



Parliamentary Immunity

A Comprehensive Study of the Systems of
Parliamentary Immunity of the United Kingdom,
France, and the Netherlands in a European
Context

Parliamentary Immunity

A Comprehensive Study of the Systems of Parliamentary
Immunity of the United Kingdom, France, and
the Netherlands in a European Context

DISSERTATION

to obtain the degree of Doctor
at the Maastricht University,
on the authority of the Rector Magnificus,
Prof. dr. L.L.G. Soete
in accordance with the decision of the Board of Deans,
to be defended in public
on Thursday 26 September 2013, at 16.00 hours

by

Sascha Hardt

Supervisor:

Prof. mr. L.F.M. Verhey (Leiden University, formerly Maastricht University)

Co-Supervisor:

Dr. Ph. Kiiver

Assessment Committee:

Prof. dr. J.Th.J. van den Berg

Prof. dr. M. Claes (Chair)

Prof. dr. C. Guérin-Bargues (Université d'Orléans)

Prof. mr. A.W. Heringa

Prof. D. Oliver, MA, PhD, LLD Barrister, FBA (Univeristy College London)

Cover photograph © Andreas Altenburger - Dreamstime.com

Layout by Marina Jodogne.

A commercial edition of this PhD-thesis will be published by Intersentia in the Ius Commune Europaeum Series, No. 119 under ISBN 978-1-78068-191-7.

Für Danielle

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As I have been told, the idea that I could write a doctoral dissertation first occurred to Philipp Kiiver when he was supervising my bachelor thesis in 2007. At that time, I may well have dreamed of a PhD position, but I was far from having any actual plans, let alone actively pursuing them. Yet, not a year later, Luc Verhey and Philipp Kiiver asked me whether I was interested to join the newly founded Montesquieu Institute Maastricht as a PhD researcher. I was more than interested but nevertheless declined the offer, instead choosing to embark on the six-month trip around the world I had planned for years. I was certain that this would be the end of my academic aspirations, but thanks to the persistence of my two supervisors it turned out differently: sitting in a little boat between two islands in the Indian Ocean, I received a phone call from Maastricht and was offered to start my PhD half a year later than initially planned.

I am most thankful to Luc Verhey and Philipp Kiiver for this second chance, for their far-sightedness, their great patience before and during the time of my appointment as a PhD candidate, and their sustained faith in my potential. I am also particularly grateful for their style of supervision: both were never indifferent, always interested and constantly ready to offer constructive criticism. At the same time, their supervision was never 'intrusive'. From the initial research proposal to the very last pages I was given – and greatly enjoyed! – the freedom to conduct my research completely independently, approach my subject in the way I pleased and write this book when and where I saw fit – mostly during unorthodox nocturnal working hours. In short, I could not have been luckier with my supervisors.

I also extend my warmest thanks and appreciation to my (former) colleagues at the Montesquieu Institute Maastricht and the *capaciteitsgroep publiekrecht*. Without the many extended lunch breaks, research meetings and discussions over coffee with Mira Scholten, Christian Syrier, Wytze van der Woude, Danielle Wenders, Rob van de Westelaken, Sandor Loeffen and Joop van den Berg, writing this book would have been a much more difficult and all too solitary exercise. I always particularly enjoyed working with my colleague and friend Mariolina Eliantonio, whose energy and drive remain a continuous source of awe and inspiration. Many others at the Faculty of Law have also contributed to making the past four years the good time that they were. Tanja van der Meer, Mark Seitter, Antonia Waltermann, as well as

Acknowledgements

Jaap Hage and his (though he would probably oppose the use of the possessive pronoun) philosophy group played no insignificant part in this.

While a PhD researcher is of course supposed to focus on completing his thesis, I took tremendous pleasure in teaching – certainly a trait I inherited from my parents – and I always found it an extremely rewarding distraction from my research. I would like to thank my students for the good time I had as a tutor and lecturer.

Despite all due and necessary romanticisation with which I can now finally look back, my PhD time has not only been nice and easy. For all their help and support whenever it was not, I am grateful beyond words to my friends, in particular to Jule Winkler and Laura Brehmer.

Finally and most importantly, I would never have been able to complete my doctorate without the love, patience, continuous support and ceaseless encouragement of my fiancée, Danielle. Thank you!

