UNIVERSITY OF BUCHAREST

FACULTY OF LAW

EDUCATIONAL MEASURES APPLICABLE TO MINOR OFFENDERS

- SUMMARY OF DOCTORAL DISSERTATION -

Supervisor:

Univ. Prof. PhD ConstantinMitrache

PhD candidate :

Lorena- Mihaela ZIDARU

Bucharest

2019

This paper is dedicated to the analysis of educational measures, a category of sanctions applicable exclusively to minors who have committed crimes. The emergence of new regulations in criminal matters (the new criminal code and the new code of criminal procedure) was dictated by a new vision of the Romanian criminal legislator. It aimed at simplifying regulations so that they could be implemented more quickly and easily, but also at transposing into our system of the principles adopted at European level and bringing it closer to the systems of other European countries.

This new perspective has led, among other changes, to changing the system of penalties for minors by removing punishments and maintaining educational measures exclusively. In turn, these educational measures have been rethought, and new measures have been introduced in the new criminal legislation, inspired mainly by the French and Spanish systems. The present study started in 2014 and continued in the coming years with an approach focused on both theoretical aspects and examples and cases from the practice of national courts. The latter were meant to illustrate and highlight the legal issues faced by judicial practice, some of them not having an obvious response in legislation and legal literature.

In the content of the paper, to the extent necessary, I have appealed to the case law of the European Court of Human Rights, but also to that of the Supreme Court and the Constitutional Court. At the same time, this paper contains references to the regulation of the legal institutions in the systems from where they come from and which have been a source of inspiration for the national legislator. Last but not least, the paper includes personal considerations, often of a deep critical nature regarding some of the particularities of educational measures. In terms of structure, the paper contains ten chapters, each of which is organized in sections and subsections to facilitate the examination and understanding of the notions addressed.

The **first chapter** consists of two sections: the criminological aspects and the evolution of the regulations on the penalty system for minor children. In the section devoted to criminological aspects I analysed the definitions of concepts such as “deviance”, “delinquency”, “offences”, “criminality” that have been given definitions and multiple explanations in the specialized papers, as well as the relationship between them, the scope covered and delimited by each of the concepts. At the same time, we examined the notion of “minor child in danger or in difficulty” and the necessity to include this category into the criminological study object, because they end up being a source for the category of juvenile offenders. I have also shown the conditions under which children are held responsible for their age, including the absolute presumption of lack of discernment before the age of 14, and the relative presumption of lack of discernment for minors aged between 14 and 16, and the relative presumption of discernment for minors aged between 16 and 18.

In the same section I presented the aetiology of juvenile delinquency as an individual act and the aetiology of juvenile delinquency as a social phenomenon. The advanced theories on the causes of juvenile delinquency at the individual level are divided into two broad categories: constitutional theories (delinquency is an innate phenomenon, originating in the individual) and the theories of the social environment (delinquency is the result of the influence the social environment has in forming the personality of an individual). As regards the internal factors (endogenous) to which juvenile delinquency was attributed, they focused on the role of heredity, respectively the role of acquired structures. In terms of external factors (exogenous) to which juvenile delinquency was attributed, they consisted in the influence of the ineluctable environment, the influence of the occasional environment, the influence of the chosen or accepted environment and the influence of the imposed environment.

Beyond the analysis of juvenile delinquency and its causes at the individual level, it can also be seen as a general phenomenon influenced by the overall development of society. Thus, theorists have noted that certain features of the political situation in some countries generate a high level of crime that includes juvenile crime. Another factor influencing delinquency in a state, including juvenile delinquency, is economic development (poverty is also reflected in the crime rate, and unemployment can also produce criminogenic effects). On the other hand, juvenile delinquency can also characterize societies where there is abundance of consumer goods, especially since these types of societies are experiencing a special development of technology and technique in general, which creates temptations for some minors. At the same time, families in large cities are characterized by the fact that parents are often very busy, so they neglect the supervision and care of their children, who are exposed to external influences, including criminogenic ones. A direct link has been established between the level of juvenile delinquency in certain geographical areas and the level of culture, multiple social surveys reveal that young people who commit delinquency often have a lower level of education.

