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The Family and Community Development Committee is requested to inquire into, consider and report to the Parliament of Victoria on the processes by which religious and other non-government organisations respond to the criminal abuse of children by personnel within their organisations, including:

1) the practices, policies and protocols in such organisations for the handling of allegations of criminal abuse of children, including measures put in place by various organisations in response to concerns about such abuse within the organisation or the potential for such abuse to occur;

2) whether there are systemic practices in such organisations that operate to preclude or discourage the reporting of suspected criminal abuse of children to State authorities; and

3) whether changes to law or to practices, policies and protocols in such organisations are required to help prevent criminal abuse of children by personnel in such organisations and to deal with allegations of such abuse.

In undertaking the inquiry, the Committee should be mindful of not encroaching upon the responsibilities of investigatory agencies or the courts in relation to particular cases or prejudicing the conduct or outcome of investigations or court proceedings.

The Committee is requested to report to the Parliament no later than 30 April 2013.*

* The deadline for reporting was subsequently extended to 15 November 2013
Chair’s foreword

On receiving our terms of reference, it was immediately evident that our Committee had been tasked with a significant and historic Inquiry. It is the first of its kind in Victoria and it has been challenging on many levels—for the victims who re-lived their traumatic experiences, for the community hearing their accounts, and for trusted non-government organisations opening themselves to scrutiny and conceding wrongdoings.

The criminal abuse of children is unacceptable in any form. It symbolises a departure from morals that are the touchstone of our humanity and our society.

The community rightly expects that it should be able to trust non-government organisations that take children into their care to engage in activities for learning, development, enjoyment or for treatment or other care they may require.

Children cannot be expected to protect themselves against the crime of abuse in organisations. We as a community must take responsibility for upholding their rights.

Our Inquiry has resulted in recommendations that we trust will provide a foundation for the protection of our children into the future. They will require non-government organisations to adequately prevent and respond to the criminal abuse of children. We have also recommended avenues of justice for those children who are now adults and seek vindication for past wrongs.

In our deliberations, we discussed the best way to create a practical and cost-effective umbrella of protections to ensure that children participating in activities will be safe from predators as far as reasonably possible. Putting aside the complexities of their design and implementation, the nature of the reforms required in Victoria is relatively straightforward.

The criminal abuse of children involves extremely serious breaches of the laws of our community. Those who engage in it, or are in positions of authority and conceal such offences, should be dealt with under the criminal law. Non-government organisations must be expected to adequately protect children in their care and respond to any allegations of criminal offences by reporting to the police and relevant authorities. Victims should have access to appropriate avenues to pursue justice for the harm they have suffered. Our recommendations reflect these essential principles.

To inform our recommendations, we ensured we heard from individual victims and their families regarding their personal experiences, insights and suggestions for reform. We also wanted to provide a genuine opportunity for their experiences to be publicly acknowledged on behalf of the people of Victoria. While often confronting, it was a privilege to hear and read the hundreds of accounts of adult victims who courageously provided their evidence in hearings and submissions. These accounts contributed significantly to our understanding of the harm caused by the physical, emotional and sexual abuse of children.

We acknowledge those victims who were unable to participate in the Inquiry—who remain locked in silence, who found the re-telling of their experience too traumatic, or who have taken their lives as a consequence of their lifelong internal struggle and pain.
The evidence provided by parents and family members also helped us to gain greater insight into the wide-ranging effects of criminal child abuse in organisations. We heard how parents and others feel deeply responsible and naive for having placed their trust in individuals and organisations that ultimately betrayed them.

At all stages we pledged to conduct a thorough Inquiry, not a hasty one. We sought to ensure that our analysis of written, oral and documentary evidence was rigorous and that any inferences or conclusions we reached were soundly based.

We also promised not to impinge on the responsibilities of the police and the courts and at the outset established referral pathways to ensure that criminal allegations were responded to appropriately and that people received professional advice on pursuing criminal and civil options. Victoria Police and the Victims Support Agency provided tremendous support and expertise at every stage of the Inquiry. Having created these parallel processes, we worked collaboratively with the SANO Task Force that was established to investigate historic and new allegations that emanated from our Inquiry.

It is significant that this Inquiry has been conducted by a Parliamentary Committee. It is an important reminder of the special powers that our Parliament is privileged to hold. It has highlighted Parliament’s capacity to consider and expose issues that may otherwise not be revealed.

The members of our Committee put aside party affiliations and worked cooperatively to hear the evidence, to deliberate on our findings and to determine the necessary recommendations. I thank them for their compassion, their dedication and for the collective sense of responsibility we all felt towards those affected by the crime of child abuse.

In undertaking this task, we were excellently supported by a team of expert advisers, a committed and skilled Secretariat, experienced Hansard reporters, and the professional counselling and de-briefing services of Carfi.

Our Inquiry marks the beginning. Having confronted and exposed hidden truths in trusted organisations, we look forward to seeing our recommendations implemented and non-government organisations actively reforming their approaches to protecting children and honouring their commitment in this Inquiry to participate in any new schemes or monitoring structures that may be established.

I am confident that members of the Victorian community would not want any reason for an inquiry of this nature to be repeated in the future. This is an opportunity to set a new benchmark for the protection of our children.

Georgie Crozier, MP
Chair
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Glossary

**Alternative dispute resolution**—An umbrella term for processes other than judicial determination in which an impartial person assists those in a dispute to resolve the issues between them.

**Alternative justice**—Includes a spectrum of approaches that provide avenues for resolving cases and claims outside the traditional justice system. Victims of criminal child abuse can access alternative justice through the traditional justice system in the form of court ordered mediation, statutory bodies such as the Victims of Crime Assistance Tribunal (VOCAT) or through external avenues or non-government protocols.

**Canon law**—Canon law is the internal ecclesiastical law governing the Catholic Church (both Latin rite and Eastern Catholic churches). Canon law provides the structure and parameters for all governance in the Catholic Church.