Sascha Hardt
Maastricht, July 2013

|

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	xv
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1. Parliamentary Immunity.....	1
1.1. The Relevance of Parliamentary Immunity.....	1
1.2. A Definition	3
1.3. Two Forms of Immunity: Non-accountability and Inviolability	4
1.4. The Immunity Dilemma.....	6
2. Methodology	7
2.1. Objectives	8
2.1.1. Understanding Parliamentary Immunity in Context.....	8
2.1.2. Differences and Commonalities.....	9
2.1.3. Trends and Developments.....	9
2.2. Methodological Challenges and Choices.....	10
2.2.1. The Problem of Comparison.....	10
2.2.2. The Problem of Selection.....	11
2.2.3. The Choice of the UK, France and the Netherlands as Case Studies	12
2.2.3.1. The United Kingdom.....	12
2.2.3.2. France	12
2.2.3.3. The Netherlands.....	14

CHAPTER 2: THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION OF PARLIAMENTARY IMMUNITY	17
1. Introduction	17
2. Parliamentary Immunity and the ECHR	18
2.1. The Relevance of ECtHR Case Law: Interpretative Effects	18
2.2. ECtHR Case Law on Parliamentary Immunity	19
2.2.1. Article 6 of the Convention: Access to Court	20
2.2.1.1. Non-accountability under Article 6 ECHR	20
2.2.1.2. Inviolability under Article 6 ECHR	27
2.2.1.3. Article 6 ECHR and the Penal Powers of Parliament	33
2.2.2. Parliamentary Immunity and Freedom of Expression: Article 10 ECHR	35
2.2.2.1. Freedom of Expression for Parliamentarians outside Parliament	36
2.2.2.2. Freedom of Expression: Speaking about Parliamentarians	39
2.3. ECtHR Case Law on Parliamentary Immunity: Conclusions	41
3. The Immunity Regime of the European Parliament	43
3.1. A Combined Immunity Regime: 27+1	43
3.2. A Discriminatory System	44
3.3. Waiving or Defending European Inviolability	46
3.4. The CJEU and the Scope of European Non-accountability	49
3.5. The Immunity System of the European Parliament: Conclusion	53
4. Concluding Remarks on Parliamentary Immunity in Europe	53
 CHAPTER 3: PARLIAMENTARY PRIVILEGE IN THE UNITED KINGDOM	 55
1. Introduction	55
1.1. Structure of this Case Study	55
1.2. Parliamentary Privilege in the UK	55
1.3. Delineation	57
2. The History of Parliamentary Privilege	58
2.1. The Origins of Parliament	58
2.2. Historical Origins and Development of Privilege	61
2.2.1. The Privilege of Freedom of Speech	63
2.2.2. The Privilege of Freedom from Arrest and Molestation	65
2.2.3. The Privilege of Access to Her Majesty	67
2.2.4. The Privilege of Favourable Construction	68
2.2.5. The Privilege of the House of Commons to Provide for its own Constitution	68
2.2.6. The Principle of Exclusive Cognisance	69
2.3. The House of Lords and the Privileges of the Commons	72