The second section of the first chapter is devoted to the evolution of regulations on the minor penalty system from the period before 1936 to the present. Thus, I briefly presented the regulations prior to 1936 which provided for a severe penalty system for minors including corporal punishments, custodial sentences, even death penalty, as well as the obligation to take special measures for minors who committed criminal offences, but they did not act with discernment. The 1936 Criminal Code that followed those laws provided for a mixed penalty system consisting of safety measures (actually considered as educational measures by their purpose) and punishments. The rule was to take a security measure, and the court would only consider penalties if it was convinced that the measure was unsatisfactory. For minors not criminally liable, protection measures were provided and for the first time in Romanian law the obligation to conduct a social inquiry to provide the court with information on the behaviour, antecedents and the moral state of the minor was regulated.

The 1968 Criminal Code preserved the mixed penalty system consisting of punishments and educational measures, as well as the rule of taking a measure, while the punishment was the exception. Nevertheless, the orientation of the courts in the following period was predominantly to punishments, which made it necessary for the Plenum of the Supreme Court to intervene through a court guidance decision. Decree No 218/1977 made important changes for minors by providing a system formed exclusively of educational measures for them. the analysis of the declared purpose of this normative act shows the specificity of the respective period and the existing political system, aimed at the sanctioning through work of those with a reprehensible conduct.

Subsequently, Law no. 104/1992 repealed Decree 218/1977, so that from 1 October 1992 the sanctioning system provided by the previous criminal code became applicable, which included both educational measures and penalties. Law no. 140/1996, which amended and supplemented the Criminal Code, introduced a new institution of criminal law, that of suspending the service of the penalty under supervision or under control. As we have seen before, the current Criminal Code has brought major changes to the penalty system for minors because it has removed the punishments and maintained only educational measures, the latter being divided into custodial measures (holding to an educational centre or detention centre) and non-custodial measures (civic internship training, supervision, weekend commitment, daily assistance).

As far as the educational measures are concerned, the rule is that the court takes a non-custodial measure against the juvenile offender. The possibility for the court to take a custodial measure against a juvenile offender is provided for in two situations: a) if the juvenile offender had committed another offence for which an educational measure was enforced and it was served or the service thereof started before committing the offence subject to trial; b) when the punishment stipulated by law for the offence committed is of seven years in prison or more or life imprisonment.However, also in the above-mentioned situations, the court has the possibility to choose between a custodial or non-custodial measure.

Chapter2 examines the general aspects regarding the educational measures, and the distinct sections deal with the obligations that can be imposed during the service of educational measures, the incidence of multiple offences, statute of limitations for criminal liability and statute of limitations for educational measures. As far as the obligations are concerned, I found it necessary to emphasize that they can only accompany non-custodial educational measures and their necessity is re-imposed required in some cases by the particularities of the juvenile offender and their re-education needs that require increased intervention measures capable of changing their behaviour and alignment to the rule of law. Since the process of supervising the minor may face some changes, the legislator regulated the possibility of changing the

obligations in the sense of their termination, imposing new obligations or maintaining the established ones, but increasing or diminishing the conditions for serving the penalty.

Multiple offences in the case of a juvenile offender may refer to the situation in which he/she committed several offences while being a minor and both while being a minor and after the age of 18, respectively. The solutions adopted by the legislator regarding the penalty system are also different. Thus, for several offences committed while being a minor, the rule is to take a single educational measure for the criminal activity in its entirety. For the second situation, the law provided for different cases depending on the custodial or non-custodial nature of the educational measure taken for the offence committed as a minor and the nature of the main punishment for the offence committed as an offender of full age.

In the event that the court ordered against an offender of full age to postpone the punishment or suspend the service under supervision or under detention, but the offender was released on parole and during the term of parole the authorities discovered that the person in question had committed while being a minor a criminal offence punished by a custodial educational measure, they shall order the cancellation of postponement, suspension or release.

As regards the statute of limitation for criminal liability, the only exceptions to the penalty system for offenders of full age concern the fact that the terms are reduced to half for those who were minors at the time of the offence. Similarly, the statute of limitation for the service of educational measures is governed by the rules laid down for juvenile offenders, only the terms being adapted to minors: 2 years for non-custodial measures, i.e. a term equal to the duration of the measure, but not less than 2 years for custodial measures.

Chapters three to eight examine non-custodial and custodial measures, by analysing each measure in a separate chapter in terms of general issues (notion, regulation, purpose), content (conditions for taking the measure, duration, possibility of postponing or discontinuing it, institutional support, content of the program that the measure involves, enforcement, consequences of non-compliance with the measure). For custodial measures, the analysis also included aspects related to changes in the enforcement system (the possibility of replacing it with the daily assistance measure, the possibility of release from the centre).

