

→ Sufficient, high standard and nearby crèches run directly by an EU Office

For reasons not of our choosing, the discussion on the “project for a new extension of the Court”, followed by the arbitrary detail “3rd Tower”, has slid onto another subject, that of “establishing a crèche in the Court of Justice”.

The latter is a long-standing claim inherited from the previous Staff Committee (2006-2008).

At its request, the Administration, back in 2007, undertook to “study the question”. Three years later, the Court of Justice, without any “study”, decided to forward the question to the Heads of Administration of the Luxembourg-based Institutions.

EPSU wishes to make its position on this matter clear.

- The increasing shortage of places in EU crèches leads at present to makeshift solutions, in private crèches, sometimes poorly equipped and with difficult access.
⇒ **EPSU demands a sufficient number of places in high standard crèches**
- Having a crèche close to the work-place helps to reduce the distances travelled daily by children and their parents.
⇒ **EPSU demands crèches within a reasonable distance**
- A crèche which is close to work must not be confused with a crèche which is built in the very building in which parents work. A crèche must, above all, be planned in such a way as to foster the children’s sound development. It must comply with the standards in force in the host country and have a garden. It cannot be part and parcel of an administrative building, let alone of one of the kind envisaged for the Court of Justice.
- The supporters of an on-site crèche argue that it would enable parents to visit their offspring during the day. However, in the interest of the smooth running of a crèche, this practice is to be avoided, because the coming-and-going of parents disturbs it. Curiously, none of the persons in charge sought such information from the professionals.
⇒ **EPSU opposes a crèche swallowed up in an administrative building**
- The management of crèches is undertaken, on behalf of all the EU institutions in Luxembourg, by the European Parliament (EP). This Institution
 - On the one hand, manages an EU crèche directly; and

- On the other, reserves places in private crèches.
- In all cases, parents contribute to the expenses according to a common scale of fees.
- To ensure the application of a common tariff, the crèches' management has to remain centralised; and to keep the costs under control, economies of scale are necessary. But that is a matter for the Institutions, which are currently under unprecedented budgetary pressure; and, first of all, for the Court of Justice, before raising the issue.

⇒ **EPSU** wants crèches to be managed by an EU Office

- A trade union is not a “customers” pressure group. Should it claim the provision of services for its members, it must also be concerned about the terms and conditions of employment of the workers who would provide that service. For **EPSU** at least, that speaks for itself.
- Presently, the EP cannot employ, under the supervision of officials, appropriately qualified Contract Staff (CS) with an unlimited period contract (Article 3a of the CEOS), because it has no ‘Office’ allowing for that. However, Article 3a CS and ‘Offices’ were invented precisely with a view to providing this type of services.
- If the EP is unwilling to set up a ‘Crèches Office’, which would enable it to employ CS under contracts for an unlimited period, then it should give up its crèches to the Commission’s OIL, which provides the appropriate legal framework.
- **EPSU** opposes the spreading of out-sourcing; it maintains that both persons (staff and users) and infrastructures must be managed directly by a single administrative EU entity. Workers have the right to know who their boss is.

⇒ **EPSU** wants crèches employing EU staff



The resurrection, on the occasion of the new extension of the Court, of the “claim” for a crèche incorporated in the future building can only caricature the Staff’s real opposition to a 3rd Tower as nothing more than a pretext seeking to obtain something else in exchange ...

For all the above reasons, and many others which can be added (e.g. multilingualism), **EPSU** opposes such a “project”, aimed at “sugaring the pill” of a 3rd yellow Tower, whereas it has the exactly opposite effect.

EPSU-CJ.lu
<http://epsu-cj.lu/>