3.	Demarcating Exclusive Cognisance: <i>Lex Parliamenti</i> and <i>Lex Terrae</i>	74
3.1.	A Categorisation	75
3.2.	The Evolution of the Relationship between <i>Lex Parliamenti</i> and <i>Lex Terrae</i> in Case Law	77
3.3.	The Defamation Act 1996	87
3.4.	The Parliamentary Expenses Scandal and <i>R v. Chaytor</i> : The End of Exclusive Cognisance?	91
3.5.	<i>Lex Parliamenti</i> and <i>Lex Terrae</i> : Conclusions.....	95
4.	Parliamentary Privilege Today	97
4.1.	The Modern Perception of Privilege.....	97
4.2.	Flexibility vs. Legal Certainty.....	99
4.3.	The Modern Privileges: The Law	101
4.3.1.	The Privileges <i>ex</i> Article 9 of the Bill of Rights 1689	102
4.3.1.1.	Freedom of Speech and Debate	102
4.3.1.2.	Proceedings in Parliament	103
4.3.1.3.	'Questioned'	109
4.3.1.4.	'Place Out of Parliament'	111
4.3.1.5.	Recent Developments and the Future of the Article 9 Privileges	113
4.3.2.	The Privilege of Freedom from Arrest	119
4.3.3.	The Enforcement of Privilege: Penal Powers of Parliament.....	121
5.	Conclusion	125
 CHAPTER 4: PARLIAMENTARY IMMUNITY IN FRANCE		129
1.	Introduction	129
1.1.	Structure of this Case Study	129
1.2.	Parliamentary Immunity in France	129
1.3.	Delineation.....	131
2.	The History of Parliamentary Immunity in France	132
2.1.	The Concept of Parliament in Pre-revolutionary France	133
2.1.1.	Representative and consultative assemblies in pre-revolutionary France .	133
2.1.1.1.	The Curia Regis	133
2.1.1.2.	The Conseil du Roi.....	134
2.1.1.3.	Parlement	134
2.1.1.4.	Les États Généraux	135
2.1.2.	The <i>États Généraux</i> as a Proto-parliament.....	136
2.2.	The Emergence of Immunity in the Revolution.....	138
2.2.1.	Minimal Privilege under the <i>Ancien Régime</i>	138
2.2.2.	The National Assembly	139
2.2.3.	The Earliest Immunity Provisions	139
2.2.4.	Two Possible Interpretations of the Emergence of Immunity	144

Table of Contents

2.3.	The 'Waltz of Constitutions'	147
2.3.1.	The Period of the National Convention	147
2.3.2.	The Constitution of Year III	150
2.3.3.	The Constitution of Year VIII	154
2.3.4.	The Constitutional Charters of 1814 and 1830	156
2.3.5.	The Constitution of 1848	157
2.3.6.	The Constitutional Laws of 1875.....	159
2.3.7.	The Vichy Regime	161
2.3.8.	The Constitution of 1946	162
2.4.	The History of Parliamentary Immunity in France: A Summary Picture ..	164
3.	Theoretical Foundations of Parliamentary Immunity	165
3.1.	The Significance of Constitutional Theory	165
3.2.	The Justification of Parliamentary Immunity in Classical Theory after Carré de Malberg	167
3.2.1.	National Sovereignty and Representation.....	167
3.2.2.	Parliamentary Immunity as a Corollary of the Representative Mandate...	172
3.2.3.	Popular vs. National Sovereignty: Constitutional Text and Reality	177
3.3.	Theoretical Foundations: A Summary Picture	180
4.	The Immunity Regime of the Fifth Republic.....	181
4.1.	The Constitutional Amendment of 1995.....	182
4.2.	The Scope of Non-accountability and Inviolability	183
4.2.1.	The Temporal Scope of the Immunities	184
4.2.2.	The Personal Scope of the Immunities	186
4.2.3.	The Material Scope of Non-accountability	187
4.2.4.	The Material Scope of Inviolability.....	190
4.3.	Procedures for Lifting Inviolability and for the Suspension of Detention or Prosecution.....	192
4.3.1.	The Procedure for Lifting Inviolability	192
4.3.2.	The Procedure for the Suspension of Detention and Measures of Prosecution	194
4.4.	The Legal Nature of Parliamentary Immunity	195
4.5.	A Justification for Inviolability?	196
4.6.	The Immunity Regime of the Fifth Republic: A Summary Picture	197
5.	Conclusion	198
CHAPTER 5: PARLIAMENTARY IMMUNITY IN THE NETHERLANDS		201
1.	Introduction	201
1.1.	Structure	201
1.2.	Terminology	201
1.3.	Parliamentary Immunity in the Netherlands.....	202

