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Foreword

Only recently we have become aware of the plight of children in institutions which were established to care for them. Their intentions were good. They were established in the late 19th and early 20th centuries against a background of very few social services for families. Institutions were the only option for some families. Many children placed in these homes were often extremely disadvantaged, coming from dysfunctional families, while others were relinquished by parents in dire circumstances who were persuaded that this would give their child a better chance in life.

There was little understanding by society of the emotional needs of children and far greater poverty than we see today. There was lack of awareness of the importance of stable parental relationships and it was easier for children to be separated from their families. What was accepted by society then is seen as harsh and uncaring now.

Some children benefitted from the order given to their lives and the education they received. Others suffered, emotionally and physically, while some were sexually abused by those whose responsibility it was to care for and protect them. This resulted in many adverse effects continuing through their adult lives.

Staff were poorly trained, there was little oversight of how these homes were run and little accountability. Many of the homes were established and run by churches and other charities. They were often underfunded and under resourced. However, government child welfare departments, who had a statutory responsibility to care for such children, favoured them because they provided cheap care.

Some were established and conducted by The Salvation Army. We now know that in some the conditions could be very harsh and abuse occurred. The Salvation Army has acknowledged the harm done to some children in their homes and now provides assistance and pastoral care for those damaged.

It is a brave organisation which publishes a document about its errors. But it is important to do so. It is a reminder to all who wish to help children that noble intentions sometimes go awry. We need to learn from our mistakes and be vigilant to ensure that children in adverse circumstances receive consistency and love, have good role models and above all, are safe. This monograph acknowledges these problems and is an important part of the healing process.

Kim Oates  AM, MD, DSc, MHP, FRACP, FRCP
Emeritus Professor of Paediatrics
The University of Sydney
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Summary

From 1893 until 1995 The Salvation Army provided institutional care for thousands of Australian children and youth. This paper describes the intentions and actions of The Salvation Army with reference to the care provided by other churches and benevolent organisations and in the context of government expectations and society's standards. It originates from the Eastern Territory and the history, after formation of two Australian territories in 1921, focuses on the Eastern Territory.

Christians in Victorian England and the Australian colonies responded to the plight of destitute children by providing food, shelter, and education in children's homes. Churches worked together with governments to provide needed social services. The institutions were often the only option for families experiencing difficulties. Some children benefitted from their time in these homes, but for many the experience had lasting painful effects.

The 2004 release of Forgotten Australians: a report on Australians who experienced institutional or out-of-home care as children, together with reports of inquiries in Queensland, New South Wales, and South Australia, and a review in Tasmania, have highlighted harsh conditions and abuse in many church-run institutions, including those run by The Salvation Army.

The Salvation Army acknowledges the abuse that occurred in its children's institutions. In December 2010 General Shaw Clifton's apology on behalf of The Salvation Army was delivered in Canberra by the Chief of the Staff, Commissioner Barry Swanson. The Salvation Army Eastern Territory now provides assistance and pastoral care to those harmed in its homes. This paper is a contribution to the process of assisting those who are healing from wounds of the past.

The inquiries have shown that church institutions of the past were characteristically closed environments, underfunded and under resourced, with untrained staff, minimal monitoring and little accountability. Churches have learned from the past and are now working together to ensure that children in their programs are safe. Today, children in churches, including Salvation Army corps are protected by mandatory reporting and other policies; staff screening, training, and supervision; and clear complaints processes.
The Salvation Army provided institutional care for thousands of Australian children and youth for over one hundred years from 1893 until 1995.

These institutions provided both short-term and long-term care with the intention of preparing them for productive lives. There were homes for girls, homes for boys, probationary homes and reformatories which were alternatives to prisons, industrial homes to prepare boys or girls for employment, farms which provided agricultural training for boys, and later, smaller family group homes.

This paper describes the intentions and actions of The Salvation Army in providing out-of-home care for children and youth in need with reference to the care provided by other churches and benevolent organisations. It attempts to place the institutional practices of The Salvation Army into the context of government and society expectations of the period.

In 2004 the Senate Community Affairs References Committee released Forgotten Australians: a report on Australians who experienced institutional or out-of-home care as children. There have also been a number of state inquiries into past institutional care. Hundreds of former residents of homes across Australia have submitted accounts of their experiences to these inquiries. Their submissions included many accounts of harsh conditions that were common practice in the past, and also physical, sexual, and emotional abuse that went well beyond the standards of the period.

The Senate Committee recommended that former care providers apologise for the harm, the hurt, and the distress they had caused. In December 2010 the second in command of the worldwide Salvation Army, the Chief of the Staff, Commissioner Barry Swanson, travelled to Canberra from London, England, to deliver General Shaw Clifton’s apology on behalf of The Salvation Army to the men and women who were in their care as children. The General was unable to attend in person as his wife was dying.

Lack of social services in the past meant that many children ended up in care when their families experienced difficult times. Some of them benefitted from their time in homes, including those of The Salvation Army. They found the care in the homes was far better than what they had previously experienced, and have gone on to live productive and rewarding lives. They are not the focus of this history. This paper is an acknowledgement of those who felt unable to speak in the past, and of those who did speak and were not believed. It is hoped that this paper will help them put their experiences into the bigger picture of children in care in past years and assist their healing from wounds of the past.

It is important to keep in mind that our view of childhood has changed over the years. Today we see many common practices of the past as harsh and uncaring, regimented and dehumanising. We need to be cautious about condemning past practices on the basis of present understandings. However, the inquiries did reveal abuse that clearly went beyond what was acceptable at the time.
In preparing this paper I examined original records held at The Salvation Army Australia Eastern Territory Heritage Centre, Bexley, NSW, and in the Mitchell Library at the State Library of NSW. I also spoke to some who worked as staff or who volunteered in Salvation Army homes. Original records are very limited as many have been lost, have deteriorated, or have been destroyed. The large number of homes involved also meant that it was not possible to examine all of the records which do exist. It was necessary to select a sample. However, the allegations of abuse in homes across Australia presented in the inquiries indicate that there were similar practices and conditions in many homes run by The Salvation Army.

This paper originates from the Eastern Territory of The Salvation Army in Australia. Thus, the history after the 1921 division into Eastern and Southern Territories focuses on the Eastern Territory and does not represent both Territories.

There was huge population growth, especially in the towns and cities in the 19th century. The industrial revolution brought many to the cities to find work. However, wages were very low and costly food meant the poor were undernourished. The housing shortage led to overcrowding, especially in London, and homelessness. Sanitation was poor. Waves of contagious diseases, including cholera, as well as starvation led to many deaths. Children helped support their families by sweeping chimneys, working in coal mines and factories, and selling matches or flowers.

Many children, homeless and destitute, lived by stealing. Child allowances, provided under the Poor Law 1601, were seen as encouraging large families and outdoor relief as benefitting the irresponsible and reducing resources for those who ‘deserved’ it. Consequently, only a low level of outdoor relief was provided under the Poor Law Amendment Act 1834 which governed administration of workhouses. The harsh conditions in these workhouses were designed to reduce costs, improve the inmates’ moral character, and encourage the poor to find other resources rather than enter the workhouse.

Children were seen by churches and philanthropists as among those most in need of help. They responded by establishing schools, orphanages, and other forms of residential care. Free education was not available to all. Believing that education would enable children to improve themselves, ‘ragged schools’ were established for children who had only ragged clothes to wear. As well as basic lessons, many schools provided food for the children and some also opened refuges. Industrial schools provided education and taught a trade, preparing children for gainful employment. From 1857, children between 7 and 14 years old who hadn’t committed a serious crime could be sentenced to time at an industrial school under the Industrial Schools Act. From 1861, sentencing was extended to include children under 14 found begging, wandering with no home or in the company of thieves, or whose parents declared them ‘to be beyond their control’, and to children under 12 whose offence would have been punishable by imprisonment. Older children who had committed serious crimes were sent to reformatories.

The Catholic Crusade of Rescue, now the Catholic Children's Society (Westminster), opened two homes in 1859, one for girls and one for boys, and in 1862 an industrial school for boys committed there by the courts for offences such as 'wandering', stealing, homelessness, begging, or being in bad company. In 1869, Methodist minister Thomas B Stephenson opened a home for orphans and abandoned children which became the National Children's Home. In the same year, Baptist minister CH Spurgeon's Stockwell Orphanage was established. In 1870 Thomas Barnardo, an evangelical Christian, opened his first home for boys. After a boy who had been turned away because the home was full was later found dead of malnutrition and exposure, the home carried the sign 'No Destitute Child Ever Refused Admission'. In 1882 the Church of England Waifs and Strays Society (now The Children's Society) opened its first home. Many more homes, set up by these groups and others, followed.

Conditions in the Australian colonies were little better. Economic depression and population growth led to increased unemployment and growth of city slum areas. Sanitation was poor, and there were epidemics of infectious diseases. In 1858 WS Jevons, a social observer who surveyed Sydney housing, wrote:

*I am acquainted with most of the notorious parts of London... but in none of these places perhaps, would lower forms of vice and misery be seen than Sydney can produce. Nowhere too is there a more complete abandonment of all the requirements of health and decency than in a few parts of Sydney.*

Attitudes towards poverty and child care were brought from England. Some thought that God determined our place in society and we shouldn't try to change it. This was expressed in the well-known 1848 hymn, *All things bright and beautiful.*

---

1 Photograph courtesy of The Salvation Army Australia Eastern Territory Heritage Centre.

The rich man in his castle,
The poor man at his gate,
God made them, high and lowly,
And order'd their estate.

It was common to divide the poor into the 'deserving', those whose poverty was due to circumstances beyond their control, and the 'undeserving', those whose poverty resulted from their own immoral habits. The 'deserving poor' were elderly, young, sick, or unemployed, and deserved help. The 'undeserving poor', those who were beggars, criminals, or otherwise immoral, did not deserve help, only punishment.

Poverty was seen as a threat to established society. New South Wales State Archives record that:

From the earliest days of the colony there was concern for the large numbers of neglected and destitute children. These children, without any form of parental control or support, were seen to endanger the moral condition of the colony.2

Similarly, Melbourne society was concerned that poor people—often seen as almost naturally diseased, criminal and dependent—might affect the lives and fortunes of the wealthy.3

In 1861 many children in Sydney were in destitute single-parent families, working to help support the family, or on the streets, scavenging, begging, and sleeping rough. Institutionalisation was seen as the solution. The child rescue movement was a major impetus in the establishment of large benevolent and orphan asylums from early in the 19th century. Institutionalisation removed children from the slums, seen as breeding grounds of immoral and criminal behaviour, placed them into more 'morally suitable environments'.

---

2 State Records of New South Wales, cited in Wesley Dalmar Child and Family Care, Submission 178 to Senate Community Affairs References Committee, 2004, p. 5.
and provided training which would fit
them for a place in established society.

From a modern perspective, 'western society
in the 19th century was characterised by
particularly brutal attitudes towards children.' In
New South Wales legislation was passed
to control 'street ruffians' by detaining them
in large institutions. A child convicted of any
offence, including minor offences, in Victoria,
Queensland and South Australia could be sent
to a reformatory. The Victorian Neglected and
Criminal Children's Act 1864 authorised licensed
child rescuers to remove children from their
parents if they considered them to be at risk. A
child could be deemed to be 'neglected' if found
begging, wandering or the parent represented
that he was unable to control the child.

The Queensland Industrial and Reformatory
Schools Act 1865 provided for establishment
of institutions 'for the care and custody of
neglected and convicted children and to prevent
the commission of crime by young persons.' Any
child under 15 was deemed to be a 'neglected
child' if found begging, homeless, without
visible means of support, or living with a person
'known or reputed' to be a thief, prostitute,
or drunkard, as well as those committing an
offence punishable by imprisonment, and any
child of an aboriginal or half-caste mother.
The 'neglected' child could be charged and
sentenced to an industrial school. Industrial
schools, 'large and barrack like', were often
combined with reformatories. Some were
set up on ships as well as in rural areas.

Parents also placed their own children in
institutions when they were unable to care for
them as there were no social services. The
institutions assumed full guardianship of the
children. Boarding out as an alternative to
institutionalisation required large numbers of
suitable foster parents and funding for inspectors
to supervise the boarded-out children. It was
not always feasible, and the preferred approach
to residential child care in Australia alternated
between boarding-out and institutionalisation
until the 1960s, when closures of large
institutions commenced.

Christian churches and societies were closely
involved with colonial governments in setting up
institutions for children. The Catholic Church
established the Melbourne Orphan Asylum in
1851 and St Vincent's Orphanage in Queensland
in 1866, which was partly government-funded.
Influenced by clergy, including the Reverend
Samuel Marsden, the NSW Government
established orphanages — the Female Orphan
School (1801) which later became the Protestant
Orphan School, and the Male Orphan School
(1819) which became the Roman Catholic
Orphan School. In 1852 the Benevolent Society,
an initiative of the Bible Society, began caring
for orphans under eight years old at Ormond
House and those above eight at the Female
Asylum. Ormond House later became Randwick
Asylum for Destitute Children. Funds came from
donations and from the NSW Government. The
Anglican Archdeacon was given responsibility
for orphan schools in 1824 and funds were
provided to Catholic institutions in 1836. In the
1860s and 1870s in Van Diemen's Land
multi-denominational, mainly Protestant, benevolent
societies established training schools and
industrial schools, funded by government grants.
St Joseph's Industrial School and Orphanage,
established by the Catholic Church, followed
in 1879. In Western Australia, churches and
charities also played a major role in establishing
institutions for children.

In colonial Australia governments did not take
full responsibility for child welfare. Instead, they
provided subsidies to charities, setting a pattern
of joint control of institutions by government
and private organisations. Charities provided
a useful option for governments. They were
prepared to take children at short notice, and
were cheaper than government-run child care.