**Care leaver**—Refers to a person who was in institutional care or other form of out-of-home care, including foster care, as a child or youth (or both) at some time during the 20th century. Care-leavers include Forgotten Australians, former child migrants and people from the Stolen Generations. Institutions were operated either by the State or by non-government and religious organisations who received per head payments from the Government or parents for the care of children.

**Catholic Church**—All references in this Report to the Catholic Church, including the Catholic Church in Victoria, relate to the Roman Catholic Church.

**Child-related work**—Paid or unpaid work involving regular direct and unsupervised contact with a child when working with or caring for children in any of the occupational categories listed in the *Working with Children Act 2005* (Vic). See Appendix 4.

**Child-safe organisation**—An organisation that acknowledges that safety does not just happen. A child-safe organisation takes action to protect children from physical, sexual, emotional, psychological and cultural abuse and from neglect. In a child-safe organisation, this commitment to protecting children is embedded in the organisation’s culture and responsibility for taking action is understood and accepted at all levels of the organisation.²

**Church authority**—Refers to the bishop or leader of a religious congregation. Priests and religious report to a church authority. For example, a priest is under the auspices of the bishop of their diocese whereas a member of a religious order is under the auspices of the leader of their specific religious order.

**Civil litigation**—A court process for victims of criminal child abuse to sue the perpetrator of the abuse (or possibly another party for failing to prevent the abuse e.g. the organisation for whom the perpetrator is a representative) for ‘damages’ or financial compensation for the harm suffered.

---


Commission for Children and Young People—An agency independent of government, established under the Children and Young People Act 2012 (Vic) that is able to table its annual report to Parliament along with the outcomes of any systemic reviews it initiates. The Commission commenced operation on 1 March 2013 and replaced the Office of the Child Safety Commissioner.

Criminal child abuse—Includes unlawful physical assaults, sexual abuse offences, such as rape or indecent assault under the Crimes Act 1958 (Vic), criminal neglect and facilitating such offences by others.

Cummins Inquiry—The Protecting Victoria’s vulnerable children inquiry was announced on 31 January 2011. The Inquiry was tasked to investigate systemic problems in Victoria’s child protection system and to make recommendations to strengthen and improve the protection and support of vulnerable young Victorians. The Inquiry Panel comprised The Hon Philip D Cummins (Chair), Emeritus Professor Dorothy Scott OAM and Mr Bill Scales AO. It presented its report to the Victorian Minister for Community Services on 27 January 2012.

Grooming—The term ‘grooming’ refers to actions deliberately undertaken with the aim of befriending and influencing a child, and in some circumstances, members of the child’s family. It is engaged in with the intention to achieve a criminal objective of sexual activity with children.

Improper conduct—Corrupt conduct or conduct that is not corrupt conduct but that, if proved, would constitute a criminal offence; or reasonable grounds for dismissing or dispensing with, or otherwise terminating, the services of the personnel in an organisation who was, or is, engaged in that conduct.

Independent school—Non-government schools but excluding Catholic Schools. Independent schools include, for example, schools affiliated with some Christian denominations such as Anglican, Lutheran, Presbyterian, non-denominational Christian schools, Islamic schools, Jewish schools, Montessori schools, Rudolf Steiner schools, Aboriginal community schools and schools that specialise in meeting the needs of students with disabilities. Most independent schools are set up and governed independently on an individual-school basis. However some independent schools with common aims and educational philosophies are governed and administered as small systems, for example the Lutheran system. 3

Law Enforcement Assistance program (LEAP)—The database used by Victoria Police to store particulars of all crimes brought to the attention of police members.4

Mandatory reporting—Introduced in Victoria in 1993, mandatory reporting requires prescribed professionals to notify state child protection services in the Department of Human Services if they have any reasonable belief that a child is in need of protection because the child has suffered or likely to suffer significant harm as a result of physical injury, emotional, psychological or sexual abuse.5 The

---
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A legislative framework for mandatory reporting is now covered by the Children Youth and Family Act 2005 (Vic) though it remains in a similar form to that introduced in 1993.

**Melbourne Response**—The Melbourne Archdiocese Response (also known as the 'Melbourne Response') was established by the Catholic Archdiocese of Melbourne in October 1996 to deal with complaints about priests, religious and lay workers under the direction of the Archbishop of Melbourne.

**Ministers of religion**—Those who perform spiritual functions associated with beliefs and practices of religious faiths and provide motivation, guidance and training in religious life for the people of congregations and parishes, and the wider community.

**Nominal defendant**—A term used by the Committee to refer to a defendant to a litigation trial that can stand in the shoes of an organisation that cannot be sued in its own name due to its legal structure.

**Non-delegable duty of care**—A duty that requires a party to take reasonable care to ensure the safety of individuals, which cannot be assigned to someone else. An example is the relationship between a school authority and its students. A school authority has a duty to take reasonable care to ensure that any act or omission by a teacher does not cause reasonably foreseeable injury to students.\(^6\)

**Non-government school**—Schools that are not operated by the Victorian Government, including Catholic and independent schools.

**Non-government organisations**—Include secular, religious and community organisations. Organisations can be clubs, associations, agencies and any other entity or group of entities. The nature, size, purpose and scope of non-government organisations are diverse and their structure and operations are wide ranging. This includes:

- incorporated or unincorporated organisations not-for-profit or for profit organisations
- volunteer-based organisations
- unfunded or government funded organisations
- local, national and international organisations.

**Organisations**—This Report uses the term 'organisation' interchangeably with 'non-government organisation'. See also 'non-government organisations'.

**Out-of-home care**—Out-of-home care services provide care for children and young people aged up to 17 years who are placed away from their parents or family home for reasons of safety or family crisis. These reasons include abuse, neglect or harm, illness of a parent and/or the inability of parents to provide adequate care. Placements may be voluntary or made in conjunction with care and protection orders.

**Personnel**—Refers to paid employees, volunteers, contractors, ministers of religion, religious leaders, and others associated with a non-government organisation for the purposes of assisting it to carry out its purpose and functions.

