the mass media and banned by social media…

More at: https://ro.sputnik.md/20220201/sondaj-inscop-aproape-70-din-romani-vor…

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQGKr9qkYWO_NoWg1jaGr7xThoqmonUsLRMCrdEs84qGVvvI10X8pQ4w2fdKbnavID4YOq2kWqqCYMD-jR-C8z2aC_AAxm1Y_BPluX5aH_VUajQ7GF7XomRqjbLbS2tqpKvsniByEa_zE0PErhqwyJzwAU0C0zqZcw_5t6-g1ALeNbkEYtSNpF31y6Qe710h9dQcbfOYdG11SONgdww-cn27O5rE0&s=518⟩

100. 1 February 2022 — "DOMESTIC VIOLENCE WITHIN MARRIAGES OF CONVENIENCE"

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE IN MARRIAGES OF CONVENIENCE

We had no money to pay for a poll, but we take this opportunity to thank INSCOP and its funders for the data recently collected, from which we have drawn the following answers:

• over 70% of Romanians want a sovereign Romania

Since a sovereign Romania and remaining in the EU — as this construction looks at present, degenerate, with the prospect of a course still more gravely deviant in the future, deviant even from a minimum of sanity, to say nothing of the relations between member states — are two entirely incompatible things, we must correctly understand the message of the roughly 75% of Romanians who would not opt AT THIS MOMENT for #RoExit. These are the Romanians whom the EU itself, with the assistance of the traitors BROUGHT to power in Romania over the years, has made dependent on badly paid jobs outside the country.

That is all that still binds Romanians to the EU: freedom of movement and the freedom to work in countries with stronger economies.

Romanians are, however, aware that they are captives in a toxic marriage, 70% of them stating that the EU delivers products of inferior quality in Romania. Likewise 70% of Romanians say that they WOULD WISH to be employed by Romanian firms.

Thus the pro-Romania current — a Romania firmly delimited from the noxious mixture of identities dissolved in the EU, a Romania with total decision-making power over its own future — is absolutely overwhelming, altogether beyond what one might have hoped.

This 70% which recurs obsessively in favour of national sovereignty, peeping out from under the skirt even where it apparently goes in support of the idea of remaining in the EU, represents the clearest measurement of the last long stretch of time.

If Romanians have an evident reluctance to supply personal data, in particular the personal numerical code, in order to support in an assumed and official manner an initiative of the #SovereigntyAct kind, we see that, once these fears are removed, Romanians speak — and they speak well, articulately, conscious of our present powerlessness, which keeps them slaves in an abusive relationship with the European Union, but ready to break the chains at the first opportunity. For that is why this "opportunity" is so brutally censored whenever there rise from the ranks of civil society voices capable of generating even political options which might convey to Romanians that they have no reason whatever to behave like slaves; that the great economic powers at the wheel of the EU will be left with the asparagus in the field and the building sites in ruin if we no longer accept working on our knees; that all their prosperity rests on the shoulders of countries like Romania, as it always has in history; and that their threats have an echo only when we submit.

When Romanians become aware that those threats are real only when we validate them, that 25% in favour of RoExit will become, as at the press of a button, at least 75% — and we have the example of the lies subsumed to the sanitary dictatorship, which are imploding one after another and which will constitute a lesson far too acid for the teachings of this sinister experiment not to be used in any other context. Including in the context of a decision concerning Romania's future inside or outside the European Union — a decision which will have to be taken by learning to set conditions ourselves as well.

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQFffCFCbAyg0AGU-_O0pKvj_ZGY29-zDlJpDKSKvw9kGFUfjxHX3rtBwB9WA9Opqixj4-aNy7wZ7qp57yPLJMclwu4MIf-Hco05Z6vwkMDRjVFsvBlTl4kWfKfSAWY141pPjA6BrlWystRDPcu4D2HgUvsHv7HLClSCjPfreq3w0osDGykCojsdd5YQJZzZYqjTeGnB21zjWqy9iaw7Br2g_Cug&s=518⟩

---

101. 20 February 2022 — On six months of struggle

On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see the page The Sovereignty Act.

My dear fighters for Sovereignty,

Six months have already passed since the Sovereignty Act was published in the Official Gazette. It is already at least six months since we have been together, side by side, in our struggle against the "new normality" and against Romania's status as a colony. For months on end we have been fighting together for the freedom and the dignity of the Romanian citizen, for our rights and liberties and for those of our children.

The process of gathering signatures has come to an end, and so the time has come for accounts, the time for analyses and for decisions. It is the ideal occasion for us to meet, to see one another face to face and to come to know one another still better.

But it is also the moment to decide how, or whether, our struggle must continue.

We together shall decide! Only we! Only together!

Present at this gathering will also be some of the initiators of the project, as well as persons who worked directly on the Sovereignty Act, such as Professor Ilie Șerbănescu, and also supporters and promoters of the Sovereignty Act.

That is why I ask you to accept my invitation to meet on Saturday, 26 February 2022, from 2 p.m., at the Hall on Bulevardul Nicolae Bălcescu 17–19, Bucharest 010043 (opposite the Dalles Hall)!

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQEkJj9vZCzGLz42XYK6DRAGyIe3mhndEfzYgTSlZ01BIrSeZtt7Ohdam8QdGL8syQefWSc8e8Ee6lH-jsKmb-C2Y9S35YByXV_1tV8COLFEKPZVeMcJnCanwyNie88MOJEFAXDUu650tcp5YErFuFU2vyOwDQMz3eI98zbYvLPCTqump1YUWbAv3PD6wiGGZM5ZcEkH_8f2Yh5eDQq2DMVcrXko&s=518⟩

---

102. 27 February 2022 — On signatures and Parliament

On the Referendum Act: the full text of the draft — see the page The Referendum Act.

414 days after its "conception", six months less two days after its publication in the Official Gazette, the draft Sovereignty Act has reached its destination: Parliament!

It was the immense labour of a wonderful team!

The process of gathering signatures for the Sovereignty Act has come to an end.

Through an immense effort by many of my friends we managed to gather approximately 33,000 signatures. It is a great deal, a very great deal for the winter season, in the middle of a pandemic, with restrictions and terror on the part of the authorities. A great deal, but not enough to send the Sovereignty Act from the street straight into Parliament under the conditions of Article 74 of the Constitution and of Law 189/1999.

Only as recently as Thursday, just two days before the event closing the signature-gathering process which took place yesterday... everything seemed lost. Everything! An immense effort... for nothing! So it seemed.

In the middle of a black period, in times of war, of dictatorship and of plandemic, the Lord was indulgent with us and gave us one more hope. He granted us one more chance!

Yes, for with God's help, WE HAVE WON!

Although we did not manage to gather the minimum of 100,000 signatures required by the Constitution, the deputies Daniel Ghiță and Dumitru Coarnă, together with six other members of Parliament, offered to carry our law, the #SovereigntyAct, into Parliament. They responded promptly to the e-mail I sent on Friday, 25 February 2022, to all the members of Parliament. And I thank them for having done so!

A miracle worked by God through wonderful people!

We thank them warmly and remain grateful to them!

We thank Mr Daniel Ghiță and Mr Dumitru Coarnă. And the other six members of Parliament!

And above all we thank God for having put the good thought into their minds!

Our struggle will now continue, indirectly, in Parliament, where we shall make interpellations, petitions and letters to the members of Parliament in order to compel them to hear our voice, the voice of those in the street! In order to force Parliament to debate, to vote and to adopt the Sovereignty Act!

This situation puts us in the position of understanding that Laws are written and amended in Parliament... by members of Parliament. That it is hard, almost impossible without the Lord's help, to carry a draft Law from the street into Parliament. And it is harder still, from the street, to make a draft Law become a Law!

That is why I believe we shall have to choose whether we wish to remain in the street, from where we may make legislative proposals in our own interest and in the interest of our nation,

or whether we wish to go into Parliament, the place where Laws are written and amended, and from there to write the laws in our own interest, in the interest of our children and of our nation!

We shall have to decide whether we wish to remain together in the street, civic fighters for Sovereignty, or to pass together into the political front line, fighters in Parliament for Sovereignty!

We have proved that we know how and are able to listen to one another, to consult one another!

We have proved that we know how and are able to identify the problems and to synthesise concrete solutions!

We have proved that we know how and are able to write Laws that are better, and better written, than those of the present members of Parliament!

I thank you all enormously for the efforts you have made!

Your striving has not been without effect!

But the time has come for us to know and to choose what it is best for us to do for the country:

Whatever your decision may be regarding our possible future political involvement, our activity within the Vrem Suveranitate Association will continue.

There we have already constituted a Think Tank, a group of reflection, For the Nation, which has already been joined by some of the most brilliant minds I know: Ilie Șerbănescu — our dean by seniority,

Carmen Tănase, Monica Pop, Ecaterina Andronescu, Cosmina Cerva, Alexandra Dume, Adrian Severin, Varujan Vosganian, Răzvan Constantinescu, Toni Neacșu, Mirel Palada, Radu Iliescu, Iulian Capsali, Adrian Ștef, Mihai Ionescu, Aurelian Popa and, last on the list, the undersigned.

The list of course remains open, awaiting others who wish to identify the problems of our society and to seek solutions.

One thing is certain: our problems as a nation are great, while those who govern us are either ill-intentioned or incapable.

That is why we are obliged to find solutions. And if we do not find them, to invent them!

Post scriptum: now, at the end of a stage, I must give quite special thanks to Mrs Mariana Alecu, Mrs Angela Bibi and Mrs Irina Varlan, as well as to Mr Cătălin Dume, Mr Mihai Ionescu, Mr Aurelian Popa and Mr Iulian Capsali, without whom nothing could have happened.

Post post scriptum: until we take a decision, since the fast is drawing near, the time has come for more quiet, peace and prayer!

(On the Referendum Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQFSApidGFJL3hW9YKKfdTEqDSNDd_7LosA720CtJIDkot_tnOnfFJytOoTeNF0SUzcZ0Vc1SAw9vDe6hqk-eEFenpBw2cG-BXy6OxbN5ayiwMLfgLqT9SpHs-3l8SGadLfJv-x9tkZ8Rt8YkzXSp2vclRu0p4P5v3g5uV9ZBrDtUgd4L3ecldsb4EzsOn27FwIpZQgn0BhXtuYnyBX82zSFQNXg&s=518⟩

103. 28 February 2022 — On the registration of the draft

On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see the page The Sovereignty Act.

The miracle announced on Saturday has come to pass

The #SovereigntyAct was registered under registration no. 87 at the Chamber of Deputies today, 28 February 2022, exactly six months after the date of publication of the draft Law in the Official Gazette no. 925 of 28 August 2021.

The voice of more than 33,000 Romanians was heard by the deputies Daniel Ghiță (PSD) and Dumitru Coarnă (PSD), the latter also obtaining the support of the following 23 members of Parliament:

- Diana Iovanovici-Șoșoacă (independent)

Today, 1 March 2022, the #SovereigntyAct gathered 10 more supporters in Parliament and has reached 35 initiators!!!

Here are the members of Parliament who have decided in the last 12 hours to join those elected representatives who were already fulfilling with honour, courage and pride the mandate entrusted to them by the citizen:

What is certain is that Dumitru Coarnă and Daniel Ghiță are working miracles in Parliament!

At this rate, with God's help, we may even get it to a vote and it will become, from a dream, a reality!

Perhaps together, civil society and members of Parliament, we shall succeed in bringing about the True Revolution!

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQEtta-Vl-FRD8y_6bpgWGkjE_1OGDepy_O6UwRFO1GpUjPfmS2jc8t08tz5fazgNstviPAW0zh6dRJ5BJPnCmp2Hl7ZLygSdZkuUNDcFt01LG341jArxUWO_4FZKIyu1KIBK1rDsGHUI0kppQ6_7JsCVkREJKC_ziCmKaOlLXQWH4eDM1MOv1zMt1Yko3fTb6Os9z4stbBBXm06_xM7Yj5EYL0Y&s=518⟩

104. 1 March 2022 — "It seems I have caused serious offence with #LegeaSuveranității. That is what I shall pay for!"

It seems I have given serious offence with the #SovereigntyAct. This is what I shall pay for!

The "parallels" are starting the #WitchHunt! They will have no luck ... 🤦

A friend in the press has sent me a list of "friends of Putin", drawn up by the undercover agents of the Parallel State, the agents of the External Factor. The operation of intimidating those with expertise, who still dare to think and to express themselves objectively, is becoming clear.

For the moment I refer only to those in the press, journalists and analysts on the list, whom I would characterise generically as the "cream of journalism" in Romania, people of great professional worth. So: to be denigrated by the agents of the parallels, in the service of the External Factor! Poor wretches, eaten up by their complexes ...

I shall return as the operation extends!

“The pro-Putinists of Romania. Random order, open list, other names will be added according to suggestions:

The most honourable 4th place I have ever occupied!

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQFzgDZdRBw2I-CdD62mjOFQD8WcuVZOd18Qas-eodwxW3dAR-hfKYB_PxZbt01YtOGU98oZJpwD2cV3ndxJhPCHPsEnp9cQjw4SgKK5dwAI7vy47-g5HMPF3pR5PY76ZO8R9HEKPuDRJg7yiZmtlilDFGDTWYgg31ujIKS7bR1XAzzkq0TJQ8QcVXL-CbTPpgIsiflrbAYPQmfgs-KEq6vvPVW2k&s=518⟩

---

105. 2 March 2022 — “In Parliament, battles harder than those in Kyiv are being fought to have #LegeaSuvera... withdrawn”

In Parliament battles harder than those at Kiev are being fought to have the #SovereigntyAct withdrawn! Right now!

IMMENSE PRESSURE is being brought to bear on the signatories FOR THE LAW TO BE WITHDRAWN FROM PARLIAMENT!!!

Every signatory member of Parliament has been telephoned and each of them has had it whispered in his ear that the Sovereignty Act is a “controversial”, “dangerous” law... that it must not reach a vote.

We shall soon see who will hold out, who will not take fright... and who will give way and withdraw his signature.

What is certain is that Dumitru Coarnă, Daniel Ghiță and Daniel Tudorache have told me that they will withstand the pressure at any price... #ToTheVeryEnd!

They will have the courage and the dignity to table the Law at any risk!

Let us see how many of the 35 will have that strength of character.

I am curious what George Simion and Diana Iovanovici-Șoșoacă will do!

And one more thing is certain: the Sovereignty Act badly disturbs the system! Some things must not merely not be voted on — they must not even be discussed in Parliament!

Why? Because this Law represents the antidote to all the lawless deeds committed by the System over the last 32 years!

They are afraid! And they react violently... with threats and pressure.

This is the moment when the waters separate: from today we shall be able to see easily who is controlled by the system and who is not! Who has dignity and a backbone and who has not!

Who represents the electorate and the Romanian people and who does not!

A hard examination! And that is why they are afraid...

George Simion has told me just now that: “All the AUR members of Parliament are maintaining their signature!”

Honour to all the patriotic members of Parliament who withstand the pressure of the system!

WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE ROMANIANS Dumitru Coarnă, Daniel Ghiță, Cionoiu Nicușor and Daniel Tudorache (HONOUR TO THEM!),

ALL THE PSD MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT HAVE WITHDRAWN THEIR SIGNATURES FROM THE SOVEREIGNTY ACT!

POST post scriptum: "Stop being curious! You ought to know me better! THEY DO NOT EVEN HAVE THE COURAGE TO RING ME, LET ALONE PROPOSE SUCH A THING TO ME! I think you have not understood until now what I do to them in Parliament. Once I have put my signature on a document, I do not withdraw it. And you ought to say that I told you from the beginning that I could take it over myself and table it as a civic initiative supported by me. It is fine that way too! Let any one of them dare tell me to withdraw my signature! HE'LL BE EATING EMBERS!"

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQFjq6AfAd_WHRVp9Y2IA4Xbl_I-PAcGH4irXe55p_sotKFXYN8NMmE6ljcZDflx1pU5wdmN_VxwWKLf3QWGGCOaW_7ryKVFG5Bvxxz0hT96hM_4MFG499kHs5r1uD-pLBxV2OOVAjJUTEsdRrWwXdOfAqVE-ABpaHjXlyVxk9pMuzOdAOddWenLFJ1fD_9uBAek9c0gRZkZjt0kjrdpiPSJAEms&s=518⟩

---

106. 2 March 2022 — "WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE ONLY DIGNIFIED ROMANIANS IN THE PSD — Dumitru Coarna, Daniel Ghiță, Cionoiu Nicușo..."

WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE ONLY DIGNIFIED ROMANIANS IN THE PSD — Dumitru Coarnă, Daniel Ghiță, Cionoiu Nicușor and Daniel Tudorache (HONOUR TO THEM!),

ALL THE PSD MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT HAVE WITHDRAWN THEIR SIGNATURES FROM THE #SovereigntyAct!

Here is the list of shame, the list of those who initially signed for the Sovereignty Act and who then, under pressure from the System and from the Party leadership, betrayed the people and their own convictions:

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQGhbtmO9HBe3H3Ydf_prNLrDGHAn7Cx8BbWCDoR11kEgCvw1mWEWf2JN3YMZZ_mT3nVflBPdtJNEolJ80L3Rbdp-NQoPw2qSaWqYguuGRdJK3fVOGs62Sexxz8e3mvKThQMJOvcM-DHLVEl70UHhijU9h_wYOHcs2UZQKNweV5S6D0h8CAm-H0AJHY214FYI-wz8Go9il64vTAgju95-6BsSKT4&s=518⟩

---

107. 2 March 2022 — "#LegeaSuveranității is PL-x 79/2022 (and not 83/2022, as we were initially told)!"

The #SovereigntyAct is PL-x 79/2022 (and not 83/2022, as we were initially told)!

It has appeared on the website of the Chamber of Deputies under no. PL-x 79/2022. Everything seems designed to mislead us.

http://parlament.ro/pls/proiecte/upl_pck.proiect?cam=2&idp=19828

Post scriptum: the link to the website of the Chamber of Deputies is blocked... either there are too many hits, or... "it has been blocked"!

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQG8XpB3S8WLOOc-AsrZgkXoiB4xrnkQkLau1DvAKrWiNa_74adxo0qVpLhn-EjBS-YgE9cftoZUTDsXNZHzjDkyNGAbO-BMpBpoMxlABuCR5O2UdYSY1gJJePD7chTnqg30FoUFHKphCOmN4YSTjxtqG_VDwbpIzTl6RsDPxgCLGatlQpvlVnslvn3sRjDc8jRJhSzPcFPl3rOy8sX8I4qII30&s=518⟩

108. 3 March 2022 — "Yesterday, once the Sovereignty Act had been registered in Parliament under no. Pl-x 79/2022, we managed..."

Yesterday, once the Sovereignty Act had been registered in Parliament under no. Pl-x 79/2022, I succeeded in bringing (in our all bringing together, all of us in the fine Vrem Suveranitate team) to a good end the project begun a year and two months ago.

My role as initiator, author and supporter of the Sovereignty Act has come to an end.

From now on the whole responsibility rests on the shoulders of our elected representatives. On the shoulders of your members of Parliament!

As I have told you, if a single article of that Law passes, we shall see spectacular changes throughout the whole of society.

If the Sovereignty Act passes in its entirety it will be, without any exaggeration… a true Revolution. A Revolution made not with the gun but with the pen, with the word, the most dangerous weapon against Dictatorship and Abuse. Perhaps the first true Revolution. And not only here.

If the Sovereignty Act does not pass, if Parliament does not adopt it… there will be no room left for any hope. At least not for me and not in this country.

That is why we shall have to force Parliament to listen to our voice.

We shall have to go on gathering signatures on the petition opened at VremSuveranitate.ro by which we DEMAND THAT PARLIAMENT ADOPT THE SOVEREIGNTY ACT!

We shall have to make one more effort and gather close to one another!

If we are to succeed… only together shall we do it.

Then, from a strictly personal point of view, I am faced with the following observation: without false modesty, through the Sovereignty Act project I have done more in the last year than some members of Parliament have done in a four-year mandate. Or even in four parliamentary mandates.

If we succeed and the Law passes, even partly, I for one believe that I shall have fully fulfilled my duty as a citizen towards my country. Without having been paid for years with "shameless salaries", but having been cursed and denigrated like a politician. For yes, of late I have had all the disadvantages of the status of a politician without any personal advantage — NOT ONE, quite the contrary. I am put on blacklists, fined, followed, cursed… at least let it all have been worth it.

And if, God forbid, we do not succeed and the Law is rejected by Parliament, it means that my contribution is not wanted by the country's betters, and therefore my struggle and my beliefs are doomed to failure in any case.

In either situation… it is obvious that my role in public life is more or less at an end. At least for the moment. And it was time… for I confess that I am rather tired.

Following my friend Aurelian's model, I too shall run a poll on my Telegram page where I shall ask your opinion, as one asks friends. I shall take account of your advice… I promise!

I await your advice here: https://t.me/DanMVChiticNecenzurat/889.

But I also reserve the right to do what my heart tells me, and as it tells me!

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQFRvfmZUmQZ6lLQVM-UpwRjAj4Tg5I6IJBfNV0tf4ay_XpoB1HbaS5lgG-lTm2w1HyTdYIvOzYzNP3iePbz8iPCU6oMtih-wxA5Kfvs6CqfaQYv9eT-XCnxKYbzwsvtsp35T9iqp6lJMyxK9_GwBK68dwhEL_f3ZvoEu50pnAjXb9OJ_AkuPWmlBYJ3gwAxhLGjCby7CCX-T2IesLfb_dX-lZGs&s=518⟩

---

109. 7 March 2022 — "From today you can ask Romanian members of parliament to adopt #LegeaSuveranității by going to ..."

Starting today you can ask the Romanian members of Parliament to adopt the #SovereigntyAct by going to https://VremSuveranitate.RO/ !

On the date of the vote in plenary we shall send Parliament your signatures in support of the Sovereignty Act!

That is why we must be many, courageous, vocal and united!

The more of us there are, the greater the chances that PL-x 79/2022 — the Sovereignty Act — will be adopted! The harder it will be for our members of Parliament to shirk the obligation to listen to our voice and the responsibility to represent us!

Go to https://vremsuveranitate.ro/inscriere/ and demand that Parliament ADOPT AS A MATTER OF URGENCY the Sovereignty Act — PL-x 79/2022 (whose parliamentary course you can follow at this link: http://www.cdep.ro/pls/proiecte/upl_pck2015.proiect?cam=2&idp=19828)!

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQHuCjcye2ACkEqY-0SEjzg5yo81zY11zRRYVezFC7SVb4CFThHcLko8zJOKjfzExohYC51LyAMF7sKs0af-qpR5HQbY9vX-STmYPqHB30uTcxsEfqvwfXoJvgmhDwUF_jYAWQzsW_fPymoO8hs6jOBFh6Nb4V8ub-97xlJEgN0NDmANMHeUqdQXU-bQs6Sap_YnqacXPlx7RuLcxyEhrKn48joQ&s=518⟩

---

110. 17 March 2022 — "Sovereignty, that ambivalent notion!"

Sovereignty, that ambivalent notion!

If you say it in Ukraine, it is worth dying for.

If you say it in Romania, it is only worth going to prison for.

If you speak of it in Ukraine, you are fighting against Putin.

If you speak of it in Europe, you are Putin's man.

What is certain is that the Ukrainians have the right to want sovereignty…

As for us, the Propagandists accuse us in every possible way when we say #WeWantSovereignty!

We no longer have the right to #Sovereignty…

Hello there, propaganda, a disambiguation is called for! Sovereignty... is it a good thing or a bad thing?

Is it good for it to be ceded a little, just so, "partially"... as you have argued so frenetically over the last few years? Or is it good only when it is ceded by Romania to your masters?

Until then I think I shall make a Ukrainian translation of the #SovereigntyAct!

It will certainly be well regarded by the authorities and will be adopted in Parliament!

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQGX4UQNrguDdZKwdjrVRi25bv1CsKStZFyTlA-ie8GIGik3kP2hsAH3Hk8IOVopi6M5wSB4xC9DK-SH49Vf8dEILrHWUH8gUysTA9-P_FjmyNxD8KZysHzYTQA3Is7lM92bjWR3qBtJlpLsT3GmaFE0a0DZddg_u5mcqBBJL_XK5FttwTvXBIJT3XRFVViZKqBl4biy4kb9OR-F8FuI4fmiex-wo&s=518⟩

---

111. 27 March 2022 — "If the plandemic propaganda has contaminated almost 100% of the world's media, the propaganda of wa..."

If the plandemic propaganda contaminated almost 100% of the planet's media, war propaganda has divided the media 30%–70% for and against worldwide.

And SOVEREIGNTY IS A GLOBAL TOPIC OF DISCUSSION, IN ALL THE MEDIA, WORLD WIDE, no matter who uses the term or how!

The Ukrainians want sovereignty. And the Russians too speak of nothing but sovereignty.

It took great losses of human life and imminent economic disaster for SOVEREIGNTY TO BECOME A SUBJECT OF DISCUSSION WHICH NO LONGER DIVIDES, WHICH NO LONGER STIGMATISES!

Let us look at the full part of this so very empty glass. And so very bitter!

SUPPORT ROMANIA'S SOVEREIGNTY TOO by asking the members of Parliament to adopt the #SovereigntyAct, signing on the page https://VremSuveranitate.ro/!

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQETnlU_YJbQk1v5d8ZujTfCZMs1bIzw6nCjm0pkmdBZkTYhFLOIcG-SBdJnUA3ebaV17NBtdSYqK3YHqtYpTzPUosxCL-h0y-RsS1LQ-B8akPS7ox2vbL4q4v3rFptiyCblB2Yvp_qG0mIXBfkhxjPvIaXeMoz7FsJHfuQbLCM_3Y-UCl84dQMtSgpLG0iLU_ihjrYbk7BF5plH59gz3rlbTJkY&s=518⟩

---

112. 29 March 2022 — On the antidote to treason

On the Demilitarisation Act: the full text of the draft — see the page The Demilitarisation Act.

Petrov — Never Ever Again! The #SovereigntyAct, the antidote to the Petrovs

I am not referring to him, to Petrov alias Băsescu, as a historical figure. He, Băsescu, is already politically, socially and historically dead. He is merely a revenant who still haunts us and who has the "privilege" of seeing his own degradation and social decomposition with his own physical eyes before being physically dead. Rather like Job, but a sinful, infernal Job. And yes, without going into legal detail, the lifting of all the privileges which this human scum enjoys as a result of having usurped the office of President of Romania is both lawful and justified.

In this post, however, I shall tell you briefly about the only way in which we shall in future avoid the appearance of another Petrov, another informer or securist implanted by the System in the highest office of the state.

The only solution is the removal of all the securists, the undercover agents and the secret services from the judiciary, from business, from social life and, above all, from political life!

The only solution is the #SovereigntyAct!

In Article 23 we expressly provided for the exclusion of the securists, for outlawing the Petrovs, by simple and specific measures:

"Law no. 51 of 29 July 1991 on the national security of Romania, republished, published in the Official Gazette no. 190 of 18 March 2014, as subsequently amended and supplemented, is amended as follows:

In Article 29, paragraphs (1) and (2) are amended and shall read as follows:

"(1) The intelligence, counter-intelligence, protection and special telecommunications services and those assimilated to them shall be organised exclusively on a civilian basis, their employees becoming by assimilation public servants with a special status, having the right to organise themselves in trade unions and to be investigated by the corresponding civilian prosecutor's offices.

Their status shall be regulated by organic law."

In Article 29, after paragraph (3) a new paragraph is introduced, para. (4), reading as follows:

"The personnel of the Romanian Intelligence Service, the Foreign Intelligence Service, the Special Telecommunications Service and the Protection and Guard Service who, on the date of retirement, held the status of permanent military cadre for a period of 15 years or more shall retain their entitlements until the moment their office ceases, in whatever manner."

After Article 33, two new articles are introduced, Art. 33^1 and Art. 33^2, reading as follows:

"33^1 (1) The participation in any manner of the intelligence and counter-intelligence services and those assimilated to them in the performance of any acts of judicial procedure is forbidden.

Influencing in any manner the prosecutor or the judge charged with conducting an investigation, by any person, including by employees or collaborators of the intelligence and counter-intelligence services and those assimilated to them, constitutes an offence and is punishable by imprisonment from 10 to 20 years and the prohibition of certain rights.

Failure to report the interference provided for in para. (1) constitutes a criminal offence and is punishable by the same penalty as that provided for in para. (2).

33^2 (1) The participation in any manner of the intelligence and counter-intelligence services and those assimilated to them in the carrying out of any activities of a political, economic or media nature is forbidden.

The holding of commercial companies, directly or indirectly, through their own personnel or through interposed persons, as well as the carrying out of commercial activities on the territory of Romania or abroad by the intelligence and counter-intelligence services and those assimilated to them, is forbidden.

The intelligence and counter-intelligence services and those assimilated to them may not use funds other than those provided for in the State Budget Law.

Any gains obtained by the intelligence and counter-intelligence services and those assimilated to them in the context of carrying out their specific activities shall be paid into the state budget.

The establishment, financing, direction or coordination, through their own personnel or through interposed persons, of non-governmental organisations by the intelligence and counter-intelligence services and those assimilated to them is forbidden.

Breach of the provisions set out in paras. (1)–(5) constitutes a criminal offence and is punishable by imprisonment from 10 to 20 years and the prohibition of certain rights.

Failure to report the acts provided for in paras. (1)–(5) constitutes a criminal offence and is punishable by the same penalty as that provided for in para. (6)."

"Article 23 amends Law 51/1991 on national security, a law predating Romania's accession to NATO and containing a series of provisions of Soviet origin, such as those providing for the militarisation of the secret services.

In order to harmonise national legislation with the legislation of Romania's NATO and European Union allies, the total demilitarisation of the intelligence, counter-intelligence, protection and special telecommunications services and of those assimilated to them has been ordered.

In the same sense, the participation in any manner of the intelligence and counter-intelligence services and of those assimilated to them in the performance of any acts of judicial procedure has been forbidden, as has the influencing in any manner of the prosecutor or the judge charged with conducting an investigation. Any act contrary to the provisions of the law, as amended, has been criminalised, carrying a penalty of between 10 and 20 years.

For the same reasons, and also in view of the imperative necessity of forbidding any kind of interference by the intelligence and counter-intelligence services and by those assimilated to them in public life outside their own sector of activity, as well as the need to return to a fair competitive framework for the business environment in Romania, the participation in any manner of the intelligence and counter-intelligence services and of those assimilated to them in the carrying out of any activities of a political or economic nature has been forbidden, as has the holding of commercial companies, directly or indirectly, through their own personnel or through interposed persons, and the carrying out of commercial activities on the territory of Romania or abroad by the intelligence and counter-intelligence services and those assimilated to them.

The measures amending the provisions of certain laws fundamental to national security were taken because, in Kennedy's words: "The very word 'secrecy' is repugnant in a free and open society; and we are as a people inherently and historically opposed to secret societies, to secret oaths and to secret proceedings. [...] For we are opposed around the world by a monolithic and ruthless conspiracy that relies primarily on covert means for expanding its sphere of influence — on infiltration instead of invasion, on subversion instead of elections, on intimidation instead of free choice, on guerrillas by night instead of armies by day. It is a system which has conscripted vast human and material resources into the building of a tightly knit, highly efficient machine that combines military, diplomatic, intelligence, economic, scientific, and political operations. Its preparations are concealed, not published. Its mistakes are buried, not headlined. Its dissenters are silenced, not praised. No expenditure is questioned, no rumor is printed, no secret is revealed. [...] That is why the Athenian law-maker Solon decreed it a crime for any citizen to shrink from controversy." (John F. Kennedy, "The President and the Press", address before the American Newspaper Publishers Association, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, 27 April 1961 — original text; the passages are quoted here in the order used in the explanatory memorandum, the omissions being marked by [...].)"

It is the key article of the Sovereignty Act, it is the "head of the corner" and, at the same time, the foundation of a healthy Romanian society which may still hope for a future. It is the only chance we have, without any exaggeration!

It is certainly the most disturbing provision for the system of all those contained in the Sovereignty Act.

It is the reason why some members of Parliament were compelled by their superiors to withdraw their signatures from this draft...

It is the reason why I call upon you to support the Sovereignty Act and to demand that the members of Parliament adopt PL-x 79/2022

By pressing the button above, we shall put pressure on our deputies and senators to adopt the Sovereignty Act.

"We, the Romanian people, initiate this draft law called the Sovereignty Act in order to put an end to medical abuses, to prohibit the export of raw timber for 100 years, to repatriate the gold reserve, to prohibit the financing of the secret services from commercial activities of a private nature, to introduce concrete penalties for the violation of the country's Constitution and to protect the human and natural resources of Romania."

(On the Demilitarisation Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQG4HUrujcuLYEaIalVBlG8-hwfkdCDxE-oUtBiPS5rj0rnBT-vt5hEE-qra5rr_gEypGbrWvbIHsyGZQNAE6pjjU_EMjmr9xgt-qSabG_ev-FqvZV4wG5ZK0_xCUm8t34j8wYyP3QLxHoZSC_ejXnFkAA9oimzJW3eIYO8Hi5tIiRzoCzeX3RmVtBaHPF35xOy5PbIVik51H0F3mHQEVrwYYsU&s=518⟩

---

113. 1 April 2022 — "The securitate man Ciolacu demands the expulsion of deputy Dumitru Coarna from ..."

Ciolacu the securist demands the expulsion of deputy Dumitru Coarnă from the PSD

This act is considered a crime against the System and the Globalists, which is why the "culprit" must be punished in exemplary fashion by the securist lackeys!

The rest of us, who have been fighting for years against the Securitate and its masters abroad, consider that deputy Coarnă has shown patriotism and courage, that he has performed a genuine act of heroism!

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQGKRqaJex9y-DW1m_d84WUFVW7Y_TMXQN7xryOLY5zIVmp60Rgx9zsQeeq050bW8rgiv2s2p7ZsrEXzBAPZjOrl-F_zpqP7d_JJPTud8ilppxG36qw8vLy19mJKsE9A3nOGkoy5RO3mhu3bnZ_VbXaACN6PAbWx1qzhq8A9URe1yQoVSy2kItVYMGX5M-wbPlIUmYBNlDZRgvyHkWL6pTE8D-CY&s=518⟩

---

114. 5 April 2022 — "Today #LegeaSuveranității was rejected in the Labour Committee of the Chamber of Deputies!"

Today the #SovereigntyAct was rejected in the Labour Committee of the Chamber of Deputies!

The Progressive-Systemic majority PNL-PSD-UDMR-USR voted as a bloc against the Law!

The Securist-Globalists in Parliament have blown their cover and are acting in unison against the National interest, against the will of the citizen!

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQHBhHMD12XUcbRXFTMko-cO4TH8N_kaZXTrwdmXt3SBPjLnV9wzTlzjPPyrphb9_BdxXUgrYcETZ0dJkLsg8reba0rrpUzxjnDOcjnvY9WY688IaoxzIGBGRTyFN8vkc2jQJyZjF7AZ1d-Pq6E7G8q2IfUX9v1sU2A-jqMGKGAAaZyE_DbbDe3qrnrBW3qLxgVcSVRyfAdbc7CyBOq4qgILEhyCE&s=518⟩

---

115. 6 April 2022 — "The "civilians" of the Economic and Social Committee (CES) have also given a negative opinion on #LegeaSuv..."

The "civilians" of the Economic and Social Council (CES) too have issued a negative opinion on the #SovereigntyAct...

The reason: "matters relating to consumer protection are regulated ... There is already in the legislative circuit a draft Emergency Ordinance (?!?) concerning better provision of..."

"… the legislative initiative is inopportune and unsustainable, in that it contains deadlines impossible to forecast…" and above all

"THERE ARE NO PERTINENT REASONS FOR TRANSFORMING MILITARY STRUCTURES INTO CIVILIAN STRUCTURES"!!!

In other words, the securists of the CES do not want the demilitarisation of the security services, do they?

I told you that this is what hurts them! This is what hurts them most of all!!!

Our draft law, the Sovereignty Act, even if it does not pass Parliament, will nevertheless have achieved one feat:

it will unmask all the undercover agents in the institutions and in the press!

We need only pay a little attention to who says what…

Watch out for the securists! They are many, they are everywhere, but they are not very bright… so that soon we shall all find out WHERE YOUR MONEY IS!

Who receives a fat sum from us in order to work for them…

(On the Demilitarisation Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQE8fvqrr9ypdJRu6g1So4khnAL9V0v-VJQAHnytJ6e5X9iLPaUcYFVYYtV3tToSrykgc8kHLUCWygMPtUo5AebPb-TRVJQWECl3nlXoqCgml7TDKsaRm_fyVpJeOLE9_tYujJGT9kq7f3BGbPaQBpGcMUDkKf6GjPlShQQWv1PbhCrwubcbzsdCzqBghrh_Q7ILFi8Cld_L0D01G97u5PmqLpQw&s=518⟩

---

116. 9 May 2022 — "I thank the friends of the Romanian people who have supported it openly and publicly from the rostrum ..."

I thank the friends of the Romanian people who supported the #SovereigntyAct openly and publicly from the tribune of Parliament!

I thank all the signatories and, in anticipation, I thank all those who will vote for this Law, so vital for Romania!

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQ-GAgLQQkzq9MxXCTH0hLRCRZCz9gUdAwUA6kv_dXdiM6SrMGnUgOJJHFSNRgyUD3yi2tvrfmaL5vsLwZ4q9_AAOp4Ss_J7JrDhCbQaC3VYasiHijpZ7DdyAyCZbBqZTrxNO_VeHV0dcBcIW5XQ0mrIQV3DezCW-sm0i2aiKT60K2XuQtFlojer1Lba0xQsq-t0aLbzwBtvYAnNiqMFW6lNZdsI&s=518⟩

---

117. 9 May 2022 — "Tomorrow at 11.00 #LegeaSuveranității will be voted on!"

Tomorrow at 11 a.m. the #SovereigntyAct will be put to the vote!

Between now and tomorrow, telephone your deputies and write to them by e-mail and text message!

Ask them to vote Our Law through,

the first exercise of the sovereignty of the Romanian people by means of direct democracy!

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQHgJ4wi8HQYin3XPyLLppjhterQfQkBDnhrxKuxQ3j52m7UxNjtRbJH7bPYMACOVjNlZ4AScsnrWYQS7ujjARj-TevWp-xmnIc_8PGFRprt3KpM8SfZ8XcFoP6BG6VE9yLrMbieWCklXKqeBq-bpBFGMLaqu0GEmgx2Tj8CCuawkqN9l4BSi_jaR-lWmVR5Z8UahViDUPYbhmvEW96oSp8Bf6Y&s=518⟩

118. 9 May 2022 — "Tomorrow we shall know the names and the exact number of the deputies who will have to be replaced at the next..."

Tomorrow we shall know the names and the exact number of the deputies who will have to be replaced in the next legislature!

The test of the #SovereigntyAct will divide the deputies of the Chamber into #patriots and #traitors.

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQFDFyv-vf0EY9erYeIP-vrUAoziFBzQHg-MX_20sKxm-hJ59lrDE9y_9658Ngouo22wUetmdP8xE8dW0GcLOtWSK4SDThWtdeY2nQW_ymuHBfwwlsAoB_vm28_bPKZdVWxH6OQ0QQn6lLHuaa7RqVlzrCcBcbwrToQl7I6cw_ehSehTeFmkDLan28_qcVp_c_uwzVxJoL9Ayf_RF42oNM3nv3my8&s=518⟩

119. 11 May 2022 — "Not a day without treason from the PSD-PNL-UDMR-USR Coalition of Treason"

Not a day without a betrayal on the part of the PSD-PNL-UDMR-USR Coalition of Betrayal

Today, 11 May 2022, FROM 12:00, THE #OFFSHORE ACT WILL BE VOTED ON IN THE SENATE. AT FULL SPEED!

And today, and for the #OffshoreAct, the toxic unanimity of the System — the #CoalitionOfBetrayal — will vote in Parliament as it did yesterday on the #SovereigntyAct: against the nation and against the interest of the citizen.

Let us go to the Senate, let us defend our resources!

https://www.senat.ro/ProgramLucruZi.aspx?Zi=2022-05-11&Comisie-ID=587d586c-13fa-4bf6-8dbb-9fc3617dbdf4

(On the offshore draft: the full text of the draft — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQG7Aa0gNfytdnf37E7eyHkI88kmA0qvXCmRgVC13EQxRwfNIHrb6gQd41fxgKcqivS1cpFldnZmT1skY-hx_D28Fqm_GUE4BM0bvk51gU8FxQ90scwEsFHTIfkDNpRIVETF5O1oer4g5Lsh2o0fr0nVwSOqo3tgFnr_dgwpu-Z1PIHY7p4YgzRV9E3wDE_hFhE1qSvGOKuD-_A8HUUST-s4jdrpo&s=518⟩

120. 11 May 2022 — "The propaganda continues to say that Romania will receive 60% of the gas extracted..."

Propaganda goes on saying that Romania will receive 60% of the gas extracted…

In reality Romania will receive nothing at all once the #OffShoreAct has been amended!

The #CoalitionOfBetrayal PSD-PNL-UDMR-USR IS HANDING EVERYTHING OVER TO THE EXPLOITING CORPORATIONS!!!

That is why nobody quotes the provisions which are supposed to bring us these benefits.

That is why I am not allowed into the Senate.

Proof of the betrayal and the villainy is the very fact that the Minister of Energy, Popescu, said with his own mouth that the amendment of the OffShore Act will de facto eliminate the surtax which exists to this day.

That is why the #SovereigntyAct had to be rejected yesterday!

If the press were a press, it ought to ask:

1. Why have you de facto eliminated the surtax from Ordinance 7/2013?

2. Why have you also included onshore gas in the category of exceptions provided for offshore gas?

3. Why do you allow the operators to sell all of Romania's gas to whomever and at whatever price they wish outside the country?

4. Why are you giving away Romania's resources free of charge?

5. Why have you eliminated the obligation for 50% of the gas extracted here to be sold on the domestic market?

(On the offshore draft: the full text of the draft — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQF5DMGBsvS1vjk9f0MwHhab95Zt6_QkyuE0Io1aMoCKf_1PLZWlX4RUtvGqmp-cfZUcONQvCu3R-sQ2K_Xt18yIR5TnWgepFLdVWegQmP1f7XWBJwUP6TT6mz8Km7z7lKxysFEU4RaSbeV6uorq8yKYys936dz3X_n8DWUpeclZbx966LKQ-EV67RLQcFFiVagPzayYQG82S6HKRZs-M7_DqCED4&s=518⟩

---

121. 11 May 2022 — "#LegeaOffShore has been amended in the Senate!"

The #OffShoreAct has been amended in the Senate!

86 senators voted for the amendments brought by the #CoalitionOfBetrayal PSD-PSD-UDMR-USR!!!

These traitors must be put on the same list as the 229 deputies who rejected the #SovereigntyAct!

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQE205OCFvs8q_ZajwUXJI1MUknvCfmjpik3VdVbE2AxyXUsrFDG9BMB4xEqFA3ItjpGXPpXMhEA3C8riSuOkEB8o7gJXzWQwhg7Bqyhmchg-gwSoHwdOk5wgeUa6N-hZyLl8eMdMf42RqFpL3MmQAREEYrv3ewp3dJze858_kXEShmH4JmJd14lxpYNQKTNgEhG2cbC3wE2lSoQBR8RMqhoOMno&s=518⟩

---

122. 11 May 2022 — "«The lawyer Dan MV Chitic is banned from the Palace of Parliament», the statement of an official..."

"The lawyer Dan MV Chitic is banned from the Palace of Parliament" — a statement by an official recorded by Diana Iovanovici-Șoșoacă.

For the time being I am the only person to enjoy such treatment...

I wrote a law... which 99% of the members of Parliament have not done. And not just any law, but the #SovereigntyAct!!!

And I opposed the amendments brought by the #CoalitionOfBetrayal PSD PNL UDMR USR to the #OffShoreAct!

For this I am persona NON grata in the Parliament of Romania.

I do not regret that I am no longer received in the House of the Betrayal of the People.

I regret only that I could not do more against these vipers and Judases!

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQGg9GF9D_Q29hEfqBYRlhCR2Db-umr4u5kMrIzy8pVxvplCGpKpvKRS9bPQ1taHnwNGZiVAw6JUSIl-PYwy8X6m-woiEYdJUSztKX0u4tAfGrzlEEuwnqrs5vYLsNY2x8onb2xaLYHHxbC_4KTApxzTdyNhurifL3jALgsy9FFqhbKci5Pldd5-QnSArImMMC7ih3KWqjq4rzVpwZ_PZWcEUSGQ&s=518⟩

---

123. 12 May 2022 — "Citizen Dan Chitic is persona non grata in the House of the PEOPLE"

Citizen Dan Chitic is persona non grata in the House of the PEOPLE

I cannot tell whether it is because I challenged Arafat's dictatorial and unconstitutional measures, or because the #SovereigntyAct provides for the demilitarisation of the secret services which protect Arafat.

In any case, we know that the sleepy criminal Bode sent the order that a citizen be denied access to the House of the People.

Are we next to be banned from our own country??

(On the Demilitarisation Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQGa_y4RXt4D4l4jxlMw-ivp2VzhCTxzjLELmptFseMvSwVtgyPXJ97QKl-FucH528E6In8W0PlJYj_n83SL1OaZiEi0gEkq4PKftbHePtSydSWS6iPXFgV4CcYttPdwgnnNiW6OUMYbh7iaND13Dol2Zx78_GEgiFznVCEjBkqlbYDF5BltknwKryfMpDcsjiYcRMzmlIChsE0-Rq2NR_gQLJXE&s=518⟩

---

124. 12 May 2022 — "Ciolacu: "It is possible that the PSD will stand together with the PNL at the 2024 elections if the nati..."

Ciolacu the cabbage-head: "It is possible that the PSD will run together with the PNL in the 2024 elections if nationalism gains ground. With a percentage of 60% such as we now have, we shall be a barrier against nationalist extremism, which would take Romania down the path of perdition and would divert us from the right European and Atlanticist path on which we find ourselves".

"The PSD unanimously rejected the Sovereignty Act because it is an absurdity fit to make a cat laugh, a utopia impossible to apply in the times in which we live"

Via Cornelia Victoria Iordache

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQEuwO7aZhuudYeX9qvBUyL-nCDl4cDPOX-Qf2DsHvL9kBLUvMXYMoG7bjhP8won7ktn9gVB1nSF4UT6k6rciK47D-sja3oOcUqOFKupUUECAhwueRtqbzGdu6F-bQI72HGTuy_QOUKvhuyT8NUHog2PiUHelzpKK1KS686IqAMD_MHOhgSifS5NubqjLmnK6G97JPqJh8fWSqRZAwA7sPF3y77K8&s=518⟩

---

125. 17 May 2022 — "Our amendments to #LegeaOffshore provide for a tax on the supplementary revenues of the..."

Our amendments to the #OffshoreAct provide for a tax on additional revenues of at least 30% of the value of the gas extracted from Romania, for 90% of it to be sold on the domestic market, for penalties for breaching these provisions of up to 30% of the turnover of the exploiting corporations, and for a deduction of at most 30% of investments per year.

In addition, gas from the territory of Romania (onshore) will no longer be extracted under the rules applicable to offshore operations, even where it lies at depths greater than 3,000 m.

Not least, the investments taken into account for the deduction from the tax on additional revenues will be considered non-deductible in the calculation of profit tax.

Will the #CoalitionOfBetrayal PSD-PNL-UDMR-USR-Minorities agree to these amendments?

We await concrete answers to the point from Ciucă, Ciolacu, Kelemen, Pambuccian!

(On the offshore draft: the full text of the draft — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQH3sKS0DwfAcF3_5Fy1DgqOxCuhb2xqMZ2l_r_IkAEYYn0r6movmL3Y1Q-5diTU6-Jnz9GE5lrRtAsrAPAL-QV6t-T93quMpSjZ16gluX7N1P4VzcGKr0Q-8kFNpZP6Rfu-3igdABHO33AvD-qFCoReGuNAakwrIzXK5BjC-fuJy2y1QeDhUiC75IyjZEsp06QoWrECut6t6oGbseEAWJBuExL8&s=518⟩

---

126. 17 May 2022 — "The Industry and Budget-Finance committees of the Chamber of Deputies have rejected all the amendm..."

The Industry and the Budget-Finance Committees of the Chamber of the Bewildered have rejected all the Chitic-Coarnă amendments, amendments supported by the AUR deputy Florin Pușcășu!

The #CoalitionOfBetrayal PSD-PNL-UDMR-USR-Minorities is working...

We are about to lose everything... for nothing!

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQH5lmw1r-Jg_gCof2RtZfvKMBoinmhg8jP9AGezXqncGeqOZsB4wUJjLtqvY3_g3mrUvgvnfI7o2SC731nOfhtNOq9G0Sog01PB13gKhMTdXRk7e3qO8g8aFW2SlGoPutIn5iAAukol7-tOSZTFM-DDNWvwCTfiUZ_fShampJCfoPYVouccgzTI2XhhwGSM7MhHxm3j9BJB94-Wwt5_9Ar03yAf8&s=518⟩

---

127. 18 May 2022 — "Here is the recording of the sitting of the Chamber of Deputies in which one of the ...was committed"

Here is the recording of the sitting of the Chamber of Deputies in which one of the most arbitrary acts of betrayal against the Romanian people was committed, namely the passing of a shameful and damaging law — the #OffShoreAct — and the rejection of all our amendments, which would have ensured that Romania's resources were exploited for the benefit of Romanians as well.

You will see how the #CoalitionOfBetrayal — PSD-PNL-UDMR-USR — handed Romania's gas over to the exploiting corporations and how it denied Romanians their right to dignity and prosperity, how the majority of the members of Parliament voted against our legitimate interests.

Tomorrow I shall return with explanations concerning the common denominator, the institution which coordinated the vote and brought about the rejection, in a single week, of two laws essential for the Romanian people: the #SovereigntyAct and our amendments to the #OffShoreAct.

The spectacle of betrayal is worth watching to the very end.

It is worth remembering one of the most shameful moments in the history of Romania.

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQGtrzOBnnu4HUN0Parx6PO7jYQPWUSBKnZhcGYB1jh-OiBK4u5tVx5n85b8RxXJDVmhpXZirOO3JE0Iy44l7DocdZk-VjePQ-W7Nul9YL2ciO8fQYPpaqOzd3VKvQoFpjYURUS0DyQUS4i5938hbU7OC31ytqWcDBmlNj4bBtXVmY8l097A6NJs1lRWHUhqeHxQP0Sbw3jAXqw2wv6WT7XZb8xU&s=518⟩

---

128. 20 May 2022 — On the country of the services

On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see the page The Sovereignty Act.

Of late I have kept hearing it said by the mouths of propaganda that Russia is not a country which has a security service but a security service which has a country. I do not know. It may be so.

What I do know for certain is that this assertion is 100% valid for Romania: it is not Romania that has security services, it is the System, the security services, that have a country still called by law Romania, and de facto called Securistan.

For years now the System has penetrated into the most unsuspected and surprising nooks of society, so much so that you could not even get in as a secretary or a cleaning woman unless you had at least a starred "recommendation", if not some post-graduate "studies" in the right place — that is, at the National Defence College in Bucharest, at the "Mihai Viteazul" National Intelligence Academy (the SRI school), or at the Romanian Diplomatic Institute (the SIE school).

I have a friend (I shall not give his name), an intelligent and very well educated gentleman who possessed every qualification to become an exponent of power but who never reached that position precisely because he was too intelligent and too free, and who confessed to me how the selections are made and what the school consists of. How and from where the recommendations must come and how you must in practice "kiss the ring" (figuratively, as in the mafia) of the Director of the College, taking as well a kind of oath of allegiance. How and what courses you take; about the immense screen at the headquarters of the Ministry of the Interior on which you can see everything, anything in Romania, in real time... and that was many years ago.

Only in this way does one reach the spheres of power... but not only there!

The whole thing has spread like a cancer, like a gangrene, into every field, into the judiciary, into the economy, into civil society, into culture itself, but above all into the political sphere.

Whatever the orientation he declares, whether so-called left or so-called right, the Romanian politician always thinks and acts "obediently" and "politically correctly"... as though he were receiving orders or had previously been through a course of training. And this for the simple reason that most "politicians" have first passed through one of the two institutions mentioned above: the National Defence College in Bucharest, the Romanian Diplomatic Institute or the "Mihai Viteazul" National Intelligence Academy — unless of course they were already undercover officers, in which case the training and re-education studies are no longer necessary. The prize pupils, the chosen few, such as Marcel Ciolacu, naturally also belong to the PRO-America Group within Parliament.

Once in Parliament, the systemic "politician", whether from the "opposition" or from the "governing side", would on certain "key" draft laws of "national interest" vote "spontaneously" and "politically correctly", as though on command, so that it became disconcerting to see de facto unanimities in the vote between government and opposition on controversial and invariably liberticidal draft Laws, as happened with Law 55/2020 (on certain measures for the prevention and combating of the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic)... you remember, don't you?

It had become so disconcerting that it became obvious the System, the security services, control Parliament in its entirety.

That was the moment when the game of government-versus-opposition came to an end... That was the moment when the System said "We are the State" and established the majority of over 90% of the present Parliament, a majority which I have called the #CoalitionOfBetrayal PSD-PNL-UDMR-USR. It would probably have been more accurate to call it the #SRICoalition... in any case, it comes to the same thing!

What followed we already know: odious Laws passed without discussion, such as the Big Brother law — a Big Brother Law initiated by Tanczos Barna, the same individual from the same formation supported by Budapest, where terrorists who acted on Romanian territory are given prizes — criticised prudently and only in part, and fearfully, by a Constitutional Court itself about to succumb

under the assault of the System; and in the last week alone we have seen how the #OffShoreAct was amended strictly and solely in favour of the exploiting foreign corporations, how censorship on the internet was officially instituted, and how the only draft law to come directly from society, from those not schooled by the System — the #SovereigntyAct — was rejected and derided by the men of the system.

Things were and are predictable. Before the vote on each essential law, in the (literally) enlisted mainstream press there appear the opinionators, the "specialists", the "opinion formers" and the teleprompter girls, who announce and "bring the good tidings" of the invariably correct choice of the SRI Parliament.

That is, when the "annunciation" does not need to come from the SRI's own official publications, so that the order may be well understood — as was the case with an explicit article which appeared a few days before the vote on the #OffShoreAct (here is the proof — https://intelligence.sri.ro/marea-neagra-o-sansa-pentru-securitatea-en...

That is why the reaction of civil society in coming forward with its own draft laws and/or amendments to the laws proposed by the system is normal and legitimate. So normal and legitimate that I fear the System may already be plotting something to silence those who take up the drafts from the street and bring them in "through the back door" into a Parliament that has become completely deaf and blind to the will of the citizen.

The risks are accepted, obviously. But the greatest risk is not the disappearance of a few people (too few, unfortunately) but the destruction of the last link between the people and the SRI Parliament.

I do not know. Probably only the elimination from the future Parliament of all the members of the #CoalitionOfBetrayal, of the #SRICoalition.

There is also a simple method for making the individual selection of each member of the future Parliament: eliminating the men of the System! Refusing to accept in the future Parliament the graduates of the system's "schools" of correction and training, the National Defence College in Bucharest and/or the "Mihai Viteazul" National Intelligence Academy, institutions which offer "master's degree studies for the promotion of the culture of security in civil society", as we read on the site https://www.animv.ro/admitere-3/, since "civil society, or the new political class, needed education in order to have access to a field which until then they had been forbidden to study, to discuss and to understand" (https://cnap.unap.ro/index.php/ro/).

What is interesting is that "Civilian and military personalities may enrol in the courses of the National Defence College, graduates of civilian or military higher education institutes who hold, or may in future hold, positions of leadership and decision in the fields of security policy and national defence", the condition for admission and enrolment being "nomination by the tutelary institution for participation in the courses;" (https://cnap.unap.ro/index.php/ro/conditiile-de-inscriere).

The natural question which arises on reading this eliminatory condition of enrolment (yes: you, from the street, cannot enrol without a "nomination") is WHICH TUTELARY INSTITUTION NOMINATED... CIOLACU, who took courses in Further Training in the field of national security and defence, "Security and good governance", in 2008–2009? Or MIHAI TUDOSE, graduate of a post-graduate course in the field of national security at the Higher College of National Security, Romanian Intelligence Service. Or SORIN GRINDEANU, likewise a graduate of a further training course on the theme "Security, diplomacy and foreign policy" at the Romanian Diplomatic Institute. Or any of the many members of Parliament and senior officials who have passed through the schools of the system, a sine qua non condition of accession to the positions they hold.

The major problem is not even that the System, that the Securitate, has spread through Romanian society at every level. As never before!

The vital problem for Romania is that the System, the Securitate, acts consistently against the nation and against liberty, as has been seen in the latest systemic legislative initiatives adopted by the SRI Parliament.

The vital problem for us as free human beings and as citizens is that the System acts directly against the interests of each one of us, beyond any discussion of principles and values.

We have already reached the point where it is one or the other: #EitherUsOrThem!

