NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON CHILD ABUSE ISSUES

IDEAS FOR A POSSIBLE FACILITY / SERVICES FOR EX-RESIDENTS:

Notes from Meeting of Tony Shanahan and Gerry Faulkner, February 28, 1996

1. Structure:
   Such a service might be a sort of CBERS writ large. This would entail:
   
   a) An independent management committee - an eventual settlement, especially if it included the Archdiocese and/or State Government, would probably demand a reconstituted management committee, certainly one that had more time to oversee what would be a bigger operation.
   
   b) This would probably include nominees from the State Government, the Archdiocese, possibly Voices.
   
   c) It may even be that some sort of “executive officer” would be needed to set up the operation, if not oversee it on an ongoing basis. Such a person might need to travel interstate to set up the arrangements for contact, assessment, referral and monitoring of services for those plaintiffs not resident in W.A.
   
   d) The office and staff would continue as at present in Perth, but probably on an expanded basis.
   
   e) We would need to utilise agencies like Centrecare in other States for initial contact and assessment of clients.
   
   f) These services as well as those services to which clients were referred would be paid for on a sessional basis.

   Careful thought would need to be given to the range of services to be offered. These would certainly include the current ones of family reunion, counselling, other referrals such as treatment for alcoholism, adult literacy programs, etc. Other areas of need would need to be seriously looked at, and these could be quite expensive. In particular, housing needs amongst some former residents and the area of financial assistance (e.g. low interest or interest free loans for approved purposes).

2. Criteria:
   Such services or facilities should be:
   
   a) Available to the plaintiffs in the New South Wales case (could or should any such facility be available to other ex-residents or “victims” who aren’t currently plaintiffs?)
b) Not duplicate other services and programs.

c) Be basically about empowerment and self-responsibility, and not operate on a handout or dependency model.

d) Not be spoken of or seen as "compensation" nor an admission of liability.

e) Be based on client needs.

f) Be independently and professionally administered, while funded by the Christian Brothers (and/or Church and/or Government).

g) Be publicised and accessible from all parts of Australia.

h) Be time limited. For example, the initial period of operation could be specified as three years, with a review to be done during the third year, leading to a decision about a possible two year extension of services.
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