---

Reasonable grounds for belief—The nature of the facts required to be established to demonstrate reasonable grounds for a suspicion or belief are different, as facts sufficient to found a suspicion may be insufficient to ground a belief.

A belief is based on reasonable grounds that criminal child abuse has occurred when all known considerations or facts relevant to the formation of a belief are taken into account and these are objectively assessed. Circumstances or considerations may include the source of the allegation and how it was communicated, the nature of and details of the allegation, whether there are any other related matters known regarding the alleged perpetrator.

Regulation—Regulation is one of the key instruments available to government to achieve its social, economic and environment objectives and to respond to community needs. It is commonly held that government regulation involves an intentional measure or intervention by a government agency that seeks to influence the behaviour of individuals, businesses and not-for-profit organisations.7

Relevant Authority—Refers to a statutory authority or government department that requires non-government organisations to report critical incidents, misconduct or other matters. For example, the Victorian Institute of Teaching, the Department of Human Services and the Department of Education and Early Childhood Development.

Religious—In the context of the Catholic Church ‘religious’ refers to priests and to brothers or sisters of orders or congregations of the Catholic faith. For example, ‘religious were teachers in many Catholic schools’.

SANO Task Force—Established to investigate historic and new allegations that have emanated from this Inquiry. The Task Force will also coordinate investigations emerging from the Australian Government Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse.

Secondary victims—In the context of abuse that occurs outside the family, secondary victims include family members, partners, friends and children of victims/survivors who are affected by a victim’s criminal abuse and its consequences.

Serious Indictable Crime—Pursuant to s.325(6) of the Crimes Act 1958 (Vic), a serious indictable offence means an indictable offence which is punishable on first conviction with imprisonment for life or for a term of five years or more.

Sexual Offences and Child Abuse Investigation Team (SOCIT)—A division of Victoria Police, the 27 SOCIT units handle reports of the sexual abuse of children across Victoria. Members of the police who work within a SOCIT unit receive specialised training on sexual offending and child abuse.

Situational crime prevention—Tackles specific crimes in specific locations where the crime event and not the offender is the object of interest. A primary objective of situational crime prevention is to reduce opportunities to offend by making the social and physical environment high risk for offending behaviour.
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**Statute of limitations**—In contrast to criminal matters, the statute of limitations in Victoria (the Limitation of Actions Act 1958 (Vic)) applies to restrict the time within which a party can issue a civil case for compensation.

**Survivor of child abuse**—Refers to a person who has survived criminal child abuse. Some people prefer to the term ‘survivor’ and others prefer ‘victim’. See also ‘victim’.

**Towards Healing**—Established by the Catholic Church in March 1997 to deal with complaints that arose in Catholic dioceses and religious institutes operating in Victoria and Australia other than the Catholic Archdiocese of Melbourne.

**Vicarious liability**—The legal liability of one person for the misconduct of another, despite the first person being free from fault. It has traditionally applied to employment of service and has been applied to some similar relationships such as contractors. However, vicarious liability does not apply in all types of relationships. At present vicarious liability generally applies only in employer–employee and contractor–principal relationships.

**Working with Children Check**—The Working with Children Act 2005 (Vic) regulates how the government determines who is suitable to work with or care for children and young people. People who work with children on a regular basis must apply for a Working with Children check and employers, volunteer organisations and employment agencies must not engage anyone in child-related work without a current ‘positive assessment notice’ or Working with Children Check card.8

**Victim**—Refers to people who have experienced criminal child abuse. The Committee acknowledges victims have also survived their experience of abuse. For the purposes of its Inquiry, the Committee refers to ‘victims’, while recognising that victims are also survivors of criminal child abuse and that some people prefer to the term ‘survivor’ and others prefer ‘victim’.

---

# Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>Australian Bureau of Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACA</td>
<td>Australian Camps Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACBC</td>
<td>Australian Catholic Bishops Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACF</td>
<td>Australian Childhood Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACNC</td>
<td>Australian Charities and Not-for-profits Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>Australian Capital Territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIFS</td>
<td>Australian Institute of Family Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIHW</td>
<td>Australian Institute of Health and Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AusAID</td>
<td>Australian Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASA</td>
<td>Centre Against Sexual Assault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>Catholic Church Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEOB</td>
<td>Catholic Education Office Ballarat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEOM</td>
<td>Catholic Education Office Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAN</td>
<td>Care Leavers Australia Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COAG</td>
<td>Council of Australian Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>Child sexual abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSOs</td>
<td>Community service organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYF Act</td>
<td><em>Children, Youth and Families Act 2005 (Vic)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEECD</td>
<td>Department of Education and Early Childhood Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>Department of Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOJ</td>
<td>Department of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPP</td>
<td>Director of Public Prosecutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS</td>
<td>Director of Professional Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVA</td>
<td>Department of Veterans Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETR Act</td>
<td><em>Education and Training Reform Act 2006 (Vic)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAQ</td>
<td>Frequently asked questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCDC</td>
<td>Family and Community Development Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISV</td>
<td>Independent Schools Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCCV</td>
<td>Jewish Community Council of Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAP</td>
<td>Law Enforcement Assistance Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIV</td>
<td>Law Institute of Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRCC</td>
<td>Military Rehabilitation and Compensation Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCPS</td>
<td>National Committee for Professional Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>New South Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPCEI</td>
<td>Office for Professional Conduct, Ethics and Investigations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSB</td>
<td>Professional Standards Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC</td>
<td>Professional Standards Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSRB</td>
<td>Professional Standards Review Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTSD</td>
<td>Post-traumatic stress disorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QARD</td>
<td>Quality Assessment and Regulation Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>Queensland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIMPA</td>
<td>Records and Information Management Professionals Australasia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>South Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNAP</td>
<td>Survivors Network of those Abused by Priests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIT</td>
<td>Sexual Offences and Child Abuse Investigation Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOR Act</td>
<td><em>Sex Offenders Registration Act 2004 (Vic)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>Victorian Transport Accident Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations International Children’s Emergency Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACP</td>
<td>Victims Assistance and Counselling Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAGO</td>
<td>Victoria Auditor-General’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCAT</td>
<td>Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIT</td>
<td>Victorian Institute of Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VLRC</td>
<td>Victorian Law Reform Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOCAT</td>
<td>Victims of Crime Assistance Tribunal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSA</td>
<td>Victims Support Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VVCS</td>
<td>Veterans and Veterans Families Counselling Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWC Act</td>
<td><em>Working with Children Act 2005 (Vic)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWCC</td>
<td>Working with Children Check</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive summary

Each year hundreds of thousands of children and young people in Victoria spend time involved with religious and other non-government organisations. These organisations provide a broad range of valuable services and social programs including child care, education, social activities, spiritual guidance and sports and recreation programs. Some organisations also provide temporary or permanent residential care away from the family.

