

A dance between judges in Karlsruhe and Luxembourg

René Smits

donderdag 06 maart 2014, 12:34



René Smits

The German constitutional complaints against the European Central Bank (ECB)'s Outright Monetary Transactions (OMT) programme have led to a unique reference by the German Constitutional Court (Bundesverfassungsgericht: BVerfG) to the European Union's top court. The Karlsruhe judges request an interpretation of EU law by the Luxembourg-based Court of Justice of the EU (CJEU). Requesting the CJEU's interpretation of an issue of Union law that may be decisive in a national court case is a requirement for the highest courts of all Member States.

[Een rechterlijke dans tussen Karlsruhe en Luxemburg](#)



René Smits



The Karlsruhe judges had never before submitted such a request. This seems like a victory for the Luxembourg judges. However, appearances are deceptive: the [request](#) contains a full analysis by the German watchdog on constitutionality why it considers the ECB's OMT programme ultra vires, i.e. beyond the powers of the central bank. The Karlsruhe judges even spell out how their brethren in Luxembourg may escape the same finding: by narrowly interpreting the ECB's decision. And they make clear that it is their own prerogative to ultimately decide whether the ECB's act agrees with the [German constitution](#). The CJEU will have to tread carefully in the interplay with the highest court of the mightiest State in the Union. One may be curious what the next step will be in the on-going dance between judges in Karlsruhe and Luxembourg.

Background: OMT

In the summer of 2012, when the euro area debt crisis was at its worst, ECB President Mario Draghi [announced](#) that, within its mandate, the ECB would do whatever it takes to preserve the euro. A few weeks later, the ECB announced its OMT programme. The central bank stands ready to buy debt instruments of States with a 'troika' programme in order to ensure that the interest rates on these States' bonds reflect their market standing, not speculation on the demise of the euro. The then prevailing market conditions saw huge interest rate differentials between euro area States. These hindered the transmission of the single monetary policy across Europe. The OMT programme is intended to restore the singleness of the ECB's monetary policy and the credibility of monetary union.

Background: ECB versus Bundesbank

The Governing Council of the ECB considers that the OMT programme, announced but not yet implemented in a legal act or applied in the markets, remains within the ECB's mandate. Germany's central bank, the [Bundesbank](#), strongly disagreed. They exchanged their arguments in the proceedings before the German Constitutional Court. The latter was seized by 36,000 citizens who wish to see the ECB's OMT programme declared unconstitutional.

The German Constitutional Court has repeatedly ruled that it is the ultimate arbiter of the lawfulness of EU legal acts within the German constitutional order. It sees itself as the guarantor of the ‘inviolable’ core of German constitutional identity. This core identity includes democratic decision-making on the national budget. Should the ECB incur losses on OMT transactions, such losses may result in budget shortfalls that are imposed upon Germany rather than autonomously decided upon by the Bundestag.

The BVerfG also considers itself competent to determine the limits of the conferral of powers to the EU by the German parliament. German authorities may not take part in the implementation of an ultravires act of the EU. Should an act be adopted beyond the powers given, German authorities must either seek an ex post validation of the act by specific authorisation, or its reversal. Such is the approach in Karlsruhe. Needless to say, the Luxembourg approach is based on the primacy of EU law.

The spectre of the ECB and the largest central bank of the Eurosystem fighting a legal battle in a Member State’s constitutional court is preferably avoided in the future. One may regard such judicial strife among members of the Eurosystem as going against central bank independence, so cherished by Germany.

Contents of the BVerfG decision

The German Constitutional Court considers the OMT decision politically motivated. The stability of the euro area and the current composition of the currency union are not values that the ECB is permitted to defend: it is confined to monetary policy and price stability. Price stability was the ultimate reason why Germany could agree to monetary union, provided it was to be secured by an independent central bank and no monetary financing takes place.

Central bank independence is an acceptable deviation from the constitutional requirements of democracy because of the – according to the Karlsruhe judges – “scientifically documented” special character of monetary policy: monetary stability is better entrusted to a central bank than to politicians with an inherently short-term view. A central bank that oversteps the limits of its mandate clashes with the democracy principle.

The Karlsruhe judges consider activation of the OMT to amount to financing of public budgets by the central bank, which is specifically prohibited by the [Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union](#) (TFEU). The ECB would be “granting assistance” to the peripheral States, just as the European Stability Mechanism

(ESM). As the CJEU has explained in its [Pringle judgment](#) on the ESM, financial assistance that seeks to serve maintaining the financial stability of the monetary union, forms part of ‘economic policy’, distinct from ‘monetary policy’. The TFEU has made the EU exclusively competent for monetary policy and has left most economic policy powers with the Member States.

By announcing OMTs, the ECB treads on the toes of the ESM and engages in ‘economic policy’. The BVerfG doesn’t accept the defence that the ECB is re-establishing normal conditions for the transmission of its monetary policy and that OMT supports the economic policies in the EU, as the central bank is bound to do. (Supporting the economic policies is the ECB’s secondary objective, behind its primary objective of maintaining price stability.) The German Constitutional Court follows the [Bundesbankin](#) saying that one cannot distinguish between ‘rational’ and ‘irrational’ elements in the interest rate surcharges that financial markets require for lending to peripheral Member States. The judges in Karlsruhe also consider that it is for the politicians to decide on the composition of the currency union: defending its current make-up is not the task of the central bank.

Only if the OMT decision were to be narrowly construed could it be considered compatible with the Treaty in the eyes of the Karlsruhe judges. They mention, *inter alia*, limiting the volume of bond purchases, requiring a time lag between bond emission and ECB purchases, not holding bonds until maturity, introducing a minimum credit rating for eligibility of bonds and introducing a preferred creditor status for the ECB.

Perspectives

One may expect the CJEU to take up the request for a preliminary interpretation in [Case C-62/14](#) with speed and to take an in-depth view of all the arguments. My guess is that the discretion the CJEU usually accords to EU institutions when it comes to decision-making in the economic sphere (in the wide sense of the term) will see it confirm that OMTs are within the central bank’s mandate. The CJEU is likely to accept that OMTs are a monetary policy instrument even though they may result in additional funding for Member States’ budgets in times of crisis, funding which is otherwise primarily achieved by economic policy instruments such as financing through the ESM.

One may expect the CJEU to emphasise the formal democratic nature of decision-making at the EU level. And the CJEU may find that, whilst it is for politicians to decide which States take part in monetary union, it is the ECB’s

task to act as guardian of the single currency and to maintain price stability in the entire, thus constituted euro area. Whether the German Constitutional Court will then follow its Luxembourg colleagues remains to be seen.

The dance between Luxembourg and Karlsruhe continues....

Source: <http://fd.nl/economie-politiek/columns/rene-smits/392860-1403/a-dance-between-judges-in-karlsruhe-and-luxembourg>

A dance between judges in Karlsruhe and Luxembourg

René Smits

donderdag 06 maart 2014, 12:34



René Smits

The German constitutional complaints against the European Central Bank (ECB)'s Outright Monetary Transactions (OMT) programme have led to a unique reference by the German Constitutional Court (Bundesverfassungsgericht: BVerfG) to the European Union's top court. The Karlsruhe judges request an interpretation of EU law by the Luxembourg-based Court of Justice of the EU (CJEU). Requesting the CJEU's interpretation of an issue of Union law that may be decisive in a national court case is a requirement for the highest courts of all Member States.

[Een rechterlijke dans tussen Karlsruhe en Luxemburg](#)



René Smits



The Karlsruhe judges had never before submitted such a request. This seems like a victory for the Luxembourg judges. However, appearances are deceptive: the [request](#) contains a full analysis by the German watchdog on constitutionality why it considers the ECB's OMT programme ultra vires, i.e. beyond the powers of the central bank. The Karlsruhe judges even spell out how their brethren in Luxembourg may escape the same finding: by narrowly interpreting the ECB's decision. And they make clear that it is their own prerogative to ultimately decide whether the ECB's act agrees with the [German constitution](#). The CJEU will have to tread carefully in the interplay with the highest court of the mightiest State in the Union. One may be curious what the next step will be in the on-going dance between judges in Karlsruhe and Luxembourg.

Background: OMT

In the summer of 2012, when the euro area debt crisis was at its worst, ECB President Mario Draghi [announced](#) that, within its mandate, the ECB would do whatever it takes to preserve the euro. A few weeks later, the ECB announced its OMT programme. The central bank stands ready to buy debt instruments of States with a 'troika' programme in order to ensure that the interest rates on these States' bonds reflect their market standing, not speculation on the demise of the euro. The then prevailing market conditions saw huge interest rate differentials between euro area States. These hindered the transmission of the single monetary policy across Europe. The OMT programme is intended to restore the singleness of the ECB's monetary policy and the credibility of monetary union.

Background: ECB versus Bundesbank

The Governing Council of the ECB considers that the OMT programme, announced but not yet implemented in a legal act or applied in the markets, remains within the ECB's mandate. Germany's central bank, the [Bundesbank](#), strongly disagreed. They exchanged their arguments in the proceedings before the German Constitutional Court. The latter was seized by 36,000 citizens who wish to see the ECB's OMT programme declared unconstitutional.