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQHZ8wH9pkFx6FYzrWA1oUc5MayjBYuIca8ibi9es-jc3bL0zND1_xfNTCaRouajq6dxcNsph8vneOaRNUHF1O2ffzgykOvsNzAJCJZoszRR9XzwBMEw5KvQ4xMw76kCAPurZbTnxhbkf9mjjlpCkoLbCEa_HwoA-USVS4R1cRSdC13huesaEgsS1SSIIpf-s0xoYb68hzKQ0re_qs2hDtAAvkBQ&s=518⟩

---

129. 23 May 2022 — "More and more often, the representatives of the System, from Gauleiter Iohannis to the heads of ..."

More and more often the representatives of the System, from Gauleiter Iohannis to the chiefs of what I have called the #CoalitionOfBetrayal — that is, the collective entity Ciucă-Ciolacu-Kelemen — tell us that the Constitution must be changed.

This Constitution has many shortcomings, but it has the great merit of having defended our rights during the plandemic and of having made the #SovereigntyAct possible.

I too should like a Parliamentary Republic and a clearer separation of powers in the state. I too should like a President with more limited and more clearly defined powers.

But the changes will have to be made by a Parliament which does not represent a mere 30% of the electorate and which is not populated by citizens with "studies" done at the "Academies" of the Securitate.

Not in a period of sanitary, military, economic and food crisis!

For AN AMENDMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION MADE NOW WILL BE THE OCCASION FOR LIMITING OUR FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS AND FOR GIVING UP WHAT IS LEFT OF NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY! I have no doubt whatever! Those are precisely THE AIMS OF THE GLOBALIST SYSTEM MEN WHO GOVERN US!

This becomes the motto of our future struggle:

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQHFRiOI4fkrvCZtzPqvLOkanAOrvpWo0AYImmNjXpwZMb93K3LqzqEMm6Mhj11nTUrv3r3NQK6dYUqG21hQx-pEm6nPI48KeK7YeVg1wXG1LJXXKk2rWRqDGpXpij151XKSl6Z3Bzrf6HPP6JESV2rWPcdeGH3sY0qYAkpaVbNLlvX6TpbQV66Zm49Nx8y6V2TbcWh0AJhIp7RE4eUtqbr12P-Gg&s=518⟩

---

130. 25 May 2022 — On the end of globalisation

On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see the page The Sovereignty Act.

George Soros announced to us yesterday that Globalisation is dying. “Even when the fighting stops, as it eventually must, the situation will never revert to the status quo ante”, he prophesies to us.

Yes, Soros is right. And he is right too when he says “That’s why I say our civilization may not survive” upon observing that other issues which concern the whole of humanity — “fighting pandemics and climate change, avoiding nuclear war, maintaining global institutions — have had to take a back seat to that struggle.” (George Soros, remarks delivered at the World Economic Forum, Davos, 24 May 2022 — original text.)

“Their civilisation”, the globalist “civilisation”, will not survive.

In fact, Globalisation is already dead. The unipolar world in which a group of decrepit billionaires and autistic IT men decided the fate of the whole planet over a pretentious dinner somewhere in a Swiss resort or in some capital of the “civilised world” came to an end on 24 February 2022. Whatever the fate of the war in Ukraine, globalisation has ceased; it perished together with the demonisation of Russia and the institution of institutionalised Russophobia in the “civilised west”.

Many will hasten to tell me that it is impossible for globalisation to end, that the process is irreversible and that, in present conditions, the world can only be globalised.

Wrong. Globalisation, in the sense in which I have used the term until now, was the perfect synonym for cultural and social uniformisation, for the abolition of traditional and social differences, for the interoperability and management of production and economic exchange, all of it carried out under the aegis of a western “Intelligentsia” which also set the agenda of global priorities and humanity’s to-do list.

This unipolar globalisation, synonymous with a world statism, has already come to an end.

The other globalisation — that of the exchange of ideas, goods and persons, but without a single command; that globalisation which has existed since antiquity with its Silk Road, or with the providential encounters of civilisations and traditions such as in Spain from the eighth to the fifteenth century, or in Syria until its destruction in the twenty-first — that globalisation will not cease. It cannot!

The globalised statism of the United States and of its allies and satellites (not to say colonies) has, however, come to an end.

The disappearance of the Dollar as the single currency of exchange at global level is the death certificate of this globalisation.

The appearance of the Chinese Yuan and of the Russian Rouble in international transactions, together with the activation of the BRICS bank in the global economy, are the birth certificates of the multipolar world.

Faced with this situation, apparently unforeseen by the former world hegemon — although extremely simple and easy to anticipate — the United States finds itself obliged to compensate for the loss of global control by tightening its control over, and isolating, the world it still governs directly, and I mean here Europe, North America, Australia and Japan.

The countries under its leadership (the EU included) are obliged to break off all contact with “the other world”, to refuse the exchange with it not only of ideas but also of goods. Clearly, in a first phase, this measure will give a bubble of oxygen to the wheezing economy of the former world leader, which will take over the functions of “utilities supplier” for its part of the world… For us, in the colony, the effects of the orders received from the metropolis are already visible. In today’s government meeting alone several measures will be taken to sever all links with the “world beyond”

the new iron wall: the Government will approve Romania's withdrawal from the International Bank for Economic Co-operation and the International Investment Bank, two "eastern" institutions of which we had been part since 1963 and 1970 respectively.

But beyond the long-term economic effects, which we shall not comment on here and now, what is certain is that the Biden administration — the one under which the death of Globalism has taken place — is incapable of realising that these measures are "pro-cyclical", doing nothing other than leading to an even more pronounced division of the world... to a still speedier death of the Globalism they dreamed of. To the disappearance of the status of sole world power: the United States is on the way to falling from the status of a Global power to the level of a regional power, the power of the "North Atlantic" Region.

And this too the "prophet" Soros seems to realise: "This could be the end of our civilisation"... It could not — it is already the end of western domination over the planet. The throwing of Russia into China's arms (witness the joint manoeuvres of these countries in the Pacific) will lead, first of all, to the "splitting" of the world in two (with an increased role for regional powers such as Turkey) and afterwards, unfortunately, to China's assumption of the role of hegemon. But that is another "prophecy".

What is certain is that Romania at this moment is on a collision course with history, and the present leadership, by the unconditional surrender of all this people's initiatives and resources to a world power which has become a regional one, without any perspective of the national interest and of the historical destiny of this people, is nothing other than a grave act of #Betrayal.

For if the purpose of what I have called the #CoalitionOfBetrayal PSD-PNL-UDMR-USR were not one foreign to the national interest, and if the agenda of government were not strictly subordinate to the plans and interests of the metropolises from which we receive "light"... this coalition of nearly 90% of Parliament would not have been permitted. Acts of betrayal (such as the rejection of the #SovereigntyAct and the adoption of the amendments brought by OMV through Ciucă-Ciolacu-Kelemen-Pambuccian to the #OffShoreAct) must be taken and secured with broad majorities. Just as today, today again!, the executive will approve the methodology of reporting and the information circuit in the National Electronic Register of Vaccinations... so that their plans continue, only on a smaller scale, here in the colonies.

There would be much more to say... but I know you do not like long articles. We shall return... until then, one conclusion:

Unipolarism is extinguished, Globalisation has set!

Say good morning to multipolarism and welcome to globalised Regionalisation.

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQHOwSGH7Eh3ON9KcWGffVr43pKTsjbfktEWmqc3VryM5bEX2t52BuFuZc08uBsGyxOGe-hWUC3XAkU6yw65dA9-JOLTV8wWJeXupnC7rhLvPN_sMdCubi8WcUkw2o6cS6RK1ERz6FgLwjo4MRBzc3_-mVcoFMod24GztT3E2BNtVnOVKMso0-FVSbryZQPK1fl5yU1ZZBKt3Z-icV_Ixr62M89zE&s=518⟩

---

131. 30 May 2022 — "Today the senators too sit the examination of #LegeaSuveranității"

Today the senators too sit the examination of the #SovereigntyAct

At full speed the members of the #CoalitionOfBetrayal want to bury in the Senate too, in the decision-making chamber, the first citizens' legislative initiative, the first law written by citizens for citizens —

not for corporations, not for metropolises, not for glow-worms great or small... a law only for citizens!

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQEFcwjfz8hvuUozj0tHcpjMhEnk4eRzEMNZi4bThpvMc3u18xaSN-bv8Z-8OiRiqPB3uHiJgajQ10tAdmNujZBQZhNo8VJkRKObGfyIZl2cVqdi4f2_dqpc5BshrV41iCECvDOQf_VNV-mjaB3UaE-ulLEzg9BOm1mWzRpvEMFwcV9R-bze_OMAQIfnNjb33_rkjEBDI3wUCGQ_NziZb-GwWgJ1M&s=518⟩

---

132. 1 June 2022 — On the laws of the Securitate

On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see the page The Sovereignty Act.

The reason why the #SovereigntyAct had to be rejected by the #CoalitionOfBetrayal?

The PSD-PNL-UDMR-USR are amending the Security laws and giving unlimited powers to the securists:

The subterranean state has decided. It is suddenly coming to the surface. It is making its status official. The status of an omnipresent and omnipotent power. The employees of the militarised institutions of force, and in particular those of the Romanian Intelligence Service, are turning into gods. Not that they were not so until now. But the law they are determined to promote installs them in that posture openly. In fact it is a legislative package. The Security laws.

Naturally, Romania needs a new set of Security laws, officially called national safety laws. The rules under which the militarised secret services function, and in particular the SRI, as well as those governing the activity of certain services belonging to other institutions of force, were for the most part drawn up in haste more than 30 years ago. Far outstripped by contemporary realities. On this point Romania does indeed need new regulations. Modern ones. Such as to bring into accord with the Constitution, with the Criminal Code and the Code of Criminal Procedure and with other organic laws the practices already established in the activity of these services, many of them at present unlawful but dictated to some extent by the need to function. And in this context, the bomb went off.

The secret services, which constitutionally are not and cannot be initiators of laws, have prepared a substantial package of legal rules, a legislative package concerning national safety. After which they placed this legislative draft in the hands of the political decision-makers. In a few days, from what has been learned — as early as next week — the Government of the four-star general Nicolae Ciucă will deal us a veritable blow with the cudgel. It will discuss, approve and promote in Parliament the new legislative package.

But why is it that since yesterday, since this information exploded in the press, several journalists and analysts have hastened to express themselves in unequivocal terms, to the effect that a grave violation of fundamental human rights and liberties is being prepared, an unprecedented abuse by the institutions of force headed by the SRI, taking advantage of the international conjuncture and of the herd effect upon a population which, living through an acute feeling of fear, feels the need to fall in behind those who, as circumstances have it, have come to be its leaders?

The text of the whole legislative package is not yet available to public opinion. It will probably be so next week, after it leaves the Government. But passages from this legislative package have been disclosed. Among other things, we are witnessing several extremely dangerous innovations in legal matters. For instance, it is envisaged that in future the arrest of an SRI employee or a search of his home, whatever the nature of the offences of which there are sound indications that he has commit-

ted them, may not be carried out in accordance with the procedures of the Criminal Code. The employees of the secret services — which, I repeat, are militarised institutions, a unique case in Europe — however grave the offences discovered by the prosecutors and however urgent their intervention ought to be, may no longer be searched or arrested even in flagrante, without the prior notification of the Director of the Romanian Intelligence Service. Or of his counterparts, in the case of other services. Moreover, a written approval will be necessary, issued by none other than the High Court of Cassation and Justice. That is, by those magistrates concerning whom we have already produced evidence that they were trained with European money intended for the family — hence through the misappropriation of funds — by SRI employees, and indeed on the institution's own premises. Finally, it is envisaged, likewise under this draft law, that all cases of this kind be investigated only by a restricted group of prosecutors designated in advance. And in the event that, in order to carry out an arrest in flagrante or to complete the legal procedures, searches or raids on official or clandestine premises of the institution are indispensable — to refer exclusively to the SRI — the prior approval of the head of the Supreme Council of National Defence is required. That is, of the President of Romania himself. The madness is that this legal regime would also extend to undercover officers. Which means, neither more nor less, that the prosecutors designated for such situations — probably also by the SRI — would have access to a series of pieces of information to which not even the director of the institution has access. That is, to the complete list of undercover officers.

In this whole legal tangle there appears one further great unknown. When they steal, the SRI agents do not steal alone. From everything that has been seen and learned over the last 30 years, they commit their offences together with, or through the intermediary of, businessmen. Who are not necessarily undercover officers. Will these too benefit from the same legal regime?

Things go, however, even further than we can imagine. Under this legislative package, every citizen and every commercial company is obliged, on a simple verbal request, to assist the SRI employee, supplying him with any kind of information and any kind of support requested. Otherwise, the citizens and the managers will be breaking the law. In that situation, SRI employees may "use law-enforcement techniques". And what might that be? Let us translate briefly. They may proceed at once to detain the person or, to give an example, to requisition his car. They become a kind of gods.

The icing on the cake consists in making official the right of the secret services, and especially of the SRI, to hold and run autonomous public undertakings, associations of a professional, social, cultural, sporting, recreational or humanitarian character.

This week this squalid business is under discussion in the governing coalition, and I would point out that I have lifted only one corner of the carpet which conceals it. Once the coalition leaders have reached agreement, the draft normative act goes to the Government, which adopts it as its own. After which the intention is to push it through Parliament at full speed."

"To err is human, but to persist in error is military."

In 1989 people cried out and died for FREEDOM!

Yesterday's Securitate has rebranded itself in the name of the safety of the state!

I lived through the age of the protocols... and I saw, as a judge, how all our work was reduced to derision by the signatures of a few heads of services and magistrates... all in the name of the fight against corruption!

Whom did it serve? And what were the costs?

We put fundamental rights in chains and told ourselves that Jesus too suffered and endured... why should we not endure?!

The age of the protocols and of those who instilled the fear of speaking, of protesting, has passed... or so we believed.

At short intervals we "wake up" to yet another... contrivance by which an attempt is made to give the protocols the force of law!

We have new people at the Court, we are no longer playing in the second division, are we?

The "draft law" (the screenshots are taken from the site Luju.ro) defies not only common sense but the very idea of the rule of law!

If it is adopted, the state governed by the rule of law becomes, officially, a state standing to attention!

Romania, turn out the light! Energy has gone up in price! Light the candle and listen to Radio Free Europe! Ah, forgive me! Europe itself has not been Free for a long time!

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQGYwe1hlXQQGg5MS2Vy-FNgir11ta3UNYBBHYzfF6Qztil0FCp1S23yVj_oATRbTKoiorwATn9VbT4_YB0PFPWNDS8zsou-VXFPeHu9kKSz9729nzzz6dgopDbj3OQDwxgPqO64ciS-SH0x_Dxpuw-4cRfjjtCd7juc_oSF5A5_jUD69l2ryOegcHFr8f7166Ls1sHbCbr6NIaoJfY2I1ukFptsc&s=518⟩

---

133. 14 June 2022 — "Turkey can manage without Exxon and without American or European corporations."

Turkey can manage without Exxon and without American or European corporations.

Turkey can extract its resources for its own people! Not for corporations, not for the "great European family", but ONLY FOR THE TURKISH PEOPLE!

Turkey can... because it is not led by an organised group of traitors.

This is what I too attempted with the amendments to the #OffShoreAct which I took into Parliament and with the other provisions of the #SovereigntyAct...

Only the Parliament of Romania does not belong to Romania!

More information at https://flux24.ro/turcia-a-dat-drumul-la-extragerea-de-gaze-din-marea-...

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQF2y0dKY6iviLnVYdL1zcaPhyE3PaQvMnn330mHyx6N0996HlWp1ViDbDJM1sfdYMMm_E_KyBdg1NQ90xfFXqDAcuT-Skgc1e2ViJJUPlfsINSi4RTcHgNcT7Bfymn36kcXwqOoIYtVJQ5y8zwQJ0V-Ak6uQo87WAZgKDj8GUMW9816TbvfrSox_ELEOW8JF6b4epUua3L2CeL3FZwhm1qob58&s=518⟩

---

134. 15 June 2022 — "Because the Securitate has been in everything and everywhere for 30 years now!"

Because the Securitate has been in everything and everywhere for 30 years now!

In every field: in politics, in the judiciary, in the economy, in culture, even in sport — everywhere it is them... The securists, the men of the System are everywhere, and above all in the key positions.

Only that everything we see is destruction, is disaster… we see only the ruins of what we were, for as much as we were.

They are the ones responsible for that mixed feeling of humiliation-shame-revolt which we have whenever we think of anything to do with this country, destroyed by the traitors and the starred imbeciles who are leading it to ruin.

What happened last night with the national football team is symptomatic: ever since the securists laid hands on the Romanian Football Federation, Romanian football has become a grotesque parody of what it once was.

The same pattern has been followed with the economy and with agriculture monopolised by foreign corporations, with industry cut up and sold for scrap, with resources given away for nothing, with a judiciary run on protocols, with everything...

But what they have done so far is not enough... they want still more power in order to bring the work of destruction to a good end. That is why the new "National Safety Laws" have appeared... the only advantage of these laws is that, if they are adopted, power will be assumed and exercised transparently by the system. And we shall be able to see who is responsible for the marasmus and for the extinction... I told you they are not intelligent: they will come out like lice on the forehead!

Yes, my dears, our problem is that the members of the securist caste which governs us are not merely thieves, scoundrels and traitors... but also very stupid and impotent! See the Burleanu case: he is the symbol of the securist and of securism in Romania, a man of the system who walked over corpses and who threw valuable innocent men into prison (see the footballer of genius Gică Popescu) in order to get to the bone, and when he got there... he made the bone so small and insignificant that he lives off pickings worthy of a worm.

And so is the whole "System", the entire Romanian establishment! Look at them, from the President to the last minister or member of Parliament of the #CoalitionOfBetrayal, and you will have before you the picture of our extinction as a people and as a country. But a pitiful, parodic picture, before which you feel nothing but embarrassment and Shame at being the contemporary of its protagonists, of its authors.

I have said it and I say it again: the only chance for this people is the sudden, brutal, even painful excision of the securist metastasis... it is #EitherUsOrThem, we are facing extinction! Just as a cancer kills its host, so the securists will kill the people from which they came and which they ought to guard.

I wanted to stop the System with the #SovereigntyAct... The System reacted: you saw Ciolacu saying that "the law is an aberration". Then the System moved on to threats.

I am sick of them, for the securists have made a whole country sick... a grave sickness which has brought us with one foot in the grave!

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQFHLSHQo-58PZ576-eMXWV3GAstSOMQMteHxBE4ua4MSkz87LCDV-PK_EFXU2M5GkFd6FSfgVA94kWb7Qm-DTPhuFqnd-Atp-5W8FVxWIJtJjIB7aBdlWYDxUb384Q4gboIm302LH4a7Fq0x6RYt0S91AInWppb5MnnMCiX2Kr4YyPfg8vIgQLLB1oXxjBx6xwQdGaZwn1sEJJKnUZL_vFnOFPeE&s=518⟩

135. 18 June 2022 — "Together with my friend Iulian Capsali"

Together with my friend Iulian Capsali

Visiting our brothers, supporters and volunteers of the Sovereignty Act, in London.

Tomorrow, 19 June 2022, we shall go to the liturgy at the Orthodox church of St George in Holborn, where I hope we shall have the joy of hearing our friend, the great chanter Valentin Gheorghe.

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQEcEmkgXylTBIkSffXD6sdzKDNfINCc8zuczsqptd48QR4Vuc2t9rfa1wvV3pboKpyDt7dRWILQit5OwcoHFpimP28UPrx-sOP6tryZtZbdSh6jsYOmST4K71huU1nFZJ8Fl5jyib5GkieGTIm5cdX2zOJjChaWbHjrIlwvH6hYpUnsmMd23AmvoFZrTj4xdhURzMC7phzUlVwas3OfTQBBrRAE&s=518⟩

136. 27 June 2022 — "On the necessity of over-taxing the profiteers of the energy crisis"

On the necessity of over-taxing those who profit from the energy crisis

The price of gas and of fuels rises from one day to the next. Astounding. Painful for every single citizen.

Prices for the end user have reached historic highs although the exchange price has not exceeded the highs recorded on 1 April 2011 (125.89 dollars a barrel of crude oil) or on 1 May 2008 (127.78 dollars a barrel of crude oil). In fact today, when at the pumps we have prices at record historic levels, the barrel of crude oil is trading on the exchange at less than 113 dollars. And if we also take into account the natural devaluation of the dollar as a result of ordinary inflationary erosion (of at least 2% a year!), we reach the conclusion that the price per barrel of oil is far lower on the exchange today than it was 11 or 14 years ago, when we paid at most 6 lei a litre of petrol.

Then where do these price increases come from?

For, obviously, the explosive increase in prices "at the pump" is not caused by any shortage of the products on the market, since that would have resulted in an increase in the exchange price. Which is not happening, save to a very small extent.

In other words, the "energy crisis" is not caused (only) by the war and by Putin... Not at all. Or only to a very small extent.

The increase in the price at the pump and in the price of gas is either induced, and therefore artificial, as a state policy — see the "green policies" and "decarbonisation" — or else it is the result of a human behaviour more noxious even than pollution itself: GREED!

As I have accustomed you, my friends, and as I have also accustomed the governors of Romania, I shall come forward with a solution — a litmus test: a legislative amendment, an amendment to the Fiscal Code. Which I submit for discussion by you and also by the "Think Tank", the Initiative Group for the Nation, born at the same time as the sending of the Sovereignty Act to Parliament.

This legislative initiative, once debated and improved, I hope — in fact I am certain — will be taken up and tabled in Parliament by our friend, deputy Dumitru Coarnă.

I set out below two possible versions of an article which will supplement the Fiscal Code with special rules and rates of taxation for "taxpayers carrying on activities in the nature of the extraction, refining or marketing of petroleum products and their derivatives", versions submitted for your attention and debate.

"Law amending the fiscal code with a view to the special taxation of taxpayers carrying on activities in the nature of the extraction, refining or marketing of petroleum products and their derivatives

Sole article: After Article 18 of Law no. 227/2015 on the Fiscal Code, Article 18^1 is introduced, reading as follows:

"ART. 18^1 — Special regime for taxpayers carrying on activities in the nature of the extraction, refining or marketing of petroleum products and their derivatives

The rate of profit tax owed by taxpayers carrying on activities in the nature of the extraction, refining or marketing of petroleum products and their derivatives, including legal persons which obtain such revenues under an association contract, for the activities provided for in this article, is 90% of the profit exceeding 10% of the turnover for the fiscal year, this tax being added to that provided for in Article 17.

Taxpayers carrying on activities in the nature of the extraction, refining or marketing of petroleum products and their derivatives, including legal persons which obtain such revenues under an association contract, for the activities provided for in this article, are liable to pay a tax at the rate of 5% applied to the revenues recorded."

The first version is an over-taxation of profits exceeding 10% of turnover, a taxation whose purpose would be to discourage greed and speculation on fuel and gas prices. It has the disadvantage, however, that it can be circumvented through "fiscal optimisations"...

Which is why I am inclined to believe that the second version, that of a direct tax on revenue, without possibilities of deduction and optimisation, would be the more appropriate.

I await your comments and proposals and those of all the "tax specialists" willing to lend a hand... to the Romanian people.

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQEUJK-_pyG9WWN95N-o1eYL8-LsFHougYNteK2oX-T8F_cARFTNDHErsutnHCGvC5mOplpN33iz3CzZyNkFRrCcwR0EpW5lmIQOFMjbxOLM2hUMd5tVXOJMTJqNJGbmQuODsPeJEI0-ZZ9uFhu9IFtscdkl9h-FOq3bxE9FeKIk5s4sCigW_1qxfYUWU7MYHVe966QEr4OAEuLOS5GVIVlIQ8_fc&s=518⟩

---

137. 29 June 2022 — "On the NECESSITY OF TAXING LARGE FORTUNES AND BUSINESSES"

On THE NECESSITY OF TAXING GREAT FORTUNES AND GREAT BUSINESSES

There is much talk in the #CoalitionOfBetrayal PSD-PNL-UDMR about a "redistribution of the fiscal burden". There is much talk, and much shrieking... and little is done. In fact, nothing at all!

For, YES, a "redistribution of the fiscal burden" is needed in Romania.

But let us do it properly, taking from where the money is, not once again from ordinary Romanians, who have always borne the cost of every crisis, of every disastrous government which has brought the country to the edge of the abyss.

That is why I bring into public discussion the necessity of TAXING GREAT FORTUNES AND GREAT BUSINESSES according to a simple rule: 1, 2, 3!

THE TAXATION OF GREAT FORTUNES I consider should be carried out on successive thresholds of taxation (applied cumulatively)

- 1% a year of the total, cumulated value of the movable and immovable assets held by a taxpayer which exceed 10 million Euros,

- 2% a year of the total, cumulated value of the movable and immovable assets held by a taxpayer which exceed 100 million Euros, and

- 3% a year of the total, cumulated value of the movable and immovable assets held by a taxpayer which exceed 1 billion Euros.

THE TAXATION OF GREAT BUSINESSES should be carried out on successive thresholds of taxation

- 1% of turnover for commercial companies with a turnover greater than 10 million Euros;

- 2% of turnover for commercial companies with a turnover greater than 100 million Euros;

- 3% of turnover for commercial companies with a turnover greater than 1 billion Euros.

I consider that in overcoming the present crisis the shoulder must be put to the wheel above all by the few and the fortunate, by those who have succeeded either through their own performance (too few) or by exploiting the "windows of opportunity" offered by the weaknesses of the Romanian state over the last 32 years, whether they be natural or legal persons.

To this scheme of taxation will be added the special tax for "taxpayers carrying on activities in the nature of the extraction, refining or marketing of petroleum products and their derivatives", of which I spoke a few days ago.

Of course, the above proposal will take the form of a legal text written according to all the requirements of Law 24/2000 on the rules of legislative technique, a legislative proposal which I hope will also reach Parliament with the help of our friend, deputy Dumitru Coarnă!

Post scriptum: I await your views, proposals and opinions on the discussion Channel which we also used on the occasion of drafting the #SovereigntyAct legislative proposal, at https://t.me/LegeaSuveranitatiiDiscutii

Post scriptum: I know, with this proposal I shall set against me all the securists and all the rich men of the country and all the multinationals... again! But it is worth it!

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ‹https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQFN8SN-JAAp1kDytdhPZVJfVfGF6y0h20jr0vVcCbaa-P28T2mU3dek6rm-D834Gqu-70M7rOcXvgKMH7kY0fcSIy3Fcqlq3djbQPelqhcZj8vNWXgkRZO0LhAiJFc8OTn6BQrkxoQR8Rvk3Pyo_tt5-HQkycyh7dyTK5EbrxnglhecagUvFJ8-uyyBd0r0A-gWnMF-wA5wUEavxRIG2lT-m5jU&s=518›

---

138. 29 June 2022 — "29.06.2022, a black day: the Romanian citizen has received a heavy blow from the senators ..."

29 June 2022, a black day: the Romanian citizen has received a heavy blow from his senators

Today, 29 June 2022, the #SovereigntyAct was rejected in the Senate of Romania by the #CoalitionOfBetrayal PSD-PNL-UDMR-USR:

Only 11 Romanians were in the chamber among the 110 senators present.

Today 99 senators betrayed the Romanian people. Which is why they will have to be replaced in the next legislature.

I thank Senator Diana Iovanovici-Șoșoacă (independent) and Senator Rodica Boancă (AUR) for the support they gave to the Sovereignty Act in the plenary of the Senate.

You can watch the sitting of shame here https://youtu.be/t7aBmPTy0dA

The discussions and the vote on the Law are at minutes 1.09.10–1.19.00 and 1.50.20–1.51.30.

I CALL UPON ALL THE SUPPORTERS OF THE SOVEREIGNTY ACT TO UNITE, SO THAT IN THE NEXT LEGISLATURE OUR WILL, THE WILL OF THE PEOPLE, MAY BECOME LAW!!!

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQEswx2Xw32g6VPkqcqVD76xwZcSLa1hc-GIf_cTZMnFBuAIez5cAGyFDeUlbEvU1nrQZP9XV3Zy3I9dpjpp9xM-0t6Jg_LkDHYHYefzHvV1ppfbqMwNoGgOXhPL_1SDiYqJ6hWWG3WpSO0JbtHPIsFC0l6u2ejJt6X_s52-Wuj3kUeIUnfCq4RuL7GjkckFciVmGpQw-GW45wP4oRMenNsSXR04&s=518⟩

---

139. 29 June 2022 — "The sound was cut off after a few minutes."

The sound was cut off after a few minutes.

I tried once more. The same "accident"!

What you do not know is that sometimes your brutal censorship says more than our words do.

That is why the #SovereigntyAct was not adopted in Parliament!

Post scriptum: no, it was not because of the mobile signal!

Facebook has just told me that the sound was partly stopped because I infringed copyright, because I reproduced content protected by copyright in... 72 territories!!!

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQErXmF5UZv-kuZ2ouytNgCQCOQqA7XCKkvBq36gqfg4ymClQ4Mhf7oBlvHCARKjjZSH4PfhM5XMfsrJHP-wtfrVvFv9UV3PyDrPSP1piJ9CJVBVtY-k9NU6bIaTJE92AkwY6zGPz_QHHL8di4qXociJN8G5ogaBk9PBl65__6FGX0G7TYuu-ppgRtVdQ0O57wdJIz4kVTkI6prxe6T_svCWtbuI&s=518⟩

---

140. 30 June 2022 — "The #CoaliţiaTrădării PSD-PNL-UDMR-USR PLACES HEAVIER LEVIES ON THE SHOULDERS OF THE CITIZEN!"

The #CoalitionOfBetrayal PSD-PNL-UDMR-USR IS PLACING HEAVIER LEVIES ON THE SHOULDERS OF THE CITIZEN!

And this while the Systemic Government taxes neither the great fortunes and businesses, nor the special pensions, nor the allowances and salaries of the senior public officials.

The whole weight of the crisis will be borne by the ordinary man.

All the many will pay more; only the few will pay... nothing, as usual!

Never mind... we, who proposed the #SovereigntyAct, shall again be the ones to take into Parliament a new draft law on the Taxation of Great Fortunes and Businesses and of taxpayers carrying on activities in the nature of the extraction, refining or marketing of petroleum products and their derivatives.

Let us see what they will say... why they will not want the taxation of great fortunes and businesses...

(On the Solidarity Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQHCsMP1J_qRUn9Xu-oowwvcKk4JUguRYGtf5EVgmyVWYEHWi3695TOySKSPBls6W7HYrkCOVyJCp9fLYUP3IXrvUeR-rkjEdGcX6fMW6JJLt2I1LS5ehWTPS55-1TxshUktlJJZuEXD602tPVqEzZOIRWQjWYAS_UfEAwIz5X3E7eoj_HibpbWlebLmte5vLOAYOIsltt2zM7o1YC-ZPzt6bTW4&s=518⟩

141. 17 July 2022 — "The press is waking up and saying what I have been saying for months: #LegeaOffshore is an act of treason."

The press is waking up and saying what I have been saying for months: the #OffshoreAct is an act of betrayal.

When I said so explicitly (it is true that Sorin Roșca Stănescu too sounded some alarms), I was considered a Putinist.

When I managed to send into Parliament a set of amendments which would have made the Offshore Act a law in the National interest, NOBODY, absolutely NOBODY in the press supported them. They did not even mention them. Probably because they came from me, a "Putinist".

When I came out in front of Parliament to shout #RomanianResourcesForRomania and to demand the adoption of the amendments I had written in the interest of Romanians and which were being put to the vote in Parliament at that very moment... there were only 30 of us... at most! Nobody was interested in a protest organised by a "Putinist", of course!

Parliament rejected all my amendments to the Offshore Act, labelling them as... "Putinist", obviously.

Now, barely two months later, the press is beginning to wake up. To say that we were Betrayed by the government of those in the #CoalitionOfBetrayal: PSD, PNL, UDMR, USR.

Late. Too late... Romania has already given away its Black Sea gas... for NOTHING.

Lamentations after the event are useless. Pitiful, even. I was convinced this is how it would be: when the "press" could have prevented this betrayal, it kept absolutely silent. The subject did not even exist. Only the propaganda barking about how well the government is doing in "unblocking the exploitation of Black Sea gas". It unblocked it, all right... and our gas became theirs, the property of the operators from foreign corporations.

I remain at peace in that, for my part, I really did everything I could to prevent this act of national betrayal.

It is a consolation which is of no help to me, however, since it will bring neither warmth into our houses nor money into our pockets.

"The Offshore Act, as it has been conceived, promulgated and now applied, transfers practically the whole quantity of gas to foreign companies which, as Floriana Jucan has demonstrated, may sell this gas to other companies, so that we, in order to benefit from it, will simply buy it at the free-market price."

You are still not interested... clearly, it is warm, very warm outside! Wait until the cold comes... and until YOUR pockets are emptied.

Then many of you will read these lines differently.

Post scriptum: here is my post of 18 May, when Parliament rejected the amendments I had proposed:

https://www.facebook.com/1645845977/posts/10218975184484340/?d=n

(On the offshore draft: the full text of the draft — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQHHKXZIVw2MLVHkShnibWJcFnIAsQuVVq5GItZdeRjltMi33spxh1PITuVg1zOZZ3-NnBlMBS6palrrJR0mgSoqslNjEr-JQ5gcY6jALZWdGUYKecMZ0_JEsk7PfK3cZuEbHjsaWuJTlaN2Ui64bXEEtPwX6PcwmOvBkAfhNgqMScNLmJBTlYhqzuwyAabTLXmU_cPnEEmt5fQdB1nEhYVqrdzg&s=518⟩

142. 18 July 2022 — "1. To finalise #LegeaSolidarității, the draft amendment of the Fiscal Code for #Impo..."

1. To finalise the #SolidarityAct, the draft amendment of the Fiscal Code for the #TaxationOfGreatFortunesAndBusinesses.

2. To divide the #SovereigntyAct into several distinct legislative drafts.

3. To travel through the country and discuss these drafts with the supporters and sympathisers of the Coalition for the Nation.

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQEubaXAkMXcWUfDiN1oEfH52Lb7rOflF4CJjo9olnxD3F4qCL2fjTU4N82qWYb5rIzOQJgxr_R1kamn6utQcaCtesOvphNC7fyvYz00vs2FVqBok9m5wwvaTn78zuTNKITMzwULtA_1ZRls9ROxKAaK2P15pSFTknXyjRL7ATTMsufV0jIpHvS-mxNhWQon8JVS-kCh-K5aczkfoq8FqLuzMjBA&s=518⟩

143. 19 July 2022 — "I promised you a draft Act for the Taxation of Large Fortunes and Businesses"

I promised you a draft Law for the Taxation of Great Fortunes and Businesses

This initiative, the #SolidarityAct, is necessary because we are in a period of profound crisis. Because Romania is a social state (Article 1(3) of the Constitution). Because we need the solidarity of people with money... because we must take taxes from those who really do have money, from those privileged by fate and by the opportunities offered by this country over the last 32 years.

Here is the text! Ready to be tabled in Parliament (I hope our friend Dumitru Coarnă will help us this time too)!

DRAFT LEGISLATION AMENDING THE FISCAL CODE

After Article 18, Articles 18^1 and 18^2 are introduced, reading as follows:

"ART. 18^1 Special regime for taxpayers with annual revenues of over 10,000,000 Euros

Taxpayers who have obtained revenues exceeding the equivalent in lei of 10,000,000 euros are liable to pay a tax at the rate of 1% applied to the revenues recorded. The exchange rate for determining the equivalent in euros is the one valid at the close of the financial year in which the revenues were recorded.

Taxpayers who have obtained revenues exceeding the equivalent in lei of 100,000,000 euros are liable to pay a tax at the rate of 2% applied to the revenues recorded. The exchange rate for determining the equivalent in euros is the one valid at the close of the financial year in which the revenues were recorded.

Taxpayers who have obtained revenues exceeding the equivalent in lei of 1,000,000,000 euros are liable to pay a tax at the rate of 3% applied to the revenues recorded. The exchange rate for determining the equivalent in euros is the one valid at the close of the financial year in which the revenues were recorded.

ART. 18^2 — Special regime for taxpayers carrying on activities in the nature of the extraction, refining or marketing of petroleum products and their derivatives

“Taxpayers carrying on activities in the nature of the extraction, refining or marketing of petroleum products and their derivatives and having annual revenues greater than 10,000,000 euros, including legal persons which obtain such revenues under an association contract for the activities provided for in this article, are liable to pay a tax at the rate of 5% applied to the revenues recorded.”

After TITLE X, TITLE X¹ is introduced, entitled “THE TAX ON GREAT FORTUNES”, reading as follows:

“Article 500¹ Taxpayers who are natural persons and whose revenues, cumulated with the value of the gains, of the securities and of the buildings existing in their patrimony on 31 December of the preceding year, exceed 10,000,000 Euros are liable to pay a solidarity tax amounting to 1% a year of the total value of the fortune.

Article 500² Taxpayers who are natural persons and whose revenues, cumulated with the value of the gains, of the securities and of the buildings existing in their patrimony on 31 December of the preceding year, exceed 100,000,000 Euros are liable to pay a solidarity tax amounting to 2% a year of the total value of the fortune.

Article 500³ Taxpayers who are natural persons and whose revenues, cumulated with the value of the gains, of the securities and of the buildings existing in their patrimony on 31 December of the preceding year, exceed 1,000,000,000 Euros are liable to pay a solidarity tax amounting to 3% a year of the total value of the fortune.

Article 500⁴ The exchange rate for determining the equivalent in euros is the one valid at the close of the financial year in which the revenues and the gains were recorded.

Article 500⁵ (1) Taxpayers who are natural persons and whose revenues, cumulated with the value of the gains, of the securities and of the buildings existing in their patrimony on 31 December of the preceding year, exceed 10,000,000 Euros are obliged to draw up an annual declaration of assets; the annual declaration of assets relating to the last amended fiscal year shall be submitted by 25 March inclusive of the following year.

Declarations of assets shall be made in writing, on the declarant’s own responsibility, and shall include the rights and obligations of the declarant, of the spouse and of the dependent children, in accordance with Annex no. 1.”

We need the #SolidarityAct — the #ActForTheTaxationOfGreatFortunesAndBusinesses!

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQEnHi463MuSByWExA8TgGz9r5_TKod2hFRdHs1Lq4hxqJq3c36HIuQSLdU_c0gco-PX-oGNQI6A8-6zV7UApvElAnpw2OL6kHAkFRehNNAjXA45P3VcYGeqBTd6RC_yLpqa4Q_npXqW0I_UysVc2lfKicIQZD7zCmu8HbCZA2KPWgazj1yvCRLVXUzEvwScGs5EvR4xILPcb6xV7U-mv5dcxZY&cs=518⟩

144. 3 August 2022 — “And on Stupidity as the trigger of Disaster”

And on Stupidity as the trigger of Disaster

If someone had set out to sketch a plan for sabotaging the “civilised world”, I do not know that he could have made a better one than the present policy pursued by the establishment in Washington and Brussels. In less than three years the ruling caste of the west has managed to wreck the west economically and to induce an apocalyptic atmosphere in the world. Memories of 2019 seem, today, to come from another world. And what until now seemed to be mere theoretical discussions about politics and geopolitics have, in recent days, become necessary explanations for the continuous worsening of our lives: galloping inflation, exorbitant prices for energy and fuels, unemployment, bank instalments impossible to bear, bankruptcies, rationing and poverty… and all of it has its source

in human activity, not in a natural disaster! In the activity of a very few people whom a terrible destiny has caused to be… very stupid.

After two years of plandemic in which the economy of the west was frozen, and in which the civilised west (not here, of course, in the colonies!) pumped billions into social protection, the bill came due as it normally would — the galloping inflation which began as early as the end of 2021. At that same time there began the wave of "sudden deaths" among the young, among the active population, all of it as a result of the imposition of experimental treatments in the second year of the pandemic. We already had inflation, illness, death, pressure on the medical system and a decrease in the number of contributors to the social insurance system, already under the pressure of the west's ageing population. And all of it as a result of the "wise decisions" of the "chiefs of the world".

Then, "to make things better", in January 2022, while many countries of the "civilised world" were still keeping their citizens shut in and restricted, there suddenly reappeared, after many years of silence, the theme of Ukraine's accession to NATO — a theme which, as everyone knew, would radicalise Russia and make it react. We are not speaking here about principles, about sovereignty and the right to self-determination and to decide with whom a country makes alliances… we are speaking about timing! And about the clear indication that these mere discussions alone would lead to war. To a war with the country from which you, western European, take the energy with which you heat yourself and with which you develop economically. It did not matter. The "principles" prevailed! Hence the cutting off of the gas and the major energy crisis at whose beginning we now stand. And more: not only have you provoked the war by throwing Ukraine into the path of Russian guns, but you also feed the conflict with weapons and intelligence, sharpening the energy crisis (not to speak of the tens of thousands of victims at the front, since nobody cares about those), bringing the world to the brink of a food crisis and… raising inflation to levels impossible to imagine even at the end of the pandemic — that is, a few months ago. More "intelligent" decisions!

And, to make it clear that the point at which we find ourselves is one of no return, here is Lavrov announcing to us that "the era of cooperation with the west is over; there will be no return to the situation prior to 24 February in Russia's relations with the USA and Europe".

All this time, the betters of the "civilised world" have told us that gas is bad, that we must economise, and be cold, and be hungry, and above all "go green". That is, go electric. That is, go solar. That is, go over to batteries. Solar panels and batteries which are produced in… you have guessed it, in China and Taiwan!

Which is why it was "normal" for you, a better of the "civilised world", to remember your "principles", sovereignty, and Taiwan's equal rights to independence and self-determination! Which is why you send Mrs Pelosi "Pearl Harbor" on a visit to Taiwan. Never mind that you risk opening a second military front. Never mind that from China and Taiwan come not only the batteries and the solar panels, but everything and anything! Even underwear, clothes, gadgets… everything! And above all chips, those chips which are in everything, from the bank card to the telephone to the missile… For China has already reacted: it is organising an economic blockade of Taiwan and is suspending the opening in the USA of a factory worth 5 billion USD, where 10,000 people were to work producing… batteries for "more green"!

In other words, without a prior plan and concrete prior action to repatriate industry to the "civilised west" (but who would work there, since the active population is small and frail and suffers either from "sudden deaths" or from the apathy and idleness brought on by western social assistance), the burning of the bridges to the western world's suppliers of energy and goods is an act of self-sabotage, downright suicidal. "Brilliant"!!!

And as you have seen, in this post I have touched briefly only on pragmatic subjects, matters of economics and of the physical survival of the west.

I have not spoken about "Cancel Culture", about the assault of the LGBTQWERTY "cult", about the erasure of the identity and traditions of the peoples of the west, about the anti-religious and especially anti-Christian fury of the politically correct establishment. That is, about the cultural, intellectual and spiritual survival of our world — a battle the "civilised west" has been losing for more than ten years…

Now, with the setting of unipolar Globalism, when all the plans for authoritarian control of the Planet have failed, the betters of the "Small Planet" have gone into a spin. A self-destructive spin, which will hasten the decline of the "civilised world". The measures taken are so idiotic, so devoid of sense, that they can no longer even be put down to villainy, but only to crass stupidity, to the ineptitude of the ruling caste of the "civilised world".

That is why we, the 99.99% who are being "governed" towards disaster by the present political caste, have the obligation to find solutions: solutions of government, solutions for a world in which we and our children may live with dignity. For politics must have as its sole purpose the good of the citizen, and the role of politics must be, as Plato held, the achievement of social unity through virtue and above all through education. That is, exactly the opposite of the policies of our present governors.

That is why we are obliged to come out of our passivity. In any way whatever. That is also why I write you these posts, which bring me many enemies and no few troubles. For — and I say this to the less quick-witted of my followers — the positions expressed are neither Putinist, nor Xi-Jinpingist, nor anti-western. For no, I do not want to live either in Russia or in China! And in no case do I want Romania to become a country built on their model — the proof stands in the #SovereigntyAct, where we tried to defend the rights and liberties of citizens against the assault of the state and to demilitarise the intelligence services and remove them from society, precisely so that we should not live as they do in the two countries mentioned above.

And that is precisely why I am obliged to draw attention to the imminence of disaster.

A disaster synonymous with the apocalypse of the "civilised world", a veritable apocalypse of stupidity.

And to see a confirmation of the above:

https://www.instagram.com/reel/Cgyu18qgOg_/?igshid=YmMyMTA2M2Y%3D

(On the Demilitarisation Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQEL5wBfzgY-FlKlCejgXn9r4Nh-1zjFQUy9kz7_kWDcyVBxECT3WmdCh6WfXVcA7c70lKwYEtnBt92NT1dDxv1_b_jtMpYesk_8N5Typbj_pUTffvWPD6_orpchzAW4JcnXC6Z2bPWNR6MqtSnsM7hsPo3s_70pKDOj5DUWP48srCxxIO8tZskh2mJ-Qayy2yeED1v1m4hwqfrmYZcLXfe2lJbg&s=518⟩

---

145. 10 August 2022 — "The wait is over: the Coalition is here!"

The wait is over: the Coalition is here!

And we are in the Coalition for the Nation!

Together, Răzvan, Aurelian, Iulian and I will make the #SovereigntyAct a law for Romania. And we shall apply it!

We shall give #RomaniaBackToRomanians, because Romania must return to the Romanian Nation!

Come and join us in the party Romania has needed for 32 years, and enrol at https://coalitiapentrunatiune.ro/adeziune/.

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQEY4RR5NLsRKMfR4xOsl4J0jV0MaQvaikGA9ZfXto9y76nLwl2FMt2AT94x79OVHg3EX0lhjpR0HaIWdXW-dOJL8CjsEWyseDMPa384y-b0PU_iC7cT0PJZCTnAZ_2pM8jvUujxruLWvXK9M_R7bSd2Gc9TJdoC6vOtuxex4QmlSqB2hobmSSdvKSQdhK8FdRFSxCXGErNQUBOLaXuMZKUm-jVY&s=518⟩

---

146. 13 August 2022 — On the men of the system

On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see the page The Sovereignty Act.

On the men of the system and the Party without a Name

As you probably know already, on Wednesday we launched the Coalition for the Nation (CpN), a sovereigntist and conservative party whose project for the country is traced out by the #Sovereignty-Act, a draft law rejected without explanation by the present Parliament. In this post I shall not tell you again about what we have done so far and what justifies the appearance of this new party, nor about what we shall do in future and how (I have already done so in several live broadcasts together with Răzvan Constantinescu, Iulian Capsali and Aurelian Popa, a founding member of the CpN).

I shall tell you instead about a reaction which we anticipated but which came sooner and more transparently than we expected: the reaction of the men of the system!

And I shall not be referring to the men of the system at the controls, those who, unknown, under the protection of anonymity, direct our destinies and take this country towards disaster; I shall show you rather how they come to do so.

I must state from the outset that we have established a rule: on joining the CpN, every aspiring member must complete a declaration on his own responsibility in which he declares that "I have not been and am not an operative worker, including an undercover one, an informer or a collaborator of the intelligence services. For as long as I am a member of the Coalition for the Nation Party I undertake not to accept any such capacity."

Why did we impose such a declaration? Because we wanted to avoid the infiltration of the Coalition by men of the system who may have a "command", a "little key" somewhere else, an occult one, a command which would make them act, in limit or decisive situations, in an interest other than that of the members, supporters and voters of the CpN. For it is well known that one leaves the "System" only feet first...

For barely three days after the launch, questions of this kind had already reached me: "but there are some former collaborators of the services who are patriots and want to join you".

My answer was simple: let them declare that they were collaborators, so that at least we know whom we are talking to...

The answer I received is symptomatic: they cannot declare any such thing, because they were undercover!!!

I say symptomatic because the situation in which Romanian society finds itself is becoming ever more obvious: a society swarming with "undercover agents" infiltrated into everything and everywhere. And who, in their overwhelming majority, work for services in thrall to a foreign interest, the ones who have turned Romania into a colony, into an outpost of globalism.

They are the members of the "Party without a Name", the party which is in everything and everywhere, the party which has been permanently in government for 32 years, whatever the emblem and colours of the parties which have succeeded one another in power since the revolution.

Well, we shall not accept this! We shall not accept being parasitised and taken over by the men of the system, we shall not accept becoming merely another branch of the Party without a Name.

Because something else is needed, another way of doing politics! We cannot accept being the subjects of the same experiment, invariably harmful to Romania for 32 years! You cannot try the same recipe and expect a different "cake" to come out! If you put in poison, poison is what you will get!

Beyond that, the situation in which our country finds itself is obvious, as obvious as the causes which have led to this disaster.

That said, the rest of you, those who have not worked for the System and do not carry out its orders, we await beside us in the #CoalitionForTheNation, and we await your applications at https://coalitia-pentrunatiune.ro/adeziune/.

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQGN0PO7-VgupupBp1mfEUUktVrecrRXjOQKmjM1oXtaMdEKOmjztOosp-GJRvi_UdNs91xgpNH32Kg1vN9fPvZ6_YlMFYouKv7KMmCZYVnq5i36KefGBEpBBJdm90xQEJ0IeWSFywSa0dV1U4EskQuH5Xg7pkNGt3VUk5IbKFSxYyAYQqQVQTYq7jSjogFhCnqLRe95YLV4QQPYbTP-T1PrxsnQ&s=518⟩

---

147. 17 September 2022 — On honour and consistency

On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see the page The Sovereignty Act.

On honour, principles and the need to be consistent with oneself

Yesterday, in my capacity as president of the Coalition for the Nation, I issued a communiqué protesting against the censorship and discrimination instituted by the government of Romania through its senior officials.

As was natural, I condemned the official statement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, made through its representative Ovidiu Raetchi, by which a citizen was forbidden to take part in a debate organised by an NGO, and this because of the differences of opinion which this citizen holds with regard to the political position of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

In other words the MFA, at the highest level, discriminated against a Romanian citizen, limiting his right to free expression because that person holds opinions which are not "politically correct", contrary to the official position of the Romanian state.

I know, we have grown used to censorship, which has unfortunately become a banal fact. But until now censorship came from private institutions, of the Facebook, press or television kind. Until now Censorship was not an official act, even if it was tacitly or discreetly imposed by the state.

Since the day before yesterday Censorship has become an official state policy, promoted publicly and without veils by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs itself, where diplomacy and elegance ought to clothe every form of expression.

Censorship and discrimination are being exhibited without shame and without a veil from the summit of the Romanian state.

Which compelled our reaction, that of the CpN! An official, firm and clear reaction to the official position of the MFA and implicitly of the Romanian state, a reaction by which we demanded the resignation of the political hack Ovidiu Raetchi, the man who publicly stated that he "goes along with the SRI", and also of Minister Bogdan Aurescu, who permitted and/or did not immediately sanction so grave a lapse by one of his subordinates.

The purpose of our reaction was to defend the principles and values we have been defending for decades: the freedom and the dignity of the Romanian citizen, whatever his name may be.

I was surprised that many of our followers, some of them declared supporters and volunteers of the Sovereignty Act, leapt up as if scalded at this statement.

The citizen censored and discriminated against is Professor Adrian Severin. And the fact that Adrian Severin had a conviction under the securist-Kövesist regime seems to make him unworthy of our protection, and even to legitimise any abuse by the state, any act of censorship and discrimination to which he is now subjected, years after he served his sentence, whether that sentence was just or unjust.

And this situation, this position taken by some of our fellow citizens, seems to me more revolting than the discrimination and censorship of which I spoke above, all the more so as it comes from those with whom we fight on the same barricade against the abusive and undemocratic state.

That is why I must clarify certain matters:

We shall defend the rights and liberties of any Romanian citizen, whatever his name and whatever he may have done or said in the past.

We shall protest against any abuse by the Romanian state committed against any citizen, whoever may stand at the head of the Romanian state.

We shall acknowledge the merits of any Romanian citizen, whatever his sins and errors, just as we shall demand the punishment of any wrongdoing and shall pray for the forgiveness of the sins of any citizen whatever his name or his qualities.

We shall remain consistent in showing and condemning the abuses and crimes of the monstrous Băsescu-Kövesi regime, the root of evil in Romania.

We shall remain grateful to any person who helps us, and we shall leave no one on our team behind.

Therefore, remaining consistent with our own principles and values, we shall act in accordance with them, whatever the risks and "collateral losses" of image this may involve.

The fact that we have been in politics for a month has not turned us into demagogic opportunists devoid of values and principles.

We shall remain nailed to our principles, even if this exposes us and brings upon us the opprobrium of some in society, and even if some supporters may be ready to tear us apart for it.

And we shall remain consistent for the simple reason that this is what society needs today: consistency in principles, honour, the confession of the truth and courage in the defence of values... to the point of sacrifice.

As for the "sensitive subject" whose name or presence inflames any public discussion, Professor Adrian Severin, my personal position, which does not bind the party, remains unchanged: an accomplished professional, who was my teacher, a man of dazzling intelligence who served his sentence for

a criminal offence of which he was convicted by the criminal Băsescu-Kövesi regime, and who is today a citizen with full civic rights.

Not least, Professor Adrian Severin was one of the few professionals who made an active and important contribution to the #SovereigntyAct.

And for that I shall always remain grateful to him.

And, in spite of all the above, yesterday's communiqué was not about Adrian Severin, nor in defence of Adrian Severin!

It was in defence of the principles and values in which I believe and in which we all in the #CoalitionForTheNation believe.

And these values and principles will not be negotiable.

Just as the rights and liberties of any Romanian citizen cannot be made conditional upon his name, his social status, his convictions or even his past.

And these positions will remain non-negotiable and unchanged, whatever the risks or the costs.

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQGAUoVA9b0xP-n5gaqFAeQs6n-Vg_Ov95dPHgt6lHSGUjsEm5uSVKOZ3QKmmy2DlIcw1Gu0eMa30CVIw_JDNMbcbjDXmumCNtr-AUkU1x3N9oTL-0KT0dAjw9Ydf-qbwQGh7-RYhqx41Tp-cmLTsM9Igtw5tnxlIyKxLTXNU3V-is3CSjXYLBV4ynpEUbH-xOr_BfmVRhgmwQQZAN7Slavk9Vx0&s=518⟩

---

148. 30 September 2022 — "The other day Rareș Bogdan appeared and told us how the gas from the Black Sea extracted by Blax..."

The other day Rareș Bogdan appeared telling us that the Black Sea gas extracted by Black Sea Oil and Gas has been contracted by the Engie group and is entirely exported, taken out of Romania. And that some very clear law ought to be applied which says that the state has priority in purchasing the gas extracted here, "and only if the Romanian state refuses that gas does one then go onto the international market."

Only that this law does not exist, and these rules were excluded from Offshore Law no. 256 of 12 November 2018. You remember, it is that law about which I raised an outcry as early as 2018, and this year I, Dan Chitic, tabled a set of amendments in Parliament, all of them in favour of the Romanian state and the Romanian citizen, and all rejected wholesale by Parliament.

Moreover, when the criminal amendments to the Offshore Act made by Ciucă – Ciolacu – Hunor – Pambuccian were introduced in Parliament, in order to sweeten the bitter pill of betrayal the chiefs of the #CoalitionOfBetrayal introduced a paragraph which allowed Romania to benefit from its resources as a priority in the event of an "ENERGY CRISIS". That proposal read as follows: "By derogation from paragraph (1) and/or (2), the Government, by Government Decision, on the proposal of the Ministry of Energy, in a situation of energy crisis and/or of distortion of Romania's supply of natural gas, may take measures for the sale, as a priority in Romania, of the quantities of natural gas extracted from the perimeters in question." It should have been paragraph 3 of Article 20 of the Law.

Only that... that paragraph did not pass Parliament. And so the last possibility for the Romanian citizen to benefit from Romanian gas disappeared! Even the notion of an "energy crisis" disappeared from the form voted by Parliament.

As for the "priority" of the Romanian State in purchasing Romania's gas resources, this simply DOES NOT EXIST in the #OffshoreAct as amended this year by the treacherous parliamentary majority!!! In fact, the only mentions of the Romanian state in the Offshore Act are those in which the Romanian state undertakes to act free of charge, to exempt from the payment of taxes and royalties and possibly to compensate the multinational operators. That is all!

That is why I challenge Mr Rareș Bogdan to quote and indicate to us which are the legal provisions giving priority to the purchase of Romanian gas by the Romanian state. I make this challenge to any member of the government and of the treacherous majority which voted this Offshore Act, a shameful law by which we have completely and for ever given up the Black Sea gas to foreign operators.

The only solution which we in the #CoalitionForTheNation see in this situation of real energy crisis is the amendment of the Offshore Act as a matter of urgency, an amendment which, in the interest of the Romanian citizen and the Romanian state, will have to contain our proposed amendments, rejected at full speed by the members of Parliament of the coalition of betrayal.

Otherwise, the hypocrisy of certain propagandists will not be able to conceal the continuing betrayal of which the #CoalitionOfBetrayal now governing Romania is guilty!

In any case, when you look at your bills and see the exorbitant prices you are paying for the cold in your houses, you should know who is to blame: no, not Putin (for we could have been more than 90% independent of Russian gas), but the traitors who govern us and who have given away for nothing the gas and the resources that belong to you!

That is why we in the Coalition for the Nation will also be in the street on 2 October!

