

**Question for written answer E-007513/2015
to the Commission**

Rule 130

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)

Subject: Basis for the position taken in relation to the Viana do Castelo shipyards

We would like to ask the Commission for clarification on the position it took today on 'state aid' to the shipyards at Viana do Castelo (ENVC), which are considered to be incompatible with EU rules, as well as the fact that the text of the decision was not disclosed, thus shielding it from detailed public scrutiny.

The Commission's findings are based on subjective assessments, such as that (1) 'the Commission concluded that no private investor would have agreed to subsidise a loss-making business for 13 years. The measures were therefore not granted under market conditions' or (2) the ENVC had no 'realistic' restructuring programme.

We would like to ask:

1. Is the Commission able to guarantee that, in Portugal or in any of the other 27 Member States, no private investor has ever subsidised loss-making enterprises for thirteen or more years - companies or investments that guarantee them some other kind of direct or indirect benefit?
2. Being aware of such situations, would the Commission advocate the return of such investments or seek to force the liquidation of the companies?

Did the Commission at any point take into account the direct and indirect benefits of more than a thousand jobs at ENVC, along with the damage caused by their loss?