Book Reviews

Guilty or Not Guilty? .... *Francis X. Busch* 326
Men of Law .... *William Seagle* 328

The Ateneo Law Journal is published bi-monthly, July through March, by the Faculty and Student Body of the College of Law, Ateneo de Manila, Deogracias T. Reyes, *Dean*, under the joint management of the College of Law Sodality of St. Thomas More, and the Aquila Legis Fraternity, Augustine M. Bello, S.J., *Regent*.

Copyright 1952 under Act 3134, by the College of Law, Ateneo de Manila. Reproduction of editorial matter in any manner, in whole or in part, without written permission from the publisher is prohibited.

Published five times a year during the academic year by the students of the College of Law, Ateneo de Manila. Known office of publication: 406 Padre Faura, Ermita, Manila. Subscription rates: ₱10.00 a year. Entered as second class mail matter at the Manila Post Office on January 8, 1953.

VOLUME II JANUARY-FEBRUARY NUMBER 4

ATENEO LAW JOURNAL

THE MADRID CONGRESS ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY.[1]

As recounted by Judge Conrado V. Sanchez[2]
to Antonio C. Carag[3]

I

FROM July 5 to July 12 of last year, 1952, eminent jurists, criminologists, psychiatrists, doctors, lawyers and law-makers of Spain, Brazil, Portugal, Ecuador, Venezuela, Bolivia, Chile, Mexico, Cuba, Argentina, Columbia, San Salvador, Nicaragua, Uruguay, Paraguay, Peru, Panama, Haiti, The Dominican Republic and the Republic of the Philippines, met in Madrid, Spain, for the first International Spanish-Portuguese-American-Filipino Congress on Penology. It must be noted here that the Congress was not restricted to the attending delegates alone, but the sessions were conducted in such a manner that non-attending jurists and penologists all over the world were able to participate by means of correspondence.

It would be worthwhile to mention the officers elected for this Congress, if only to let the reader get acquainted with a number of the participating foreign delegates. Don José Agustín Martinez Viademonte, one of the foremost

---

[1] All Spanish texts and references were freely translated by the authors.
[2] Court of First Instance, Manila, Branch No. 7 Professor, College of Law, Ateneo de Manila.
[3] Ll.B., '53, College of Law, Ateneo de Manila. This writer assumes sole responsibility for all the Footnotes in this article.

criminologists in the Spanish speaking world, was its President. The Vice-President was Don Eugenio Cuello Calón, Professional Lecturer in the Universidad Central de Madrid and a world recognized contemporary authority in Criminal Law. Its Director General was Dr. Federico Castejón y Martinez de Arizala, Justice of the Supreme Court of Spain.

The Philippine delegation was composed of: Secretary of Justice Oscar Castelo; Dr. Manuel B. Moran, Philippine Ambassador to Spain; Congressman Severino de Leon of Catanduanes; Eustaquio Balagtas, Director of Prisons; Dr. Jorge Bocobo, Chairman, Code Commission; Dr. Guillermo Guevarra, Member, Code Commission; Mr. Francisco Claraval, Philippine Consul to Spain; Dr. Antonio Estrada, Cultural Attache, Philippine Embassy, Madrid; and, Judge Conrado V. Sanchez, Court of First Instance, Manila.

Article I of the Statutes of the Madrid Congress reads thus: The Spanish-Portuguese-American-Filipino Institute of Penology is constituted as a scientific organization and is non-political in character. Its purposes are:

A) The development of solidarity among the criminologists of the Spanish-Portuguese-American-Filipino community, by means of a more intimate collaboration of those who, individually and collectively, are dedicated to the study and application of the juridico-penal sciences in any of its aspects.

B) The investigation of criminality and its causes, proposing preventive, curative or repressive measures to combat it, as well as legal reforms in the judicial, criminal and penological field.

C) To encourage the development of theoretic as well as practical penal law and all the necessary and indispensable rules for its efficacy and the propagation and diffusion of its principles and rules.