The German Constitutional Court has repeatedly ruled that it is the ultimate arbiter of the lawfulness of EU legal acts within the German constitutional order. It sees itself as the guarantor of the ‘inviolable’ core of German constitutional identity. This core identity includes democratic decision-making on the national budget. Should the ECB incur losses on OMT transactions, such losses may result in budget shortfalls that are imposed upon Germany rather than autonomously decided upon by the Bundestag.

The BVerfG also considers itself competent to determine the limits of the conferral of powers to the EU by the German parliament. German authorities may not take part in the implementation of an ultravires act of the EU. Should an act be adopted beyond the powers given, German authorities must either seek an ex post validation of the act by specific authorisation, or its reversal. Such is the approach in Karlsruhe. Needless to say, the Luxembourg approach is based on the primacy of EU law.

The spectre of the ECB and the largest central bank of the Eurosystem fighting a legal battle in a Member State’s constitutional court is preferably avoided in the future. One may regard such judicial strife among members of the Eurosystem as going against central bank independence, so cherished by Germany.

Contents of the BVerfG decision

The German Constitutional Court considers the OMT decision politically motivated. The stability of the euro area and the current composition of the currency union are not values that the ECB is permitted to defend: it is confined to monetary policy and price stability. Price stability was the ultimate reason why Germany could agree to monetary union, provided it was to be secured by an independent central bank and no monetary financing takes place.

Central bank independence is an acceptable deviation from the constitutional requirements of democracy because of the – according to the Karlsruhe judges – “scientifically documented” special character of monetary policy: monetary stability is better entrusted to a central bank than to politicians with an inherently short-term view. A central bank that oversteps the limits of its mandate clashes with the democracy principle.

The Karlsruhe judges consider activation of the OMT to amount to financing of public budgets by the central bank, which is specifically prohibited by the [Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union](#) (TFEU). The ECB would be “granting assistance” to the peripheral States, just as the European Stability Mechanism

(ESM). As the CJEU has explained in its [Pringle judgment](#) on the ESM, financial assistance that seeks to serve maintaining the financial stability of the monetary union, forms part of ‘economic policy’, distinct from ‘monetary policy’. The TFEU has made the EU exclusively competent for monetary policy and has left most economic policy powers with the Member States.

By announcing OMTs, the ECB treads on the toes of the ESM and engages in ‘economic policy’. The BVerfG doesn’t accept the defence that the ECB is re-establishing normal conditions for the transmission of its monetary policy and that OMT supports the economic policies in the EU, as the central bank is bound to do. (Supporting the economic policies is the ECB’s secondary objective, behind its primary objective of maintaining price stability.) The German Constitutional Court follows the [Bundesbankin](#) saying that one cannot distinguish between ‘rational’ and ‘irrational’ elements in the interest rate surcharges that financial markets require for lending to peripheral Member States. The judges in Karlsruhe also consider that it is for the politicians to decide on the composition of the currency union: defending its current make-up is not the task of the central bank.

Only if the OMT decision were to be narrowly construed could it be considered compatible with the Treaty in the eyes of the Karlsruhe judges. They mention, *inter alia*, limiting the volume of bond purchases, requiring a time lag between bond emission and ECB purchases, not holding bonds until maturity, introducing a minimum credit rating for eligibility of bonds and introducing a preferred creditor status for the ECB.

Perspectives

One may expect the CJEU to take up the request for a preliminary interpretation in [Case C-62/14](#) with speed and to take an in-depth view of all the arguments. My guess is that the discretion the CJEU usually accords to EU institutions when it comes to decision-making in the economic sphere (in the wide sense of the term) will see it confirm that OMTs are within the central bank’s mandate. The CJEU is likely to accept that OMTs are a monetary policy instrument even though they may result in additional funding for Member States’ budgets in times of crisis, funding which is otherwise primarily achieved by economic policy instruments such as financing through the ESM.

One may expect the CJEU to emphasise the formal democratic nature of decision-making at the EU level. And the CJEU may find that, whilst it is for politicians to decide which States take part in monetary union, it is the ECB’s

task to act as guardian of the single currency and to maintain price stability in the entire, thus constituted euro area. Whether the German Constitutional Court will then follow its Luxembourg colleagues remains to be seen.

The dance between Luxembourg and Karlsruhe continues....

Source: <http://fd.nl/economie-politiek/columns/rene-smits/392860-1403/a-dance-between-judges-in-karlsruhe-and-luxembourg>

A dance between judges in Karlsruhe and Luxembourg

René Smits

donderdag 06 maart 2014, 12:34



René Smits

The German constitutional complaints against the European Central Bank (ECB)'s Outright Monetary Transactions (OMT) programme have led to a unique reference by the German Constitutional Court (Bundesverfassungsgericht: BVerfG) to the European Union's top court. The Karlsruhe judges request an interpretation of EU law by the Luxembourg-based Court of Justice of the EU (CJEU). Requesting the CJEU's interpretation of an issue of Union law that may be decisive in a national court case is a requirement for the highest courts of all Member States.

[Een rechterlijke dans tussen Karlsruhe en Luxemburg](#)



René Smits



The Karlsruhe judges had never before submitted such a request. This seems like a victory for the Luxembourg judges. However, appearances are deceptive: the [request](#) contains a full analysis by the German watchdog on constitutionality why it considers the ECB's OMT programme ultra vires, i.e. beyond the powers of the central bank. The Karlsruhe judges even spell out how their brethren in Luxembourg may escape the same finding: by narrowly interpreting the ECB's decision. And they make clear that it is their own prerogative to ultimately decide whether the ECB's act agrees with the [German constitution](#). The CJEU will have to tread carefully in the interplay with the highest court of the mightiest State in the Union. One may be curious what the next step will be in the on-going dance between judges in Karlsruhe and Luxembourg.

Background: OMT

In the summer of 2012, when the euro area debt crisis was at its worst, ECB President Mario Draghi [announced](#) that, within its mandate, the ECB would do whatever it takes to preserve the euro. A few weeks later, the ECB announced its OMT programme. The central bank stands ready to buy debt instruments of States with a 'troika' programme in order to ensure that the interest rates on these States' bonds reflect their market standing, not speculation on the demise of the euro. The then prevailing market conditions saw huge interest rate differentials between euro area States. These hindered the transmission of the single monetary policy across Europe. The OMT programme is intended to restore the singleness of the ECB's monetary policy and the credibility of monetary union.

Background: ECB versus Bundesbank

The Governing Council of the ECB considers that the OMT programme, announced but not yet implemented in a legal act or applied in the markets, remains within the ECB's mandate. Germany's central bank, the [Bundesbank](#), strongly disagreed. They exchanged their arguments in the proceedings before the German Constitutional Court. The latter was seized by 36,000 citizens who wish to see the ECB's OMT programme declared unconstitutional.

The German Constitutional Court has repeatedly ruled that it is the ultimate arbiter of the lawfulness of EU legal acts within the German constitutional order. It sees itself as the guarantor of the ‘inviolable’ core of German constitutional identity. This core identity includes democratic decision-making on the national budget. Should the ECB incur losses on OMT transactions, such losses may result in budget shortfalls that are imposed upon Germany rather than autonomously decided upon by the Bundestag.

The BVerfG also considers itself competent to determine the limits of the conferral of powers to the EU by the German parliament. German authorities may not take part in the implementation of an ultravires act of the EU. Should an act be adopted beyond the powers given, German authorities must either seek an ex post validation of the act by specific authorisation, or its reversal. Such is the approach in Karlsruhe. Needless to say, the Luxembourg approach is based on the primacy of EU law.

The spectre of the ECB and the largest central bank of the Eurosystem fighting a legal battle in a Member State’s constitutional court is preferably avoided in the future. One may [regard](#) such judicial strife among members of the Eurosystem as going against central bank independence, so cherished by Germany.

Contents of the BVerfG decision

The German Constitutional Court considers the OMT decision politically motivated. The stability of the euro area and the current composition of the currency union are not values that the ECB is permitted to defend: it is confined to monetary policy and price stability. Price stability was the ultimate reason why Germany could agree to monetary union, provided it was to be secured by an independent central bank and no monetary financing takes place.

Central bank independence is an acceptable deviation from the constitutional requirements of democracy because of the – according to the Karlsruhe judges – “scientifically documented” special character of monetary policy: monetary stability is better entrusted to a central bank than to politicians with an inherently short-term view. A central bank that oversteps the limits of its mandate clashes with the democracy principle.

The Karlsruhe judges consider activation of the OMT to amount to financing of public budgets by the central bank, which is specifically prohibited by the [Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union](#) (TFEU). The ECB would be “granting assistance” to the peripheral States, just as the European Stability Mechanism

(ESM). As the CJEU has explained in its [Pringle judgment](#) on the ESM, financial assistance that seeks to serve maintaining the financial stability of the monetary union, forms part of ‘economic policy’, distinct from ‘monetary policy’. The TFEU has made the EU exclusively competent for monetary policy and has left most economic policy powers with the Member States.

By announcing OMTs, the ECB treads on the toes of the ESM and engages in ‘economic policy’. The BVerfG doesn’t accept the defence that the ECB is re-establishing normal conditions for the transmission of its monetary policy and that OMT supports the economic policies in the EU, as the central bank is bound to do. (Supporting the economic policies is the ECB’s secondary objective, behind its primary objective of maintaining price stability.) The German Constitutional Court follows the [Bundesbankin](#) saying that one cannot distinguish between ‘rational’ and ‘irrational’ elements in the interest rate surcharges that financial markets require for lending to peripheral Member States. The judges in Karlsruhe also consider that it is for the politicians to decide on the composition of the currency union: defending its current make-up is not the task of the central bank.