The overwhelming majority of children who participate in organisational activities or who are cared for by personnel in non-government organisations are safe and they gain great benefit from engaging in such activities and services.

Given children’s vulnerability and dependence on adults, however, there will always be a degree of risk of them being criminally abused by employees or others associated with non-government organisations. The community now acknowledges the incidence of criminal abuse over many years in some of society’s most trusted and respected institutions and organisations.

The criminal abuse of children represents a departure of the gravest kind from the standards of decency fundamental to any civilised society. Although our society has understood this for a long time, we have not given enough attention to the need to take adequate protective measures to prevent it.

The experience of criminal child abuse has profound and lifelong consequences for the physical, psychological and emotional wellbeing of victims. For parents of children abused in the care of trusted organisations, it is a betrayal beyond comprehension.

Community outrage at the occurrence of criminal child abuse in organisations has led to the establishment of public inquiries internationally, nationally and in Victoria. Notably in Australia, religious organisations have generally been overlooked in these inquiries. In addition, religious organisations in Victoria have generally not initiated internal reviews to determine the extent of criminal child abuse and how their systems and processes may have contributed to its occurrence.

Religious organisations are among the most revered and trusted institutions in society. Internationally, the exposure of systemic child abuse in religious organisations has called into question this trust and the integrity of some of these organisations. The Catholic Church, in particular, has been at the centre of a worldwide scandal.

The 2012 Cummins Inquiry\(^1\) identified concerns regarding the handling of criminal child abuse in religious organisations in Victoria, and recommended that:

> A formal investigation should be conducted into the processes by which religious organisations respond to the criminal abuse of children by religious personnel within their organisations.\(^2\)

---

In response to this recommendation and through the Governor in Council, the Victorian Government requested that the joint investigatory Family and Community Development Committee undertake an inquiry into these processes. Members of Parliament from multiple political parties and both Houses of Parliament comprise the Committee.

In establishing this Inquiry, the Government requested the Committee inquire into responses to criminal child abuse by all non-government organisations that interact directly with children. In addition to its primary focus on religious organisations, the Committee has considered recreational, sporting, childcare, education, community and other child-related services and activities operated by non-government organisations.

**Confronting and exposing the truth**

In undertaking its Inquiry, the Committee asked some obvious but fundamental questions about the occurrence of criminal child abuse in religious and other non-government organisations:

- what is the extent of criminal child abuse in organisations and how has it been able to occur
- why was it not addressed long ago
- is the abuse to be properly viewed as the activity of a relatively few aberrant individuals for which they alone could be held responsible
- are there others (including the leadership of organisations involved) that contributed through organisational cultures, structures and policies, and that should be held accountable
- what should we do now to secure justice for those who have suffered and continue to do so
- how do we, as a community, protect children in the future?

Non-government organisations cooperated at every stage of the Inquiry, assisting the Committee to find answers to these questions by giving evidence, providing additional information and enabling access to relevant files.

Evidence and information provided to the Inquiry showed that even today, leaders of some non-government organisations are reluctant to fully acknowledge that they adopted policies that gave first priority to protecting the interests of their organisation. It is beyond dispute that some trusted organisations made a deliberate choice not to follow processes for reporting and responding to allegations of criminal child abuse.

There has been a substantial body of credible evidence presented to the Inquiry and ultimately concessions made by senior representatives of religious bodies, including the Catholic Church, that they had taken steps with the direct objective of concealing wrongdoing.

The Committee welcomed the commitment made by many organisations during the course of the Inquiry to actively cooperate with any new schemes that the Victorian Government establishes in response to the Inquiry’s recommendations. The CEO of the Catholic Church’s Truth, Justice and Healing Council, Mr Francis Sullivan, recently stated that the community should ‘judge us on our actions’. It is reasonable for the community to expect that organisations will honour their undertakings.

---

Victims of criminal child abuse

Central to the Inquiry has been the experiences of victims who were subjected to physical, sexual and emotional abuse in their childhood. The task of the Committee has been to focus on systemic issues, not to report on what occurred in individual cases. In order to understand the overall situation, however, it has examined hundreds of individual accounts.

In addition to its systemic focus, an important responsibility of the Committee has been to provide a genuine opportunity for the personal experiences, insights and recommendations of individual victims and their families to be publicly acknowledged on behalf of the people of Victoria. The community has also been able to hear the views of the various groups that have supported victims and their families.

The majority of evidence received by the Inquiry related to the criminal abuse of children within the Catholic Church in Victoria—in their parishes, schools and homes—and also within the Salvation Army. Most accounts were provided by adult victims who disclosed their experience a long time after the abuse occurred. For many it was the first time they had been given the opportunity and support to disclose their abuse. The Committee valued the courage of the hundreds of victims who shared their experiences. They contributed significantly to its knowledge and understanding of the crime of child abuse in non-government organisations.

Experiences and impacts

The Committee heard graphic accounts that detailed horrendous and traumatic experiences of victims abused as children in the care of non-government organisations that spanned a period of decades through to more recent times.

Victims provided confronting accounts of their feelings of fear and helplessness when subjected to physical, emotional and sexual abuse by personnel in organisations. In circumstances of sexual abuse, many explained that as children they lacked the intellectual framework to understand their abuse. They spoke of subsequent feelings of guilt and embarrassment, and a belief that they needed to conceal what they felt was a deeply shameful secret.