D) Maintain close relationship with similar scientific institutions as well as penal-technical institutions and penitentiaries with the purpose of obtaining a comprehensive knowledge through the exchange of information, studies and publications.

E) In the judicial spirit of the Spanish-Portuguese-American-Filipino community, to arrive at a uniform criterion in Penal Legislation.

This article does not propose to discuss all the points taken up by the Madrid Congress, but will confine itself only to the subject of Juvenile Delinquency. This is a phase of the Philippine legal system which is, sad to admit, very much neglected.

When the Third Commission of the Madrid Congress was organized, which Commission was created to deal directly with Juvenile Delinquency, a big majority of all the delegates applied for membership therein. Members as well as non-members actively participated in its sessions and in answer to queries sent out by the Congress long before its sessions opened, criminologists, psychiatrists and medico-legal experts all over the Spanish speaking world contributed scholarly articles, most notable of which was the written work submitted by Professor Cuello Calón.

How does the noted criminologist view the problem of Infantile and Juvenile Delinquency? Cuello Calón points out, how, in actual moments of crises and in post war years, the criminality of adolescents constitutes an alarming social evil. After axamining the data that more or less faithfully records reality, he underscores the fact that the highest number of juvenile delinquents were recorded in the years 1942 and 1943. The number of such delinquents went down in the succeeding years, but still, the percentage at present is still higher than in pre-war years. In certain countries today, as in France for example, the number of juvenile delinquents is gravely rising upwards. This makes the criminality of boys and youngsters constitute one of the most desolate criminal phenomenon of our time. At the same time it brings forward a tremendous social problem whose solution requires the united efforts of criminologists, psychiatrists, psychologists and educators.

The reformatory treatment of minors has passed through different epochs. This clearly shows that an ideal solution has not yet been found. To the scientific and humanitarian phases through which, in its development, the treatment of minors has passed, one of substantive importance has appeared in our present generation. This phase we may

call, The International Phase. From the efforts realized by the International Association for the Protection of Infants, 1921, and, hereafter, through the defunct League of Nations and today, the United Nations, there has been organized various international conferences which tried to open a road to international cooperation.

Upon examination of the juridico-penal status of the minor through comparative legislation, with special reference to Hispano-American countries, the conclusion is reached that certain countries establish an absolute penal minority, [4] during which the minor is not subject to any penal liability whatsoever, and, from another point of view the criterion is also maintained that the minor be examined psychologically to establish his criminal responsibility. [5] While some legislation impose to a certain age limit measures leading to the education and reform of the young delinquent, [6] others have recourse to special penal

[4] Art. 12. (R.P.C.) Circumstances which exempt from criminal liability:
a) A person under nine years of age.
b) A person over nine years of age and under fifteen, unless he has acted with discernment, in which case, such minor shall be proceeded against in accordance with the provisions of article 80 of this Code. (rf. Art. 80, RPC, infra, Footnotes: RPC, Act. 3815 as amended).
When such minor is adjudged to be criminally irresponsible, the court, in conformity with the provisions of this and the preceding paragraph, shall commit him to the care and custody of his family who shall be charged with his surveillance and education; otherwise, he shall be committed to the care of some institution or person mentioned in said article 80.

[5] Our Philippine Courts have no social investigation of delinquents to speak of as up to the present, our country is in dire need of qualified psychiatrists, psychologists and psychoanalysts. In no one of the innuemerable Philippine Colleges and Universities is a specielized course in Juvenile Care and Education offered.