Only if the OMT decision were to be narrowly construed could it be considered compatible with the Treaty in the eyes of the Karlsruhe judges. They mention, *inter alia*, limiting the volume of bond purchases, requiring a time lag between bond emission and ECB purchases, not holding bonds until maturity, introducing a minimum credit rating for eligibility of bonds and introducing a preferred creditor status for the ECB.

Perspectives

One may expect the CJEU to take up the request for a preliminary interpretation in [Case C-62/14](#) with speed and to take an in-depth view of all the arguments. My guess is that the discretion the CJEU usually accords to EU institutions when it comes to decision-making in the economic sphere (in the wide sense of the term) will see it confirm that OMTs are within the central bank’s mandate. The CJEU is likely to accept that OMTs are a monetary policy instrument even though they may result in additional funding for Member States’ budgets in times of crisis, funding which is otherwise primarily achieved by economic policy instruments such as financing through the ESM.

One may expect the CJEU to emphasise the formal democratic nature of decision-making at the EU level. And the CJEU may find that, whilst it is for politicians to decide which States take part in monetary union, it is the ECB’s

task to act as guardian of the single currency and to maintain price stability in the entire, thus constituted euro area. Whether the German Constitutional Court will then follow its Luxembourg colleagues remains to be seen.

The dance between Luxembourg and Karlsruhe continues....

Source: <http://fd.nl/economie-politiek/columns/rene-smits/392860-1403/a-dance-between-judges-in-karlsruhe-and-luxembourg>

A dance between judges in Karlsruhe and Luxembourg

René Smits

donderdag 06 maart 2014, 12:34



René Smits

The German constitutional complaints against the European Central Bank (ECB)'s Outright Monetary Transactions (OMT) programme have led to a unique reference by the German Constitutional Court (Bundesverfassungsgericht: BVerfG) to the European Union's top court. The Karlsruhe judges request an interpretation of EU law by the Luxembourg-based Court of Justice of the EU (CJEU). Requesting the CJEU's interpretation of an issue of Union law that may be decisive in a national court case is a requirement for the highest courts of all Member States.

[Een rechterlijke dans tussen Karlsruhe en Luxemburg](#)



René Smits



The Karlsruhe judges had never before submitted such a request. This seems like a victory for the Luxembourg judges. However, appearances are deceptive: the [request](#) contains a full analysis by the German watchdog on constitutionality why it considers the ECB's OMT programme ultra vires, i.e. beyond the powers of the central bank. The Karlsruhe judges even spell out how their brethren in Luxembourg may escape the same finding: by narrowly interpreting the ECB's decision. And they make clear that it is their own prerogative to ultimately decide whether the ECB's act agrees with the [German constitution](#). The CJEU will have to tread carefully in the interplay with the highest court of the mightiest State in the Union. One may be curious what the next step will be in the on-going dance between judges in Karlsruhe and Luxembourg.

Background: OMT

In the summer of 2012, when the euro area debt crisis was at its worst, ECB President Mario Draghi [announced](#) that, within its mandate, the ECB would do whatever it takes to preserve the euro. A few weeks later, the ECB announced its OMT programme. The central bank stands ready to buy debt instruments of States with a 'troika' programme in order to ensure that the interest rates on these States' bonds reflect their market standing, not speculation on the demise of the euro. The then prevailing market conditions saw huge interest rate differentials between euro area States. These hindered the transmission of the single monetary policy across Europe. The OMT programme is intended to restore the singleness of the ECB's monetary policy and the credibility of monetary union.

Background: ECB versus Bundesbank

The Governing Council of the ECB considers that the OMT programme, announced but not yet implemented in a legal act or applied in the markets, remains within the ECB's mandate. Germany's central bank, the [Bundesbank](#), strongly disagreed. They exchanged their arguments in the proceedings before the German Constitutional Court. The latter was seized by 36,000 citizens who wish to see the ECB's OMT programme declared unconstitutional.

The German Constitutional Court has repeatedly ruled that it is the ultimate arbiter of the lawfulness of EU legal acts within the German constitutional order. It sees itself as the guarantor of the ‘inviolable’ core of German constitutional identity. This core identity includes democratic decision-making on the national budget. Should the ECB incur losses on OMT transactions, such losses may result in budget shortfalls that are imposed upon Germany rather than autonomously decided upon by the Bundestag.

The BVerfG also considers itself competent to determine the limits of the conferral of powers to the EU by the German parliament. German authorities may not take part in the implementation of an ultravires act of the EU. Should an act be adopted beyond the powers given, German authorities must either seek an ex post validation of the act by specific authorisation, or its reversal. Such is the approach in Karlsruhe. Needless to say, the Luxembourg approach is based on the primacy of EU law.

The spectre of the ECB and the largest central bank of the Eurosystem fighting a legal battle in a Member State’s constitutional court is preferably avoided in the future. One may [regard](#) such judicial strife among members of the Eurosystem as going against central bank independence, so cherished by Germany.

Contents of the BVerfG decision

The German Constitutional Court considers the OMT decision politically motivated. The stability of the euro area and the current composition of the currency union are not values that the ECB is permitted to defend: it is confined to monetary policy and price stability. Price stability was the ultimate reason why Germany could agree to monetary union, provided it was to be secured by an independent central bank and no monetary financing takes place.

Central bank independence is an acceptable deviation from the constitutional requirements of democracy because of the – according to the Karlsruhe judges – “scientifically documented” special character of monetary policy: monetary stability is better entrusted to a central bank than to politicians with an inherently short-term view. A central bank that oversteps the limits of its mandate clashes with the democracy principle.

The Karlsruhe judges consider activation of the OMT to amount to financing of public budgets by the central bank, which is specifically prohibited by the [Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union](#) (TFEU). The ECB would be “granting assistance” to the peripheral States, just as the European Stability Mechanism

(ESM). As the CJEU has explained in its [Pringle judgment](#) on the ESM, financial assistance that seeks to serve maintaining the financial stability of the monetary union, forms part of ‘economic policy’, distinct from ‘monetary policy’. The TFEU has made the EU exclusively competent for monetary policy and has left most economic policy powers with the Member States.

By announcing OMTs, the ECB treads on the toes of the ESM and engages in ‘economic policy’. The BVerfG doesn’t accept the defence that the ECB is re-establishing normal conditions for the transmission of its monetary policy and that OMT supports the economic policies in the EU, as the central bank is bound to do. (Supporting the economic policies is the ECB’s secondary objective, behind its primary objective of maintaining price stability.) The German Constitutional Court follows the [Bundesbankin](#) saying that one cannot distinguish between ‘rational’ and ‘irrational’ elements in the interest rate surcharges that financial markets require for lending to peripheral Member States. The judges in Karlsruhe also consider that it is for the politicians to decide on the composition of the currency union: defending its current make-up is not the task of the central bank.

Only if the OMT decision were to be narrowly construed could it be considered compatible with the Treaty in the eyes of the Karlsruhe judges. They mention, *inter alia*, limiting the volume of bond purchases, requiring a time lag between bond emission and ECB purchases, not holding bonds until maturity, introducing a minimum credit rating for eligibility of bonds and introducing a preferred creditor status for the ECB.

Perspectives

One may expect the CJEU to take up the request for a preliminary interpretation in [Case C-62/14](#) with speed and to take an in-depth view of all the arguments. My guess is that the discretion the CJEU usually accords to EU institutions when it comes to decision-making in the economic sphere (in the wide sense of the term) will see it confirm that OMTs are within the central bank’s mandate. The CJEU is likely to accept that OMTs are a monetary policy instrument even though they may result in additional funding for Member States’ budgets in times of crisis, funding which is otherwise primarily achieved by economic policy instruments such as financing through the ESM.

One may expect the CJEU to emphasise the formal democratic nature of decision-making at the EU level. And the CJEU may find that, whilst it is for politicians to decide which States take part in monetary union, it is the ECB’s

task to act as guardian of the single currency and to maintain price stability in the entire, thus constituted euro area. Whether the German Constitutional Court will then follow its Luxembourg colleagues remains to be seen.

The dance between Luxembourg and Karlsruhe continues....

Source: <http://fd.nl/economie-politiek/columns/rene-smits/392860-1403/a-dance-between-judges-in-karlsruhe-and-luxembourg>

A dance between judges in Karlsruhe and Luxembourg

René Smits

donderdag 06 maart 2014, 12:34



René Smits

The German constitutional complaints against the European Central Bank (ECB)'s Outright Monetary Transactions (OMT) programme have led to a unique reference by the German Constitutional Court (Bundesverfassungsgericht: BVerfG) to the European Union's top court. The Karlsruhe judges request an interpretation of EU law by the Luxembourg-based Court of Justice of the EU (CJEU). Requesting the CJEU's interpretation of an issue of Union law that may be decisive in a national court case is a requirement for the highest courts of all Member States.