Children not in the care of their families told of their experiences of criminal abuse in institutions and the feeling of losing their identities. Many absconded only to be returned and subjected to further abuse.

Sexual and other criminal offences committed against children are not a new phenomenon. The Committee challenged the assertion by some non-government organisations that child abuse had been poorly understood in the past:

- When was the commission of a sexual offence upon a child not a matter of great seriousness under our criminal law, against the principles of all of our various religious faiths, and abhorrent to our community?
- When was it not understood that children are vulnerable to physical and sexual abuse and that they need protection?
- How many complaints or established incidents of abuse would be necessary before it was acknowledged that a systemic problem existed within some organisations, and that their structures, processes and cultures required full investigation?
Conduct of this kind has been condemned by society for centuries. It has attracted severe penalties under our criminal law for a long time. Up until 1949 buggery of a child under the age of 14 and rape were offences that carried the death penalty.4

Expert knowledge of the effects of child abuse has been in the public domain since the 1960s.5 It is widely recognised that children subjected to criminal abuse in organisations and institutions often experience lifelong impacts that include mental health problems, addiction issues, relationship difficulties, issues with anger and difficulties with life skills, education and employment.

In addition, the consequences of criminal abuse suffered by children in organisations and institutions can be intensified due to the often high moral standing of the perpetrator. More specifically, children abused by a minister of religion or a spiritual leader have been found to develop a sense of alienation from the world.6 Abuse by a trusted religious figure can destroy a child’s belief that the world is a safe place and can make the world seem chaotic and unstructured.7 Like most people, victims want the opportunity to feel safe and to belong to their community.

The effects of criminal child abuse in organisations also extend to families. Parents explained to the Inquiry their feelings of profound guilt that they had not protected their child and had been drawn in by the grooming tactics of the perpetrator. Some victims of child abuse blamed their parents for not protecting them. Inquiry participants told the Committee of their families being fragmented and damaged as a consequence of the abuse a family member has experienced.

Some local communities, particularly religious communities, have been ruptured by the responses of organisations to criminal child abuse by their employees and other personnel. Community members spoke of a loss of trust in organisations they had previously held in high regard.

These impacts of the criminal abuse of children in the care of organisations have implications for society more broadly, including significant costs to the community in expenditure on health and education, as well as productivity loss.

**Pursuit of justice—‘unfinished business’**

Adult victims of criminal child abuse by personnel in trusted organisations told the Inquiry they were seeking justice for what they often felt to be the loss of their innocence as a child. They wanted to see consequences for perpetrators—to see them removed from their position in the organisation, reported to police and potentially punished through the criminal justice system.

Victims also had hopes and expectations that organisations they had trusted would acknowledge that they failed in their duty of care to protect them from the harm of criminal abuse. They hoped organisations would listen to their experiences

---

4 See Appendix 3 for a list of penalties.
and validate them by providing an expression of remorse and a meaningful acknowledgement of wrongdoing.

The Committee heard, however, that many victims were not given the basic level of respect they expected and deserved. Organisations often did not assume responsibility for the harm victims had suffered, and sometimes even concealed the truth. Victims spoke of ‘unfinished business’ and resentment resulting from the inadequate response of the organisation to their disclosure of abuse.

Adding to victims’ sense of injustice was their feeling of betrayal by organisations, particularly the Catholic Church. This feeling resulted from the inconsistent approaches by organisations to victims versus offenders—that is, giving inadequate support to victims, while providing pastoral, legal and financial support to offenders. They spoke of unfulfilled promises by leaders in the organisation and the trivialising of their experiences.

In determining its recommendations, the Committee considered the suggestions for reform from victims and their families in addition to the evidence of other participants and experts. It identified the following important areas for reform:

- Stronger requirements for organisations to take responsibility to protect children in their care including taking reasonable steps to protect them from criminal abuse.
- Improved responses to allegations of criminal child abuse in non-government organisations, including oversight of these responses by an independent body and compulsory reporting to police.
- Reforms to the criminal law to improve the potential for perpetrators and those who conceal their crimes to be prosecuted and punished, and the introduction of grooming as separate offence.
- Reforms to civil laws to make it easier for victims to sue non-government organisations.
- An independent, alternative avenue of justice for those who cannot make a claim through the civil justice system.

These reforms are discussed in depth in this Report and briefly outlined here.

**Context—criminal child abuse in organisations**

In order to identify strategies to improve responses to the criminal abuse of children in non-government organisations, it is necessary to understand the scale of the problem, the nature of the organisations relevant to the Inquiry, and the risks of abuse occurring within them. To assist in improving processes into the future, it is equally important to understand how religious and non-government organisations have handled allegations of the criminal abuse of children in the past.

There is no way today that we can accurately count the total number of victims of criminal child abuse in non-government organisations. But based on what we do know, and recognising the reluctance of victims to report such offences, we can reasonably estimate that there have been several thousand victims criminally abused in non-government organisations in Victoria alone.

The internal structure and culture of organisations can influence the level of risk that personnel could criminally abuse children in their care, and organisations
must actively seek to address those risks. Notably, there is no ‘typical’ offender who criminally abuses children in organisations. Perpetrators of child sexual abuse, for example, range from those who are predatory, using grooming tactics to gain access to children, to those who are more opportunistic and take advantage of a situation or an opportunity to offend.

**Non-government organisations—Inquiry focus**

The diversity of the non-government organisations that participated in the Inquiry reflected the broad range of activities and services these organisations engage in across Victoria. The purpose, size, available resources and structure of the organisations varied considerably.

The Committee identified that there are unique circumstances that victims of criminal child abuse experience in religious organisations. While the extent of abuse in these settings compared with other organisations is difficult to ascertain, the Committee heard that children subjected to criminal abuse have been less likely to be adequately protected in religious organisations than in any other group in society. There are many reasons for this, including the policy of forgiveness, the self-protection of many religious organisations and their trusted, revered status in society.