(On the offshore draft: the full text of the draft — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQEbSEpybymGRkVVdGB_22cE6u4SM49Crfj3CfJcfHZr1MDkfxFyH_O2mge7K-KdDJJqp82dJScNDxe3Xh_Cw63bZsAvd–u1uUhHYAYu9LxcPWXutHLBhmG5KVQvgej0JuBSXjPs9dH9gz3WyDUXeLa8mcr94_DGlLilt65H4Dk4Yfv_tMVFHuHEQpw-uEggEFTMknS74_5S7iMCtWKThJSNi4&s=518⟩

149. 5 October 2022 — On the speech of the director of the SRI

On the Demilitarisation Act: the full text of the draft — see the page The Demilitarisation Act.

The domestic event of the year was, without doubt for me, yesterday's speech by the director of the SRI, Eduard Hellvig. Through his statement he seems to have made a visible move to change the compass heading of national security policy, a change made in prime time, evidently — as in seamanship — so as to be seen from afar by the overwhelming majority of the population of Romania, which has begun to hold sovereigntist convictions.

"In this world, nationalism should not be merely the preserve of certain extreme discourses or approaches, but also a kind of instinct possessed by those of democratic, liberal thinking, who today have the mistaken tendency to move away from subjects such as patriotism or traditions.

(…) I believe that support for democracy can coexist with attachment to traditional values, religion, elements of national identity."

(…) "I do not think there should be so great a separation between national pride and support for universal democratic principles. Thanks to these principles, European societies have managed to be the model of development to which so many millions of migrants aspire. And the cultivation of national pride should not be left solely to the approaches of extremists or populists. As a personal opinion, I believe that a moderate, balanced nationalism should be reassumed, redefined and recul-

tivated also by those of democratic and balanced thinking in the western states, including in the Romania of the future."

Moreover, the Director of the SRI also addressed themes which I have been pointing out for many, many years, and acknowledged the sins not only of the past but also of the present of the institution he leads, acknowledging even that he is aware that there is much mistrust in society regarding the number of "undercover officers" and their agenda in various strategic sectors, giving assurances that since the beginning of his mandate their activity has been carried out "strictly within the limits of the law":

"I know the sins of which the institution is accused, some of them real, others attributed to us unjustly. I also know of the problems generated by some former SRI employees positioned either behind all sorts of people or gravitating around state-owned companies. I can tell you that we are aware of these problems and we shall do everything in our power to solve them", declared Eduard Hellvig.

(...) "Politics and the activity of gathering intelligence must not overlap. Too often, however, the mistakes of the past also affect the behaviour of those in the present. Too many politicians, in previous decades, grew accustomed to receiving 'indications' or 'suggestions' about what they had to do. Politicians are elected by the people to think with their own minds, invested with their trust to take decisions about how Romania will look in the future, not merely to put out the fires of the present and to apply plans thought up by others. And yet too many want others to take decisions in their place, too many even expect to receive suggestions from the services. We shall not consolidate democracy until we encourage every institution to assume the mandate it has, without abuses and without excesses."

Why have I given you all these quotations from the SRI director Eduard Hellvig?

So that you may see how significant is his change of attitude and direction by comparison with the position he expressed in 2014, when he said that "A return to nationalism would be tantamount to the end of the European Union, with all that this means for its citizens — from the abolition of borders and the aspiration to a better life, to the essential democratic liberties, first among them freedom of expression."

After eight years, and after tens of percentage points of the population have swung from embracing the progressive-globalist current to the sovereigntist-conservative one, the position of the SRI director and of the institution appears to have pivoted... in other words, the Securitate, the System, appears to have gone over to the people's side...

Is that so? Well, it will be simple to see whether these are merely political or politicking statements or whether they are indeed national security strategies which will really be implemented in the SRI's activity.

For instance, it would be a good beginning if the system's infiltrators in the press stopped labelling as a "Putinist" and an "enemy of the people" every person who supports sovereigntist-conservative policies. Another good step would be to permit access to the mainstream media, closed for years to any individual expressing views contrary to the System and to Globalism.

In fact a very good sign would have been if, at Sunday's protest, the services had not stuck their tail in, had not divided the masses of people, had not set them against one another to the point of a brawl... yes, that would have been a good sign! But it was not so. The System could not restrain itself and remote-guided the pseudo-leaders of the "sovereigntists" in such a way that the people should see that the "sovereigntists" are capable neither of unity, nor of political vision, nor of viable

solutions for the Nation… but only of scandal, shouting and stadium chants. That is, that they are not fit to take power, to take the reins of the country. That is what they wanted. And they achieved what they set out to do: the Securitate once again fulfilled its globalist role and discredited for a long time to come not only any idea of protest and street movement but also the idea of uniting the sovereigntist forces. Certainly, it had material to work with… but the System's activity was transparently visible in the concertedly dissonant action of the frail parliamentary opposition in discrediting the idea of protest and of a sovereigntist movement.

Yes, until yesterday the System's activity remained visibly in support of the progressive-colonialist forces, a fact also visible in the concerted action of the "press" in denigrating in recent days another conservative pillar — the most important one! — the Church, through the avalanche of revelations concerning the involvement of certain churchmen in all sorts of sexual scandals.

In short, all this happened until yesterday…

All this was, however, before yesterday's speech by Hellvig. From today… everything will change!

As a lawyer I am used to giving pre-eminence to the presumption of good faith, and I shall do so even in the case of Mr Hellvig, director of the SRI… But this good faith can and must be proved. And the first proof, as I have said, would be an end to the persecution and denigration of sovereigntists and conservatives, and of churchmen too.

Then, more complicated and longer-term, would be the extraction and return to "barracks" of all the infiltrators in the press, in the business world and above all in the judiciary!!!

Equally important, essential even, would be the removal of the SRI and of the other services from the legislative process, for yes, many — most — of the laws are written by the men of the System.

Because in the end the supreme gesture of normality would be to bring Romania's intelligence services up to NATO standards, that is, to demilitarise them…

In other words, Mr Hellvig ought to follow point by point the provisions of Chapter IV of the #SovereigntyAct… the very one which was denigrated in the press and rejected in Parliament by Mr Hellvig's own men. But that too was before yesterday.

But I really do want to believe in the sincerity and good faith of the Director of the SRI.

However that may be, we in the #CoalitionForTheNation shall go #ToTheVeryEnd!

And whatever the Securitate may do, we #GiveRomaniaBackToRomanians!

(On the Demilitarisation Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQGiFVsSqYfJLrxvCbMz5Rpz-LKZEYHEDMPW-Ctvh_rCORZkwJjJu8gCSf1nzFW6xieLnExYXR7h4VSBIsevFwrsOpIFqJuJg82TEh7Jso-TrxlO-M0wAEUno3zJ8NnvxZsB6cbwPPHwfFujcmRF4owcnyxykZ3ZuVfnCRHZsAWLjE-h1WlM9W-2tZQl6cIv7WnvUcG6C7NdvTfyyLmJWcLYMTZ2w&s=518⟩

---

150. 17 October 2022 — On the rejection of the Sovereignty Act

On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see the page The Sovereignty Act.

Why was the #SovereigntyAct rejected at full speed in the summer?

Because it went against the plans of the vipers of the #CoalitionOfBetrayal PSD-PNL-UDMR, plans which today we have seen materialise in the adoption of Predoiu's inJustice Laws, in the transformation of Romania into a colony without a Constitution!

Here is what obligations and penalties the Sovereignty Act provided in Article 9 for all public officials, including magistrates:

Law no. 286 of 17 July 2009 on the Criminal Code, published in the Official Gazette no. 510 of 24 July 2009, as subsequently amended and supplemented, is amended and supplemented as follows:

(8) In Article 297, after paragraph (2) a new paragraph is introduced, para. (3), reading as follows:

"(3) The act of a public official in applying any legal provisions declared unconstitutional by Decision of the Constitutional Court of Romania is punishable by imprisonment from 7 to 10 years."

Now it is clear why they did not want the #SovereigntyAct to become law, isn't it?

Because their target, as early as the summer, was the Constitution itself and our rights and liberties!

When the #CoalitionForTheNation comes to govern, the Sovereignty Act will become Law and the Constitution the Supreme Law in Romania!

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQEHCAxRhhqsUq2yhBjGVfpx94Rr3vxZHIlkePzQElNuHSwDI-vA8lQva0Ru-2UMjxumEeZYmSzXfyE4vuG4pMczsGxwFdR_WtN5cnLeXokODhkKOl2F3yAtVmkkQgXLjKRrk1KunqzhFil-9e8Cf6jApFtDC96my_YNRCGIi1iApxyb9s89uaxffM6qRDZwkz_PSqHVus7aFyYBy_rTQZhzV6Fv-6&s=518⟩

---

151. 24 October 2022 — "Awaiting the NATO attack on the Russian troops in Ukraine launched from Romania, the fac..."

While we await the NATO attack on Russian troops in Ukraine launched from Romania, a fact which will automatically place us on the map of nuclear targets,

I propose that we make a Retrospective of the great achievements of Iohannis and of those in the #CoalitionOfBetrayal PSD-PNL-UDMR-USR against the Romanian people over the last two years:

- they put us in prison at home, terrorised us, kept our children away from school and impoverished us on the basis of Law 55/2020, adopted by them unanimously;

- they forcibly jabbed us, making us potential subjects of sudden departure;

- they took our money, 1 billion euros, to pay for 120 million jabs;

- they rejected the only law written by us, the people, the #SovereigntyAct;

- they gave away the Black Sea gas free of charge to foreigners by amending the #OffShoreAct;

- they denied us the right to justice, reintroducing the Securitate into the judiciary and de facto repealing the Constitution when they adopted the #PredoiuLaws...

Now we are waiting to be dragged into a war which is not ours and which may be fatal to us...

With so much fatalism and defeatism, so much cowardice and love of comfort... perhaps we deserve everything that is happening to us while we wait.

Let us put on a manea and grill a mititei... at least let us be hap-hap-hap-happy when what we are waiting for arrives!

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQEtocZ54vxoC69OJnc3Qzb9wQhFUv1xrLL-hkgY_pQDaVlTbpOw-y1lFCe38n6Uisw7EM3_QmWvitIWp8k_LKKx3vTasst8lQULDdwKE8MDU9zDXlG85aD4O9ASyz-15b0_Eh3_mM0LUO6teF5JResqjQ6oUs9vcI64VDQagP2GaTr-2lxEdcv8Woe2v9InnvGwZ8mKMa6wDBq9hYBsEe1_kA6i_x&s=518⟩

---

152. 3 November 2022 — "Ciolacu announces the taxation of big capital"

Ciolacu announced the taxation of big capital

"1% on the turnover of large companies!"

That is, what the #CoalitionForTheNation has been demanding for five months:

Let him copy the whole of the #SolidarityAct — the law on the taxation of great businesses and fortunes!

What we proposed will in the end prove to be the only solution. Let us hope it is not too late...

(On the Solidarity Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQG7fDpFwLCTAG0DC6fMBi_YjKDBCRu0wt_FeBAyopl-Q4EIMX0dYzoBMKLqFHnLS6L4OJ6QZ3fK-E0NK1Kb8-WOk3KuPfKaNknHVnxeI42hQA6T2n_9nkkNgpvHQ8ixgd6RuZzgU6xHHeFQ3rAbJFZVHrFarAspPyJPnMszXYQK697_tmZnRi9PymYcHud71_sLLLuYb1BSW6Bq-GhXLuVxSbE-jc&s=518⟩

---

153. 4 November 2022 — "While the population of Romania grows poorer and is tormented by shortages, cold and inflation..."

While the population of Romania grows poorer and is tormented by shortages, cold and inflation...

The profits of the foreign-owned banks rise unceasingly — the banks through which the chiefs of the colony of Romania control and siphon off the country's financial resources!

The time has come for the real taxation of great fortunes and businesses.

In the coming days we in the Coaliția pentru Națiune will bring back into discussion the #ActForTheTaxationOfGreatFortunesAndBusinesses, supplemented with fiscal provisions for the effective and efficient assistance of all citizens who work and who have dependants.

I hope that on this draft too — essential for all of us — we shall find the parliamentary support we had for the #SovereigntyAct, for the draft amending and supplementing the #OffshoreAct in Romania's interest, and for the #JusticeLaws.

Post scriptum: details of the exorbitant profits of certain banks may be found here: https://financialintelligence.ro/profit-net-de-un-miliard-de-lei-pentr...

Details of the Law amending the Fiscal Code in the interest of the Romanian citizen will likewise be found on this page!

(On the offshore draft: the full text of the draft — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQEMrLbTcXgUUkhho-pWD1w-YGci-FBcfE7USnKw4nfEHECjCwvNy7KCZmVBdt1sdBrt15fks52rwDzu63G4yFmRq-uFANJtWYSDhCAieIuYsFE_2kzspXLt2P_Vtv2VjvXPNS2dhH7E8qbjpXwU8jP5wZqhkkXy-Es4LJ3jRzMjKYNnx852iCiFXVlpW2XrWuZAJypBMdxXbimv3ayvStUIU84vw&s=518⟩

154. 5 November 2022 — On the taxation of large fortunes

As I told you yesterday evening, the new draft law announced by the #CoalitionForTheNation as early as the summer — THE ACT ON SOLIDARITY AND ON THE TAXATION OF GREAT BUSINESSES AND FORTUNES (DRAFT LEGISLATION AMENDING THE FISCAL CODE — Law no. 227/2015 on the Fiscal Code) — is ready and will shortly be tabled in Parliament by deputy Dumitru Coarnă (a fact confirmed by him live, and to Mrs Adriana Bahmuțeanu).

I set out below the full text as well as a link to the document in PDF format.

"THE ACT ON SOLIDARITY AND ON THE TAXATION OF GREAT BUSINESSES AND FORTUNES

DRAFT LEGISLATION AMENDING THE FISCAL CODE

Starting from the constitutional principle that Romania is a social state (Article 1(3) of the Constitution) built on the solidarity of its citizens (Article 4(1) of the Constitution),

taking into account the need to simplify tax collection and make it more efficient, a fact apt to increase predictability and also competitiveness in the economy,

having regard to the need to encourage the birth rate and also to increase the degree of social protection which may be granted indirectly by the state through family members,

and also to the need to encourage work and to reduce the share of social assistance,

the present amendment of Law 227/2015 is adopted:

After Article 18, Articles 18^1 and 18^2 are introduced, reading as follows:

"ART. 18^1 Special regime for taxpayers with annual revenues of over 10,000,000 Euros

1. Taxpayers who have obtained revenues exceeding the equivalent in lei of 10,000,000 euros are liable to pay a tax at the rate of 1% applied to the revenues recorded. The exchange rate for determining the equivalent in euros is the one valid at the close of the financial year in which the revenues were recorded.

2. Taxpayers who have obtained revenues exceeding the equivalent in lei of 100,000,000 euros are liable to pay a tax at the rate of 2% applied to the revenues recorded. The exchange rate for determining the equivalent in euros is the one valid at the close of the financial year in which the revenues were recorded.

3. Taxpayers who have obtained revenues exceeding the equivalent in lei of 1,000,000,000 euros are liable to pay a tax at the rate of 3% applied to the revenues recorded. The exchange rate for determining the equivalent in euros is the one valid at the close of the financial year in which the revenues were recorded.

ART. 18^2 — Special regime for taxpayers carrying on activities in the nature of the extraction, refining or marketing of petroleum products and their derivatives

"Taxpayers carrying on activities in the nature of the extraction, refining or marketing of petroleum products and their derivatives and having annual revenues greater than 10,000,000 euros, including legal persons which obtain such revenues under an association contract for the activities provided for in this article, are liable to pay a tax at the rate of 5% applied to the revenues recorded."

Article 101(2) of Law 227/2015 on the Fiscal Code is amended and shall read as follows:

"(2) The tax shall be calculated by applying a rate of 10% to the monthly taxable income from pensions and, respectively, a rate of 90% to the monthly taxable income from pensions exceeding 11 gross national minimum wages."

Article III. After TITLE X, TITLE X^1 is introduced, entitled "THE TAX ON GREAT FORTUNES", reading as follows:

"Article 500^1 Taxpayers who are natural persons and whose revenues, cumulated with the value of the gains, of the securities and of the buildings existing in their patrimony on 31 December of the preceding year, exceed 10,000,000 Euros are liable to pay a solidarity tax amounting to 1% a year of the total value of the fortune.

Article 500^2 Taxpayers who are natural persons and whose revenues, cumulated with the value of the gains, of the securities and of the buildings existing in their patrimony on 31 December of the preceding year, exceed 100,000,000 Euros are liable to pay a solidarity tax amounting to 2% a year of the total value of the fortune.

Article 500^3 Taxpayers who are natural persons and whose revenues, cumulated with the value of the gains, of the securities and of the buildings existing in their patrimony on 31 December of the preceding year, exceed 1,000,000,000 Euros are liable to pay a solidarity tax amounting to 3% a year of the total value of the fortune.

Article 500^4 The exchange rate for determining the equivalent in euros is the one valid at the close of the financial year in which the revenues and the gains were recorded.

Article 500^5 1.) Taxpayers who are natural persons and whose revenues, cumulated with the value of the gains, of the movable and immovable assets and of the buildings existing in their patrimony on 31 December of the preceding year, exceed 10,000,000 Euros are obliged to draw up an annual declaration of assets; the annual declaration of assets relating to the last amended fiscal year shall be submitted by 25 March inclusive of the following year.

Declarations of assets shall be made in writing, on the declarant's own responsibility, and shall include the rights and obligations of the declarant, of the spouse and of the dependent children, in accordance with Annex no. 1."

Article 77(2), second paragraph, is amended and shall read as follows:

"For taxpayers who obtain gross monthly incomes of between 1,951 lei and 20,000 lei, the personal deduction shall be granted as follows:

for taxpayers with one dependant — 10% of the income tax due;

for taxpayers with two dependants — 20% of the income tax due;

for taxpayers with three dependants — 30% of the income tax due;

for taxpayers with four or more dependants — 50% of the income tax due."

Link to the document in pdf format: https://t.me/DanMVChiticNecenzurat/1739

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQE_X7hCOj7Pi23Vf9UwGxIldTsRE2pP-RxGkoUYX4GIsMS7XMB9LywcGiMhut-vPvPUVjk_49n9DHbQH08L5gcXMXkoKcBowlHZrcYdB3HnVEitG_7wEseLE9nnrruJfSsXYzTsaC_LiLkmTqhhU-pSO1AKKHbLkE8vy6uKIoTG2UVfL7V098pzpbmi7k6VRv89yU5h-mWzpbthxJNa8Rt3TBHCw&s=518⟩

155. 14 November 2022 — "The other day the people at Hotnews took an interview with me"

The other day the people at Hotnews interviewed me

Yes!!! Hotnews!!! You know as well as I do who they are and what interests they represent — a fact revealed without any modesty by the man who commented on the context and on what the interviewees said, an old Băsescu activist, the quintessence of anti-national progressivism and of neocolonialism. But we shall not dwell on that… what matters is the signal! The System is aware of the trend. Which means it will do everything it can to strike at us, to discredit us, to divide us.

Another aspect important for us is that in the "category" of extra-parliamentary "small parties", the #CoalitionForTheNation was the first to be mentioned. That may mean something too…

I set out below what they selected from what I said — a few sentences out of nearly an hour of interview — as well as the link at which you can read the whole article.

"Dan Chitic, the leader of the Coalition for the Nation, says that his formation is a conservative one and fits perfectly into the sovereigntist current. Indeed, the Coalition for the Nation promoted and tabled in Parliament the sovereignty act, which was rejected by the members of Parliament after the intervention of the PSD and PNL leaders.

* Dan Chitic, Coalition for the Nation: "Sovereigntism, for us, is putting the national interest before everything else and having the power to decide, even if you decide wrongly. Sovereigntism comes from sovereign, the royal right to decide, and that right belongs to the people, and it means that we Romanians have the right to choose according to our concrete and immediate interests, not the interests of a broad and extremely vaguely defined family such as the European family. (…)

* When you have a family that humiliates you and leaves you waiting at the gates of Schengen and imposes on you mechanisms for supervising your justice system — a justice system which works better here than in the Netherlands — and then asks you for solidarity and asks you to give from your own resources for the common good… that is not fair. If Trump could say America First and was not arrested, we too can say 'Romania First'."

In Dan Chitic's view, the sovereignty act is the basis of a platform which could bring together the sovereigntist parties of Romania.

"We have sympathisers of sovereigntism and conservatism amounting to something like 60% of the electorate. We ought to set ourselves as a realistic objective the winning over of 25–30%. As far as I am concerned there have been only informal discussions, not institutional ones, about creating a sovereigntist pole. If we manage to get past our vanities we could create a common platform bringing together 25–30% of the electorate. Any future political collaboration with AUR will be carried out only on the basis of a political agreement registered as an alliance with the court, not on a handshake, not by standing on joint lists, because we have painful memories of one another", Dan Chitic believes."

https://www.hotnews.ro/stiri-politic-25897522-cum-pregateste-aur-polul…

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQEWdiE3HmlSYL_aYoXemRExecinmcWxe2CI1_xioq-4ut6mIX4Vwa_u5HCFm5z-m0zVZZj4PSI2aQR-sGZxpM3KiVa2ks-pLVaaew5ar8k6Wx-1lvN1YSBSqOh7Gkjn38XEAiJ3MB6msgnukY1MLesjqdSVDhs-_QIDRHxUrS7mCFF7DFc8KNxI5bCrVTo_isc0_z7crdq_4vLjbMvG0grfj5WRd&s=518⟩

---

156. 19 December 2022 — On the need for a new Constitution

On the Demilitarisation Act: the full text of the draft — see the page The Demilitarisation Act.

Thirty-three years after the Revolution, the last solution: #ANewConstitution!

Now, ten days after the historic humiliation to which Romania was subjected and

#TwentyYearsOn from the last revision, it is obvious that the present disaster in which Romanian society finds itself, the pauperisation, the abuse and the humiliation to which the Romanian citizen is subjected, and even the colonial status imposed from outside through an inept and treacherous political class — all of it has one primary cause, one cause of all causes: the Constitution!

It is the incoherences and the deficiencies of the Constitution that permitted the ceding of national sovereignty — a ceding which consisted in the alienation for nothing of our resources and riches, the violation of our fundamental rights, the abuse of power by presidents, the anti-national law-making carried out by every government of the last decades on the basis of an abusive "legislative delegation", and the abandonment of the national interest in favour of the interests of national and supra-national super-powers.

The present Constitution was conceived in 2003 to be a constitution of "Euro-Atlantic integration", an integration achieved at any price, on our knees, at the price of giving up the defence of our legitimate interests, of our dignity, of national sovereignty.

Now, #TwentyYearsOn, when we are already members (second-class ones, unfortunately) of the Euro-Atlantic alliances into which we hoped in good faith to integrate in 2003, after we have paid a heavy price for entry into the "Euro-Atlantic family" by ceding resources, riches and, above all, #Sovereignty,

#TheTimeHasCome to bring back to the fore the national interest, the interest of the Romanian citizen.

For these reasons, we in the #CoalitionForTheNation are launching the project of a broad revision of the Constitution, a project intended to turn the #ConstitutionOfEuroAtlanticIntegration of 2003 into the #ConstitutionOfSovereignty, into the #ConstitutionOfNationalDignity regained in 2023, without this meaning that we leave the alliances of which we are now part at international level.

To this end, the principal measures we have in view are:

- The total prohibition of the extradition of Romanian citizens;

- The prohibition of subjecting Romanian citizens to any kind of experimental treatment;

- The prohibition of access to appointed and elected public offices for the men of the "System" for a period of 5 years from the cessation of the capacity they held;

- Constitutional regulation of the traditional family based on freely consented marriage between a man and a woman;

- Reduction of the president's mandate from 5 years to 4 years;

- Limitation of the President's powers in favour of Parliament;

- Strict limitation of the government's legislative delegation;

- Prohibition of regulating by emergency ordinance the abolition, alienation or concession of assets in public ownership;

- Limitation in time of appointed public offices;

- Acceptance on the national territory in peacetime of foreign troops only after obtaining the prior consent of Parliament;

- Inclusion in the Supreme Council of National Defence of the heads of the two chambers of Parliament;

- Limitation in time of the mandate of the heads of the secret services;

- The obligation to update the Royalties owed under concession contracts to the level of European prices every five years.

- Romania's participation in the international bodies and alliances of which it is part, with observance of the Constitution of Romania and in the higher and sovereign interest of the Romanian people;

- Establishment as a constitutional principle that accession, the ratification of revisions of founding treaties and Romania's withdrawal from international Bodies and Alliances shall be effected only by a law adopted through the sovereign decision of the Romanian people expressed by referendum.

- Strict annual control by the Court of Accounts over public resources;

- The appointment of three judges to the Constitutional Court by the Economic and Social Council on the proposal of civil society.

- Facilitation of the review of constitutionality by reducing the number of deputies and senators who may refer a matter to the Constitutional Court, and the inclusion of ordinances among the normative acts whose constitutionality may be examined at any time at the request of members of Parliament.

- Extension of the review of constitutionality to treaties already ratified.

The specific measures proposed in the present draft revision of the Constitution do not seek to change the institutional architecture of the Romanian state — which would require a far broader revision or even a new Constitution — but to repair the numerous specific problems which have caused the marasmus of Romanian society under the rule of the Constitutions of 1991 and 2003 respectively.

The present proposals for amending the Constitution are apt to transform Romania from a "semi-presidential" republic into a "semi-parliamentary" one in which, although the President of Romania continues to be elected directly by the people, Parliament — as the representative body through which the Romanian people exercises its sovereignty — will acquire the pre-eminent role in the Romanian state. At the same time, limiting the possibility of delegating legislative powers to the executive, which will have as its direct effect the restriction of the executive's right to issue ordinances and emergency ordinances, is apt to consolidate the separation of powers in the state and strengthens Parliament's role as legislator while at the same time conferring on it an enhanced role in supervising the activity of the executive.

Not least, the demilitarisation of the intelligence services, the prohibition on participation in political life by persons who have been part of the "system", the limitation in time of the duration of appointed public offices (all of them directly inspired by fundamental rules of our strategic partner the USA), as well as the strict, obligatory annual control by the Court of Accounts over public resources, are all strictly necessary measures for making Romanian society transparent, normal and democratic.

#TwentyYearsOn, the #Constitution2023 will have to restore to the Romanian people dignity, justice and the power to hope. That is why the Romanian citizen, the addressee and final beneficiary of this project, is called upon to analyse and debate our proposals, to comment on and correct the articles we propose.

That is why, beginning today, 19 December 2022, we shall launch a group for discussion and comment in which all political and non-political forces, parliamentary or non-parliamentary, and all citizens are called upon to express their opinions and to make further proposals for amendment if

these are considered necessary. Observations will have to be made on a form which we shall make available on the group https://t.me/+W-oH4Yyxi9pjNTE0.

At the same time, we call upon all specialists in constitutional law to express their informed opinions and to take an active part in this public debate, which will last until about the middle of February.

That is why, from today onwards, the #ConstitutionOfSovereignty is no longer merely the project proposed by the #CoalitionForTheNation, but will be the project of the whole of society, of all those who take part in the debates and in the gathering of signatures under Article 150 of the Constitution.

We call in this way upon all patriotic and sovereigntist forces, political or non-political, parliamentary or non-parliamentary, to join this enormous effort to bring about the change we all desire, the change for the better in Romanian society for which we still hope.

500,000 signatures will be needed… an immense number, but not impossible to gather! For we must understand that only we, the citizens, can force change, and this for the simple reason that in Parliament we do not have "a quarter of the number of deputies or of senators" who would be patriotic enough to promote these strictly necessary amendments which we must bring to the Constitution.

The revision of the Constitution is an immense challenge for Romanian society. But this challenge must be accepted and assumed, for the amendments must be made before the Presidential elections of 2024, when the elected President will have to begin his 4-year mandate, a mandate which he will have to end in the same year as the mandates of the members of Parliament elected to the future Parliament, in 2028.

Yes, it is a historic window of opportunity which we have no right to ignore! That is why I ask all of you who sincerely love this country to set aside any pride or stirring of vanity, to set aside natural personal sympathies or antipathies, to become involved in this project and to organise yourselves so as to be able to gather the immense number of signatures needed for the revision of the Constitution.

Let us show them that power really does belong to the people!

Let us, the people, decide how we want our Romania to be: a dignified and sovereign Romania!

Read the amendments to the Constitution in full at https://t.me/DanMVChiticNecenzurat/1880

(On the Demilitarisation Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQGm_uZMVpr4kjRjuHEbyXgsGYZqSFG0tAg4Hrwd-IaMUSHuv-J_P7OmBwpQiNhxFa4jYxsS7YD2hvNCuPbqjRgDLur-qtJlEnKaYuNdp_bxLTsS4DaEATc9JooGbHQGCYiQrV6uwLSVDXFEg8JGUuEuNZi6-XZsXM6MCokTWThA1ml2Lb9bWjY1_B2OHRZXkazfTDUbWSrey2ko-_t4wDOs5vNlr&s=518⟩

157. 20 December 2022 — On the accusations levelled at the author

On the Solidarity Act: the full text of the draft — see the page The Solidarity Act.

Much has been said about Chitic in the twelve years since he appeared in public life. It has been said that he is mad, that he is stupid, that he is an amateur, naive, violent, selfish, villainous, conceited, a Pharisee, a hypocrite, a liar… the list is so long that whole pages could be written with nothing but the epithets so generously bestowed on him. And all of them, every one, can be found on Chitic's own social-media pages, since whether out of laziness — as some would say — or out of shamelessness — as others would say — or perhaps merely out of a bizarre fidelity to the principle of freedom of expression, Chitic has never deleted the critical, sometimes downright scabrous comments made about him; for the only comments ever deleted were those that were racist, antisemitic, or that attacked religious beliefs and traditions, of whatever kind they might be.

Of late, however, a new epithet has appeared in certain Facebook circles, and this "compliment" comes from what might have been called "his own camp": "Chitic, the System's man" (and these too you can find among the comments, for they have not been deleted either)! And it has not merely appeared in passing: it is a "current" which some wish to enlarge and intensify. And intensive work is being done on it!

This classification cannot be left as it is, for it is not a simple opinion perhaps based on a personal antipathy, or perhaps on a state of irritation — for yes, Chitic is neither handsome nor charming, but small, unattractive and rather surly and cantankerous, which might justify any condemnation of the infamous character.

NO! "Chitic, the System's man" cannot be filed under "and others", for it is an assertion which can be analysed factually, on the public words and deeds of the man who over time has been labelled either a KGB man, or a CIA man, or even a Mossad man, or, more recently, "the System's man" — that is, either an SRI man or an SIE man, or in any case the man of one of our many "intelligence" structures.

Well, let us see what might determine this conviction, on what this opinion might be founded.

Could it be the fact that only the other day it was announced that his public Facebook page would shortly be shut down?

Or perhaps the fact that in the latest project he has launched for public discussion, "Chitic, the System's man" has just proposed that the demilitarisation of the intelligence services be regulated at Constitutional level — in the same place where he proposed the introduction of an article forbidding the men of the system to enter political life both during their "service" and in the first five years after leaving the system? Yes, it is clear: the #ConstitutionOfSovereignty was written by men of the system who want to give Transylvania to the Hungarians... just as the referendum on the traditional family failed so that Dragnea should not escape prison!

Could it be the "Solidarity Act — the Act on the taxation of great fortunes and businesses"? — a law written back in the summer and offered to any member of Parliament willing to table it for debate in Parliament, a member of Parliament who to this day has not come forward...

Or perhaps the #OffShoreAct is the cause of Chitic being labelled "the System's man" — a law which he was the first, yes, the very first, to oppose, as early as 2018. The spring of 2018, to be precise, when it was voted in the Senate in Tudose's version, after which it was sweetened by Dragnea, because those in the #CoalitionOfBetrayal — indeed its very chiefs Ciucă – Ciolacu – Kelemen, through Virgil Popescu's pen — moulded it to be 100% friendly to the operators. Incidentally, it was also "Chitic, the System's man" who this year sent into Parliament the only set of amendments which would have turned it into a law serving the national interest — amendments which were actually read out in the plenary of Parliament and rejected by the Overwhelming parliamentary majority. And they were rejected while "Chitic the System man" was protesting at the gates of Parliament in the rain together with a handful of people... Yes, that must be it! In any case, it is interesting to note how in the last ten days the mainstream media has discovered this terrible act of betrayal about which "the System's man" has been shouting for four years... naturally, being the System's man, no television station invites him to say what he has been saying for four years!

Another indication might be that this same "man of the system" howled in despair against what he called the #PredoiuLaws, a set of so-called "justice" laws by which the Constitution and the Decisions of the Constitutional Court and of the High Court became optional for judges, and by which the door is thrown wide open to the "collaboration" of the services with the "independent judiciary".

No — the #SovereigntyAct must be the reason! That draft law for which he gathered 33,000 signatures and which he took into Parliament only for it to be rejected, this same year, by the same Coalition of Betrayal PSD-PNL-UDMR-USR... a law by which 1 law was repealed, 19 laws and ordinances amended, 80 articles amended, added or repealed, including those providing once again — what do you know? — for the demilitarisation of the intelligence services (Chitic, this "System man", is probably desperate to become a civilian!), or for the prohibition of clear-cutting the forests, or for the repatriation of the gold, or for the prohibition of discrimination on the ground of the administration of medical treatments... That too is an indication!

Or perhaps he is suspected of being "the System's man" because he has no longer been invited to say anything since roughly the period when the signature-gathering campaign for the #SovereigntyAct was launched.

Or perhaps because he dared to found a party, the #CoalitionForTheNation — financed from his own money and sabotaged in every possible way from every side — a party at whose head he was the first to dare say "#ROexit?" as early as 2017, although then, as now, he always put a question mark after it... like any securist, of course.

Or perhaps because he openly and publicly opposed the Kövesist terror for years, a period in which he spent most of his time in the television studios of those who had far more, far greater and far more personal stakes than a principled but extremely risky struggle for justice, for freedom and for the rule of law...

Or perhaps because as early as 2010 he dared, like a true "man of the System", to confront Băsescu in person — which brought him not merely a slap from Băsescu but one from the whole system, the proof of which stands to this day in the recordings of Blejnar looking for Chitic over "financings".

These and many other things might stand as solid arguments for describing him, Chitic, as stupid, mad, an amateur or naive. That is probably why Chitic has never responded in any way to these compliments and does not delete the comments of "friends" who caress him with such epithets.

But the label "Chitic, the System's man" is one Chitic cannot understand. Nor accept. And it really does give him insomnia! Perhaps the year has been too long, too hard, and perhaps he is tired. That, probably, is why this is also the first time he has written about the monstrosities of which he has been accused over the years, sometimes by former close allies (too close!) who have thrown tons of slops, foul gossip and scabrous inventions. He never replied, in any way! But this business of "Chitic, the System's man" was too much, the drop that filled the cup of total disgust, which had to be expressed.

And perhaps it was tiredness and nausea that made Chitic write this post about himself in the third person... and that too is a first!

Perhaps this was the only way I could speak to you about the filth in its pure state into which I consciously agreed to enter over the last twelve years of my life, and about an absurd struggle which I still obstinately wage against an abject system and an equally abject indifference.

I am not complaining... I merely concede the point to those who have labelled me mad, stupid, an amateur or naive! But this business of "Chitic, a man of the System" I really do not accept. And I do not permit it!

To be labelled "a man of the System" is by far the gravest insult that could ever be offered me — ever!, as our strategic partner would say.

And that is too much even for me!

(On the Solidarity Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQE7zeKsk2M4_cr2cWoo7OQ0XTKWCQBHsGRJ2BNWh2yusfVswstea-YZe5P-PopS2_ASGc_ZJUf7NE2wyGrSJNb7f_FtidB1Q5_1CIeKj3V8skb9Up2GM36Yf7Fjbe8Hc8resB7BnNnwc5WU2roSi2t7a5YkfImAQgg5DCsLFFjJGXxpMzKbjFPS4-78aRob0XMxlRzBaZMhm4WcS2DqYYZshThS9&s=518⟩

---

158. 20 December 2022 — "Because Parliament will have to decide what troops will be on the territory of Romania before ..."

Because Parliament will have to decide what troops are to be on the territory of Romania before they arrive!

Because we must never again be faced with a fait accompli, because Parliament must never again accept troops already present on the territory of the country!

That is why the #ConstitutionOfSovereignty expressly provides:

Art. 118(5): "(5) In peacetime, foreign troops may enter, be stationed on, carry out operations on or pass through the territory of Romania only with the prior consent of Parliament and under the conditions of the law or of the international treaties to which Romania is a party."

Let us show them that power really does belong to the people!

Let us, the people, decide how we want our Romania to be: a dignified and sovereign Romania!

Read the amendments to the Constitution in full at https://t.me/DanMVChiticNecenzurat/1880

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQGuk-eudJo6a-mD-cfRVQ8Ileb1TW9MzZYouanz54X2nGOmxhnGOrtKD1-ZTRhUai79KFCRdvckFL0sJSuq3jBelaWdKotxjKX8I6HBIlMKhorJqOQAVM5oWyzayR5EusF6YCFObo46b2MkCqQsn5g9fS_-cgdLfBN-0OydQSOzE4e0AawMUbUncfcJYvWcQ-r2AfvJvF1-Wmu-wN9wglD8UgsR&s=518⟩

---

159. 21 December 2022 — "Even the discussions around the #ConstituțiaSuveranității project badly frighten the #System..."

Even the discussions around the #ConstitutionOfSovereignty Project badly frighten the #SecuristSystem in Romania!

Why? Here is a concise explanation in five quotations:

"No one may be subjected to torture or to any kind of inhuman, degrading or experimental punishment or treatment." — proposed amendment to Art. 22(2).

"The following may not belong to political parties: the judges of the Constitutional Court, the ombudsmen, national or European magistrates, active members of the army and of the intelligence services, police officers and other categories of public servants established by organic law. These professional categories may not belong to political parties and may not hold appointed or elected public office for a period of 5 years from the cessation of the exercise of those offices." — proposed amendment to Art. 40(3).

"The family is founded on the freely consented marriage between a man and a woman, on their equality and on the right and duty of the parents to ensure the upbringing, education and instruction of the children." — proposed amendment to Art. 48(1), openly borrowed from the drafts of the Coalition for the Family.

"(3) Appointed public offices, or the offices and capacities filled by direct designation, for which no competition is organised, may be held for a mandate of at most 4 years which may be renewed only once, unless another duration of the mandate or number of mandates is provided for by the present Constitution." — proposed amendment to Art. 116(2).

"(4) The intelligence services and those assimilated to them shall be organised exclusively on a civilian basis, under the conditions of the law. The organisation of military or paramilitary activities outside a state authority is forbidden.

In peacetime, foreign troops may enter, be stationed on, carry out operations on or pass through the territory of Romania only with the prior consent of Parliament and under the conditions of the law or of the international treaties to which Romania is a party." — proposed amendments to Art. 118(4) and (5).

"The royalties owed under concession contracts shall be updated to the level of the prices applied in the European Union every five years." — proposed addition to Art. 136(4).

And the reasons are far more numerous — you will see...

But even these alone would have been enough to unleash the wave of personal attacks against the initiator, or the incitement of useful idiots to come out and say on the "networks" that "if we revise the constitution we give the Hungarians the chance to take Transylvania from us!" — this on the model of "if you vote in the referendum on the family, Dragnea gets off!" — all this although Article 152 of the Constitution, "Limits of revision", expressly provides that:

"(1) The provisions of the present Constitution concerning the national, independent, unitary and indivisible character of the Romanian state, the republican form of government, the integrity of the territory, the independence of the judiciary, political pluralism and the official language may not form the object of revision.

Likewise, no revision may be made if it results in the suppression of the fundamental rights and liberties of citizens or of their guarantees.

The Constitution may not be revised during a state of siege or a state of emergency, nor in time of war."

But what does it matter... "if we revise the Constitution we lose Transylvania and we lose the rights we have as well", say the system's trumpets in chorus. "Look how good the Constitution was... it saved us during the pandemic!" say others... Yes, it was so good that we were shut up in our houses for two years for a cold and were forced to inject ourselves with experimental serums so that we are now dying in droves. But... "the Constitution was good, it saved us!" What saving was done was done by a handful of people for those who wished to be saved, not by the Constitution...

Finally, there is also the category of useful idiots who say "now is not the moment!"... really, but when? After we have elected for five years the President proposed and permitted by the System? Would it not be better to have the system's servant at the "head of state" for 4 years... perhaps we shall have better luck with the next one! For YES, the #ConstitutionOfSovereignty expressly provides for the shortening of the President's mandate as well:

"(1) The mandate of the President of Romania is 4 years and is exercised from the date of taking the oath." — proposed amendment to paragraph 1 of Art. 83.

You see, these are only some of the reasons why the System would never have wanted the #RevisionOfTheConstitution to be discussed — not now, and not a #Revision made by (truly) civil society!

Never mind! We shall discuss it. And we shall do so in detail, article by article, beginning 9 January 2023. Until then I invite you to read the amendments to the Constitution in full at https://t.me/DanMVChiticNecenzurat/1880.

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQH_3DWS9BJ5n6jUCdaaioFv4beGNcCmHIXu2fiSNo713CIxglqCgncUewInIM-BKXrMMpw6VQHMYPj5InD7PoghVHws-dt5aPXZsNFkaOGD2cWBzY3rnee-xK3RPCsvkzUhpQhf1PXuzvZ2M4QFePkwCl5Rr9dE8JopTjRmwGC_wwuyWnjiZTRdsbIbWcViklfBSiCb1JMWnYBkWIaIR4A5i23l&s=518⟩

160. 22 December 2022 — On ROexit and the referendum

On the Constitution of Sovereignty: the full text of the draft — see the page The Constitution of Sovereignty.

On "#ROexit?" and the #ConstitutionOfSovereignty!

You know my view on ROexit; I shall not take up the arguments again here but will only point out that I was the first, back in 2017, to launch this "slogan-concept", and that from then until now I have always placed a question mark beside ROexit. Why? Simple: because only the people can and must decide such a matter.

But in order ever to decide, the people will have to be able to organise a referendum on this theme, for at present, under the rule of this Constitution, that is absolutely impossible. That is where the idea of the necessity of amending the Constitution started from: the people must be able to organise a referendum on this theme when the majority considers it opportune. That is what is written in our draft revision of the Constitution. For these reasons, as I have said, we in the #CoalitionForTheNation have launched the project of a broad revision of the Constitution, a project intended to turn the #ConstitutionOfEuroAtlanticIntegration of 2003 into the #ConstitutionOfSovereignty, into the #ConstitutionOfNationalDignity regained in 2023, without this meaning that we leave the alliances of which we are now part at international level.

Even so, many ardent supporters of ROexit, without so much as reading the draft revision, say that we do not need a revision but simply to leave the EU directly… Only that this is impossible under the present wording of the Constitution: any referendum organised on this theme would be declared unconstitutional by the Constitutional Court for the simple reason that the present Constitution, in Title VI "Euro-Atlantic integration", provides only for the manner in which we integrate, and not for what should be done, and how, if we wish to leave the alliances of which we are part.

That is why we had to change Title VI entirely — from its title to its content.

I set out below the text as it is proposed to be revised and the text of the present constitution:

"Title VI — Romania's participation in international bodies and alliances

Art. 148 — The supremacy of the Constitution and of the sovereign interest of the people in the conduct of international relations

Romania shall fulfil exactly and in good faith the commitments it has undertaken and the obligations incumbent upon it under the Founding Treaties of the international bodies and alliances it has joined, with observance of the Constitution of Romania and in the higher and sovereign interest of the Romanian people.

Art. 149 — Accession, ratification of the revision of founding treaties and Romania's withdrawal from international bodies and alliances

Romania may accede to international bodies and alliances, may ratify the revision of founding treaties or may withdraw from the international bodies and alliances of which it is part, by a law adopted through the sovereign decision of the Romanian people expressed by referendum.

The referendum for accession, for ratification of the amendment of founding treaties or for withdrawal from the Bodies and Alliances of which Romania is part may be initiated by the President of Romania on the proposal of the Government, by at least one quarter of the number of deputies or of senators, or by at least 500,000 citizens with the right to vote. Citizens who manifest and exercise the right provided for in the present article must come from at least half of the counties of the country, and in each of these counties or in the municipality of Bucharest at least 20,000 signatures must be registered in support of this initiative.

The draft law providing for accession, for ratification of the amendment of founding treaties or for withdrawal from the Bodies and Alliances of which Romania is part shall be adopted by the Chamber of Deputies and by the Senate with a majority of at least two thirds of the number of members of each Chamber.

If no agreement is reached through the mediation procedure, the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate, in joint sitting, shall decide by the vote of at least three quarters of the number of deputies and senators.

The law on accession to international bodies and alliances, on ratification of the revision of their founding treaties, or on withdrawal from the bodies and alliances of which Romania is part shall be adopted after its approval by referendum, organised within at most 30 days of the date of adoption of the draft or of the proposal of revision, and shall enter into force on the date of publication in the Official Gazette of Romania, Part I, of the decision of the Constitutional Court confirming the results of the referendum.

The rejection by referendum of the ratification of the revised founding Treaties of the organisations and alliances to which Romania is a party shall have as its effect Romania's withdrawal from those international Organisations or Alliances."

The text of the present Constitution, of the 2003 #ConstitutionOfEuroAtlanticIntegration:

Romania's accession to the founding treaties of the European Union, with a view to transferring certain powers to the community institutions and to exercising in common with the other member states the competences provided for in those treaties, shall be effected by a law adopted in the joint sitting of the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate, with a majority of two thirds of the number of deputies and senators.

As a result of accession, the provisions of the founding treaties of the European Union, as well as the other binding community regulations, shall take precedence over contrary provisions of domestic law, with observance of the provisions of the act of accession.

The provisions of paragraphs (1) and (2) shall apply, correspondingly, to accession to the acts revising the founding treaties of the European Union.

Parliament, the President of Romania, the Government and the judicial authority shall guarantee the fulfilment of the obligations resulting from the act of accession and from the provisions of paragraph (2).

The Government shall transmit to the two Chambers of Parliament the drafts of binding acts before they are submitted for approval to the institutions of the European Union.

Accession to the North Atlantic Treaty

Romania's accession to the North Atlantic Treaty shall be effected by a law adopted in the joint sitting of the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate, with a majority of two thirds of the number of deputies and senators."

You will find the differences for yourselves. And you will decide whether we must revise the Constitution, whether we need #ANewConstitution.

Let us show them that power really does belong to the people!

Let us, the people, decide how we want our Romania to be: a dignified and sovereign Romania!

Read the amendments to the Constitution in full at https://t.me/DanMVChiticNecenzurat/1880

(On the Constitution of Sovereignty: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQHkPaxrysM3AD0YlEkik8GOJTZO7OMRz22BiLzvLjRnr6KniFaRoWU60afBQ0PuPLdh2utLMRsxYPAFfrQTMOu5r-VJ9ku8oXDm3buMGJteiS46FlZdbosS9HhwFHkcTe4E3VO6WShtJuf-uM8cnmpIGALCORhcNUqzi-aL-37MmLvY6zhRGBjTzjBgPZVVAZmP_JW0XAfKH1r70D3lWGR7CDy6qJ&s=518⟩

---

161. 23 December 2022 — "#ConstituțiaSuveranității needs your involvement!"

The #ConstitutionOfSovereignty needs your involvement!

Direct and assumed involvement is needed in the discussions on the text of the revision, in the future process of gathering signatures and in the financial support of the Vrem Suveranitate Association, which will organise the whole process of debates and, subsequently, of gathering signatures.

This true Revolution will be made by us, by ordinary citizens, who will also write the Constitution that will be the foundation of the Third Republic (the first being the Republic instituted by the communists, the second the Republic instituted by the Constitution of 1991/2003 — the constitution of the system that confiscated the Revolution of '89; the third Republic being able to be the republic of the citizens, founded on the #ConstitutionOfSovereignty), and it cannot be achieved without the involvement of each one of us:

Those who wish to take part in the discussions on the text of the revision are invited to follow the link https://t.me/+W-oH4Yyxi9pjNTE0

Those who wish to be involved in the future process of gathering signatures are invited to follow the link https://t.me/+hOtfFiekDMhkZWFk

Those who wish to support us financially are invited to sponsor us lawfully, before the end of the year, with 20% of their company's profit/income tax.

This sponsorship is made out of the tax for the fourth quarter of 2022.

For the sums to be deductible for your firm, the transfer must be made by 30 December 2022 and a sponsorship contract must have been concluded!

Your accountant will draw up Declaration 177 and submit it, so that you are in order and we are able to support the work to which we have committed ourselves for the country.

The redirection of the tax on micro-enterprise income for the sponsorship of non-profit legal entities may be effected only if the beneficiary of the sponsorship is registered, on the date of payment of the sum in question by the fiscal authority, in the Register of entities/places of worship for which fiscal deductions are granted, pursuant to Art. 25(4^1).

You will have to conclude sponsorship contracts before the end of 2022, since their number and date will be entered in Form 177, "Application for the redirection of profit tax/tax on micro-enterprise income", completed for this year.

We shall make available to you the model sponsorship contract if you wish to be our partner in this work.

Natural persons and authorised natural persons may donate up to 3.5% of their salary tax or income tax.

This may be done by completing Declaration 230 by May 2023, or the single declaration in the case of authorised natural persons.

The accounts of our association are: Asociația "Vrem Suveranitate"

If you wish to contribute money out of your generosity in order to help our work, you may do so into the same accounts above.

Let us show them that power really does belong to the people!

Let us, the people, decide how we want our Romania to be: a dignified and sovereign Romania!

Read the amendments to the Constitution in full at https://t.me/DanMVChiticNecenzurat/1880

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQFE4ge1m_XWq2hWdxHybFP0K06Jkhf9Ao1Da8y-cBt0dERuDukrIoMilLoceugqmIpAIW8BswIJJmgLBsM-dzFs_8A2e3bdLKDyoCjuOu1LU5ziau-U0cp3K1WfRR8ZH0nfGMEY-b80q374nxq2TdmIy_27XmvRC1566TBHmDb2Eoh8_rPP8GCLajlTukPLbCK_ssGBVkCDDKNm2IgibrMe7O4Hhd&s=518⟩

---

162. 29 December 2022 — "The year that begins in a few days will be a turning point, for after 2 years of pandemic ..."

The year that begins in a few days will be a turning point, for after two years of pandemic (isn't it true that you have almost forgotten that only a year ago you were "responsible" and "showing that you cared"?) and a year of war in eastern Europe, 2023 will come to seal the changes that have begun. I shall try to tell it to you briefly, with the note that... I sincerely hope I am wrong about everything I write below.

On the one hand, the West, the "Small Planet", will do everything in its power to win the war in Ukraine. It is a matter of life and death for the west, since a military failure would hasten the loss of hegemony of the USA and its allies over the planet. That is why the conflict will grow sharper in the first part of the year, fed massively by the west with weapons, technology and intelligence. On the other side, beyond the territorial stakes and Putin's game with the west, Russia too cannot afford to lose in Ukraine, since its military force alongside its natural resources are the only arguments conferring on it an important position on the "Big Planet", a position which would immediately be taken over entirely by China in the event of a Russian military failure (this is, moreover, the reason why China does not support Russia militarily). In other words, a defeat in Ukraine would throw Russia out of the great games on both the Small Planet and the Big Planet, and the defeat could be fatal to Russia — as my friend Dan Diaconu rightly remarked in his article today. That is why there are enough arguments to make a major escalation of the conflict around May or June not merely possible but even probable, and to make the use of tactical nuclear weapons probable if Russia does not manage to conquer the four Ukrainian provinces by conventional means.

At the same time, independently of the evolution of the war, the tendency of the states of the Big Planet to organise themselves around the BRICS structure will continue. The International Monetary System as we know it will be shaken (still more) violently, a fact which will accentuate the economic crisis towards which we of the Small Planet are heading at increasing speed. Obviously, a victorious Russia will catalyse this process and hasten the major rupture between the two "Planets".

And speaking of the crisis... the crisis will not come. The crisis is already here; only many still refuse to accept it. On the "Small Planet" the crisis is masked by the hundreds of billions pumped into the west's war effort. But this money, made with a pen and turned into armaments and aid for Ukraine, will accentuate the already galloping inflation and will throw into poverty tens of millions of citizens of the "civilised world", who will see a lifetime's savings melt away within a few years... After the first year, more than 20% of the real value of savings and incomes has already evaporated. Consumption will fall. It will be said that this is a consequence of the population becoming aware of ecological problems... False! It will be nothing but poverty.

Poverty which will also bring instability and revolts on the "Small Planet". Hence the western establishment's fear of losing control over rebellious populations. Hence the tightening of control over the population and the sharpening of censorship. Hence... dictatorship. Yes, in almost the whole of the west in 2023 the screw will be tightened hard and rights and liberties will be drastically restricted.

As for us, here in Romania, we already feel all this. For, from our status as a fourteenth-rate Colony, not only can we not influence the major decisions of the world's betters — which is obvious! — but we shall not even try to act in the national interest, slaloming between the interests and vanities of the great. NO! We shall merely follow exactly the directions traced out by the greater or lesser glow-worms. The only unknown is how zealous the local gauleiters will be in carrying out the orders received. And I believe they will be more servile and more treacherous than ever. That is why the coming year will be a "special" year.

The System will be more and more present and more and more visible — a fact confirmed also by the amendments to the code of criminal procedure made yesterday, in the last government meeting of this year.

It, the System, will prepare Iohannis's replacement. And it will show him to us. Very well, two or even three versions of the same doll will be offered, each version coloured differently, of course. At the same time, the "boys with blue eyes" will annihilate every possible alternative: they will divide it, demonise it or ridicule it, or both at once — anything to hold back a feeling of discontent which will follow a rising trend as financial problems multiply.

The #CoalitionOfBetrayal, although it will remain functional de facto, will break up, probably in the first half of the year. No, they will not quarrel over the national interest; they will have to mime a struggle led by the champions of the coming presidential elections, two of the "dolls" of which I spoke.

Our resources will continue to be "outsourced" out of "solidarity" with the old continent, of course!

We shall be still poorer, still more frightened, still more divided!

So much for the "prophecies". For beyond the rather sombre landscape which I believe the future holds for us, we shall have to do what we know to be right and what we know we must do. Whatever the chances of success, whatever the utterly disproportionate strength of the adversary. The truth must be confessed at any price, the good must be done at any risk!

That is why next year too we shall go on doing what we have to do:

The #CoalitionForTheNation will launch the most interesting programme of... but I shall tell you about that soon.

And, as you already know... the #ConstitutionOfSovereignty will enter public debate from January, debates which will themselves displease the system — I know that! But they will also give rise to many discussions and polemics among people of good faith, discussions which will have the gift of

awakening consciences... perhaps even the national conscience. For yes, I assure you that the discussions concerning the #Constitution2023 will mark the coming year (let that too be part of the "prophecy").

Finally, as the poet says: "De-o fi una, de-o fi alta... Ce e scris și pentru noi, / Bucuroși le-om duce toate, de e pace, de-i război." (Mihai Eminescu, *Scrisoarea III*. In the author's literal rendering: "Be it one thing, be it another... whatever is written for us too, / we shall bear it all gladly, whether it be peace or war.")

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQFUMeNGyPBlPl7IJeF-h2_N9ZON2LMmWpzp0rINdYecPHVvaY0g78EqZVTgsizfpA3e8B1TX94ysfi4vjBv_lkz1qPzb9lKnOfF84q5muAwSv8TWj6K4XnX1SmDotCbPluM-qBo3Ar-rZLD4N48_NgomZNZHQqIFEdWroL1Dw0JHh-b71nrsy3mrixSncHlhihQ4ExH7sn6Glbmqoza0RZSkSNwsc&s=518⟩

---

163. 30 December 2022 — "Two days ago a piece of news of capital importance appeared, which all too few have unders..."

Two days ago a piece of news of capital importance appeared, which too few have ventured to comment upon:

"Government sources revealed to Inpolitics this morning that the primary purpose of the legislative amendments of 17 November is to permit the training of Ukrainian military troops in Romania. A decision which the Ciucă government put off as long as it could, because of the possible consequences. Until it could put it off no longer!"

But what "legislative amendments" are these?

In reality, the permission for Ukrainians to train in Romania comes as a result of amendments made to a ministerial Order of 2014 — YES, A MINISTERIAL ORDER!!! — which provides:

"(1) Applications for obtaining approval for the entry/exit and stationing of armed forces belonging to the member states of NATO, of the European Union and of the Partnership for Peace, or to states with which Romania has concluded agreements in the field, or for their transit of the national territory, with a view to participation in exercises, training and ceremonial activities on the territory of Romania

or for the purpose of participation in operations carried out outside the national territory, (!!!!!!!!)

shall be submitted at least 4 working days before the planned date of entry into Romania of the forces, of the military products and equipment or of the material goods for ensuring support, as the case may be."

Thus, as Bogdan Tiberiu Iacob rightly observed, "among the members of the Partnership for Peace who would have this right is Ukraine which, thanks to the order of 17 November, could theoretically prepare ripostes against Russia or Belarus involving Romanian territory, for preparation or for launching. Just as Russia or Belarus could be attacked from our territory by armed forces from NATO, from EU states which are not NATO members, and from other states with which we have concluded various conventions."