[Een rechterlijke dans tussen Karlsruhe en Luxemburg](#)



René Smits



The Karlsruhe judges had never before submitted such a request. This seems like a victory for the Luxembourg judges. However, appearances are deceptive: the [request](#) contains a full analysis by the German watchdog on constitutionality why it considers the ECB's OMT programme ultra vires, i.e. beyond the powers of the central bank. The Karlsruhe judges even spell out how their brethren in Luxembourg may escape the same finding: by narrowly interpreting the ECB's decision. And they make clear that it is their own prerogative to ultimately decide whether the ECB's act agrees with the [German constitution](#). The CJEU will have to tread carefully in the interplay with the highest court of the mightiest State in the Union. One may be curious what the next step will be in the on-going dance between judges in Karlsruhe and Luxembourg.

Background: OMT

In the summer of 2012, when the euro area debt crisis was at its worst, ECB President Mario Draghi [announced](#) that, within its mandate, the ECB would do whatever it takes to preserve the euro. A few weeks later, the ECB announced its OMT programme. The central bank stands ready to buy debt instruments of States with a 'troika' programme in order to ensure that the interest rates on these States' bonds reflect their market standing, not speculation on the demise of the euro. The then prevailing market conditions saw huge interest rate differentials between euro area States. These hindered the transmission of the single monetary policy across Europe. The OMT programme is intended to restore the singleness of the ECB's monetary policy and the credibility of monetary union.

Background: ECB versus Bundesbank

The Governing Council of the ECB considers that the OMT programme, announced but not yet implemented in a legal act or applied in the markets, remains within the ECB's mandate. Germany's central bank, the [Bundesbank](#), strongly disagreed. They exchanged their arguments in the proceedings before the German Constitutional Court. The latter was seized by 36,000 citizens who wish to see the ECB's OMT programme declared unconstitutional.

The German Constitutional Court has repeatedly ruled that it is the ultimate arbiter of the lawfulness of EU legal acts within the German constitutional order. It sees itself as the guarantor of the ‘inviolable’ core of German constitutional identity. This core identity includes democratic decision-making on the national budget. Should the ECB incur losses on OMT transactions, such losses may result in budget shortfalls that are imposed upon Germany rather than autonomously decided upon by the Bundestag.

The BVerfG also considers itself competent to determine the limits of the conferral of powers to the EU by the German parliament. German authorities may not take part in the implementation of an ultravires act of the EU. Should an act be adopted beyond the powers given, German authorities must either seek an ex post validation of the act by specific authorisation, or its reversal. Such is the approach in Karlsruhe. Needless to say, the Luxembourg approach is based on the primacy of EU law.

The spectre of the ECB and the largest central bank of the Eurosystem fighting a legal battle in a Member State’s constitutional court is preferably avoided in the future. One may regard such judicial strife among members of the Eurosystem as going against central bank independence, so cherished by Germany.

Contents of the BVerfG decision

The German Constitutional Court considers the OMT decision politically motivated. The stability of the euro area and the current composition of the currency union are not values that the ECB is permitted to defend: it is confined to monetary policy and price stability. Price stability was the ultimate reason why Germany could agree to monetary union, provided it was to be secured by an independent central bank and no monetary financing takes place.

Central bank independence is an acceptable deviation from the constitutional requirements of democracy because of the – according to the Karlsruhe judges – “scientifically documented” special character of monetary policy: monetary stability is better entrusted to a central bank than to politicians with an inherently short-term view. A central bank that oversteps the limits of its mandate clashes with the democracy principle.

The Karlsruhe judges consider activation of the OMT to amount to financing of public budgets by the central bank, which is specifically prohibited by the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU). The ECB would be “granting assistance” to the peripheral States, just as the European Stability Mechanism

(ESM). As the CJEU has explained in its [Pringle judgment](#) on the ESM, financial assistance that seeks to serve maintaining the financial stability of the monetary union, forms part of ‘economic policy’, distinct from ‘monetary policy’. The TFEU has made the EU exclusively competent for monetary policy and has left most economic policy powers with the Member States.

By announcing OMTs, the ECB treads on the toes of the ESM and engages in ‘economic policy’. The BVerfG doesn’t accept the defence that the ECB is re-establishing normal conditions for the transmission of its monetary policy and that OMT supports the economic policies in the EU, as the central bank is bound to do. (Supporting the economic policies is the ECB’s secondary objective, behind its primary objective of maintaining price stability.) The German Constitutional Court follows the [Bundesbankin](#) saying that one cannot distinguish between ‘rational’ and ‘irrational’ elements in the interest rate surcharges that financial markets require for lending to peripheral Member States. The judges in Karlsruhe also consider that it is for the politicians to decide on the composition of the currency union: defending its current make-up is not the task of the central bank.

Only if the OMT decision were to be narrowly construed could it be considered compatible with the Treaty in the eyes of the Karlsruhe judges. They mention, *inter alia*, limiting the volume of bond purchases, requiring a time lag between bond emission and ECB purchases, not holding bonds until maturity, introducing a minimum credit rating for eligibility of bonds and introducing a preferred creditor status for the ECB.

Perspectives

One may expect the CJEU to take up the request for a preliminary interpretation in [Case C-62/14](#) with speed and to take an in-depth view of all the arguments. My guess is that the discretion the CJEU usually accords to EU institutions when it comes to decision-making in the economic sphere (in the wide sense of the term) will see it confirm that OMTs are within the central bank’s mandate. The CJEU is likely to accept that OMTs are a monetary policy instrument even though they may result in additional funding for Member States’ budgets in times of crisis, funding which is otherwise primarily achieved by economic policy instruments such as financing through the ESM.

One may expect the CJEU to emphasise the formal democratic nature of decision-making at the EU level. And the CJEU may find that, whilst it is for politicians to decide which States take part in monetary union, it is the ECB’s

task to act as guardian of the single currency and to maintain price stability in the entire, thus constituted euro area. Whether the German Constitutional Court will then follow its Luxembourg colleagues remains to be seen.

The dance between Luxembourg and Karlsruhe continues....

Source: <http://fd.nl/economie-politiek/columns/rene-smits/392860-1403/a-dance-between-judges-in-karlsruhe-and-luxembourg>

A dance between judges in Karlsruhe and Luxembourg

René Smits

donderdag 06 maart 2014, 12:34



René Smits

The German constitutional complaints against the European Central Bank (ECB)'s Outright Monetary Transactions (OMT) programme have led to a unique reference by the German Constitutional Court (Bundesverfassungsgericht: BVerfG) to the European Union's top court. The Karlsruhe judges request an interpretation of EU law by the Luxembourg-based Court of Justice of the EU (CJEU). Requesting the CJEU's interpretation of an issue of Union law that may be decisive in a national court case is a requirement for the highest courts of all Member States.

[Een rechterlijke dans tussen Karlsruhe en Luxemburg](#)



René Smits



The Karlsruhe judges had never before submitted such a request. This seems like a victory for the Luxembourg judges. However, appearances are deceptive: the [request](#) contains a full analysis by the German watchdog on constitutionality why it considers the ECB's OMT programme ultra vires, i.e. beyond the powers of the central bank. The Karlsruhe judges even spell out how their brethren in Luxembourg may escape the same finding: by narrowly interpreting the ECB's decision. And they make clear that it is their own prerogative to ultimately decide whether the ECB's act agrees with the [German constitution](#). The CJEU will have to tread carefully in the interplay with the highest court of the mightiest State in the Union. One may be curious what the next step will be in the on-going dance between judges in Karlsruhe and Luxembourg.

Background: OMT

In the summer of 2012, when the euro area debt crisis was at its worst, ECB President Mario Draghi [announced](#) that, within its mandate, the ECB would do whatever it takes to preserve the euro. A few weeks later, the ECB announced its OMT programme. The central bank stands ready to buy debt instruments of States with a 'troika' programme in order to ensure that the interest rates on these States' bonds reflect their market standing, not speculation on the demise of the euro. The then prevailing market conditions saw huge interest rate differentials between euro area States. These hindered the transmission of the single monetary policy across Europe. The OMT programme is intended to restore the singleness of the ECB's monetary policy and the credibility of monetary union.

Background: ECB versus Bundesbank

The Governing Council of the ECB considers that the OMT programme, announced but not yet implemented in a legal act or applied in the markets, remains within the ECB's mandate. Germany's central bank, the [Bundesbank](#), strongly disagreed. They exchanged their arguments in the proceedings before the German Constitutional Court. The latter was seized by 36,000 citizens who wish to see the ECB's OMT programme declared unconstitutional.

The German Constitutional Court has repeatedly ruled that it is the ultimate arbiter of the lawfulness of EU legal acts within the German constitutional order. It sees itself as the guarantor of the ‘inviolable’ core of German constitutional identity. This core identity includes democratic decision-making on the national budget. Should the ECB incur losses on OMT transactions, such losses may result in budget shortfalls that are imposed upon Germany rather than autonomously decided upon by the Bundestag.

The BVerfG also considers itself competent to determine the limits of the conferral of powers to the EU by the German parliament. German authorities may not take part in the implementation of an ultravires act of the EU. Should an act be adopted beyond the powers given, German authorities must either seek an ex post validation of the act by specific authorisation, or its reversal. Such is the approach in Karlsruhe. Needless to say, the Luxembourg approach is based on the primacy of EU law.

The spectre of the ECB and the largest central bank of the Eurosystem fighting a legal battle in a Member State’s constitutional court is preferably avoided in the future. One may regard such judicial strife among members of the Eurosystem as going against central bank independence, so cherished by Germany.