Non-government organisations and their interactions with children continually evolve and the nature of organisations 70 to 80 years ago is markedly different from organisations today. While the functions and activities of organisations may evolve over time, organisational culture is often more resistant to change. This has implications for the way in which organisations respond to the criminal abuse of children by personnel in their organisations.

**Past handling of criminal child abuse by organisations**

The Committee noted that organisations have been handling criminal child abuse by people employed or associated with them for a long time, and the majority of the evidence from victims to the Inquiry indicated that between the 1950s and 1980s the response of specific organisations to such abuse was seriously inadequate and sometimes non-existent, particularly in religious organisations.

Reflecting on past responses to the criminal abuse of children can provide insights into how organisations have evolved in their systems and processes over time. It also assists in understanding the enduring nature of organisational culture and the extent to which organisations learn from past mistakes.

To better understand their past handling of this problem, the Committee focused particularly on the religious organisations that the majority of evidence and other information received concerned—that is, the Catholic Church in Victoria, the Salvation Army and the Anglican Diocese of Melbourne.

Evidence to the Inquiry revealed that historically these organisations were often motivated by self-interest and the protection of the organisation. This resulted in serious consequences for the safety and protection of children.

---

8 Transcript of evidence, Professor Patrick Parkinson, University of Sydney, Melbourne, 19 October 2012, p. 3.
9 Transcript of evidence, Professor Patrick Parkinson, p. 3.
In regard to the Catholic Church specifically, the Committee found that rather than being instrumental in exposing the criminal abuse of children and the extent of the problem, senior leaders of the Church:

- trivialised the problem
- contributed to abuse not being disclosed or not being responded to at all prior to the 1990s
- ensured that the Victorian community remained uninformed of the abuse
- ensured that perpetrators were not held accountable, with the tragic result being that children continued to be abused by some religious personnel when it could have been avoided.

Analysis of the Catholic Church’s past handling of this problem shows that as an organisation it had many of the internal features of an organisation at high risk of its personnel perpetrating criminal child abuse. These features include its:

- trusted role in caring for children
- culture and power
- complex hierarchy and structure
- teachings and beliefs
- processes for responding to allegations—including the failure to report abuse to the police
- response to alleged offenders—including the relocation and movement of offenders and failure to suspend them from their duties.

The Committee found that other organisations, particularly other religious organisations, share many of these features, which have continued to influence the responses of many organisations to allegations of criminal child abuse to the present day. The Committee considered that such features and consequent responses by organisations may help to explain why many victims remain aggrieved. Importantly, the way in which an organisation has handled reports of suspected criminal child abuse is inextricably linked to the desire of victims for justice.

Reforms—inquiries, policy and legislation

In response to public inquiries, community outrage and media attention, governments have given greater attention to the protection of children from abuse over the past two decades.

The introduction of mandatory reporting in 1993 was a significant development for the protection of children from abuse in families. This made it mandatory for professionals in specific occupations that involve working with children to report suspected child abuse within families to child protection services in the Department of Human Services (DHS). It enabled the Victorian Government to more effectively identify children at risk in families and to intervene early to reduce the risk, and when necessary, remove children from the care of their parent/s or primary carer/s.

In Victoria, important policy and legislative developments relating to the protection of children in the context of organisations have been more recent and include the establishment of the Working with Children Check system in 2005 and the creation
of an independent Commission for Children and Young People in 2012, which is responsible for promoting child-safe organisations and for conducting inquiries into service provision relating to the safety and wellbeing of an individual or a group of vulnerable children. Yet the Inquiry revealed that there is still more to be done.

**Prevention—organisations and their duty of care to protect children from criminal abuse**

Victims of child abuse conveyed a strong message to the Inquiry that they should never have experienced abuse while in the care of personnel in a non-government organisation. The community also recognises that much of the offending committed against children could have been prevented if society in general had honoured its obligation to protect its vulnerable children and young people.

Non-government organisations have both a moral and legal responsibility to protect the children in their care. The Committee makes recommendations to strengthen the accountability of organisations and clarify their legal duty to take all necessary steps to prevent criminal child abuse.

**Effectively selecting suitable personnel**

Non-government organisations need to actively ensure they appoint personnel who are suitable to work with children. This includes, but is not limited to, their staff, volunteers, contractors and ministers of religion. To do this, they need to use a combination of recruitment and selection strategies, and have rigorous screening tools and checking processes.

The Working with Children Check (WWCC) system in Victoria provides a useful screening tool, but the Committee identified some limitations with the system. These limits include a reliance on individuals to update their WWCC card, a lack of monitoring to ensure compliance and a lack of clarity regarding whether all ministers of religion need to undergo checks before their appointment.

The Committee recommends improvements to the operations of the Working with Children Act 2005 (Vic) (WWC Act) to further strengthen the WWCC system by:

- requiring organisations to report any allegations of misconduct relating to children
- increasing monitoring of compliance
- clarifying the requirements for religious organisations to ensure all ministers of religion have a current WWCC.

The Committee found that the majority of organisations have WWCC processes in place, but do not always use them correctly and can unknowingly over-rely on them as a tool for preventing the appointment of unsuitable personnel.

**Managing situational risk**

Managing the internal situational risks of children being exposed to criminal abuse by employees and others associated with organisations is just as important as preventing unsuitable people being appointed to positions. It involves assessing risks to the organisation, establishing behavioural expectations of their personnel,
providing ongoing support, supervision and training, and considering risks in the physical environment.

The Committee reviewed the systems and processes of non-government organisations and identified that there are considerable variations in the approaches adopted to manage the situational risks of personnel committing criminal offences against children. Organisations need leaders and managers with the ability to cultivate organisational cultures that protect children from criminal abuse. The Committee considered that there is scope for peak bodies to work more actively with their members to provide guidance for creating child-safe organisations.

The Committee recommends that an independent statutory authority assist peak organisations to provide their members with guidance for protecting children from criminal child abuse in their organisations and provide advice on the implementation of effective systems and processes.