[6] Art. 80. (R.P.C.) Suspension of sentence of minor delinquents.—Whenever a minor of either sex, under sixteen years of age at the date of the commission of a grave or less grave felony, is accused thereof, the court, after hearing the evidence in the proper proceedings, instead of pronouncing judgment of conviction, shall suspend all further proceedings and shall commit such minor to the custody or care of a public or private benevolent or charitable institution, established under the law for the care, correction or education of orphaned, homeless, defective, and delinquent children, or to the custody or care of any other responsible person in any other place subject to visitation and supervision by the Director of Public Welfare or any of his agents or representatives, subject to such conditions as are prescribed herein below until such minor shall have reached his majority or for such less period as the court may deem proper.
The court, in committing said minor as provided above, shall take into consideration the religion of such minor, his parents or next of kin, in order to avoid his commitment to any private institution not under the control and supervision of the religious sect or denomina-

measures, and in the cases of countries such as Holland, Belgium, Germany and France, the practice is to apply common penalties of major gravity in the case of minors who constitute an extreme menace to society. The general rule, however, is the application of exemplary measures. The imposition of common penalties constitute the exception, and, whenever imposed, these common penalties are lessened by degrees [7] so that today we can safely assert that the youth is not a proper subject for the Penal Code.

tion to which they belong.
The Director of Public Welfare or his duly authorized representatives or agents, the superintendent of public schools or his representatives, or the person to whose custody or care the minor has been committed, shall submit to the court every four months and as often as required in special cases, a written report on the good or bad conduct of said minor and the moral and intellectual progress made by him.
The suspension of the proceedings against a minor may be extended or shortened by the court on the recommendation of the Director of Public Welfare or his authorized representatives or agents, or the superintendent of public schools or his representatives, according as to whether the conduct of such minor has been good or not and whether he has complied with the conditions imposed upon him, or not. The provisions of the first paragraph of this article shall not, however, be affected by those contained herein.
If the minor has been committed to the custody or care of any of the institutions mentioned in the first paragraph of this article, with the approval of the Director of Public Welfare and subject to such conditions as this official in accordance with law may deem proper to impose, such minor may be allowed to stay elsewhere under the care of a responsible person.
If the minor has behaved properly and has complied with the conditions imposed upon him during his confinement, in accordance with the provisions of this article, he shall be returned to the court in order that the same may order his final release. (As amended by Com. Act No. 99 and Rep. Act No. 47.)

[7] Art. 80, par. 7, (RPC):
In case the minor fails to behave properly or to comply with the regulations of the institution to which he has been committed or with the conditions imposed upon him when he was committed to the care of a responsible person, or in case he should be found incorrigible or his continued stay in such institution should be inadvisable, he shall be returned to the court in order that the same may render the judgment corresponding to the crime committed by him.
Art. 68 (RPC):
Penalty to be imposed upon a person under eighteen years of age.—When the offender is a minor under eighteen years and his case is one coming under the provisions of the paragraph next to the last of article 80 of this Code, the following rules shall be observed:

1. Upon a person under fifteen but over nine years of age, who is not exempted from liability by the reason of the court having declared that he acted with discernment, a discretionery penalty shall be imposed, but always lower by two degrees at least than that prescribed by law for the crime which he committed.

2. Upon a person over fifteen and under eighteen years of age the penalty next lower than that prescribed by law shall be imposed, but always in the proper period. (Cf. Art. 80, RPC, supra; Footnotes.)

At this point, we examine the principal measures applied to delinquent minors, from the classical treatment of family responsibility, to guarded freedom or system of test, to confinement in repressive institutions. The measure that causes the last inconvenience to everybody concerned consists in requiring from those who have authority and responsibility at home over the minor, guaranties of good conduct not only in accordance with the principles of ethics but also proper hygenic and therapeutic care. In cases where the minor's family offers adequate guarantees,[8] the guarded freedom or system of test, or using more familiar terms, the probation or parole system, is recognized to be of extraordinary value because it avoids the imposition of prison penalties and above all, the rupture of family ties. In cases where the minor has no family of his own, (as in the case of an orphan,) the recourse is to place said minor under the care and custody of honorable families. Many other measures are employed: as in England, where they found important and distinct improvement in the so-called "approved hostels" and "probation homes"—semi-freedom institutions authorized by the State; and, so-called "center of retention" which are open during the recreation hours and where the minors go to work on their week-end vacations. In the same manner, in Germany, since 1943, an analogous disciplinary measure was adopted, consisting of the arrest of delinquent minors during their free hours.