Contents of the BVerfG decision

The German Constitutional Court considers the OMT decision politically motivated. The stability of the euro area and the current composition of the currency union are not values that the ECB is permitted to defend: it is confined to monetary policy and price stability. Price stability was the ultimate reason why Germany could agree to monetary union, provided it was to be secured by an independent central bank and no monetary financing takes place.

Central bank independence is an acceptable deviation from the constitutional requirements of democracy because of the – according to the Karlsruhe judges – “scientifically documented” special character of monetary policy: monetary stability is better entrusted to a central bank than to politicians with an inherently short-term view. A central bank that oversteps the limits of its mandate clashes with the democracy principle.

The Karlsruhe judges consider activation of the OMT to amount to financing of public budgets by the central bank, which is specifically prohibited by the [Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union](#) (TFEU). The ECB would be “granting assistance” to the peripheral States, just as the European Stability Mechanism

(ESM). As the CJEU has explained in its [Pringle judgment](#) on the ESM, financial assistance that seeks to serve maintaining the financial stability of the monetary union, forms part of ‘economic policy’, distinct from ‘monetary policy’. The TFEU has made the EU exclusively competent for monetary policy and has left most economic policy powers with the Member States.

By announcing OMTs, the ECB treads on the toes of the ESM and engages in ‘economic policy’. The BVerfG doesn’t accept the defence that the ECB is re-establishing normal conditions for the transmission of its monetary policy and that OMT supports the economic policies in the EU, as the central bank is bound to do. (Supporting the economic policies is the ECB’s secondary objective, behind its primary objective of maintaining price stability.) The German Constitutional Court follows the [Bundesbankin](#) saying that one cannot distinguish between ‘rational’ and ‘irrational’ elements in the interest rate surcharges that financial markets require for lending to peripheral Member States. The judges in Karlsruhe also consider that it is for the politicians to decide on the composition of the currency union: defending its current make-up is not the task of the central bank.

Only if the OMT decision were to be narrowly construed could it be considered compatible with the Treaty in the eyes of the Karlsruhe judges. They mention, *inter alia*, limiting the volume of bond purchases, requiring a time lag between bond emission and ECB purchases, not holding bonds until maturity, introducing a minimum credit rating for eligibility of bonds and introducing a preferred creditor status for the ECB.

Perspectives

One may expect the CJEU to take up the request for a preliminary interpretation in [Case C-62/14](#) with speed and to take an in-depth view of all the arguments. My guess is that the discretion the CJEU usually accords to EU institutions when it comes to decision-making in the economic sphere (in the wide sense of the term) will see it confirm that OMTs are within the central bank’s mandate. The CJEU is likely to accept that OMTs are a monetary policy instrument even though they may result in additional funding for Member States’ budgets in times of crisis, funding which is otherwise primarily achieved by economic policy instruments such as financing through the ESM.

One may expect the CJEU to emphasise the formal democratic nature of decision-making at the EU level. And the CJEU may find that, whilst it is for politicians to decide which States take part in monetary union, it is the ECB’s

task to act as guardian of the single currency and to maintain price stability in the entire, thus constituted euro area. Whether the German Constitutional Court will then follow its Luxembourg colleagues remains to be seen.

The dance between Luxembourg and Karlsruhe continues....

Source: <http://fd.nl/economie-politiek/columns/rene-smits/392860-1403/a-dance-between-judges-in-karlsruhe-and-luxembourg>

A dance between judges in Karlsruhe and Luxembourg

René Smits

donderdag 06 maart 2014, 12:34



René Smits

The German constitutional complaints against the European Central Bank (ECB)'s Outright Monetary Transactions (OMT) programme have led to a unique reference by the German Constitutional Court (Bundesverfassungsgericht: BVerfG) to the European Union's top court. The Karlsruhe judges request an interpretation of EU law by the Luxembourg-based Court of Justice of the EU (CJEU). Requesting the CJEU's interpretation of an issue of Union law that may be decisive in a national court case is a requirement for the highest courts of all Member States.

[Een rechterlijke dans tussen Karlsruhe en Luxemburg](#)



René Smits



The Karlsruhe judges had never before submitted such a request. This seems like a victory for the Luxembourg judges. However, appearances are deceptive: the [request](#) contains a full analysis by the German watchdog on constitutionality why it considers the ECB's OMT programme ultra vires, i.e. beyond the powers of the central bank. The Karlsruhe judges even spell out how their brethren in Luxembourg may escape the same finding: by narrowly interpreting the ECB's decision. And they make clear that it is their own prerogative to ultimately decide whether the ECB's act agrees with the [German constitution](#). The CJEU will have to tread carefully in the interplay with the highest court of the mightiest State in the Union. One may be curious what the next step will be in the on-going dance between judges in Karlsruhe and Luxembourg.

Background: OMT

In the summer of 2012, when the euro area debt crisis was at its worst, ECB President Mario Draghi [announced](#) that, within its mandate, the ECB would do whatever it takes to preserve the euro. A few weeks later, the ECB announced its OMT programme. The central bank stands ready to buy debt instruments of States with a 'troika' programme in order to ensure that the interest rates on these States' bonds reflect their market standing, not speculation on the demise of the euro. The then prevailing market conditions saw huge interest rate differentials between euro area States. These hindered the transmission of the single monetary policy across Europe. The OMT programme is intended to restore the singleness of the ECB's monetary policy and the credibility of monetary union.

Background: ECB versus Bundesbank

The Governing Council of the ECB considers that the OMT programme, announced but not yet implemented in a legal act or applied in the markets, remains within the ECB's mandate. Germany's central bank, the [Bundesbank](#), strongly disagreed. They exchanged their arguments in the proceedings before the German Constitutional Court. The latter was seized by 36,000 citizens who wish to see the ECB's OMT programme declared unconstitutional.

The German Constitutional Court has repeatedly ruled that it is the ultimate arbiter of the lawfulness of EU legal acts within the German constitutional order. It sees itself as the guarantor of the ‘inviolable’ core of German constitutional identity. This core identity includes democratic decision-making on the national budget. Should the ECB incur losses on OMT transactions, such losses may result in budget shortfalls that are imposed upon Germany rather than autonomously decided upon by the Bundestag.

The BVerfG also considers itself competent to determine the limits of the conferral of powers to the EU by the German parliament. German authorities may not take part in the implementation of an ultravires act of the EU. Should an act be adopted beyond the powers given, German authorities must either seek an ex post validation of the act by specific authorisation, or its reversal. Such is the approach in Karlsruhe. Needless to say, the Luxembourg approach is based on the primacy of EU law.

The spectre of the ECB and the largest central bank of the Eurosystem fighting a legal battle in a Member State’s constitutional court is preferably avoided in the future. One may regard such judicial strife among members of the Eurosystem as going against central bank independence, so cherished by Germany.

Contents of the BVerfG decision

The German Constitutional Court considers the OMT decision politically motivated. The stability of the euro area and the current composition of the currency union are not values that the ECB is permitted to defend: it is confined to monetary policy and price stability. Price stability was the ultimate reason why Germany could agree to monetary union, provided it was to be secured by an independent central bank and no monetary financing takes place.

Central bank independence is an acceptable deviation from the constitutional requirements of democracy because of the – according to the Karlsruhe judges – “scientifically documented” special character of monetary policy: monetary stability is better entrusted to a central bank than to politicians with an inherently short-term view. A central bank that oversteps the limits of its mandate clashes with the democracy principle.

The Karlsruhe judges consider activation of the OMT to amount to financing of public budgets by the central bank, which is specifically prohibited by the [Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union](#) (TFEU). The ECB would be “granting assistance” to the peripheral States, just as the European Stability Mechanism

(ESM). As the CJEU has explained in its [Pringle judgment](#) on the ESM, financial assistance that seeks to serve maintaining the financial stability of the monetary union, forms part of ‘economic policy’, distinct from ‘monetary policy’. The TFEU has made the EU exclusively competent for monetary policy and has left most economic policy powers with the Member States.

By announcing OMTs, the ECB treads on the toes of the ESM and engages in ‘economic policy’. The BVerfG doesn’t accept the defence that the ECB is re-establishing normal conditions for the transmission of its monetary policy and that OMT supports the economic policies in the EU, as the central bank is bound to do. (Supporting the economic policies is the ECB’s secondary objective, behind its primary objective of maintaining price stability.) The German Constitutional Court follows the [Bundesbankin](#) saying that one cannot distinguish between ‘rational’ and ‘irrational’ elements in the interest rate surcharges that financial markets require for lending to peripheral Member States. The judges in Karlsruhe also consider that it is for the politicians to decide on the composition of the currency union: defending its current make-up is not the task of the central bank.

Only if the OMT decision were to be narrowly construed could it be considered compatible with the Treaty in the eyes of the Karlsruhe judges. They mention, *inter alia*, limiting the volume of bond purchases, requiring a time lag between bond emission and ECB purchases, not holding bonds until maturity, introducing a minimum credit rating for eligibility of bonds and introducing a preferred creditor status for the ECB.