1 National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to
Children, cited in A Lamont & L Bromfield, "History of
Child Protection Services", Australian Institute of Family
2 Community Affairs References Committee, Forgotten
Australia: a report on Australians who experienced
institutional or out-of-home care as children (Canberra:
3 Ibid., p. 14.
4 Ibid., p. 19.
5 Ibid., p. 23.
In 1874 the NSW Commission into Public Charities severely criticised institutional child care, noting the violence inflicted on girls at the Biloela Asylum, and the 'factory-like style, isolation from the community and lack of after care supervision' at the Randwick Asylum. Boarding-out rather than institutionalisation had been implemented in South Australia and Victoria in the late 19th century, and in the 1880s it was successfully advocated in New South Wales by Mrs Jefferis, wife of the pastor of Pitt Street Congregational Church. Legislation followed and the orphan schools were closed. In Tasmania, the government orphanage closed in 1879, though industrial or training schools continued to operate, as did church institutions.

Awareness of child abuse was emerging. In 1873 the case of Mary Ellen McCormack had roused public attention in the United States. Mary Ellen, nine years old, was found by Mrs Etta Wheeler, a visiting church worker, 'shackled to her bed, grossly malnourished, scarred and badly beaten'. Mrs Wheeler, horrified, reported this to authorities, but there were no laws protecting children. She then appealed to the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, arguing that Mary Ellen was a 'human animal', entitled to the same protection as other animals. They pursued the case, Mary Ellen was placed in care, and her adoptive mother went to prison. The case led to establishment of the New York Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, the first such organisation in the world, and to the first laws protecting children from abuse. Following this, similar societies were established in the United Kingdom and Australia, followed by legislation. In Australia, child protection has always been a state responsibility. By the end of the century children were protected in most states from 'obvious' forms of abuse by legislation and establishment of Children's Courts.

1 ibid., p. 20.
3 Lamont & Bromfield, pp. 1-2.
In July 1865 William Booth, a Methodist minister, began evangelistic preaching to the poor, homeless, and destitute on the streets of London.

He intended to send the new converts to established churches, but found that they were not comfortable or welcome there. This led him to found the East London Christian Mission. Initially his 1878 report of the Mission's work was headed 'The Christian Mission ... is a Volunteer Army.' Booth's son Bramwell objected that he was not a volunteer for he was compelled to do God's work. William Booth replaced 'Volunteer' with 'Salvation', and The Salvation Army was born.\(^1\)

Initially focused on work with adults, Booth did not want children excluded, and children's meetings soon commenced. These included free basic education. Rescue homes for 'fallen women' provided much-needed shelter and care. In 1885, becoming aware that young girls were being lured into brothels, the Army raised public concern and succeeded in having the age of consent raised from 13 to 16.

Booth saw the practical needs of the poor, and in 1886 began sending in Army 'slum sisters' who provided food and clothing to the needy, prayed with the sick, and established homes for prostitutes and orphaned 'waifs and strays'.

In 1890, William Booth published *In Darkest England and The Way Out*\(^2\) which presented his plans for social reform. He wrote:

> The citizens in Darkest England, for whom I appeal, are (1) those who, having no capital or income of their own, would in a month be dead with sheer starvation were they exclusively dependent upon the money earned by their own work; and (2) those who by their utmost exertions are unable to attain the regulation allowance of food which the law prescribes as indispensable even for the worst criminals in our gaols. Darkest England, then, has a vast despairing multitude in a condition nominally free, but really enslaved—these it is whom we have to save.

---

Booth particularly focused on children.

Whatever may be thought of the possibility of doing anything with the adults, it is universally admitted that there is hope for the children. 'I regard the existing generation as lost,' said a leading Liberal statesman. Nothing can be done with men and women who have grown up under the present demoralising conditions. My only hope is that the children may have a better chance. Education will do much. But unfortunately the demoralising circumstances of the children are not being improved—are, indeed, rather, in many respects, being made worse.

It will be said, the child today has the inestimable advantage of education. No; he has not. Educated the children are not. They are pressed through 'standards', which exact a certain acquaintance with A B C and pothooks and figures, but educated they are not in the sense of the development of their latent capacities so as to make them capable for the discharge of their duties in life.

Booth proposed farm colonies to train the poor in agricultural practices, preparing them for migration to the colonies. Their children would have the advantages evident in life in the country.

The town-bred child is at a thousand disadvantages compared with his cousin in the country. But every year there are more town-bred children and fewer cousins in the country. To rear healthy children you want first a home; secondly, milk; thirdly, fresh air; and fourthly, exercise under the green trees and blue sky. All these things every country labourer's child possesses, or used to possess. In towns tea and slops and beer take the place of milk, and the bone and sinew of the next generation are sapped from the cradle.

For children and youth, he advocated industrial schools to provide training as well as basic education.

I also propose, at the earliest opportunity, to give the subject of the industrial training of boys a fair trial; and, if successful, follow it on with a similar one for girls. I am nearly satisfied in my own mind that the children of the streets taken, say at eight years of age, and kept till, say twenty-one, would, by judicious management and the utilisation of their strength and capacity, amply supply all their own wants, and would, I think, be likely to turn out thoroughly good and capable members of the community.

A pictorial chart from the period, shown on the following page, demonstrates the extent of Booth's vision. The 'Key to the Chart' explains that it depicts 'the appalling extent of the misery and ruin existing in Great Britain' with 'victims of vice and poverty who are sinking to ruin but whom the Officers appointed to carry out the Scheme are struggling to save.' The rescued would be brought into refuges, workshops and other establishments in the City Colony, those who had 'proved themselves worthy of further assistance' would go on to the Farm Colony, and from there, via steamers, to overseas British colonies, Canada, the USA, or to the Colony-Over-Sea which had not yet been established. The City Colony included homes for children and a boys' industrial home, as well as restoration of children to parents.

Bailey's analysis of Booth's contribution to social work states that The Salvation Army expressed a traditional evangelical attitude to poverty—"one inimical to radical social reform.' The Army saw sin as the source of poverty, the gospel as the solution. However, 'the Salvation Army was a movement both of the working class and in intimate relationship with the submerged.' It was not 'bent simply on imposing middle-class values on the uncultured poor.' Ausubel, in his analysis, concluded that 'the concern for social justice that figured so prominently in early 20th century England and did so much to transform the conditions of
"...the Way Out"—is still IV!

The Salvation Army Social Campaign, 1890
English life owed not a little to the campaign of General Booth.\textsuperscript{12}

In Australia, Salvation Army meetings began in Adelaide in 1880, then in Sydney and Melbourne in 1882, and in Tasmania and New Zealand in 1883. Centres were established in Brisbane in 1885 and in Western Australia in 1891. Administered from Melbourne as the Australasian Territory, social work was integral to the Army’s mission. In 1883 Major James Barker leased a house in Carlton (Victoria) for prisoners released from gaol. The Army’s Social Wing grew under Barker’s leadership, and when the Victorian government appealed to religious groups to open homes to replace their reformatories, the Catholic Church and the Army responded.

Charles Jeffries, in charge of Army social work in Victoria, wrote in his journal:

\begin{quote}
"The government of Victoria have agreed to hand over to us boys from reformatories with a view to gradually closing these establishments which are virtually juvenile prisons. Our home, by order of the government, has been gazetted as a ‘private reformatory’ to give us control over the boys. The government is to pay us a capitation grant of ten shillings per week for every boy, about half of what it has been costing them."\textsuperscript{3}
\end{quote}

The Army established its first children’s home in Australia in 1893, a reformatory at Heidelberg, which later moved to Pakenham and subsequently to Bayswater. The moves provided more land, allowing for vocational training and instruction in farming, dairying, and fruit growing.

\begin{quote}
"As soon as possible classification was arranged, and three types of homes were provided for (1) boys of tender years left without guardians, (2) boys a little older
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{1} Photograph courtesy of The Salvation Army Australia Eastern Territory Heritage Centre.

\textsuperscript{2} H. Ausubel, ‘General Booth’s Scheme of Social Salvation’, \textit{The American Historical Review}, 56/3 (1951) 519-525.

who were in danger as a result of neglect, and (3) boys who had committed some offence which had brought them into the hands of the police.

Government reports after seven and ten years revealed that as many as 83% of those who had passed through Salvation Army homes were found to be earning an honest living.

Brunswick Girls' Home in Victoria followed in 1895. In 1897 further homes opened, including Paradise Boys' Industrial Colony (Manly, New South Wales), Rhyandarra Girls' Industrial Home and Riverview Boys Industrial Colony (Queensland), Bayswater Boys Home (Victoria), and Collie Estate (Western Australia). By 1902 the Army had opened 12 children's homes in Australia, and had an estimated 400 children and youth in its institutions in Australia and New Zealand.

Brunswick Girls' Home, Vic.

---

2 Ibid.
4. Child migration

British children seen as problems to society, as at risk, or in need of better care had been emigrated to the colonies since the 1600s.

Emigration to the colonies was used for children convicted as criminals until 1853. It was also seen as rehabilitation for young offenders and as a way to prevent others from slipping into bad ways. The greater proportion of child migrants other than convicts were sent overseas between the 1860s and 1890s, most to Canada and some to New Zealand, Southern Rhodesia and the Cape. Smaller numbers came to Australia.

The British Poor Law Amendment Act 1850 authorised Poor Law Guardians to fund the emigration of ‘recalcitrant’ children, and the Custody of Children Act 1891 legalised the work of private emigration societies. It has been estimated that up to 150,000 children were sent to British colonies between 1618 and 1967, including those convicted as criminals. Most were between eight and fourteen years old.

Child migration schemes involved many church and charitable groups, including Barnardos, the National Children’s Home (Methodist), the Children’s Society (Church of England), Catholic social agencies, the Presbyterian Church, the Church of Scotland, and The Salvation Army. Catholic child migration was centralised through the Crusade of Rescue in 1899. Other organisations, such as the Fairbridge Society, were set up by philanthropists specifically for this purpose.

Migration would ‘rescue’ children from overcrowded cities and give them opportunities to grow up ‘where fresh air, hard work and

Boys on their way to the Presbyterian Dhurringile Rural Training Farm

religious instruction would make them fine, upstanding citizens.1 Barnardos stated that 'For many of our children, emigration cuts the cord that in this country would bind them to degraded relatives and seriously handicap their futures'.2 Father N Waugh, Director of the Catholic Crusade of Rescue stated:

A double service is rendered to religion, humanity and civilisation, in carrying off the children of distress to the open lands beyond the sea, to live in the open, to work with nature, to wrestle with forest, field and stream, to forget the fetid city slums, to think and strive and pray in the open, to grow strong and self-reliant, to be the guardians of the outpost of civilisation, religion and new endeavour... every child a pioneer of the Empire.5

Christian churches and philanthropists were motivated by spiritual concerns for the children, sending them to Christian residential institutions where religious training would be provided. Emigration also saved money for those managing out-of-home care. A child cost 12£ each year in a parish workhouse, but only a one-off payment of 15£ if sent overseas.6 Charities were assisted with some government funding towards emigration costs, particularly under the Empire Settlement Act 1922.

Governments saw the children as an investment in the overseas empire, and a benefit to the colonies by increasing the British population and workforce. In his

---

6 Humphreys, p. 80.
welcome of child migrants in August 1938, His Grace the Archbishop of Perth stated:

At a time when empty cradles are contributing woefully to empty spaces, it is necessary to look for external sources of supply. And if we do not supply from our own stock we are leaving ourselves all the more exposed to the menace of the teeming millions of our neighbouring Asiatic races.¹

Child migration to Australia continued even after child labour had become unacceptable in Britain and the Canadian government had prohibited migration of unaccompanied children under 14 years old. After Federation in 1901, the Immigration Restriction Act set the 'white Australia policy' and 'good white stock' was sought to populate the country. In 1913 a Federal Government advertising campaign in Britain led to a migration 'boom'. The British Government provided funds to non-government organisations to support migration under the Empire Settlement Act 1922, and in Australia the Joint Commonwealth and States Scheme brought cooperation of state and federal governments to support migration.

The flow of migrants slowed during the depression of the late 1920s, and largely stopped during World War II. However, after the war child migration was reactivated, based on agreements between the British and Australian governments. The British Oversea Migration Board actively promoted child migration, forming agreements with voluntary societies who were receiving government assistance. In Australia, the children were placed in establishments operated by the charitable societies and church groups. The Minister for Immigration was their legal guardian until they were 21 years of age.

In its 2000-2001 inquiry into child migration, the Senate Community Affairs Committee was unable to ascertain accurate figures for the

total number of child migrants to Australia, but concluded that between 6,000 and 7,500 were brought to Australia in the 20th century. The largest numbers were brought by Barnardos, the Fairbridge Society, and Catholic religious orders. Smaller numbers came in the care of the Church of England, the Methodist Church, the Presbyterian Church, and The Salvation Army.

The Salvation Army had set up an Emigration Board in 1894 to assist migrants, including unaccompanied children, and about 50,000 adults and children were migrated between 1908 and 1914. At first, young men trained in elementary agriculture at the Hadleigh Farm Colony in Essex were sent to Canada. Later, they were migrated to Salvation Army training farms at Riverview in Queensland and at Putaruru in New Zealand. Most of the migration activity occurred in the 1920s, including charter of the SS Vidi on four occasions to bring couples and unaccompanied youth to Australia. School-age children were placed in Bexley and Goulburn Boys' Homes and Anncliffe and Canowindra Girls' Homes in New South Wales. Older youth went to Riverview Training Farm in Queensland, which had been established for this purpose. Some also went to 'Seaforth' in Gosnells, Western Australia.

Emigration was seen as an opportunity for the poor to have a better life in a healthier rural environment. The Army's policy on emigration had been stated by General William Booth in 1903.

*I hold that Migration... (1) Must be advantageous to the country which the migrant leaves; (2) Must be acceptable to the country receiving the migrant; (3) Must be beneficial to the migrant... and to fail in any of these conditions is to fail in all.*

In 1937, when the Empire Settlement Act was under review, The Salvation Army published a 20 page booklet, *Empire Migration and Settlement*. General Evangeline Booth sent a copy to the Australian Minister of the Interior. RH Wheeler, an officer of the Immigration Department, added a memorandum, stating that "The force of the Army was the attention paid to after-care ... the Commonwealth was singularly fortunate in the selection of Salvation Army officers who controlled migration activities at this end." The Minister commended the Army for its assistance with migration. The *Empire Settlement Act* was renewed for another 15 years, and in 1948 the Army applied for 36 males up to 15 years old to be trained at Riverview.