In almost all countries of the world today, there are established institutions of correctional education.[9] Although employing different methods, they can be classified into: a) the quarter system; b) institutions of the family type; c) emphasis on professional education; d) predominance of the scientific treatment.

8 Here, we call such homes Placement Homes or Foster Homes. If the adopted parents employ said delinquent, the delinquent will be paid a correspondingly reasonable salary. If the adopted parents take the child as a member of their family, the child will, of course, receive no wage. About 50% of the real parents of delinquents, however, are willing to take custody of their wayward child under guarantees of proper surveillance and good behaviour. The Courts make the proper assignment of delinquents to said homes only as a matter of form, depending entirely on the official recommendation of the Social Welfare Commissioner.

9 Here in the Philippines, we have the government Training School for Boys, the Training School for Girls, Boys Home, Girls Home, the Orphanage, which when all taken together constitute what is more popularly known as Welfareville Institutions.

It is an admitted fact, however, that the Welfareville Institutions has shamefully failed in the accomplishment of its purpose. The majority of its graduates come out hardened criminals, while the few "reformed" boys that go out of its forbidding confines are no more than human wrecks, completely broken down, physically and spiritually. It is shocking to know that even today, whippings, lashings and other physical tortures such as months of solitary confinement and reduced diets are daily being meted out in said institutions.

Cuello Calón believes that proper and effective institutional treatment for children and adolescents is realized only in institutions whose penal characteristics are totally eliminated; where a profound intellectual education permits penal readaptation, professional formation, physical development, and lastly, where those in authority acquire a workable knowledge, at the least, of the personality of the delinquent. Upon close examination of present-day laws, it can fortunately be observed that contemporary legislation recognizes the above stated principle. Nevertheless, there are still many practices in such correctional institutions which have received widespread and justifiable criticisms. This is true even in the United States, a country whose national consciousness for the problem presented by delinquent minors is one of the most sensitive in the world.

Hardly any person of note disagrees with the consensus of opinion that, except in those cases of extreme danger, children and adolescents should not be subjected to penalties as are provided in the Penal Code, but may be the subjects of educative and reformatory measures. The jail, whatever be the penitentiary rule applied, always leaves a stigma on the child, to his future detriment. This is the reason why a big number of legislations wisely forbid the imposition of prison penalties on minors. The imposition of fines seems to be a good substitute for short prison penalties, but its efficacy is directed more to the parents to compel added vigilance and care with regards to their wards, rather than to the child himself. Another substitute for encarceration which has found general approval in the countries of Europe is the "principle of opportunity", according to which, the authorities in charge of penal prosecution simply fail to prosecute the crime committed when and if such prosecution is considered as noxious or injurious to the morals of the minor. Of the same significance appears to be the system of "suspension of sentence".

It is suggested that the Court having jurisdiction of minor delinquents be constituted in the collegiate system in as much as due to the multiplicity of its functions a sole judge can not attend to all of his duties properly. It is believed that the Court should be composed of a Judge, specialized in this line, as the presiding officer, and some assessors with knowledge of the problems of the delinquent youth as members. Among its members must be counted a doctor and a woman assessor.[10] Significance should be laid on the fact that in the Nordic countries the treatment of minors is not given to organizations of the police type, but to administrative ones, thus avoiding the remotest semblance of penal punishment.[11]

The intervention of the prosecuting attorney in the judicial trial of the minor should be completely eliminated and the personality of the defense attorney should be recognized only in cooperation with the Judge in the solution of particular cases.[12] There should be a total absence of publicity in such cases and the common judicial procedure should not be unfurled to the tender mind of the minor. Following the same line of thought, the minor should at all costs not come in contact with the tainted influence of adult prisoners.