Chapter 3 examines the measure of civic traineeship, an educational measure inspired by French law, which does not have a correspondent in the previous Romanian criminal code, being absolutely new. During the period in which the minor attends such a program, the mission of those who organize the traineeship is to explain him/her what are the legal and social consequences if he/she continues to commit offences, in order to raise awareness of his/her behaviour in the future. The traineeship is considered the easiest

non-custodial measure in the current Romanian criminal code, and the court can opt for it in the case of offenders posing a low social danger or offences with a low social risk.

The Criminal Code did not provide for a minimum duration of the measure, so that the court is able to set a minimum duration of the measure, but the maximum duration of is 4 months. There is no provision in our law regarding the possibility of discontinuing the traineeship if there are causes that would trigger the need for an interruption, as is the case with French law. As a result, in the Romanian legislation neither the probation service nor the court have an instrument provided by the legislator to interrupt the traineeship measure. In our view, however, *de legeferenda* such a procedure should be regulated because in practice there may be impediments to the commencement or continuation of the measure.

At the institutional level, the probation service through a probation officer designates the community institution where the traineeship takes place, and the same officer will coordinate and supervise the traineeship. In our opinion, the Romanian legislature regulated the possibility of participation of other actors outside the probation service in the service of non-custodial measures. Such institutions may be legal entities governed by public law and private law. The former, by being part of the State system, must provide support and contribute as efficiently as possible to the re-education of juvenile offenders, while the latter, on their own initiative, are subjected to the procedure of empowerment by the court.

The structure of the civic traineeship program requires that it includes three content domains (elements of moral-civic education, legal education, project for the benefit of community), and several themes include in the domains depending on the particularities of age, emotional and intellectual development, offence for which the minor was sanctioned and other aspects considered relevant. The civic traineeship programme is designed to provide theoretical and practical training, so the modules include exercises, projects and applications.

The enforcement of the measure involves a meeting between the representative of the probation service, the minor and his/her parents, in which they are informed by the enforcing judge about the measure imposed, what it consists of, its purpose and the consequences for non complying with it, and within 60 days from the date of the above-mentioned meeting, the minor will be included in the civic traineeship. In the event of non-compliance with the imposed measure or obligations, the court has several options which include extending the measure within the upper limit of 4 months or replacing it by one of the other three more severe non-custodial measures.

Chapter 4 is dedicated to analysing the supervision measure that is not completely new in terms of content, because in the old criminal legislation there was the educational measure of supervised release, the two measures being partly similar. The study of the measure includes a comparison with the measure of release under

supervision, highlighting the common elements and the progress made by the new legislation.

In terms of content, supervision involves controlling and guiding the minor in his/her daily schedule for a period between 2 and 6 months under the coordination of the probation service to ensure attendance to school or vocational training and the prevent carrying out certain activities or getting in touch with certain people that could affect the process of his/her rehabilitation. Supervision and guidance while serving the educational measure of supervision are performed as a rule by the parents of the minor, and the control of the service of the educational measure of the supervision and the control of the fulfilment of related duties by the person exercising the supervision is done by the probation officer. Since the law does not expressly provide for the means by which the probation officer actually carries out the control of the person concerned, he/she is free to organize the control activity as deemed necessary, depending on the forms and modalities considered the most effective, but also depending on the resources at their disposal.

With regard to the supervisor, the legislator has limitedly determined the persons who can supervise the juvenile offender, with a precise mention of their quality: parent, adoptive parent, guardian, "trusted person". In my opinion, I find it essential for the adult person chosen to supervise the juvenile offender to be a trusted, responsible person, who can make sure that the minor respects the measure imposed.

By analysing the place that the measure of supervision takes in the category of non-custodial educational measures and its purpose and content, we note that there is a correlation between them. Thus, supervision is regulated as the second severe non-custodial measure after the traineeship. As a rule, the measure is imposed on juvenile offenders who have committed low to medium gravity offences, at first confrontation with criminal law. Compared to the other non-custodial measures, supervision does not imply the establishment of a schedule including a certain number of activities. In the case of this measure, such a schedule of the minor already exists, and the probation service only monitors the way it is respected. In any case, the effectiveness of the educational measure of supervision depends to a large extent on a correct assessment of the daily schedule of the minor and on the possibilities for supervision of the persons in his/her family, evaluation which is the responsibility of the probation officer and subsequently, when choosing a measure, of the court.

