
CONTENTS

<i>Foreword</i>	v
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	vii
<i>Table of Cases</i>	xv
<i>Table of Legislation</i>	xxiii

1. Introduction	1
I. The Question of EU Competence after Lisbon	1
II. The Problems of the Existing Limits to EU Competences	3
III. Main Arguments of the Book	8
IV. Case Study—EU Regulatory Criminal Law	10
V. Chapter Synopsis	13

Part I: A Framework for Legality Review

2. Principles Limiting the Exercise of EU Competences	19
I. Introduction	19
II. The System of Competence Monitoring	20
III. Principle of Conferral	21
A. Theory and Judicial Review	21
B. Can the Principle of Conferral Act as a Check on the Exercise of EU Competences?	30
IV. Principle of Proportionality	32
A. Theory and Judicial Review	32
B. Evaluation: Is Proportionality a Principle that can be used to Challenge EU Measures before the Court?	36
V. Principle of Subsidiarity	39
A. Theory and Judicial Review	39
B. Evaluation: Is Subsidiarity a Ground Apt to Challenge the Exercise of EU Competences before the Court?	40
VI. Conclusions	43
3. Judicial Competence Review of EU Legislation	45
I. Introduction	45
II. The Link between Institutional and Conceptual Factors in Determining Intensity of Judicial Review	46
III. The Case for Strict Procedural Review	49

IV.	The Court of Justice's Track Record on Procedural Review	54
A.	Vodafone: Article 114 TFEU and Proportionality	55
B.	Afton Chemical: Procedural Proportionality	57
C.	Germany v Parliament and Council: Procedural Subsidiarity	59
V.	Setting the Framework for a General Standard of Review and Test for Legality of EU Legislation.....	61
A.	Spain v Council: Providing the Fruits for an Appropriate Standard for Judicial Review.....	61
B.	Analysis: Why Does Spain v Council Provide a Good Source for a General Standard of Review and Test for Legality?	62
C.	Spain v Council Expresses a General Standard of Review.....	64
D.	Standard for Review and Test for Legality.....	65
E.	Rationale and Issues with the Test	67
F.	The Relationship of the Proposed Test to the EU Courts' Current Approach	69
VI.	Conclusions.....	71

Part II: Limits to EU Powers

4.	Limits to the Union's Criminal Law Competence.....	75
I.	Introduction.....	75
II.	Limits to the Exercise of the Union's Criminal Law Competence Prior to the Lisbon Treaty.....	77
A.	Account of the Environmental Crimes and the Ship-Source Pollution Judgments.....	77
B.	Do the Environmental Crimes and Ship-Source Pollution Judgments Express a General Criminal Law Competence?	79
C.	Was the Environmental Crimes Directive Validly Adopted under Article 192 TFEU?	80
i.	Scope and Content	80
ii.	Are Criminal Laws Essential to Enforce EU Environmental Policy?.....	81
III.	Limits to the Exercise of Express Union Criminal Law Competence after Lisbon Treaty (Article 83(2) TFEU)	85
A.	Substantive Limitations on the Exercise of Union Competence under Article 83(2) TFEU	85
i.	Effective Implementation of a Union Policy.....	85
ii.	The 'Essentiality' Condition	86
iii.	Does the Market Abuse Crimes Directive Conform to the 'Essentiality' Requirement in Article 83(2) TFEU?.....	89
a.	The Scope of the Directive	89
b.	Are Criminal Laws Effective and Indispensable for the Enforcement of EU Market Abuse Policies?.....	92

B.	Procedural Limitations to the Exercise of Union Competences under Article 83(2) TFEU.....	97
i.	What is the Meaning of ‘Harmonisation Measures’ in Article 83(2) TFEU?	97
ii.	Application of the ‘Harmonisation’ Requirement to EU Market Abuse Legislation	100
IV.	Conclusions.....	102
5.	The Legal Basis for EU Criminal Law Legislation—A Constitutional Choice?	105
I.	Introduction.....	105
II.	The Relationship Between Article 83(2) TFEU and Article 114 TFEU with Respect to Criminalisation Measures.....	106
A.	The Scope of Article 114 TFEU in Legal Basis Litigation.....	106
B.	A Dormant Criminal Law Competence outside Title V.....	111
C.	Case Study: The Fourth Anti-Money Laundering Directive	114
III.	The Fight Against Fraud: The Relationship Between Article 325 TFEU and Article 83(2) TFEU	119
A.	The Context of the PIF Proposal	120
B.	The Views of the EU Institutions on the Legal Basis for the PIF Proposal.....	121
C.	Analysing the EU Institutions’ Arguments on the Legal Basis for the PIF Proposal	123
IV.	Conclusions.....	129
6.	Subsidiarity as a Constraint to the Exercise of EU Competences	133
I.	Introduction.....	133
II.	The Substantive Meaning of Subsidiarity.....	135
A.	Fleshing Out the Meaning of Subsidiarity—The Edinburgh Guidelines	135
B.	Legitimate Justification for EU Internal Market Harmonisation.....	136
C.	An Evidence-based and Decentralised Understanding of Subsidiarity.....	143
III.	Judicial Review of Subsidiarity.....	145
A.	The Problems of Judicial Enforcement of Subsidiarity	145
B.	The Main Challenges in Enforcing Subsidiarity before the Court of Justice.....	146
C.	Intensity of Subsidiarity Review	147
D.	A Test of ‘Adequate Reasoning’ and ‘Relevant Evidence’ for Subsidiarity Compliance	148
E.	National Parliaments, Impact Assessments and Subsidiarity Review	151
F.	The Proposed Review Standard’s Relationship to the Court’s Current Approach	152

IV.	Case Study: The Market Abuse Crimes Directive	153
V.	Conclusions.....	156
7.	Political Control of EU Competences—National Parliaments in the Field of EU Criminal Law	159
I.	Introduction.....	159
II.	National Parliaments' Remit under the EWS Procedure	160
III.	National Parliaments' Pursuit of Competence Control in Practice—The Yellow Card Against the EPPO Proposal	167
A.	Context and Rationales for the EPPO Proposal.....	167
B.	The Commission's Subsidiarity Justification	168
C.	The Reasoned Opinions of the National Parliaments	170
D.	The Response of the Commission	176
E.	Evaluating the Merits of the National Parliament's Objections.....	177
IV.	Conclusions.....	182
8.	Conclusion	187
I.	Competence Control of the Exercise of EU Competences.....	187
II.	Reconstructing the Limits of the Treaties.....	191
III.	Epilogue: Future Prospects.....	199
	<i>Bibliography</i>	203
	<i>Index</i>	215