Once a minor is detained, or left to the care of their respective families, until the time the Court takes adequate measures for his treatment, an exhaustive study must be made into his person and the environment in which he lived in order to arrive at a sympathetic understanding of his physical and psychological characteristics. There have been much criticism against the actuations of Juvenile Courts, especially in the United States, where they have been accused of charges as grave as the unreasonable application of the same procedure as that practiced in the ordinary Courts of Justice; apathy in the part of the Judges and skepticism on the part of the public. Furthermore,

10 The general criticism to women's intervention in the care and cure of juvenile delinquents is the fact that the women place more emphasis on emotional treatment to the prejudice of scientific methods.

11 Here in our country, juvenile delinquency cases are handled exclusively by the police force, municipal or city. The treatment such minors receive from police officers is no different from that received by adult criminals.

12 An interesting observation should be made here. A plea of guilty by a minor delinquent is never admitted by our Courts, on the theory that he is not fully cognizant of the gravity or consequences of his plea.

there is an undeniable tendency to consider such Courts as subterfuges to evade the full force of penal severity. The limited application of scientific methods in the diagnosis and treatment of minors, as well as the political influences that play in the appointment of its Judges, also find widespread condemnation. It should be noted, however, that such criticisms never strike at the substance of the Juvenile Courts as an institution, but only to the organization and procedures of the same. As to whether Juvenile Courts should have an administrative or judicial character, Cuello Calón believes the latter to be better, since besides possessing the power of imposing repressive measures, the presence of its presiding Judge guarantees the non-imposition of arbitrary measures. It should be hoped that the Juvenile Courts must act on the basis of the legal character of the delinquent and not loose sight of the legal definition of the crime committed so as to distinguish between the delinquent, properly designated, and the minors who do not possess real, criminal despositions. In the latter case, only administrative regulations should be imposed.

The Juvenile Courts must entertain only the extreme cases of juvenile delinquency, i.e., minors who are proven dangers to society. As for the other cases of minors who do not constitute such a menace,[13] the great weight of opinion is that they should be readapted to organizations which, like the schools, give incalculable opportunities to the minors in their physical as well as moral rehabilitation.[14] Of course, it should be taken into account that a big number of legal problems are beyond the orbit of theoretical solution so that in such cases, where pure theorizing becomes futile and inadequate, it becomes necessary to have recourse to the more drastic, but effective, measures employed by the Juvenile Courts.

13 Some of the delegates even advocated that juveniles are not criminals at all, but misfits in society, the products of lopsided economics. It is hard to dispute the practical truth, for example, of the saying that "a hungry boy will always steal." It is honestly believed by most of the criminal law authorities then present that the acts complained of are no more than the result of immaturity; intellectual, perhaps physical, as well as moral. With these principles in mind, what such children need is psychology, not penalty.

14 A good example of this would be the Convent of the Good Shepherd, in Quezon City, an institution for the orphaned, abandoned and wayward girls. Unfortunately, in spite of repeated demands, the government has refused to support this deserving institution on the ground of the "separation of Church and State."

It is an evident fact that the delinquent, until he reaches the age of twenty or twenty-one years, cannot be treated in the same manner as an adult. He should rather be subjected to a rule where reformation is the principle. But as plenty of these young men are admittedly dangerous criminals, one should not go to the other extreme by neglecting to exercise the safeguards necessary for the preservation of organized society.[15]

The noteworthy, but not unexpected, feature of the Congress that marked the deliberations of the Third Commission on "Infantile and Juvenile Criminality" was the lively interest and sincere enthusiasm shown by all the participating delegates to the Congress, members and non-members of the Third Commission alike. It was very apparent that Juvenile Delinquency has reached such grave proportions in the various countries represented, that its proper remedial measure has come to constitute a proper topic for international discussion.