It has not been possible to determine how many child migrants the Army brought to Australia.

Some Salvation Army records in the UK were lost during the war. The Army reported to the Senate Committee inquiring into child migration that it no longer holds records of child migrants. In its report, *Lost Innocents*, the Senate Committee concluded that from 1950 until 1960 the Army brought fewer than 100 child migrants to Australia. Riverview was approved to receive child migrants in 1950 and subsequently admitted 77 British migrant boys above school-leaving age. In 1960, the Army's agreement with the British Government to bring child migrants to Riverview was terminated.

While the Australian government was actively promoting immigration, including child migration, professional attitudes about appropriate child care in Britain were changing. The Curtis Committee Report emphasised that out-of-home care should be modelled as nearly as possible on the 'natural family', and that treatment of children sent overseas should be of the same standard. In 1947 the United Kingdom Government accepted the recommendations of the Committee.

Two reports published in the 1950s were based on visits to Australia to review care of child migrants. Both the Moss Report (1953) and the Ross Report (1956) were critical of many...
establishments in Australia which were caring for the children.

The Moss Report supported continuation of migration for some children, but the Ross Report completely rejected child migration. The Ross Report noted the institutional nature of the establishments visited, staff with insufficient knowledge of child care, lack of a 'homely atmosphere', lack of educational and employment opportunities, geographical isolation, and exploitation of children as cheap labour in some cases. Of the 26 institutions visited, the Report particularly condemned five — Dhurringile (Presbyterian), Bindoon (Catholic), St John Bosco Boys' Town (Catholic), Magill (Methodist), and The Salvation Army's Riverview Training Farm. The Report stated that others could have been named but were not singled out for political reasons. After visiting the institutions, however, the Australian government replied that it found 'no justification for your government to take any action to cause even the temporary deferral of child migration to Australia.' Child migration continued until 1967 when Barnardos brought the last nine children to Australia.

More recently, the tragic consequences of child migration have been recognised, largely due to the pioneering work of UK social worker Margaret Humphreys. The organisations who had been involved in child migration did not at first welcome this exposure. Public awareness had been raised when 'The Leaving of Liverpool' was televised in Australia and the UK. In 1989 Margaret Humphreys met with representatives of organisations involved in child migration, including Barnardos, the Fairbridge Society, the Children's Society, National Children's Homes, the Church of England, the Roman Catholic Church, and The Salvation Army. Former child migrants had begun requesting their records, and she expressed her concern about the impact of this information on them, and their need for counselling. The Salvation Army representative dismissed her concerns. 'We've been at this for over one hundred years now. We know what we're doing, we have the most experienced people.' Margaret Humphreys states:

As I was about to leave, the Salvation Army colonel approached and said that she could see I was a well-meaning person, but it was unfortunate that I had talked to the press. She told me to let the whole matter drop. I would never get the Child Migrants Trust off the ground. 'Go back home to your family, dear, and leave it alone. '2

The Child Migrants Trust, which Margaret Humphreys established in 1987, is now a major resource for Britain's former child migrants. With offices in the UK and Australia, it conducts family research, provides information regarding family origins, and counselling to prepare former child migrants to reunite with their families.

The Australian Senate inquiry has made it clear that the care given to the children and youth brought to Australia did not even meet the standards expected at the time, and that in many cases serious abuse occurred. Some of the perpetrators have since been convicted of criminal activity, including members or former members of the Catholic and Anglican Churches and The Salvation Army.3

The practice of migration alone caused emotional scars for many that persisted throughout their adult lives. Barnardos Australia has stated 'We have no hesitation in saying that it was a shameful practice, that it was barbaric, and that it was completely against any practices that we would currently uphold'4 and the National Children's Home 'is firmly of the view that child migration was a major mistake and we now deeply regret having taken part in it'.5

---

1 Community Affairs References Committee (2001), pp. 40-41.
2 Humphreys, p. 193.
4 Committee Hansard, 22.3.01, p.467 (Barnardos Australia), cited in Community Affairs References Committee (2001), p. 6.
The first half century was marked by two world wars and the depression, disrupting families and increasing welfare needs. The number of children placed into institutions, both government and non-government, increased to a peak in 1968, and many more homes were opened to meet the demand for places.

It has been estimated that almost half a million children grew up in institutional care in the 20th century. In the early 1900s there were no major changes in child welfare. Abandoned and ‘rescued’ children were boarded out with approved families or placed in institutions. The lack of social services meant that they might be children of single mothers, or in families experiencing domestic violence, poverty, divorce, or some other crisis or ongoing hardship. Many had been charged with being uncontrollable, neglected, or in moral danger. Others were placed in institutions by their families, who were expected to make regular payments. It was thought the children would be better off, that the order and discipline of an institution was the best thing for a child when the family was in difficulties.

Children often weren’t told why they were in care. Many felt stigmatised as they were not part of what a very conservative Australian society saw as the norm — a ‘traditional family’ of male breadwinner and homemaker mother looking after the children. A statement by the NSW

Deputy Premier and Minister for Education in 1956 shows that attitudes towards children needing care had scarcely changed since colonial days.

*Deprived children, whether in their own homes or out of them, are a source of social infection as real and serious as are carriers of diphtheria and typhoid.*

State governments relied on the non-

---

3 Photograph courtesy of The Salvation Army Australia Eastern Territory Heritage Centre.
government sector to provide care for children, with churches playing a major role in the establishment and management of the homes.

Without the voluntary children’s homes it would have been impossible for the Victorian government to carry out its residential child care function in the 1950s and 1960s.¹

Some key points about ... [WA out-of-home care] are: it has historically been one of a state sponsored system, with more facilities run by the private than the public sector. The role of charitable, mainly religious, bodies in the provision of out-of-home care has been paramount.²

At the start of the century, institutional care was favoured over boarding out, and large institutions for children continued until governments became more involved and closures commenced in the 1960s,³ though there was a shift toward smaller homes by the 1950s. Child welfare policy was concerned with legal procedures regarding removal of children and the authority of guardians. This concern with legal details was reflected in the administration and staffing of institutions.⁴ The needs of the children, particularly their emotional needs and the effects on them of being institutionalised received little attention until the 1960s.⁵

Punishment in children’s homes in New South Wales under the Child Welfare Act 1939 reflected the standards of society at the time. Punishable acts included disobedience; insulting, obscene, indecent, or profane words; threats; indecent behaviour; irreverent behaviour in divine service; idleness or negligence in work; and 'conduct to the prejudice of good order and discipline.' Punishments included forfeiting rewards or privileges, alteration of meals, isolated detention, fatigue duty, physical exercise under supervision, and corporal punishment, not exceeding three strokes on each hand. The Act further states that ‘Striking, cuffing, shaking, or any other form of physical violence, other than that permitted by this Act, or under the general rules of law, is prohibited.’⁶ This Act was in force until the Children (Care and Protection) Act 1987 (NSW) was passed. Under the State Children Act 1911 in Queensland, the Superintendent of an institution could punish any State child guilt of misconduct. Corporal punishment was ‘to be administered as seldom as possible ... only resorted to when absolutely necessary for discipline, and not for first offences unless of a grave nature’.⁷ Similar legislation was in force in other states.

Churches and societies involved in out-of-home care of children did set standards. Barnardo’s, a major provider of child care in Britain, had over 8,000 children in 188 homes in 1933. Conditions in their homes would have been typical of the period in the UK and in Australia.

The homes ran along strictly disciplined lines and children were instilled with a sense of responsibility and self-sufficiency. They were expected to rise early and spent hours cleaning and tidying their rooms, digging and planting in the garden and carrying out maintenance work. All children received elementary education and some form of job training. Boys were still trained for manual jobs and

⁵ Community Affairs References Committee (2004), pp. 21-22.
⁶ Ibid., p. xv.
⁸ Forde, p. v.
Girls were encouraged to enter domestic service, although by the Second World War the carpenters and boot-makers of Thomas Barnardo's day had given way to electricians and motor mechanics, while girls became librarians, typists and hairdressers.

Residential care emphasised children's physical and moral welfare rather than their emotional wellbeing. Some homes accommodated hundreds of children and staff were sometimes harsh and distant. All aspects of life were controlled and even pocket money was regulated. Family contacts were not encouraged and children were not permitted to see their records to find out about their background. Instead, children were taught to see Barnardo's as their true family, and the charity kept in touch with them even after they had left the homes as young adults.²

Barnardo's (UK) introduced changes in 1941 when its standards of accommodation and staffing were criticised in a Ministry of Health report. A staff training school was established where students studied a range of subjects including childcare, child psychology, children's hobbies, games and Bible story-telling. In 1942 a qualified social worker was appointed to take charge of boarding out and in 1944 staff were issued The Barnardo Book.

The Barnardo Book ... advised staff on everything from daily routine (children should not rise before 6.30am) to discipline in the dining room ("complete silence is not desirable and savours of institution rather than home"). Overall, the book aimed to encourage a more relaxed attitude towards children.³

---

¹ Photograph courtesy of The Salvation Army Australia Eastern Territory Heritage Centre.

² 'Barnardo's Children' [web document], Barnardo's, p.10, retrieved 27 April 2012, <http://www.barnardos.org.uk/what_we_do/who_we_are/history.htm>

In the UK, the Church of England Waifs and Strays Society issued its 1904 *Handbook for Workers* to every member of staff involved in its homes and boarding out program. Children under seven were generally boarded out, and those older were placed in a home. The homes were small and intended to approximate a Christian family home as far as possible. Annual inspections by a member of the Executive Committee or the Clerical Secretary covered the condition of the facilities and the physical health and cleanliness of the children, as well as checking the punishment book. Homes were to be visited by a member of the Committee at least once a week at varied times, in order to see if the rules were being properly carried out. Children were to be trained to earn their own living, which involved assisting in the house work, to prepare them for service. Rewards were to be in place so that deprivation of them could be used to maintain discipline. Punishments were to be avoided if possible. Punishments in boys' homes consisted of loss of rewards and privileges or rank, reduction in quality or quantity of food, confinement in a light room or cell or 'moderate personal correction and chastisement.' The maximum number of strokes of a birch rod or cane was specified. Punishment in girls' homes was the same with the exception of corporal punishment.  

Conditions in Australia were slower to change, but by mid-century welfare organisations were beginning to emphasise keeping a child in its natural family. Concerns were emerging regarding conditions in children's institutions. The 1945 Inquiry into Parramatta Girls' Industrial School was 'scathing' regarding its staff, buildings and equipment. Conditions in homes housing child migrants in Australia were found unacceptable when inspected for the 1956 British Ross Report. There
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1 Photograph courtesy of Colin Foster, son of a former Manager.


3 Senate Standing Committee on Social Welfare, p. 13.

were also concerns about the treatment of children. The 1961 Schwarten Inquiry into Westbrook, a Queensland correctional centre, particularly focused on the harsh punishments inflicted on the boys.1 There was a trend to smaller group or family homes, and as government policies changed and support services in the community increased, the large institutions gradually closed. In the late 20th century, governments moved to reduce and contract out health and welfare services, with churches and non-government organisations continuing to play an essential role.2

1 Ibid., pp. 14–15.

6. Salvation Army children’s homes in the 20th century

“I thank individually and collectively the many church and other organisations for the cooperation and assistance they render to my Department in an honorary capacity. Throughout this State, thousands of excellent citizens ... are doing outstanding work without thought of payment, for the benefit of the community.”


6.1 An expanding ministry

The Salvation Army is a Christian denomination, operating as a church and as a network of social services. At the 1911 International Social Council, General William Booth declared 'Our social operations are the natural outcome of Salvationism, or, I might say, of Christianity as instituted, described, proclaimed, and exemplified in the life, teaching, and sacrifice of Jesus Christ.' Its administrative structure, based on a military model, is "top-down and strongly hierarchical." Headed by the General at International Headquarters in London, all other officers are appointed. Territories administer the work locally. Initially, Salvation Army work in Australia, together with New Zealand, Fiji and Tonga, comprised the Australasian Territory. In 1907 New Zealand, Fiji and Tonga became a separate Territory, and in 1921 the Australian


Children at Stanmore Childrens' Home, NSW.

Tonga, comprised the Australasian Territory. In 1907 New Zealand, Fiji and Tonga became a separate Territory, and in 1921 the Australian

4 Photograph courtesy of The Salvation Army Australia Eastern Territory Heritage Centre.
Territory was divided into the Eastern and Southern Territories. These have continued to the present time. The Eastern Territory covers New South Wales, Queensland, and the ACT. The Southern Territory covers Victoria, South Australia, Western Australia, Tasmania and the Northern Territory. Each Territory is headed by a Territorial Commander who reports directly to International Headquarters in London.

For the period 1909 to 1921, Commissioner James Hay, the Australian Territorial Commander, reported that existing homes had been 'greatly enlarged and new ones established.' The expansion to a peak in the 1940s to 1960s is evident in the graph following. The homes and their locations are listed in Appendix 1. The number of Salvation Army children's homes decreased when widespread closures of large institutions commenced.

Some of the earliest Salvation Army homes in Australia were established for 'reformatory boys', those seen to be at risk of becoming criminals. In 1905 the Army noted the lack of success of government training ships and reformatories, and presented the Army's intentions for their institutions. These comprised three homes at Bayswater in Victoria, Riverview in Queensland, one at Mount Barker, South Australia, and two in the Collie River district of Western Australia. An article in the Social Report 1904-05 expresses the purpose of the Army and reflects the understanding of child welfare at that time.

One of the chief causes of failure has been the fact that too much reliance was placed on cold, hard-and-fast discipline, and little of human or Christ-like sympathy has been extended. ... Intelligent and faithful Officers are appointed, the refining influence of good women is a strong feature, and the beneficial effect of beautiful surroundings is recognised. ... The boy has to be taught to work ... He must have time to play ... He must in many cases be assisted with his education ... the morals of the
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1 Sandall, p. 228.