1.3.1.	Issues	204
1.3.1.1.	Historical Reasons for Limited Parliamentary Immunity	204
1.3.1.2.	How Limited is Dutch Parliamentary Immunity in Reality?	205
1.3.1.3.	Parliamentary vs. Political Immunity	206
1.4.	Delineation.....	206
2.	The History of Parliamentary Immunity in the Netherlands	207
2.1.	The Republican Period	207
2.1.1.	The Republic of the Seven United Netherlands (1579-1795)	207
2.1.2.	The Earliest Immunity Provisions in Holland	210
2.2.	The Batavian and French Period: 1795-1814.....	214
2.2.1.	The Batavian Republic.....	214
2.2.1.1.	Immunity under the Constitution for the Batavian people of 1798	215
2.2.1.2.	No Immunity under the Batavian Constitutions of 1801 and 1805.....	217
2.2.2.	The Kingdom of 1806 and the French Annexation.....	219
2.3.	The Kingdom of the Netherlands 1814/15-1848.....	220
2.3.1.	‘Enlightened Absolutism’ and a Weak Parliament	220
2.3.2.	Inviolability for Crimes in Office: Indirect Freedom of Speech?	222
2.4.	Towards the Constitution of 1848.....	226
2.4.1.	The Abolition of Inviolability	227
2.4.2.	Inviolability Traded for Non-accountability	229
2.4.3.	The Disputed Scope of Non-accountability.....	231
2.5.	More Non-accountability and Less Inviolability: A Negative Correlation?	233
2.6.	Developments during the 20 th Century.....	234
3.	The Dutch Immunity System Today	241
3.1.	The Scope of Non-accountability ex Article 71 of the Constitution	241
3.1.1.	Personal Scope.....	242
3.1.1.1.	Members, Ministers, Secretaries of State.....	242
3.1.1.2.	Other Persons	242
3.1.1.3.	Can the State be Held Liable Instead?	246
3.1.2.	Temporal and Spatial Scope	248
3.1.2.1.	No Spatial Privilege	248
3.1.2.2.	Non-accountability for the Duration of the Meeting only.....	248
3.1.3.	Material Scope.....	249
3.1.3.1.	No Limitations with Regard to the Content of Utterances Covered by Non-accountability	249
3.1.3.2.	No Immunity for ‘Private’ Publications, even if Identical to Protected Utterances	250
3.1.3.3.	All Forms of Legal Action are Barred.....	252
3.2.	The Disciplinary Powers of the Chambers	253
3.3.	The Immunity Dimension of Article 119 of the Constitution	254
3.3.1.	A Hypothetical Potential.....	255
3.3.1.1.	Crimes Committed in Office (Ambtsmisdrijven)	255
3.3.1.2.	Does this Procedure Amount to Inviolability?.....	257

Table of Contents

3.4.	Wilders and Beyond: A Case for Broadening Immunity?	259
3.4.1.	The Prosecution of Geert Wilders.....	260
3.4.2.	Parliamentary vs. Political Immunity	261
3.4.2.1.	Freedom of Speech for Politicians in Public Political Debate.....	261
3.4.2.2.	Does Parliamentary Immunity Offer a Solution?	264
4.	Conclusion	266
CHAPTER 6: COMPARATIVE CONCLUSIONS		271
1.	Smallest Common Denominators	271
2.	Lessons from History	272
2.1.	A Summary of the Historical Origins of Parliamentary Immunity.....	272
2.2.	Freedom of Speech as the Epitome of Parliamentarianism.....	275
2.3.	Inviolability as a Secondary Immunity	276
3.	Theory and Parliamentary Immunity	278
3.1.	The Justification of Parliamentary Immunity in Constitutional Theory	278
3.2.	Constitutional Theory has a Conservative Effect	280
4.	The State of Material Immunity and Developments	281
4.1.	Parliamentary Immunity in the UK, France and the Netherlands: Material Similarities and Differences	281
4.1.1.	Non-accountability	281
4.1.2.	Inviolability.....	283
4.1.3.	The Case of the Netherlands: Towards Political Immunity?	284
4.2.	The Immunity of the European Parliament.....	285
4.3.	ECtHR and CJEU: A Functional Approach Towards Parliamentary Immunity	286
4.4.	Do National Systems Develop in a ‘Functional’ Direction?	287
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....		289
POLITICAL DOCUMENTS		301
CURRICULUM VITAE.....		303

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CJEU	Court of Justice of the European Union
CSP	Standards and Privileges Committee
CSPL	Committee on Standards in Public Life
ECHR	European Convention of Human Rights
ECJ	European Court of Justice
ECtHR	European Court of Human Rights
EP	European Parliament
EU	European Union
ICERD	International Convention on the Elimination of all Racial Discrimination
MeP	Member of the European Parliament
MP	Member of Parliament
TEC	Treaty establishing the European Community
TEU	Treaty on European Union
UK	United Kingdom