Chapter 5 describes the measure of week-end curfew, inspired by Spanish criminal law, a new measure in Romanian law, since in the previous regulation no educational measure having similar content can be identified. Curfew consists of the obligation of the minor not to leave the dwelling on Saturdays and Sundays between 4 and 12 weeks unless he / she is obliged to participate in programs or to perform activities imposed by the court during this period. Among the non-custodial measures regulated by

the Romanian criminal code, the curfew is considered more severe than the civic traineeship and supervision, but less severe than the daily assistance.

One aspect which distinguishes the measure from the other measures is its discontinuity in terms of the actual period for which it takes place. By its nature and the way of regulation, the measure only covers Saturdays and Sundays, when the minor is obliged to stay at home, while he/she is not subject to any restrictions during the rest of the week.

Similarly to other non-custodial measures, the curfew requires the support of the probation service, provided through probation officers. They control the two components of this measure: first, the way the minor respects the measure and, secondly, the way the supervisor carries out the duties. Control is done through visits to the minor's home, scheduled or unannounced, as the case may be. In all cases, however, the minor (if he/she is alone) or the supervisor (if there is such a person) has the obligation to allow the officer to make the control by entering the home.

In terms of content, compared to the other educational measures, curfew has a rather concise content and does not require participation in programs designed to determine changes in the behaviour of the minor. It is at least doubtful that such a measure could respond to the re-education needs of a minor who has committed a relatively serious offence or had previously committed offences. In this situation, the minor in question needs a sufficiently long period of time to follow one or more programs meant to lead to behavioural changes. If the minor has already appropriated a series of distorted valuesand developed a behaviour contrary to the rule of law, no change can be realistically expected as a result of his/her isolation at home for several days over several weeks. Just as criminal behaviour is the result of several factors that have acted over a considerable period of time, so "remodelling" requires time and adequate educational resources.

Chapter 6 is intended to present the educational measure of daily assistance, inspired by the Spanish law, where it is found as assistance in a day centre, and is new in Romanian legislation, where it was introduced on 1 February 2014 by the current provisions of the Criminal Code. Daily assistance implies the minor's obligation to follow a schedule established by the probation service that contains the timetable and conditions for the activities to be carried out, as well as the prohibitions imposed on the minor.

Among the educational measures in the Romanian criminal code, daily assistance is considered to be the most severe non-custodial measure after traineeship, supervision and curfew. This hierarchy which places daily assistance on the position of the most severe non-custodial measure is justified by reference to the length of the measure, its rigorous schedule, and the obligations imposed on the sanctioned minor.

The probation officer controls the service of the measure by the minor and the performance of the duties by the community institution exercising supervision when applicable, and if the minor also attends a course, the probation officer also monitors its development. The analysis of the legal provisions and the mechanisms envisaged for their application, the proper enforcement of the measure appears to be guaranteed. In fact, the difficulties to effectively control the enforcement of the measure are numerous, caused primarily by the insufficient resources of the probation service.

We have in mind issues such as the lack of sufficient means of transport to allow officers to move to neighbouring areas where some of the juvenile offenders subject to those measures live, but also the main weakness of the probation system, the lack of staff able to ensure the proper performance of the duties assigned to them by law. Moreover, we must keep in mind that the activity of a probation officer also includes tasks beyond those concerning juvenile offenders and educational measures taken against them by the court.

In order to identify the needs of the minor, the probation officer must dedicate enough time to the discussion with the minor, and the accompanying parent, to identify as much as possible the minor's vulnerable points so that they can then create a program addressing the identified problems. With regard to the content of the program, the activities are essentially to be organized according to the needs of the minor and the deficiencies they present, as well as their interest in certain areas and activities. For daily assistance, unlike other non-custodial educational measures, the involvement of probation officers is more pronounced as they set the timetable for the activities and the conditions of carrying them out, monitoring their observance, so that the minor's choices can only manifest within the limits imposed by the probation service.

Chapter 7 is dedicated to presenting the measure of admission to an educational centre, also provided by the French, English, Swiss, Greek, Dutch, Spanish and German law, a measure which is not new in the Romanian criminal law. When we affirm the lack of absolute novelty for the Romanian law, we take into account that the provisions of the previous Romanian Criminal Code regulated admission to re-education centres as one of custodial measures for juvenile offenders, similar in terms of reason and purpose pursued.