28 Garlina for the Children
lad must be watched. Here comes in the opportunity for that personal, faithful dealing which no purely official system could provide... Finally 75 per cent pass out into society decent, honourable citizens.¹

Early in the century General Bramwell Booth issued regulations for officers engaged in social work, including work with children. Neglected children in need of assistance and those 'living in surroundings such as to make it very easy for them to become criminals, vagrants, or paupers' were to be removed from their present circumstances to 'prevent them ultimately following careers of vice and crime.²

The Commanding Officer of each children's home was to have 'all necessary assistants.' The maximum number of residents was fifty, and 'innocent' boys or girls were to be kept separate from those 'over precocious and well schooled in evil ways.' Boys' names were to be used, not numbers. Children were to attend school, the benefits of suitable recreation were recognised, and attention was given to after-care. The officers were to be patient, avoid threatening the children, have an even and cheerful demeanour, and 'inspire the feeling that whatever happens Officers will deal justly and without favouritism.'

Punishment was not, as a rule, to extend beyond one day, and corporal punishment was strictly forbidden in girls' industrial homes. In boys' homes, punishments 'must be as few as possible' and 'minor transgressions must not be made occasions for punishment.' The boy should be 'suitably reproved' but if he persisted, extra duties could be imposed. He could be deprived of a meal, have it alone, have his food varied, or stand whilst eating. Privileges could be restricted. Only the Commanding Officer could administer corporal punishment.³ ⁴

6.2 Gill Memorial Home for Boys

Gill Memorial Home for Boys in Goulburn NSW was a Salvation Army home for boys. Gill, made possible through a bequest by Mr Joseph Gill, opened in September 1936 with accommodation for 80. By the end of October there were 76 boys in residence. Occupancy varied from 65 to 80 until February 1943 when the number rose to 82. By September 1948, 425 boys had passed through the Home.⁵ In the early 1960s, however, average start of the month occupancy ranged from 32 to 49.

There were many reasons for admission to Gill in the 1940s. Some boys were brought because their father was in the services or a prisoner of war and their mother was ill, some because they were 'uncontrollable,' would not attend school or their mother was deceased, had deserted, or was working. A few came to have schooling. Some were handed over as wards of the State due to truanting, stealing, or lack of control. Age at admission in the early 1940s varied from 3 to 15 years old. Those under 5 were brothers of older boys who were admitted at the same time, which allowed the siblings to stay together. The majority of admissions were by personal application. Very few boys came from the Child Welfare Department, prison, or the police courts.

Over the years the boys had outings to nearby parks and bushland, sport was encouraged, and indoor entertainment was arranged in bad weather. They were involved with the local Salvation Army Corps, and had their own band. There were concerts and sports carnivals. Both staff and boys were engaged in maintaining the grounds. In 1946 the Manager established the Gill Old Boys Club, 'to foster life-long friendship and goodwill among the lads who pass through the Gill Memorial Home.' A Scout Troop and Cub Pack started in 1955.

The Eastern Territory Men's Social Secretary inspected Gill in February 1951. He reported that there were separate, well-kept files on each boy, the boys' clothes were 'quite good' and well kept, dormitories and rooms were excellent, and healthwise, all were well.

¹ Annual Social Report 1904-05 (Melbourne: Salvation Army National Headquarters).
³ ibid., pp. 266-271.
⁵ Goulburn Evening Post, 22 Sep 1948.
The boys were 'systematically employed,' being 'given much work to do in the Home'. Mail was censored, punishment was administered rarely and only by the Manager, and there was after-care for boys when they left the Home. Content of meals was also noted. The only negative comment was that the Library was 'small and very poor' and comprised the only study room for over 50 high school boys. This was considered a 'serious problem'.

In the early years, staff at Gill numbered 7 to 10 Salvation Army officers and 1 to 2 employees. However, staff numbers dropped to 6 in 1947, caring for an average of 75 to 80 boys. Difficulties were reported due to 'a number of changes' and 'much hardship has been experienced by a continuous shortage of helpers.' Some staff appointments came with no experience with children, necessitating training. Major Hedley Foster, Manager from 1959 to 1965, noted in his memoir: 'Change of officer staff every year, and it was a lot to train new officers to handle boys.' From the start the staff responsible for running Gill included a number of female officers until 1964–1966 when there was only one female officer, and 1967 through 1970 when there were no female officers on staff. However, although not formally appointed to staff, officers' wives were involved in supervising the hired domestic staff, running clubs, and helping with dispensing medicines, sewing, kitchen supervision, and with the young children.

It was difficult to find and retain appropriate staff for the home. Working with the range of boys in residence was difficult, finances were limited, and officers were under stress. Absconders meant pressure from the police or child welfare, and periodic visits and inspections by Army superiors brought further pressures.

Children across a range of ages came in from a great variety of backgrounds. Like Thomas Barnardo, the Army was unwilling to turn away any child in need, and found it difficult to expel those who caused problems. A home could hold a 14 year old from the courts who'd committed a misdemeanour, a 6 year old whose mother said he was uncontrollable, and some whose parents were unable to care for them. Some would have been abused in the past. Major Foster has stated 'We had boys who were difficult, very difficult, and I often wondered what became of them.' He took a personal interest in the boys, recalling one, 'a lad with life, somewhat hard to control, but a likeable chap for all that.' Later, as a Prison Chaplain, he found him in solitary confinement for murder, helped him get piano lessons, and maintained contact for some time.

---

1 Photograph courtesy of The Salvation Army Australia Eastern Territory Heritage Centre.
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Another was at Gill 'for robbing a bank...used to boast of his doings but later learnt more of the teaching of the Home and made better.' A third was 'a tough bush lad and most friendly though full of life and had to be restrained at times. We were to meet up with him later...he is doing really well.' During that period the Goulburn Apex Club was 'very generous', supplying wood and also taking up to 150 boys and girls for a trip to Canberra. The Lions Club also helped by levelling an area for a soccer field.

6.3 The costs of expansion

Expansion of the Army's social work in the 20th century had created financial problems.

The Army's early social work was not a carefully planned project, taking into account all sociological factors, all economic and psychological implications. Still less — in spite of criticisms to the contrary — was the social work an artful scheme to buy souls ... The social work was a spontaneous response to the aching misery it saw ... But the very speed of its response caused problems: The Army was saddled with heavy financial burdens which put great pressure on its officers. Homes often became very large, making regimentation inevitable and sometimes detracting from that 'free, happy, jolly' spirit Barker had wanted.

The Army relied on a number of sources to cover the costs of caring for children in the homes, as shown in Table 1. Work, presumably by the children, contributed a significant portion of the income which fell short of expenditure by 1000£ in 1910.

In 1952 the NSW Child Welfare Department issued a statement of costs, comparing government and Salvation Army homes (Table 2). The difference in costs between State Government and Army homes raises questions about the standard of care possible in Army homes, which must have had to rely on work done in the homes and on donations. Other church institutions were in similar situations, as noted in the Forde Inquiry into Queensland institutions.

The levels of funding on which almost all of the denominational institutions operated were patently insufficient to allow the provision of proper individual care. Yet the Department continued to place children in those institutions because they provided a cheap means of lodging children for whose care it was responsible, and it was able to use as justification the fact that the children were, after all, in Christian care. The churches, for their part, acquiesced in this indiscriminate placement of children because of their perceived obligation to provide refuge to homeless children, however inadequate their resources might be.

Finances at the Gill Home in the 1950s did not cover needs identified by the Manager. In March 1951 he instituted ongoing correspondence with the Eastern Territory, requesting a vehicle to transport boys to high school. He noted that it took the boys a half hour of fast walking to cover the two mile distance to the school. No vehicle was approved until January 1960, necessitating interim measures in bad weather which included hiring a bus and using the Manager's personal vehicle. In 1954 a visiting officer raised concerns about the boys' inadequate winter clothing. In reply, the Manager stated that the boys' school clothes were adequate, but their play clothes were 'usually thin and ragged'. A number of boys had only one pair of shoes, and went barefoot when those needed repair, which was frequent due to the distances walked. Sandshoes had been issued, but were often lost. There was no money to purchase more clothing or shoes for the boys despite
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requests to the Territory and to their parents, and nothing was being donated. Parents were expected to pay a weekly fee, but not all did so.

At the start of 1961 the Gill Manager, expecting to have only three experienced staff, objected to the appointment of an inexperienced young officer. In a letter to Territorial Headquarters he noted the ‘near disastrous results of short staff of last year’ and stated that ‘The number of boys must be reduced and this deteriorates the financial position.’ The reply was ‘We all had to begin at some time and place, and someone had to take the trouble of training us.’

Financial and staffing pressures were not limited to Gill. A former staff member from Bexley Home for Boys in Sydney recalls the purchase of lamb carcasses from the abattoir which were then butchered at the home. Staff ‘scrounged’ at the markets and at Coles for provisions. Staff pay was very low and some went without food at times. Many officers assigned to the homes were single and came with little or no experience with children. Some judged unable to cope with a pastoral role were assigned to the homes where it was thought they would receive training. Dr Merelyn Bates, daughter of a former Riverview Manager, has stated: ‘Towards the end at Riverview, my father was nothing but a grey, strained mess.... The place nearly killed him. The pressure was incredible. The Army didn’t give him many officers. There was no support. The place was a dump; a hovel. He tried so hard to get the physical circumstances changed.’

Major Bennett’s attempts to improve Riverview in the 1970s, reported at the time in the Queensland Times and The Sunday Mail, were unsuccessful despite his appeals to the Army and to the Queensland Education Department.

2 Ibid.
6.4 Institutional changes

In large institutions, regimentation was necessary to manage the numbers, but changes were brought in as awareness of children's needs grew. In the 1970s the Manager of Bexley Home for Boys stopped the practice of boys marching to church in uniform, clothing was improved, a separate home for boys under five was established, and a scheme called Sunday Parents was instituted. The boys spent Sundays with families known to the Manager. In some cases Sunday Parents took 'their' boy with them on holidays. There was a swimming pool at the Home, Christmas parties were held, community organisations arranged outings and barbecues, and the local Lions women came in to help mend the boys' clothes. Soil was acquired to build up part of the grounds for a playing field. There was good liaison with the local school. Boys having difficulty with their school work were tutored by university students and a volunteer teacher.

In the 1970s and 1980s, child protection departments came to prefer smaller group care over larger institutions. In 1980 Gill was restructured as Gill Memorial Family Group Home to 'approximate the size and form of a normal family home.' Gill Memorial Home closed in 1995.

1 Lamont & Bromfield, p. 3.
7. Child abuse is recognised

"In all actions concerning children, whether undertaken by public or private social welfare institutions, courts of law, administrative authorities or legislative bodies, the best interests of the child shall be a primary consideration."

— United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, Article 3.1

In 1962, Dr Henry Kempe and his colleagues published ‘The battered-child syndrome’ in a prestigious American medical journal. They documented medical evidence of physical injuries caused to children through physical abuse by their caregivers. The public attention this generated in the United States led to the establishment of professionally staffed child protection services in all states by the late 1960s, and to the first child abuse reporting laws. These dealt with abuse within the family, but did not cover abuse by adults who were not members of the child’s family.

In 1974, Big Brothers of America became aware that they had attracted adults who sought sexual contact with children. They instituted in-depth screening and better supervision of adults working with children, but other organisations didn’t acknowledge any problems at the time. In the 1980s some organisations serving children were sued ‘for failing to prevent and properly respond to allegations of sexual abuse’, leading them to implement abuse-prevention programs.1

Similar abuse was identified in Australia and state governments were pressured to address the situation. Welfare departments and government-based child protection services were instituted in most states and territories. Definitions of abuse gradually expanded. In the 1980s child sexual abuse became recognised worldwide, and in the 1980s and 1990s the impact of neglect was included. In the 1990s, emotional abuse accompanying physical abuse and neglect was identified, and definitions of abuse were extended to include all youth up to 18 years old. Mandatory reporting of child abuse and neglect became law in Tasmania, New South Wales, and South Australia in the 1970s, and Queensland in 1980. All states now have mandatory reporting laws.2

In 1985 the Senate Standing Committee on Social Welfare issued its Report, Children in Institutional and Other Forms of Care. The Committee found that 62% of children in institutional care in 1984 were in non-government institutions, the majority in smaller centres. Children were interviewed, with some stating that this form of care was better for them than what they’d come from, but others found ‘the lack of privacy, personal space, freedom,


2 Lamon & Bromfield, pp. 2-3.
security, love and affection, almost unbearable. Education was inadequate, staff recruitment and retention were difficult, and opportunities for staff education were inadequate in some states. The Committee reported that the cost to government was less when institutional care was provided by non-government organisations. In New South Wales, figures for 1980-81 showed a cost to government of $317 per week per child in a government institution, and $36 per week per child in a subsidised non-government institution. Abuse was said to be 'beyond the subject matter of this inquiry', and 'an inquiry at the national level ... is warranted'.

As awareness of child abuse increased worldwide, allegations of sexual and physical abuse involving religious leaders became public in 1985 in the United States, with similar allegations emerging in Australia in 1992. That year the ABC broadcast 'The Ultimate Betrayal', the first program to suggest clerical sexual abuse in Australia. 'The Leaving of Liverpool', documenting child migration to Australia, also revealed cases of physical and sexual abuse by members of religious bodies.

Churches were offering child-focused activities and groups, with clergy and lay leaders able to be alone with children. We now know that these are situations where abuse can occur. Clergy have authority and influence over children, and may use spiritual manipulation or God as an emotional grooming tactic. In the past, society found it unthinkable that abuse, particularly sexual abuse, could occur in the church, and when allegations emerged, churches did not deal with them appropriately. Attitudes towards offenders were influenced by teachings on forgiveness. Offenders who 'confessed' were seen as forgiven, and their victims were told to forgive them. The factors which facilitated child abuse were even stronger in children's homes, where clergy and church workers had complete control over the children with minimal outside scrutiny.

Up until the late 20th century, children had no legal rights. The situation of a juvenile in Australia, as in the United States, was expressed in 1967 by a US Supreme Court Judge.