**Establishing child-safe policies**

A written child-safe policy demonstrates an organisation’s commitment to its duty to reasonably protect children from criminal child abuse while in its care. It may be long or short depending on an organisation’s purpose, size or the activities it undertakes. Ideally it should be simple and accessible, and contain:

- a statement of zero tolerance of criminal child abuse
- principles to guide decisions
- procedures on the employment of new personnel
- a risk management approach
- processes for reporting allegations of criminal child abuse.

In its review of the systems and processes used by organisations to prevent child abuse, the Committee identified that there is considerable variation in knowledge and the level of preventive action taken by organisations, ranging from proactive efforts by some organisations to others that are inactive and lacking in knowledge.

The Committee recommends that the Victorian Government review its contractual and funding arrangements with early education and community service organisations to require them to have a minimum standard for ensuring a child-safe environment and a zero tolerance approach to criminal child abuse. It also suggests that the Victorian Government explore which other organisations or sectors might benefit from the application of these minimum standards.

**Responding to allegations of criminal child abuse in organisations**

It is an unfortunate reality that despite preventive efforts there will be circumstances in which children in the care of non-government organisations are physically, emotionally or sexually abused. When an allegation of suspected criminal abuse of a child is made in an organisation, there need to be effective systems and processes in place to ensure the situation is handled immediately and appropriately, including reporting to the police and other relevant authorities. Organisations also need to
support the victim and ensure that all parties are treated fairly and consistently. They need to provide clarity regarding:

- what behaviour or conduct should trigger a notification
- who should make the notification of any concerns and the person in the organisation to be notified
- requirements for reporting to police and other authorities and the timing of reporting
- internal processes during and after an investigation
- internal reviews to assess and improve systems and processes.

In evidence provided to the Inquiry, very few organisations demonstrated that they have simple, transparent and easily accessible systems and processes for responding to an allegation or suspicion of criminal child abuse. In addition, many organisations do not appear to incorporate requirements to undertake internal systemic reviews to ensure ongoing learning and improvement.

The Committee determined that it is essential that following the notification of suspected child abuse to a person in authority, if that person reaches a reasonable belief that criminal conduct may have occurred, it should be immediately reported to police.

In its review of organisational processes, the Committee found that organisations and their personnel often find it challenging to determine how to appropriately assess an allegation of criminal child abuse and identify if there are reasonable grounds to believe criminal conduct has occurred. This difficulty has implications for the timely reporting of matters to police and other relevant authorities. Such decision making can be complex and it is usually the responsibility of personnel in authority, such as a CEO, senior manager or religious leader in the organisation, to make the decision to report.

The Committee identified that many of the organisations it heard from, and the personnel within them, did not appear to have the skills, knowledge or understanding required to confidently and appropriately respond to an allegation of suspected child abuse. In most situations, organisations want to do the right thing, but lack the knowledge to act decisively.

To improve responses by organisations to allegations of child abuse, there needs to be a coordinated system for monitoring existing processes. Such a system would include:

- independent scrutiny of organisations when concerns arise regarding the handling of reported child abuse
- building the knowledge, skills and ability of personnel in organisations to assess allegations and respond appropriately
- identification of patterns and trends of child abuse within organisations and sectors.

The Committee recommends that the Victorian Government authorises an independent statutory body with relevant powers and resources to oversee and monitor the handling of allegations of child abuse by relevant government departments, religious and non-government organisations.
Current responses to allegations of past criminal child abuse

It is well established that victims of child abuse often delay disclosing their abuse for years or decades and, in some cases, never tell anyone. The Committee heard that many victims of past child abuse by personnel in organisations disclosed their abuse to an organisation and were then directed into an internal process to ‘settle’ their matter.

In the mid-1990s, the Catholic Church created two systems for responding to allegations of criminal child abuse, both of which are still currently operating—the Melbourne Response (applicable only to the Catholic Archdiocese of Melbourne) and Towards Healing. In addition, some other religious and non-government organisations have processes in place to respond to similar allegations of past criminal child abuse by their personnel. The Committee acknowledges that some approaches were designed by organisations to be an independent, alternative form of justice for victims, but victims told the Inquiry that they did not view them this way.

The Committee accessed many files relevant to the Anglican Diocese of Melbourne, the Salvation Army and the two systems used by the Catholic Church. It also accessed internal complaint files regarding individuals within some orders and dioceses that form part of the Catholic Church in Victoria.

In its review of the existing internal systems and processes adopted by these religious organisations, the Committee identified the following features:

- They are not truly independent of the organisations.
- They contain no existing recognition of or support for secondary victims of criminal child abuse.
- Their approach to financial compensation often does not provide a clear explanation of the basis on which an organisation makes a financial payment, how the amount awarded is determined and obligations regarding confidentiality.
- They rarely encourage participants in the process to seek independent legal advice before reaching an agreement that might affect their subsequent legal rights.
- They tend to provide generic apologies that do not focus on the specific circumstances of the individual and the role played by both the perpetrator and the organisation in regard to the damage suffered by the victim.
- Only some provide counselling support, and some of those that do tend to provide inadequate counselling for a number of reasons, including limited sessions offered, counselling services not tailored to individual needs or counselling services operated internally by the organisation responsible for the abuse.
- Some demonstrated a reluctance to implement effective disciplinary processes for offenders in their organisation, such as suspending them from their duties, removing their title or their membership with the organisation.

Whether considered individually or in combination, these features of the internal processes have contributed to the ongoing and increased dissatisfaction of victims and their families with the response of non-government organisations to allegations of criminal child abuse.

10 See Appendix 9.
11 See Appendix 10.
Inquiry into the Handling of Child Abuse by Religious and Other Non-Government Organisations

While the Committee received evidence, largely from organisations, that some victims found the approaches satisfactory, the overwhelming message in both oral and written submissions to the Inquiry was that most organisational responses do not adequately meet the needs of victims in achieving justice and that an alternative system of justice, absolutely independent of the organisation, is needed.