Perspectives

One may expect the CJEU to take up the request for a preliminary interpretation in [Case C-62/14](#) with speed and to take an in-depth view of all the arguments. My guess is that the discretion the CJEU usually accords to EU institutions when it comes to decision-making in the economic sphere (in the wide sense of the term) will see it confirm that OMTs are within the central bank’s mandate. The CJEU is likely to accept that OMTs are a monetary policy instrument even though they may result in additional funding for Member States’ budgets in times of crisis, funding which is otherwise primarily achieved by economic policy instruments such as financing through the ESM.

One may expect the CJEU to emphasise the formal democratic nature of decision-making at the EU level. And the CJEU may find that, whilst it is for politicians to decide which States take part in monetary union, it is the ECB’s

task to act as guardian of the single currency and to maintain price stability in the entire, thus constituted euro area. Whether the German Constitutional Court will then follow its Luxembourg colleagues remains to be seen.

The dance between Luxembourg and Karlsruhe continues....

Source: <http://fd.nl/economie-politiek/columns/rene-smits/392860-1403/a-dance-between-judges-in-karlsruhe-and-luxembourg>

A dance between judges in Karlsruhe and Luxembourg

René Smits

donderdag 06 maart 2014, 12:34



René Smits

The German constitutional complaints against the European Central Bank (ECB)'s Outright Monetary Transactions (OMT) programme have led to a unique reference by the German Constitutional Court (Bundesverfassungsgericht: BVerfG) to the European Union's top court. The Karlsruhe judges request an interpretation of EU law by the Luxembourg-based Court of Justice of the EU (CJEU). Requesting the CJEU's interpretation of an issue of Union law that may be decisive in a national court case is a requirement for the highest courts of all Member States.

[Een rechterlijke dans tussen Karlsruhe en Luxemburg](#)



René Smits



The Karlsruhe judges had never before submitted such a request. This seems like a victory for the Luxembourg judges. However, appearances are deceptive: the [request](#) contains a full analysis by the German watchdog on constitutionality why it considers the ECB's OMT programme ultra vires, i.e. beyond the powers of the central bank. The Karlsruhe judges even spell out how their brethren in Luxembourg may escape the same finding: by narrowly interpreting the ECB's decision. And they make clear that it is their own prerogative to ultimately decide whether the ECB's act agrees with the [German constitution](#). The CJEU will have to tread carefully in the interplay with the highest court of the mightiest State in the Union. One may be curious what the next step will be in the on-going dance between judges in Karlsruhe and Luxembourg.

Background: OMT

In the summer of 2012, when the euro area debt crisis was at its worst, ECB President Mario Draghi [announced](#) that, within its mandate, the ECB would do whatever it takes to preserve the euro. A few weeks later, the ECB announced its OMT programme. The central bank stands ready to buy debt instruments of States with a 'troika' programme in order to ensure that the interest rates on these States' bonds reflect their market standing, not speculation on the demise of the euro. The then prevailing market conditions saw huge interest rate differentials between euro area States. These hindered the transmission of the single monetary policy across Europe. The OMT programme is intended to restore the singleness of the ECB's monetary policy and the credibility of monetary union.

Background: ECB versus Bundesbank

The Governing Council of the ECB considers that the OMT programme, announced but not yet implemented in a legal act or applied in the markets, remains within the ECB's mandate. Germany's central bank, the [Bundesbank](#), strongly disagreed. They exchanged their arguments in the proceedings before the German Constitutional Court. The latter was seized by 36,000 citizens who wish to see the ECB's OMT programme declared unconstitutional.

The German Constitutional Court has repeatedly ruled that it is the ultimate arbiter of the lawfulness of EU legal acts within the German constitutional order. It sees itself as the guarantor of the ‘inviolable’ core of German constitutional identity. This core identity includes democratic decision-making on the national budget. Should the ECB incur losses on OMT transactions, such losses may result in budget shortfalls that are imposed upon Germany rather than autonomously decided upon by the Bundestag.

The BVerfG also considers itself competent to determine the limits of the conferral of powers to the EU by the German parliament. German authorities may not take part in the implementation of an ultravires act of the EU. Should an act be adopted beyond the powers given, German authorities must either seek an ex post validation of the act by specific authorisation, or its reversal. Such is the approach in Karlsruhe. Needless to say, the Luxembourg approach is based on the primacy of EU law.

The spectre of the ECB and the largest central bank of the Eurosystem fighting a legal battle in a Member State’s constitutional court is preferably avoided in the future. One may regard such judicial strife among members of the Eurosystem as going against central bank independence, so cherished by Germany.

Contents of the BVerfG decision

The German Constitutional Court considers the OMT decision politically motivated. The stability of the euro area and the current composition of the currency union are not values that the ECB is permitted to defend: it is confined to monetary policy and price stability. Price stability was the ultimate reason why Germany could agree to monetary union, provided it was to be secured by an independent central bank and no monetary financing takes place.

Central bank independence is an acceptable deviation from the constitutional requirements of democracy because of the – according to the Karlsruhe judges – “scientifically documented” special character of monetary policy: monetary stability is better entrusted to a central bank than to politicians with an inherently short-term view. A central bank that oversteps the limits of its mandate clashes with the democracy principle.

The Karlsruhe judges consider activation of the OMT to amount to financing of public budgets by the central bank, which is specifically prohibited by the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU). The ECB would be “granting assistance” to the peripheral States, just as the European Stability Mechanism

(ESM). As the CJEU has explained in its [Pringle judgment](#) on the ESM, financial assistance that seeks to serve maintaining the financial stability of the monetary union, forms part of ‘economic policy’, distinct from ‘monetary policy’. The TFEU has made the EU exclusively competent for monetary policy and has left most economic policy powers with the Member States.

By announcing OMTs, the ECB treads on the toes of the ESM and engages in ‘economic policy’. The BVerfG doesn’t accept the defence that the ECB is re-establishing normal conditions for the transmission of its monetary policy and that OMT supports the economic policies in the EU, as the central bank is bound to do. (Supporting the economic policies is the ECB’s secondary objective, behind its primary objective of maintaining price stability.) The German Constitutional Court follows the [Bundesbankin](#) saying that one cannot distinguish between ‘rational’ and ‘irrational’ elements in the interest rate surcharges that financial markets require for lending to peripheral Member States. The judges in Karlsruhe also consider that it is for the politicians to decide on the composition of the currency union: defending its current make-up is not the task of the central bank.

Only if the OMT decision were to be narrowly construed could it be considered compatible with the Treaty in the eyes of the Karlsruhe judges. They mention, *inter alia*, limiting the volume of bond purchases, requiring a time lag between bond emission and ECB purchases, not holding bonds until maturity, introducing a minimum credit rating for eligibility of bonds and introducing a preferred creditor status for the ECB.

Perspectives

One may expect the CJEU to take up the request for a preliminary interpretation in [Case C-62/14](#) with speed and to take an in-depth view of all the arguments. My guess is that the discretion the CJEU usually accords to EU institutions when it comes to decision-making in the economic sphere (in the wide sense of the term) will see it confirm that OMTs are within the central bank’s mandate. The CJEU is likely to accept that OMTs are a monetary policy instrument even though they may result in additional funding for Member States’ budgets in times of crisis, funding which is otherwise primarily achieved by economic policy instruments such as financing through the ESM.

One may expect the CJEU to emphasise the formal democratic nature of decision-making at the EU level. And the CJEU may find that, whilst it is for politicians to decide which States take part in monetary union, it is the ECB’s

task to act as guardian of the single currency and to maintain price stability in the entire, thus constituted euro area. Whether the German Constitutional Court will then follow its Luxembourg colleagues remains to be seen.

The dance between Luxembourg and Karlsruhe continues....

Source: <http://fd.nl/economie-politiek/columns/rene-smits/392860-1403/a-dance-between-judges-in-karlsruhe-and-luxembourg>

A dance between judges in Karlsruhe and Luxembourg

René Smits

donderdag 06 maart 2014, 12:34



René Smits

The German constitutional complaints against the European Central Bank (ECB)'s Outright Monetary Transactions (OMT) programme have led to a unique reference by the German Constitutional Court (Bundesverfassungsgericht: BVerfG) to the European Union's top court. The Karlsruhe judges request an interpretation of EU law by the Luxembourg-based Court of Justice of the EU (CJEU). Requesting the CJEU's interpretation of an issue of Union law that may be decisive in a national court case is a requirement for the highest courts of all Member States.

[Een rechterlijke dans tussen Karlsruhe en Luxemburg](#)



René Smits



The Karlsruhe judges had never before submitted such a request. This seems like a victory for the Luxembourg judges. However, appearances are deceptive: the [request](#) contains a full analysis by the German watchdog on constitutionality why it considers the ECB's OMT programme ultra vires, i.e. beyond the powers of the central bank. The Karlsruhe judges even spell out how their brethren in Luxembourg may escape the same finding: by narrowly interpreting the ECB's decision. And they make clear that it is their own prerogative to ultimately decide whether the ECB's act agrees with the [German constitution](#). The CJEU will have to tread carefully in the interplay with the highest court of the mightiest State in the Union. One may be curious what the next step will be in the on-going dance between judges in Karlsruhe and Luxembourg.

Background: OMT

In the summer of 2012, when the euro area debt crisis was at its worst, ECB President Mario Draghi [announced](#) that, within its mandate, the ECB would do whatever it takes to preserve the euro. A few weeks later, the ECB announced its OMT programme. The central bank stands ready to buy debt instruments of States with a 'troika' programme in order to ensure that the interest rates on these States' bonds reflect their market standing, not speculation on the demise of the euro. The then prevailing market conditions saw huge interest rate differentials between euro area States. These hindered the transmission of the single monetary policy across Europe. The OMT programme is intended to restore the singleness of the ECB's monetary policy and the credibility of monetary union.