A child, unlike an adult, has a right 'not to liberty but to custody'. He can be made to return to his parents, go to school, etc. If his parents default in effectively performing their custodial functions ... the state may intervene. In doing so it does not deprive the child of any rights because he has none. It merely provides the 'custody' to which the child is entitled.

For the first time, Australian children were given basic human rights under the law when in 1990 the Australian Government ratified the 1989 United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. The Convention gives children the right 'to develop to the fullest' and to 'protection from harmful influences, abuse and exploitation.' Its core principles are non-discrimination; devotion to the best interests of the child; the right to life, survival and development; and respect for the views of the child.

---

8. Inquiries and apologies

"I want to say that, after 40-odd years, at long last somebody is listening to us. At long last we can talk about these events that happened to us."

— Brian Hart, who grew up in a Salvation Army Home, WA, in the 1950s

8.1 The Wood Report

In 1997 the Hon. Justice JRT Wood presented the Final Report of the Royal Commission into the New South Wales Police Service. The Report documented child sexual abuse within churches as part of the Paedophile Inquiry, recognising that "there had been a substantial incidence of sexual abuse involving clergy, members of religious orders, ministers of religion, acolytes, and others involved on a paid or unpaid basis in and around Churches or institutions associated with or conducted by Churches or religious bodies." The Commission reported that in the past churches had generally rejected complaints of sexual abuse by clergy, and had not notified the appropriate authorities. Reasons for this included confusion over loyalty to the Church, between forgiving the offender and protecting the wider community, and over the limits of confidentiality; a desire to avoid legal liability; and uncertainty over the appropriate response if the victim did not want police action. In 1994 the Uniting Church had stated:

In the past there has been a tendency for the Church to create a cloak of silence. Often victim/survivors have been unwilling to complain because of the myths which have existed and because of an apprehension that they will not be believed.

The Catholic Church has stated:

In the past, lacking the knowledge provided by the modern behavioural sciences, Church authorities sometimes denied or minimized the seriousness of such incidents or accepted too readily the promise by an offender that such behaviour would not be repeated.

Attitudes had changed, and the Royal Commission 'received total support from all Churches and religious organisations with which it dealt'. The Royal Commission encouraged the churches "to adopt procedures which promote reporting and facilitate police investigation of child sexual abuse."


4 Wood, p. 1027.
8.2 The Forde Report and apologies

In May 1999 Leneen Forde AC presented the Report of the Commission of Inquiry Into Abuse of Children in Queensland Institutions which documented abuses in over 150 institutions from 1911 onwards that 'went far beyond prevailing acceptable limits.' Only three of the orphanages and other residential institutions examined were government-operated. The remainder were run by churches—The Salvation Army, the Anglican, Presbyterian, Methodist, Congregational (subsequently Uniting), and Open Brethren Churches, and a number of Catholic Orders.

The Inquiry utilised the testimony of witnesses and archival material. A number of significant themes emerged: 'problems of size and funding; neglect of physical, emotional, social and educational needs; psychological, physical, and sexual abuse; staffing issues; complaint mechanisms; and the role of the relevant government department.'

Riverview Training Farm for Boys, run by The Salvation Army, exemplified many of the problems. By the early 1970s living conditions were known to be 'old, dilapidated and run down.' In 1972 Ipswich City Council found them 'unhygienic and primitive.' State departmental reviews in subsequent years repeated the criticisms, but many requests from The Salvation Army for more government funding were apparently unsuccessful. Education for the boys was limited. In 1973 the Superintendent of Riverview, in a published article, stated: 'We dare not emphasise education here. Most of the boys will eventually be employed in labouring jobs.'

Staff numbers were inadequate, with three men supervising up to 60 boys at night and on weekends. A departmental report in 1973 stated that: 'Conditions for staff are poor, provisions for time off and other basic entitlements are unsatisfactory and wages paid are low.'

Former Riverview residents stated that corporal punishment was routinely administered by various staff members, not just the Superintendent, for misdemeanours such as missing the train home from school or not eating meals. Departmental archival material from the 1970s recorded 'numerous allegations...of either harsh physical discipline or abuse.' Former residents of Alkira, another Salvation Army Home, also reported physical punishment for misdemeanours. This contravened Regulation 24 of the State Children Acts.

Regarding corporal punishment, the Inquiry found a 'clash of philosophies... in relation to many of the denominations running residential facilities.' There is archival evidence of 'longstanding contention between the Riverview administration with the Department as to what punishment was acceptable.' There were similar problems at Alkira. However, despite what it saw as breaches of the Children's Services Regulations, the State did not take action to address the situation.

In the same year the Forde Report was released, the Queensland Government together with the Catholic, Anglican, Uniting, and Baptist Churches, The Salvation Army, and the Churches of Christ apologised to those harmed in Queensland Institutions during their childhood.

8.3 The Senate Report and apologies

In August 2004 Forgotten Australians presented the results of the Senate Community Affairs References Committee inquiry into institutional and out-of-home care of Australian children in the last century. Almost two-thirds of alleged abuses occurred in church-run institutions, with reports of punishment for misdemeanours, harsh corporal punishment, humiliation, sexual abuse, inadequate clothing, regimentation, and exploitation as 'slave labour' with children working long arduous hours for the homes. Submissions contained allegations of abuse in homes run by the Anglican, Uniting, Presbyterian and Methodist Churches, The Salvation Army, Catholic orders and the Plymouth Brethren, as well as in those run by charitable and government organisations. The limited data available indicated that the major churches/agencies involved were the Catholic Church, The

1 Forde, p. 11.
2 Forde, p. 61.
4 ibid., pp. 40-63.
Salvation Army and Barnardos. Submissions reported abuses in Salvation Army institutions in New South Wales, Queensland, Victoria, South Australia, and Western Australia.

The Committee rejected the argument that the treatment children received simply related to the times. Some treatment could relate to conditions and practices seen as harsh today, but the Committee stated that: 'the many accounts it received of excessive and unwarranted assault or of sexual assault go beyond anything that could conceivably be argued as normal for the time.' The Committee found that 'Abuse seemed to be able to thrive and survive in institutions over such a long period due to a combination of reasons that centred around a culture of silence, of power and personal control.' Children were not asked for their views and complaints were dismissed. Children who complained were generally not believed, 'even where there was evidence of physical and sexual abuse.' In some cases children who reported abuse were accused of lying and were beaten. There was a culture of bullying in many institutions. Sometimes older children were put in charge of younger ones whom they abused just as they had been abused. Government regulation and monitoring were lacking, with some witnesses unable to recall welfare ever visiting. Some said they'd been dressed up for it but weren't spoken to, while others said they did speak to the visiting officers with little or no result.

Many staff were untrained and unsuited to the work. Those in non-government institutions were on low pay, making it difficult to retain suitable staff in sufficient numbers. The submission from Wesley Delmar stated:

The necessity for detailed scrutiny and training of applicants for jobs involving the care of vulnerable children has only been recognised in recent years. Our records seem to indicate that in the 1950s and 1960s there was a belief that references from upright citizens were sufficient to ensure that suitable people were recruited to do this work.

Governments had not emphasised the need for appropriately trained staff. No training for staff was required by the Department of Child Welfare in New South Wales under the Child Welfare Act 1939. In her submission, Joanna Pengrase pointed out that anyone could apply to run a home for children if they met the requirements of the Act and their fitness and respectability was attested to by a 'responsible person' such as a JP, medical practitioner, or church minister. 'Inspections by child welfare authorities were infrequent and ineffective.' Staffing problems were linked to funding. State governments provided minimal funding to voluntary organisations, which then needed to rely on volunteers and staff on low pay in poor accommodation working long hours in an isolated location. The Committee stated that churches 'had a tendency to place their least qualified members on the staff of children's homes.'

Staff with concerns about wrongdoing in a church-run institution would find it difficult to raise objections.

There is anecdotal and other evidence that persons in religious and charitable organisations are even more vulnerable than private or public sector employees when it comes to challenging authority in their organisations, because of almost absolute financial and employment dependence. Their livelihood and old age care may be entirely reliant on the organisation concerned. As it stands, the fear of intimidation and reprisals for speaking out, through for example the withdrawal of financial support in retirement, would be a strong deterrent.

The Committee found record retention practices in government departments and non-government agencies 'ranging from almost total loss or destruction to well kept and fulsome...'
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"From 1894 to 1977 the constriction of the Riverview Home for Boys operated by The Salvation Army. Boys lived here who, for many and varied reasons beyond their control, were unable to be cared for by their families."

Plaque unveiled at Riverview on 21st April 2007

records.' State ward files were apparently destroyed in New South Wales, and probably in other States. Floods and fires caused losses in some cases. Records that do exist are often scanty.

Until the 1970s there were very few or no legislative requirements or guidelines for the types of records that should be kept. The most common and reasonably widespread form of client records is an admissions register. Punishment books are also reasonably common!1

Catholic Welfare Australia stated:

There appears to have been a deliberate choice in some cases not to have too many details of a child's life recorded so that the child could 'start afresh' without the stigma of illegitimacy, or broken relationships. Of course, that has meant that people have often felt devastated because the records that they have been able to access are so scanty and superficial. Also the sheer pressure of the day to day work must have also contributed to not writing up records not to mention the issue, of what kind of information should have been kept which was not e.g. medical and dental records. As stated previously no uniform standards applied until recent decades.2

Following release of the Report, the Western Australian Government issued an apology in April 2005, the Tasmanian Government in May, the New South Wales Government in June, the Victorian Government in August 2006, and the South Australian Government in June 2008. On 16th November 2009, Prime Minister Kevin Rudd announced, in a moving speech, the motion of apology to the Forgotten Australians and former child migrants.

In 20033 and in 2004 The Salvation Army apologised to those who were harmed as children in its care. The apology was reiterated in 2009. Apologies are in Appendix 3. Commissioner Les Strong, head of The Salvation Army Eastern Territory, apologised to care leavers at reunions held at Gill Memorial

3 C Dow & J Phillips, 'Forgotten Australians' and 'Lost Innocents': Child migrants and Children in Institutional Care in Australia, Background Note (Canberra: Parliamentary Library, 11 Nov 2009).
Home for Boys in 2006 and at Riverview Home for Boys and Bexley Home for Boys in 2007. Lieutenant Colonel Geanette Seymour apologised to care leavers at the Indooroopilly Home for Boys Reunion in 2007. Care leavers from each of these homes were invited to attend ‘their’ reunion, a memorial plaque was unveiled at each site, and the care leavers were presented with books of photos taken in the past in ‘their’ home.

On 7th December 2010, General Shaw Clifton, international leader of The Salvation Army, apologised to care leavers of Salvation Army homes (Appendix 4). Mr Jim Luthy, President of CLAN (Care Leavers Australia Network), had written to the General to request this apology and he was invited to respond to the apology. When younger, Mr Luthy had spent time in the Gill Memorial Home for Boys. His response, following the apology, was based on four points: that, in Kevin Rudd’s words, ‘great evil has been done’, that every person deserves respect, that those in power over others should protect them and promote their welfare, and that The Salvation Army’s response to abuse allegations is a moral issue. He called on the present day Army to apologise to the ‘good officers’ who ‘did not know who to turn to and who tried to make our lives more enjoyable.’ He also called on the Army to clarify its policy towards care leavers, noting occasions when replies to correspondence had expressed ‘repugnant views.’ He closed with several personal stories which highlighted the need for the apology.

The full text of his response is available on the CLAN website at <www.clan.org.au>.

8.4 The Tasmanian Report

In November 2004 the Tasmanian Ombudsman released the Review of Claims of Abuse from Adults in State Care as Children. Claimants reported abuse in homes run by The Salvation Army, the Catholic Church, Churches of Christ, the Anglican Church, and the State Government, as well as in foster care placements. The claimants who participated in the Review most commonly wanted an apology.


acknowledgement that the alleged abuse most likely occurred, access to personal files, counselling, and ‘assurance that today’s system prevents the sort of abuse they have suffered’. The Tasmanian Government offered ex gratia payments to claimants, but the Ombudsman recommended against a full Commission of Inquiry into child abuse in Tasmania.

8.5 The Mullighan Report and apologies


Nothing prepared me for the foul undercurrent of society revealed in the evidence to the Inquiry; not my life in the community or my work in the law as a practitioner and a judge. I had no understanding of the widespread prevalence of the sexual abuse of children in South Australia and its frequent devastating and often lifelong consequences for many of them.

From the 1940s onwards, sexual abuse was alleged to have occurred in all types of care, including government and non-government institutions, smaller group care and foster care. Evidence was given relating to sexual abuse in homes operated by the Anglican Church, the Catholic Church and The Salvation Army, and in institutions for Aboriginal children operated by the Lutheran Church, the Catholic Church and the United Aborigines Mission.

Institutions operated by religious organisations which received wards of the State were subject to government supervision and control. In the mid-1950s to 1970s, the Children’s Welfare and Public Relief Board inspected those accepting children under seven years old. From 1965 all

2 Ombudsman Tasmania, Listen to the Children: Review of Claims of Abuse from Adults in State Care as Children (Hobart, 2004), pp. 3, 15-16, 37.
non-government institutions were required to be licensed under the Social Welfare Act, necessitating their inspection. Further legislation in 1972 set standards of care and uniform procedures.¹

The Salvation Army Boys Home at Mount Barker, Eden Park, established in 1900 as a probationary institution, provided care for boys referred to in historical records as 'uncontrollable', 'sub-normal' or 'severely emotionally disturbed', as well as boys placed privately. The South Australian Department responsible for child care was 'closely involved' with Eden Park throughout its period of operation. It was subject to the same 'supervision and authority' as the government's own institutions. In 1940 and 1941, there were allegations of sexual abuse at Eden Park. Inquiries revealed 'an ongoing reliance on physical punishment'. The first incident of 'indecent conduct' led to arrest and conviction of a staff member. Six months later another employee was arrested. In 1941 The Salvation Army replaced the entire male staff. Allegations of abuse continued and in 1944 all state wards were removed from Eden Park, but it continued to care for children placed privately.