The measure of admission to an educational centre is a custodial measure involving the admission of the juvenile offender into an institution specialized in the rehabilitation of minors, where they attend schooling and training programs according to their skills, and social reintegration programs. In the case of custodial measures and implicitly of admission to an educational centre, the intervention on the juvenile is intensified, as he/she is forced to stay in the educational centre where he/she attends the activities of the program. From the perspective of the minor's deprivation of liberty, the educational measure has a repressive effect, although, as it results from the regulation of the measure, it has an essentially educational character.

As regards the postponement or interruption of the service of the measure of admission to an educational centre, it should be mentioned that these are regulated and the provisions applicable to adults on the reasons justifying the granting of the postponement/interruption, the procedure of solving the claim, the obligations they have during the postponement or interruption period, the competent court that solves the application and the record of interruptions are fully applicable in case of postponement or interruption of the educational measure of admission to an educational centre.

Given that the persons admitted to educational centres carry out their activities at the centre in question, they must be adequately equipped to meet the needs of the persons admitted. In particular, an educational centre must have facilities for educational and recreational programs and accommodation, preparation and serving of meals, medical assistance and visits. In addition, in order to carry out the mentioned activities, specialized and technical-administrative staff have to work within the educational centre.

In relation to the rights of the persons admitted to such a centre, Law no. 254/2013 expressly provides that minors admitted to educational centres enjoy the rights guaranteed by law to adults serving sentences in prison. In some cases, however, they are customized to meet the structure and needs of the minors, with adaptations resulting from the fact that these people, having a different age, have other ways of exercising their rights and other needs. Execution of the measure is governed by a set of rules that constitute the scheme of enforcement. Admission to the educational centre has only one scheme of enforcement common to all persons admitted, a scheme that has to meet the physical and mental development needs of the minors admitted.

During the enforcement of the measure, the minor admitted has the obligation to behave appropriately, to follow the rules and to make efforts to rehabilitate themselves. A behaviour contrary to the rules governing the activity in the educational centre is likely to affect the re-education process of the minor in question of the other people in the centre, so the law provides the possibility for the court to order the continuation of the enforcement of the measure in a penitentiary for persons who have reached the age of 18 and have a behaviour that negatively influences or hinders the process of rehabilitation and integration of the other persons admitted. On the other hand, an appropriate behaviour manifested during the stay in the educational centre can lead to the replacement of the admission measure with that of daily assistance or early release.

Chapter 8 contains and analysis of the measure of admission to a detention centre, the most severe custodial measure, in the regulation of which the Romanian legislator was inspired by the provisions of other European law systems: the main model is Spanish law, as well as regulations from French law, German law and Austrian law. The measure consists of admitting the juvenile offender to an institution specializing in the rehabilitation of minors under guard and supervision, where they pursue intensive

social reintegration programs and school and vocational training programs according to their skills.

In relation to the safety of detention centres, this is a particularly important aspect because, on the one hand, admission implies the deprivation of liberty for the minors, but the particularities determined by their age must be taken into account. At the same time, a detention centre, compared to an educational centre, requires the conduct of educational and training activities under a stricter security and surveillance regime.

According to the law, a detention centre is equipped with facilities, devices, staff and technical means to ensure the supervision and control of the premises, interior spaces and access ways and is equipped with a surveillance and accompanying service that must prevent possible actions of avoiding the educational measure and committing any other unlawful actions, in accordance with the management's obligation to provide minimum measures to ensure the safety of such centres. Although detention centres are equipped with means and staff meant to ensure safety, some difficult situations cannot be managed by the National Administration of Penitentiaries (such as events that disturb public order or endanger the life or bodily integrity of persons or security of property), in which case support may be requested from the Ministry of Internal Affairs.

In relation to the conduct of the persons detained in such centres, the law sets expressly two main categories of obligations: to attend schooling up to the level of compulsory general education and to participate in vocational training courses and other activities organized in the centre. Even if in terms of content, admission to a detention centre is similar to admission to an educational centre, the specific features of the former should not be omitted, namely that the programs are carried out in an intensive manner and that the activities are carried out under security and supervision. As a rule, the intensive nature of the programs implies their higher frequency compared to the educational centre, but also a distinct content in the sense of more information and complex modalities of transmission.

