

**Question for written answer E-007007/2015
to the Commission**
Rule 130
Richard Sulík (ECR)

Subject: Project Mario - defending the rights of child migrants

Project Mario is co-financed by the European Union's Daphne III programme. Programme stakeholders interviewed children from one Member State who were living in utterly substandard conditions in another Member State. Although the child respondents were living in squalid conditions, engaged in activities incompatible with European or national law, such as begging or child labour, and were deprived of access to basic education, those contributing to the project (including social workers from the same country of origin as the children) were unable to arrange for all of the children interviewed to receive assistance, partly because of reticence or fear among the children themselves.

If children are exposed to grim living conditions or are involved in inappropriate and/or dangerous activities, can they be denied assistance because they themselves refuse it?

Is it true that, according to the project findings, minors from one Member State living in another Member State enjoy a lower degree of protection than minors from their host Member State and even than minors from third countries?

If so, does this situation chime with EU policies and principles?