When regular inspections by the Department commenced in 1950, initial reports were positive. However, in 1959 there were reports of a 'dark punishment room'. Subsequently, allegations were raised, information was given to the police, a former staff member went to solicitors because of his concerns, and the Department noted ongoing deficiencies and concerns about discipline and sexual abuse at the home. The Department 'considered that the overall philosophy of care is based on a staff philosophy that reflects emphasis on control and punishment rather than more modern and appropriate styles of managing difficult children.'² However, no action was taken.

In 1982 The Salvation Army closed Eden Park, stating that there was 'no present need for this service', and that 'there is a change in the pattern of child-care which we must recognise.'³ In 2008, following the release of the Mullighan Report, the South Australian Government, together with the Anglican, Uniting, Lutheran, and Catholic Churches apologised to those who suffered abuse while in State care.

¹ Ibid., p. 33.
² Ibid., p. 95.
³ Ibid.
9. What has been learned?

"Abuse seemed to be able to thrive and survive in institutions over such a long period due to a combination of reasons that centred around a culture of silence, of power and personal control."

— Forgotten Australians, 2004

Many factors led to abuse in children's homes, including lack of understanding of children's emotional needs, under-funding, closed environments, young untrained carers, lack of complaints mechanisms, minimal monitoring and little accountability. Society, state governments, the departments responsible for children in care, the non-government organisations and the institutions themselves all played a part.

In just eight years in Australia, a number of inquiry reports have revealed not only shameful chapters in the nation's history, but also contemporary problems of child protection. Some reveal vulnerable children being institutionalised and subject to reigns of terror that have had devastating consequences for hundreds of thousands of adult citizens. They clearly describe an institutional culture characterised by all the features of what is now referred to as "systems abuse" whereby '...harm [is] done to children in the context of policies or programmes that are designed to provide care or protection'. Others reveal current and inadequate child protection systems that are regularly crisis-ridden, under-resourced, understaffed and have a high turnover of often inexperienced and overworked workers.

Carers need to have a "fundamental belief in the rights of children". Children seen as "bad" are "dehumanised or devalued" by the carers and are more likely to be abused. Carers must be appropriately trained, then supervised, supported, and valued. Lack of recognition or consultation can result in unethical behaviour.

Practices should be frequently reflected on to keep them in line with acceptable practices of the day. Hierarchical structures pose particular dangers. In such structures, standards of care are set by those not working directly with the children. The direct carers tend to disregard the standards, "believing that they are not based on what conditions are really like".


3 Forde, pp. 16-20.


1 Forde, p. 92.
Children need to be heard and to participate in decision-making about their lives. Their powerlessness was a 'central cause' for abuse. Adult abusers in institutions had the power.

A reflection on the patterns of the development of children's institutions in Australia is a reminder of the power of groups such as the churches, and the powerlessness of women, children and young people and poor families.

Inadequate funding was a major issue. The Forde Report found that:

One of the most obvious causes of systems abuse is the lack of funding and resourcing. Resource constraints have been a perennial problem for institutions.

Despite this, consecutive government departments continued to place children in institutions without regard to their capacity to provide proper care for the numbers they were receiving.

Abusers are responsible for their actions. However, the importance of environmental factors was emphasised by research into sexual abuse of minors by Catholic priests in the United States. The study found that 'Individual characteristics do not predict that a priest will commit sexual abuse of a minor. Rather, vulnerabilities, in combination with situational stresses and opportunities, raise the risk of abuse.'

---

1 Photograph courtesy of The Salvation Army Australia Eastern Territory Heritage Centre.
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The past experience of The Salvation Army bears out the importance of adequate financial and staff resources; clear policies and procedures; good staff training; appropriate appointments; ongoing staff training, supervision, and support; accountability within the organisation and to the government; and a functional complaints mechanism. A good working relationship with relevant government bodies is essential. The hierarchical structure of the Army and its potential impact on the powerlessness of children and carers in lower positions must be taken into account in writing policies and procedures. The focus must be on the children.

In the 1990s Australian churches took positive steps to address the problem of past child abuse, setting policies and procedures in place for dealing with allegations of abuse against their clergy, staff and volunteers in their programs. These include the Uniting Church Procedures for use when complaints of sexual abuse are made against ministers, the Presbyterian Church in NSW Breaking the Silence: Policy and procedures for protecting against and dealing with sexual abuse within the Church, the Anglican Protocol for dealing with sexual misconduct by church workers in the Anglican Church Diocese of Sydney, the Catholic Towards Healing: Principles and procedures in responding to complaints of sexual abuse against personnel of the Catholic Church in Australia and The Salvation Army Procedures for Complaints of Sexual and Other Abuse Against Salvationists and Workers.

Since the General's Apology in 2010 The Salvation Army has continued to provide assistance and pastoral care for those harmed in Salvation Army homes. The Eastern Territory website states:

From 1894 to the 1970s The Salvation Army operated children's homes around Australia. The Salvation Army deeply regrets that not all the children in its care received the love and protection they deserved. Some of the children experienced great fear living with rigid and harsh discipline. Some became victims of physical, emotional and/or sexual abuse. The Salvation Army acknowledges its failure with those children. The Salvation Army offers all persons who were hurt its unreserved apology.

If you have a grievance against The Salvation Army, please contact us. We will hear you.

The Salvation Army will encourage you to meet with a psychologist or professional counsellor to prepare a written statement and we will carry the cost of that. Then we will offer to meet with you so you can tell our representatives your story in person. The representatives will offer you a personal apology. The Salvation Army may be able to assist with the cost of professional counselling. Where required we will cooperate fully with the police.

The lifelong effects of growing up in institutions are now recognised. A recent survey by CLAN, the Care Leavers Australia Network, found many care leavers experiencing multiple disadvantage including long-term unemployment, fair to very poor physical and mental health, and issues with trusting people in authority and maintaining close relationships, as well as many other negative experiences as adults. The findings were summarised in a simple formula.

\[
\text{Separation from parents and siblings} + \\
\text{a childhood of neglect and abuse} = \\
\text{An adulthood of social exclusion and entrenched multiple disadvantage}
\]

Respondents to the CLAN Survey stated that the Senate Report, apologies, and support were the most helpful parts of their healing. Counselling, access to records and help finding family were the most frequently used services.

The Salvation Army is committed to providing as much personal information as possible to...
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care leavers who enquire. Tragically, records from many Salvation Army homes have been lost, some through natural disasters and some in accordance with practices of the time. Those records that still exist are minimal, reflecting standards of the time that did not recognise the importance of having personal records for children when they had grown. The Salvation Army Eastern Territory Special Search Service and Family Tracing Service provide support and help for care leavers seeking information about their past and their families.¹

The Professional Standards Office of The Salvation Army Eastern Territory provides support and action for those who wish to complain about unprofessional or abusive behaviour by Salvation Army personnel. An overview of its services and an outline of how a complaint is handled are in Appendix 5.

"Confronting the reality of sexual abuse by clergy and church workers has been, and continues to be, a painful and difficult journey for the Australian Churches."

— Safe as Churches? Consultation, 2004

Although not specifically identified by the inquiries, physical, sexual or emotional abuse by church leaders is also spiritual abuse. These leaders are in a position of spiritual power and 'spiritual power is arguably the most dangerous power of all.' When there is sexual abuse, there is destruction of a system of meaning. What ought to be positive becomes negative, what ought to be love becomes the using of a person, what ought to be trustworthy can no longer be trusted. The harm is magnified if church leaders do not respond appropriately when informed of the offence. This makes dealing with the legacy of past abuse, and protecting children and youth today priorities for all churches and religious organisations.

In 2004 the National Council of Churches in Australia (NCCA) held the first Safe as Churches? ecumenical consultation, bringing together for the first time representatives of 12 Australian Churches to consider the reality of sexual abuse by clergy and church workers. Speakers at this and subsequent consultations bring expertise from a range of professions, with workshops and seminars facilitating deeper exploration of issues. The fifth Consultation was held in 2011 as churches continued to respond to the challenges, share their experiences, and work together to establish safe church communities. The denomination, the pastor or leader, and the congregation are all involved in establishing a safe church. Tim Dyer, in his Keynote Address to the 2007 Consultation, emphasised that a safe church shows 'connection and cohesion' between three areas: denominational protocols, processes and policies; the systemic health of the congregation; and the personhood of the pastor/leader. These three areas of vulnerability within churches have not only been identified, but also provided with resources in order to reduce the potential for abuse to occur.

The Safe Church Network, established by the NCCA, facilitates cooperation among churches, encourages development and implementation

2 ibid., pp. 218-219.

10. Keeping children safe in today's churches
of Safe Ministry policies, develops and shares resources, and provides Safe Church training. On joining the Safe Church Training Agreement (SCTA), a denomination, diocese, or other church organisation receives an ‘8 hours initial organisation assessment and advice in the area of Safe Church policy, procedures and implementation’ to ‘formulate a holistic safe church strategy.’ Safe Church Awareness and Refresher workshops, which cover training in duty of care and child protection as well as good leadership practice, safe leaders and safe programs, are available to all churches. There are currently 34 members of the SCTA, including Anglican, Australian Christian, Baptist, Catholic, Christ Evangelical, Coptic Orthodox, 4 Square, Lutheran, Presbyterian, Seventh Day Adventist, and Uniting Churches as well as Christian Outreach Centre Australia, Churches of Christ, and The Salvation Army Eastern Territory. Members of the SCTA can access Safe Church workshops to train their workers. Another training program for churches is ChildSafe, developed by Scripture Union Australia. Safe Church and ChildSafe programs both offer up-to-date standards and training resources to ensure that as far as possible children will be safe from harm.

The Salvation Army Eastern Territory has had guidelines on safety and care practices for child related programs since 1994 and is an Endorsed Training Partner of the SCTA. All who apply for ministry in the Territory must sign the Code of Conduct, complete Caring for Kids training (SCTA Awareness Workshops), and have a state based Working With Children Check. The Code of Conduct is in Appendix 6.

Selection and screening of Eastern Territory officers now include background checks and psychometric testing to assess their suitability. The Territory Officer Wellbeing team provides pastoral care, accountability, mentoring and supervision referral for officers in the field. This builds capacity, supporting and enhancing the abilities of those in charge of congregations to keep within personal and professional boundaries.

Initially, both Salvation Army territories based their guidelines on Scripture Union’s manuals. Over time the Eastern Territory aligned itself with the Safe Church movement while Southern Territory remained with the Scripture Union ChildSafe material. Anyone in leadership or working with children in the Southern Territory is required to have a current police check or adhere to a state-based Working With Children Check, and complete a ChildSafe training course. 4

In 2007 the General directed every Salvation Army territory and command around the world to submit their child protection policy to International Headquarters. In the twelve months leading up to the submission date territories were able to consult with each other, write policies, and refine existing ones. In 2007 the Eastern Territory released its Child Protection Policy and the Southern Territory’s policy soon followed. Every expression of The Salvation Army, whether a church or a centre, is responsible to make sure children and teenagers are safe. Duty of care is seen as a legal, moral, and spiritual responsibility.

The Salvation Army is committed to the care, nurturing and protection of all children. Because children are vulnerable persons, The Salvation Army will always strive to provide safe places for any child who comes within its care. The Salvation Army will take strong and definite action if there are ever any suspicions of abuse against children. 5

---

5 Child Protection Policy, The Salvation Army Eastern Territory.
Caring for Kids training covers the different types of abuse, including positional power and spiritual abuse, how to recognize them, and how to respond to a child who has disclosed. Government and Salvation Army reporting requirements are explained. Procedures to be followed in the event of suspicion or allegation against a Salvationist or other team member are clearly set out. If a team member is an immediate risk to a child, they are to be removed from the program immediately. If they are not an immediate risk, the matter is referred to the Territorial Professional Standards Committee for assessment and action.¹ ² Today, when a complaint is raised, it is addressed.

As well as its churches, The Salvation Army operates many centres which offer activities for children. Employment selection criteria for centre staff working in child-related areas include relevant professional training and child-safety clearance. Employees in centres must comply with Human Resources complaints processes, and the policies and procedures of the centre where they work. Volunteers are screened and never work alone or unsupervised. To protect those who raise issues, there are now whistle-blower policies in place.

Today The Salvation Army offers a wide range of programs and services for children, youth, and families who are experiencing disadvantage or harm in some form. Each Salvation Army corps (church) is different in its programs and services. All programs attempt to engage with parents and families, providing a safe place and healthy role models, thereby helping to build capacity and resilience for all participants. Early intervention helps reduce the risk of harm. Games, craft, music and fun activities are offered through preschooler groups for children with their parents or carers and Kids Clubs for primary school children. Other programs provide breakfast for children before school and homework help after school. Youth groups offer social activities and Bible study groups where youth can explore their faith, connect with other young people, and be mentored. SAGALA (Salvation Army Guarding and Legion Activities), a program for children and teenagers, builds integrity, provides community service experience, teaches life skills, and promotes leadership development. SAGALA partners with the Duke of Edinburgh program for teenagers. The Collaroy Centre in Sydney runs two annual camps for underprivileged children from local corps and their communities, and an annual camp for single mothers. Some corps offer parenting courses aimed at specific groups such as single mothers, fathers as primary carers, or grandparents. There are work training programs and literacy programs specifically designed for young people.

Children and youth brought before the courts are supported by corps officers and Salvation Army court chaplains. Chaplains also visit youth detention centres to support young people there. The Salvation Army Counselling Service provides professionally trained counsellors, and secure accommodation for women and children experiencing domestic violence is available in refuges throughout Australia.

Oasis Youth Support Network, located in Surry Hills, Sydney, and other regional centres, provides over 25 cutting edge programs that offer critical points of intervention and support for homeless and disadvantaged young people between 16 and 24 years old. These include case management, counselling, crisis and transitional accommodation, legal support, accredited workplace training, education and vocational opportunities, specialist intervention services and multimedia training. The Oasis mission statement reads: 'The Oasis Youth Support Network provides a place of safety and care where, through compassion and skilful intervention, troubled young people find refuge and hope to achieve dreams and potential.'