Pursuant to this, the Third Commission drew up a set of Thirteen Conclusions which was unanimously approved by the Congress at its final Plenary Session. The Thirteen Conclusions are:

1) A minimum age limit must be fixed, not less than sixteen years, until the attainment of which age no penalties should be imposed to violators, and instead, only reeducation should be applied, depending on individual cases.
   In the exceptional cases where the minor approximates the minimum age limit, and the measures recommended above are proved ineffective, said minors may be sent to the institutions referred to in Conclusion 3.

2) It is recommended that a minor whose age is above the minimum age limit marked in Conclusion 1, but not more than 18 years, can be subjected to the rule enunciated in Conclusion 1, or in the alternative, to that of Conclusion 3.

15 When a minor is brought back to our Courts for a second time, on a charge graver than the first one committed, sentence shall be imposed on him, if found guilty thereof, without benefit of prior social investigation.

3) The minors, to whom penalties of restraint of liberty are applied, must discharge such penalties in institutions, whether predominantly educative or religious in character, where the minor is prepared for free life; in an atmosphere of confidence and the corresponding sense of responsibility, by the Borstal System,[16] the prison-school system, or other analogous systems. Such institutions may practice repressive measures in the initial stages of the minor's confinement.

4) If the minors were to be declared mentally ill or abnormal, to whom are not recommended the treatment referred in Conclusion 1, or, where the confinement referred to in Conclusion 3 is entirely ineffective, then adequate social protection may be resorted to.

5) The confinement of the minor can be extended until he reaches the age of majority, or the approximate age of the same, when it is necessary for the reeducation of the minor; and always subject to compulsory revision of the case in periods determined by law or on any other time as the Court may deem proper.

6) If the internee has completed the maximum period of confinement in the institution and he seems inadaptable to free life, the most appropriate measures of social protection should be taken, as for ex-

16 In 1908 England enacted a law called the Borstal Act which provided for the special handling of juvenile criminals by juvenile reformatory institutions or Borstals. They were concerned in terms of educating the youthful offender for self-control and then provided a graded system of advancement leading finally to release. The aftercare of discharged inmates was taken over by the Borstal Association which was the supervising agency for licensed boys (those discharged on parole). According to Brockway's account (c, 1926), The Borstal institution operated on a "house"-system basis, with chosen prefects in charge (akin to the cottage plan and monitor system that was developed in the U.S. and originally borrowed from la colonie agricole of Mettray, France). The routine day was 15 hours, beginning with physical exercise and alotting 8 hours for work and 2 hours for study. Liberty of inmates was restricted at first, and later increased, even to the point of permitting outside attendance in technical schools. The minimum term of sentence was 2 years, the maximum, 3 years. Release on parole or on license could be made after 6 months for boys and 3 months for girls. Brockway contended that the main defect of the Borstal reformatories is that they are more penal than educational. (Searchlights on Delinquency—K. R. Eissler, Ed. International Universities Press, Inc., N.Y., Copy. 1949)

ample, confinement in an institution for incorrigibles or habitual delinquents.

7) The Juvenile Courts shall have exclusive competence to try the violations committed by the minors to which Conclusion 1 refers and to decide upon the applicable measures.

8) It is most convenient that the decisions regarding the confinement of minors as set forth in Conclusions 4, 5, 6, and others related to such confinement, be confided to an institution specialized in the study of the person of the minor.

9) The Juvenile Courts will give the necessary guarantees to safeguard the interests of the minors, their relatives and educators. The intervention of the prosecuting officer and that of the defense counsel may be admitted but always in the spirit of cooperation with the Court. All persons permitted to intervene in said Juvenile Courts, especially the presiding Judges, must have had special training, the necessary scientific preparation, and sufficient experience on the subject matter of minor delinquency.
The effective intervention of women is recommended for they, by nature, possess the highly developed aptitude to perform the functions of the Juvenile Courts and similar institutions charged with the jurisdiction of minors.

10) The minor shall be observed, physically and psychically, before the decision of the Court is handed down and while the measures established are in force, especially in cases where the desired result justifies it.