In conclusion... we are preparing to enter a war... without the consent of parliament, but merely through an amendment made to a Ministerial Order...

You see, that is why all the securists writhe when we say that it must be written explicitly into the Constitution that

"(5) In peacetime, foreign troops may enter, be stationed on, carry out operations on or pass through the territory of Romania only with the prior consent of Parliament and under the conditions of the law or of the international treaties to which Romania is a party."

thus amending paragraph 5 of Article 118 of the Constitution.

Very well — the slaves in our services, those who have turned Romania into a fourteenth-rate colony, are also disturbed by the amendment I have proposed to para. 4 of the same article of the Constitution: "(4) The intelligence services and those assimilated to them shall be organised exclusively on a civilian basis, under the conditions of the law. The organisation of military or paramilitary activities outside a state authority is forbidden."

I told you: the debates on the proposed amendments to the Constitution, entitled the #ConstitutionOfSovereignty — debates which will begin in January — will give the System and the system men great headaches...

Because they have no arguments against the amendments we are proposing. Because the amendments are necessary and strictly in our interest, the interest of the citizens, being on a collision course with the interests of the System.

That is why many system "sleepers" will give themselves away... they will pop like popcorn. Much good may it do them!

For more details, read the whole article here: https://inpolitics.ro/update-mapn-modifica-pe-sest-legislatia-rusia-po...

https://inpolitics.ro/mapn-confirma-inpolitics-trupele-ucrainene-vor-f...

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQFhD-auvjfWyjR5vmyFSy8GVsJzydMAtN1E641jtunXyX72sHuFfn5CnAOTayQ0N6KKO-jM7vws1_OxdzFc9yNYlfWVcIke2rCzVlmhE2fLYripYJH-zorR1YBKO8zHjO5fvsgna5pmB7LXx3vOEy-gqZVVvumT_LjSBmp6iqX7LgVEE1WKExMEl3mV3vPEYACkADGLu8DDqeGtPtmZIK5NiQCzpW&s=518⟩

---

164. 4 January 2023 — "The #CoalițiaTrădării PSD-PNL-UDMR-USR is destroying the middle class, the engine of the national economy:..."

The #CoalitionOfBetrayal PSD-PNL-UDMR-USR is destroying the middle stratum, the engine of the national economy: THE GOVERNMENT TRIPLES THE TAXES OF SMALL ENTREPRENEURS IN 2023!

Christmas has passed. And the New Year... I did not want to spoil your holidays with bad news, very bad news, but now, if I did not tell you, I would become an accomplice in the villainy: for the average Romanian taxes are tripling! You do not believe me? Follow the irrefutable demonstration below:

I have taken the case of a Romanian on an average income, generally a professional, who works hard in order to become as good as possible in his field.

Monthly sum invoiced 10,000 lei/month — 120,000 lei/gross income per year

Deductible expenses, for example: 45,000 lei/year

This year, our dear, serious and hard-working Romanian paid the following taxes on his limited company.

Compulsory and non-deductible health contribution = 3,060 lei/year

In 2023, our dear Romanian will contribute to the state budget, keeping the same taxable income of 75,000 lei/year, as follows:

Compulsory and non-deductible health contribution = 7,200 lei/year

Compulsory employee status with taxes of = 15,756 lei/year (this also includes a health contribution of 3,060 lei/year)

Total taxes 2023 on the same firm, with the same income = 30,156 lei

Our hard-working Romanian will contribute to the state budget a sum far greater than this year: three times greater!

They have done the same with authorised natural persons and professionals of every kind. Yes, even I and all my colleagues at the bar come within the scheme of increases... within the general project of impoverishing the middle stratum!

For our "generous" governors have raised the health contribution from 3,060 to 7,200 lei, without even giving us the right to deduct this contribution!

The health expenditure (the one on the limited company paid for dividends, amounting to 7,200 lei, and also the one for authorised natural persons, which is likewise 7,200) is a non-deductible expense, treated in the same way as income tax!

The only deductible health expenditure remains the one from salary, of 3,600 lei — that is all!

They would have done better to say that the tax had been raised from 10% to 20%.

But it seems that health needs money dedicated to it, which nobody may touch!

Now, for us, ordinary taxpayers and subjects of a state governed by the #CoalitionOfBetrayal, all that remains is to ask ourselves some simple and legitimate Questions:

What has the Romanian state done for us to justify raising the health contribution on dividends from 3,060 lei/year to 7,200 lei/year + a further 3,600 lei of health contribution paid by the same Romanian out of the salary he pays himself from his firm?

In total, our hard-working Romanian will pay a sum of 10,800 lei for health alone in 2023!

What extraordinary contributions has the Ministry of Health made, such as to raise our Romanian's contribution from 3,060 lei a year to 10,800 lei a year on the same income?

And there is one more: why has NOBODY, but ABSOLUTELY NOBODY in the "free press" told us anything until now? Where are the fiscal specialists in the press (for I am neither a tax specialist nor a journalist, but a simple citizen!) who should have told us this back when the government was drawing up the budget and the taxes for 2023, who should have sounded the alarm in good time so that this robbery of the middle class should not take place?? Where??? For me it is this, this last question, that hurts most of all!

They have struck precisely at the middle stratum of Romanians: they have pauperised the foundation and, at the same time, the engine of Romania's development. For to this 30% increase in taxes must of course be added the inflation which already exceeded 20% back in 2022. And the bank instalments... some of which have risen by as much as 50%!!!

In other words, in 2023 the "middle" Romanian will have a real net income 50% lower.

In 2023 we shall live twice as badly as in 2022... and 2022 was not exactly good...

Obviously, our draft law, the draft conceived by the #CoalitionForTheNation, the "#SolidarityAct — the Act on the taxation of great fortunes and businesses", was not even considered, neither by the opposition nor, still less, by those in the #CoalitionOfBetrayal... quite simply the rich and the very rich must be protected; social assistance nowadays is granted exclusively to corporations and to rich men... that is what is #PoliticallyCorrect, that is what is #RightWing, so they say... is that not what we all wanted from childhood?

One thing alone is certain: the middle stratum will pay all the bills — the bill for the plandemic, the bill for the war, and the bill for the economic crisis we have just entered... all of them will be paid by us, by the middle stratum!

The same middle stratum which, in its overwhelming majority, does not go out into the street because it has no time, or because it is not "trendy", "chic" or "cool", or which merely considers that things are still going well for them... they will not go well much longer! That is certain!

"never mind, they have lowered the tax on stock-exchange transactions..."

(On the Solidarity Act: the full text of the draft — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQHi_l4vH7hFSUH9p072yCvQ5lEicZY-FvYi_T9y13MU4Qyv5VZNYwlyPaftWEBG7t0CtLAK7MWDbSeHSrTG6nOayK3OpChnGZ4qlyxS0nxV3A5f8KW4e1wFzVIuiRfb82EEWAHwPZ9BAezhzx84aZdrumzMLuwoOvF-s5JcublILRBgDtJagfbmTRtS2s5LZc90P4k7yDIbDGorgJTAvzrb29Q-c&s=518⟩

---

165. 9 January 2023 — "«Paragraph (2) of article 19 is repealed.»"

"Paragraph (2) of Article 19 is repealed."

Today at 06.00 my childhood friend, who had in the meantime also become my client, SMD, took off for the USA. He went there not on holiday nor on a business trip... but extradited. Extradited by Romania to the USA, at the request of the USA (although he had never been in the USA), on the basis of transparent accusations resting on a single statement... yes, the mere statement of a witness-informer arrested there some time ago placed on his shoulders seven counts of indictment whose combined penalties come to 150 years in prison!!! and led to the confiscation of all his money, although the extradition request mentions no damage whatever.

No, it is not a matter of drugs, nor obviously of any killing, but of the sale of certain electronic components which SMD manufactures in China: a simple act of trade in electronics was enough for him to be "provisionally arrested" for 4 months and extradited...

I shall not dwell now on the manner in which the Court of Appeal and the High Court analysed and "judicially examined" the "request" sent by the Great Glow-worm, a request which initially was no more than a page long and which was enough to put him in "provisional arrest" for more than 4 months. There is no point, for you know: purely formally, because the role of an "impartial court" had to be played, when in fact all that had to be confirmed was the custom whereby IN THE LAST 20 YEARS A REQUEST FOR THE EXTRADITION OF A ROMANIAN CITIZEN TO THE USA HAS NEVER BEEN REFUSED!

In fact — ATTENTION!!! — as things stand, ANY ROMANIAN CITIZEN MAY BE EXTRADITED TO THE USA AT ANY TIME, FOR ANYTHING, FOR NOTHING! This is not an exaggeration, it is a state of fact!

I shall say nothing to you about the degrading Extradition Treaty between Romania and the United States of America of 10 September 2009, signed for Romania by Tudor-Alexandru Chiuariu, then

minister of justice, and for the United States of America by Ambassador Nicholas F. Taubman (yes, by the ambassador, not by Chiuariu's counterpart, who had no time for formal nonsense out in the colonies!!!), in which Romania offers to deliver up to the USA at any time and for any reason. On the basis of "reciprocity", of course... a reciprocity under which I have not found in the archives EVEN ONE AMERICAN CITIZEN EXTRADITED BY THE USA TO ROMANIA. NOT ONE!!! Incidentally... do you remember Teo Peter? — God rest him! Well, remember then that his killer did not do a single day in prison... neither here nor there! That is roughly what reciprocity amounts to.

I shall tell you only this further: that such an extradition, even if a fair trial before an impartial judge were to follow there — really?/God help us! — has direct effects on the rights and liberties of the Romanian citizen other than the right to liberty, which is obviously restricted. Beginning with the right to a defence, which you cannot exercise when you know no lawyers and have no resources to pay the fees charged in New York or Washington, and going as far as the right to see your family, who, even if they had the money to reach the USA, have no visas. That is why on Friday SMD saw from the police lock-up of the Transport Police — very probably for the last time — his old and ill father, as well as the old martial-arts teacher he had known since his school days. Need I add that, being extradited, he could not benefit from any house arrest or judicial supervision even if the court were willing to grant it, for the simple reason that... he has no domicile in the USA? What would be the point... it is all too obvious.

And all this has one single cause: para. 2 of Art. 19 of the Constitution revised in 2003, which says: "(2) By derogation from the provisions of paragraph (1), Romanian citizens may be extradited under the international conventions to which Romania is a party, under the conditions of the law and on the basis of reciprocity."

This article was introduced expressly in 2003 in order to make possible the extradition of Romanian citizens, something not permitted by the Constitution of 1991, which provided, in a fundamentally correct manner, simply that

"A Romanian citizen may not be extradited or expelled from Romania."

This is the normal attitude in a sovereign state, which must defend and try each of its citizens through its own courts, under its own laws.

This is the reason why in the #ConstitutionOfSovereignty paragraph 2 of the 2004 #ConstitutionOfEuroAtlanticIntegration will be repealed — the paragraph which permits the extradition of Romanian citizens — a repeal and a return to the constitutional normality that existed before the revision of 2003, which will constitute a guarantee of the defence of the rights and liberties of Romanian citizens by a state which fully assumes the prerogatives of #Independence and #Sovereignty.

We await comments on the version put up for debate and your proposals for amending the Constitution on the Telegram channel https://t.me/+W-oH4Yyxi9pjNTE0.

Read all the amendments (so far) proposed for debate at https://t.me/DanMVChiticNecenzurat/1880.

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQEyR33z4Ztuf3nQ04iyUWrfLLzn-vK9AmT_PiFm13r41Cm9Md87ZTBRVI3u7KPo3_dIMdgqtuS4ewgqm2_w-8qubt52gNNk-FD6lr461IjaXxJ7Dzbfvj06n2sVrnXfTwjluJpK7wHfJEswOp0xhN0OIwsdJ2nhgb-Sw_04Zw1YSrTTqc2Mbb8MAjWgixu-ZB82qer3hFH-6EY6MlAumCwcvAFnI&s=518⟩

166. 17 October 2022 — "«(2) No one may be subjected to torture or to any kind of punishment or inhuman treat...»"

"(2) No one may be subjected to torture or to any kind of inhuman, degrading or EXPERIMENTAL punishment or treatment. Medical treatments are possible only with complete and honestly informed consent."

From 2022 onwards, immediately after the end of the plandemic, the young population of Romania, like that of the whole "civilised world", was struck by a wave of deaths called "sudden", by cerebral vascular accidents as well as thromboses and other grave vascular diseases. Not a day passes without our hearing of some surprising "departure" of persons still in their prime, without our reading news of the young and the very young, apparently in perfect health, who suddenly fall as though scythed down. Many others, like my friend George — who is still in hospital more than 15 months after the stroke he suffered 13 hours after the administration of the "treatment", with minimal chances of recovery — have had their lives destroyed, the state assuming no responsibility whatever and leaving them without any material or medical assistance. (See here https://www.national.ro/coronavirus/insp-a-facut-publice-reactiile-adv...

All this you already know. As you know the (still) probable cause of this scourge: the experimental treatments — you know which ones! Please do not forget that for one of the most widely administered treatments to which the population of Romania and of the world was subjected in the last year of the pandemic, in order to confirm its "efficacy and safety", the "Final clinical study report for study C4591001, randomised, placebo-controlled, observer-blind" must be submitted in... December 2023!! Although the "treatment" had already been forcibly administered to very many millions of citizens as early as 2021!!!

Such a thing must NEVER happen again! That is why we must do NOW everything in our power to prohibit the compulsory administration of experimental treatments, all the more so as there is already talk in the "media" of new pandemics of who knows what, of anything at all! Even an implicit obligation, such as the one resulting from a prohibition on entering public places or on practising certain professions, is too much! Too much to be forced to accept "experimental treatments"!

That is why EXPERIMENTAL TREATMENTS have been introduced alongside torture and inhuman or degrading treatment among those to which NO ONE MUST BE SUBJECTED, save where the person expresses consent following complete and honest information from the producer.

On the other hand, given the fundamental importance of this rule, in the light of the experience of recent years, it will have to be (or ought to have been) laid down at Constitutional level, precisely so that it cannot be amended according to circumstances by toxic majorities such as that of the #CoalitionOfBetrayal PSD-PNL-UDMR-USR!

For this reason, in the #ConstitutionOfSovereignty, in Article 22(2), the term "EXPERIMENTAL" has been introduced, supplementing the phrase "inhuman or degrading treatment", already forbidden by the present Constitution as well.

If this fundamental matter had been regulated by the present Constitution, the nightmare and the disaster we have been living through in recent years would not have been possible. Many, very many lives and destinies would have been saved. By a single word which must be added to the Constitution!

That is why we need the #Constitution2023: the ill-fated history of recent years must not be repeated! NEVER!

That is why we must have the courage to discuss and to propose the amendments that are absolutely necessary from the perspective of the experience of recent years. NOW!

We await comments on the version put up for debate and your proposals for amending the Constitution on the Telegram channel https://t.me/+W-oH4Yyxi9pjNTE0.

Read all the amendments (so far) proposed for debate at https://t.me/DanMVChiticNecenzurat/1880.

post archive ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQHltYyMb7sryanUmgFWhR6OGUj1CqkL8VtxG7TfLN6Ff1F9Fp42NCLuS4lS1yzq7RkIqyQ9tlmmSYUfwJ8kW-l-zwGX-CaF-iE5c3R8qLZdgCgLMDRmKn2PTJnuahFfwu90gwiBWl9Bupvg8OieMrsDWvTBeEC7eBFmMqwmyRA31KwM1SoksYN_GD9D–ZKyuJc7uCPW7uBY9XnjZRDxw7vppFs&s=518⟩

---

167. 11 January 2023 — On political quarantine

On the Demilitarisation Act: the full text of the bill — see the page The Demilitarisation Act.

"The judges of the Constitutional Court, the people's advocates, national OR EUROPEAN magistrates, the ACTIVE MEMBERS of the army, of the INTELLIGENCE SERVICES, the police officers and other categories of public servants established by organic law may not belong to political parties. These professional categories may not belong to political parties and may not hold appointed or elected public office for a period of 5 years from the cessation of the exercise of those functions."

That is to say, #LustrationOfTheSecuritate, #LustrationOfTheSystemMen, laid down at constitutional level!!!

This third proposal for revising the Constitution is, beyond question, the neuralgic point of our whole undertaking so far as the System is concerned, so far as concerns the caste of Securitate men who dominate Romania; for the present wording of paragraph 3 of article 40 of the Constitution is, without any doubt, the foundation of the discretionary power of the secret services in Romania, the root of the Securitate metastasis that has seized not merely the machinery of the state but the whole of Romanian society.

The explanation is simple. In the present wording of the constitutional text ("The judges of the Constitutional Court, the people's advocates, the magistrates, the active members of the army, the police officers and other categories of public servants established by organic law may not belong to political parties."), "by chance" the "active members of the secret services" — that is, the Securitate men — are not listed among those who may not belong to political parties. If you are a soldier, a police officer, a magistrate, a people's advocate or a judge of the Constitutional Court, you may not belong to a political party. If, on the other hand, under the present Constitution, you are a Securitate man, if you draw your pay from the intelligence services, you may! And this despite the fact that the "intelligence services" are mentioned in the Constitution, at article 65(2)(h), so that the prohibition could have been laid down in their case too. In truth I am wholly convinced that the "fathers of the Constitution" (two of whom, Professor Antonie Iorgovan and Professor Ioan Muraru, I had the honour of having as my teachers) thought of including them as well among those forbidden party membership, and wished to do so; and I am just as convinced that immense pressure was brought to bear upon them so that this should not happen. Sadly they are no longer among us to tell us why it was precisely the Securitate men whom they left out of the list of those who may not belong to political parties.

What is certain is that the present wording of article 40(3) of the Constitution has allowed an oligopoly of power to be set up in Romania — that of the intelligence services, known in short as "the System" — and a true caste of Securitate men to be constituted. No, this is no exaggeration: we may speak of a "caste" of Securitate men, for it is relatively closed and perpetuates itself by heredity,

having become in the meantime all but identical with the stratum of the rich and the very rich of Romania.

It is late to repair what has been done: the caste of the Securitate has already seized Romania — big capital (in so far as it is Romanian), the political leadership (observe merely how many have kissed the ring of the System by passing through the "academies" of the Securitate), the press, "civil" society: everything is controlled by the System, by those of the Securitate Caste. Everything, absolutely everything, from the stripping of Romania's assets, the destruction of its industry, the implementation of neocolonialism and of political correctness in the country, the abuses in the justice system, the setting up of censorship and of the thought police, to the terror and the plunder of the plandemic and our entanglement in the conflict in the east — ALL of them, every one, are the result of decisions taken by those of the Securitate Caste. That is beyond dispute.

That is why it is very hard, well-nigh impossible, to repair anything of what has already been done. Yet I still wish to believe that it is not too late to halt the perpetuation of an aberrant state of affairs, to treat the cause of all the ills, the root of the evil which, if it is not extirpated, will do nothing but deepen this state of affairs, will spread the metastasis and the stagnation of Romanian society until its extinction — of that I am convinced.

And the only remedy is #LustrationOfTheSecuritate from political life: their removal, or the disclosure of their names. And that cannot be done otherwise than at constitutional level, for the introduction of such a provision into a sub-constitutional law would be struck down at once and rejected as unconstitutional by the Constitutional Court and by the System's men who have been sent into that institution as well. I say it again: this measure, vital for Romania, can be taken only by revising the Constitution. Without any exaggeration: #LustrationOfTheSecuritate is the only and the last chance of survival for this nation.

Returning to the revised text proposed, I stress that, for the sake of "equal treatment", the same prohibition on belonging to political parties must also "benefit" European magistrates — whether they be judges or prosecutors.

In order to give effect to the constitutional norm as proposed for revision, I have proposed introducing a new sentence within the same article (all the amendments have been drafted in such a way that the revision does not entail renumbering the articles of the Constitution): "These professional categories may not belong to political parties and may not hold appointed or elected public office for a period of 5 years from the cessation of the exercise of those functions."

This provision is inspired by the way the institutions of the United States work — our guiding beacon in matters of democracy, is it not? — where no member of the army or of the intelligence services may enter politics or be appointed to public office for 5 years from the cessation of his function. So it was with George Bush senior, with Colin Powell, with all those we know of and all those we do not. Now... if this is good and right in the United States, why should it not be so in Romania?! Consider, for example: had we had this constitutional rule, we should not have had... Ciucă, who from head of the army (Chief of the General Staff) became, immediately upon leaving that post, president of the National Liberal Party and thereafter Prime Minister of Romania, turning this country into a quasi-militarised state.

Not least, such a provision would prevent the Ciucă situation from repeating itself in the case of other "lads from the system", members of the Securitate caste, who might "resign" from an intelligence service in order to enter a party at once, or to be appointed to high official office. Moreover, I must say it plainly and in so many words: the wording we propose for the revision would close for

good every road towards political life or towards the Cotroceni Palace for the "Goddess of Justice", a.k.a. L.C.K.

Of course, this prohibition too cannot be laid down OTHERWISE than at constitutional level, any other form of regulating the five-year ban being, as things now stand, unconstitutional.

I am aware that this article undermines — not to say dynamites! — any chance that our proposal for #RevisingTheConstitution should ever become reality. I know only that "What is impossible with men is possible with God" (Luke 18:27). If ever we are to be rid of the Securitate metastasis, we shall be rid of it… only with divine help. That I know.

For all that, whatever may come to pass, the discussion itself about the source of the evil will make us conscious of it and will give us weapons with which to fight it. Not least, the debate on the revision, the subject #Constitution2023, will unmask a great many Securitate "sleepers" deeply embedded in the Romanian press and in Romanian civil society: they will be the ones who shout loudest against any discussion of revision and who will, of course, accuse me of being "a man of the services" myself.

Beyond any risk (when you open subjects of this kind you may expect anything at any moment. Ask yourselves only why, until the Sovereignty Act and the present revision bill, nothing was said about the need for the lustration of the Securitate and for the demilitarisation of the services. Why, indeed?), beyond the spectre of the whole undertaking being useless, I sincerely believe that the mere debating of the themes of the revision bill will bring a great gain to Romanian society.

That is why we must have the courage to discuss and to propose the amendments that are absolutely necessary in the light of the experience of recent years. NOW.

For #TheConstitutionOfSovereignty is a necessity.

We await your comments on the version put up for debate and your own proposals for amending the Constitution on the Telegram channel https://t.me/+W-oH4Yyxi9pjNTE0.

Read all the amendments (thus far) proposed for debate at https://t.me/DanMVChiticNecenzurat/1880.

(On the Demilitarisation Act: the full text of the bill — see page 000.)

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQGCz3KvoWtJibAnxgnq63xBbTmteNw-lAa52AS19ekaogRFYbwe1Z61i41iPe4ZW4tew6uCmgYjWYL2IfJFxFuPSMIp-wSe-BIN_vm2wTIuR4RmU-5VYtrer0XzwvjJsOSQby-CP2EiOymBoQP4LZKlzTeG1vClPAKmoDnHpirLqdJzvaRYxHFXgkGK05f9opggn1AMaVL3v7bzgTTcTItC380M&s=518⟩

---

168. 13 January 2023 — "The Chambers of Parliament, in joint sitting, «l) Appoint the Prosecutor General of the Prosecutor's Offi…»"

The Chambers of Parliament, sitting jointly, "l) Appoint the Prosecutor General of the Prosecutor's Office attached to the High Court of Cassation and Justice and the Chief Prosecutors of the National Anticorruption Directorate and of the Directorate for Investigating Organised Crime and Terrorism."

The appointment by Parliament of the Prosecutor General and of the chief prosecutors of the National Anticorruption Directorate and of the Directorate for Investigating Organised Crime and Terrorism would be a first effective measure for putting an end to the abuses of the Public Ministry, and at the same time for enhancing the standing and the role of Parliament within the institutional architecture of the Romanian state, and for strengthening constitutional democracy and the balance of powers in the state.

Thus, by placing the power to appoint the Prosecutor General and the chief prosecutors of the two directorates within the competence of Parliament, #TheConstitutionOfSovereignty would have the effect of sharing out the appointment of the leadership of the Public Ministry among ALL THE POWERS OF THE STATE — namely the EXECUTIVE (through the minister of justice, who makes the proposal), the JUDICIAL POWER (through the Superior Council of Magistracy, whose opinion is required) and the LEGISLATIVE POWER (through the appointment itself, by the vote cast in the joint sitting of the two Chambers of Parliament) — a state of affairs apt to give effect to the principle of "checks and balances" laid down by the Constitution in article 1(4).

At the same time, removing the President of Romania (a part of the executive power, according to the way the Constitution has been construed and applied in recent years) from the procedure for appointing the Prosecutor General would be an effective means of diminishing the power and the pressure of the executive upon the judicial power and, at one and the same time, of curtailing the powers and the principal attributions of the President, which would be transferred to the legislative power, to Parliament, "the supreme representative body of the Romanian people and the sole legislative authority of the country" (article 61 of the Constitution), the body through which the people exercises its sovereignty (article 2 of the Constitution).

This is only one of the changes brought by #Constitution2023 which will bring about a profound institutional reform of the Romanian state, enlarging democracy and guaranteeing the sovereignty of the Romanian people — the fundamental elements of what I have called #TheThirdRepublic.

We await your comments on the version put up for debate and your own proposals for amending the Constitution on the Telegram channel https://t.me/+W-oH4Yyxi9pjNTE0.

Read all the amendments (thus far) proposed for debate at https://t.me/DanMVChiticNecenzurat/1880.

Post scriptum: probably only with such a Prosecutor General would the complaint lodged by the Coalition for the Nation concerning the genocide to which our "leaders" have subjected the Romanian people be investigated seriously and impartially.

It is fortunate that the offence of genocide is not subject to any limitation period.

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQGKAgBTfMI3K2KVtzHibhCr0YAIyUE3apxqXGG8UrL6bTMW-AcCvL2oOVELTVnSHQqndDaC0v69JXFNqE-HunCemwV8erBlbOsC5eNHDSwjsoEtKrCHLqajq3FoT-uXsbuMRwM_E4–K9CmeMIJfItTUCNBKvdyNBiXeJtRGxCjQfmzYQ2PTdCpyUSOnZBLKJvfJXwwDjHRdI3c2C64j-YGEEM8&s=518⟩

---

169. 14 January 2023 — On the President of the System

On the Constitution of Sovereignty: the full text of the bill — see the page The Constitution of Sovereignty.

On the President of the System, alias "the Head of State"… and the need for change.

"A fish rots from the head," says a wise Romanian proverb. #TheTimeHasCome to stop "cleaning it from the tail" and to face the problem head-on, acknowledging what the constant source of these unending troubles is and where it springs from. The answer is simple: from Cotroceni.

Invariably the President of Romania, become abusively "the Head of State", whatever his name may have been, has been the source of the evil, the patron of the plunder, the father of the abuse and of the turning of Romania into a colony. Three names — Ion Iliescu, Traian Băsescu and Klaus Werner Iohannis, each with terms of office that will have amounted to ten years — have marked the history of these years beyond repair, Romania having been remade in their image and likeness. There is no need for me to go into detail. You feel it in your own skin every day: by 2024 we shall have lived

through 30 black years under three Presidents installed by the System, to which must be added four years under a President defeated by the System — Emil Constantinescu.

Because they were able to. Because #TheConstitutionOfEuroAtlanticIntegration allowed them to — the greatest common denominator of the three terms, Iliescu's, Băsescu's and Iohannis's. Because Romania's semi-presidential regime is manifestly a failure for the people and a success for the System: that is #TheSecondRepublic, founded by Iliescu.

Because "the Presidency" is the quintessence and the symbol of the System's power in Romania; it is the institution through which Romania was brought to its knees and turned into a colony controlled by and through the caste of the local Securitate men.

Only a blind man or a fool could fail to see it. If each of the three "forced and abused" the Constitution and went beyond his constitutional powers… it is for the simple reason that the present Constitution allowed them to. Because, being made by men, it is imperfect… or else it was perfect precisely in order to bring us here, where we are: slaves of the system in a country turned into a second-rate colony on the margin of an empire.

That is WHY there is an imperative need to change the law that permitted and made possible the disaster — the present Constitution; that is why #RevisingTheConstitution is urgently needed.

Shortening the term of office and curtailing the constitutional prerogatives of the President of Romania are the only way out of the institutional impasse in which we have found ourselves for 33 years — and this can be done only through the changes brought by #TheConstitutionOfSovereignty:

The first measure to be taken is to shorten the President's term from 5 years to 4, as it was originally laid down in the Constitution of 1991:

"(1) The term of office of the President of Romania is 4 years and is exercised from the date of the taking of the oath." (Article 83(1) as it is to be amended.)

It is a historical fact (and the only constitutional "justification") that the President's term was extended from 4 years to 5 for the benefit of Mr Adrian Năstase. Just as it is an undeniable fact that the beneficiaries of that change were Mr Băsescu and Mr Iohannis. The result? Lengthening the President's term beyond that of Parliament turned him into "the Head of State" and gave stability and discretionary power to the System of which he became the chief exponent.

This state of affairs can be changed simply: shorten the President's term, returning to a term of 4 years.

And it must be done now, in 2023, in order to fix at 4 years the term of the President whom "the Romanians will elect" in 2024 — whoever he may be. The next opportunity to shorten the President's term will be in… 2044, twenty years hence, when the parliamentary elections will once again fall together with the presidential ones. Until then it will not be possible, for no one will agree to shorten his own term: neither the President nor the members of Parliament. It is that simple.

The second measure by which the President can and must be "disconnected" from the System is to limit his power to appoint generals within it.

"b) confers the ranks of marshal, general and admiral only with the binding opinion of the specialised committees of Parliament." (Article 94(b) as it is to be amended.)

Under the wording proposed in our bill for revising the Constitution, the ranks of marshal, general and admiral will be conferred by the President ONLY with the binding opinion of the specialised

committees of Parliament, as is done in the "Great Firefly", in the United States (well, if they are held up to us as a perpetual example, let us take from them the good things too, shall we not?).

In this way the System, through the President's hand, will no longer be able to advance every one of its lackeys to the rank of general with umpteen stars. Do you want examples? There are many, very many, for we have more generals than corporals in Romania... perhaps one example would be Florian Coldea, the former Deputy Director of the Romanian Intelligence Service, who rose from major to general within a few years... or, why not, another good example is the General–Prime Minister Nicolae Ciucă, who bears four stars on his shoulder — FOUR!

"(3) Three judges are appointed by the Economic and Social Council on the proposal of civil society, of the trade unions and of the employers' associations, three by the Chamber of Deputies and three by the Senate." (Article 142(3) as it is to be amended.)

An equally important prerogative of the President that must be curtailed at once is that of appointing judges to the Constitutional Court — the means by which "the Head of State" secures and strengthens his power (and prolongs it even after he has left office) through the men appointed to the Constitutional Court for terms of... 9 years! There is, moreover, NO JUSTIFICATION whatever for ONE SINGLE MAN, whoever he may be, appointing THREE JUDGES of the Constitutional Court. This prerogative must pass from the Man of the System to civil society, which must propose directly to the Economic and Social Council which citizens are to determine, alongside those appointed by Parliament, the manner in which the laws are applied and construed in accordance with the Constitution.

Cutting away the prerogative of appointing judges of the Constitutional Court, together with the removal of the right to appoint the Prosecutor General and the Chief Prosecutors of the Directorate for Investigating Organised Crime and Terrorism and of the National Anticorruption Directorate, of which I spoke yesterday — see here: https://m.facebook.com/story.php?story_fbid=10220056984448663&id=1645845977 — is the guarantee that justice will be depoliticised by being taken out from under the control of "the Head of State", the Man of the System. But of the measures for defending and enlarging the independence of the judiciary we shall speak on other occasions too.

What is certain is that shortening the President's term (from 5 years to 4) and his power (taking from "the Head of State" the powers to appoint at his discretion generals and judges of the Constitutional Court, and likewise the Prosecutor General and the Chief Prosecutors of the two directorates), coupled with an enlargement of the powers of Parliament and of civil society, constitute the basic elements of the institutional architecture of what I have called #TheThirdRepublic.

Thus the Republic in which we live (whether we like it or not, whether we are monarchists or not) will be transformed from a "semi-presidential" Republic into a "semi-parliamentary" one, in which the fundamental role in the state will be taken up by Parliament (which will become the sole and true "Head of State") and in which the people will continue to elect its President directly — a President to whom will remain the essential role (and the original one, according to the true intention of the "fathers of the Constitution" of 1991) of MEDIATOR BETWEEN THE POWERS OF THE STATE, BETWEEN THE STATE AND SOCIETY, AND GUARDIAN OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL ORDER.

The foregoing are some of the essential changes brought by #Constitution2023 which will bring about a profound institutional reform of the Romanian state, enlarging democracy and guaranteeing the sovereignty of the Romanian people — the fundamental elements of what I have called #TheThirdRepublic.

We await your comments on the version put up for debate and your own proposals for amending the Constitution on the Telegram channel https://t.me/+W-oH4Yyxi9pjNTE0.

Read all the amendments (thus far) proposed for debate at https://t.me/DanMVChiticNecenzurat/1880.

(On the Constitution of Sovereignty: the full text of the bill — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQFmAVCAb1nmt2vPjXBqfwbgobhV7sWH2Cq4bw-tpzNzyc_jNmEyb-XA0LN44QqXzcox-woCH8-7jW9zoREzOMn9o3iNZaRTxRXShLoczKiHPgy1PbGj9ckiHTPVyx662tVHcra4pUM29P1rSqjV5D1X9mvyx__o_uk-GBUzeqz1IEZaeVBk7xKKKL9KmcEBLM-quqgvtU82QPj1X5g21kJ18DPQY&s=518⟩

---

170. 16 January 2023 — On the referendum and the elections

On the Constitution of Sovereignty: the full text of the bill — see the page The Constitution of Sovereignty.

"(2) No referendum of any kind may be held at the same time as elections, of whatever nature these may be."

Under the present Constitution the referendum is one of the ways in which sovereignty is exercised (article 2 of the Constitution) and may be held in three situations expressly and exhaustively laid down by the Constitution:

1. The referendum for the removal of the President following his suspension by Parliament (article 95 of the Constitution);

2. The referendum forming part of the procedure for revising the Constitution (article 151 of the Constitution); and

3. The consultative referendum whereby the President, "after consulting Parliament, may ask the people to express, by referendum, their will on matters of national interest" (article 90 of the Constitution).

(So no, a referendum for the removal of the President cannot be held on the strength of a collection of signatures, however many there may be.)

None of the provisions of the Constitution has been so plainly mocked and turned into a political weapon as this last article (one instance being the latest "deformation" of constitutional reality with the signatures for the removal of Mr Iohannis).

Two Presidents of the System have abused it: Traian Băsescu Petrov and Klaus Werner Iohannis, both of them beneficiaries of those two five-year terms…

The first "consultative referendum" was held in 2009 by Petrov on the subject of "a unicameral Parliament with no more than 300 members", and

the second, held in 2019 by Mr Iohannis, put the question: "Do you agree with prohibiting the Government from adopting emergency ordinances in the field of offences, penalties and judicial organisation, and with extending the right to challenge ordinances directly before the Constitutional Court?"

1. Both referendums took place at the same time as elections: the first, on the unicameral Parliament and the reduction in the number of members, was held together with the presidential elections, which brought Petrov a further five-year term; and the second, the referendum on "justice", secured

for Mr Iohannis's National Liberal Party, and for the European People's Party, the majority of the Romanian seats in the European Parliament.

2. Neither was ever put into practice; neither has come to anything after 14 years and 5 years respectively, the legislation on which the people had been "consulted" never having been adopted.

3. Both were costly deceptions at the expense of Romania's budget, whose sole purpose was to obtain an electoral advantage for those in power at the time, out of those referendums and out of the people's trustfulness.

For which reason, in #TheConstitutionOfSovereignty, we have introduced after paragraph 1 of article 90 of the Constitution (the paragraph governing the consultative referendum) a new paragraph forbidding a referendum to be superimposed upon elections of any kind.

Only thus will the System and those in power no longer be able to take advantage of, and divert to their own ends, a generous constitutional rule which becomes, in the hands of traitors, an instrument of deception… of a continuing kind.

"8. In article 90, after paragraph 1, a paragraph 2 is added, reading as follows:

"(2) No referendum of any kind may be held at the same time as elections, of whatever nature these may be."

This proposed amendment too, alongside those set out in the past few days, is among the essential changes brought by #Constitution2023 which will bring about a profound institutional reform of the Romanian state, enlarging democracy and guaranteeing the sovereignty of the Romanian people — the fundamental elements of what I have called #TheThirdRepublic.

We await your comments on the version put up for debate and your own proposals for amending the Constitution on the Telegram channel https://t.me/+W-oH4Yyxi9pjNTE0.

Read all the amendments (thus far) proposed for debate at https://t.me/DanMVChiticNecenzurat/1880.

(On the Constitution of Sovereignty: the full text of the bill — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQHzrdfHhDVG1VwLwNqhtdMrk88awzOdpjeQpJ2NWhGfDrZNN-H4cACkTeMpd0pbXykrhl557XARgZFvvRg_tA-p34rwpx-mrIKb811iGXCXQHF-sqN5xZjG97n_MC_778n2oQ4pb7qIB1Zcy5oGUDR27Y_CWBFcfhP68iPnxEnVv2DComEs2VJPWNKuMEZ2cVe_8_-0TuK1rSqnU1eVLHhOkzlo&s=518⟩

---

171. 17 January 2023 — "The largest project for the #RevizuireaConstituției initiated by civil society! The largest..."

The largest bill for #RevisingTheConstitution ever brought forward by civil society. The largest public debate on the constitution in Romania's history. The most ambitious project for reforming the state in the past 33 years.

This is how the Constitution of the Third Republic is written:

Following yesterday's post concerning the amendment of article 90 of the present Constitution, Professor Adrian Severin wrote to me:

"I think it would be well to add two further sentences:

No consultative referendum may be initiated on matters for which the Constitution excludes citizens' initiative, or which involve procedures concluded by mandatory referendums."

We thank Professor Adrian Severin, one of the country's foremost professors of law over many decades past, and we inform you that this proposal has been incorporated into #Constitution2023 and will form the third paragraph of article 90, the second added by this initiative.

We await your comments and proposals on the version put up for debate and your own proposals for amending the Constitution on the Telegram channel https://t.me/+W-oH4Yyxi9pjNTE0.

Read all the amendments (thus far) proposed for debate at https://t.me/DanMVChiticNecenzurat/1880.

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQG8opm25jBKq-COJy03Bhe_lNN0a2yMsscs406-I7d2XwDYvGNiugL8H02Ch5kDVlxpuO4p-GDsh-V9ylQdwHFYnF-QUIRZOz5m21LB8TTRPhBJPXAAtv19KKfl3MD3nOD2z0vo7AKVQTTvOxrxcHRIkZga4-49f5YLxkKhxrqePtQA-L16__nyGVgBSHI1cA7bvDjNuAXx_lvC5flAcLsOqPEQ&s=518⟩

---

172. 18 January 2023 — "You have forgotten that between 15 May 2020 and 9 March 2022, until less than a year ago..."

Have you forgotten that between 15 May 2020 and 9 March 2022 — less than a year ago (!!!) — you were under a "state of alert", in truth under a state of dictatorship, a state of slavery: shut up in your houses, made conditional, controlled, muzzled and terrorised? Have you forgotten that you had no right to leave your houses or to walk the streets at night, or to enter a shop unvaccinated? Have you forgotten that your rights were pared away month by month through Government Decisions which prolonged your state of slavery... and all of it on the pretext of protection against a virus? You have forgotten.

Just as you have forgotten that the 5G Strategy for Romania was likewise adopted by... Government Decision.

Who could remember all the villainies committed over the past 33 years by way of Government Decisions? They are "beyond counting", like the money and the enemies in a manele song.

You have forgotten... which is normal and healthy for the mind, forgetfulness being a good analgesic for the soul and an effective sedative for suffering and mental disturbance.

But this forgetting of ours, man's forgetting, is medicine for the mind of the individual and, at one and the same time, the curse of nations and the weapon of tyrants and scoundrels.

That is why WE MUST NOT FORGET that it was through Government Decisions that we were terrorised, humiliated, separated and set against one another; that it was through Government Decisions that our liberty was taken from us and our rights confiscated.

Because if we forget... we shall be reminded. By experiencing again, by living through again, other abuses and yet others, graver and graver.

Let us not forget: through Government Decisions, additions were made to the law — indeed, law itself was made.

And all this happened because... they, those who governed us, were scoundrels, yes. But also because they were able to, because they were allowed to. Because this Constitution, #TheConstitutionOfEuroAtlanticIntegration, left them room for villainy, allowed them to legislate by way of administrative acts of a normative character.

That is why, in #TheConstitutionOfSovereignty, the field in which the Government may issue Government Decisions, and the object of those decisions, have been strictly limited.

In order to avoid the situation already experienced during the plandemic, in which regulations were added one after another to the infamous and unconstitutional Law 55/2020, curtailing our rights, a new constitutional limit MUST be placed upon the Government's power (at present discretionary) to issue Government Decisions:

"By government decisions the content of the primary rule which orders the issuing of the decision may neither be amended nor added to."

Regulating at constitutional level the Government's right to issue Government Decisions, together with the strict limitation of legislative delegation (the Government's right to issue ordinances and emergency ordinances), of which we shall speak in the coming days, amounts to establishing effective guarantees for the democratisation and the transparency of the act of governing and, at the same time, a strengthening of Parliament's role as "the supreme representative body of the Romanian people and the sole legislative authority of the country" (article 61 of the Constitution).

Here is the wording of article 108(2) in #Constitution2023:

"(2) Decisions are issued for the organisation of the execution of the laws. By government decisions the content of the primary rule which orders the issuing of the decision may neither be amended nor added to."

I know that discussions about laws and the Constitution may seem to many of you dull and pointless; yet these discussions are about us and about our lives, about rights, liberties and normality as we now understand it and as we wish to live in it... so they do have a point, for they make us understand what is happening to us and why, and what it is we are living through.

That is why, beyond the wooden language imposed by legislative technique, I shall go on discussing and making known the essential themes of Romanian society, at any risk of colliding with the interests of the System or with the vanities of certain confrères or comrades on the barricade.

That is why we ask you to take part as well, and we await your comments and proposals on the version put up for debate and your own proposals for amending the Constitution on the Telegram channel https://t.me/+W-oH4Yyxi9pjNTE0.

Read all the amendments (thus far) proposed for debate at https://t.me/DanMVChiticNecenzurat/1993.

Post scriptum: still on Government Decisions, up to the minute, in the "fashion" of the day, via Cora Muntean:

"DRAFT GOVERNMENT DECISION on the release from the state reserves and the granting by Romania of urgent external humanitarian aid, free of charge, to Ukraine, with a view to ensuring the protection of the population in the context of the conflict in Ukraine."

Hello there, leaders of the coalition: stop doling it out drop by drop, give it all at once, so that we know where we stand. And so that Zelenskyy may mention us in a podcast.

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQEc96wKsdNana-c7lLN-bD-vbyL_CBqcx1ZPVZjnduHUDxS7Mles4pbJ3LBCccgHrT9UgDzFDL3cvICJx1jzXrEeIlM5Lxyo4Ld4PF2F3h1B0Uc7QSkHxtOd7jRSkZtUtY7il_8ZYJ1TTRnm2co-AZuuRTE2HSLrY9LK-p8QBIA9m50xnqodPnVeEjkX1ehj0RCdlNEKZZTrRRJq8pdIui8afmO0&s=518⟩

173. 19 January 2023 — "Yesterday's scandal over the draft Ordinance regulating the identity Card..."

Yesterday's uproar over the draft ordinance regulating the electronic identity card illustrates perfectly everything I told you yesterday about the need to regulate and to limit, at constitutional level, the Government's right to issue Government Decisions, together with the strict limitation of legislative delegation (the Government's right to issue ordinances and emergency ordinances).

It is as though the Lord had ordained that yesterday — at the debate held at the Ministry of the Interior — we should have the typical example of legislation that creates the normative space for abuse, and likewise of a gross intrusion by the executive into the process of law-making.

We saw how the executive was not merely delegated, without justification, to legislate on a matter essential to the working of the Romanian state, but how it also created loopholes for itself, leaving room to intrude in future into the law-making process by way of Government Decisions through which additions will be made to the law at the executive's pleasure, whenever and however the "governor" of the day in the colony of Romania may wish.

The ordinance discussed and disputed yesterday clearly bears upon, and produces effects in, the electoral field as well, for which reason it cannot be regulated by government ordinance, the implicit object of the regulation falling within the sphere of organic laws.

That is why the limitation of the Government's right to issue ordinances "in fields which are not the object of organic laws" (as is already laid down in article 115 of the Constitution) must be reinforced by repeating it, through a deliberate legislative "tautology", in an amendment to article 108(3) of the Constitution, namely:

"(3) Ordinances are issued pursuant to a special enabling law, within the limits and on the conditions laid down therein, and may regulate exclusively in the field reserved to ordinary laws."

But more important than this, it is essential that in the future Constitution the possibility of legislative delegation to the government, and the government's power to issue ordinances, should be strictly limited.

So that what happened yesterday may no longer be possible, and so that Parliament may assume in full the responsibility of legislating.

So that ordinances and emergency ordinances may not be withdrawn indefinitely from Parliament's scrutiny, thereby making of the executive the principal law-giver in Romania.

That is why article 115(3) of the present Constitution must be amended, so as to read as follows in #TheConstitutionOfSovereignty:

"(3) Ordinances shall be submitted for Parliament's approval, in accordance with the legislative procedure, before the expiry of the enabling period. Failure to observe that period entails the cessation of the ordinance's effects. (...)"

Thus, unlike the present wording of paragraph 3 ("(3) If the enabling law so requires, ordinances shall be submitted for Parliament's approval, in accordance with the legislative procedure, before the expiry of the enabling period. Failure to observe that period entails the cessation of the ordinance's effects."), under our proposal all ordinances must be submitted for Parliament's approval BEFORE the expiry of the enabling period, and failure to observe it will entail the cessation of the ordinance's effects.

In other words, even when it delegates law-making to the executive in matters of limited importance, Parliament retains control over that law-making process, the absence of confirmation, the absence of Parliament's approval, having the effect that the ordinance ceases to have effect by operation of law.

Only a blind man or an ill-wisher could fail to see that day after day we have confirmation of the limits and the weaknesses of this Constitution — #TheConstitutionOfEuroAtlanticIntegration — the one that made and still makes possible the abuse of the executive and the legislating of dictatorship and of institutionalised terror; the one that reduced Parliament's role to a purely decorative one; the one that left the application or the confiscation of citizens' rights and of national sovereignty to the will of a few men.

Tomorrow we shall go on to set out briefly the amendments we propose to article 115 of the present Constitution, and we shall discuss the need to limit the power of the executive, of the Government, to issue emergency ordinances.

Until then, we ask you to take part as well in this so necessary debate, and we await your comments and proposals on the version put up for debate and your own proposals for amending the Constitution on the Telegram channel https://t.me/+W-oH4Yyxi9pjNTE0.

Read all the amendments (thus far) proposed for debate at https://t.me/DanMVChiticNecenzurat/1993.

Post scriptum: to illustrate what is said above, see here a fragment from yesterday's debates — https://fb.watch/i8IQNr_V5E/

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQEZxgjSKS0itRSk0vPOC5P5J2CbYu2oBiI7b4ZEhdv6yI_qAxmbG29Uvlu582bHzpDMFoVTeQLOvFAPlgv-T7zHTMpw-lA96NbY9kQnJZUMfJtCYFxobdlZElG67QI-0BozWaw07yrWB8BocOMpWJjJevZOIXGcqkGZtA9GNh1jU4FuPJpuIKGVevduV4VWRqdQ44ipP_YA4N7WaGF0V56POmxo&s=518⟩

---

174. 20 January 2023 — On decarbonisation and the tax on the sun

"The Emergency Ordinance on the DECARBONISATION of the energy system", which provides for the closing down and mothballing of the lignite- and coal-fired generating units. Or the Emergency Ordinance introducing the TAX ON THE SUN.

These emergency ordinances, and many others — far too many for us to call them all to mind now — have a few things in common besides villainy:

1. The absence of any real justification for the legislative delegation (the delegation of the right to legislate, to make laws) by Parliament to the executive;

2. The absence of any urgency about them, almost all of them being capable of adoption — and requiring adoption — only after serious debate, given their far-reaching effects upon society;

3. The impossibility of any prior review of their constitutionality;

4. Their instantaneous entry into force upon publication in the Official Gazette (unlike laws, which come into force three days after publication in the Gazette);

5. Once the emergency ordinances have been adopted, the impossibility for members of Parliament to refer them to the Constitutional Court;

6. The subsequent, formal and utterly belated review of their lawfulness by Parliament — there being at this moment emergency ordinances which have not reached the floor of Parliament even after a great many years;

7. The production of every effect sought by the executive before it is legally and formally possible for the ordinances to be set aside or rejected by Parliament.

This is why the Government resorts hundreds of times a year (186 times in 2022!!!) to the instrument of the emergency ordinance: law-making directly by the executive; law-making without prior review of constitutionality; the undermining of the legislative power, and therefore of the sovereignty of the Romanian people.

In two words: ABUSE and DICTATORSHIP are the reasons for the avalanche of thousands of emergency ordinances we have had over the past 33 years.

The source of the evil: THE PRESENT CONSTITUTION — #TheConstitutionOfEuroAtlanticIntegration, the one that made possible the executive's abuse of law and the undermining of the legislative power in Romania. That is, the ABUSE and the DICTATORSHIP of which I spoke above.

That is why #RevisingTheConstitution is needed.

That is why #TheConstitutionOfSovereignty comes to correct these drafting errors in the present Constitution — we do not know whether they were intended or not — the errors that have brought us to the state in which we find ourselves today.

In #Constitution2023 the present provision, contained in the final sentence of article 115(5) of the Constitution — "If, within no more than 30 days from the date of its submission, the Chamber before which it is brought does not decide upon the ordinance, the ordinance is deemed adopted and is sent to the other Chamber, which also decides under the emergency procedure." —

is to be replaced and supplemented by the following wording:

"The Chamber before which it is brought shall decide upon the ordinance as a matter of urgency, the ordinance being sent to the other Chamber, which also decides under the emergency procedure. (...) Failure to observe the period entails the cessation of the emergency ordinance's effects. If, within no more than 90 days from its adoption by the first Chamber before which it is brought, the deciding Chamber does not pronounce upon the emergency ordinance, the ordinance is deemed rejected."

In this way, where there truly exists an exceptional situation in which the executive must legislate AS A MATTER OF URGENCY, then after the emergency ordinance has been issued BOTH Chambers must likewise decide upon it AS A MATTER OF URGENCY — WITHIN 90 DAYS AT MOST OF ITS ISSUE — the members of Parliament either adopting or rejecting the emergency ordinance issued by the Government.

The consequence of Parliament's passivity will be the IMPLICIT AND AUTOMATIC REJECTION of the emergency ordinance after those 90 days, that passivity and implicit rejection being regarded as a sanction applied by Parliament to the executive.

Likewise, another important change brought by #TheConstitutionOfSovereignty with regard to the regime of emergency ordinances is an amendment to article 146(d) of the Constitution, whereby these normative acts are included among those which may be challenged before the Constitutional Court by members of Parliament, the number of members required to make such a referral falling from 50 deputies or 25 senators to 20 deputies or 10 senators respectively. We shall speak of this at greater length when we examine the amendments proposed to article 146 of the Constitution. Until then, here is our proposed amendment to article 146(1)(d):

"d) rules upon objections of unconstitutionality concerning laws and ordinances, raised before the courts of law or of commercial arbitration; an objection of unconstitutionality may also be raised directly by the People's Advocate or by at least 20 deputies or at least 10 senators;",

the text of the present Constitution providing merely that:

“d) rules upon objections of unconstitutionality concerning laws and ordinances, raised before the courts of law or of commercial arbitration; an objection of unconstitutionality may also be raised directly by the People’s Advocate;”

I know that these discussions, however much I try to simplify and condense them, make neither pleasant nor easy reading.

But their whole purpose is to make us conscious of the roots of the troubles that have brought us to the state we are in, and also to make us know and understand the present Constitution as it is — imperfect, and violated by those in power. I hope that, after the debates to come, we shall all understand why the constant villainy of those who govern us obliges us to amend the Constitution in order to limit their state of power and their inclination to abuse.

That is why we ask you to take part as well in this so necessary debate (DO NOT FORGET — on 25 January 2023 we meet at 6 p.m. at the Coffee House for the Nation, at 1 Petru Cercel Street, Sector 4, Bucharest) and we await your comments and proposals on the version put up for debate and your own proposals for amending the Constitution on the Telegram channel https://t.me/+W-oH4Yyx-i9pjNTE0.

Read all the amendments (thus far) proposed for debate at https://t.me/DanMVChiticNecenzurat/2018.

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQFvNa8_JOHD6ERjmyyYSBsd3AAa3IRH-fi-8aLTSVRnzLA2sBBLe-orX_PRmnnL1PuBmAhUNIgQOJ4MLPIb4Eo84nBvO9eJvgcfwmBnkjDJw3L55uULpjaJOwo1yanUx73RLIN-ZzhQ_Zp47mL3OOkvDUxa3Fylwqfbuto7RzFQLa3V4_bl82LjTws0XpjsXd8ncVoQ3dwXiZAaLb-GzTjJeBudo&s=518⟩

---

175. 21 January 2023 — “Post scriptum: “chance” had it that precisely on that date — 10.12.2022, on that very day, exactly…”

Post scriptum: “chance” would have it that on precisely that date — 10 December 2022, on that very day, immediately before the unexpected “visit” paid in my absence by the mysterious visitors — I had the first discussion ever on the subject of #TheConstitutionOfSovereignty.

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQH91yx7FNwaef-cWMgNvZjmwbntm2Zngd71T5sbx4VngjeojOBs18XRirIuCuMTvhopSY7DuXZJKa1gdB5LnteUE8z9N-ZbNitea2GGOSCM7ggj5VxCk4G91SwD8uzIjUvAQgnJ8ZyU9ypLEd7iH7-KdSjgvyI0SaZiF0lwwGh5PgicOGajsAp8VHFlPQY2Hi3RE7VZYfWrISDNHu4K8lNqKNCk&s=518⟩

---

176. 23 January 2023 — On the false defence of the Constitution

On the Constitution of Sovereignty: the full text of the bill — see the page The Constitution of Sovereignty.

On the Securitate men who cry “Securitate!!!”

I return to it and say it again: invariably, every time we speak with arguments about the need to revise the Constitution, there appears a pack of barkers who put on that same old record — “if we touch the Constitution the Hungarians will take Transylvania from us”, or that “we shall lose our sovereignty, and/or our rights”… or all of these together if we change anything in the Constitution!!!

The “spontaneous” appearance of the barkers and of the other alarmist trumpeters is no accident — obviously! For this is an old Securitate manoeuvre: it is sociologically demonstrated that the obsessive repetition of a lie takes on the appearance of a truth. An example: so it was too with the manipulation about “Dragnea gets off” at the referendum on the family, for it was said at the time that if people voted YES at the referendum on the question of introducing into the Constitution the

provision concerning the "natural family"/"traditional family", then "Dragnea would get off". Dragnea did not get off — but neither is the traditional family regulated and defended in the Constitution... and the lie remained a lie: not just any kind of lie, but a destructive one.

And so it is now... we are attacked with lies both gross and stupid, but lies that hold, that take with "the people". For the System knows well what to do and how to go about it... it is paid handsomely enough, out of our own money.

In reality, everything trumpeted above by the barkers, and other such things besides, can be revised by NO ONE and NEVER — including the matters touching upon unity, independence, national sovereignty, territorial integrity or the rights of citizens.

This is stated expressly in article 152 of the Constitution (a Constitution one ought to read at least once before saying anything whatever about it, and all the more so about the "dangers of revision"):

"The provisions of this Constitution with regard to the national, independent, unitary and indivisible character of the Romanian State, the republican form of government, territorial integrity, independence of the judiciary, political pluralism and official language shall not be subject to revision.

Likewise, no revision shall be made if it results in the suppression of the citizens' fundamental rights and freedoms, or of the safeguards thereof."

It is for this reason — so that those subjects mentioned in article 152 of the Constitution should NEVER be altered — that I have always said we need a revision and NOT a new Constitution, in which EVERYTHING could be reopened. And WE DO NOT WANT THAT.

So it is enough to read the Constitution once to realise that these are fuses lit by the Securitate men to stop us, simple citizens, from doing WHAT WE MUST DO.

So I do not know whether those who peddle the notions about the "dangers of revising the Constitution" are Securitate men... possibly, indeed probably. But I know for certain that, if they are not Securitate men, they are useful idiots peddling "their" slogans, and that they are doing the System's work.

That is why, in order to counter the manoeuvres of the Securitate men and of the useful idiots, we ask you to take part as well in this so necessary debate (DO NOT FORGET — on 25 January 2023, from 6 p.m., we meet at the Coffee House for the Nation, at 1 Petru Cercel Street, Sector 4, Bucharest).