---

1 Caring for Kids, Level 1 Awareness Workshop, 2011.
11. Conclusion

“The Salvation Army is committed to the care, nurturing and protection of all children.”

— The Salvation Army Eastern Territory Child Protection Policy

Tragically, Salvation Army homes for children were unable to fully realise William Booth's vision. The Salvation Army no longer operates institutions for children in Australia and remaining properties have found new uses. Booth College, where Eastern Territory trainee officers prepare for ministry, has campuses at the former Bexley Home for Boys and Stanmore Children's Home. The Riverview property now provides residential aged care at Riverview Gardens and houses the Canaan School for Training and Development. Canaan is a site for camps, retreats, training, and conferences. It also runs government-funded social programs for marginalized and disadvantaged people, assisting them to gain employment and become independent. The plant nursery 'Watch Them Grow' is a self-sustaining social enterprise where visitors and volunteer workers enjoy the scenery and atmosphere.1

In recent years there have been annual reunions of Riverview 'homies', men who were there as boys. Initiated and organised by Bob Toreaux, a Riverview 'homie', and funded by The Salvation Army, the reunions have enabled many of these men to get together with others who were their family and to talk about their past experiences with them and with Salvation Army staff.2 At the fifth Riverview reunion held in August 2011 a special memorial plinth, sponsored by The Salvation Army and Ipswich Mayor Paul Pisasale, was unveiled.

Churches, including The Salvation Army, have come a long way and now embrace 'Prevention as Mission' rather than as a distraction from their mission. Screening of applicants is more rigorous, policies that reflect safe programs are in place, educational programs better prepare those in ministry and congregations, behaviour-based guidelines have been
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developed for workers, and response to survivors of abuse has improved.¹

Tim Dyer’s model for reducing the space for vulnerability within churches defines three areas of potential vulnerability in churches: the denomination, the leader, and the congregation. The Salvation Army as a denomination now has clear policies and procedures in place to protect children. Leaders—whether officers or others—are screened, selected, trained, supervised and supported to work safely with children. People in Salvation Army corps—the congregations—are being educated about child safety and care matters through internal training. A safe church culture is developing so that if someone sees or hears about something inappropriate that involves children, there is a procedure to follow to report misconduct. If there are reasonable grounds to suspect that a child is at risk of harm at home or elsewhere outside an Army program, Salvationists are to act as if they are mandatory reporters, and where possible continue to support the child and the family. Children and young people themselves are encouraged to talk to safe people about any concerns. Mandatory reporting, whistle-blower policies, and complaints processes empower church members today to talk about misconduct issues involving children as well as those involving vulnerable adults.

This research has sought to present an overview of The Salvation Army’s experience in out-of-home care for children and youth in need. This care was given within the context of the society and culture of the time. Whilst it is helpful to remember the past and reflect on what went wrong as well as on what succeeded, it is also helpful to learn from past experiences. Today The Salvation Army Eastern Territory is fully committed to hearing stories from the past—both the positive and the negative—in order to validate each person’s experience and provide support for them as they make meaning of what happened. The Salvation Army now strives to ensure continual improvement to its services for children, youth and other vulnerable persons in its care.

¹ M Applewhite, “Patterns of Abuse in Faith-based Communities”, Safe As Churches? Consultation V, 21 July 2011 [Presentation notes by S Cleland].
Bibliography

General history


'The Salvation Army


'Foster, HC, My Life, unpublished monograph.

'Orders and Regulations for Officers of the Men's Social Work of the Salvation Army, The Salvation Army Book Department, Melbourne, 1915.

'Orders and Regulations for Social Officers (Women), The Salvation Army Book Department, Melbourne, 1916.


**Institutional care**


**Child migration**


**Child abuse and protection**


**Reviews and inquiries**


Safe churches


Caring for Kids, Level 1 Awareness Workshop, February 2011, The Salvation Army Eastern Territory.


Procedures for Safety and Care in Salvation Army Youth and Children’s Ministries, The Salvation Army Eastern Territory.


Appendices

Appendix 1: Salvation Army institutions for children in Australia
Submissions to Australian Senate Inquiry, 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Opened</th>
<th>Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARNCLIFFE GIRLS’ INDUSTRIAL HOME</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE NEST – CHILDRENS’ HOME</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE NEST – GIRLS’ HOME</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171 Wollongong Road, Arncliffe (Transferred to Stanmore)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOYS’ PROBATIONARY HOMES</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOYS’ HOME</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOLLING MEMORIAL BOYS’ HOME</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsland Road and Barnsby Grove, Bexley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residential Care for Boys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Opened</th>
<th>Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DULWICH HILL FAMILY GROUP HOME</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 Wardell Road, Dulwich Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARLWOOD FAMILY GROUP HOME</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Sutton Avenue, Earlwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residential Care for Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Opened</th>
<th>Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LA PERouse WOMEN’S AND CHILDREN’S HOME</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Cable Station, La Perouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Home for Women and Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Opened</th>
<th>Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARADISE BOYS’ INDUSTRIAL COLONY</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANLY BOYS’ PROBATIONARY HOME</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANLY BOYS’ HOME</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittwater Road, Dee Why (Boys moved to Goulburn)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residential Care for Boys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Opened</th>
<th>Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NARWEE FAMILY GROUP HOME</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 Grove Street, Narwee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residential Care for Children
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Opened</th>
<th>Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RESCUE HOME – THE HARBOUR</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Cambridge Street, Stanmore</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIRLS’ INDUSTRIAL HOME</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97 Cambridge Street, Stanmore</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE LODGE, YOUNG WOMENS’ HOSTEL</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILDRENS’ HOME</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILDRENS’ HOME/STUDENT HOSTEL – FEMALE</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIRLS’ INDUSTRIAL HOME</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE LODGE, YOUNG WOMENS’ HOSTEL</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILDRENS’ HOME</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILDRENS’ HOME/STUDENT HOSTEL – FEMALE</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARRICKVILLE CHILDRENS’ RESIDENCE</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 George Street, Marrickville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALGATE HOUSE BOYS’ HOME</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>633 Lane Street, Broken Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LYNDON HOUSE GIRLS’ HOME</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Blatchford Street, Canowindra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILL MEMORIAL BOYS’ HOME</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn Street, Goulburn</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(became Gill Memorial Family Group Home)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILL MEMORIAL FAMILY GROUP HOME</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Eldon Street, Goulburn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Mary Street, Goulburn</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Queensland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Opened</th>
<th>Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THE NEST CHILDRENS’ HOME</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIRLS’ INDUSTRIAL HOME</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOME FOR INVALID WOMEN/GIRLS</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHELMER HOME FOR WOMEN/GIRLS</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Victoria Street, Chelmer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Queensland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Opened</th>
<th>Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THE NEST CHILDRENS’ HOME</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIRLS’ INDUSTRIAL HOME</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOME FOR INVALID WOMEN/GIRLS</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHELMER HOME FOR WOMEN/GIRLS</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Victoria Street, Chelmer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Queensland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Opened</th>
<th>Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THE NEST CHILDRENS’ HOME</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIRLS’ INDUSTRIAL HOME</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOME FOR INVALID WOMEN/GIRLS</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHELMER HOME FOR WOMEN/GIRLS</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Victoria Street, Chelmer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Queensland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Opened</th>
<th>Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THE NEST CHILDRENS’ HOME</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIRLS’ INDUSTRIAL HOME</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOME FOR INVALID WOMEN/GIRLS</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHELMER HOME FOR WOMEN/GIRLS</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Victoria Street, Chelmer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre</td>
<td>Opened</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORTON HOUSE</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Curtis Street, The Range, Toowoomba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Residential Care for Girls**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Opened</th>
<th>Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOYS' PROBATIONARY HOME</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDOOROOPIILY BOYS' HOME</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOYS' HOME AND HOSTEL INDOOROOPIILY</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chappel Hill, Indooroopilly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Residential Care for Boys**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Opened</th>
<th>Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOYS' HOME WASHPOOL</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Boys evacuated from Indooroopilly)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Residential Care for Boys**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Opened</th>
<th>Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RIVERVIEW PREVENTATIVE HOME FOR NEGLECTED GIRLS</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIVERVIEW GIRLS' INDUSTRIAL HOME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Girls moved to Rhyandarra, Yeronga)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHYANDARRA GIRLS' INDUSTRIAL HOME</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaduma Street, Yeronga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHYANDARRA CHILDRENS' HOME</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHYANDARRA GIRLS' HOME</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>1942</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Residential Care for Children/Girls**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Opened</th>
<th>Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RIVERVIEW BOYS' INDUSTRIAL COLONY</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIVERVIEW BOYS' PROBATIONARY HOME</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIVERVIEW TRAINING FARM</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIVERVIEW TRAINING FARM FOR OVERSEAS BOYS</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIVERVIEW TRAINING FARM FOR BOYS</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDEAVOUR FARM</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HILLSDALE VILLAGE FOR BOYS</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Residential Care for Boys**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Opened</th>
<th>Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GUNDANAH FAMILY GROUP HOME</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Vista Court, Barney Point, Gladstone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Residential Care for Children**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Opened</th>
<th>Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BETHESDA HOSTEL AND CHILDRENS' HOME</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETHESDA CHILDRENS' HOME</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETHESDA FAMILY CARE CENTRE</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Care of Mothers, Children, Family**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Opened</th>
<th>Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAYSWATER BOYS’ HOME</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(The Basin, became The Basin Farm) No. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 2</td>
<td>1900 (7)</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 3</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Residential Care and Reformatory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOX HILL BOYS’ HOME</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310 Elgar Rd, Box Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Residential Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNSWICK GIRLS’ HOME</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union St, Brunswick (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls Residential Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST CAMBERWELL GIRLS’ HOME</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Catherine Booth Girls Home)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brinsley Rd, East Camberwell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls Residential Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST KEW GIRLS’ HOME</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(William Booth Girls Home)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Sackville St, East Kew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls Residential Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLENROY GIRLS’ HOME</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widford St, Glenroy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls Residential Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARBOUR – GIRLS’ WOMENS’ HOME</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Cohuna St, West Brunswick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls Residential Care/Reformatory/Industrial Home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEIDELBERG BOYS’ HOME</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidelberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys Residential Care - Reformatory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JACANA – CHILDRENS’ HOME</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Boulevard, Jacana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Residential Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KARDINIA CHILDRENS’ HOME</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Riverview Terrace, Belmont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Residential Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MURRUMBEENA GIRLS’ HOME</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dandenong Rd, Murrumbeena</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls Residential Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Opened</th>
<th>Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pakenham Boys' Home</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>1897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riddells Creek Girls' Home</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton Vale Girls' Home</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaumont Girls' Home</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullarton Girls' Home</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Town Boys' Home</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Barker Boys' Home (Eden Park)</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwood Girls' Home</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodville Girls' Home</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collie Estate (Boys &amp; Girls)</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>1921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottesloe Girls' Home</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalgoorlie Girls' Home</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>1924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nedlands Boys' Home</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>1970s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subiaco</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrington Boys' Home</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maylands Girls' Home</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Boys Residential Care – Reformatory
Girls Residential Care
Children's Residential Care
Appendix 2: Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Poor Law Amendment Act legalises child migration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>Rev William Booth begins work in East London.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>First case of cruelty to children argued in New York.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>NSW Royal Commission into Public Charities critical of conditions in homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>First use of the term 'Salvation Army'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>The Salvation Army begins work in Australia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>UK Prevention of Cruelty to Children Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Booth publishes <em>In Darkest England and the Way Out</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>The Salvation Army opens first Children's Home at Heidelberg (Vic).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>The Salvation Army Emigration Board established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895-1900</td>
<td>Salvation Army Homes for Children opened in New South Wales, Queensland, Victoria, South Australia and Western Australia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>White Australia Policy (Immigration Restriction Act)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Kingsley Fairbridge establishes Society for the Furtherance of Child Emigration to the Colonies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914-1918</td>
<td>World War I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>First official party of Barnardo Boys arrives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>Empire Settlement Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Canada restricts child immigration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925-1929</td>
<td>The Salvation Army charters SS Vedic to bring migrants to Australia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Christian Brothers establish Tardun Farm School in Western Australia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Barnardos establishes Farm School, Picton, &amp; children's homes in Sydney.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929-1930</td>
<td>The Great Depression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>UK-Australia child migration sponsorship agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939-1945</td>
<td>World War II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>NSW Government Inquiry into Parramatta Girls' Industrial School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>UK Curtis Report indicates changes in childcare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>UK Moss Report critical of Australian institutions for child migrants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Ross Report criticises Australian institutions, opposes child migration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Medical identification of parental neglect and physical abuse of children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Mandatory reporting of child abuse introduced in USA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Publication of <em>The Battered-child Syndrome</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Barnardo's sends last child migrants to Australia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Public allegations emerge in USA of sexual and physical abuse involving religious leaders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Senate Committee Report: Children in Institutional and Other Forms of Care.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>UN Convention on the Rights of the Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catholic Bishops release protocol for dealing with allegations of criminal behaviour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Allegations of abuse involving religious leaders emerge in Australia. ABC broadcasts <em>The Ultimate Betrayal</em> and <em>The Leaving of Liverpool</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Empty Cradles published (republished as Oranges and Sunshine). Uniting Church Procedures for use when complaints of sexual abuse are made against ministers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Anglican development of national child protection strategy. The Salvation Army apologises to care leavers at Gill Memorial Home for Boys reunion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>The Salvation Army apologises to care leavers at reunions at Riverview Home for Boys, Indooroopilly Home for Boys, and Bexley Home for Boys. All Salvation Army Territories directed to submit their child protection policies to International Headquarters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>The General of The Salvation Army apologises to Australian care leavers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Salvation Army apologies, 2004-2009

News

Public Relations Office
Level 2, 26-28 Prospect Street
Box Hill VIC 3126
Telephone: (03) 9895 6200

Statement by The Salvation Army regarding abuse issues revealed by the Senate Inquiry

30 August 2004

The Salvation Army is deeply regretful of any incident of abuse perpetrated by its staff. It acknowledges that during the 1940's, 50s, 60s and 70s some children in our care were subjected to abuse. A number of former Children's Home residents have been in touch with The Salvation Army and we would be willing to speak with others.

