

WRITTEN QUESTION E-4010/09  
by Edward Scicluna (S-D)  
to the Commission

Subject: Excessive deficit proceedings against Malta

What were the main reasons why the Commission gave Malta only until December 2010 to bring its deficit down below 3% while, at the same time, projecting that 2009 and the first half of 2010 would be marked by poor economic performance, with falling output and high unemployment?

At a time when the economies of all Member States are experiencing such difficulties, why was a longer timeframe not set – such as 2013 (as suggested by the IMF) – since this would have allowed the Maltese Government to enact an effective stimulus package to save jobs and stimulate investment?