For no, we do not know whether we shall get as far as collecting signatures; we do not know whether we shall be able to collect at least 500,000 signatures or, once they are collected, whether we shall lodge the revision bill in Parliament. All this we shall decide together.

What I do know for certain is that we must identify and discuss the causes that have brought us to the state we are in, that we must have the courage to discuss them and the strength to find remedies... we, simple citizens, together: our own remedies for our own troubles.

That is why we await your comments and proposals on the version put up for debate and your own proposals for amending the Constitution on the Telegram channel https://t.me/+W-oH4Yyxi9pjNTE0.

Read all the amendments (thus far) proposed for debate at https://t.me/DanMVChiticNecenzurat/2018.

POST SCRIPTUM: not a few have reproached me with having said myself, I know not how many months ago, that it is NOT for #TheCoalitionOfBetrayal to carry out the revision. I say so still. For I am convinced that they, the traitors in power, would amend even articles 74 and 150 of the Constitu-

tion — the articles that give the Romanian citizen the possibility of bringing legislative initiatives and, respectively, initiatives for revising the Constitution. Those we shall not touch — God forbid! — for it was on their basis that we wrote both #TheSovereigntyAct and #TheConstitutionOfSovereignty.

But WE, THE PEOPLE, must revise the Constitution.

If we wish to leave anything behind us for those who come after.

(On the Constitution of Sovereignty: the full text of the bill — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQGnFL8VGhO6LJBAwDsBbDxX5zv9dylsTQB3TKT2c2D7hvKIn3P132hEcpfoANvXZ2MAyosHrsH4ouuffVo5VotSYP6n-bmQVwi7Jf_fVkbjMBcY6mv88na4WF2sXIO5kF5zfRX8LUsfvJ1YVStkouaeBw2EoOvEdKb_ngZ3K4heFVcZVB8Zgy071KYCYpKZPvHholD0DG0vLJIwLCPL1Tft1s6A&s=518⟩

---

177. 24 January 2023 — "Many happy returns and every happiness!"

Many and happy returns, in full felicity!

Tomorrow, 25 January 2023, from 6 p.m., there will be held at the Coffee House for the Nation in Bucharest, 1 Petru Cercel Street, Sector 4,

the first public debate on the bill for #RevisingTheConstitution entitled #TheConstitutionOfSovereignty, or #TheConstitutionForTheNation.

Anyone, any Romanian citizen, is welcome and is invited to make proposals, to voice criticism, or simply to attend the first public debate on a bill for revising the Constitution — a bill that comes wholly from the ranks of civil society and that was written outside Parliament and without the influence of the "institutions" and the "services" that have been governing our lives occultly for 33 years.

We should be particularly honoured if there were among us professors of law, specialists in constitutional law, or "mere" practitioners of the law, to take part and enrich this debate.

A warm invitation is likewise addressed to journalists interested in an unprecedented project — assuredly the most far-reaching, the most spontaneous and the most "immanent" project for revising a Constitution in the history of Romania, if not indeed of Europe.

Not least, we hope that our call will be heard by those politicians who, whatever their convictions or the "colour" of their party shirt and flag, still feel something for this country and this people, who still care about the future of this country.

This message is an invitation sincerely made and a plea addressed to all those who believe that the Romanians and Romania deserve another chance.

The discussions will have as their subject, plainly, a general theme — the need for, or the timeliness of, such a revision bill — as well as one or more of the particular themes of revision considered thus far in #Constitution2023, namely:

Amendments whose purpose is to strengthen and to guarantee the rights of the citizen;

Amendments whose purpose is to limit the power of the intelligence services and their influence upon society;

Amendments whose purpose is to enlarge the power of Parliament;

Amendments whose purpose is to diminish the power of the President;

Amendments whose purpose is to strengthen and to guarantee the independence of the judiciary;

Amendments whose purpose is to defend and to increase the national wealth;

Amendments whose purpose is to strengthen democracy, to guarantee national sovereignty and to defend the supremacy of the Constitution and the sovereign interest of the people in the conduct of international relations.

We must have the courage to discuss freely even a matter as delicate as the Constitution;

we are bound to acknowledge that the country has come to this pass not only because of incompetent, treacherous or corrupt politicians, but also because of the fundamental Law that permitted the villainy, that made the betrayal possible; and

we may dare to say that there are things in the Constitution which can and must be put right or bettered.

#AfterThirtyThreeYears since the Second Republic was set up by Ion Iliescu through the adoption of the Constitution of 1991, and since its revision of 2003/2004 and the adoption of what I have called #TheConstitutionOfEuroAtlanticIntegration,

#TheTimeHasCome for us to design together #TheThirdRepublic, which will have to be founded upon a revised Constitution, upon #TheConstitutionOfSovereignty.

We apologise in advance for any clumsiness of organisation or for what may prove too cramped a space for this gathering.

We look forward to seeing you and we ask you to take part as well in this so necessary debate; we await your comments and proposals on the version put up for debate and your own proposals for amending the Constitution on the Telegram channel https://t.me/+W-oH4Yyxi9pjNTE0.

Read all the amendments (thus far) proposed for debate at https://t.me/DanMVChiticNecenzurat/2018.

(On the Constitution of Sovereignty: the full text of the bill — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQG4iOT0hN9RM4gzulvHLpaqX1Kk5jqF51uPmxw120DrReqSCA8jme6UZvkNMDKcGphcUfikNcFwzlkPNACecs9Gj-eCcMooFJAaRWuk74ANLZl-43c5z_-Bw0kznAIf1zNdeUA0ayp5i-UlWwUSfgIZCcrJhu96E4nm5TGfvozy-bdvGSuxRjJ_WgjbMuhcdqOjWkIYDDhfz_W0jI1ob-HHvEk&s=518⟩

---

178. 26 January 2023 — On four anti-securitate measures

On the Demilitarisation Act: the full text of the bill — see the page The Demilitarisation Act.

How to treat the Securitate metastasis effectively with only four measures

Yesterday, 25 January 2023, the first debate on the bill for #RevisingTheConstitution, called #TheConstitutionOfSovereignty or #TheConstitutionForTheNation, was held in Bucharest.

Immediately after a general presentation of the bill, and after some discussion on the need for it and its timeliness, the debate turned of its own accord to the way in which Romania may be saved from the Securitate metastasis that rules the country with a high hand and controls society in every one of its sectors — Romania's major problem for 33 years past.

The conclusion is simple: only a constitutional reform can take the country out from under the empire of the Securitate System, out from under the domination of the Caste of the Securitate men.

By putting into effect, at constitutional level and SIMULTANEOUSLY, FOUR SIMPLE MEASURES:

1. The demilitarisation of the intelligence services, which can be effected by amending article 118(4) of the Constitution and introducing one simple (but effective) sentence: "The intelligence services and those assimilated to them shall be organised exclusively on a civilian basis, under the conditions laid down by law."

2. The appointment of the heads of the intelligence services by Parliament and not by the President — a measure that can and must be laid down at constitutional level by adding a new paragraph to article 119 providing that "The heads of the intelligence services are designated for a period of 4 years in a joint sitting of Parliament."

3. Limiting in time the term of persons appointed to public offices or dignities — something not provided for in the present Constitution, which can be regulated by introducing a new paragraph (paragraph 3) to article 116: "(3) Appointed public offices, or the offices and capacities for which direct designation is made and for which no competitive examination is held, may be held for a term of at most 4 years, renewable once only, unless another duration of the term or another number of terms is provided by this Constitution."; and, the theme already discussed,

4. Forbidding the members of the intelligence services to "belong to political parties and to hold appointed or elected public office during the exercise of their function and for a period of 5 years from the cessation of the exercise of those functions" — as I have proposed that article 40(3) of the Constitution be amended and supplemented.

Of the need to demilitarise the intelligence services I have written repeatedly. In the explanatory memorandum drawn up for #TheSovereigntyAct I pointed out, two years ago already, that "Law 51/1991 on national security is a law prior to Romania's entry into NATO and one that lays down a series of provisions of Soviet origin, such as those providing for the militarisation of the secret services." That is why, if only for the sake of harmonising national legislation with that of our NATO and European Union allies, I said that the total demilitarisation of the intelligence, counter-intelligence, protection and special telecommunications services, and of those assimilated to them, was imperative.

Far more than this: the militarised — and at the same time secret (if not indeed occult!) — structure of Romania's intelligence services places them beyond any control, not only that of civil society but that of the state as well, and at the same time grants them, de facto, total immunity before any jurisdiction.

This "omnipotence", and likewise the impunity of the "military men" in the secret services, have caused the members of these services to constitute themselves into a true ruling caste exercising total, authoritarian and discretionary control over the apparent directors of the Romanian state. Unrestricted access to information about every aspect of the life of every inhabitant of Romania grants them an unlimited power exercised from the political level to the judicial and the economic, so that in the year 2023 there is no sphere of activity in Romania that is not worked like a puppet by the caste of the Securitate men.

By way of an aside: a businessman who, willy-nilly, inevitably ends up at the table of the Securitate men told me the other day that at the economic level a veritable battle is being waged between the Securitate clans. Why? For the simple reason that THEY ARE EVERYWHERE, so that inevitably, when one Securitate man strikes at or fleeces some third company, from that quarter there is invariably heard the howl of another Securitate man... whence the "competition" and the "fight" between the Securitate clans. What is certain is that everything outside the Caste of the Securitate men, everything that does not belong to the System, is irrelevant. Or becomes irrelevant the moment it meets the men of the System.

The demilitarisation of the services is not, however, the only remedy for this trouble; it is not the sole treatment for the Securitate metastasis that has spread through the country. The measure of demilitarisation must be coupled with the "democratisation" of the services by having the heads of the intelligence services appointed by Parliament and NOT by the President.

In fact the President is the "institution" of the Romanian state most easily controlled and worked like a puppet by the System. Whence the enormous stake of the presidential elections, in which, invariably, ONLY A MAN OF THE SYSTEM CAN WIN. Why? Because only the Man of the System must come to be in a position to control, however formally, the System, by appointing the "heads" of the services. This vicious circle can be broken only by granting the right and the "privilege" of appointing the "heads" of the services to Parliament, the institution in which power is (at least in theory) exercised collectively and which "is the supreme representative body of the Romanian people and the sole legislative authority of the country". In this way, not only will the election of the President carry a smaller stake and thereby become less subject to the System's influence, but at the same time Parliament — appointing the "heads" of the services which it also (again in theory) "controls" through its specialised committees, and taking part, through the presidents of the two Chambers, in the Supreme Council of National Defence (as we shall show in the coming days) — will exercise power directly in the Romanian state, Parliament thus becoming the prevailing power in the institutional architecture of the Romanian state.

The third measure designed to lift Romanian society out from under the domination of the Caste of the Securitate men is the limitation in time of the term of persons appointed to public offices or dignities. The Governor of the National Bank — in office for 33 years. The head of the Protection and Guard Service — in office for 19 years. The president of the Competition Council — in office for 14 years. Only three examples of persons occupying key offices in the Romanian state who have made themselves "eternal" in the positions to which they were appointed. Appointed by the System and kept in office by that same System. These "fixed stars" of the "empyrean" of the Romanian establishment are, beyond doubt, the key persons of the System, the persons indispensable to it, who confer stability and continuity upon the discretionary power of the Caste of the Securitate men. That is why one of the remedies for dismantling the Securitate System in Romania is to limit every appointed or designated office to at most two terms of 4 years each. Besides, if a person who is elected (at least in theory), such as the President of the country, may not have more than two terms, why should a person appointed to an office be able to hold that office or dignity for an indefinite period?

The last of the measures mentioned above among the remedies for combating the Caste of the Securitate men — a remedy of which I spoke on 11 January as well — is #LustrationOfTheSecuritate from political life, their removal or the disclosure of their names. I said then that this measure cannot be carried out otherwise than at constitutional level, for the introduction of such a provision into a sub-constitutional law would be struck down at once and rejected as unconstitutional by the Constitutional Court and by the System's men who have been sent into that institution as well.

I find myself obliged to repeat: this measure, vital for Romania, can be taken only by revising the Constitution. Without any exaggeration: #LustrationOfTheSecuritate is the only and the last chance of survival for this nation.

In order to give effect to the constitutional norm as proposed for revision, I have proposed introducing a new sentence within the same article (all the amendments have been drafted in such a way that the revision does not entail renumbering the articles of the Constitution): "These professional categories may not belong to political parties and may not hold appointed or elected public office for a period of 5 years from the cessation of the exercise of those functions."

This provision is inspired by the way the institutions of the United States work — our guiding beacon in matters of democracy, is it not? — where no member of the army or of the intelligence services may enter politics or be appointed to public office for 5 years from the cessation of his function. So it was with George Bush senior, with Colin Powell, with all those we know of and all those we do not. Now… if this is good and right in the United States, why should it not be so in Romania?! Consider, for example: had we had this constitutional rule, we should not have had… Ciucă, who from head of the army (Chief of the General Staff) became, immediately upon leaving that post, president of the National Liberal Party and thereafter Prime Minister of Romania, turning this country into a quasi-militarised state.

Not least, such a provision would prevent the Ciucă situation from repeating itself in the case of other "lads from the system", members of the Securitate caste, who might "resign" from an intelligence service in order to enter a party at once, or to be appointed to high official office.

All the measures mentioned above, taken together, are the only ones capable of lifting the country out from under the rule and the control of the Services and out from under the domination of the foreign powers that control those Services; and thus they are the measures apt to make #Sovereignty a reality and not merely a constitutional statement. For we must be aware that nothing in Romania happens without the will and outside the strict control of the System: neither the post-"revolutionary" plunder, nor the alienation of our resources, nor the indebting of the country, nor the felling of the forests or the depositing of the gold in foreign banks, nor the measures taken during the pandemic, nor the forced vaccination… nothing, absolutely nothing was done without their will, without their helping and "commissioning" our "Betters and Masters" abroad…

If we understand where the evil comes from, we shall also know what "treatment" to apply.

That is why we ask you to take part as well in this so necessary debate (DO NOT FORGET — on 8 February 2023 we meet at the Coffee House for the Nation, at 1 Petru Cercel Street, Sector 4, Bucharest) and we await your comments and proposals on the version put up for debate and your own proposals for amending the Constitution on the Telegram channel https://t.me/+W-oH4Yyx-i9pjNTE0.

Read all the amendments (thus far) proposed for debate at https://t.me/DanMVChiticNecenzurat/2018.

(On the Demilitarisation Act: the full text of the bill — see page 000.)

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQHQmaVpS9kK5on-U28Fk8Yt-tinimatrOqPn4lI6PfPCiKId3cz5Us0qgLcd3GBE-Qkef_YEV7VxeyQ6oKLd8I0Y19SUakFDvgk3nkA8VmmfA-hxNa8WafkafKHzSwMjS-Jw52ntVeDyi2zaRVY5lc2ubSLUL1k8QcGekfE9rfuivsT5upF-BoKksoKKyv_uB8wTBbzwfBglebOjiccQIFkwplA8&s=518⟩

---

179. 27 January 2023 — On the foreign troops

The invasion continues: France and Germany have decided to send more soldiers to Romania

"The soldiers are coming. The United States is keeping its troops on our country's territory, and thousands of French and German soldiers will train alongside our own troops this year. (…)

The Franco-German military exercises are to take place at brigade level. (…) The decision was taken at the Élysée, where the French and German governments marked 60 years since the reconciliation of the two great powers."

So ran a news item three days ago. We learned from the press that "THE SOLDIERS ARE COMING", that "thousands of French and German soldiers" will enter Romania "for training".

And we learn further that "the decision was taken at the Élysée, where the French and German governments marked 60 years since the reconciliation of the two great powers." Just as the decision to prolong the "stay" of the 9,000 American soldiers, over whom a two-star general has been placed in command (fewer stars, it is true, than the General in Long Johns or those who hold forth on Antena 3), was taken in Washington without Bucharest being asked.

The trouble is not so much that we learned of it from the press... but that Romania's Parliament and Government learned of it from the press as well.

So how is this? "The decision was taken at the Élysée"?! Not in Bucharest? Why not in Bucharest? Why was the decision to receive soldiers in our own country not taken in the capital of the country receiving the soldiers of other countries, allied though they be?

Usually, the act of sending soldiers into a foreign country, decided upon in a capital other than that of the country receiving the foreign soldiers, is called... an INVASION.

Do you want proof that I am not exaggerating? Try to imagine the converse: Mr Iohannis decides in Bucharest that Romania will send troops to France and to Germany. Or indeed to the United States, why not — are we not allies?

Plainly, such a thing is impossible. And that for the simple reason... well, you know. I have spoken of it before; I have said again and again that our status is that of a colony, of occupied, annexed territory, and by no means that of an "ally" or of "a member with equal rights in a union"... see also the matter of Schengen.

I shall not even speak to you of the extremely — and "still more extremely", if one may put it so — dangerous slope down which the conflict in Ukraine has gone, a fact proved not only by the deliveries of weapons but also by the massing of troops on NATO's eastern border, in the immediate proximity of the conflict... a "coincidence", of course. In short, I shall refrain from further comment on what is obvious, so as not to "needlessly stir up panic", so as not to disturb the "quiet" and the "peace of mind" of some of my readers.

I shall return, however, to a theme that I know irritates many men of the System... I shall return to the CAUSE of the situation in which we find ourselves.

And so I say it again: it is not the lackeys at the top of the state, controlled by the Securitate caste and by their masters abroad — it is not they who are to blame. That is how they are made, that is what they are... no more was to be had of them. Not even the fact that they got there, or that others work them like puppets, is what matters. It is natural that this should happen if it can: the craftiest run the game, and so it has been since the world began.

The trouble is that it was possible to come to this, that there "was room" for the abuses and the betrayals of the past 33 years... and the "space" for villainy, and for cowardice, and for abuse of power, and for betrayal was left — whether deliberately or perhaps not — by... the Constitution. Yes, however much this obvious fact may vex some, it cannot be got round. Nor ignored. For if we do not understand the cause of the trouble, we shall not manage to identify workable remedies either.

As regards the veritable invasion of our allies' troops upon Romanian territory, a single sentence would have sufficed to clothe this situation in a form at least not humiliating for our nation:

"In time of peace, foreign troops may enter, be stationed upon, carry out operations upon or pass through the territory of Romania ONLY WITH THE PRIOR CONSENT OF PARLIAMENT and under the conditions laid down by law or by the international treaties to which Romania is a party."

This wording of article 118(5) of the Constitution would spare the humiliations to which the Romanian state is subjected when it finds itself obliged to accept any number of soldiers of foreign powers, allied though they be, following decisions taken in foreign capitals and communicated to Bucharest through the press.

It is clear that the present wording of article 118(5) of the Constitution, namely

"Foreign troops may enter, be stationed upon, carry out operations upon or pass through the territory of Romania only under the conditions laid down by law or by the international treaties to which Romania is a party.",

permits the Romanian state the status of "observer", of "mere spectator", in matters touching upon the entry into the country of foreign troops which may carry out even "operations" solely on the basis of "the international treaties to which Romania is a party".

Yes, it is painful to acknowledge, but the root of the evil and of this people's humiliation lies in #TheConstitutionOfEuroAtlanticIntegration, the one that makes servility possible, the one that leaves room for — and indeed encourages — Romania's status of vassalage.

That is why, in the bill for #RevisingTheConstitution entitled #TheConstitutionOfSovereignty, we have introduced into article 118(5) of the Constitution the phrase "ONLY WITH THE PRIOR CONSENT OF PARLIAMENT", which will make the access of foreign troops to Romanian territory conditional upon a vote in Parliament — a vote which, even if it be formal and cast in a "politically correct" manner by the members of Parliament to come, will spare us the humiliation to which we are subjected by our "allies", who decide over the "head" of Bucharest which troops come to Romania or leave it.

I know it is hard to break out of clichés, out of our own "mental comforts" and self-induced certainties... but the evidence forces itself upon us: something must be changed. Everything must be changed, beginning with the foundation... that is, with the Constitution.

That is why we ask you to take part as well in this so necessary debate (DO NOT FORGET — on 8 February 2023 we meet at the Coffee House for the Nation, at 1 Petru Cercel Street, Sector 4, Bucharest) and we await your comments and proposals on the version put up for debate and your own proposals for amending the Constitution on the Telegram channel https://t.me/+W-oH4Yyx-i9pjNTE0.

Read all the amendments (thus far) proposed for debate at https://t.me/DanMVChiticNecenzurat/2018.

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQF1-5oOUV9if2ND7P-h7i48ewnjSo2JussmUMPD4S3uQNW0TNpFSadUYZXBrdKS9F2jSHHKoXSMFXJ-Yri4lXJd-WpJlGFN3zedOLpN9uA8IYRb396yZhbqUNHFM65p-hAZAvM8teYJ7-gRWl0S_H10z9BT4kIe-4_YRl4Pbl2DaxqSUqFNBU8dgjvO5vu6BVWdARldIqc_U9Nd4WKGW4E3ImW8Q&s=518⟩

---

180. 28 January 2023 — On one more attempt

On "One More Attempt", an attempt that amounts to a last chance

Yesterday my friend Sorin Roșca Stănescu wrote an article entitled "One More Attempt" about the bill for #RevisingTheConstitution entitled #TheConstitutionOfSovereignty. It is his first article on this subject; it comes two months and seven days after the launching of the project; and it is an article that says nothing about #TheCoalitionForTheNation — the "place" where "a group of jurists came together, some of them good specialists in constitutional law", and from which set out this "generous project", as he himself describes this "attempt to promote a revision of the Fundamental Law".

But two old friends do not fall out over such small details, the more so as one of the friends is avowedly and irremediably "attached" to a political project competing with the one that gave rise to this "One More Attempt". That being so, and his recent sympathies and effusions being known, I appreciate and thank my friend S.R.S. for having made this effort at objectivity.

Beyond these "small details", I must tell you that S.R.S. is both right and wrong at the same time in his brief analysis of this initiative embodied in #TheConstitutionForTheNation.

S.R.S. IS RIGHT when he says that "the failed state to which Klaus Iohannis refers is a community of citizens without a Constitution. The Constitution of Romania is an ostrich-camel. Neither a parliamentary republic nor a presidential republic. A combination. And that is all. Moreover, from many points of view its provisions are outdated. Thirdly, such as it is, it is no longer observed. In ceding attributes of sovereignty we have, willy-nilly, given up a whole series of its provisions. The decisions of the Constitutional Court have come to be invalidated by the courts. In these circumstances, I think that what we call the political class ought to be given one more chance."

So it is, and I shall go on saying it: the Constitution of Romania, de facto repealed by #ThePredoiuLaws, is an "ostrich-camel" not merely because it is a combination of a presidential republic with a parliamentary one, but also because it is a combination of a constitution theoretically protective of the citizen's rights with one that strengthens excessively the power of the executive over the other powers in the state and that has left the "System" a clear road to take possession of Romanian society. In truth, all the ills of the past 33 years were, if not occasioned, then at least "permitted" by the present Constitution.

It — #TheConstitutionOfEuroAtlanticIntegration of 2003 — made possible the monopolisation of political, economic and legal life by the System and created the constitutional framework for Romania's status as a colony. That is why, rationally and objectively speaking, any discussion of this or that political personage and of their deeds is utterly useless and beside the point, so long as their actions and the effects of those actions are caused by the System and made possible by the present Constitution — both of them subjects taboo for the press and for the greater part of civil society alike.

S.R.S. IS NOT RIGHT, however, where he says that "revision is a mistake" and that it "is the repetition of a major political mistake, one that profoundly marked the failed experience of the Social Liberal Union. Romania needs not a revision of the Fundamental Law but a new Constitution. From beginning to end. One that need no longer pass through the filter of the Constitutional Court. One that might also aim at setting the justice system upon new, modern foundations."

In reality, the only guarantee that article 1 of the Constitution will be preserved — the article which provides expressly that

"(1) Romania is a NATIONAL, SOVEREIGN and INDEPENDENT, UNITARY and INDIVISIBLE State.

The form of government of the Romanian State is a Republic.

Romania is a democratic and social state governed by the rule of law, in which human dignity, the citizens' rights and freedoms, the free development of human personality, justice and political pluralism represent supreme values, in the spirit of the democratic traditions of the Romanian people and of the ideals of the Revolution of December 1989, and are guaranteed.

The State is organised according to the principle of the separation and balance of powers — legislative, executive and judicial — within the framework of constitutional democracy.

In Romania the observance of the Constitution, of its supremacy and of the laws is mandatory." —

These PROVISIONS CANNOT BE AMENDED OR CHANGED BY REVISION, for article 152, bearing the marginal title "THE LIMITS OF REVISION", provides expressly as follows:

"(1) The provisions of this Constitution with regard to the national, independent, unitary and indivisible character of the Romanian State, the republican form of government, territorial integrity, independence of the judiciary, political pluralism and official language SHALL NOT BE SUBJECT TO REVISION.

Likewise, NO REVISION SHALL BE MADE IF IT RESULTS IN THE SUPPRESSION OF THE CITIZENS' FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS, OR OF THE SAFEGUARDS THEREOF."

Article 152 of the Constitution proves why the fears induced in some, in the Securitate manner, are false — the fear that by a revision the unitary or indivisible character of the Romanian state might be given up (that is, the theme of "losing Transylvania"), or that certain rights and freedoms might be abolished or curtailed; and at the same time it is the chief reason why REVISING THE CONSTITUTION IS THE ONLY REMEDY THAT CARRIES NO RISK FOR THE STATE AND FOR THE ROMANIAN NATION.

A new Constitution written and adopted by #TheCoalitionOfBetrayal — Social Democrats, Liberals, the Hungarian Union and the Save Romania Union — without the limits clearly laid down by article 152 of the present Constitution, would not merely

NOT be "a chance for Romania to regain, by this means, its lost sovereignty", nor a means whereby "under a new Fundamental Law we might protect the riches that remain to us. And first of all our people." — as S.R.S. hopes without foundation —

but might, without any exaggeration, be the end of Romania's statehood and the hastening of the disappearance of the Romanian people.

This hypothesis appears to be borne out by the very fact that S.R.S. says, in so many words, that "the Constituent Assembly (which would have to write a new Constitution — our note) might also propose, and nail down, a new administrative and territorial organisation of the state. Beginning with the euroregions." — a hypothetical possibility that OBLIGES US TO OPPOSE THE WRITING OF A NEW CONSTITUTION, these being the very points which the adversaries of territorial integrity and of national sovereignty are pursuing.

Not least, the fact that this "new Constitution" would have to be written only by "the next Parliament", which would have to "turn itself for a time into a Constituent Assembly", starts from the premise that the amendment of the fundamental law ought to be carried out after 2024 — which would automatically entail the implicit preservation of the five-year term of the President of Romania, for surely no one imagines that the President or any member of Parliament would be willing to lose even an hour of his term, let alone a year.

Besides, to believe that politicians such as Ciucă, Ciolacu & Co. — all of them men promoted and protected by the System — can and will write a Constitution #ForTheNation is childishness... if not indeed a major error.

NO, I most certainly DO NOT AGREE TO A NEW CONSTITUTION WRITTEN BY THE NEXT PARLIAMENT.

I am absolutely convinced: THE CONSTITUTION MUST BE REVISED, NOW AND BY THE PEOPLE.

And I am convinced of this too, that the future will prove me right, whether we succeed or not: NOW is #TheLastChance, and

for all these reasons, even if the #TheConstitutionOfSovereignty project is "without many chances", the fact that it is written outside Parliament and far from any wood inhabited by the System — a fact proved precisely by the circumstance that "the three great parties, the Social Democrats, the Liberals and AUR, are not in agreement about it" and "do not have the paternity of this project" —

means that #Constitution2023 IS THE ONLY CHANCE OF CARRYING OUT A SERIOUS CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM IN ROMANIA, A REFORM THAT ALSO OFFERS THE GUARANTEE THAT THE UNITY OF THE COUNTRY AND ITS TERRITORIAL INTEGRITY WILL BE PRESERVED, AND LIKEWISE THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS.

That is why we ask you to take part as well in this so necessary debate (DO NOT FORGET — on 8 February 2023 we meet at the Coffee House for the Nation, at 1 Petru Cercel Street, Sector 4, Bucharest) and we await your comments and proposals on the version put up for debate and your own proposals for amending the Constitution on the Telegram channel https://t.me/+W-oH4Yyx-i9pjNTE0.

Read all the amendments (thus far) proposed for debate at https://t.me/DanMVChiticNecenzurat/2018.

Post scriptum: the full article written by S.R.S. may be found here: http://www.corectnews.com/politics/nc-o-ncercare

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQFXtaVRjXiZrcrzjjUEgudT5WDBCOV2S2q70YjLbqF8FdCE1kYNU3m3_vimVJsTU5XD9CxG6TVzO4O-ON-sRAYRGGa0P843_gQ_x3rlmHx1rfo6dO2ON4jN2eI5RYzjR8OFDZRaLeZuZoKJDydk7UQtrUUKX-5NKvp_1zqrdOBlQG4iZbB4cV36pEnKOyC3u9SXgoc7_ZICrZN9E8QL44FQdJuw&s=518⟩

---

181. 30 January 2023 — "I learned today that I have been included on another "black list" of "people and vehicles of the propaga..."

I learned today that I have been included on another "blacklist" of "people and vehicles of Russian propaganda in Romania". And this in a book written by an "academic" who just "happens" to have a criminal conviction, one Sorin Bocancea.

Badea confirmed it too, on Antena 3 — what at first had seemed merely another piece of Securitate "gossip".

And this only two days after it was said that I had been selling "sovereigntist certificates" alongside the exponents of the sovereigntist movement in Romania, all of them labelled as members of a supposed group of supporters of the Sovereignty Act…

Of course it is all a "coincidence" — plainly, one well orchestrated by the System.

What is certain is that the fight is growing fiercer. Anything is possible. Any abuse whatever.

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQFDumXtnarBhg7m5bp7TH-JJqRdEJ2p5DsRN2GopPnu0WMPQV6UukQdHqlwTllKQe6rMQ7e5hRhJ8i-H7AZh0VdZymtXFF6x1NsjywpGMHrHmI1tq_ZRNHGozKsrlZFMfpbfDRFybFu8rHmaqWGYo5xLeirmEpHPllltuGiiAvdNQR4r_9FkcxbAjmXvc6y-4-bic8-F8HO1Y8VRUOYjEs-iz1FE&s=518⟩

---

182. 30 January 2023 — "But only when they become victims in the battles between the securitate clans."

But only when they become victims in the battles between the Securitate clans.

Take today's example: Gabriel Țuțu, head of the state company Romarm since the end of 2019 (who could have run Romarm, Romania's principal supplier of defence equipment, if not a Securitate

man?), detained today by the National Anticorruption Directorate together with the former manager of the national football team, Victor Pițurcă.

Mr Țuțu has an "impeccable" curriculum vitae. On Romarm's website he is described thus:

* "An extremely motivated and proactive manager, with solid experience in the field of security systems and information security.

* A high level of integrity and the support given to the team define a leader's conduct with proven results in the position of manager.

* 10 years' experience in the Romanian Intelligence Service and 5 years in commercial security, during which time prolific collaborations were maintained with several governmental, diplomatic and intelligence agencies.

* Excellent management and leadership skills, with proven experience in security and risk management in difficult and high-risk environments.

* Experience in the management of state companies and governmental institutions."

Today Gabriel Țuțu was detained for allegedly having received, through an intermediary, the sum of 50,000 lei in a matter in which the state is said to have been caused a loss of some 8 million lei.

The affair is of the greatest interest, for it represents the tip of the tip of the iceberg made up of the hundreds of millions of euros' worth of business the Securitate men did during the plandemic. And yet… only 50,000 lei?

Clearly, Țuțu is not the stake here. Still less Victor Pițurcă. The target appears to be Lucovid Orbán.

Could it be Ciucă? Virgil Popescu? I do not know. Perhaps.

In fact what we are watching is a battle to the death between certain Securitate clans, fighting over a budget that has shrunk more and more in the wake of the plandemic, of the war in the east and of the imminent economic crisis. The money grows less and less, and they are very many and very greedy. And ferocious when their finances "go into the red".

Last Thursday I told you that "this 'omnipotence', and likewise the impunity of the 'military men' in the secret services, have caused the members of these services to constitute themselves into a true ruling caste exercising total, authoritarian and discretionary control over the apparent directors of the Romanian state. Unrestricted access to information about every aspect of the life of every inhabitant of Romania grants them an unlimited power exercised from the political level to the judicial and the economic, so that in the year 2023 there is no sphere of activity in Romania that is not worked like a puppet by the caste of the Securitate men.

By way of an aside: a businessman who, willy-nilly, inevitably ends up at the table of the Securitate men told me the other day that at the economic level a veritable battle is being waged between the Securitate clans. Why? For the simple reason that THEY ARE EVERYWHERE, so that inevitably, when one Securitate man strikes at or fleeces some third company, from that quarter there is invariably heard the howl of another Securitate man… whence the 'competition' and the 'fight' between the Securitate clans. What is certain is that everything outside the Caste of the Securitate men, everything that does not belong to the System, is irrelevant. Or becomes irrelevant the moment it meets the men of the System."

Everything that happened today confirms once more what I have been telling you for years.

This reality makes me say that Romania cannot be cured of this metastasis of the Caste of the Securitate men, which has spread through the whole of society, otherwise than by dismantling the System — a dismantling that cannot be carried out otherwise than by demilitarising the intelligence services and placing them under the strict control of Parliament, a Parliament that ought also to appoint the heads of those Services, which have become veritable organised-crime groups.

That is one of the principal aims of the bill for #RevisingTheConstitution called #TheConstitutionOfSovereignty — a bill against which the Securitate men, more or less under cover, are protesting violently.

For the time being, paradoxically, the only effective weapon against the men of the System is... the budget crisis, the "systemic" hunger for money created by the crises we have been living through these past years.

The winners will, of course, be the Securitate men again. But only those Securitate men who control the National Anticorruption Directorate.

For the time being I shall ask you once more to take part as well in this so necessary debate (DO NOT FORGET — on 8 February 2023 we meet at the Coffee House for the Nation, at 1 Petru Cercel Street, Sector 4, Bucharest) and we await your comments and proposals on the version put up for debate and your own proposals for amending the Constitution on the Telegram channel https://t.me/+WoH4Yyxi9pjNTE0.

Read all the amendments (thus far) proposed for debate at https://t.me/DanMVChiticNecenzurat/2018.

(On the Demilitarisation Act: the full text of the bill — see page 000.)

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQH-6Z4yVKrMPVfge4u4XxE3H5jbrR8NddYEN-Uc88NNSQJY0CjSN9b2LHiSXrF5xsOJWznXjJ2F4yMla20KxXYOvZyS-mFBxfy8m0iXZdwYO79BAPwwuHeAn7QZJBtG1xYhh_rFpBq2MFcFvCZvQwveBl_Og0IerjbukK7SYrFTgTx0DVm1pHJdXV_JPNx_POxGydUBj9g0y6riCDeJtMixk1Z8&s=518⟩

183. 1 February 2023 — On the strengthening of Parliament

On the Demilitarisation Act: the full text of the bill — see the page The Demilitarisation Act.

Enlarging the power of Parliament, as "the supreme representative body of the Romanian people" — as article 61 of the Constitution lays down — is the only possibility the Romanian people has of emerging from the present stagnation, of combating the Securitate metastasis and of exercising its national sovereignty.

That is why, in the bill for #RevisingTheConstitution entitled #TheConstitutionOfSovereignty, no fewer than 13 amendments have been made to 7 of the articles of the present Constitution, with the sole purpose of enlarging Parliament's power within the Romanian state. I know that to speak of Parliament and of enlarging its power is a very unpopular subject, quite as unpopular as the institution of Parliament itself. But one thing must be said plainly: that unpopularity is likewise an effect of the work of the Caste of the Securitate men, who on the one hand constantly discredit the institution, both through the "independent" press and through concerted campaigns of propaganda (do you remember the demonising to which Petrov subjected Parliament?), and on the other through the doings of certain members of Parliament, more or less "bestarred", who by their acts and their omissions work directly for the destruction of the prestige of the supreme forum of the Romanian people.

One thing alone is certain: the weaker Parliament is, the more the personified dictatorship of the System will grow. And one further remark... what defines a democracy is not the popularity and the power of the president or of one or another of the state's institutions of force, such as the army or the

fire brigade. Powerful presidents and powerful institutions of force are to be found in the harshest dictatorships in the world too... When you say North Korea, what comes to mind?

That is why, at any price, at any risk, whether we like it or not, Parliament is the institution that must be strengthened, that must become omnipotent in Romania.

Today I shall speak briefly of the last three amendments (one of them already commented upon in the course of the discussion about the need to demilitarise the intelligence services).

The first of these amendments concerns article 119 of the Constitution and the introduction of a paragraph providing for the inclusion of the presidents of the two Chambers of Parliament in the Supreme Council of National Defence. At present that Council is composed "as of right of the President, the Prime Minister, the Minister of Defence, the Minister of Justice and the heads of the intelligence services." That is to say, the executive power and its de facto masters — the intelligence services, what I have called the Caste of the Securitate men. This monopoly can and must be broken by introducing the representatives of the two Chambers of Parliament among the Council's members as of right.

This measure, together with the designation, likewise directly by Parliament, of the heads of the intelligence services and the demilitarisation of those services, constitutes the precondition for the "de-Securitisation" of Romanian society. Without any risk of exaggeration, these measures would constitute the first and the true Revolution in Romania.

The second amendment of which we speak today is made to article 146(1)(a)–(d) of the Constitution; and although that article governs the powers of the Constitutional Court, the proposed amendments are apt to strengthen once again the power of Parliament and, by implication, democracy and national sovereignty.

Thus, a measure essential to enlarging Parliament's power and diminishing the System's influence within the Romanian state is the reduction in the number of members of Parliament required to refer to the Constitutional Court the possible unconstitutionality of laws, treaties and the regulations of Parliament, and likewise of ordinances and emergency ordinances (the unconstitutionality of these last two kinds of normative act being at present incapable of being raised by members of Parliament at all).

Concretely, reducing the number of members of Parliament required to refer a matter to the Constitutional Court for an a priori review of constitutionality from 50 deputies (as the present Constitution provides) to 20 deputies (under our proposal), and from 25 senators to 10 senators respectively, would constitute the guarantee of an effective review of the constitutionality of the normative acts adopted both by Parliament and by the Government. And if the reduction in the number of members of Parliament required to challenge normative acts before the Constitutional Court will be a guarantee that the parliamentary opposition can effectively and efficiently submit laws to a review of constitutionality, then subjecting ordinances and emergency ordinances to the same regime of review upon possible referrals made by members of Parliament (and not only by the People's Advocate or by the courts of law or of commercial arbitration) will mean that the normative acts adopted by the executive are effectively subject to the same rules and the same rigours as those adopted by Parliament — which would amount to a return to normality. In other words, the executive, the Government, will after 33 years lose the unjustified privileges it enjoys in relation to the legislative power, the power that most faithfully represents the interests of the people.

In proposing all these amendments to Romania's fundamental law, we are seeking to raise the need to transform Romania from a semi-presidential republic — a republic in which one single man, the

President, holds a determining position within the state and a dominant position in relation to the powers of the state — into a semi-parliamentary republic, a republic in which, although we shall go on electing our President directly, effective and pre-eminent power will belong to Parliament.

I know you will tell me: "Parliament is not popular!" Or, "look at the members of Parliament we have today." I know… but that is merely the effect of the faulty way in which the institutional and state architecture was designed by the present Constitution.

My answer is therefore a simple one: until we become conscious of Parliament's fundamental importance and give it the pre-eminence it deserves, we shall not live in a democracy.

What is more, so long as we place the emphasis upon the President and upon his election, and leave the reins of the state in the hands of a single man, we cannot claim either that we are "democrats" or even that our interests are represented. You do not believe me? Recall the names of the Presidents the people has elected, and what they did for the people.

That is why we must have the courage to discuss openly, without evasions, and to seek remedies together. We! Not they!

That is why we ask you to take part as well in this so necessary debate (DO NOT FORGET — on 8 February 2023 we meet at the Coffee House for the Nation, at 1 Petru Cercel Street, Sector 4, Bucharest) and we await your comments and proposals on the version put up for debate and your own proposals for amending the Constitution on the Telegram channel https://t.me/+W-oH4Yyx-i9pjNTE0.

Read all the amendments (thus far) proposed for debate at https://t.me/DanMVChiticNecenzurat/2018.

(On the Demilitarisation Act: the full text of the bill — see page 000.)

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQELn87KQ3YE1IKzQ2IvTsKf2D8QPPOauKY1p7e0ceuWPQyepoW3XKSrTBJqovBGxALJ4pjmjODC1Hb0Ix-nbOs71y-GRg6NJk-zP9qMPqfX3CHz0fstFO8SFSjPQePK-WHXEOz_fpMfUYQvc2pcOKRGbTgP5E7UE9672pwDhR1SqSq7Dx_IJ1Bd83UIZjK2NEzZTN5zybfETxiG4UqpxA4GxK9E&s=518⟩

184. 3 February 2023 — "On the thievery of the multinationals and on the need for taxes, for solidarity and... for plagia..."

On the thievery of the multinationals and on the need for taxes, for solidarity and… for well-made plagiarism.

OMV Petrom has made the largest profit ever made by a company in Romania — a net profit of 10.3 billion lei last year, up 260 per cent on the year before, when it had made a mere 2.86 billion lei. This as a result of the "energy crisis" caused by Putin, of course, and in the middle of the post-plandemic financial crisis…

By way of an answer, Mr Ciolacu announced a few days ago his "programme of government". The only remarkable and approximately coherent thing in it was that he would propose a "solidarity tax", a levy of 1 per cent on the turnover of the multinationals.

To be sure, it is vague, badly expressed (how, in fiscal terms, does one define the notion of "multinationals"?) and… it is obvious: he has plagiarised our bill entitled "The Solidarity Act — the Act on the Taxation of Great Businesses and Great Fortunes"… (a bill that is still waiting for a courageous member of Parliament to lodge it in Parliament).

But I am not vexed that Mr Ciolacu plagiarises me by copying certain passages from the legislative initiative written and taken up by #TheCoalitionForTheNation.

I am vexed only that Mr Ciolacu has plagiarised our bill badly and incompletely. And very late, villainously late; for even if a "solidarity tax" were adopted today, it could come into force only from the next fiscal year.

Whereas we opened the debate as long ago as last summer (from 19 July 2022) on the bill entitled "#TheSolidarityAct — THE ACT ON THE TAXATION OF GREAT BUSINESSES AND GREAT FORTUNES, A LEGISLATIVE BILL AMENDING THE FISCAL CODE, Law no. 227/2015 on the Fiscal Code", and on 24 November 2022 we closed the stage of consultations and public debate, settling the final form of the bill (and of its explanatory memorandum) and placing it at the disposal of any member of Parliament who… might have had the courage to take up such a bill. The proof is here — https://t.me/DanMVChiticNecenzurat/1792. At that same link you will also find the full text of the legislative proposal and of the explanatory memorandum. Ready to be taken up and copied.

Thus far no one has had the courage… I go on waiting, I go on hoping.

Our offer stands. We accept and even encourage plagiarism — but only if it is well done, not like Mr Ciolacu's.

But let me remind you of the "essence" of the provisions we proposed more than six months ago:

"The Solidarity Act" introduces the "1, 2, 3 rule" and provides for a progressive tax on turnover for all companies with a turnover of more than 10 million euros. Namely:

— 1 per cent of turnover for taxpayers whose revenues have exceeded the leu equivalent of 10,000,000 euros;

— 2 per cent of turnover for taxpayers whose revenues have exceeded the leu equivalent of 100,000,000 euros; and

— 3 per cent of turnover for taxpayers whose revenues have exceeded the leu equivalent of 1,000,000,000 euros.

What is more, #TheSolidarityAct anticipated the "OMV problem" and would have countered effectively the Austrians' "dribbling" by laying down a special tax of 5 per cent of turnover for "taxpayers carrying on activities in the nature of the extraction, refining or marketing of petroleum products and their derivatives and having annual revenues greater than 10,000,000 euros"… and that no one could have got round.

For #TheSolidarityAct also introduced a tax, likewise progressive, applying the same "1, 2, 3 rule", upon the great fortunes of natural persons. Thus there was laid down a tax of

— 1 per cent of the total value of the fortune for taxpayers who are natural persons whose revenues, taken together with the value of their gains, their movable assets and the buildings in their patrimony as at 31 December of the preceding year, exceed 10,000,000 euros;

— 2 per cent of the total value of the fortune for taxpayers who are natural persons whose revenues, taken together with the value of their gains, their movable assets and the buildings in their patrimony as at 31 December of the preceding year, exceed 100,000,000 euros; and

— 3 per cent of the total value of the fortune for taxpayers who are natural persons whose revenues, taken together with the value of their gains, their movable assets and the buildings in their patrimony as at 31 December of the preceding year, exceed 1,000,000,000 euros.

In addition, #TheSolidarityAct introduced a tax upon the "shameless pensions" which, though paid out of the consolidated state budget, exceed the salary of the President of Romania, laying down for

such pensions a rate of "90 per cent of the monthly taxable income represented by that part of the pension exceeding 11 gross national minimum wages".

All the money thus gathered could have covered the holes in the budget, including a "hole" that #TheSolidarityAct would itself have created by instituting tax deductions for citizens with several dependants, thereby encouraging the birth rate in Romania. To that end our bill provided deductions for "taxpayers whose gross monthly revenues lie between 3,600 lei and 20,000 lei", as follows:

"(i) for taxpayers with one dependant — 20 per cent of the income tax due;

for taxpayers with two dependants — 30 per cent of the income tax due;

for taxpayers with three dependants — 40 per cent of the income tax due;

for taxpayers with four or more dependants — 50 per cent of the income tax due."

Simple, fair and effective. Such is the bill #TheSolidarityAct proposed by #TheCoalitionForTheNation.

So simple, so fair and so effective that no one has had the courage to lodge it in Parliament. Or even to plagiarise it properly.

I repeat: our challenge and our offer stand.

Which member of Parliament has the courage to lodge #TheSolidarityAct in Parliament?

(On the Solidarity Act: the full text of the bill — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQHxZ37e-KxMMpC0ioirTfFVWxfUuUl7xVALuNwXl4ejOmXGrNfU5M8PViFl-Bg_UaTaBIBFIqdfTFF2g56T93HlQF6Q30xZpXMzHjRDkk18eEj3xWH39xLeo0hZ4G-WP1Mw_iDGNAYCAp8XqrqhjduS29DzCfW1FCxIFeNV2oWK5L1wgZdGj2wkMTxkNORbpEXSZNeyPzDeXq5OFgXc3inZPG2RQ&s=518⟩

---

185. 8 February 2023 — "Today, from 18.00, we meet at the Café for the Nation in Bucharest, Str Petru Cercel NR..."

Today, from 6 p.m., we meet at the Coffee House for the Nation in Bucharest, 1 Petru Cercel Street, Sector 4,

where the second public debate will be held on the bill for #RevisingTheConstitution entitled #TheConstitutionOfSovereignty, or #TheConstitutionForTheNation.

Anyone, any Romanian citizen, is welcome and is invited to make proposals, to voice criticism, or simply to attend the first public debate on a bill for revising the Constitution — a bill that comes wholly from the ranks of civil society and that was written outside Parliament and without the influence of the "institutions" and the "services" that have been governing our lives occultly for 33 years.

The subject of today's discussions will be the amendments whose purpose is to strengthen and to guarantee the rights of the citizen, and more precisely the proposals concerning:

— the repeal of article 19(2) of the Constitution — the paragraph that permits the extradition of Romanian citizens to third countries with which Romania has treaties to that effect;

— the amendment of article 22(2) of the Constitution — where the proposed amendment provides for the express prohibition of subjecting Romanian citizens to any experimental treatment whatever,

and makes any medical treatment conditional upon the complete and honestly informed consent of the patient;

— the amendment of article 48(1) and (2) of the Constitution — whereby it is to be stipulated at constitutional level that the family "is founded upon the freely consented marriage between a man and a woman", and likewise the lifting of the requirement that a civil marriage exist before the religious marriage rite may be performed.

All these amendments have already been the subject of comments published on my Facebook page, namely:

— on 9 January 2023, on the subject of the extradition of Romanian citizens (https://www.facebook.com/dan.chitic/posts/pfbid02CRg5KwJ6aRLTF9Fx4ZgJ7...);

— on 10 January 2023, on the subject of the prohibition of compulsory subjection to experimental treatments (https://www.facebook.com/dan.chitic/posts/pfbid0SLC5NdGnBFmsXu9pjxLBHu...); and

— on 12 January 2023, on the subject of the traditional family and of freeing the religious marriage from the requirement of a civil one (https://www.facebook.com/dan.chitic/posts/pfbid02uDpXjhk4nvL2jCExxEi1E...)

It is plain that almost all the amendments have as their ultimate purpose the strengthening of the citizen's rights (from those concerning the independence of the judiciary to those limiting the power and the influence of the intelligence services upon society, or defending and increasing the national wealth); but for reasons of organisation, or indeed "didactic" reasons, so that we may discuss each article more "settledly", we shall confine ourselves today to these three amendments.

Of course, our proposed amendments may be not merely commented upon but themselves amended or supplemented. Indeed, following suggestions received from you, I have been advised to take up some of the amendments proposed in 2013 by the specialists gathered around Crin Antonescu.

That is why we ask you to take part as well in this so necessary debate, and we await your comments and proposals on the version put up for debate and your own proposals for amending the Constitution on the Telegram channel https://t.me/+W-oH4Yyxi9pjNTE0.

Read all the amendments (thus far) proposed for debate at https://t.me/DanMVChiticNecenzurat/2018.

(On the Constitution of Sovereignty: the full text of the bill — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQEOAnLeXdzfuQ1O4UlaO30HCt3ZNtJVFrk96u2zYCKTXmcXYOiKDLq4ktJ3o9q5qExCp7WL5eZkztPim0orfByTUden-1thGcOFN4sL7gnm_MWt_eRkrhPbfWwUuPghiJtZE8HAJeFKaxg_sWU-DX-nsSV5FREeGyuBTAu0HFDQDHzAN4BVC7aJrFHKg4roU6RcFJ-x1SDbyM3fxB5daahZ_Gs&s=518⟩

186. 11 February 2023 — "ATTENTION: ATTEMPT TO UNDERMINE DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS IN ROMANIA — Dic..."

ATTENTION: AN ATTEMPT TO UNDERMINE DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS IN ROMANIA — dictatorship "is coming back".

The plagiarists Ciucă (Prime Minister) and Bode (Minister of the Interior) are being original and are bringing totalitarianism back to Romania in plain, unequivocal forms. So that it may be clear to everyone.

#TheCoalitionOfBetrayal, through the National Liberal Party, at the highest level, is attempting to reintroduce dictatorship into Romania by way of a proposed amendment to the Criminal Code punishing with 1 to 5 years' imprisonment "the act of a person who, in public, (...) by threats or by grave affronts to the dignity of persons, disturbs public order and quiet", and, as an aggravated form, with 2 to 7 years if the act is committed by two or more persons together.

In other words, any protest whatever could lead to the arrest and the sentencing of its participants to a heavy term of imprisonment!

You do not believe me? Here is the infamous legislative proposal of those at the top of the National Liberal Party:

"11. Article 371 is amended and shall read as follows:

The act of a person who, in public, by violence committed against persons or property, or by threats or grave affronts to the dignity of persons, disturbs public order and quiet is punishable by imprisonment from 1 year to 5 years.

If the act provided for in paragraph (1) is committed by:

two or more persons together;

a person carrying a firearm, an object, a device, a substance or an animal capable of endangering the life, health or bodily integrity of persons, the penalty is imprisonment from 2 to 7 years."

I do not know whether this proposal will be adopted. I hope not, for if this abomination were to pass Parliament we should enter dictatorship outright. I sincerely hope it does not pass. And I shall do everything in my power to see that it does not.

What matters is that this "initiative" SHOULD NOT BE FORGOTTEN. The intention of its authors is clear, and the form of the legislative proposal as it has appeared in the press makes them guilty of the act of ATTEMPTING TO UNDERMINE DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS IN ROMANIA.

Of course, that act is unfortunately not made an offence by the Criminal Code.

But it can and must be punished by the Romanian electorate.

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQEQH1Ovq_QiatAQxloOyg0ovSro0fsQ50UhOf-Jae5cgwtd-peN2kRcfh8C3E7G-FXa_hsp-gw_w2A6hkWOhB2gIYU8hP8Jb04NEM-wAKOVVaVv4Pb_oUTvNW44GVWTerN4MyISzo_xsGg6pmGBqdhvIICbilP_VrWmiasxRpgfUwefbuixEZlcK1ILFyBqzIMgj_YpyvuURjizYfO4XgN6x_WQPk&s=518⟩

---

187. 16 February 2023 — "Two days ago Diana Șoșoacă tabled in the Senate a piece of the project called #LegeaSolidarității..."

Two days ago Diana Șoșoacă lodged in the Senate a piece of the bill called #TheSolidarityAct.

In fact Diana has taken up the amendments made six months ago by #TheCoalitionForTheNation, through #TheSolidarityAct, to the Fiscal Code — amendments that concern ONLY the taxation of great businesses.

This is very good. We thank her warmly for this great help given to us and to the Romanian people.

In the end we are all fighting #ForTheNation.

The bill also contains, however, provisions for the taxation of great fortunes, the taxation of the "shameless pensions", and likewise tax deductions for taxpayers with several dependants — the last having as their declared purpose the encouragement of the birth rate.

I hope these amendments too will be introduced in the legislature as soon as possible. Perhaps by Diana. Or by AUR, which, through Antonio Andrușceac, has expressly undertaken to do so. Or perhaps by Dumitru Coarnă, who received them in December 2022.

It does not matter. What matters is that they should reach Parliament and be discussed and voted upon there.

I am glad that my work, our work, the work of those of us in #TheCoalitionForTheNation, is being turned to account and placed in the service of the nation.

I leave you here below the complete bill as it was written and generically named #TheSolidarityAct: https://t.me/DanMVChiticNecenzurat/1792

It is worth noting that we, those of #TheCoalitionForTheNation, wrote a bill under which OMV would not have been exempted from the "solidarity tax", since — unlike the Government's "specialists" — we included the marketing of petroleum products among the activities attracting the surcharge. And that for a simple reason: we, unlike the Government, are not the lawyers of the exploiters at OMV.

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQFeFJrqDs3Z3r63YvcAs1lHbSeu9Et-lXoTFcTBkCJEXkNIjVtTIwP-sBZDz8kz_OeaE5fbqrBMaix0K-NR8G59Ov7i7qJM0GXeP5FpvGxiNCPFM1aMJT9LvfUE1q5K8amkO528Jc_tmMWee1ISSP9tzlDeELtGHcn_ctu65BZXFIj6uE0ZgMHRsUPJ1rADEw01-NAm92kwLWKmUlwVX-hTCzzY&s=518⟩

---

188. 17 February 2023 — "Today, 17.02.2023, Diana Șoșoacă tabled a second segment of #LegeaSolidarității written..."

Today, 17 February 2023, Diana Șoșoacă lodged a second segment of #TheSolidarityAct written by #TheCoalitionForTheNation.

It is the article of the bill amending article 77 of the Fiscal Code, which grants deductions to persons with several dependants who fall outside the 3,600-lei ceiling imposed by the present fiscal code but whose revenues do not exceed 20,000 lei.

Moreover, our proposal applies to all taxpayers — not merely to employees but to the self-employed as well.

There remains to be lodged, from #TheSolidarityAct, the part taxing great fortunes and the "shameless pensions".

I am waiting to see who will move faster #ForTheNation…

The people needs you to move faster.

To those interested I leave here the complete bill as it was written and generically named #TheSolidarityAct: https://t.me/DanMVChiticNecenzurat/1792.

Take it and lodge it in Parliament as soon as you can.

Set aside your vanities, I beg you. Follow our example.

(On the Solidarity Act: the full text of the bill — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQGpU1DuEmR-daBqAdfcnW5yahUvxOQesuFhuLgq9ZYp6R2xBbCFSAhp7bUjMDUArDUFPwXPwRjpo1cqrYwu7O5n-qQ-G29UE2AaqUf9Grey6jvlNiuuI0A0VInIdXlLG-pwRzVNToRx6uuJ6-Wh4cyFfFoDQ38UrHJzbNXDPdksEwRCx-x9qpGpbXqAgEkS0nODQYpXd2TKR-bRga3EyLFUhNGXA&s=518⟩

189. 22 February 2023 — "On the need for normality. The protest against the works on the Bystroye Canal at ..."

On the need for normality. The protest against the works on the Bystroe Canal, outside the Embassy of Ukraine in Bucharest, at 2 p.m. — as a sign of normality.

I made no comment on the two speeches of yesterday. None at all.

There was no point. Whoever was interested, I am sure, followed them and understood what there was to understand from the position and the vantage point from which he watched them — everything was said plainly and clearly. Whoever was not, plainly has no interest in anything in the real world, and there is no point in troubling him... indeed I think that may well be the right choice, given the situation we are in.