Background: ECB versus Bundesbank

The Governing Council of the ECB considers that the OMT programme, announced but not yet implemented in a legal act or applied in the markets, remains within the ECB's mandate. Germany's central bank, the [Bundesbank](#), strongly disagreed. They exchanged their arguments in the proceedings before the German Constitutional Court. The latter was seized by 36,000 citizens who wish to see the ECB's OMT programme declared unconstitutional.

The German Constitutional Court has repeatedly ruled that it is the ultimate arbiter of the lawfulness of EU legal acts within the German constitutional order. It sees itself as the guarantor of the ‘inviolable’ core of German constitutional identity. This core identity includes democratic decision-making on the national budget. Should the ECB incur losses on OMT transactions, such losses may result in budget shortfalls that are imposed upon Germany rather than autonomously decided upon by the Bundestag.

The BVerfG also considers itself competent to determine the limits of the conferral of powers to the EU by the German parliament. German authorities may not take part in the implementation of an ultravires act of the EU. Should an act be adopted beyond the powers given, German authorities must either seek an ex post validation of the act by specific authorisation, or its reversal. Such is the approach in Karlsruhe. Needless to say, the Luxembourg approach is based on the primacy of EU law.

The spectre of the ECB and the largest central bank of the Eurosystem fighting a legal battle in a Member State’s constitutional court is preferably avoided in the future. One may regard such judicial strife among members of the Eurosystem as going against central bank independence, so cherished by Germany.

Contents of the BVerfG decision

The German Constitutional Court considers the OMT decision politically motivated. The stability of the euro area and the current composition of the currency union are not values that the ECB is permitted to defend: it is confined to monetary policy and price stability. Price stability was the ultimate reason why Germany could agree to monetary union, provided it was to be secured by an independent central bank and no monetary financing takes place.

Central bank independence is an acceptable deviation from the constitutional requirements of democracy because of the – according to the Karlsruhe judges – “scientifically documented” special character of monetary policy: monetary stability is better entrusted to a central bank than to politicians with an inherently short-term view. A central bank that oversteps the limits of its mandate clashes with the democracy principle.

The Karlsruhe judges consider activation of the OMT to amount to financing of public budgets by the central bank, which is specifically prohibited by the [Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union](#) (TFEU). The ECB would be “granting assistance” to the peripheral States, just as the European Stability Mechanism

(ESM). As the CJEU has explained in its [Pringle judgment](#) on the ESM, financial assistance that seeks to serve maintaining the financial stability of the monetary union, forms part of ‘economic policy’, distinct from ‘monetary policy’. The TFEU has made the EU exclusively competent for monetary policy and has left most economic policy powers with the Member States.

By announcing OMTs, the ECB treads on the toes of the ESM and engages in ‘economic policy’. The BVerfG doesn’t accept the defence that the ECB is re-establishing normal conditions for the transmission of its monetary policy and that OMT supports the economic policies in the EU, as the central bank is bound to do. (Supporting the economic policies is the ECB’s secondary objective, behind its primary objective of maintaining price stability.) The German Constitutional Court follows the [Bundesbankin](#) saying that one cannot distinguish between ‘rational’ and ‘irrational’ elements in the interest rate surcharges that financial markets require for lending to peripheral Member States. The judges in Karlsruhe also consider that it is for the politicians to decide on the composition of the currency union: defending its current make-up is not the task of the central bank.

Only if the OMT decision were to be narrowly construed could it be considered compatible with the Treaty in the eyes of the Karlsruhe judges. They mention, *inter alia*, limiting the volume of bond purchases, requiring a time lag between bond emission and ECB purchases, not holding bonds until maturity, introducing a minimum credit rating for eligibility of bonds and introducing a preferred creditor status for the ECB.

Perspectives

One may expect the CJEU to take up the request for a preliminary interpretation in [Case C-62/14](#) with speed and to take an in-depth view of all the arguments. My guess is that the discretion the CJEU usually accords to EU institutions when it comes to decision-making in the economic sphere (in the wide sense of the term) will see it confirm that OMTs are within the central bank’s mandate. The CJEU is likely to accept that OMTs are a monetary policy instrument even though they may result in additional funding for Member States’ budgets in times of crisis, funding which is otherwise primarily achieved by economic policy instruments such as financing through the ESM.

One may expect the CJEU to emphasise the formal democratic nature of decision-making at the EU level. And the CJEU may find that, whilst it is for politicians to decide which States take part in monetary union, it is the ECB’s

task to act as guardian of the single currency and to maintain price stability in the entire, thus constituted euro area. Whether the German Constitutional Court will then follow its Luxembourg colleagues remains to be seen.

The dance between Luxembourg and Karlsruhe continues....

Source: <http://fd.nl/economie-politiek/columns/rene-smits/392860-1403/a-dance-between-judges-in-karlsruhe-and-luxembourg>

A dance between judges in Karlsruhe and Luxembourg

René Smits

donderdag 06 maart 2014, 12:34



René Smits

The German constitutional complaints against the European Central Bank (ECB)'s Outright Monetary Transactions (OMT) programme have led to a unique reference by the German Constitutional Court (Bundesverfassungsgericht: BVerfG) to the European Union's top court. The Karlsruhe judges request an interpretation of EU law by the Luxembourg-based Court of Justice of the EU (CJEU). Requesting the CJEU's interpretation of an issue of Union law that may be decisive in a national court case is a requirement for the highest courts of all Member States.

[Een rechterlijke dans tussen Karlsruhe en Luxemburg](#)



René Smits



The Karlsruhe judges had never before submitted such a request. This seems like a victory for the Luxembourg judges. However, appearances are deceptive: the [request](#) contains a full analysis by the German watchdog on constitutionality why it considers the ECB's OMT programme ultra vires, i.e. beyond the powers of the central bank. The Karlsruhe judges even spell out how their brethren in Luxembourg may escape the same finding: by narrowly interpreting the ECB's decision. And they make clear that it is their own prerogative to ultimately decide whether the ECB's act agrees with the [German constitution](#). The CJEU will have to tread carefully in the interplay with the highest court of the mightiest State in the Union. One may be curious what the next step will be in the on-going dance between judges in Karlsruhe and Luxembourg.

Background: OMT

In the summer of 2012, when the euro area debt crisis was at its worst, ECB President Mario Draghi [announced](#) that, within its mandate, the ECB would do whatever it takes to preserve the euro. A few weeks later, the ECB announced its OMT programme. The central bank stands ready to buy debt instruments of States with a 'troika' programme in order to ensure that the interest rates on these States' bonds reflect their market standing, not speculation on the demise of the euro. The then prevailing market conditions saw huge interest rate differentials between euro area States. These hindered the transmission of the single monetary policy across Europe. The OMT programme is intended to restore the singleness of the ECB's monetary policy and the credibility of monetary union.

Background: ECB versus Bundesbank

The Governing Council of the ECB considers that the OMT programme, announced but not yet implemented in a legal act or applied in the markets, remains within the ECB's mandate. Germany's central bank, the [Bundesbank](#), strongly disagreed. They exchanged their arguments in the proceedings before the German Constitutional Court. The latter was seized by 36,000 citizens who wish to see the ECB's OMT programme declared unconstitutional.

The German Constitutional Court has repeatedly ruled that it is the ultimate arbiter of the lawfulness of EU legal acts within the German constitutional order. It sees itself as the guarantor of the ‘inviolable’ core of German constitutional identity. This core identity includes democratic decision-making on the national budget. Should the ECB incur losses on OMT transactions, such losses may result in budget shortfalls that are imposed upon Germany rather than autonomously decided upon by the Bundestag.

The BVerfG also considers itself competent to determine the limits of the conferral of powers to the EU by the German parliament. German authorities may not take part in the implementation of an ultravires act of the EU. Should an act be adopted beyond the powers given, German authorities must either seek an ex post validation of the act by specific authorisation, or its reversal. Such is the approach in Karlsruhe. Needless to say, the Luxembourg approach is based on the primacy of EU law.

The spectre of the ECB and the largest central bank of the Eurosystem fighting a legal battle in a Member State’s constitutional court is preferably avoided in the future. One may regard such judicial strife among members of the Eurosystem as going against central bank independence, so cherished by Germany.

Contents of the BVerfG decision

The German Constitutional Court considers the OMT decision politically motivated. The stability of the euro area and the current composition of the currency union are not values that the ECB is permitted to defend: it is confined to monetary policy and price stability. Price stability was the ultimate reason why Germany could agree to monetary union, provided it was to be secured by an independent central bank and no monetary financing takes place.

Central bank independence is an acceptable deviation from the constitutional requirements of democracy because of the – according to the Karlsruhe judges – “scientifically documented” special character of monetary policy: monetary stability is better entrusted to a central bank than to politicians with an inherently short-term view. A central bank that oversteps the limits of its mandate clashes with the democracy principle.