11) The procedure will have to be simple, rapid, and flexible. The detention of minors must never take place in prisons or common police posts. In the absence of such locals, they must always be absolutely separated from adult criminals. The minor must never appear in a public trial.

12) The Juvenile Courts can apply the measures most convenient for the minor, modify, substitute, or leave them without effect, when the interest of the minor so demands. Within these measures, the following will principally be applied:

a) Pardon
b) Amonition
c) Submission to probation or parole. (This measure can be combined with any of the others.)
d) Placing the minor on a semi-confinement rule.
e) Placing the minor under the care of an adopted family.
f) Confinement in State or Private Institutions, depending on each particular case.

The confinement should be ordered only in cases where the other measures have proved ineffective. Such confinement shall take place in institutions predominantly agricultural or industrial in character, depending on the personal interest of the minor, giving special consideration to his vocational capabilities and his desired future occupation. The rules of such institutions must permit the formation of small groups of minors of similar inclinations.
The supervision and care of the minors should continue even after they have undergone the prescribed period for correctional training.

13) A study should be made of the jurisdiction of Juvenile Courts with the end in view of broading it, so as to include cases of abandonment of the family, maltreatment of the wife or children, guardianship and adoption.[17]

II

In the Philippines today, there is no single Court that has lawfully been endowed with exclusive jurisdiction over cases involving juvenile delinquents. In practice, every Court may, at one time or another, be a Juvenile Court. The only criterion observed is whether the Court has jurisdiction over the case if the offender therein were an adult.

[17] This was proposed by Dr. Jorge Bocobo and finds its equivalent in article 139 of the proposed Code of Crimes.

If so, then for that particular case said Court is a Juvenile Court. In other words, no Court in our country is exclusively a Juvenile Court.

However, in the City of Manila, Branch V of the Municipal Court has, by directive of the Department of Justice, been assigned to handle all city cases in which juveniles are involved as accused. But this particular assignment does not mean to say that this Branch, No. V, does not have other assignments. Juvenile cases actually constitute only a portion of its total work. One criticism becomes immediately patent in this practice of non-exclusiveness. Every Court being only occasionally a Juvenile Court renders the same improperly qualified to treat delinquents with the greatest advantage, for the said Court, without any fault of its own, would necessarily lack the required aptitude and training and experience.

In every session of the Philippine Congress, a Bill seeking to create eight regional Juvenile Courts in the country is presented. Every adjournment of Congress finds this Bill shelved or complacently by-passed, for two reasons. First: the country apparently cannot shoulder, at present, the financial burden that would result with the establishment of the nine regional Juvenile Courts. Second: the country today is confronted with more pressing problems, as for example, the elimination of the Huk problem and the rehabilitation of bridges, roads and public schools and buildings. Without giving an exhautive discussion, which would not be proper here, the writer says that the above-mentioned reasons are fallacious, on two grounds. First: The problem of Juvenile Delinquency is just as important as the Huk problem or the country's material rehabilitation. Second: If the government has to run on a deficit spending basis, for all sorts of reasons, why cannot the government throw in a few hundred thousand pesos more for the establishment of Juvenile Courts? The government could not find a more cogent reason to defend its much criticized system of government budgeting.

From an analysis of present day circumstances surrounding the problem of Juvenile Delinquency, many years still have to pass before juveniles become the recipients of proper care and consideration. But, the Filipino

people possess a completely un-Asiatic quality that may cut this period short. We have a prepensity for surprising our ownselves. So that with the sincere and continued efforts of the distinguished members of the Philippine Delegation to the Madrid Congress our own Juvenile Delinquency problem may be solved sooner than most of us expect.

Acknowledgment is gratefully made to the Hon. N. Almeda Lopez, Presiding Judge, Branch V of the Municipal Courts, City of Manila; and to Atty. Elpidio Laiz, of the Social Welfare Commission, for the help extended the writer in the collection of local material.