Perhaps more important is what was said after yesterday's speeches, far more explicitly and concisely:

Sergey Ryabkov (Deputy Foreign Minister of Russia): "The United States wants Russia to be defeated; in that case Russia will defend itself with any weapons — the world is on the brink of a global conflict"... or

Medvedev: "If the United States wants to defeat Russia, then we have the right to defend ourselves with any kind of weapons, including nuclear ones... If Russia halts the 'military operation' without having obtained victory, Russia will no longer exist, it will be blown to pieces; if the United States stops supplying weapons to the Kiev regime, the war will end."

What is certain is that from yesterday onward anything is possible. At any moment. There remains a shadow of hope in the peace plan proposed and negotiated by China these very days. In short, God have mercy. Literally.

For all that, for the sake of our mental and physical health, we are bound to live normally, as though nothing were happening, as though we were not on the edge of the abyss...

And it is NORMAL to protest, as much and as best we can, against the aggression upon Romania and the ecological crime committed against the Danube Delta by our "good" neighbour Ukraine:

The Bystroe Canal must be closed or, at the least, blocked. IMMEDIATELY.

For which reason, today from 2 p.m. we shall meet at the Embassy of Ukraine to say together:

Ukraine oppresses the Romanian minority in Ukraine!

Ukraine is illegally building the Bystroe Canal, which constitutes an act of aggression against Romania!

That is why I call upon you to come too, so that together we may defend Romania from Ukrainian aggression.

Then, it is NORMAL as well that we should meet from 6 p.m. at the Coffee House for the Nation (at 1 Petru Cercel Street, Sector 4, Bucharest), where we await you to comment together upon, and to improve, the proposal for amending the Constitution called #TheConstitutionOfSovereignty (we await proposals and comments on the Telegram channel too: https://t.me/+W-oH4Yyxi9pjNTE0).)

Read all the amendments (thus far) proposed for debate at https://t.me/DanMVChiticNecenzurat/2018.

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQHaAh0sd-FnYqcqn3vZYQepiXBlK-JEel6TczSNLSx7a3UM9gZjRQfMHFjPMYV3_StsWNJwfct-DA4PZ_G1W9h38HO0zmCRZFDoLN0_gLj1Q7vI8y2gCO6Ozyw7xGJEPlURw_sf3BXL0V3MgFQS4McfqMkInE17w0URDp9-JmENfqHm-0PjOeda9RoA2fomgS24JYnU-mSkoX8-1RRYs8zJvn0&s=518⟩

---

190. 3 March 2023 — "On Monday, 6 March 2023, we meet from 14.00 in front of the Embassy of Ukraine to say clearly and..."

On Monday, 6 March 2023, we shall meet from 2 p.m. in front of the Embassy of Ukraine to say clearly and aloud:

Ukraine, stop the aggression against the Danube Delta!!!

We await all of you who care about the destiny of this people, about the future of this country, whatever your convictions, leanings or political allegiances.

We await above all you, the greens, the ecologists, the supporters of the green deal: come and support the cause of the Danube Delta. Show that you are consistent with yourselves, with the principles and the values you proclaim. Come and show that you are Romanians too, and not merely "green", and that between the "political correctness" of the "Slava Ukraini" kind and the urgent need to save the Delta... you choose the Delta and the national interest.

Then, from 6 p.m., we meet at the Coffee House for the Nation (at 1 Petru Cercel Street, Sector 4, Bucharest) to discuss #TheConstitutionOfSovereignty. Yes, next week the discussions will be held on Monday and not on Wednesday, as usual.

Post scriptum: I shall inform Greta of our protest as well. Greta Thunberg, of course. Who knows, perhaps she will turn up to support the Delta.

Post post scriptum: here is the latest message I have written to the "saviour of the planet", Miss Greta Thunberg:

On Monday, March 6, 2023, we will meet at 2 p.m. in front of the Embassy of Ukraine in Bucharest to say loud and clear:

Ukraine, stop the aggression against the Danube Delta!!!

That's why I make one more call, the same call:

As I have already said in several previous messages,

my name is Dan MV Chitic, I am a lawyer and I am writing to you from Romania.

I am calling on you in this way to ask for your help in an environmental problem of planetary gravity: the Danube Delta, a UNESCO site and Biosphere Reserve, is irreparably affected at this very moment by the dredging works carried out illegally by Ukraine on Bâstroe canal.

According to the words of an expert in the matter of the Danube Delta, the professor Alfred Vespremeanu, Director of the Marine and River Research Station "Sf. Gheorghe", he explained in the press that "if you dredge the Bâstroe canal, then the first consequence in terms of hydrology will be that this arm will draw more water from the collateral arms. It is about the old Stambul, which is the largest branch in the Chilia Delta, and then the Oceacov branch, which is in an erosion phase anyway."

“If the entire Chilia branch were to deepen up to Ismail (...) It would slowly draw more water from the Tulcea branch, from the Romanian branches — Sulina and Sfântu Gheorghe — which is not desired.”

The specialist’s conclusion is simple: “(Dredging the Bâstroe Canal) It is an unacceptable pressure in one of the few deltas that remain very beautiful and natural”

In other words, at these very moments, illegal work is being done that is destroying one of the most spectacular and valuable ecosystems in Europe and the world.

That’s why I appeal to you, dear Greta, and call you to Romania to come to the aid of the Danube Delta, thus putting your entire reputation and media power in support of the Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve.

Thank you in advance for the help you will give to the Danube Delta!

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQEPbddB0FziYnAbIqJ-UdZlkuo0wyIP4zTSNYvIjafdAZFE0470ru7UWZgpQ2NA4yw_CCjM6cC-9t_JPG5qZRfuP09-UHXeMcznUprVOoQ_3_A0CGfAFDOziuaQgpGhXH_logV6X-o2fwDAGNsGLr6W8iqxlojBo9gzHR59rQi8hmVh1XhE7JUWiM42cb04Ym4ewLNzWi9QE-9RI0y2ZbZH5vE&s=518⟩

---

191. 11 March 2023 — “In the MSM they are beginning to speak of the large fortunes of certain top System men”

The mainstream media is beginning to speak of the great fortunes of certain top men of the System.

#TheSolidarityAct, proposed by #TheCoalitionForTheNation — the act that provides for the taxation of great fortunes — continues to be ignored by the members of Parliament to whom it was made available... already written. It needs only to be lodged with the Standing Bureaux.

You answer that question...

If I were to do it, I should be reproached with being spiteful.

(On the Solidarity Act: the full text of the bill — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQHrN0VeauP-8dE4MA1QuckwD7sUBBXeekndUmCiVi-wiNVSOQU8UkrKAqWfRUQ_EwEWdhEdi9u4ZdtbEFzfi-BzQSdx_rmTgiLryXC8E6hrgfLFdrTlJs_VdowH0Fqtlbgu_o3B8cQVuc2XRQFtUWskNqrFG86F7PaHLge6e9jACq5565ak0QhfQamupbWawCWl7-PUK-CyYQ69xuoOCZcrLMMo&s=518⟩

---

192. 14 March 2023 — “At the “House of the People”... come to make the last small adjustments to #LegeaSolidarității (Le...”

At the “House of the People”... come to make the last small adjustments to #TheSolidarityAct (the act on the taxation of great fortunes) before it is lodged for adoption.

This time we are working together with those of AUR, as we did before with Diana Șoșoacă and with Dumitru Coarnă.

That, as I see it, is what it means to bring together, to coalesce the patriotic forces: to work disinterestedly, without vanity and without empty ambitions of greatness, with each of them in turn... #ForTheNation.

By the way... I believe that we, #TheCoalitionForTheNation, have written more laws from the street than 90 per cent of the members of Parliament have ever written.

(On the Solidarity Act: the full text of the bill — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQHzpAAaE-0oc6ZyzWqeDsimBjhW8x6Qa-Z79EQPAHAHiHXJP-wumKJtcnL99RSF_Ol06toph3Khljb1Q8A3w5d1MOttHduR43o0qqaOOrTpYyahD_x2SLThekrqvnAB3QSH_S6sA_Oa6jS1qcyfeyyIJ9w_bQogqbZHy3XT4bDusyF7Yjc_TDFRTpZoCS2rgIXiv1z-8jPRonqY3J8DrtJutPQY&s=518⟩

---

193. 14 March 2023 — "The System kills, the System destroys destinies, the System undermines the national economy, the System..."

The System kills, the System destroys destinies, the System undermines the national economy, the System has captured the leadership of the state, the System betrays the national interest... Yes, the System — that thicket of services and agencies, each more "intelligence" and more "secret" than the last — is a national metastasis, beyond any doubt.

The latest confirmation comes from the quarter where we should least have expected it: from Rareș Bogdan, first vice-president of the National Liberal Party, who says expressly that Bogdan Aurescu, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, is the System's man. And we believe him. We have been saying it for a long time.

It is simple: the evil must be cut off at the root. The intelligence services must be demilitarised, and former or serving agents of those services must be prevented from reaching key civilian offices.

Radically: by laying down these rules at constitutional level.

That is why I set in motion the bill for #RevisingTheConstitution called #TheConstitutionOfSovereignty, in which this is regulated clearly and without ambiguity.

Tomorrow, 15 March 2023, at the Coffee House for the Nation in Bucharest, 1 Petru Cercel Street, Sector 4, we shall discuss the following concrete proposals:

"Article 40(3) is amended and shall read as follows:

"(3) The judges of the Constitutional Court, the people's advocates, national or European magistrates, the active members of the army, of the intelligence services, the police officers and other categories of public servants established by organic law may not belong to political parties. These professional categories may not belong to political parties and may not hold appointed or elected public office for a period of 5 years from the cessation of the exercise of those functions."

"After article 116(2) a new paragraph, paragraph (3), is added, reading as follows:

"(3) Appointed public offices, or the offices and capacities for which direct designation is made and for which no competitive examination is held, may be held for a term of at most 4 years, renewable once only, unless another duration of the term or another number of terms is provided by this Constitution."

"Article 118(4) and (5) are amended and shall read as follows:

"(4) The intelligence services and those assimilated to them shall be organised exclusively on a civilian basis, under the conditions laid down by law. The organisation of military or paramilitary activities outside a state authority is prohibited."

"After article 119(1) a new paragraph, paragraph (2), is introduced, reading as follows:

"(2) The Supreme Council of National Defence is composed as of right of the President, the Prime Minister, the presidents of the two Chambers of Parliament, the Minister of Defence, the Minister of

Justice and the heads of the intelligence services. The heads of the intelligence services are designated for a period of 4 years in a joint sitting of Parliament."

We await you, to debate these proposals together — for our proposed amendments may be not merely commented upon but themselves amended or supplemented.

That is why we ask you to take part as well in this so necessary debate, and we await your comments and proposals on the version put up for debate and your own proposals for amending the Constitution on the Telegram channel https://t.me/+W-oH4Yyxi9pjNTE0.

Read all the amendments (thus far) proposed for debate at https://t.me/DanMVChiticNecenzurat/2018.

(On the Demilitarisation Act: the full text of the bill — see page 000.)

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQFS1nOl1YlKr9ouAt3shAtgSvyu9TPo1-CbuPbSJaxGlQp9C6lUb3Sc2q3sbxawL4iINIuOAJvwTW6MVGqWamBcE3KIG-mDcHgjOu0R2e7GoXHI_MFPWdL0XAOWJp8gMPrGKN4AxhWDsKsGp0wRd6Ngdxj6PERb-Hi8-wKj7qP4jp1IkhO3rYNTB9va_ymYp_8pDSbhS5Sz030ZmyyZO_zcOpvQ&s=518⟩

---

194. 21 March 2023 — On moribund globalisation

On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the bill — see the page The Sovereignty Act.

When I see these pictures I feel the urge to "quote myself" again... this time I bring back to your attention a post of 25 May 2022:

"George Soros announced to us yesterday (24 May 2022) that globalisation is dying. 'Even when the fighting stops, as it eventually must, the situation will never revert to the status quo ante,' he prophesies.

Yes, Soros is right. And he is right too when he says 'That is why I say that our civilisation may not survive,' upon observing that 'other problems that concern mankind — such as pandemics, climate change and the avoidance of nuclear war, and the maintenance of global institutions — have had to take second place.'

'Their civilisation', the globalist 'civilisation', will not survive.

In truth, globalisation is already dead. The unipolar world in which a group of decrepit billionaires and autistic technologists decided the fate of the whole planet at some grand dinner in a Swiss resort or in one or another capital of the 'civilised world' came to an end on 24 February 2022. Whatever the outcome of the war in Ukraine, globalisation has ceased; it perished together with the demonising of Russia and the establishment of institutionalised Russophobia in the 'civilised West'.

Many will hasten to tell me that it is impossible for globalisation to end, that the process is irreversible and that, as things now stand, the world can only be globalised.

Wrong. Globalisation, in the sense in which the term has been used until now, was the perfect synonym of cultural and social uniformity, of the abolition of traditional and social differences, of the interoperability and management of production and economic exchange — all of it under the aegis of a Western 'intelligentsia' which also set the agenda of global priorities and mankind's to-do list.

That unipolar globalisation, synonymous with a world étatisme, has already ended.

The other globalisation — that of the exchange of ideas, goods and persons, but without a single command; the globalisation that has existed since antiquity with its Silk Road, or with those providential meetings of civilisations and traditions as in the Spain of the eighth to the fifteenth centuries, or in Syria until its destruction in the twenty-first — that globalisation will not cease. It cannot.

But the globalised étatisme of the United States and of its allies and satellites (not to say colonies) has come to an end.

The disappearance of the dollar as the sole medium of exchange at world level is the death certificate of this globalisation.

The appearance of the Chinese yuan and of the Russian rouble in international transactions, together with the activation of the BRICS bank in the global economy, are the birth certificates of the multipolar world.

Faced with this situation — apparently unforeseen by the former world hegemon, though very simple and easy to anticipate — the United States finds itself obliged to compensate for the loss of global control by tightening its control over, and isolating, the world it still leads directly: I mean here Europe, North America, Australia and Japan.

The countries under its leadership (the European Union included) are obliged to break off every contact with 'the other world', to refuse the exchange not merely of ideas with it but of goods as well. Plainly, in a first stage this measure will give a bubble of oxygen to the gasping economy of the former world leader, which takes on the office of 'utilities supplier' for its part of the world... For us, in the colony, the effects of the orders received from the metropolis are already visible. In today's cabinet meeting alone, several measures will be taken to sever any link with 'the world beyond' the new iron wall: the Government will approve Romania's withdrawal from the International Bank for Economic Co-operation and the International Investment Bank, two 'eastern' institutions of which we had been a member since 1963 and 1970 respectively.

But beyond the long-term economic effects, which we shall not discuss here and now, what is certain is that the Biden administration — the one under which globalism died — is incapable of realising that these measures are 'pro-cyclical', doing nothing other than leading to an even sharper division of the world... to a swifter death of the globalism they dreamed of. To the disappearance of the status of sole world power: the United States is about to fall from the rank of a global power to that of a regional power, the power of the 'North Atlantic' region.

And this the 'prophet' Soros seems to realise as well: 'This could be the end of our civilisation'... It could not — it already is the end of Western domination over the planet. Throwing Russia into the arms of China (witness the joint manoeuvres of those countries in the Pacific) will lead, first, to a 'splitting' of the world in two (with the enhanced role of certain regional powers such as Turkey), and then, sadly, to China taking on the role of hegemon. But that is another 'prophecy'.

What is certain is that Romania is at this moment on a collision course with history, and that the present leadership — by the unconditional surrender of all this nation's initiatives and resources to a world power become regional, with no view to the national interest or to the historical destiny of this people — is doing nothing other than committing a grave act of #Betrayal.

For if the purpose of what I have called #TheCoalitionOfBetrayal — the Social Democrats, the Liberals, the Hungarian Union and the Save Romania Union — were not foreign to the national interest, and if the agenda of government were not strictly subordinated to the plans and interests of the metropolises from which we receive our 'light'... this coalition of almost 90 per cent of Parliament would not have been permitted. Acts of betrayal (such as the rejection of #TheSovereigntyAct and the adoption of the amendments brought by OMV through Ciucă, Ciolacu, Kelemen and Pambuccian to #TheOffshoreAct) must be carried and secured by broad majorities. Just as today, this very day, the executive will approve the methodology for reporting and the information circuit in the National

Electronic Register of Vaccinations... so their plans continue, only on a smaller scale, here in the colonies.

Much more might be said... but I know you do not like long articles. We shall return; until then, a conclusion:

Unipolarity is extinguished, globalisation has set.

Say good morning to multipolarity, and welcome to globalised regionalisation."

I know... I tend to get them right. But it is hardly difficult.

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the bill — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQEVsO6c2M2KrJ3CVSAbmVd-eLOQFqqsQIKEhZ_vypLBhXeJjkPXtlnqAxEd-QlcJRByuom4eey2bn3TgpPvz7Eon-FKiOgYou2WCHLo-qiw05WntaMk-49CtZRDkrUc8z2tASoZrkW63_PKVIzybMBpEkZMduUdjbkQzYDsc_aS5bc3czgPkCgZ_zSzI2j7piKr7A4Gq0Tg0s2LzsHMblPaHyRw&s=518⟩

---

195. 27 March 2023 — "Twenty-five years together #PentruNațiune. Together We Stand for the Nation!"

Twenty-five years together #ForTheNation. Together we stand for the Nation.

You opposed and criticised the anti-national "privatisations" of the Năstase government.

You protested and stood against the Băsescu–Kövesi–Coldea dictatorship.

You opposed the National Anticorruption Directorate–Romanian Intelligence Service binomial and the abuses of the "anti-corruption" men?

We were together. In the street and in the courts.

You did not vote for Iohannis and his globalist-progressive clique?

You opposed the lie and the dictatorship of the plandemic and of vaccination?

You are for peace and against any involvement of Romania in the war in Ukraine?

We are once again on the same side of the barricade.

You are firmly opposed to digitalisation, to artificial intelligence and to total control over the citizen?

This time too we were together from the very beginning.

For decades we have been together: we think, we feel and we act alike.

And because there had to be a place where all of us who are of this kind could gather, #TheCoalitionForTheNation came into being.

It is only with us, with those of #TheCoalitionForTheNation, that you have been #AlwaysTogether.

The time has come to gather in one place and to stand for the Nation.

We have programmes and legislative solutions, not merely slogans. Projects such as #TheSovereigntyAct, #TheSolidarityAct, the amendments to #TheOffshoreAct or #TheConstitutionOfSovereignty are the proof that #WeKnow and that #WeCan.

Yes. You yourself. Or anyone whom you consider worthy to represent you.

#TheTimeHasCome. The time has come for each of #Us to become involved and to take responsibility.

Go to https://coalitiapentrunatiune.ro/candidațipentrunațiune/ and put forward your own candidacy, or that of the person you wish to represent you.

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the bill — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQED6z4MZ5AFS81Zy-g9Eo-7YMNJIB0qdtWOm_XDPEQ3xlQ_FdTmkFjfSuN7eza1zeSOPMdfq7xPvAZrVldnHDn5tA0Aq6nzm2nUsiHmNLox5ThlozZce5TJLwjIcG1KXPGMEhPyUepygy-VPvqEGoS-Br96CuIWZmoPjIffZ03ufi8ACjanqpdIeFjZSqRP8gIQZR-2klTgbGPwJninPK–ea5gE&s=518⟩

---

196. 12 April 2023 — On the lists of disinformers

And so the propagandistic filth has appeared — the "article" prepared some months ago by the Soros networks of the Bucharest "press":

"The network of lies: the Facebook influencers who ventilate conspiracies, disinformation and pro-Kremlin propaganda"

"Disinformation, pro-Russian narratives, far-right opinions and conspiracy theories are being rolled out on social networks in the context of the war in Ukraine and of the medical and economic crises of recent years. In Romania, the ecosystem for radicalising opinion, influencing public debate and altering democratic values uses the Facebook platform as its principal vehicle. The disinformation operation is led by public figures, politicians, lawyers and journalists with tens or hundreds of thousands of followers. Among the influencers of disinformation there stand out George Simion, Dana Budeanu, Cristian Terheș, Iosefina Pascal, Diana Șoșoacă, Mihai Lasca, Dan Chitic, Adriana Bahmuțeanu and Șerban Nicolae.

Flavia Durach, a specialist in the study of disinformation, explained in an interview given to Context.ro that the term disinformation "specifically defines information which is distorted or entirely false and which is disseminated intentionally".

Internet users with a lower level of media education, who have a chronic distrust of the mainstream media and of the authorities, and whose thinking inclines towards conspiracy theories, end up being exposed almost exclusively to disinformation, adds Flavia Durach, associate professor at the Faculty of Communication and Public Relations of the National University of Political Studies and Public Administration in Bucharest, explaining that "in fact this balance is overturned between what would be an expert source and this alternative ecosystem of information, which only appears to be information, but in which you in fact find a mixture of scarcely credible information, some of it false, and at other times opinions that are not founded on evidence".

Following the technical analysis carried out within the investigation The Network of Lies, in which we identified the sites publishing disinformation, we downloaded, with the help of the CrowdTangle API, the list of public Facebook groups and pages which had shared links to any of those domains. We refined the data so as to include only posts from the year 2022. We selected the groups and pages which had shared at least 3 links from those sites, yielding 1,696 Facebook groups and pages (map here). At a further stage the database was limited to those public groups and pages which had shared at least 5 posts containing links to the domains in question. Thus we reduced the initial collection to a total of 782 public groups and pages from Romania.

The map below, produced with Gephi, an open-source program, shows the sites with disinformation content (red nodes) and the connected Facebook groups and pages (nodes in other colours). The colour of the clusters of groups and pages depends on Gephi's modularity algorithm, which groups

together the more strongly connected nodes. This means that a cluster of Facebook groups and pages of a single colour supplied links to a particular site (or sites).

Dan Chitic is a lawyer and was one of the first promoters of the RoExit current, Romania's exit from the European Union. Together with Daniel Dragomir, a former colonel of the Romanian Intelligence Service convicted of corruption and sent for trial by the Directorate for Investigating Organised Crime and Terrorism in the Black Cube case, he also founded an anti-European party, in 2019, called the National Alliance.

Together with his father, Chitic was a partner in a company whose majority shareholder was Sorin Roșca Stănescu, set up in 2004 and struck off in 2011. Later, Dan Chitic was S.R.S.'s lawyer. He also represented Diana Șoșoacă's husband.

At the end of 2020, Chitic lodged with the Bucharest Tribunal an application to "bring the defendant Facebook before Romanian justice", as the lawyer wrote on that same social network. His access to his page had been restricted after he had repeatedly breached the community standards. He was claiming damages of 50 thousand euros, but the application was annulled by the court.

He organised and took part in protests against the restrictions of the Covid pandemic period and incurred fines. He then appealed to his supporters to donate money so that he could pay the penalties, and posted his personal bank accounts on Facebook.

Towards the end of 2021, Sputnik ran the headline: "Dan Chitic and George Simion have joined forces", after the two announced their mutual support for the projects they promote.

In 2022, the Sovereignty Act, devised by Chitic, Roșca Stănescu and other "representatives of civil society", was lodged in Parliament by 23 elected members, of whom 15 from AUR, Diana Șoșoacă and Mihai Lasca. The bill, with its controversial provisions, which was also supported by George Simion, was rejected both by the plenary of the Chamber of Deputies and by that of the Senate.

Later, in August, the founding of a new party was announced, established by Dan Chitic, the physician Răzvan Constantinescu, a well-known adherent of Covid conspiracy theories, and others. The Coalition for the Nation is a sovereigntist and conservative party whose project for the country is set out by the Sovereignty Act, as Chitic maintains.

Disinformation is propagated on Dan Chitic's Facebook pages, with more than 60,000 followers and 37,000 respectively, and also on the group on that same platform, called Alongside Dan Chitic, which he moderates and which has gathered more than 5,400 members in two years.

After Context asked him for a point of view, Dan Chitic wrote on Facebook: 'A new campaign of calumny, demonisation and defamation is being prepared against me. I have been "officially" informed of it by the request for a "point of view" concerning what appears to be an article in which I shall be branded, with "politically correct" fury, as a "Putinist".' Dan Chitic did not answer the request sent by Context.ro.

Romanian sites directly involved in distributing disinformation, conspiracy-theory or far-right content, which promote Dan Chitic:

https://context.ro/reteaua-minciunilor-influencerii-de-pe-facebook-car...

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQExuTAPz_Y5T1ViziPuhrin-pJR94m-vPAMu80chEjYjG2q_WTpdWPR2LHik4axCSRYmOftrOnmWJ2eP7mHVcR3GHLMFQi3DtJu_WCTWGE-ICW8VaScBUrwn-Kfy7DUHjA4Tged2s5-a1Vg3I7rEufRF0-UDKf6xVPmBVp-DZif3nak261TVJmq6AeiV1HVBzHtEZ0C5tfwvBzj1YfuZB7HSQKlg&s=518⟩

197. 18 April 2023 — "Their latest work: PLX 145/2023, a draft law which compels the globalisation of education ..."

Its latest handiwork: PLX 145/2023, a bill that compels the globalisation of children's education and their "nationalisation", if the parents do not conform to progressive-globalist norms and dogmas.

The law has already passed the Senate, with the votes and the complicity of many.

The Chamber of Deputies remains: the last redoubt in which we may still defend childhood and the right of a parent... to be a parent.

Tomorrow an attempt will be made to vote this criminal bill, initiated by #TheCoalitionOfBetrayal — the Social Democrats, the Liberals, the Hungarian Union and the Save Romania Union: https://www.cdep.ro/pls/caseta/eCaseta.OrdineZi?dat=20230419!

That is why I call upon all of you, and above all upon those of #TheCoalitionForTheNation, to come out tomorrow from noon in front of the Chamber of Deputies, in Izvor Park.

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQF3PgnQltXG7GIP223kFXIel75cZ7wgzwHOZsx6FKqf__K9LUAz_27gXHb-wbjBtiEXAdfQIedaSGfZpUFPYxwfd0eBy-W3apq0vXuiAiRakviQ6cjc-4YQDRpu0DWQpZH7ftNFG1Km8kz4yPrYDmzOjZZnqGnDbbywDu_X6Ez5hYB6Kb8IkC4p64BBfkhfKcajVe36bnMs0f1SjNtE6WsHmVSA&s=518⟩

198. 9 June 2023 — "Sometimes, the fact that you do or have done what is or was right matters more than the result..."

Sometimes the fact that you do, or have done, what is or was right matters more than the result itself. In truth, not sometimes but always.

Today I observe that Elon Musk too has become a supporter of the ideas advanced and enacted in #TheSovereigntyAct.

We, those of #TheCoalitionForTheNation, proposed as long ago as 2021 clear legal rules and the criminalisation of altering the sexual identity of minors.

Let us give him a model of legislation in this field:

Law no. 272 of 21 June 2004 on the protection and promotion of the rights of the child, republished, published in the Official Gazette no. 159 of 5 March 2014, as subsequently amended and supplemented, is amended and supplemented as follows:

In article 9, after paragraph (1) a new paragraph, paragraph (1^1), is introduced, reading as follows:

"The biological sexual identity of the child acquired at birth may not be altered before the age of 18."

In article 28, after paragraph (4) a new paragraph, paragraph (5), is introduced, reading as follows:

"It is prohibited to make available to children under the age of eighteen any information or material promoting departure from biological sexual identity, gender reassignment and homosexuality."

Law no. 286 of 17 July 2009 on the Criminal Code, published in the Official Gazette no. 510 of 24 July 2009, as subsequently amended and supplemented, is amended and supplemented as follows:

In article 197, after paragraph (1) two new paragraphs, paragraphs (2) and (3), are introduced, reading as follows:

"(2) The act of causing a minor who has not attained the age of 18 to alter the biological sexual identity acquired at birth is punishable by imprisonment from 7 to 15 years.

If the act provided for in the preceding paragraph has been committed by a parent, guardian, teacher or instructor, or has produced physical consequences upon the minor, the special limits of the penalty are increased by one third."

Yes — notwithstanding that those of #TheCoalitionOfBetrayal rejected this law, I know that I did what I had to do, even though I was marginalised and demonised for it.

The price paid was worth it… for when I look in the mirror I am, truly, not ashamed — neither before myself and my own, nor before God. And that is probably the greatest reward of all.

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the bill — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQEdUK2hKhahZOt8p5cqn_mM65nVjTTVRRtgDFJNY4ERG_wtFTO__pInnmrv-PLmx61N-Q7gkbF_dJ408kR7mxZyds3265VDzBumAHk5mOBupIRLQnXDjFxzfA4_QC2KOBIgXN_oGmwe_zwo7h4SuGlI_LkJvH53Tltt_HJjjVA2djS8pkzIFvlHRSMcfhsFKnTc9y3EUSIv_pvdoRvYQAybxdhE&s=518⟩

---

199. 13 July 2023 — "Plagiarising the #LegeaSolidarității proposed by CpN: he wants to tax the multinationals and the large..."

He is plagiarising #TheSolidarityAct proposed by the Coalition for the Nation: he wants to tax the multinationals and the great fortunes. And quite right too.

Let him plagiarise #TheSovereigntyAct as well — and since he is at it, let him do it properly, #AllTheWay.

Raising the value-added tax on food, on the other hand, is a piece of villainy… they should have confined themselves to copying our bills.

(On the Solidarity Act: the full text of the bill — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQF_-IxiSZFRHcgY9NdkcfdDYdaRA2I3AbLmx9Vfg9QJ5hwa7k_aWONwk84G-HtsUV3o2yVgazzLCOCZDWS-F8-7XfQQweRYdEguxPn0Cx5UhBLlQCR7dYI2MYWrzANKzL9BFIKemM7a3PsUsLPTr5z4lyN13oq_hSXgDw5bkyuicaD1ez3Wb5Z1DcX-XnlG4BYouF5jkjLBAFUpSAHUMRmms-JtY&s=518⟩

---

200. 26 September 2023 — "Ciolacu goes to Parliament to assume responsibility for the amendment of the Fiscal Code"

Ciolacu goes to Parliament to assume responsibility for the amendment of the Fiscal Code.

An hour beforehand, NO ONE knows what is being amended, or how…

Parliament ought to bring the Government down, if only for the haste and for the Prime Minister's manifest contempt towards the legislature — if not also for the lack of transparency with which Romania's taxes and levies have been amended.

I say it again: even if every increased tax and levy were justified and necessary… the manner in which these amendments are adopted is UNACCEPTABLE.

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQHdyy9OiCXFYo1Nz__FEmq7lNpK7U44rpjvL6mRzZ8GStwppx-ZBBIlqMKJ2hDX7OajuXHMP-FyCBETe1CVcfK6NGxumSvIvq3D9sGQKOZGIg7CeFdWjIcUHyT-DZQ_T8Ai0zbEpjwy_Qg_DYcMO03MwoeGSwGj0BSc1jBHB_hC0DUEkO9k9RbmQyFDIPZ4lJxC_Ns8btx1mKH50jat8LZfRyB_8&s=518⟩

201. 12 October 2023 — On revision and partial referendums

On the Constitution of Sovereignty: the full text of the bill — see the page The Constitution of Sovereignty.

Someone has just sent me the recording below of a public statement by George Simion on the subject of revising the Constitution:

“Setting in motion the steps for 2 REFERENDUMS (?!?), for the family between a man and a woman and for cash…” (George Simion)

2 REFERENDUMS?! For revising 2 articles of the Constitution?

It is the sure road to failure… like the useless collection of signatures for “the removal of Iohannis”… (by the way, what came of that undertaking?)

Well then, we should hold 30 referendums… since we wish to amend 30 provisions, should we not?

Rarely have I seen such a display of incompetence… the whole legal department of AUR ought to be dismissed, for they have placed their leader in a more than embarrassing position.

Sincerely, this is not “friendly fire” within the “sovereigntist camp”, but merely a piece of advice:

George, talk to professionals — real professionals — you are, after all, a party polling 20 per cent. Talk to Gigi Piperea; he is with you, is he not?

Or ask us, those of the Coalition for the Nation… for we know how.

By way of proof, entirely free of charge and disinterestedly, we give you below the text of the law revising the Constitution, within the limits accepted by AUR, as it ought to read in order to produce the effects G.S. announces:

“Bill for revising the Constitution of Romania

The Constitution of Romania of 21 November 1991, republished in the Official Gazette no. 767 of 31 October 2003, is amended and supplemented as follows:

1. In article 44, after paragraph 9, a paragraph 10 is added, reading as follows:

“(10) The Romanian citizen has the right to keep, to use and to dispose of his property freely and unconditionally, according to his own will. The obtaining, holding and use of any currency in cash may not be limited or made conditional.”

2. Article 48(1) is amended and shall read as follows:

“(1) The family is founded upon the freely consented marriage between two persons of opposite sex, born male and female, upon their equality and upon the right and duty of the parents to ensure the upbringing, education and instruction of their children.”

After the initiating group is constituted before a notary, this bill, previously authenticated, is lodged with the Legislative Council and, once the opinion is obtained, is published together with that opinion in the Official Gazette. From the date of publication there are 30 days until the collection of signatures may begin. Then, if the 500,000 signatures are gathered (×2?!), one reaches Parliament — and only afterwards (and only if the bill is voted through) does one reach the referendum (×2?!?!).

Because the subject is too important to be buried by incompetence or, who knows, perhaps even by ill will.

We, the Coalition for the Nation and the Romanian Sovereigntist Bloc, as we have said and as we demonstrate by this very post, are ready to help any serious undertaking to revise the Constitution.

Only, those two amendments are wholly insufficient.

That is why I make a public appeal to George Simion's wisdom:

Let us sit down at the table, let us find the best solution.

If we are "touching the Constitution" at all, we must revise everything that made it possible for us to reach the state we are in.

After Dej's Constitution, which laid the foundations of the first republic — a republic made by and for the communists; after Iliescu's Constitution, which laid the foundations of the second republic, a republic made by and for the Securitate men,

#TheTimeHasCome for the third republic: a republic made by and for the nation.

Let us set aside our vanities, let us stop listening to counsel that comes out of the woods, let us do what must be done #ForTheNation.

That is why we leave here the bill for revising the constitution which we put forward for debate, entitled #TheConstitutionOfSovereignty.

(On the Constitution of Sovereignty: the full text of the bill — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQEGCTddk33y8UzrrecP6GbM2mCB7S7w8MVBbxe60YpqNGiFBnmqoN-Cli8c6Zjs_EzLWLcwuQY8NTNrUpf2SOtr9WaDlpRIXrmPiNg9d2DHf2OZfp4takGmHMD6r5CYT104ElYfrCKLPYlaUKybW2uJEX_4ierMJTj8USEbLN7BYqe5etg9gEFeiTZcJyfG_nzbfY5HEWCrwbhtgN8peGqzJivB9&s=518⟩

---

202. 26 November 2023 — "«The sovereignists want to launch the white swan into the coming electoral pond»"

"The sovereigntists want to launch the white swan into the coming electoral pond" — a column by Orlando Teodorovici on the launch of the Romanian Sovereigntist Bloc.

The newspaper article reproduced here is not carried in this edition.

(On the Demilitarisation Law: the full text of the bill — see page 000.)

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQHRWt_a5-6JhYVIFew10NzHcfgN1gHWTJUJQMEMvdxhjhklUpP3WwT2rxNV5dh4513q-Kh8ByY5JVKKOWpLU6L3WpqTkhkYJ7lhxw8rLp9z4IdB3xU0Zd7lcLc2K1kr8wRyeGw77QBPbS0H-wQB-3Z74RslnLtGcJSFr0M0fLovTitrOBKxH2eriuOwG6SHHRyjwwHMjaSBWnTjpXX6Uy7ZtCeKg&s=518⟩

---

203. 29 December 2022 — "The year that begins in a few days will be a turning point, for after 2 years of pandemic ..."

The year that begins in a few days will be a turning point, for after two years of pandemic (is it not true that you had all but forgotten that only a year ago you were being "responsible" and "showing that you care"?) and a year of war in eastern Europe, 2023 will come to seal the changes already begun. I shall try to tell it to you briefly, with the caveat that... I sincerely hope to be wrong in everything I write below.

On the one hand the West, the "Small Planet", will do everything in its power to win the war in Ukraine. It is a matter of life and death for the West, for a military failure would hasten the loss of the

hegemony of the United States and its allies over the planet. That is why the conflict will sharpen in the first part of the year, fed massively by the West with weapons, technology and intelligence. On the other side, beyond the territorial stakes and beyond Putin's game with the West, Russia too cannot afford to lose in Ukraine, for its military strength together with its natural resources are the only arguments that give it an important position on the "Great Planet" — a position that would at once be taken over entirely by China in the event of a Russian military failure (which is, incidentally, the reason why China does not support Russia militarily). In other words, a defeat in Ukraine would throw Russia outside the great games on both the Small Planet and the Great one, and the defeat could be fatal to Russia — as my friend Dan Diaconu rightly observed in his article today. That is why there are arguments enough for a major escalation of the conflict around May or June to be not merely possible but probable, and for tactical nuclear weapons to be used should Russia fail to take the four Ukrainian provinces by conventional means.

At the same time, independently of how the war goes, the tendency of the states of the Great Planet to organise themselves around the BRICS structure will continue. The international monetary system as we know it will be shaken (still more) severely, which will sharpen the economic crisis towards which we of the Small Planet are heading at increasing speed. Plainly, a victorious Russia will catalyse this process and hasten the great rupture between the two "Planets".

And speaking of crisis... the crisis will not come. The crisis is already here; only many still refuse to accept it. On the "Small Planet" the crisis is masked by the hundreds of billions pumped into the West's war effort. But that money, made with a pen and turned into armaments and aid for Ukraine, will sharpen the already galloping inflation and will cast into poverty tens of millions of citizens of the "civilised world", who will see a lifetime's savings melt away within a few years... After the first year, more than 20 per cent of the real value of savings and incomes has already evaporated. Consumption will fall. It will be said that this is a consequence of the population becoming conscious of ecological problems... False. It will be nothing but poverty.

Poverty which will bring instability and revolt on the "Small Planet". Whence the Western establishment's fear of losing control over rebellious populations. Whence the tightening of control over the population and the hardening of censorship. Whence... dictatorship. Yes, in almost all the West the screw will be turned hard in 2023, and rights and liberties will be drastically curtailed.

As for us, here in Romania, we feel all this already. For from our status as a fourteenth-rate colony, not only can we not influence the major decisions of the world's great — which is obvious — but we shall not even try to act in the national interest, slaloming among the interests and vanities of the mighty. No. We shall merely follow to the letter the directions traced by fireflies greater or smaller. The only unknown is how zealous the local gauleiters will be in carrying out the orders they receive. And I believe they will be more servile and more treacherous than ever. That is why the coming year will be a "special" one.

The System will be more and more present and more and more visible — a fact confirmed by the amendments to the code of criminal procedure made yesterday, in the last cabinet meeting of this year.

It, the System, will prepare Iohannis's replacement. And it will show him to us. Very well: two or even three versions of the same puppet will be offered, each version coloured differently, of course. At the same time, the "lads with blue eyes" will annihilate every possible alternative: they will divide it, demonise it or ridicule it, or all of these at once — anything to hold back a feeling of discontent which will grow as financial troubles multiply.

#TheCoalitionOfBetrayal, though it will remain functional in fact, will break up, probably in the first half of the year. No, they will not quarrel over the national interest; they will have to mime a struggle led by the future presidential contenders, two of the "puppets" of whom I spoke.

Our resources will continue to be "externalised", out of "solidarity" with the old continent, of course.

We shall be still poorer, still more frightened, still more divided.

So much for the "prophecies". For beyond the rather sombre landscape which I believe the future holds for us, we shall have to do what we know to be right and what we know we must do. Whatever the chances of success, whatever the utterly disproportionate strength of the adversary. The truth must be confessed at any price; the good must be done at any risk.

That is why next year too we shall go on doing what we have to do:

#TheCoalitionForTheNation will launch the most interesting programme of... but that I shall tell you presently.

And, as you already know... #TheConstitutionOfSovereignty will enter public debate from January — debates which will themselves displease the System, I know that. But they will also give rise to a great deal of discussion and polemic among men of good faith, discussion apt to awaken consciences... perhaps even the national conscience. For yes, I assure you that the discussions concerning #Constitution2023 will mark the coming year (let that be part of the "prophecy" too).

In short, as the poet says: "Be it one thing, be it another... what is written for us too, we shall bear it all gladly, be it peace, be it war."

I have left above the "prophecies" made exactly a year ago, for the year 2023, of course. I leave it to you to draw up the balance of what came true.

By tomorrow I shall try to set down the forecasts for 2024 as well.

Until then, let us try to be optimistic.

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQHwbRyVEEpDqnUmc9tR_Y7J-DmzMVTijj2SuxEH3cf3oUy3jo2lP7OMdZDCjIEybxLX-SQ3-UehwEFr1ioCX1GjFGapb-mjTax3VYJeBRFeamFhQD0Yyr_G4dOiA2cEzjMTwRnth5YMlIkcf2S5lL6VUR4Ey3DKlqYKSkvFvFaou9pDD7GMOBHk-nLuU9O4LXHpb95sCnmWBaIMrmpP52JN6Rup&s=518⟩

---

204. 28 January 2024 — "The steamroller of sexo-Marxism has reached the Balkans too. Greece is the first victim. Romania follows,..."

The steamroller of sexo-Marxism has reached the Balkans too. Greece is the first victim. Romania is next, at best next year, after the elections. If not sooner.

That is why I have opened the discussions and the preparations within the Romanian Sovereigntist Bloc for setting in motion the procedures to amend the Constitution — a Constitution in which it will have to be stated expressly that "the family is founded upon the freely consented marriage between two persons of opposite sex, born male and female..."

That is why we shall have to gather millions of signatures for #TheConstitutionOfSovereignty.

Let me hear our detractors now, telling us again that the undertaking is of no use...

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQFzIR5V0Vn9WQqZcCjAk-Casy0Euy4_12V_eNOMOQsiE6uDV8vY0AKz8tIX5WXp3ZRycmdSHaZcfFXAUnZrzSPOypHWhPBrucrzTSCV54yuEB0R6ufchPtt-DFYLiNV2DJFdyR4S58eMqjIPW8p0insX72L5gS7I-wpP8a2CRf_Y9sMxRgXrLPOHYzYf4IfksKIC9CAtGVRIKNrBFOO3W3u3h6Pg&s=518⟩

205. 2 February 2024 — "By way of conclusion after the launch of the "Constitution of AUR""

In place of a conclusion, after the launching of "AUR's Constitution"

If the System wished to create a valve for releasing the sovereigntists' fury, this is how it would go about it: it would amend 3 paragraphs of public impact but utterly neutral — some of them indeed favourable — for the Securitate men and the oligarchs, deceiving a few weighty names into supporting the "great reform". Moreover, it would be the ideal vehicle for certain accepted, if not favoured, parties to reach a significant but not decisive percentage.

Because... in the end... who has the most black money, who has a great deal of cash from border trafficking, from drugs, from anything at all — trafficking controlled by "them" as well?

Why, "they" do. The men of the System. All of us together have not as much cash as the crumbs in the "pocket" of one of them.

And so, leaning upon our legitimate wish to be free to hold cash... they will be able to launder wholesale, as they do now, the immense sums of cash they have. It is that simple.

Then the wording "man and woman" proposed for article 48 of the Constitution, too vague in our days, will also permit marriage between transgender persons... you will see then a flood of sex-change operations. There will come, besides, a decision of the European Court of Human Rights or of the Court of Justice of the European Union which Romania will be obliged to observe under the present article 148 of the Constitution... and that will be that: we shall be a rainbow country and a "traditionalist" one at the same time.

In truth, without radical, far-reaching amendments to the Constitution which strengthen all the citizen's rights as a whole and which attempt to annihilate the "omnipotence" of the System, the three amendments proposed by AUR are merely a cosmetic touch upon the squalor of the Romanian state... in fact, an electoral vehicle. And nothing more.

And the first purpose of it is to smother the only real constitutional reform that would take place in Romania in the past 33 years: #TheConstitutionOfSovereignty, the only one capable of creating #TheThirdRepublic, a republic of the citizens. It is exactly what they did during the collection of signatures for #TheSovereigntyAct. The same people. Again against us.

And, as then, so today, we received assurances at the highest level that we should work together and gather signatures together for both projects.

For all that — old and already burned so many times — I still believe in honour and good faith.

I know, every chance is that I shall be burned once more... I know that very well.

What is very sad is that, unfortunately, none of this was noticed by many, very many valuable people — most valuable people, whom I sincerely love and admire — which is why they fell into this very skilfully laid trap... and that is one more proof that the System does not sleep.

And yet... what if I have been wrong? What if I am accusing these people, who want the good of the country, for nothing? What if I am sinning by accusing them of betrayal and villainy for nothing?

What if they really do gather signatures for #TheConstitutionOfSovereignty as well?

Then I shall ask forgiveness and weep bitterly.

And I shall even vote for their presidential candidate...

The future will prove and demonstrate to us... whether the past mends itself in a loop, whether he who stings you two or three times can also be honest once, and whether the System is truly in all things and everywhere.

(On the Sovereignty Act: the full text of the bill — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQFxj20eElwmEeHXPyEIO-xu9z3xfiFq0wCjpft3p8Shr8YNkEcgTXoIAWRQ7UWI46MM97Hu7IQSXOas-FVC_ULV6KDO5ItOJ_Egc0rgh7BOASs2V_C1eTWAIDrGPRilvWFZp-DzQZnuZ6kdhy-uyXOyma-8z-6FO5NfLKLlY5_auqglIZSmsRjIA8w_Le0ddm7BDlxpANQ4xvp8A95tLwYvxYOU4&s=518⟩

---

206. 2 February 2024 — "Disinformation in prime time on Antena 3!!!"

Disinformation in prime time on Antena 3!!!

They have just said that the Sovereigntist Bloc wants the Constitution revised (which is true) and a monarchy established with "a monarch from the imperial house of Japan, of conduct above all suspicion" (which is FALSE!)!!!

In reality, this "original" opinion belongs to Pavel Șuian, a former Romanian diplomat, who said in an interview for România Liberă that Romanians would need "a monarch from the imperial house of Japan, of conduct above all suspicion, of unrivalled prestige in the world, who could restore to Romanians the hope of national rebirth."

In reality, the Sovereigntist Bloc alliance is putting forward a revision bill called the #ConstitutionOfSovereignty, seeking a #ThirdRepublic and not a monarchy — if only because art. 152 of the present Constitution, headed "Limits of revision", expressly provides that

"(1) The provisions of this Constitution concerning the national, independent, unitary and indivisible character of the Romanian State, the republican form of government, the integrity of the territory, the independence of the judiciary, political pluralism and the official language may not be the object of revision."

So even if we wanted a monarchy, the present Constitution does not allow it. It is simple!

Discussion is good, however original it may be. Disinformation is NOT!

What remains, therefore, is the DISINFORMATION put out by Antena 3.

A sign that our revision project is a real danger to the System.

Our project — not other people's minor copies!

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQE-UKH8LipsJyD3s3kJZeStSU6P-XiqdfgZEKqv-PONzJCEsxf2cBE-Q5wxZHbNSv_dxMxJfvYKuDYliTnVm1XChwofcbj6Ps611fDAJfQlK6So1PBNTbksz-4Sn6JrB-f1KPUjaIVZmb99uHTpRKfJgU5fcXn-VHgQUe6QJu6ak1nOVaWZOM3_3ELhgjyisxJ8afB2mTH13G6aqamKGRWhcwey4&s=518⟩

---

207. 11 March 2024 — "We are beginning the legal procedure for the popular legislative initiatives the Constitution of Sovereignty..."

We are beginning the legal procedure for the popular legislative initiatives "Constitution of Sovereignty" and "Solidarity Law".

Anyone wishing to be part of the initiative committee is asked to send their identity card to notariatvisu@gmail.com, the e-mail address of the VISU Corneliu Individual Notarial Office, at 44

Mendeleev Street, 2nd floor, flat 4, District 1, Bucharest (near Piața Romană), by tomorrow, 12.03.2024, at 12.00;

the signing of the documents provided for by Law 189/1999 will take place at the same address between 15.00 and 16.30, likewise tomorrow, 12.03.2024.

To date, Mrs Gabriela Baltag and Mr Dan Puric have also joined this project!

(On the Solidarity Law: the full text of the bill — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQHy1n-eR__agkDD3r5U1FTD6oq1gnyAYjhDY3SWf-dYk_7VfWEGcirtSf6tAr98QtSlDPFv4jos1YptA61eZcWBQXCnBRzmNuZaIwL0CtRMzeEQKXNNy0RUs72nHbSkGpVssk4ICXDhaIV2Ix20VIvmNV26P-QQQc4m1Y35zI-ar2ZbD_mhRqGhs14LOyOr8fh9xS2ZzLbYpeloRXmhaKQiSX-gxg&s=518⟩

---

208. 13 March 2024 — "Today, 13.03.2024, pursuant to Act 189/1999, there were submitted to the Legislative Council for an opin..."

Today, 13.03.2024, under Law 189/1999, the bills "#ConstitutionOfSovereignty" and "#SolidarityLaw" were filed with the Legislative Council for its opinion.

This is the moment to say a great thank you to the person whose contribution to these two bills, and to the #SovereigntyLaw, was decisive:

Without the rigour, the inspiration and the consummate legislative craft of my friend Ingrid, all these citizens' legislative initiatives would have been no more than declarations of good intentions.

I also thank here every person who made direct and substantial contributions, such as Mrs Gabriela Baltag, or gave extremely valuable advice and suggestions, such as Mr Adrian Severin, Mr Toni Neacșu, Mr Valentin Busuioc, or Mr Sorin Roșca Stănescu.

Not least, I say THANK YOU to the members of the Coalition for the Nation and to the dozens of "ordinary citizens" who took part in the debates and who made this initiative a living one, brought to completion through a long dialogue and through debates that were at times stormy.

After the opinions are obtained, in about 30 days, and after publication in the Official Gazette, comes the hardest stage — the one in which we shall need to gather at least 500,000 signatures.

That will be the stage in which every one of you will be needed.

That is why we invite you to become VOLUNTEERS for the CONSTITUTION OF SOVEREIGNTY by signing up here: https://www.constitutiasuveranitatii.ro/deveniti-voluntar/

And for that I THANK YOU already, every future VOLUNTEER!

Your unborn children and grandchildren will thank you for it too, I assure you!

(On the Referendum Law: the full text of the bill — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQGC_NjfEhlipYXmEnmonUs8wbkAtRIC9PDE-GhkZ7DeaxcwDp-MYCGyddDut2TOgpJMxI10CBzNhNeMsZySkN-wxZpXfZ7OkhZXfzCboEqsvpiR2vsjOS0PwcVbkfp3jmqZtVEXIM6-1hXxX9DUvetM_1m6DqLHJf7ZtKeYZ3rL9Q8Iqql-doU3XlhXQDZBhL-n6w10fegpYxQBLLdlCFYuqQX0&s=518⟩

---

209. 13 March 2024 — "After a sitting of more than 4 hours, until close to midnight"

After a meeting of more than 4 hours, lasting until close to midnight,

the Coalition for the Nation, following the new course assumed by the new leadership of the Romanian Sovereigntist Bloc,

has decided to leave the BSR political alliance.

The reasons behind this decision are:

— the failure to take ownership of the Constitution of Sovereignty project and of the principles set out in the political programme "The Third Republic" put to the alliance by the CpN;

— the violent rejection of support for the candidacy of Mr Dan Puric, held to be "pro-Russian", and the support, even if only hypothetical, for the candidacy of Mr Mircea Geoană;

— the failure to observe minimal democratic rules in taking decisions within the BSR, even so much as convening meetings and publishing the agenda before sittings at which crucial decisions are taken, such as admitting new members to the alliance or electing a new president of the alliance/party.

Without wishing to enter into sterile disputes with our former allies,

we wish that God may show them the best path for the people they wish to represent and to lead!

We, the Coalition for the Nation, shall go on supporting the programme "The Third Republic" and the "Constitution of Sovereignty".

(On the Constitution of Sovereignty: the full text of the bill — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQEUViohKs-xLl2PPbKJn29naFJMvuyhab99MuCbc_zGxmTqGS4Wxl4crNQ_LpXtf7A-bDzUiDdgGVL3Ki-nX1sN6OO-ZoL0utxb43npWj8OGJe0_pc-dTz3ILGchFg3v2TIy4SV7to2tVJcosJ7y0m5CuPIIiPJGG8_CQwjj5gkmrBfEumS0UM1qWaCyOAHGyojHjoVgCcmFd2rhNNDHCOqpyNM&s=518⟩

---

210. 12 June 2024 — On the Third Republic

On the Demilitarisation Law: the full text of the bill — see the page Demilitarisation Law.

For those who can still hope, for those who still want to believe: an appeal for unity for a sovereign Romania, for a THIRD REPUBLIC!

This post is not for everyone. It is only for those few among us who, understanding and accepting reality, can nevertheless still hope and still want to believe. Personally... I am striving with all my might to be one of them, because, beyond the personal success of certain political leaders — whom I sincerely congratulate here — I cannot fail to note the electoral disaster of the patriotic and sovereigntist movement in Romania. Yes, it was a disaster: to be voted for by only 20% of the electorate after the horrors of the plandemic and the imminent catastrophe in Ukraine is a disaster. I shall not comment here and now on the causes or the responsibilities for that disaster. Not now, because right now I want to believe that it is not all over yet, that our generation has not failed.

Right now I stubbornly hope and believe that something can still be done!

And that is why I propose that, at the eleventh hour, we all gather together — "AUR people", "Șoșoacă people", "CpN people", "Peasantists", "patriots", "nationalists" — around a single project, to give Romania a chance, to prepare for the autumn elections.

The project I put to you is the CONSTITUTION OF SOVEREIGNTY — THE THIRD REPUBLIC, the constitutional amendment bill published on Friday, 7 June 2024, in Official Gazette no. 531, which you can find here: http://www.monitoruljuridic.ro/act/ini-iativ-legislativ-din-7-iunie-20...

We need 500,000 signatures, which we must gather in the next 4 months (the last 2 months being set aside for the formalities), in order to send to Parliament this project which will change Romania from its foundations — as is already confirmed by the mud with which the systemic-globalist press has greeted it. But beyond the deep reform of Romania brought by the 50 amendments proposed to the Constitution of Romania, this project may be the last chance to come together for the final assault we must prepare for this autumn — an assault in which names and personal vanities will count for very little and in which only the principles and values that unite us will be able to make the difference.

That is why I invite you all to take part in this last effort and to sign up as volunteers in the coming days at https://www.constitutiasuveranitatii.ro/deveniti-voluntar/. If we are enough volunteers, our project will have a chance... and together we shall be able to go on believing and hoping!