The Karlsruhe judges consider activation of the OMT to amount to financing of public budgets by the central bank, which is specifically prohibited by the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU). The ECB would be “granting assistance” to the peripheral States, just as the European Stability Mechanism

(ESM). As the CJEU has explained in its [Pringle judgment](#) on the ESM, financial assistance that seeks to serve maintaining the financial stability of the monetary union, forms part of ‘economic policy’, distinct from ‘monetary policy’. The TFEU has made the EU exclusively competent for monetary policy and has left most economic policy powers with the Member States.

By announcing OMTs, the ECB treads on the toes of the ESM and engages in ‘economic policy’. The BVerfG doesn’t accept the defence that the ECB is re-establishing normal conditions for the transmission of its monetary policy and that OMT supports the economic policies in the EU, as the central bank is bound to do. (Supporting the economic policies is the ECB’s secondary objective, behind its primary objective of maintaining price stability.) The German Constitutional Court follows the [Bundesbankin](#) saying that one cannot distinguish between ‘rational’ and ‘irrational’ elements in the interest rate surcharges that financial markets require for lending to peripheral Member States. The judges in Karlsruhe also consider that it is for the politicians to decide on the composition of the currency union: defending its current make-up is not the task of the central bank.

Only if the OMT decision were to be narrowly construed could it be considered compatible with the Treaty in the eyes of the Karlsruhe judges. They mention, *inter alia*, limiting the volume of bond purchases, requiring a time lag between bond emission and ECB purchases, not holding bonds until maturity, introducing a minimum credit rating for eligibility of bonds and introducing a preferred creditor status for the ECB.

Perspectives

One may expect the CJEU to take up the request for a preliminary interpretation in [Case C-62/14](#) with speed and to take an in-depth view of all the arguments. My guess is that the discretion the CJEU usually accords to EU institutions when it comes to decision-making in the economic sphere (in the wide sense of the term) will see it confirm that OMTs are within the central bank’s mandate. The CJEU is likely to accept that OMTs are a monetary policy instrument even though they may result in additional funding for Member States’ budgets in times of crisis, funding which is otherwise primarily achieved by economic policy instruments such as financing through the ESM.

One may expect the CJEU to emphasise the formal democratic nature of decision-making at the EU level. And the CJEU may find that, whilst it is for politicians to decide which States take part in monetary union, it is the ECB’s

task to act as guardian of the single currency and to maintain price stability in the entire, thus constituted euro area. Whether the German Constitutional Court will then follow its Luxembourg colleagues remains to be seen.

The dance between Luxembourg and Karlsruhe continues....

Source: <http://fd.nl/economie-politiek/columns/rene-smits/392860-1403/a-dance-between-judges-in-karlsruhe-and-luxembourg>

A dance between judges in Karlsruhe and Luxembourg

René Smits

donderdag 06 maart 2014, 12:34



René Smits

The German constitutional complaints against the European Central Bank (ECB)'s Outright Monetary Transactions (OMT) programme have led to a unique reference by the German Constitutional Court (Bundesverfassungsgericht: BVerfG) to the European Union's top court. The Karlsruhe judges request an interpretation of EU law by the Luxembourg-based Court of Justice of the EU (CJEU). Requesting the CJEU's interpretation of an issue of Union law that may be decisive in a national court case is a requirement for the highest courts of all Member States.

[Een rechterlijke dans tussen Karlsruhe en Luxemburg](#)



René Smits



The Karlsruhe judges had never before submitted such a request. This seems like a victory for the Luxembourg judges. However, appearances are deceptive: the [request](#) contains a full analysis by the German watchdog on constitutionality why it considers the ECB's OMT programme ultra vires, i.e. beyond the powers of the central bank. The Karlsruhe judges even spell out how their brethren in Luxembourg may escape the same finding: by narrowly interpreting the ECB's decision. And they make clear that it is their own prerogative to ultimately decide whether the ECB's act agrees with the [German constitution](#). The CJEU will have to tread carefully in the interplay with the highest court of the mightiest State in the Union. One may be curious what the next step will be in the on-going dance between judges in Karlsruhe and Luxembourg.

Background: OMT

In the summer of 2012, when the euro area debt crisis was at its worst, ECB President Mario Draghi [announced](#) that, within its mandate, the ECB would do whatever it takes to preserve the euro. A few weeks later, the ECB announced its OMT programme. The central bank stands ready to buy debt instruments of States with a 'troika' programme in order to ensure that the interest rates on these States' bonds reflect their market standing, not speculation on the demise of the euro. The then prevailing market conditions saw huge interest rate differentials between euro area States. These hindered the transmission of the single monetary policy across Europe. The OMT programme is intended to restore the singleness of the ECB's monetary policy and the credibility of monetary union.

Background: ECB versus Bundesbank

The Governing Council of the ECB considers that the OMT programme, announced but not yet implemented in a legal act or applied in the markets, remains within the ECB's mandate. Germany's central bank, the [Bundesbank](#), strongly disagreed. They exchanged their arguments in the proceedings before the German Constitutional Court. The latter was seized by 36,000 citizens who wish to see the ECB's OMT programme declared unconstitutional.

The German Constitutional Court has repeatedly ruled that it is the ultimate arbiter of the lawfulness of EU legal acts within the German constitutional order. It sees itself as the guarantor of the ‘inviolable’ core of German constitutional identity. This core identity includes democratic decision-making on the national budget. Should the ECB incur losses on OMT transactions, such losses may result in budget shortfalls that are imposed upon Germany rather than autonomously decided upon by the Bundestag.

The BVerfG also considers itself competent to determine the limits of the conferral of powers to the EU by the German parliament. German authorities may not take part in the implementation of an ultravires act of the EU. Should an act be adopted beyond the powers given, German authorities must either seek an ex post validation of the act by specific authorisation, or its reversal. Such is the approach in Karlsruhe. Needless to say, the Luxembourg approach is based on the primacy of EU law.

The spectre of the ECB and the largest central bank of the Eurosystem fighting a legal battle in a Member State’s constitutional court is preferably avoided in the future. One may regard such judicial strife among members of the Eurosystem as going against central bank independence, so cherished by Germany.

Contents of the BVerfG decision

The German Constitutional Court considers the OMT decision politically motivated. The stability of the euro area and the current composition of the currency union are not values that the ECB is permitted to defend: it is confined to monetary policy and price stability. Price stability was the ultimate reason why Germany could agree to monetary union, provided it was to be secured by an independent central bank and no monetary financing takes place.

Central bank independence is an acceptable deviation from the constitutional requirements of democracy because of the – according to the Karlsruhe judges – “scientifically documented” special character of monetary policy: monetary stability is better entrusted to a central bank than to politicians with an inherently short-term view. A central bank that oversteps the limits of its mandate clashes with the democracy principle.

The Karlsruhe judges consider activation of the OMT to amount to financing of public budgets by the central bank, which is specifically prohibited by the [Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union](#) (TFEU). The ECB would be “granting assistance” to the peripheral States, just as the European Stability Mechanism

(ESM). As the CJEU has explained in its [Pringle judgment](#) on the ESM, financial assistance that seeks to serve maintaining the financial stability of the monetary union, forms part of ‘economic policy’, distinct from ‘monetary policy’. The TFEU has made the EU exclusively competent for monetary policy and has left most economic policy powers with the Member States.

By announcing OMTs, the ECB treads on the toes of the ESM and engages in ‘economic policy’. The BVerfG doesn’t accept the defence that the ECB is re-establishing normal conditions for the transmission of its monetary policy and that OMT supports the economic policies in the EU, as the central bank is bound to do. (Supporting the economic policies is the ECB’s secondary objective, behind its primary objective of maintaining price stability.) The German Constitutional Court follows the [Bundesbankin](#) saying that one cannot distinguish between ‘rational’ and ‘irrational’ elements in the interest rate surcharges that financial markets require for lending to peripheral Member States. The judges in Karlsruhe also consider that it is for the politicians to decide on the composition of the currency union: defending its current make-up is not the task of the central bank.

Only if the OMT decision were to be narrowly construed could it be considered compatible with the Treaty in the eyes of the Karlsruhe judges. They mention, *inter alia*, limiting the volume of bond purchases, requiring a time lag between bond emission and ECB purchases, not holding bonds until maturity, introducing a minimum credit rating for eligibility of bonds and introducing a preferred creditor status for the ECB.

Perspectives

One may expect the CJEU to take up the request for a preliminary interpretation in [Case C-62/14](#) with speed and to take an in-depth view of all the arguments. My guess is that the discretion the CJEU usually accords to EU institutions when it comes to decision-making in the economic sphere (in the wide sense of the term) will see it confirm that OMTs are within the central bank’s mandate. The CJEU is likely to accept that OMTs are a monetary policy instrument even though they may result in additional funding for Member States’ budgets in times of crisis, funding which is otherwise primarily achieved by economic policy instruments such as financing through the ESM.

One may expect the CJEU to emphasise the formal democratic nature of decision-making at the EU level. And the CJEU may find that, whilst it is for politicians to decide which States take part in monetary union, it is the ECB’s

task to act as guardian of the single currency and to maintain price stability in the entire, thus constituted euro area. Whether the German Constitutional Court will then follow its Luxembourg colleagues remains to be seen.

The dance between Luxembourg and Karlsruhe continues....

Source: <http://fd.nl/economie-politiek/columns/rene-smits/392860-1403/a-dance-between-judges-in-karlsruhe-and-luxembourg>