



EN

The Staff Committee Rules – OK? Saga

- 4 October 2006 – The SC attempts to pass through the staff's General Meeting the following addition to the Rules on staff representation:

“The Staff Committee shall nominate members to represent the staff in various bodies (Joint Committees ... etc). Those nominated shall be committed to representing and advocating the Staff Committee majority's views”.

- This motion is supported by the two majority lists, *SJE* and '*Transparence & Changement*' (which later on took over *Union Syndicale Luxembourg*). It is opposed by the then *Union Syndicale* Delegation (now *EPSU*).
- In breach of the above Rules, the proposal is put to the vote; the result is: 50 votes in favour, 1 against, 44 abstentions.
- The Director for PerFin intervenes to point out that adopting an amendment to the Rules requires a 2/3 majority and that, therefore, the proposed amendment has not been adopted!

- Elections held on 6 December 2006 confirm the same majority on the Staff Committee (7 seats for *SJE* + 3 seats for '*Transparence & Changement*').
- The Administration reminds the newly elected Staff Committee of its duty to adopt *its own* Rules.
- These Rules on the internal running of the SC are to be adopted by the SC itself and not by a General Meeting.
- What an opportunity to introduce not just one provision, but a whole *system* of gagging and suppressing minorities!

- 21 March 2007 – The SC's leaders present their draft Rules to the other members :
 - i) Until a document's adoption, SC members are bound by secrecy.
 - ii) Once a decision has been adopted, every member has to uphold it (the “principle of 'democratic' centralism”).
 - iii) The provision not adopted by the last General Meeting is taken up in the Rules;
 - iv) Finally, a 2/3 majority of the SC can, by a '*motion of censure*', terminate the mandate of one of its members (*a rule actually in force at the Court of Auditors!*).

- 28 June 2007 – By 9 votes in favour, with 3 against, the SC adopts a mitigated, but still unacceptable, version of its initial draft. The SC proudly communicates its Rules

to DG PerFin, stating that they are taking immediate effect.

- 13 July 2007 – DG PerFin summons the SC and invites it to reconsider its text.

-
- 2 April 2008 – After Marathon meetings, the SC ends up, willy nilly, with a compromise barely acceptable to its different trends.

- A 'democratic' re-awakening? Or just a splintered majority's fear of getting caught in its own trap?

-
- EPSU complains to the European Ombudsman about the Court of Auditors' beacon provision. No chance! The Ombudsman, the Court of Auditors, its SC and *Union Syndicale* seem to be unanimous in the view that, so long as this –admittedly somewhat embarrassing– provision is not applied, no problem!

- | |
|---|
| ● Democracy cannot be taken for granted, defend it with EPSU! |
|---|