And we have both cause and purpose to come together in this colossal collective effort which it is our duty to make, for this is how we fight for:

1. strengthening and guaranteeing the rights of the citizen (articles 1, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 34, 44 and 48 of the Constitution will be amended and supplemented), namely:

— the express mention of the equality of the three powers gives them, in addition, a constitutional guarantee and, at the level of cooperation between them, excludes any tendency towards a possible ranking among them;

— the essence of the rule of law is compliance with court judgments; the practice of recent years and the conduct of those called upon to comply with a court judgment have confirmed that a constitutional enshrinement of this obligation is needed;

— internationally, the phrase "optimal and predictable" has been used since 2004; it is more current and consistent with the reality of the legislation, with its application and with the real dysfunctions, namely the heavy workload, the shortage of staff and logistics, the unstable legislation;

— the prohibition of subjecting citizens to experimental medical treatments, or to any medical treatment whatsoever without the written, full and honestly informed consent of the patient;

— protection of children's sexual identity acquired at birth;

— the pre-trial detention warrant is issued by the judge of rights and liberties. It is important that this measure be taken only by a judge of the court with material jurisdiction to try the merits of the case, avoiding the situation in which detention is ordered by a judge of another court situated in the same territorial area as the prosecutor's office making the application, while the trial is conducted by a different court (a situation existing in current judicial practice). The provisions on pre-trial detention (including those on jurisdiction) must be regulated at constitutional level, since individual liberty must be protected from arbitrariness at that level;

— the prohibition of surveillance of the Romanian citizen without the prior authorisation of the court;

— without the express mention of a penalty under the law, the constitutional text does not require the enactment of binding rules to prevent the possible use of unlawfully obtained evidence;

— the principle of equality of arms between prosecution and defence is a necessity, being a guarantee of the parties' right to a fair trial under art. 6 ECHR, a guarantee imposed as a mandatory requirement by the European Court in all cases ending in the conviction of the Romanian State;

— the additional guarantee of the inviolability of the home must be taken into account, because a search is sometimes ordered by a tribunal in a case in which jurisdiction to try the merits belongs to the court of appeal;

— a practice has taken hold which has wrongly become the rule, of issuing authorisations at the stage of preliminary acts, when, in order to guarantee citizens' rights, the requirement of the opening of a criminal investigation ought to be imposed. Not infrequently, recourse is had to special laws (the National Security Law) with more generous limits in this matter as regards the conditions of the authorisation given by the judge. In this latter case the random allocation system, mandatory in all other cases in which a court is seised, is circumvented, since the judges of the High Court of Cassation and Justice who issue national security warrants are "specially designated" judges, not subject to the principle of random allocation;

— strengthening and guaranteeing the right to a defence without interference or conditions on the part of the State;

— the prohibition of limiting or making conditional the obtaining, holding and use of any currency in cash;

— the family founded on the freely consented marriage between two people of opposite sex, born man and woman;

— the right of the person to self-determine and to develop freely according to their own free will;

— the prohibition of increasing, diminishing, disturbing or altering the physical or mental individual integrity of the person by technological means without their consent;

2. limiting the power and influence of the intelligence services over society (articles 40, 116, 118, 119 will be amended and supplemented), namely:

— members and former members of the intelligence services may not hold appointed or elected public office for a period of 5 years from the cessation of those functions;

— the intelligence services and those assimilated to them will be organised exclusively on a civilian basis, under the conditions of the law, which means the demilitarisation of the intelligence services;

— the heads of the intelligence services will be appointed by Parliament in a joint sitting of the two chambers;

3. increasing the power of Parliament (articles 62, 65, 72, 74, 75, 108, 115, 118, 119 and 146 will be amended and supplemented), namely:

— strengthening democracy and increasing the representativeness of Parliament by imposing at constitutional level an electoral threshold of 1% for entry into Parliament;

— Parliament will designate the Prosecutor General and the Chief Prosecutors of the National Anti-corruption Directorate and of the Directorate for Investigating Organised Crime and Terrorism;

— we favour the removal of the final sentence concerning the revocation by the Chamber of the measure taken in the case of a flagrant offence. The interference of the Chambers, by revoking such measures in the course of a criminal trial, infringes the principle of the separation of powers in the State and the independence of the judiciary;

— lowering the number of signatures required for a citizens' legislative initiative from 100,000 to 30,000;

— abolishing the tacit adoption of laws;

— limiting the legislative delegation to the executive;

— the exclusive right of Parliament to give prior consent for foreign troops to enter, be stationed or conduct operations on Romanian territory in peacetime;

— the inclusion in the Supreme Council of National Defence of the speakers of the two Chambers of Parliament;

— lowering the number of members of Parliament who may refer a matter to the Constitutional Court from 50 to 20 deputies and, respectively, from 25 to 10 senators;

4. diminishing the power of the President (articles 83, 90, 94, 103, 142 will be amended and supplemented), namely:

— reducing the President's term from 5 to 4 years;

— limiting the President's right to call referendums;

— the President will award the ranks of marshal, general and admiral only with the binding opinion of the specialised committees of Parliament;

— obliging the President to designate as candidate for Prime Minister the candidate put forward by the party with the largest number of members of Parliament;

— the President will no longer appoint judges to the Constitutional Court;

5. strengthening and guaranteeing the independence of the judiciary (articles 124, 125, 126, 132, 133, 134, 146 and 147 will be amended and supplemented), namely:

— increasing administrative control at court level by enlarging the power of court presidents (evaluation, designation to other management posts, delegation, secondment, transfer) is an obvious danger to the independence of judges, an independence which must be guaranteed at the highest level;

— the non-involvement and non-membership of judges in the secret services, and also in occult, secret or discreet associations and societies, is mandatory;

— the exclusion of the political factor from the appointment of judges, namely of the President of Romania; this mechanism must be rethought, given that proposals for appointment belong to the guarantor of the independence of the judiciary, namely the Superior Council of the Magistracy; for prosecutors, the proposal for appointment may be made by the Public Ministry, whose powers are at present exercised through the Prosecutor's Office attached to the High Court of Cassation and Justice;

— besides teaching posts in higher education, the presence of judges must also be guaranteed in teaching posts at the National Institute of Magistracy (which may in future be rethought as the National Institute of Judges) and the National School of Clerks. Similar additions may be made as regards the presence of prosecutors in teaching posts at the National Institute of Magistracy (which may in future be rethought as the National Institute of Prosecutors) and the National School of Clerks;

— the independence of the judiciary can be guaranteed only by judges, since only they enjoy real independence. It is therefore necessary to rethink at constitutional level the authority which provides guarantees of judicial independence and thereby consolidates the rule of law, namely the Superior Council of the Magistracy, of which prosecutors will no longer be members;

— the Superior Council of the Magistracy may comprise a maximum of 10 judges, each elected by the general assemblies of judges across the whole country, a circumstance apt to ensure full representativeness of those elected (who, moreover, represent all judges and not only those of the court from which they come). The structure of the number of judges corresponding to each court must be rethought, in relation to the number of courts and of judges existing nationally;

— the length of members' terms must be rethought, since the six-year period has not always produced the best results, but only a consolidation of influence and of the abuse of power;

— likewise, it must be expressly stated at constitutional level that the term of the president of the Superior Council of Judges is one year, and that this term of office may not be extended, renewed or subjected to any other "legal innovation";

— the provision concerning the participation of the President of Romania in the sittings of the Council, introduced at the 2003 revision, must be repealed;

— the procedural rules concerning the decisions handed down by the Superior Council of Judges must be removed and readapted as regards their legal nature and the remedy against them;

— the Constitutional Court will be able to find a treaty unconstitutional even after ratification;

— failure by judges and prosecutors to comply with the decisions of the Constitutional Court will constitute a disciplinary offence and will be sanctioned under conditions laid down by an organic law;

6. defending and increasing the national wealth (articles 116, 136, 140 will be amended and supplemented), namely:

— minimum and maximum budgets set by the constitution: 6% — education, 9% — health, 2% — defence in peacetime;

— appointed public offices, or the offices and positions filled by direct designation, will be held for a maximum of 2 terms of up to 4 years;

— the royalties due under concession contracts will be updated to the level of prices in the European Union every five years;

— the Court of Accounts will monitor the management of public resources and will report its findings to Parliament at least once a year, the Report being public;

7. strengthening democracy, guaranteeing national sovereignty and defending the Supremacy of the Constitution and of the sovereign interest of the people in the conduct of international relations (articles 70, 97, 120, 148 and 149 will be amended and supplemented), namely:

— the possibility of removing by referendum those elected by direct vote: the President, members of Parliament, mayors and presidents of county councils;

— the fulfilment of obligations undertaken by Romania through treaties only in compliance with the Constitution of Romania and in the higher and sovereign interest of the Romanian people;

— Romania's accession to, and withdrawal from, international bodies and alliances will be effected only by a law adopted by the sovereign decision of the Romanian people expressed by referendum.

Our fate and that of our children, the future of Romania, depend on us alone!

Can you still believe and hope that together we can change something?

(On the Demilitarisation Law: the full text of the bill — see page 000.)

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQEOnehRikej6KxIJGzPgVqzD7TTImMs_rLGvmsdUJg0l9UU-gnwV-CbWaySTLr2jTTg_4ftxQIY3SlfIr5u-FEpLbZk-ww_tevXqZskOpOJ_7ioDmhHmY2zHQjKvMnFVEfspHY4Nd7xVRzSdvLa3jObyfHRqHO-t-Tl_Ra4MtuzdXwlkwJxeVChLjlMmNCnePHvXqom-NaQsNAqLvI90l7IuLds&s=518⟩

211. 25 June 2024 — On the integrity of the person

On the Constitution of Sovereignty: the full text of the bill — see the page Constitution of Sovereignty.

Do you want the Constitution to prohibit the increasing, diminishing, disturbing or altering of the physical or mental individual integrity of the person by technological means without their consent?

If YES, we must gather signatures for the #ConstitutionOfSovereignty!

BECOME VOLUNTEERS by signing up at https://www.constitutiasuveranitatii.ro/deveniti-voluntar/ !!!

I remind you that we have ONLY 3 MONTHS to gather 500,000 signatures in order to send to Parliament the constitutional amendment bill published in Official Gazette no. 531/2024.

(On the Constitution of Sovereignty: the full text of the bill — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQH5FiVGUw-nqTyzM77wvn6tR0hQWdsBRB2bFU0EiFsvZhjccMqJFLITypo5AgCq-tZn-oJI9hr-dubyr3MSd_hT4tnXlF9otpXiRA3mBcWMC22ny736NoROa-biFZFKgkDBL4JdXRuyQI_dDCcdueC4Xo0mPFdhEhbODmXyQ_FKPdOdVOC_mVmNwXbx3tsyS-wdJ6ZdMx8X21En-K8Vqfehx47V8&s=518⟩

212. 28 June 2024 — “Twelve days ago we launched the signature-gathering campaign for #ConstituțiaSuveranității”

Twelve days ago we launched the signature-gathering campaign for the #ConstitutionOfSovereignty.

I waited for those at AUR to offer support, as Claudiu Târziu personally undertook to do.

Nothing — not the slightest trace of honouring their own commitments, either from Târziu or from Simion... as usual!

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQF1sMXMks9hOuRB6R9pwFMOvJNHpcoapDJGTFRgy9Fqfn38qheocB8EgPF6UwuU10LauL25sKyoBqHEWYfs126c-QjH_IKW56y4W-ArZm4vi58D4VzP6hrXRpjCA30eHi_n80lSqqAvxMLMDyXYvtPLmGxjqxOyt3xvMbNGj3K_zzWUqiFtparP8E6_Ay8T7AO_ZZFQTwORkS8z0JFLWngD5sZo&s=518⟩

213. 22 July 2024 — On the composition of the Superior Council of Magistracy

On the Constitution of Sovereignty: the full text of the bill — see the page Constitution of Sovereignty.

Do you want the independence of the judiciary to be strengthened and guaranteed, including by excluding prosecutors from the Superior Council of the Magistracy, the Superior Council of the Magistracy to be made up of 15 members, of whom:

a) 10 are elected by the general assemblies of judges and validated by the Senate; these are elected as follows:

— 2 from among the judges of the courts of first instance, by the judges serving in those courts;

— 3 from among the judges of the tribunals, by the judges serving in the tribunals;

— 3 from among the judges of the courts of appeal, by the judges serving in the courts of appeal;

— 2 from among the judges of the High Court of Cassation and Justice, one elected by the judges serving in the criminal division and one elected by the judges serving in the other divisions;

b) 2 representatives of civil society, specialists in the field of law, enjoying high professional and moral repute, who have not been members of political parties in the last 5 years, elected by the Senate; they take part only in the plenary proceedings;

c) the minister of justice, the president of the High Court of Cassation and Justice and the prosecutor general of the Prosecutor's Office attached to the High Court of Cassation and Justice?

If YES, we must gather signatures for the #ConstitutionOfSovereignty!

BECOME VOLUNTEERS by signing up at https://www.constitutiasuveranitatii.ro/deveniti-voluntar/ !!!

I remind you that we have ONLY 3 MONTHS to gather 500,000 signatures in order to send to Parliament the constitutional amendment bill published in Official Gazette no. 531/2024.

Instructions for filling in the "List of Supporters"

of the citizens' legislative initiative entitled

"Constitution of Sovereignty — THE THIRD REPUBLIC",

published in the Official Gazette of Romania, Part I, no. 531/7.VI.2024

1. Download and print ONLY the List made available by the initiative Committee.

2. Fill in the List writing neatly and preferably in block capitals — illegible or partly illegible entries will be annulled!!!

3. Each "List of Supporters" is to be filled in with the details of citizens domiciled in a SINGLE Administrative-Territorial Unit (UAT), that is, citizens domiciled within the area of ONE SINGLE TOWN HALL (what matters is the formal domicile, the one on the Identity Card, not the actual one — the residence!). In Bucharest, Lists are to be drawn up for each District separately. More precisely, if we have before us 3 citizens domiciled in 3 different UATs, we shall draw up three different lists. By way of example: one citizen domiciled in Bucharest District 1, one in District 3 and a third in the commune of Vânători, Giurgiu County — we shall draw up 3 Lists of Supporters: one for the Municipality of Bucharest District 1, one for the Municipality of Bucharest District 3 and one for Giurgiu County, commune of Vânători. Those in the diaspora will proceed in exactly the same way: a person living in London but whose domicile (last domicile) on their identity document is in the commune of Vânători, Giurgiu County, must be entered on a separate list from another person also living in London but whose domicile on their identity card is in Bucharest District 3.

4. We, the volunteers, must fill in each field carefully, checking the accuracy of the details on the identity cards.

5. Under "Domicile" we enter only the street..., number..., block..., flat...; the details concerning the County or the Municipality of Bucharest, and respectively the Town, Commune or District, are to be entered EXCLUSIVELY in the field at the head of the table.

6. The signature must be handwritten, made in person by the holder of the Identity Card! and by no one else!!!

7. At the foot of the page, the full details of the "authorised person" are to be entered — that is, the identification details and signature of the volunteer collecting the signatures. The same requirements as above must be observed in this section too.

8. Volunteers (and only volunteers!!!) are asked to send, together with the "Lists of Supporters", a copy of their own Identity Card. This precaution is necessary in order to prevent the infiltration of

possible saboteurs who might attempt to submit lists with false signatures. NOTE: lists of signatures not accompanied by a photocopy of the identity document of the "authorised person" cannot be used (this applies only to Volunteers who have not already sent a photocopy of their identity document!).

9. You may be a volunteer either for yourself alone, or by gathering signatures only from your family and friends.

10. Send the lists to 7 Hristo Botev Blvd., 4th floor, flat 4, District 3, PO 030231, Bucharest, addressee: the Initiative Committee of the Constitution of Sovereignty.

We thank you for your involvement and for your support in regaining Romania's Sovereignty and restoring the Dignity of the Romanian citizen! It is our only chance!

The Initiative Committee of the Constitution of Sovereignty

GIVE ROMANIA A CHANCE! BECOME VOLUNTEERS BY GOING TO

https://www.ConstitutiaSuveranitatii.ro/deveniti-voluntar/

(On the Constitution of Sovereignty: the full text of the bill — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQHSIg-5zBgUxBn-gkMrnkTB8ZU6eiWtF6Djm9VEQeTO1qDSXJcDFpW6rdwJGhXcQBBfZ7fUo-UHoMq52nUm-fJTR_W-meB_podWBK712TvqadgyfezOedytMu387WLTyva7B4aJ2fdRYUFR_GbNQYPpxeoMiQwIrFYGPIJoEBYGWhExqlxH0viw20pQ0Kdx8nJhD1AQsLhJnbJkwdCsmzrNcm59U&s=518⟩

---

214. 26 July 2024 — On the liability of magistrates

On the Constitution of Sovereignty: the full text of the bill — see the page Constitution of Sovereignty.

Do you want the Constitution to establish the accountability of magistrates — judges and prosecutors to be first investigated by the judicial inspectorate (which will operate under the authority of the minister of justice) and tried by the Superior Council of the Magistracy, which will act as the tribunal in matters of disciplinary liability of judges and prosecutors, the Decisions of the Superior Council of the Magistracy in disciplinary matters being open to appeal before the High Court of Cassation and Justice (before which may likewise be challenged the decisions of the Superior Council of the Magistracy refusing to impose disciplinary sanctions on judges and prosecutors)?

If YES, we must gather signatures for the #ConstitutionOfSovereignty!

BECOME VOLUNTEERS by signing up at https://www.constitutiasuveranitatii.ro/deveniti-voluntar/ !!!

I remind you that we have ONLY 3 MONTHS to gather 500,000 signatures in order to send to Parliament the constitutional amendment bill published in Official Gazette no. 531/2024.

Instructions for filling in the "List of Supporters"

of the citizens' legislative initiative entitled

"Constitution of Sovereignty — THE THIRD REPUBLIC",

published in the Official Gazette of Romania, Part I, no. 531/7.VI.2024

1. Download and print ONLY the List made available by the initiative Committee.

2. Fill in the List writing neatly and preferably in block capitals — illegible or partly illegible entries will be annulled!!!

3. Each "List of Supporters" is to be filled in with the details of citizens domiciled in a SINGLE Administrative-Territorial Unit (UAT), that is, citizens domiciled within the area of ONE SINGLE TOWN HALL (what matters is the formal domicile, the one on the Identity Card, not the actual one — the residence!). In Bucharest, Lists are to be drawn up for each District separately. More precisely, if we have before us 3 citizens domiciled in 3 different UATs, we shall draw up three different lists. By way of example: one citizen domiciled in Bucharest District 1, one in District 3 and a third in the commune of Vânători, Giurgiu County — we shall draw up 3 Lists of Supporters: one for the Municipality of Bucharest District 1, one for the Municipality of Bucharest District 3 and one for Giurgiu County, commune of Vânători. Those in the diaspora will proceed in exactly the same way: a person living in London but whose domicile (last domicile) on their identity document is in the commune of Vânători, Giurgiu County, must be entered on a separate list from another person also living in London but whose domicile on their identity card is in Bucharest District 3.

4. We, the volunteers, must fill in each field carefully, checking the accuracy of the details on the identity cards.

5. Under "Domicile" we enter only the street..., number..., block..., flat...; the details concerning the County or the Municipality of Bucharest, and respectively the Town, Commune or District, are to be entered EXCLUSIVELY in the field at the head of the table.

6. The signature must be handwritten, made in person by the holder of the Identity Card! and by no one else!!!

7. At the foot of the page, the full details of the "authorised person" are to be entered — that is, the identification details and signature of the volunteer collecting the signatures. The same requirements as above must be observed in this section too.

8. Volunteers (and only volunteers!!!) are asked to send, together with the "Lists of Supporters", a copy of their own Identity Card. This precaution is necessary in order to prevent the infiltration of possible saboteurs who might attempt to submit lists with false signatures. NOTE: lists of signatures not accompanied by a photocopy of the identity document of the "authorised person" cannot be used (this applies only to Volunteers who have not already sent a photocopy of their identity document!).

9. You may be a volunteer either for yourself alone, or by gathering signatures only from your family and friends.

10. Send the lists to 7 Hristo Botev Blvd., 4th floor, flat 4, District 3, PO 030231, Bucharest, addressee: the Initiative Committee of the Constitution of Sovereignty.

We thank you for your involvement and for your support in regaining Romania's Sovereignty and restoring the Dignity of the Romanian citizen! It is our only chance!

The Initiative Committee of the Constitution of Sovereignty

GIVE ROMANIA A CHANCE! BECOME VOLUNTEERS BY GOING TO

https://www.ConstitutiaSuveranitatii.ro/deveniti-voluntar/

(On the Constitution of Sovereignty: the full text of the bill — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQFFd6lLAOA-dOCRgC2YhtE80TwFZEqARI4OWHrck2kOP-XolSP2qv7oTAUx4ZRw396tq3LOC–4sJGxkAV5nRGtC4JP-bX8iMAB0JtVK3r3UnIF0ToOh-MXJWn4CYyHIMYVeoiIx_4nuVmFoN2mYCqQ6rnyBz5VPMPqvOcGzCzIk1ANVk1Z9x5R6M9Qf696t-n2CvCM33GDDTPPO0SymyqQUR6I&s=518⟩

215. 10 August 2024 — On changing the system

On the Constitution of Sovereignty: the full text of the bill — see the page Constitution of Sovereignty.

Changing the keys of a computer will not improve, still less change, the operating system. Just as the most virtuoso pianist in the world, set before the keys of an untuned piano, will manage neither to perform a score coherently and harmoniously, nor to tune the piano "on the fly".

That is why I have been and shall remain convinced that the solution for reforming a dysfunctional system, for correcting and improving it, is to "rewrite" the system itself, and not merely to change its "operators".

Merely changing the "operators" of that perverted, virus-ridden system, one which has become non-functional and even harmful, cannot lead to the correction of the system but, most probably, to the perversion and "infection" of the operators, even when they are, ab initio, in good faith.

Without "rewriting the operating system", or at least without setting clear, coherent objectives framed within a synthetic vision aimed at a deep reform of the State, any "change" is nothing other than what the Poet impeccably summed up in the lines "Other masks, the same play; other mouths, the same scale"...

That is why I personally believed that a reset and an "upgrade" of the "system" must be carried out from outside the system, directly by the beneficiaries of the "system" — by the citizens themselves! and only in their interest. And since the virus-ridden, non-functional "system", the "untuned piano" of which I speak, is the Romanian State itself, I believed that the one who must reset the system, who must tune the piano by himself and for himself, is the Romanian citizen himself, that "ordinary citizen" in the street.

As an "ordinary citizen", alongside you, "ordinary citizens", I tried to do this three years ago with the #SovereigntyLaw (the moment when the concept of "sovereigntism" was born in Romania), two years ago with the #SolidarityLaw, and this year, after two and a half years of extensive discussions and public consultations, alongside some of the greatest legal specialists of our time, I put forward the #ConstitutionOfSovereignty.

For more than a month I have been speaking to you about this last one and I have explained as concisely as I could how the proposed amendments strengthen and guarantee the rights of the Romanian citizen, limit the power and influence of the intelligence services over society, increase the power of Parliament and diminish the power of the President, strengthen democracy and guarantee the independence of the judiciary, defend sovereignty and increase the national wealth.

And I invited you to become volunteers for it.

Of course, I understood that the System in operation, perverted and virus-ridden as it is, and its operators, perverted and infected in their turn, would react and reject as a foreign body any proposal for change, any attempt to tune a piano too worn to sound harmonious again. Which is exactly what happened. The #SovereigntyLaw was brutally thrown out in Parliament in 2022 by the #CoalitionOfBetrayal, and this year the Legislative Council showed its true colours and made a fool of itself with the opinion it gave on the #ConstitutionOfSovereignty. But all this I expected.

What I did not expect was to receive no support, not so much as a sign, from any of the great leaders who preach sovereigntism — enlightened leaders, indeed, whose names I am not even worthy to utter. For yes, I went and, humbly, I asked for their support and offered unconditionally the entire constitutional amendment project to each of them, asking nothing, absolutely nothing personal in

return (and all of this I could prove, if it served any purpose, by the whole of the correspondence sent to them, correspondence which went unanswered).

In these circumstances, since fewer than 1,000 citizens have come forward as volunteers to date, and since they, in the time remaining, with all the goodwill and all the effort they might make, would be unable without the structures of large parties to gather at least 500,000 signatures in support of the #ConstitutionOfSovereignty project, there is nothing left but to thank all of you who were still able to hope and still wanted to believe that we can change this country for the better.

I thank especially you — you know who you are (and if you ever allow me, I shall name each of you in a future post) — who worked over these last two and a half years to give legal form to a dream, to a project for an ideal country. But also you who came forward as volunteers and took on an immense labour, as well as those who have already signed the forms supporting the constitutional amendment project.

We all know, we have been and are convinced, that what we did is the only way still to save this people, this country. The words may seem large, but they are not. The future will confirm it, and the fact that our projects remain as a witness through time in the Official Gazettes in which they were published will prove it: any work of restoring the Romanian State will without doubt follow this path and may, who knows?, even use the same words to clothe the only ideas and principles that can secure us continuity, prosperity and dignity as a nation.

But for us, most probably, it will no longer matter.

What does matter, however, is that in complete good faith and entirely disinterestedly we did together what we believed: together we worked for good and for truth. And for that, now, at the end of our labour, I thank you once again!

For the rest, to do what still had to be done… it is too late. Or too early!

Only for hoping and believing is it never too late! nor too early!

(On the Constitution of Sovereignty: the full text of the bill — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQG1EB0kfmvHnNJUzuEGQ1FHqi6weKXT1aHVQs3cjIbRfbT5TbeiddFJARFv4t0knz4D88Ox-xiN2zgN8fKMvrP5JYr-cz0rzlRuFR-5CBOYvEIAh5HOv–rBnpx-L6AwdCvRTzK9F9hZyWY50SQj0bOTeu30Hhr8rCbh2RaJNGLmeVtjftiLAaBXzKgDKGDAYmXA-2aLBPDy79ShTCwNhIfhmts&s=518⟩

---

216. 18 August 2024 — On the Bulgarian example

On the Sovereignty Law: the full text of the bill — see the page Sovereignty Law.

The President of Bulgaria has promulgated a Law, published in the Official Gazette of Bulgaria and in force from 16.08.2024, which prohibits “propaganda, promotion or incitement” in the education system in respect of “ideas and views connected with non-traditional sexual orientation and/or gender identity other than the biological one”.

Progressives were scandalised… but they are glad that with us it could not be done.

Romanian conservatives look to the Bulgarians with longing. And they are frustrated that with us it is still not possible…

Yet few now remember that such legal provisions have already been published in the Official Gazette of Romania! As far back as 2021!!!

More precisely, through the Official Gazette of Romania no. 925/28.IX.2021, Article 6 provided for the amendment of Law no. 272/2004 on the protection and promotion of children's rights, introducing express provisions concerning the defence of the physical and psychological integrity of the minor, in their capacity as a citizen holding rights. Thus, up to the age of 18, any form of intervention on the body of the minor aimed at altering the sexual identity acquired at birth was prohibited. At the same time, it was prohibited to make available to children any materials of a pornographic nature or promoting departure from gender identity, such materials being capable of causing psychological trauma that will mark the citizen's entire life. In adopting these amendments, regard was had both to the best interests of the child and to the child's right to decide and dispose knowingly of their own body once psychological maturity is reached, so that any premature influences on the normal physical and psychological development of the Romanian citizen should be removed. Not least, regard was had to the irreversible character of any premature gender alterations — alterations which will have a negative effect both on the development of the minor and, through their direct influence when carried out during minority, on the birth rate in Romania, an aspect which directly affects national sovereignty.

Certain acts committed against minors were even brought within the criminal sphere: in article 9, paragraph 2, art. 197 of the Criminal Code, headed "Ill-treatment of a minor", is amended by the introduction of two new paragraphs, namely paragraphs 2 and 3. Paragraph 2 of article 197 criminalises "the act of causing a minor who has not reached the age of 18 to alter the biological sexual identity acquired at birth", whether or not it achieved the outcome sought by the perpetrator. The reason for criminalising this act lies in the grave mental, psychological and behavioural disturbances such an act may cause in the minor, even if the minor cannot alone dispose of the actual, physical alteration of their sexual identity acquired at birth. Paragraph 3 introduces an aggravated form of the act provided for in paragraph 2, as introduced by the present bill, increasing by one third the penalty applied to the perpetrator if that person is a parent, guardian, teacher or professor, or if the act itself produced physical consequences on the minor, whatever the perpetrator's capacity.

And matters went much further than the Bulgarians ever imagined: paragraph 4 of article 9 of the Law amends paragraph 4 of article 221 of the Criminal Code, raising from 13 to 14 the age from which the act of causing a minor to witness the commission of exhibitionist acts, or shows or performances in which sexual acts of any kind are committed, is punishable.

The act of making available to a minor materials of a pornographic nature, or with content explicitly describing sexuality, was likewise criminalised. Regard was had to the need to preserve the innocence and natural development of the minor in accordance with the moral norms generally accepted by society, up to an age at which the criminalised acts lose their dangerousness and are no longer apt to affect the minor's psychological development.

Likewise brought within the sphere of criminal wrongdoing was the act of making available to a minor any materials of a pornographic nature, or with content explicitly describing sexuality, having regard to the best interests of the minor and to the negative impact of pornographic materials, or of content explicitly describing sexuality, on the psyche and development of minors at a tender age.

And no, that is not all! Romanians went even further in their audacity: in their "criminal recklessness towards political correctness", the authors of these retrograde legal norms published in Official Gazette no. 531 of 7 June 2024 an amendment to the Constitution of Romania whereby, after paragraph (3) of article 22, paragraph (4) was introduced, expressly providing that "(4) The biological sexual identity of the child acquired at birth may not be altered before the age of 18."

All this, and many other specific solutions to vital problems of today's Romania, has already been published in the Official Gazette of Romania. But it was not adopted by Parliament nor promulgated by the President... for these were "only" two popular legislative initiatives, namely the #SovereigntyLaw and the #ConstitutionOfSovereignty. Both were ardently sabotaged by the overwhelming majority of Romania's "sovereigntists", and the first bill — the #SovereigntyLaw, the wellspring of "sovereigntism" in Romania — was furiously rejected in Parliament by the #CoalitionOfBetrayal PSD-PNL.

That is how history was written. God alone knows what is to come!

As for me, now a mere onlooker, my conscience is at peace and I consider that I did everything I could... and more than that!

And I venture to make only one humble suggestion to the great sovereigntist politicians whose names I am not even worthy to mention: do not be ashamed — copy! Copy from the Official Gazette of Romania no. 925/28.IX.2021 and from Official Gazette no. 531 of 7 June 2024!!!

And Romanians will be the better for it. And you, as illustrious politicians, will have the chance to enter history!

(On the Sovereignty Law: the full text of the bill — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQGJ4MDnPN3kOJZroRu0RUP6y-V1t6QhdGr7h2QbYOdl2VshS2TecF7a__f3-V45wkbvhbHYn2gMVwU16Cysf7Gck-VFP9LOsyPStY4v0a5hgw3FGKAQuKiF9HNmNcAlmEkrd14ISSGwBD_YzGDgdHtbhc_4x6rsYVaA-mZOeEEI68l85EC2d8cfjB8r1iQvPefVLn3mQsFxNCRydIr4PgbcEBUY&s=518⟩

---

217. 26 August 2024 — "As I promised you the other day, before entering the break in my involvement in civic life..."

As I promised you in recent days, before entering the pause from involvement in public life that I promised myself, I submit to you for study and debate one more legislative proposal, aimed at amending Health Law no. 95/2006, more precisely as regards cases of malpractice and the liability of medical staff (articles 642 to 681).

I have called this legislative proposal the "George Law", George being our friend who, as many of you know, has been bedridden for 3 years following the administration (contraindicated according to the manufacturer's own leaflets!) of a "miracle treatment/vaccine" then in the experimental phase, without so much as a minimal prior examination or medical history being taken.

After the discussions and debates on the proposed text (which we shall hold here but also face to face), I shall make the resulting text available to my friend Antonio Andrușceac (and to any other member of Parliament) so that it may be placed on the agenda of Parliament in accordance with parliamentary procedure.

Here is the text I submit to you for study and debate:

George Law — Law on the protection of victims of malpractice:

Amendments and additions to Law 95/2006 — Title XV, Civil liability of medical staff and of the supplier of medical, sanitary and pharmaceutical products and services

1. Paragraph 5 of article 642 is amended and shall read as follows:

"5. The civil liability governed by this law does not preclude the engagement of criminal liability, if the act which caused the harm was brought about by acts or omissions committed with direct or

indirect intent, or with advertent negligence, by the medical staff in breach of the laws, procedures and medical protocols, and constitutes an offence under the law."

2. After paragraph 5 of article 642, paragraph 6 is added, reading as follows:

"6. Malpractice is presumed where the harm to the patient appears within 72 hours of the medical or medico-pharmaceutical acts giving rise to harm to the patient and a causal link has been established between the harm suffered and the medical or medico-pharmaceutical act. In such cases, the Commission for monitoring and professional competence for malpractice cases shall draw up a report within 7 days of being seised and shall adopt a decision on the case within a maximum of 30 days from the date of the referral, in accordance with the procedure laid down by article 670 and following of this law."

3. After paragraph 1 of article 645, paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 are added, reading as follows:

"2. Public or private healthcare units are obliged to bear in full the costs of treatment, surgery and all other medical expenses of patients who are victims of medical malpractice and who suffer side effects and/or disability for a period longer than 20 days as a result of medical or medico-pharmaceutical acts administered by their medical staff. The patient's prior informed consent does not exonerate from the liability governed by this paragraph. The liability of public or private healthcare units does not exonerate from liability the medical staff involved in the medical act, who shall be held jointly and severally liable.

3. The ministry of health is obliged to bear in full the costs of treatment, surgery and all other medical expenses of patients who suffer side effects and/or disability for a period longer than 20 days as a result of the administration of vaccines which are compulsory and/or recommended under the National Vaccination Programme, as well as of other vaccines compulsory or recommended in endemics or in periods of epidemic and pandemic. The patient's prior informed consent does not exonerate from the liability governed by this paragraph. The units referred to in para. (1) of art. 644 are liable under civil law for the harm caused by the medical staff they employ, jointly and severally with them.

4. The provisions of paragraphs 3 and 4 of this article apply to all patients, whether or not the medical or medico-pharmaceutical acts giving rise to harm to the patient were committed before the amendment or the entry into force of the law."

4. Article 676 is amended and shall read as follows:

"The court competent to settle the disputes provided for in this law is the tribunal in whose territorial jurisdiction the patient who is the victim of the malpractice complained of has their domicile."

I await your comments and additions!

Thank you in advance for your involvement!

(On the George Law: the full text of the bill — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQGsqcNqprk3oj8QTPysPvRk1w0tzrtNhxKI5QOea6Sg_zF3hXaKJyDhV2-Z0wBcYkLZNZZ0cKpMHzqtyEHwJgMjAmn-WOR-Ufim2ninUU1PWvdzCwieuFW81LyHux0Pqnd0778pjkYKqv9DD7YfES_88xYT_nls64_4KD2S6RQshQsAgzZfL3OiIGfSh-60X0kHDJYy6OvWGXpVx7kZd1LYg_YQ&s=518⟩

---

218. 17 September 2024 — "Many said that the mass killing of the sheep of Romania was a deliberate act, unjustified..."

Many said that the mass killing of sheep in Romania was a deliberate, unjustified and purely self-destructive act. "Conspiracy theorists"…

Yet… the proposal to abolish the NATIONAL AGENCY FOR ANIMAL HUSBANDRY through Emergency Ordinance 85/2024 strengthens the suspicions of the many and largely confirms an apparent intention to destroy Romanian animal husbandry.

This Ordinance was censured and article 6, which provided for the abolition of the ANZ, was repealed in committee in the Senate… on paper!

But we must remain very attentive to the legislative process, for much can happen before it reaches the Chamber of Deputies, the decision-making chamber.

One question remains: HOW IS THE PROPOSAL TO ABOLISH THE NATIONAL AGENCY FOR ANIMAL HUSBANDRY JUSTIFIED?

This question must be answered by the minister of agriculture — Florin-Ionuț Barbu — but also, and above all, by Marcel Ciolacu, Prime Minister of Romania and candidate for the country's Presidency.

P.S.: I set out below the manner in which I was "alerted" to this grave problem:

"Good evening. I am XXXXXXXXX and I spoke with you today, at church.

I am writing back to give you briefly some information.

Last year there appeared in the public domain, including in the press (see agrointeligenta), a proposed Government Decision reorganising the MADR by abolishing and reorganising 14 subordinate structures.

On 20 May this year there appeared on the MADR website a proposed Emergency Ordinance reorganising the MADR in which, of the 14 structures, only 6 remained.

On 28 June, Emergency Ordinance 85/2024 was published, which has virtually nothing in common with the proposal put out for public consultation.

By this Ordinance, the only institution in Romania responsible for preserving Romanian animal breeds (their recognition and their publication on the European Commission's website), the National Agency for Animal Husbandry, is abolished (by total dissolution).

And this despite the numerous steps taken to make decision-makers aware of the gravity of the consequences of this normative act.

At present, bill 385 approving Emergency Ordinance 85 is before the agriculture committee of the Romanian Senate.

The trade union took part in the sitting and subsequently filed an amendment repealing the part of the Ordinance concerning the reorganisation of the MADR.

Emergency Ordinance 85 also contains a State aid scheme, besides the reorganisation part.

The senators support us in our efforts, but the decision-making chamber is the Chamber of Deputies.

I earnestly ask for your help. We have no political backing; we are relying on public opinion and on the good sense of those who still want a future for this country."

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQFyqq3UKeybJ5KrvN0I4YJfHWubWRAF4AeXtEqt3gIX4NXauP-WNYhAOZIX4EW0JBuSj-1xVmLRcXmEIpfvRKtSoqzYLF_YZvYCkorEK1jh7YTQGJRBZ1NpKCWhIYaY9OhCb1babqGO0J1UZizI4VXdZA7MzqqRqI_k-dkentgEvt_UYPKodp4a5PPuAz85c6ZPW8qvjBkRnU-qKXUmLSeULDtk&s=518⟩

219. 10 October 2024 — On the failure of the revision

On the Constitution of Sovereignty: the full text of the bill — see the page Constitution of Sovereignty.

The systemist Bulă Simion, saboteur of Romania's sovereigntist projects, has accomplished his mission!

The reward? He will most probably reach the second round!

The politically correct and progressive press is exultant: the revision of the Constitution has failed! They say the reason is that "the Patriarchate did not give its blessing"…

False! It is not the Church that is to blame for the failure of the constitutional revision!

In reality, the constitutional reform project was sabotaged by the systemist Bulă Simion, initiator of a mini-project of constitutional revision whose sole purpose was in fact to smother the wide-ranging revision project called the #ConstitutionOfSovereignty, consultations on which had been begun more than a year before the launch of the "rival" project of hAUR (with a silent h)!

Bulă Simion did the same in sabotaging the #SovereigntyLaw project when, in the winter of 2021, he set about gathering "signatures for the suspension of Iohannis"!

The result? Iohannis was never suspended (for the simple reason that no procedure exists at constitutional level for gathering signatures to suspend the President!!!), but neither were the signatures for the #SovereigntyLaw gathered.

Bulă, on the other hand, built himself a mega database which he has used in every campaign.

Bulă Simion did the same with the 2 "rival" constitutional revision projects: he launched his own revision project exactly when we were finalising the #ConstitutionOfSovereignty.

Why? Because the wide-ranging revision of the Constitution proposed by civil society (together with those of the CpN) would have brought radical changes to society — changes which would at the very least have made impossible a decision as absurd as the "Șoșoacă Decision"!

The result? Neither of the two projects reached Parliament, to the delight of the progressives.

Besides, how can those at hAUR (with a silent h) now explain their failure to gather the 500,000 signatures for the revision of the Constitution, when they boast of having gathered hundreds of thousands of signatures every time in order to take part in each round of elections?

For a long time I believed that his chief "motor" was strictly personal: dividing the sovereigntists, copying and appropriating the programmes and projects he was incapable of initiating, with the sole aim of polishing his image as "leader" of the sovereigntist movement.

Now, after the Constitutional Court's decision in the Șoșoacă case — a Decision whose first and only beneficiary is Bulă Simion — it becomes obvious that the man is not acting on his own. All the sabotage and all the obstacles placed in the way of genuinely sovereigntist projects had as their chief motor not his vanity and selfishness, but direct orders from his masters in the System, the very ones who helped him when needed, even from within the Constitutional Court!

He did the same with the dozens, indeed hundreds, of sincere people whom he marginalised within his own party or within the so-called "sovereigntist" wing, in order to promote strong-arm men of his own ethnic group. Here too the motive was not merely "selfish"! No! Those were the orders! The clans had to be harnessed to a political movement… and thus became direct contributors to the System and part of the System. And that is how stability is reinforced in our little country…

The conclusion is simple: Bulă Simion is 100% the System's man, which is why he stands every chance of reaching the second round of the presidential election.

And that is how and why, after the latest mini-scandal in the party, the light of the stabor restored order and discipline in hAUR (with a silent h, yes?!).

All the players, whatever their rank or division, made their self-criticism and returned to operational teamwork, united in a single struggle.

Here is how the progressive press exults at the sovereigntists' failure brought about by Bulă:

https://pressone.ro/patriarhia-nu-a-dat-binecuvantare-dan-puric-pipere...

(On the Constitution of Sovereignty: the full text of the bill — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQEVRTpvEcs42kCq2kXkZOXvIQ2AwlRMv4moqP6SSEAN-yudt2AzXScymLnfwgnPxQH5SSHQSuR4ed8SWc04luIDw-b4vMrtcVznR_SxyRbf1GA8PNKcXyvIstEu78kQoooDsSqJ02n1NJmwAtReUaUnjNA-2cvBCwRtEKaxlTv96a_KB-e4xmdpWRNLUw57cbEvHX5gqBRI_VixEBAZfepHqLgn8&s=518⟩

---

220. 1 November 2024 — "#LegeaGeorge, the law I announced in the summer and which I named with the name of my friend..."

The #GeorgeLaw, the law I announced in the summer and named after our friend who is a victim of vaccination — a law for the protection of victims of malpractice — has been filed with the Chamber of Deputies by my friend Antonio Andrușceac, a member of Parliament like few others, who also had some suggestions and additions to the text we proposed!

The "George Law", if and when it is voted by the two chambers of Parliament, will prevent the repetition of situations such as those of the plandemic and will ensure the protection and care of people in George's situation — people struggling with incurable or degenerative illnesses as a result of the side effects caused by certain medical treatments, people in permanent need of extremely costly medical care.

For those who wonder and who ask me:

NO, I AM NOT STANDING FOR ANYTHING! So this law is not a means of running an electoral campaign for myself; it is the answer to a real need. I did only what had to be done, because it had to be done!

I thank my friend Antonio Andrușceac from the bottom of my heart for his contribution to the text of the law and, above all, for having been willing to file it with the Chamber of Deputies!!!

I hope that the other bills we have ready — among them the "LAW on the reform and demilitarisation of State bodies with responsibilities in the field of national security", the "GREEN ROMANIA LAW" (a law strictly regulating clear-cutting of Romania's forests), a "Bill amending and supplementing the Criminal Code", a "Bill amending and supplementing Electoral Law no. 208 of 20 July 2015", the "LAW OF SOLIDARITY AND OF THE TAXATION OF LARGE BUSINESSES AND FORTUNES — a BILL AMENDING THE FISCAL CODE, Law no. 227/2015", and also a "BILL AMENDING THE 'OFFSHORE LAW' no. 256 of 12 November 2018" — will all share the same fate and be filed in Parliament before the end of this legislature. Any member of Parliament willing to file them is welcome to work with us!

I set out below the full text of the Bill, a Bill which I hope the future Parliament, as full as possible of true Romanians, will vote on as soon as possible!

for amending and supplementing Law no. 95/2006 on reform in the field of health and the Patients' Rights Law no. 46/2003

The Parliament of Romania adopts this law

Art. I – Law no. 95/2006 on reform in the field of health, republished in the Official Gazette of Romania, Part I, no. 652 of 28 August 2015, with subsequent amendments and additions, is amended and supplemented as follows:

1. In article 653, paragraph (5) is amended and shall read as follows:

"(5) The civil liability governed by this law does not preclude the engagement of criminal liability, if the act which caused the harm was brought about by acts or omissions committed with direct or indirect intent, or with advertent negligence, by the medical staff in breach of the laws, procedures and medical protocols, and constitutes an offence under the law."

2. In article 653, after paragraph (5) a new paragraph, para. (6), is introduced, reading as follows:

"(6) Malpractice is presumed where the harm to the patient appears within 72 hours of the medical or medico-pharmaceutical acts giving rise to harm to the patient and there are reasonable grounds to suspect a causal link between the harm suffered and the medical or medico-pharmaceutical act. In such cases, the Commission for monitoring and professional competence for malpractice cases shall draw up a report within 7 days of being seised and shall adopt a decision on the case within a maximum of 30 days from the date of the referral, in accordance with the procedure laid down by article 679 and following of this law."

3. In article 655, after paragraph (2) three new paragraphs, paras. (3) to (5), are introduced, reading as follows:

"(3) Public or private healthcare units are obliged to bear in full the costs of treatment, surgery and all other medical expenses of patients who are victims of medical malpractice and who suffer side effects or disability for a period longer than 20 days as a result of medical or medico-pharmaceutical acts administered by their medical staff. The patient's prior informed consent does not exonerate from the liability governed by this paragraph. The liability of public or private healthcare units does not exonerate from liability the medical staff involved in the medical act, who shall be held jointly and severally liable.

The ministry of health is obliged to bear in full the costs of treatment, surgery and all other medical expenses of patients who suffer side effects or disability for a period longer than 20 days as a result of the administration of vaccines which are compulsory or recommended under the National Vaccination Programme, as well as of other vaccines compulsory or recommended in endemics or in periods of epidemic and pandemic. The patient's prior informed consent does not exonerate from the liability governed by this paragraph. The units referred to in para. (1) of art. 644 are liable under civil law for the harm caused by the medical staff they employ, jointly and severally with them.

The provisions of paragraphs 3 and 4 of this article apply to all patients who suffer harm as a result of medical or medico-pharmaceutical acts. The existence of the harm shall be established and certified on request, at any time, by the Commission for monitoring and professional competence for malpractice cases, irrespective of when the medical or medico-pharmaceutical act giving rise to the harm was carried out. The Commission's Decision is subject to the procedure laid down by article 684 of this law.

4. Article 687 is amended and shall read as follows:

The court competent to settle the disputes provided for in this law is the tribunal — civil division — in whose territorial jurisdiction the patient who is the victim of the malpractice complained of has their domicile, or the tribunal — civil division — in whose territorial jurisdiction the malpractice complained of took place."

5. After article 704 a new article, art. 704^1, is introduced, reading as follows:

Medicines or medical devices for which the manufacturer does not offer guarantees and demonstrably viable remedies against adverse effects may not be marketed or used, nor may such medical treatments be applied.

The marketing or use of medicines, vaccines, medical devices and other pharmaceutical products for which complete clinical trials have not been carried out according to the methodology laid down by Law is prohibited."

6. In article 811, paragraph (1) is amended and shall read as follows:

Within the meaning of this chapter, advertising for medicines means information by direct contact (the "door-to-door" system), as well as promotion intended to stimulate the prescription, distribution, sale or consumption of medicines; advertising for medicines shall be carried out exclusively through:

— advertising for medicines addressed to persons qualified to prescribe or distribute medicines;

— visits by medical representatives to persons qualified to prescribe medicines;

Art. II – The Patients' Rights Law no. 46 of 21 January 2003, published in the Official Gazette of Romania, Part I, no. 51 of 29 January 2003, with subsequent amendments and additions, is amended and supplemented as follows:

1. Article 4 is amended and shall read as follows:

"(1) The patient has the right to be informed about the medical services available and about how to use them.

Medicines, medical devices and other therapeutic means may be administered and applied to Romanian citizens only after obtaining the patients' written consent, following prior and mandatory information given on the basis of the leaflets provided by the manufacturer of the medicines proposed, medical emergencies excepted."

2. After article 362 a new article, art. 363, is introduced, reading as follows:

No citizen may be discriminated against, positively or negatively, as a result of accepting or refusing a treatment or medical device. The act of discriminating against a citizen as a result of accepting or refusing a treatment or medical device constitutes an offence and is punishable under the criminal law."

This law was adopted by the Parliament of Romania, in compliance with the provisions of art. 75 and art. 76 para. (2) of the Constitution of Romania, republished."

(On the George Law: the full text of the bill — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQHkHHW66hdsU3njUVSwmnd9H-dD_pwxCg7quOfG1XUv5hC4V5QtPSO0QCxIaLUKMZ9d71OAJm-DW_7miRl94V4LGEPf4M6j_HwSiPAfw0McUH4U6oxX-7AkRUZBaHTtiEDOlXnihu0XXzBFX1urYkiibeftSi5OSDL_gTnyhcmed5IvUdakeZFvXf15mELlvged_AffBcV5Lg6-o8sbYP-wOXabu2A&s=518⟩

221. 3 January 2025 — "The change we are all waiting for can only be brought about by a change of system,..."

The change we are all waiting for can come about only through a change of system, not merely through the change of a few men — this is now clearer than ever! We can no longer wait for the system to "reform itself"... it will not happen!

IT IS WE WHO MUST FORCE THE SYSTEM TO REFORM ITSELF!

And "changing the system" can be done only by changing the system's "operating system", that is, by a wide-ranging REVISION OF THE CONSTITUTION OF ROMANIA. But revision will be possible only if it is IMPOSED BY THE PEOPLE, by an immense number of citizens!

That is why I believe it is more important than ever to return to the project we have worked on together over the last 3 years, to the #ConstitutionOfSovereignty — a project for a deep revision of the Constitution which I propose we supplement, in the light of recent events, with 5 new articles:

"13. In article 37, after paragraph 2, paragraph 3 is added, reading as follows:

'(3) The right to be elected of Romanian citizens who meet the conditions laid down in the preceding paragraphs may not be restricted except by a final criminal judgment.'"

"24. In Article 82, paragraph (1) is amended and shall read as follows:

'(1) The result of the election for the office of President of Romania is validated by the High Court of Cassation and Justice.'"

"34. In article 118, after paragraph (5), paragraphs (6) and (7) are introduced, reading as follows:

'(6) On the territory of Romania, command of Romanian or foreign armed forces stationed under the conditions of the preceding paragraph belongs exclusively to the Romanian army. The transfer of authority over the armed forces of Romania is prohibited.'"

"49. In article 146, letter f) is repealed." (That is, the provision stating that the Constitutional Court "oversees the observance of the procedure for the election of the President of Romania and confirms the results of the ballot".)

"51. In article 147, after paragraph (4), two new paragraphs are introduced, paragraphs (5) and (6), reading as follows:

(...) '(6) In cases of unconstitutionality found under article 146 letters a) to d), the law or the regulation shall be sent back for re-examination. If the law is adopted in the same form by a majority of at least two thirds of the members of each Chamber, the objection of unconstitutionality is set aside and promulgation becomes mandatory.'"

Let us not leave the fight against the System on the shoulders of a single person!

Do you have the courage to join the fight... if only with a signature?

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQFu7eJsqgV6jmH1Gu8TbLnJfqwwd9Cj_HUYGhYOCWdojJR9QDCJ_IK_MMNp3r-ayJtpuLvdWr0fy_vn_CsyjNJ5-m0sz3qxuIehL5–2AKCRH9SLLO_t1hXB30saLrfMUYjyUuDpVyP2ZC1tn0eGCGbKLxDiknVKj46sFxFuFdkq1o-TUaE6hpmA4ozULrCg_g8iyf972LjAmCzoxvzFHGwhjQ&s=518⟩

222. 4 January 2025 — "We are in the midst of the personal dictatorship of the usurper Klaus Werner Iohannis, who at this m..."

We are in the midst of the personal dictatorship of the usurper Klaus Werner Iohannis, who is at this moment serving a presidential term unlimited in time.

How is this possible, when it was unimaginable a month ago???

The abuse of the System and the villainy of an aberrant Decision of the Constitutional Court.

But this abuse by the Constitutional Court and, by implication, the personal dictatorship of the usurper Iohannis are possible ONLY because the present Constitution left room to be forced, left room for interpretations which led to the establishment of a personal dictatorship.

THAT IS WHY THE CONSTITUTION MUST BE REVISED! URGENTLY!

How can we prevent in future the establishment of another personal dictatorship by some other future usurper like Iohannis?

By amending article 83 of the Constitution.

"Article 83 is amended and shall read as follows:

'(1) The term of the President of Romania is 4 years and is exercised from the date of the oath, which shall take place in the same calendar year as the election of Parliament.'

The President of Romania exercises the office until the oath is taken by the newly elected President, without that term exceeding 4 calendar years.

The term of the President of Romania may not be extended for any reason. After the end of the President's term, in the event of war, disaster or impossibility of holding the presidential election, the office of interim President shall be exercised, in order, by the president of the Senate or the president of the Chamber of Deputies, for a period of no more than 12 months, within which the new President of Romania must be elected."

Any struggle waged at this moment against an abusive System and a personal dictatorship is meaningless unless its ultimate aim is not only to remove the state of illegality but also to prevent a future return to abuse and dictatorship.

The ultimate aim of our struggle must be to strengthen citizens' rights and consolidate democracy.

And our aim can be achieved only by adopting the radical revision of the Constitution proposed by the #ConstitutionOfSovereignty project!

As I told you, the change we are all waiting for can come about only through a change of system, not merely through the change of a few men — this is now clearer than ever! We can no longer wait for the system to "reform itself"... it will not happen!

IT IS WE WHO MUST FORCE THE SYSTEM TO REFORM ITSELF!

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQEwNfgNCYBHg8Ygngu2iNK5E7xbBDcGYVWM6PihDbj-Tk33-nUwlca7pBpFWJWKpQl1M2-Bonc4puVw_8B2jGh0Jn6_ToKkF-PEmP-FIT9q_xKzCN9Gr5qtBO1BVT_3Xi4ATIIwla8sHq9d3hGLfuo8DLQ9XzeRCN47rf5fJEPIA7HV8n581XNNisKq2zZClIVITymMCYXpFj8Sjwe6Mn0pH0SD8&s=518⟩

223. 8 February 2025 — "Călin Georgescu spoke today about the turnover tax on the multinationals (in ..."

Călin Georgescu spoke today about the turnover tax on multinationals (in fact, on the only large businesses in Romania!) as the sole way of stopping tax evasion — sorry, "tax optimisation" — by the large companies which make profits in Romania but export them in the form of fictitious expenses.

Good! As usual, we think alike, we feel alike!

In fact, as far back as 2023 I wrote a bill to that effect — THE SOLIDARITY LAW — some, I believe, remember that bill, which I spoke about at length at the time and which I made available to Diana Șoșoacă and also to those at AUR... yet no one was willing to carry THE SOLIDARITY LAW through to the plenary.

Why? I leave you to find the answer to that question!

I hope that after CG reaches Cotroceni this bill will reach Parliament... and that it will be adopted there; I want to believe it will become LAW.

I set out below the full text (and a link to the pdf version of the legislative proposal: https://t.me/DanMVChiticNecenzurat/3246)) of the SOLIDARITY LAW, which I make available to any member of Parliament interested in carrying it through to the plenary:

LAW ON THE TAXATION OF LARGE BUSINESSES AND FORTUNES

Law no. 227/2015 on the Fiscal Code and

on certain measures necessary for the implementation of petroleum operations by holders of petroleum agreements concerning offshore petroleum perimeters

Starting from the constitutional principle that Romania is a social state (Article 1 para. 3 of the Constitution) built on the solidarity of its citizens (Article 4 para. 1 of the Constitution),

bearing in mind the need to simplify and make more efficient the collection of taxes and duties, which is apt to increase predictability and also competitiveness in the economy,

having regard to the need to encourage the birth rate and to increase the degree of social protection which the state can afford indirectly through family members,

and also to the need to encourage work and reduce the share of social benefits,

I. amendment of Law 227/2015 on the Fiscal Code:

1. After article 18, articles 18^1 and 18^2 are introduced, reading as follows:

"ART. 18^1 Special regime for taxpayers with annual revenues over 10,000,000 euros

1. Taxpayers who have achieved revenues exceeding the lei equivalent of 10,000,000 euros are liable to pay tax at the rate of 1% applied to the revenues recorded. The exchange rate for determining the euro equivalent is that in force at the close of the financial year in which the revenues were recorded.

2. Taxpayers who have achieved revenues exceeding the lei equivalent of 100,000,000 euros are liable to pay tax at the rate of 2% applied to the revenues recorded. The exchange rate for determining the euro equivalent is that in force at the close of the financial year in which the revenues were recorded.

3. Taxpayers who have achieved revenues exceeding the lei equivalent of 1,000,000,000 euros are liable to pay tax at the rate of 3% applied to the revenues recorded. The exchange rate for determin-

ing the euro equivalent is that in force at the close of the financial year in which the revenues were recorded.

ART. 18² — Special regime for taxpayers carrying on activities in the nature of extraction, refining or marketing of petroleum products and their derivatives

"Taxpayers who carry on activities in the nature of extraction, refining or marketing of petroleum products and their derivatives and have annual revenues greater than 10,000,000 euros, including legal persons which achieve such revenues under an association contract for the activities referred to in this article, are liable to pay tax at the rate of 5% applied to the revenues recorded.""

2. Art. 101 paragraph 2 of Law 227/2015 on the Fiscal Code is amended and shall read as follows:

"(2) The tax is calculated by applying a rate of 10% to the monthly taxable pension income and, respectively, a rate of 90% to the monthly taxable income constituted by the part of the pension exceeding 11 gross minimum wages nationally."

3. After TITLE X, TITLE X¹ is introduced, entitled "THE TAX ON LARGE FORTUNES", reading as follows:

"Article 500¹ Taxpayers who are natural persons and whose revenues, together with the value of gains, movable assets and buildings in their patrimony as at 31 December of the preceding year, exceed 10,000,000 euros are liable to pay a solidarity tax of 1% a year of the total value of their wealth.

Article 500² Taxpayers who are natural persons and whose revenues, together with the value of gains, movable assets and buildings in their patrimony as at 31 December of the preceding year, exceed 100,000,000 euros are liable to pay a solidarity tax of 2% a year of the total value of their wealth.

Article 500³ Taxpayers who are natural persons and whose revenues, together with the value of gains, movable assets and buildings in their patrimony as at 31 December of the preceding year, exceed 1,000,000,000 euros are liable to pay a solidarity tax of 3% a year of the total value of their wealth.

Article 500⁴ The exchange rate for determining the euro equivalent is that in force at the close of the financial year in which the revenues and gains were recorded.

Article 500⁵ 1) Taxpayers who are natural persons and whose revenues, together with the value of gains, movable and immovable assets and buildings in their patrimony as at 31 December of the preceding year, exceed 10,000,000 euros are required to draw up an annual wealth declaration; the annual wealth declaration for the last amended fiscal year is to be filed by 25 March inclusive of the following year.

Wealth declarations are made in writing, on the declarant's own responsibility, and contain the rights and obligations of the declarant, of the spouse, and of dependent children, in accordance with annex no. 1."

4. Article 77 paragraph 2 subparagraph 3 is amended and shall read as follows:

"For taxpayers earning gross monthly revenues between 3,600 lei and 20,000 lei, the personal deduction is granted as follows:

for taxpayers with one dependant — 20% of the income tax due;

for taxpayers with two dependants — 30% of the income tax due;

for taxpayers with three dependants — 40% of the income tax due;

for taxpayers with four or more dependants — 50% of the income tax due.