We had more than 30,000 children in our care throughout Australia during this time and the vast majority of children regarded the time spent with us as a positive experience but some have reported abuse.

In these cases The Salvation Army attempts to bring healing by listening and making a personal apology. It also funds counselling and practical assistance.

Anyone wishing to make contact with The Salvation Army can do so by writing to:

The Salvation Army
PO Box A435
Sydney South NSW 1232

or

The Salvation Army
Locked Bag 1
Mont Albert VIC 3127
Apology to Children in Care

From the 1920s to the 1970s The Salvation Army operated children's homes around Australia. The Salvation Army deeply regrets that not all the children in its care received the love and protection they deserved. Some of the children experienced great fear living with rigid and harsh discipline. Some became victims of physical abuse and some of sexual abuse. The Salvation Army acknowledges its failure with those children.

The Salvation Army offers all persons who were hurt its unreserved apology.

The Salvation Army invites any persons who were hurt to make contact so they can tell their story in person. Representatives of the Army will offer a personal apology. The Salvation Army may be able to assist with cost of professional counselling. Where necessary, full cooperation with the police will be given.

The Salvation Army Reiterates its Apology

16 November, 2009

The Salvation Army acknowledges the Federal Government's decision to offer a formal apology, on behalf of the nation, to any children who were abused whilst in institutional care during the 20th century.

From the 1890s to the 1980s The Salvation Army operated many children's homes around Australia. The Salvation Army deeply regrets that not all the children in its care received the love and protection they deserved. Some of the children experienced fear living with rigid and harsh discipline. Some became victims of physical abuse and some of sexual abuse.

The Salvation Army acknowledges its failure with those children and again strongly reiterates its unreserved apologies issued since August, 2004 to former residents of any of its children's homes who were subjected to any form of abuse or maltreatment.

The Salvation Army, along with other agencies which provide care for children not living with their families, is determined to ensure that the voices of children and teenagers are heard and responded to. Governments and communities, alongside welfare agencies, need to provide appropriately resourced services for children and youth in care to ensure that they are properly empowered and skilled to live independent lives in the future.

The Salvation Army will continue to work as closely as possible with those former residents of its children's homes who come forward to tell their stories and seek assistance in some way.

Communications Director
The Salvation Army Australia Southern Territory
Appendix 4: Apology by the General of The Salvation Army, General Shaw Clifton, to care leavers of Salvation Army homes, 7 December 2010

I am very pleased that this gathering is taking place today. It is a gathering I have long anticipated and I was looking forward keenly to being with you all in person for this highly significant and deeply sensitive occasion. Imagine therefore my profound disappointment on being required to undergo a few weeks ago open heart surgery for a double bypass and a replacement aortic valve. All this has denied to me and to my wife, Commissioner Helen Clifton, the privilege of being present with you in person today. I am deeply grateful to Commissioner Barry Swanson and Commissioner Sue Swanson for agreeing to travel from London, England, to be with you all as our personal representatives. I have asked Commissioner Barry Swanson, as second in command of the Army, to speak for me as you meet. I send you warmest personal greetings. I record also my personal sense of deep sorrow and regret at the events of the past which are being remembered today. I know that these events are constant memories for you all and in many cases also for your loved ones.

I am grateful for this opportunity to speak on behalf of The Salvation Army to men and women who were children in the care of The Salvation Army in years past. I want to thank Jim Luthy for the courage to write to me and initiate the idea that has culminated in this gathering. I acknowledge the support of CLAN (Care Leavers Australia Network) in working toward this day. The territorial leaders of The Salvation Army in Australia: Commissioner Linda Bond and Commissioner Raymond Finger are also here to show their support on this significant occasion.

Between 1894 and the early 1990’s, The Salvation Army operated children’s homes throughout Australia. During those years, over 30 thousand children were cared for in over 55 Salvation Army homes staffed by more than 3,000 Officers and employees. Some children were only infants, many were young teenagers. Some were with us briefly, others for their whole childhood. There were many and varied circumstances that led to these children being placed in our care.

To our great regret, some of these children did not benefit from their experience and were not well cared for by our staff. We acknowledge that at certain times in our history, the atmosphere in some homes was rigid, harsh, and authoritarian. Many children did not experience the gentleness of love that they needed. Some children suffered abuse and deprivation. As a result their stories are full of hurt, rejection, discouragement and a failure to realise potential.

As the International Leader of The Salvation Army, I express to all Australian care leavers, our deepest sorrow for these failures and hurts. The Salvation Army offers you our heartfelt apology. To you all, we say ‘Sorry.’

That greater love was not given when you were so vulnerable - we are sorry.

For any harsh words, violent actions or abuse - we are sorry. These should never have happened.

For when you tried to speak out and you were not listened to or believed - we are sorry.

That the process of being placed in care meant for some that you lost family and extended family - we are sorry.

For those who did not find the support you needed as you grieved for your losses - we are sorry.
To our Indigenous care leavers, for the loss of culture and connection to your land - we are sorry.

For those who could not navigate the pain of their life experience and are no longer with us - we are deeply sorry.

To your families, your wives and husbands, your children, your partners, who have also suffered because the deprivations of childhood can impact on adulthood relationships - to you we say sorry.

The Salvation Army acknowledges that you were not to blame for what you experienced. We are now listening to your life stories.

I want to thank those Salvation Army Officers who did give compassionate care. Some of you objected to the harsh treatment given - I pay tribute to your courage and we thank you for the kindness you brought and the positive difference you were able to make to some of those precious children.

As General of The Salvation Army, I am glad that our two Australian Territories now have firm policies in place to protect children. I am grateful that both territories have previously issued apologies. In some cases, reunions have been held at the home sites, and apologies have been given there. I am also glad that both territories are able to assist former 'children in care', who contact The Salvation Army. Where care leavers make direct contact themselves with the Army, caring and just procedures are followed. Many care leavers have been helped, for example, by assistance with counselling costs, or by receiving a personal apology. We desire to support all our care leavers to find healing and hope for their future. I invite all care leavers who feel pain from their time in a Salvation Army home who have not yet contacted us, to do so.

Finally, as leader of this global Christian movement, I want to affirm the true values which underpin The Salvation Army and the Christian Church. We follow the one who said, 'Let the children come to me.' He has called everyone to a pathway of love, respect, and compassion. While at times we failed him in the past, we do not want to now. We want all to know and experience his gracious love and healing. With that desire in our hearts, we say, God bless you.
Appendix 5: The Professional Standards Office, The Salvation Army Australia Eastern Territory

Overview of the Professional Standards Office

The Professional Standards Office (PSO) is attached to the Eastern Territory Headquarters in Sydney and is responsible for the professional behaviour of Salvation Army personnel in ACT, NSW and Qld. This includes Officers, Soldiers, adherents and employees. The PSO provides independent support and action for persons who wish to complain about the unprofessional or abusive behaviour of Salvation Army personnel. There are no Salvation Army Officers working in the PSO.

Importantly, The Salvation Army in the ACT, NSW and Queensland adopts a Restorative Approach to issues relating to current and historic abuse. This approach allows us to work with victims in their journey toward personal restoration as opposed to adopting an adversarial or legal approach.

The full-time Territorial Integrity Coordinator allows the PSO to understand complaints about abusive behaviour and to provide an independent review. Part of this role is to support complainants and to progress complaints to the senior leadership of The Salvation Army. The PSO is also supported by a Child Protection Coordinator who is responsible for education and for maintaining standards for those working with children under 18 years old. The PSO also has the services of four other staff who assist in various ways by receiving and communicating with persons who make complaints. These staff sometimes assist with compiling information in support of complaints.

What does this mean for former residents of our children’s homes? As a former resident, you may want to locate information about your past. The Salvation Army may have some records you knew nothing about; records that might help you connect some of dots about your past. Some former residents have been quite surprised by the information that existed about their past. This has even included letters from parents which tell a story about why the child was placed into a home.

You may just want to tell someone about your experiences as a child in a home. You might want to let the Army know how you feel about the time you spent at one of the homes. It could be a personal experience or something happened that was just not right, or it may be about abuse you have suffered. We have spoken with some people who wanted to talk about the abuse they suffered from their parents and then how similar abuse continued in a Salvation Army home. Whatever your concern about your time in a Salvation Army home, our office wants to help or refer you to the right place. We welcome the opportunity to help you.

We encourage you (or a support person if you prefer) to contact the Professional Standards Office in the Eastern Territory either by phoning the Territorial Integrity Officer, Mr Peter Hatte, on 02-9226-9779, emailing him on peter.hatte@aye.salvationarmy.org or by writing to him at The Salvation Army, PO Box A435, Sydney South NSW 1235. We hope to have all this information (and more) up and running on our new information website later this year. The site will provide all this information plus historical information and photos from Salvation Army homes. It will also include an acknowledgement of the past wrongs. We will include recently completed research about our homes in Australia. This will be publicly available and we will ask CLAN to link to the site for the information of members.
What about the actual process of making a complaint? The following steps outline the process for someone who was abused while in Salvation Army care.

1. Either the Integrity Coordinator or our administrative assistant will take your initial inquiry.

2. First, we will acknowledge what has happened to you. That will be done by phone, email or letter.

3. We will then follow up with a letter containing information about the rest of the process, including details of information we will need from you.

4. We will undertake searches through our Family Tracing Unit, which maintains records on all Salvation Army Homes, to locate as much information as we can about your time in care. We can make this information available to you if you would like a copy.

5. We will ask you to prepare a written statement about your time in care and how the abuse impacted on you at the time and later in your life. We call this an ‘Impact Statement’. We know this can be difficult for some people to do, and we try to help in those circumstances by arranging some assistance.

6. Once your statement is prepared, it is forwarded to the PSO. It will then go before a special committee of approximately 9 people from various areas of The Salvation Army including the PSO Manager and the Territorial Integrity Coordinator. This committee meets once a month and all matters are kept confidential. Basic details will be noted about your matter and the Committee will authorise our Integrity Coordinator to arrange a time and place to meet you.

7. The Integrity Coordinator will meet with you at a time and place that suits you (accompanied by a female support person). The purpose of this is to allow the Coordinator to hear about your past experiences and how these things affected your life from your time in the home up to the present day. It will help us understand your current circumstances, including relationships and health. It’s also a time when you can tell ‘the face of The Salvation Army’ exactly how you feel about what happened to you and how it has impacted on your life. You will also have the opportunity to let The Salvation Army know what you want out of this process. If you feel that you would rather speak only to a male or female, this can be easily arranged. In any case we will raise these issues with you prior to any face to face visit with you. Unless specifically requested no Salvation Army Officers are involved in this part of the process.

8. After your meeting with the Coordinator your Impact Statement will be read in full at the next Committee meeting. This will be followed by a written and verbal report from the Coordinator about his visit with you, which will include how your time in the Home has impacted on your life and all the details and comments you want to relay to The Salvation Army. The Committee will also hear what you think should happen as a result.

9. The Committee will consider, in confidence, the details you set out in your Impact Statement, the information provided by the Coordinator about the visit, and details of any records obtained from Family Tracing about your time in the Home.

10. The Committee will then make a decision within its delegated authority. The Committee has the discretion to respond in a number of ways, including the offer of medical/counselling support for you (and in some cases your family), financial assistance, or some form of assistance that may be unique to your particular circumstances. It is important to note that the Committee recognises that they cannot change what has happened in the past just by offering support and/or money. The Committee is very aware that no amount of support or money can truly compensate you for abuse that happened to you while in a home.

11. After the Committee has made a decision, the Coordinator will call or visit you again to talk with you about the decision. The PSO will also send you a letter outlining how your matter was received by those on the Committee. It may also include some formal offer.
Appendix 6: Code of Conduct for Working with Children and Young People, The Salvation Army Eastern Territory

The Salvation Army is committed to saving, nurturing, and raising up children and youth to be passionate disciples of Jesus Christ.

We support the rights of the child, and will act without hesitation to ensure a safe and caring environment is maintained at all times. We also support the rights and wellbeing of our ministry workers and encourage your active participation in building and maintaining a secure environment for all participants.

I will:
- Work as part of a ministry team to fulfill to the best of my ability specific roles and tasks given to me.
- Work under the leadership of my Corps Officer and team leader, and be accountable to them for my ministry with children/youth.
- Be aware of the imbalance of power inherent in adult-child/youth relationships.
- Treat all children and youth with respect and conduct myself at all times in a way that is a positive example to the children/youth I serve, so that my attitude and language affirms dignity and self worth.
- Build appropriate relationships with children/youth and their families in a transparent manner, so I am a positive role model and worthy representative of The Salvation Army.
- Engage in respectful and transparent ways when using electronic communication with the children and youth in my programs.
- Respect cultural differences.
- Maintain a childsafe environment for children and young people.
- Raise all concerns, issues and problems with my team leader as soon as possible.

I will not:
- Behave in any way that may harm children/youth or be seen as abusive or bullying whether verbally, emotionally, physically, sexually or spiritually.
- Make sexually suggestive comments to, or in the presence of, children/youth, even as a joke.
- Engage in inappropriate physical contact of any kind including tough physical play or physical reprimand.
- Smoke, take alcohol or use harmful drugs when supervising or working with children or youth.
- Act in any way that shows unfair and differential treatment of children/youth.
- Photograph or video a child or young person without the consent of the child or young person and his/her parents or guardians.

Failure to comply with this Code of Conduct may mean that I will be asked to withdraw from children's/youth ministry.

I accept the above Code of Conduct and agree to:
- Identify with the aims of The Salvation Army as stated above and to actively demonstrate this in my childrens/youth ministry position.
- Follow organisational policy and guidelines around the safety and care of children and youth as outlined in the Caring for Kids manuals.
- Commit to my own growth and development as a childrens/youth ministry worker and in my faith journey, by participating in relevant training and worship.

Signed: [Name]
Date: [Date]
Name in full: [Name]
Corps Officer's signature: [Signature]
To obtain more copies of this publication, contact The Salvation Army, Australia Eastern Territory, Professional Standards Office, on 02 9266 9781.