If a single enforcement scheme common to all persons admitted is applicable to admission to an educational centre, the educational measure of admission to a detention centre involves two types of detention, closed and open. The criteria that help distinguish between the two types of enforcement of the educational measure are the degree of restriction of the freedom of movement of the persons admitted, the way and the place of organizing and carrying out the activities. As a rule, the type of detention is established according to the period of the educational measure: for the persons who have to serve less than 3 years the open detention is imposed, while for the persons who have to serve more than 3 years the closed detention is imposed.

In **Chapter 9** I analysed the procedural aspects of cases involving juvenile offenders. Thus, I stressed the need for these cases to be settled by specifically designated judges, a requirement imposed also by international regulations based on the idea that

judges who solve cases involving minors must have a thorough training in minor matters, training including concepts of psychology, sociology, criminology, and contributing to their formation so as to enable them to better understand and address these causes. At the same time, cases involving juvenile offenders have some procedural peculiarities which include the interdiction of the hearing publicity to protect the interests of minors and to avoid exposing them, the need for urgent judgment, and especially for the rapid clarification of the legal situation of minors, but also for the educational measures taken when establishing the guilt to be effective in relation to the time of the offence. With regard to hearing the minor, this will usually take place only once, the re-hearing may be admitted by the judge only in duly justified cases.

At the same time, the court is required to summon certain persons and institutions, such as the probation service, the parents of the minor or the guardian, respectively the curator or the person holding the custody or in charge of supervising the minor. The reason for such summoning stays in the fact that, according to the Romanian legislator, the persons mentioned have rights and obligations in the juvenile proceedings. In particular, they have the possibility to provide clarifications on the situation of the minor, to make requests and even proposals on the measures that may be ordered. The summoning of these persons is made for each trial unless they are aware of the dates set for trials.

In the same chapter, I described the procedure for the admission of guilt, as well as the different scenarios that the court may encounter depending on the concrete situation of the juvenile offender: the minor wishes to admit the offence, but his/her legal representative opposes and does not give their consent, the minor does not have a legal representative or the latter cannot be found for trial in order to express their consent for recognition, the situation of the juvenile offender at the date of the offence, who turned 18 during the criminal proceedings.

In cases with juvenile offenders another mandatory requirement is the drafting of the evaluation report by the probation service and the breach of the legal provisions imposing the obligation to obtain it implies, in our opinion, the sanction of relative nullity, conditional upon the occurrence of an injury proved and impossible to be removed otherwise than by abolishing the act. An additional form of protection guaranteed by the legislator to minors is that for the minor suspect or defendant legal aid is mandatory, and failure to comply with this provision leads to absolute nullity. Moreover, if juveniles aged between 14 and 16 are prosecuted for alleged offences, a forensic-psychiatric expertise is required to verify the existence of discernment. Such a check is necessary because the juvenile aged between 14 and 16 is criminally liable only if it proves to have committed the act with discernment, since there is a relative presumption of lack of discernment for this category of juveniles.

Chapter 10 contains the conclusions of this paper, namely that the form and content of legal texts respond to the current needs of society and minors in Romania and have the capacity to determine the decrease of juvenile delinquency, the prevention of acts contrary to the criminal law and the re-education of those who have already been in contact with criminal law. However, we must not forget that these attributes, even if they are necessary, are not in themselves sufficient to achieve the proposed objectives, and their effectiveness depends to a large extent on the way they are implemented.

As we have already shown, at the time when the new legal provisions came into force, there were no organizational, administrative or financial measures to support them properly. Over time, some aspects have been improved and contributed to a better functioning of criminal justice in case of juvenile offenders, while others are not yet resolved. I believe that in this regard it is especially useful to listen to the signals that the actors involved in the act of justice, but also the literature through researchers transmit, and act accordingly.

At the same time, if indisputable legal progress has been achieved in terms of legislation, it must not be forgotten that juvenile delinquency has multiple causes that generate and maintain it so that its reduction requires addressing and remedying all of them. It is true that all the educational measures regulated in the new legislation for minors are complex and address some of the factors underlying the commission of offences, but there are also unresolved deficiencies that outweigh the resources and possibilities available to the criminal justice system. As a consequence, the legislative and the executive power have the difficult task of addressing all these issues and finding the right means to resolve them. I believe that it is only through convergent efforts in multiple fields and with adequate financial support and human resources that the number of juvenile offenders can be reduced.