For taxpayers earning gross monthly salary revenues over 20,000 lei, the personal deduction is not granted."

amendment of LAW no. 256/2018 on certain measures necessary for the implementation of petroleum operations by holders of petroleum agreements concerning offshore petroleum perimeters:

Article 1 is amended and supplemented and shall read as follows:

"(1) This law lays down certain measures necessary for the implementation of petroleum operations of exploration, development and exploitation of petroleum deposits and of abandonment, as well as of the works/well works pertaining to petroleum operations, carried out by holders of petroleum agreements concerning offshore petroleum perimeters, in accordance with the provisions of the petroleum agreements concluded between the holders and the National Agency for Mineral Resources, hereinafter ANRM.

Where a holder is party to a petroleum agreement covering both onshore petroleum perimeters and offshore petroleum perimeters, or is the holder of one or more petroleum agreements covering both onshore and offshore petroleum perimeters, the provisions of this law apply only to petroleum operations carried out in respect of offshore petroleum perimeters."

In article 2, letters m), n), o), p) and r) are repealed.

Article 18 is amended and shall read as follows:

"Art. 18. – Holders of petroleum agreements concerning offshore petroleum perimeters in course of performance at the date of entry into force of this law shall be subject, throughout their duration, to the level of royalty, the percentage rates of petroleum royalty, the gross production thresholds pertaining to those rates and the specific tax regime applicable to exploration, development, exploitation and abandonment activities carried out under the laws in existence at the date of entry into force of this law."

In article 19, after paragraph 11, paragraph (12) is introduced:

"(12) Investments taken into account in calculating the deduction from the tax on additional revenues are not taken into account in calculating the fiscal result of the periods for the payment of corporate tax, in the sense that no tax reductions/exemptions or cost deductions are accepted for them, they being regarded as non-deductible for the purposes of calculating corporate tax."

Article 19 is amended and shall read as follows:

"Art. 19. – (1) Holders of petroleum agreements concerning offshore petroleum perimeters, including their subsidiaries and/or those belonging to the same economic interest grouping which actually carry on both extraction activities and activities of selling the natural gas extracted from those perimeters, are required to calculate, declare and pay the tax on additional offshore revenues.

Additional revenue means the difference between the weighted average price of natural gas sold from own domestic production from offshore perimeters and the purchase price of natural gas from domestic production for household and non-household customers in 2012, namely 45.71 lei/MWh, multiplied by the volumes of gas sold from domestic production from offshore perimeters.

The tax on additional offshore revenues provided for in para. (1) is calculated by applying one or more calculation rates, as the case may be, to the additional revenues obtained from the sale of natural gas extracted from offshore perimeters, as determined in accordance with annex no. 2, from which tax the value of investments in the upstream segment is deducted. The tax on additional offshore revenues takes account of the reference price set by the ANRM for the calculation of

royalties. Transactions carried out below the reference price are taxed at the reference price. The tax calculation rates are determined on the basis of the natural gas selling prices charged by holders of petroleum agreements concerning offshore petroleum perimeters, according to the price grid below, adjusted annually from 1 January 2019 by the annual consumer price index, as follows:

50% of the additional revenue for prices up to and including 85 lei/MWh;

15% of the additional revenues obtained from charging prices above 85 lei/MWh and less than or equal to 100 lei/MWh;

30% of the additional revenues obtained from charging prices above 100 lei/MWh and less than or equal to 115 lei/MWh;

35% of the additional revenues obtained from charging prices above 115 lei/MWh and less than or equal to 130 lei/MWh;

40% of the additional revenues obtained from charging prices above 130 lei/MWh and less than or equal to 145 lei/MWh;

50% of the additional revenues obtained from charging prices above 145 lei/MWh and less than or equal to 160 lei/MWh;

55% of the additional revenues obtained from charging prices above 160 lei/MWh and less than or equal to 175 lei/MWh;

60% of the additional revenues obtained from charging prices above 175 lei/MWh and less than or equal to 190 lei/MWh;

70% of the additional revenues obtained from charging prices above 190 lei/MWh.

The maximum limit of the deduction for investments in the upstream segment may not exceed 30% of the total tax on additional offshore revenues.

The economic operators referred to in para. (1) shall calculate, declare and pay the additional offshore tax monthly, by the 25th of the month following that for which the tax is due.

The form and content of the declaration concerning the tax on additional offshore revenues shall be established by order of the president of the National Agency for Fiscal Administration, within 30 days of the date of entry into force of this law.

In so far as the application of these provisions requires the issuing of instructions concerning the tax on additional offshore revenues, these shall be issued by joint order of the minister of public finance and the minister of energy, with the opinion of the ANRM.

The sums owed by holders of petroleum agreements concerning offshore perimeters as tax on additional revenues shall be collected into a special account used for financing the establishment and extension of natural gas distribution networks and connections to the national gas transport system, as well as other investments established by Government decision. The allocation of the sums collected is made by Government decision. The collection of the tax on additional revenues is administered by the National Agency for Fiscal Administration, in accordance with Law no. 207/2015, as subsequently amended and supplemented.

The cumulative value of investments in the upstream segment, recorded in the accounts in accordance with the legal rules in force, from the entry into force of this law until the month for which the tax on additional offshore revenues is calculated, as well as the value of investments from the work programmes carried out and approved by the ANRM under the petroleum agreements, which were

recorded in the accounts up to the date of entry into force of this law, shall be reduced monthly by the value of the investments in the upstream segment deducted from the tax on additional offshore revenues. The deductions apply until the cumulative value of investments in the upstream segment approved by the ANRM and recorded in the accounts in accordance with the laws in force is reached.

In the event of disposal of the investments for which the deduction provided for in paras. (3) and (4) was obtained, the deduction granted shall be subtracted from the cumulative value of investments in the upstream segment in proportion to the ratio between the value of the investments transferred and the value of the investments recorded in the upstream segment in the reference period in which it was granted.

Investments taken into account for the deduction from the tax on additional revenues may not be the subject of other deductions."

Article 20 is amended and supplemented and shall read as follows:

"Art. 20. – By way of derogation from the provisions of art. 177 of the Electricity and Natural Gas Law no. 123/2012, as subsequently amended and supplemented, holders of petroleum agreements concerning offshore petroleum perimeters, including their subsidiaries and/or those belonging to the same economic interest grouping, from the date of entry into force of this law, in so far as they contract the sale of natural gas on the wholesale market within a calendar year, are obliged to conclude, in the calendar year in which they deliver the natural gas, contracts on the centralised markets, transparently, publicly and without discrimination, in accordance with the rules issued by the National Energy Regulatory Authority, hereinafter ANRE, for the sale of a minimum quantity of natural gas which may not be less than that represented by a rate of 90% of the quantity of natural gas from own production contracted for delivery in the calendar year in question, as seller. The quantity of natural gas contracted on the centralised markets, transparently, publicly and without discrimination, is sold under a procedure approved by ANRE, so that buyers of natural gas cannot be made subject to a condition of purchasing a minimum quantity imposed by the seller."

Article 21 is amended and supplemented and shall read as follows:

"Art. 21. – The rate provided for in art. 20 shall remain unchanged throughout the duration of the agreements."

In Article 25, after letter m), letter n) is added, reading as follows:

"n) failure by holders of petroleum agreements to comply with the provisions of arts. 19 and 20 shall be sanctioned by a fine corresponding to 30% of the turnover of the year in which the breach was found."

Article 33 is amended and shall read as follows:

"Art. 33. – From the date of entry into force of this law, in the case of offshore petroleum agreements the provisions of Government Ordinance no. 7/2013 on the establishment of the tax on additional revenues obtained as a result of the deregulation of prices in the natural gas sector, approved with amendments by Law no. 73/2018, as subsequently amended and supplemented, and those of Government Ordinance no. 6/2013 on the establishment of special measures for the taxation of the exploitation of natural resources other than natural gas, approved with amendments and additions by Law no. 261/2013, as subsequently amended, shall not apply."

Article 34 is amended and shall read as follows:

"Art. 34. – For the purpose of applying the provisions of arts. 18, 19 and 21, the ANRM and the holders of petroleum agreements may conclude addenda to the petroleum agreements concerning offshore petroleum perimeters granted in concession at the date of entry into force of this law."

I, the undersigned, _____, personal identification number _____, holder of identity card/passport series _____ no. _____, domiciled at _____ _____, of Romanian citizenship and _____ (if applicable),

being aware of the provisions of art. 326 of the Criminal Code concerning false statements and of art. 9 of Law 241/2005 on tax evasion,

declare on my own responsibility that together with my family I hold wealth which I estimate at the value of _____, of which the following form part:

NOTE: those situated in other countries are also to be declared.

* The categories indicated are: (1) agricultural; (2) forestry; (3) within the built-up area; (4) water surface; (5) other categories of land outside the built-up area, if in civil circulation.

*2) Under "Holder" there shall be stated, in the case of own property, the name of the owner (the holder, the spouse, the child), and in the case of jointly owned property, the share and the names of the co-owners.

NOTE: those situated in other countries are also to be declared.

* The categories indicated are: (1) flat; (2) dwelling house; (3) holiday house; (4) commercial/ production premises.

*2) Under "Holder" there shall be stated, in the case of own property, the name of the owner (the holder, the spouse, the child), and in the case of jointly owned property, the share and the names of the co-owners.

1. Motor vehicles/cars, tractors, agricultural machinery, motorboats, yachts and other means of transport subject to registration under the law

NOTE: all goods held in ownership are to be mentioned, whether or not they are on Romanian territory at the time of the declaration.

2. Goods in the form of precious metals, jewellery, works of art and objects of worship, art and numismatic collections, objects forming part of the national or universal cultural heritage, whose aggregate value exceeds 5,000 euros

NOTE: all goods held in ownership are to be mentioned, whether or not they are on Romanian territory at the time of the declaration.

1. Bank accounts and deposits, investment funds, equivalent forms of saving and investment, including credit cards, if their aggregate value exceeds 5,000 euros

NOTE: those held in banks or financial institutions abroad are also to be declared. * The categories indicated are: (1) current account or equivalent (including card); (2) bank deposit or equivalent; (3) investment funds or equivalents, including private pension funds or other accumulation schemes (those pertaining to the previous fiscal year are to be declared).

2. Investments, direct investments and loans granted, if their aggregate market value exceeds 5,000 euros

NOTE: investments and holdings abroad are also to be declared.

* The categories indicated are: (1) securities held (government securities, certificates, bonds); (2) shares or social parts in commercial companies; (3) loans granted in a personal capacity.

3. Other assets producing net income which together exceed the equivalent of 5,000 euros a year:

NOTE: those situated abroad are also to be declared.

Income of the declarant and of the members of their family, earned in the last completed fiscal year (in accordance with art. 41 of Law no. 571/2003 on the Fiscal Code, as subsequently amended and supplemented)

NOTE: income originating abroad is also to be declared.

This declaration is a public document and entails criminal liability under the law for the inaccuracy or incompleteness of the data stated.

Date of completion .....

Signature .....

Formula for calculating the tax on additional offshore revenues

Depending on the level of the weighted average price of natural gas sold from own domestic production from offshore perimeters, hereinafter PMPC, the following calculation formulas apply:

if the PMPC is less than or equal to 85 lei/MWh, adjusted by the CPI as the case may be, the total tax on additional offshore revenues due is calculated by the formula:

IVSC = ISO_85 = 0.50 * VS_85; VS_85 = (PMPC – PRC) * VGC; VID = min (VI; 0.3 * IVSC)

IVST – the total tax on additional offshore revenues due; IVSC – the total tax on additional offshore revenues calculated;

ISO_85 – the tax on additional offshore revenues due, calculated at a PMPC less than or equal to 85 lei/MWh;

VS_85 – the additional revenue from offshore perimeters, calculated at a PMPC less than or equal to 85 lei/MWh;

PMPC – the weighted average price of natural gas sold from own domestic production from offshore perimeters, or the reference price, as the case may be;

PRC – the purchase price of natural gas from domestic production for household and non-household customers in 2012, namely 45.71 lei/MWh, adjusted annually by the CPI rate from 1 January 2019;

VGC – the volumes of gas from domestic production from offshore perimeters sold;

CPI – the annual consumer price index of the previous year published by the National Institute of Statistics of Romania;

VID – the value of deductible investments in the upstream segment;

VI – the cumulative value of investments in the upstream segment as provided for in art. 19 para. (9), reduced monthly by the VID value deducted;

2. Where the PMPC is between 85 lei/MWh and 100 lei/MWh inclusive, adjusted by the CPI as the case may be, the total tax on additional offshore revenues due is calculated as follows:

IVSC = 0.5 * (85 - PRC) * VGC + ISO; ISO = CI * VS

ISO – the additional offshore tax calculated on the additional revenues from the sale of natural gas from charging PMPC prices between 85 lei/MWh and 100 lei/MWh inclusive, adjusted by the CPI as the case may be;

CI – the rate of taxation of additional revenues from the sale of natural gas [15% — under art. 19 para. (3) letter b)], applicable where PMPC prices between 85 lei/MWh and 100 lei/MWh inclusive are charged;

PB – the minimum base price of the corresponding calculation interval; thus, for PMPC prices between 85 lei/MWh and 100 lei/MWh inclusive it is 85 lei/MWh;

VS – the additional revenue from offshore perimeters, calculated on the sale of natural gas at PMPC prices between 85 lei/MWh and 100 lei/MWh inclusive;

3. Where the PMPC exceeds 100 lei/MWh, adjusted by the CPI as the case may be, the total tax on additional offshore revenues due is calculated as follows:

IVSC = 0.5 * (85 - PRC) * VGC + ISO; VID = min (VI; 0.5 * IVSC)

ISO – the sum of the additional offshore taxes, calculated for each price interval in accordance with art. 19 para. (3) letters b) to i), namely:

ISOi – is calculated according to the calculation formula in point 2, where the corresponding terms have the following meanings:

CI – the rate of taxation of additional revenues from the sale of natural gas, for each corresponding price interval in accordance with art. 19 para. (3) letters b) to i);

PB – the minimum base price of the corresponding calculation interval, adjusted annually from 1 January 2019 by the CPI;

VS – the additional revenue from offshore perimeters, calculated for each corresponding price interval.

Example of calculation: for the sale of a VGC volume of 1 MWh at a selling price of 110 lei/MWh, the total tax on additional offshore revenues due is calculated by applying the above formulas as follows:

IVST = IVSC – VID = 17.037 - 5.1111 = 11.9259 lei

IVSC = 0.5(85 - PRC)VGC + ISO = 0.5(85 - 45.71)1 + 5.25 = 17.037 lei

ISO = CI1 * VS1 + CI2 * VS2 = 0.15·15 + 0.3·10 = 5.25 lei

VID = 0.3·IVSC = 0.3·17.037 = 5.1111 lei, where:

CI1 = 0.15 – rate of taxation (15%) of additional offshore revenues from the sale of natural gas, applicable where prices between 85 lei/MWh and 100 lei/MWh inclusive are charged, under art. 19 para. (3) letter b);

CI2 = 0.3 – rate of taxation (30%) of additional offshore revenues from the sale of natural gas, applicable where prices between 100 lei/MWh and 115 lei/MWh inclusive are charged, under art. 19 para. (3) letter c);

VS1 = (100 - 85) * 1 = 15 lei, the additional revenue from offshore perimeters, calculated as the difference between 100 lei/MWh and 85 lei/MWh;

VS2 = (110 - 100) * 1 = 10 lei, the additional revenue from offshore perimeters, calculated as the difference between the PMPC (110 lei/MWh in the example given) and 100 lei/MWh (the minimum base price of the interval);"

(On the offshore bill: the full text of the bill — see page 000.)

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQHyyBiKHnH18NLWDvC35ZM11BEelxM9bCb6s2BFwowId8swCjtvuyut4iwcFpRiWtg6FMyZ_m7crmubYC-oM1Rm-DO1229fxigK6z8j3EJkfCyypMTkjRO3PAGcVyX9AOBuX7sswVZGBG9n_9Yrd8fxIwVhl0nwIhlvq9V6NzusG80t7dsh4Qb1Uh_kNysgdrCt-JCzIZXBTa71GvJnlqhHUpGE&s=518⟩

---

224. 5 March 2025 — "Trump: "I WANT PEACE!" and "The Revolution of Common Sense cannot be stopped!" — the message of normal..."

Trump: "I WANT PEACE!" and "The Revolution of Common Sense cannot be stopped!" — the message of normality that is shaking the Western political world!

In Trump's speech, in which the usual seasoning was not lacking — the frenetic applause of Republican conservatives and the jeers of the Democrat "resisters" — it was said from Washington to America and to the whole world that white has become white again and black black; that the daring has returned to say that a man is a man and a woman is a woman, that men must not compete against women; it was said that a country's borders must be guarded, and that there cannot be 3.5 million people aged between 150 and 159 — "a far healthier country than I imagined", as Trump put it — in a country where staggering sums have been invested to establish abnormality worldwide, such as 22 billion for "sedentary migrants" (!!!), 20 million for left-wing policies in Moldova, or tens of millions for research on transgender mice...

In that speech, the world was told that the aberration of "political correctness" and State policies against nature have come to an end!

And the "civilised world", down to its last colonies, began to tremble when it heard the president of the country that has imposed democratic standards on the world for the past hundred years say unequivocally that "We shall restore REAL DEMOCRACY IN THE USA" and that "the days when unelected bureaucrats ruled us are over"! Systemists in every corner of the world, including in the colony called Romania, began to shake convulsively... an entire world is collapsing: the world of the Deep State, of the parallel state. Of course, they will say it will take time before the effects of the new policies of normality are implemented in their small countries too. They are wrong: they should look at the capitulation of Zelensky, frenetically supported by the decadent great EU, who capitulated within a single day of the historic moment — 03.03.2025 — when Trump halted the supply of arms that was "feeding" the criminal war in Ukraine.

All of it bore a single name: "THE GREAT LIBERATION OF AMERICA", a liberation that heralds the world's liberation from the "DOGMAS OF ABNORMALITY AND ANTI-TRADITION" generically called "political correctness".

This "Great Liberation of America" comes at the same time as a "RECOVERY OF SOVEREIGNTY" through the "DEFENCE OF THE LIFE AND RIGHTS OF CITIZENS" and the establishment of a "FAIR JUSTICE"!!!

Yes, that is exactly what Trump said: a FAIR JUSTICE... can that be heard in Bucharest too, at the High Court? Or even at the Constitutional Court???

Trump says that policies to protect children and young people will be implemented in America, speaking of the need to reduce cancers and illnesses induced by substances, medical treatments and toxins in food — policies for which he has appointed Health Secretary Kennedy as the person re-

sponsible... in the same context, Trump mentioned a chilling statistic: whereas a few decades ago the incidence of autism was 1 in 10,000, today it is 1 in 36.

The protection of children from abuse committed against them through "toxic ideology in schools" — the prohibition on schools teaching curricula that promote transgenderism, and also the criminalisation of sex change in children (YES! exactly as was stipulated in the #SovereigntyLaw — a law I wrote and promoted and which was rejected by the former Parliament) — the REMOVAL OF WOKE POLICIES FROM SCHOOLS becoming the new State policy of the USA: "YOU ARE PERFECT AS GOD CREATED YOU"!

On foreign policy, besides the recovery of the Panama Canal and the annexation of Greenland — lines that seem to be cardinal directions of the new USA — TRUMP SPOKE ABOUT PEACE IN UKRAINE:

"We shall put an end to the bloody conflict in Ukraine (...): 'do you want us to go on like this for another 5 years???'"

"Europe has spent more money buying Russian gas than on Ukraine's defence...

This very day I received a letter from Zelensky saying he is ready to come to PEACE talks!"

"I appreciate having received that letter and at the same time I have spoken with Russia too and received strong signals that they are ready for peace as well. HOW WONDERFUL THAT WOULD BE!"

Yes, it would be wonderful if this speech were heard, listened to and understood in the rest of the "civilised world" too... so that we might hope it becomes a civilised world again!

(On the Sovereignty Law: the full text of the bill — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQHqwzsC4wgIbPEOhn7MQ_Mh-oLTx5yGR1y6IBAWkWpm6rohwjH-H9u7S_d9oMDILp3thRXILsSAcCuZL91AYHGXhtPxgrXcsPjf4xzR8_CC3DLaXJ8bvWCFQqPH0ptx6ZaBZ1LBKSNm0Pep0c_Rt1I-MIkmMN29pxAWrUT-caz_6b89rN9PtLRb4t3BgeatEs7fxebthY-RljrAMlHHErTIZRVDg&s=518⟩

---

225. 20 May 2025 — On Us and Them

On the Sovereignty Law: the full text of the bill — see the page Sovereignty Law.

On the System and the 2 sides of the same coin

And on the need for peace between "Us" and "Them".

(Do not read the author's name and try to read this text, written as concisely as possible, to the end.)

Us and Them, whoever We may be, whoever They may be — sovereigntists or progressives, left or right, red or blue, green or yellow. Once every 4 or 5 years We find ourselves facing Them in an absurd contest over slogans, over colours, in a bitter fight for nothing, for lies (which we know are lies), in which we are told it is essential that "ours should win" — an "ours" who is not ours, of whom no one knows where he came from, where he was "born" and "raised". All we know is that "ours must win" so that we too may win. Although we never win anything (and this is proved every time), whether that "we" is Us or Them. All we do is pay for the whole game — for "ours" and for "theirs", but above all for the "Referee", always the same one — and we play by his rules. Some lose (nearly always the same ones), others win in this game, but all of us play by their rules and, above all, we pay them all (the winners, the losers, and above all the Referees). We pay them ever more dearly and with ever greater effort — we, and "Us", and "Them", whoever "Us" or "Them" may be!

In the "Grand Final" of 18 May, the "Referee" made both "Us" and "Them" choose a camp and a colour in a game organised according to the Referee's rules. And one side of a coin… one of the sides was sovereigntist-nationalist. The other side was progressive-globalist. Except that these "sides", bearing no resemblance to each other, were the sides of the same coin, "drawn", "polished" and "shaped" by the one and only referee of the match. And never in the last 25 years has this been more obvious than in the "elections" of 2025. NEVER!

Concretely: we had to choose between the "sovereigntist-nationalist" George Simion and the "progressive-globalist" Nicușor Dan. Why did I use quotation marks? Because either candidate could easily have worn the other's shirt and colour. If the "Referee" had so wished! If so it had been decided by the referee — one and the same as the candidates' trainer (!!!) somewhere along the way of their formation. For both of them — Nicușor Dan and George Simion — were raised and trained in the same schools, by exactly the same mentors and trainers: traian băsescu (alias Petrov), Alina Mungiu-Pippidi, Monica Macovei, Laura Codruța Kövesi and, yes… the one and only, the inimitable Floriaaan Coooooldeeeaaa! Both were "around there", both came from there! Hundreds of photographs, dozens of public and notorious stories tell us so beyond dispute… yet both "Us" and "Them" refused to believe them any longer and locked ourselves in a bitter struggle with an expected and predictable ending.

I know much, too much for my own health, about the path of our candidates… I know how Simion led the ultras groups at the pro-Roșia Montană demonstrations of 2013 (that is where I met him); I know how prominent members of the PMP were sent to Chișinău by băsescu to speak there with "his man", that same George Simion, who lived and travelled in grand style on "nobody knows" what funds; and I also know how Coldea threatened UDMR members of Parliament with "I'll set Simion on you"; I even know how another founding "father" of AUR was recruited by a well-known securist to whom he was informing on his "nest comrades" in Bacău; and above all I know all too well the confidence with which the jobless young GS spoke about AUR's golden future (the party then only weeks old), with no career other than that of a terrace agitator — odd, is it not? And I know too how he, George Simion in person, at a negotiation in the autumn of 2020 asked me in front of 10 to 12 witnesses to stop criticising Laura Codruța Kövesi!!! And to stop mentioning Adrian Severin, to publicly disown him… And that I experienced personally, not by hearsay! Just as I personally experienced the constant sabotage of genuinely sovereigntist initiatives such as the #SovereigntyLaw or the #ConstitutionOfSovereignty by that same George Simion… I shall not go into detail now, it would take us too far. Though I could.

Just as I know, from one of his own "trainers", about Nicușor's past as an early informer, his grave problems with concentrating on a text — let us say — how he was pushed to set up the USB and then the USR… why certain construction groups nearly always found the Town Hall's doors open… and all of it is connected with the same Mr Florian Coldea! I know a great deal, but I really do not think it healthy for me to say more about the future President in office of Romania… for the next 10 years.

Returning to the wider picture of the "playing field": whereas until now the battle for the post of "Head of State" (a notion likewise invented by them) was fought between different gangs "of referees" from the same System, now, in 2025, it is astonishing how a single gang, FC's gang, has managed to carry two of its men into the final! It even managed to persuade the Americans and the French each to back one of them! Astonishing! Brilliant, I swear!

The only one who could have spoiled the party of Coldea and the "Cluj group" would have been Crin Antonescu, backed by the other gang of systemists, the "Eduard Hellvig gang", to name it generically; but so that Crin should have no chance of reaching the final, Maior's godson was sent into

the "qualifiers" (you don't know who that is? Mr Ponta — sic!)... who let the "two brothers", the two sides of the same coin, pull ahead into the final... it all fits together, does it not?

What is certain is that we have one certain winner — the Referee! And now we know who wears the referee's kit, and we know too that the two finalists were merely the two sides of the same coin, drawn, polished and owned by one and the same "Referee". And we understand as well why one side of the coin did everything possible to make the other side of the coin win — because that is what the referee wanted!

But above all we ought to understand one more thing, both "Us" and "Them": in this game nobody wins — neither "Us" nor "Them" — only the Referee... that is, the System!

That is why I beg you all, both Us and Them: hate each other no longer, let yourselves be divided no longer by games that are not ours, do not tear each other's eyes out over a future already drawn by others, by the same systemists... by the same Referee. Break your teeth no longer on counterfeit coins... try rather to bite the hand that throws them!

"I have seen all the works that are done under the sun; and, behold, all is vanity and vexation of spirit."

As a confirmation of the above comes also the following item now circulating online:

"At this moment, GS is being pushed by Trump towards only two options: either he challenges the elections before the Constitutional Court and demands that Telegram be summoned to the case to produce the evidence it holds concerning France's interference in the elections, or it will be shown that he was merely a pawn of the System — but even in that case, the USA will still never recognise ND's legitimacy."

(On the Sovereignty Law: the full text of the bill — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQEBk49jp2Cbluxs7YyU519ciamwpm_SpDyxtpGFiLY-pIwPQaBpCwovuzDnMtfDub1OgwK8Qm-mVsQjYS1B_h1HPg8ysug6gDjUt0Tsu5HaYwyo2prkTx67T6DWJqHZjAHF7oXQLVWzwf9QSlRAA7kZmnJ2QwVnfDa1TXHJUGD4VYlyf1RLDXoPhIW0Xo8oWGyqxNO2sCwAkaJkC6PV-ZvnwjfA&s=518⟩

---

226. 25 June 2025 — "Today Dumitru Coarnă tabled in Parliament "THE ACT OF NATIONAL SOLIDARITY — THE ACT ON THE TAXA..."

Today Dumitru Coarnă filed in Parliament the "NATIONAL SOLIDARITY LAW — LAW ON THE TAXATION OF LARGE BUSINESSES AND FORTUNES, A BILL AMENDING THE FISCAL CODE — Law no. 227/2015 on the Fiscal Code and LAW no. 256 of 12 November 2018 on certain measures necessary for the implementation of petroleum operations by holders of petroleum agreements concerning offshore petroleum perimeters" — a bill I wrote more than two years ago, but which has only now become a pressing matter of the day.

I hope that members of Parliament from all parties will understand the necessity of this law and will vote it as a matter of urgency.

Here is what our bill provides:

The Law on national solidarity and the taxation of large businesses and fortunes makes specific amendments to Law 227/2015 on the Fiscal Code and to Law 256/2018 on certain measures necessary for the implementation of petroleum operations by holders of petroleum agreements concerning offshore petroleum perimeters, whose purpose is to increase budgetary revenues by taxing large

taxpayers, both legal and natural persons, at fixed percentage rates set by thresholds of revenue and, respectively, of wealth held, in order to fund the tax deductions offered to taxpayers with several dependants. Thus:

I. Amendments to Law 227/2015 on the Fiscal Code:

Article 1 adds, after article 18 of the Fiscal Code, three new articles introducing a special taxation regime for certain categories of taxpayers who are legal persons with annual revenues over 10,000,000 euros. To that end, after article 18, articles 18^1, 18^2 and 18^3 are introduced, governing the taxation regime, by thresholds of turnover and by the nature of the activity, of large corporate taxpayers in Romania. This measure is apt to encourage the activity of large taxpayers and to increase economic competitiveness. In essence, the rule introduces for large taxpayers turnover-tax thresholds similar to those already existing in Title III of the Fiscal Code, where the turnover-tax regime for Romanian micro-enterprises is laid down.

Starting from the success of the rule of low-rate turnover taxation — a major factor in the development of the national economy in recent years, and also a factor of attractiveness for many foreign economic operators who chose Romania precisely because of this method of taxation — the introduction by symmetry of the same method of taxation for large taxpayers is a measure to encourage their economic development and to attract large capital and commercial companies to our country, thus turning Romania into an important player in hosting and encouraging large business in Europe and in the world.

Likewise, it is evident that setting turnover-tax rates is apt to increase the predictability of fiscal rules for the economic operator and, at the same time, facilitates the determination and payment of taxes owed by large taxpayers to the Romanian State. The latter effect is intended to avoid possible errors arising when the taxpayer calculates taxable profit under the present rules, and to limit the interaction of economic operators with the agents of the Romanian tax authority during tax inspections — which is apt to make the work of the tax authority more efficient and to reduce the staff charged with the fiscal control of large taxpayers.

To that end, the introduction of art. 18^1 into the Fiscal Code brings three taxation thresholds for large taxpayers:

Paragraph 1 provides a rate of 1% applied to revenues recorded in each fiscal year for "taxpayers who have achieved revenues exceeding the lei equivalent of 10,000,000 euros (ten million euros)"; paragraph 2 introduces a rate of 2% applied to the revenues of taxpayers who have achieved revenues exceeding the lei equivalent of 100,000,000 euros (one hundred million euros); and paragraph 3 sets a rate of 3% of the revenues of taxpayers who have achieved revenues exceeding the lei equivalent of 1,000,000,000 euros (one billion euros). The exchange rate for determining the euro equivalent is that in force at the close of the financial year in which the revenues were recorded.

As may be seen, the introduction of taxation thresholds of 1% to 3% applied to the revenues of large taxpayers is similar and symmetrical to the taxation regime of micro-enterprises, which is apt to encourage large taxpayers in a manner similar and symmetrical to small entrepreneurs, thereby applying without discrimination one of the fiscal solutions most appreciated nationally and internationally.

Article 18^2 introduces into the Fiscal Code a first exception to the rule laid down in the preceding article for large taxpayers, introducing a new rate of 5% applied to the revenues recorded by large taxpayers who carry on activities in the nature of refining or marketing petroleum products and their derivatives and who have annual revenues greater than 10,000,000 euros. This increased rate is

similar to the existing one governing the "Special regime for taxpayers carrying on activities in the nature of night bars, night clubs, discotheques and casinos", and takes into account, on the one hand, the statistically established exceptional situation whereby, whatever the difficulties faced by the national economy — pandemic, a state of war on the country's borders — the profitability of undertakings operating in the fields mentioned above is growing; and, on the other hand, the success and proliferation of business in a field of activity already taxed at 5% of the revenues recorded annually.

Similarly and for the same reasons, Articles 18^3 and 18^4 introduce into the Fiscal Code exceptions similar to that provided for in art. 18^2 for taxpayers carrying on activities in the nature of the extraction of crude oil and natural gas, as well as for taxpayers carrying on activities in the nature of the transport and distribution of electricity.

Likewise, art. 18^5 introduces a further exception, applied this time to taxpayers carrying on activities in the nature of financial intermediation, namely — without being limited to these — monetary intermediation activities, including activities carried out by banks, savings banks, credit cooperatives, or activities of the postal credit transfer system and postal activities of savings banks; the granting of credit for the purchase of housing by specialised institutions (housing banks); monetary activities by postal order (payment orders); or the activities of holding companies, mutual funds and other similar financial entities; financial leasing; or other lending activities, such as financial service activities relating primarily to the making of loans by institutions not involved in monetary intermediation, where the granting of credit may take a variety of forms, such as loans, mortgages, credit cards, etc.

This measure, similarly to that provided for in art. 18^2, took into account the recording by such taxpayers of significant increases in revenue in economically and socially difficult periods, together with an inexplicable simultaneous stagnation of profitability caused by rising expenses.

All these reasons justify the introduction of a special taxation threshold of 5% of the annual revenues obtained by large taxpayers carrying on activities in the fields mentioned above, namely for large taxpayers carrying on activities in the nature of extraction, refining or marketing of petroleum products, as well as for large taxpayers carrying on activities in the nature of financial intermediation whose annual revenues exceed 10,000,000 euros.

Article 2 amends paragraph 2 of Law 227/2015 on the Fiscal Code and establishes a taxation of special pensions, introducing a taxation rate of 90% of the monthly taxable income constituted by the part of the pension exceeding 11 gross minimum wages nationally.

In setting this rate and this taxation threshold, account was taken of the fact that, under Law 153/2017, the President of Romania receives a legal allowance of 12 gross minimum wages nationally, and also of the fact that, as a matter of principle, no one should receive from the general consolidated budget of the State sums greater than those received by the highest dignitary of the Romanian State, the President of Romania.

For these reasons, and starting from this principle, a taxation rate of 90% was set for the monthly taxable income constituted by the part of the pension exceeding 11 gross minimum wages nationally; thus all sums derived from pensions exceeding 11 gross minimum wages nationally are taxed at 90%.

Article 3 introduces a new title into the Fiscal Code: after TITLE X, TITLE X^1 is introduced, entitled "THE TAX ON LARGE FORTUNES", the rule introducing for the first time in Romania a tax owed by taxpayers who are natural persons holding wealth greater than 10,000,000 euros (ten million euros).

The rule introduces into Romanian taxation the notion of "large fortune" for the Romanian taxpayer who is a natural person, the lower threshold of large fortunes being set at ten million euros — unlike that laid down in other States of the European Union where, as in the case of France, the tax on large fortunes is owed once wealth of 1.2 million euros is exceeded.

In setting this high threshold for taxing large fortunes, account was taken of the need to increase the wealth of Romanian citizens and their ability to develop businesses so as to increase general well-being, but also of the obligation of those whose wealth has exceeded the threshold of 10,000,000 euros to contribute in a special, personal and direct manner to raising the general standard of living and to the development of the country in which they live and make their profits — this special contribution being made both in their personal interest and in the general interest.

TITLE X^1 introduces three taxation thresholds, as follows:

— a solidarity tax of 1% a year of the total value of the wealth for taxpayers who are natural persons and whose revenues, together with the value of gains, movable assets and buildings in their patrimony as at 31 December of the preceding year, exceed 10,000,000 euros (ten million euros);

— a solidarity tax of 2% a year of the total value of the wealth for taxpayers who are natural persons and whose revenues, together with the value of gains, movable assets and buildings in their patrimony as at 31 December of the preceding year, exceed 100,000,000 euros (one hundred million euros);

— a solidarity tax of 3% a year of the total value of the wealth for taxpayers who are natural persons and whose revenues, together with the value of gains, movable assets and buildings in their patrimony as at 31 December of the preceding year, exceed 1,000,000,000 euros (one billion euros).

The solidarity tax will be calculated on the whole of the declared wealth and will be owed at the level established by law until the wealth falls below the legal threshold set, so that no person whose wealth does not exceed 10,000,000 euros will be taxed, whatever wealth they may previously have held.

For the purpose of establishing the solidarity tax owed, natural persons whose estimated wealth exceeds 10,000,000 euros are required to draw up annually a wealth declaration as set out in Annex I, the annual wealth declaration for the last fiscal year having to be filed by 25 March inclusive of the following year.

The exchange rate for determining the euro equivalent of the wealth is that in force at the close of the financial year in which the revenues and gains were recorded.

The solidarity tax is the means by which the holders of large fortunes show their solidarity with their fellow citizens and, at the same time, it is the way in which they help the development of the State which created for them the conditions for significant material accumulation.

Article 4 amends subparagraph 3 of article 77 of the Fiscal Code and extends the scope of personal deductions for taxpayers with one or more dependants who earn revenues between the limit laid down in paragraph 2, namely 3,600 lei, and the limit of 25,000 lei, as follows:

"(i) for taxpayers with one dependant — 20% of the income tax due;

for taxpayers with two dependants — 30% of the income tax due;

for taxpayers with three dependants — 40% of the income tax due;

for taxpayers with four or more dependants — 50% of the income tax due.

For taxpayers earning gross monthly salary revenues over 25,000 lei, the personal deduction is not granted."

The deductions are granted for any kind of revenue, no longer being addressed exclusively to salary income, so that as wide a range of taxpayers as possible may benefit from these fiscal facilities.

The purpose of the deductions from income tax is to support taxpayers who care for several people (children, parents, spouses) and, at the same time, to encourage active people with average incomes to have children, the State assuming indirectly (through the personal deductions governed by this law) and directly (through the statutory child allowances) part of the costs of raising children, as part of the national policy of increasing the birth rate.

This fiscal rule is apt to encourage work and constitutes a direct measure to halt demographic decline and to encourage the return home of Romanians from the diaspora.

Amendments to Law 256/2018 on certain measures necessary for the implementation of petroleum operations by holders of petroleum agreements concerning offshore petroleum perimeters

The energy sector, in particular that of offshore natural gas, is a central pillar of the national economy. The present context, marked by price fluctuations and by the need to ensure energy security, has raised the question of revising the legislative framework governing taxation in this field. To that end, the bill amending LAW no. 256/2018 makes a series of adjustments aimed at increasing taxation for holders of petroleum agreements as regards the operation of offshore petroleum perimeters. Increased taxation is often viewed with scepticism; in the present case, however, the arguments in favour are numerous and well founded.

First, fair and efficient taxation can contribute to the State budget, providing additional resources which can be invested in critical infrastructure, education or health. Moreover, in a sector as profitable as natural gas extraction, a higher tax can discourage speculation and encourage long-term investment, striking a balance between corporate profit and collective well-being.

To understand the necessity of the bill amending the legislation, it is essential to understand the formula for calculating the tax on additional offshore revenues. That formula is adjusted according to the weighted average price of natural gas sold (PMPC), taking into account also the consumer price index (CPI). Taxation thus adapts to market conditions, maintaining an equitable level of taxation correlated with economic realities.

This method of calculating taxes ensures a fair contribution by petroleum companies to the national budget, without discouraging investment in exploration and development. In addition, the emphasis is on fiscal transparency and predictability, giving operators the ability to plan their activities in the medium and long term.

Examining the calculation formula in detail, we see that it is structured on three levels of natural gas prices, each with a specific method of applying taxation. In the case of a PMPC less than or equal to 85 lei/MWh, a basic formula is used which includes the calculated additional revenue and the value of deductible investments. This approach encourages the reinvestment of profits and supports the development of the sector.

To illustrate how this mechanism works, let us take a gas price of 85 lei/MWh or less. The tax on additional offshore revenues (IVST) is calculated by subtracting the value of deductible investments (VID) from the total tax calculated (IVSC). When the price rises between 85 and 100 lei/MWh, the taxation rate becomes progressive, reflecting a greater contribution to the State budget while maintaining an incentive to invest.

When the weighted average price of gas exceeds the threshold of 100 lei/MWh, the calculation formula becomes still more complex, underlining the need to divide the additional revenues into price intervals. This means that for each price segment above 100 lei a different rate of taxation applies, thereby increasing the degree of fiscal contribution as market prices rise. This approach ensures fiscal equity and recognises market performance, while allowing holders of petroleum agreements to benefit from a stable and predictable fiscal framework.

Likewise, the value of deductible investments in the upstream segment is an important point, since it encourages reinvestment and the continued development of the infrastructure needed for the extraction and processing of natural gas. This policy not only stimulates economic growth but also helps create new jobs, thus contributing to reducing unemployment and to long-term economic prosperity. Another crucial aspect of the bill is the way it treats the cumulative values of investments. By allowing the monthly reduction of the value of deductible investments, a mechanism is created for recognising companies' efforts to update and improve their operations. This can have a positive impact on energy efficiency and on reducing greenhouse gas emissions, aligning the offshore energy sector with the country's sustainability and environmental objectives.

For these reasons, in the present economic and social context, global economic and ecological pressures require a reassessment of the way natural resources are exploited and, by implication, taxed. LAW no. 256/2018 on certain measures necessary for the implementation of petroleum operations by holders of petroleum agreements concerning offshore petroleum perimeters stands at the centre of a lively debate, with solid arguments supporting the need to increase and to amend taxation.

You will find the full text of the bill here:

(On the offshore bill: the full text of the bill — see page 000.)

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQFm6XTELN2YPZMD6JOWOSdiLd9f20qvI91Rj5akBaNB45ojA3YbldBo8UppbhdBFJZyYeesBsbe5Eqr2oU-A1wQ-0J05MuFFXY2-WOc8JOzg-UHCNOTsYu2lrsWn8gyoJklnDoL2J6MGwZdb1ONHSKB6gIMKLrAJyyIsb6xtHMrjc-C0bS_Y7Woxw8YArwJPr4iMl4cWiUrgkO3m1SACvbVmAmq4&s=518⟩

---

227. 27 June 2025 — "#LegeaSolidarităţiiNaţionale, the Act on the taxation of large fortunes and businesses, can bring at le..."

The #NationalSolidarityLaw, the law taxing large fortunes and businesses, can bring at least 100 billion into the national budget and can save the country from the immense crisis it is in.

For two years I have been telling you about it… now the press has taken it up as well!

I thank Mr Dumitru Coarnă for filing it in Parliament and for giving Romania the chance to escape poverty.

We know already… they will do exactly and in good time whatever their puppeteers in Brussels and the local and global oligarchs decide…

If and when this last bill of mine too is rejected, I shall consider that I have done everything in my power for the country and… I shall bring my public activity definitively to an end.

https://evz.ro/taxe-diferentiate-pentru-companii-si-impozit-pe-averile…

(On the Solidarity Law: the full text of the bill — see page 000; the explanatory memorandum — see page 000.)

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQFywYhF6tyT2knVkOHCWyB7-xCD-j0I4_7yUOABzWy0y4YBKY8L7N6uo_k0b2ox6qXnmZCtxWg6JlLQTPrxibynhysD3VbsinNLWBDV3CGa-PvfwnbnmPcPKfOzg7WE9HQm8lZnrmiLTyKWO9GRwRthPw1KHv4Lk-VokEZub1h75jHTvXYy6jqVoS2XqVyer6hKsDwYuoNVHMvwxZJwrpc3dwnh4&s=518⟩

228. 27 June 2025 — "I asked chat GPT what the budgetary impact of #LegeaSolidarităţiiNaţionale would be"

I asked ChatGPT what the budgetary impact of the #NationalSolidarityLaw would be.

"The bill 'National Solidarity Law – Law on the taxation of large businesses and fortunes' proposes several fiscal changes which could have a substantial budgetary impact. On the basis of public data and the measures set out in the document, we can make the following preliminary estimate of the impact on Romania's budget:

It is proposed to introduce a progressive tax for companies with high annual revenues:

• 1% for revenues between 10 and 100 million euros;

• 2% for revenues between 100 million and 1 billion euros;

• 3% for revenues above 1 billion euros.

• According to ANAF data, in 2022 there were around 2,200 companies with revenues above 10 million euros, together accounting for more than 1,200 billion lei in annual revenues.

• Applying an average of 1.5% tax (a weighted estimate), this yields additional revenue of approximately:

1,200 × 1.5% = 18 billion lei a year

A new title is proposed in the Fiscal Code — "The tax on large fortunes" — applicable to natural persons with net wealth above certain thresholds:

• 1%, 2% and 3% according to the value of the wealth.

• According to a 2022 Credit Suisse report, Romania has some 25,000 people with wealth above 1 million USD (~5 million lei).

• If, hypothetically, 10,000 of them are taxed at an average of 1% of net wealth annually, and the average taxable wealth is 6 million lei:

10,000 × 6,000,000 × 1% = 600 million lei a year

• 10% on monthly taxable pension income;

• 90% on the part of the pension exceeding 11 gross minimum wages (11 × 3,700 lei = 40,700 lei/month in 2025).

• CNPP data indicate fewer than 1,000 pensioners with pensions above 30,000 lei/month.

• If 500 people exceed the ceiling and are additionally taxed by about 20,000 lei/month × 12 months × 90%:

500 × … × 90% = 108 million lei a year

4. Additional offshore revenues (amendment of Law 256/2018)

• A progressive taxation formula is introduced depending on the price of natural gas, and the deductibility of investments is limited.

• The bill provides no direct budgetary impact, but on the basis of sector data the estimated additional revenues may reach 2–4 billion lei a year, depending on the price of gas and the volume of sales.

5. Tax deductions for taxpayers with dependants

• A reduction of up to 50% in income tax for those with 4 or more dependants.

• If 100,000 taxpayers benefit from an average deduction of 2,500 lei a year:

100,000 × 2,500 = 250 million lei in lost revenue

□ Estimated total net annual budgetary impact (positive):

Tax on large businesses +18 billion lei

Tax on large fortunes +0.6 billion lei

Tax on high pensions +0.1 billion lei

Additional offshore tax +3 billion lei

Loss from personal deductions –0.25 billion lei

⚠ Important note: these estimates are indicative and based on public data/statistics from ANAF, CNPP and international sources. The actual impact depends on tax compliance, the structure of wealth, the price of gas and the effective application of the law. No official impact study is included in the legislative document."

Here too is a budgetary justification sheet in official format, produced by the same ChatGPT:

"Here is a budgetary justification sheet in official format, drafted according to the model used by the Ministry of Public Finance, adapted for the bill on the National Solidarity Law – Law on the taxation of large businesses and fortunes.

1. Title of the draft normative act:

National Solidarity Law – Law on the taxation of large businesses and fortunes

(Bill amending and supplementing Law no. 227/2015 on the Fiscal Code and Law no. 256/2018 on certain measures necessary for the implementation of offshore petroleum operations)

Members of Parliament – Legislative initiative group

□ Additional revenues to the general consolidated budget

□ Tax deductions with a negative impact on revenues

□ Changes to the taxation regime in the energy and financial sectors

5. Estimated impact on the general consolidated budget:

Proposed fiscal measure / Type of impact / Annual estimate* (million lei)

Tax on large businesses (1–3% of turnover) — Revenues — +18,000

Additional tax for petroleum and financial companies (5%) — Revenues — +3,000

Tax on large fortunes (1–3% a year of net wealth) — Revenues — +600

Tax on special pensions (90% of the amount exceeding 11 minimum wages) — Revenues — +100

Increased personal deductions for taxpayers with dependants — Fiscal expenditure — –250

* Estimates based on public data from ANAF, CNPP, INS, BNR and on international reports (Credit Suisse, Eurostat)

• Requires the updating of ANAF systems for the collection and verification of the tax on large fortunes.

• A precise definition of the mechanism for assessing the net wealth of natural persons is necessary.

• Requires the establishment of a mechanism for filing and checking the new annual wealth declarations.

• The additional offshore tax entails adjusting the reporting and verification mechanisms for holders of petroleum agreements.

7. Compatibility with international commitments:

✔ Consistent with the OECD principles on preventing base erosion (BEPS)

✔ Complies with Romania's obligations under the European Green Deal on the energy transition

✔ Aligned with the social equity objectives of the 2030 Agenda (UN)

• Opinion of the Competition Council (if it is considered to be disguised State aid in certain industries)

The adoption of the bill is apt to generate an estimated budgetary surplus of more than 21 billion lei a year, reducing pressure on the budget deficit, contributing to fiscal equity and strengthening social solidarity. The impact is positive, significant and sustainable in the medium and long term."

Let us see how the "experts" in Parliament and Government will contradict ChatGPT! ;)

(On the offshore bill: the full text of the bill — see page 000.)

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQEz8PhGdipGwb2BXkuRNEcQ6HV8kzITIeXyS8Z0M6kHXpDZcfZz-OP-2cExMI1eLo3GutJz0q_1LVCpCU29gVwaFla7OHFiCABip2EXZWtnA2iDfM9vS1cqO_0rJ4nIPhXsfOct6DoYWvanebxX_9mRJMFmfILJPh600mRWyus5GsWTOEzHs7RbHChwAzX_ZfomjdZwh1vYxRc7KxK9uOzq3gc&s=518⟩

---

229. 11 October 2025 — On the magical society

QUO VADIS? On the end of "democracy" and the dawn of the "magical society". (4 — conclusions)

Starting from what has been set out above, we shall begin to understand better what has happened over the last 5 years, at least since the Covid years — the point from which it became evident ("crystal clear", as the strategic partner says) that decisions are taken in spheres other than the three constitutionally recognised powers: legislative, judicial and executive, as they were theoretically divided by Aristotle and Montesquieu.

The reason is simple: the de facto "governors" of today's world seem to have understood that, of all the attributes of power spoken of above, only one is not explicitly controlled or "possessed" under constitutional principles: KNOWLEDGE.

Thus, if AUTHORITY is the almost exclusive attribute of the Judicial power, the other attributes are shared by the other 2 powers of the modern state: FORCE and BUREAUCRACY — by the executive; CHARISMATIC POWER and (in part) BUREAUCRACY — by the legislative and by the people's other "elected representatives" (from village mayors to the President of the Republic).

KNOWLEDGE, however, is not explicitly assumed by any of the powers, although for thousands of years "social influence flowed from control of the esoteric forms of knowledge". This appears to have

been understood by the oligarchic regime that controls Power worldwide, each oligarch/clan of oligarchs realising that holding financial power is not enough to make one the holder of absolute power!

And so we stand exactly at the threshold of the passage from oligarchy to tyranny — as Plato would say if he were rewriting the Republic today — but not by the (exclusive) force of arms: by the power of KNOWLEDGE.

There are three means by which the financial OLIGARCHY has already, at this moment, taken absolute control of KNOWLEDGE, and has thus seized "MAGICAL" control of power worldwide (or at least in what we have called the "Small World", understood today as the "ANTI-BRICS world"):

CONTROL OF "INFORMATION" — through control and censorship of the online space, which in recent years has become the principal source of information and will in future be the sole source of information on the planet.

CONTROL OF "SCIENCE" — through the discretionary funding of research centres and, by implication, of the discoveries and innovations they produce.

CONTROL OF "INTELLIGENCE" — through the corruption and perversion of "NATURAL INTELLIGENCE" (see the capture of the "intellectual elites" over the last 35 years by Soros) and, more recently, through the invention and control of "ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE".

If to all this we add the indissoluble (or at least indiscernible) link between high Finance and the secret services... we shall fully understand the "exercise of power" that was the "Covid pandemic".

Do we remember? Then, in 2020, overnight, a "group of scientists" — somewhere, no one knows where — discovered the "killer virus" and the devastating effects it could have on man and even on mankind... They "sounded the alarm" and... POWER — the formal powers (executive, legislative and judicial) of every country and indeed of the whole planet... LOCKED UP MANKIND!!!

Subsequently, those same "men of science" — somewhere, no one knows where — also discovered overnight the "cure" for the "killer virus"... and POWER — the formal powers (executive, legislative and judicial) of every country — imposed in one form or another the administration of the cure on all the inhabitants of the planet...

The "COVID test" (this is the real "Covid test"!) confirmed it: the system works. The attribute of KNOWLEDGE, held in well-hidden "temples of science" and by quasi-anonymous "priests" (men of science and certain members of the secret services) — and therefore without any "popular" legitimacy — was able to dictate to the constitutional powers of the State (legislative, executive and judicial) what to do and how to do it — and that on a Global scale!!!

And if I had some reservations and wanted to believe (with all my might) that what happened in the "Covid years" was a historical accident, along came the social and political experiment called "THE ANNULMENT OF THE ELECTIONS OF 6 DECEMBER 2024" — when it was all confirmed once more, in the small social-experiment laboratory called Romania. Have we forgotten? Then, certain unknown persons — but holders of a KNOWLEDGE that cannot be doubted — said that the elections had been rigged by influencing the voting intentions of Romanians! So not only did these "KNOWERS" know what was happening "on the net" (which, of course, they control), but they also knew how Romanians would have voted had they not been influenced! And they know too that Romanians would certainly have voted differently had they not been influenced by the "disinformation campaign" of the ADVERSARY, of the Enemy (yes, "enemies" will appear constantly in the "official stories", for, as in any myth, you need the forces of good and of evil)! And these "KNOWERS",

"masters of information", unelected and indeed unknown to anyone, dictated — without a single concrete piece of evidence — to the formal powers of the state what to do. And "the powers of the state" did it! — this is the classic example of what we have called the "MAGICAL SOCIETY".

YES, the dawn of the "MAGICAL SOCIETY" has broken: the exercise of EFFECTIVE POWER has passed from the HOLDERS OF APPARENT POWER (the representatives of the state) to the HOLDERS OF KNOWLEDGE (shall we call it A NEW OCCULT POWER?), who dictate indirectly and mediately (through the representatives of the state/states) the destinies of human society. Evidently, the phenomenon will grow and become ever more visible... and as everything becomes more "transparent", the power of the "HOLDERS OF KNOWLEDGE" will also become generally accepted by the population! And this because "THEY KNOW!", "THEY KNOW THE TRUTH!". And because the HOLDERS OF KNOWLEDGE do not exercise power directly, THEY WILL BE LOVED... EVEN VENERATED! And thus will appear the "HIGH PRIESTS" who hold "KNOWLEDGE" and the "KEYS OF KNOWLEDGE" — INFORMATION, SCIENCE AND ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE. And we already know at least 2 people who even now personify the attributes of "KNOWLEDGE" in the collective mind: Bill Gates and Elon Musk (each of course representing an opposing camp — good and bad being merely the label you attach according to the "ideological position" you occupy — both caught in a quasi-ritual and plainly theatrical struggle, as between the Deva (the shining one) and the Asura (the powerful spirit)...

Returning to the question at the beginning of this article — "WHO TAKES THE DECISIONS IN OUR WORLD?" — only one answer seems certain: THE DECISIONS ARE NOT TAKEN BY THOSE WHO APPEAR TO TAKE THEM. Decisions are no longer taken by the legislative power, nor by the executive, nor, most of the time, even by the judiciary.

THE DECISIONS come served up by "THOSE WHO KNOW" — be they secret services, men of science, or international institutions (all of which will in the very near future have a single common denominator: "ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE" and its "HIGH PRIESTS")... Even in official speeches the verb is used almost every time impersonally: "it was necessary...", "it was done...". Thus "it was necessary" to buy billions' worth of armaments, to give them to Ukraine, to raise taxes and duties... "it was necessary" — a formulation by which the formalised power of states escapes the "moral (and political) responsibility" for its acts by casting it upon the real holders of power: they "ONLY OBEYED ORDERS" from the one or those who hold power (as soldiers do on a battlefield)!

This attachment of the "charismatic heroes" of the classical (national) states ("elected and legitimated by the people") to the "image" of "THOSE WHO HOLD KNOWLEDGE", this abdication from the responsibility of governing by assigning it to the "CENTRES OF KNOWLEDGE" (whether "men of science" as in the "COVID years" or "intelligence services" as in the case of the annulment of the Romanian elections), shows in fact that there is, de facto, a delegation of power to the new centres of power, to the "HOLDERS OF KNOWLEDGE" — which indicates two things to us:

1. DEMOCRACY HAS BECOME PURELY FORMAL; OUR SOCIETY ALREADY HAS A "MAGICAL" CHARACTER, BEING RUN INFORMALLY AND OCCULTLY BY THE "CASTE OF THOSE WHO KNOW";

2. HUMAN SOCIETY IS ALREADY UNDER A SUPRANATIONAL GOVERNANCE OF "THOSE WHO KNOW", their power far exceeding the "visible" power of the formalised institutions which still retain a national and democratic component (however faint), such as the EU, the OSCE, the UN or even NATO.

Assuredly, this is only the beginning of this new order. We are only at the dawn of the MAGICAL SOCIETY run by "THOSE WHO KNOW", by "THOSE WHO CONTROL KNOWLEDGE", and the

continuing development of “Artificial Intelligence” only strengthens and hastens the establishment of the absolute power of “THOSE WHO KNOW” (who still exercise it through “our elected representatives”, the “charismatic heroes” of the “functioning democracies”). How far? To the point where they will try to replace the Divine itself, God and His priests, with the new omniscient and omnipotent entity — Artificial Intelligence and its new “high priests”... and then, I believe, will be the end.

archived post ⟨https://www.facebook.com/dyi/1/?l=AQHd8Jiq0hzOzgy1XHA2EZ3Gy6U2H-voBlLIig4-4U8uRKBaA8rD85PQMaoOMunvjXjRCvECF4sz4mCLKlzIo_lTDxZXgp7Q1qYAaIJYlZPAo1WwqPrGKlXtfBCRcg5-fY1umcL3n9hSSbD6DUDNY5QVqAe-GvV9IqvikXVp2bQW3STB7zs4WyjRYR6vbyAVrCtY5_9g7Is-2ZhBbckL_sJnnMARXY&s=518⟩