**Police investigations of child sexual abuse**

In the past, police investigators had a limited understanding of the complexities of child sex offending and treated sexual offences like any other crime. Victoria Police acknowledged to the Inquiry that its past approach to investigating allegations of criminal child abuse had shortcomings. In 2009, a dedicated unit was established within Victoria Police to carry out investigation of sexual offences. The unit included investigators with specialised training about sexual offending and child abuse, and it adopted the ‘whole story’ approach.

Previously, victims were often required to repeat their account numerous times, with the risk of re-traumatisation. With the whole story approach, police investigators are now expected to understand more about the way people remember trauma and focus on eliciting a full, free and uninterrupted account.

In the past the priorities for police were to get a statement, obtain forensic evidence and gather corroborating evidence. But now police investigators are expected to focus on the entire relationship between a perpetrator and the victim to look at how the crime was crafted over a period of time.

The Committee found that the approach adopted by police in dealing with victims of child sexual abuse is of vital importance. A respectful and targeted investigation can increase the rate of reporting of sexual assault, increase the conviction rate, and also reduce the attrition rate throughout the prosecution process. The Committee determined that the Victoria Police approach to investigating sexual offences, particularly historical offences, has improved over the last decade. Despite this, the Committee considers that Victoria Police needs to ensure it adopts an approach of continual improvement.

**Criminal law reform—responding to allegations of criminal child abuse**

The law provides a critical avenue for protecting children from harm and appropriately responding to individuals who criminally abuse children or put them in danger.

The Committee identified a need to strengthen criminal laws to create greater responsibility for personnel in authority to report criminal child abuse and to deal appropriately with alleged and proven offenders. The legislative reforms it proposes also aim to ensure that a broader range of behaviour employed by child sex offenders is classified as criminal conduct.

If the Victorian Government implements the Committee’s recommendations for criminal law reform, it will be critical for organisations to ensure they have appropriate systems and processes in place. Relevant personnel in positions of authority will need to clearly understand their responsibilities.
**Grooming—child sex offending**

The term ‘grooming’ refers to actions deliberately undertaken with the aim of befriending and influencing a child, and in some circumstances members of the child’s family, for the purpose of sexual activity with the child. These actions are designed to establish an emotional connection in order to lower the child’s inhibitions and gain access to the intended victim. In this respect grooming involves psychological manipulation that is usually very subtle, drawn out, calculated, controlling and premeditated.

The Committee identified that the conduct of grooming a child or a child’s parents or others with criminal intent to engage in sexual activity with a child is currently not a criminal offence. The existing law in Victoria and nationally relates to a course of action specific to various forms of communication between the perpetrator and the victim. The Committee is conscious that grooming can occur in many other contexts other than via telecommunications which are currently covered by legislation. It determined that the criminality of grooming behaviour through personal contact should be recognised in legislation.

Traditionally, the courts have treated conduct recognised as ‘grooming’ as an aggravating feature of the sexual offence committed against a child. The Committee found that treating grooming as an aggravating feature of a sexual offence does not sufficiently recognise the damage such conduct causes to those subject to grooming who are categorised as ‘secondary’ or ‘passive’ victims. It identified that these victims experience significant damage through the deliberate betrayal and manipulation of their trust often alongside a feeling that they ultimately and unknowingly contributed to the abuse occurring. The Committee determined that the grooming of a child victim and secondary victims should be classified as a separate criminal offence, not merely an aggravating feature.

The Committee recommends that the Victorian Government review the *Crimes Act 1958* (Vic) to create a criminal offence of grooming that would not require a substantive offence of child sexual abuse to have been committed and that would be available in response to the grooming of people other than the primary child victim, or intended child victim, of the sexual abuse.

**Reporting to police**

Given that criminal child abuse involves extremely serious breaches of the laws of our community, the Committee considered the failure to report or the concealment of such offences is more appropriately dealt with under the criminal law than under the current welfare or child protection regime of mandatory reporting in Victoria. A number of witnesses to the Inquiry highlighted the importance of differentiating between:

- mandatory ‘welfare’ reporting—that is, reporting the risk of child abuse or neglect within a home or family setting to child protection services in DHS (and determining whether to intervene or remove the child from the care of their parent/s or primary carer/s), and
- compulsory ‘criminal’ reporting—that is, reporting a reasonable belief of criminal child abuse by personnel in an organisation to police.

The Committee determined that personnel in positions of authority in non-government organisations need to be responsible for reporting a reasonable belief
that criminal child abuse has occurred in their organisation. Children are often unable to disclose what is happening to them and the responsibility to protect them rests with adults who become aware of what may be happening.

Currently liability for the concealment of a crime only arises if the person receives a benefit from the concealment. The Committee considered whether there is a need to reform criminal laws to strengthen the potential for personnel in organisations who conceal such crimes or who are aware of the risks to children, to be prosecuted and punished. It determined that there is a need to introduce a criminal offence for a situation where a person fails to report to police material information about the criminal abuse of a child. The offence would be irrespective of whether the person receives any benefit for concealing or failing to report the information.

The Committee recommends that the Victorian Government amends s.326 of the Crimes Act 1958 (Vic) to remove the element of ‘gain’. If this element is removed, then a person who fails to report a serious indictable offence involving the abuse of a child will be guilty of an offence.

**Child endangerment**

The Committee found that there are no criminal charges that can be brought against personnel in organisations in positions of authority, such as a CEO or religious leader, who relocates an alleged offender of criminal child abuse. It considered this is unacceptable both in terms of meeting community expectations of what standards should be imposed as well as identifying clear sanctions for those who do not uphold their obligations as members of society.

In order to provide an additional impetus for people to report a belief of criminal child abuse to police, the Committee found that consideration must be given to the introduction of a new criminal offence of child endangerment.

A child endangerment provision would make a significant contribution to Victoria’s legal framework to protect children at risk. The provision would ensure that where a person in authority intentionally or recklessly fails to take steps to protect a child from harm or abuse, that person can be found guilty of a criminal offence. People who know that a child is being abused and are in a position to do something about it would have a direct legal duty to intervene to protect the child.

The creation of the offence of child endangerment would impose criminal responsibility on those who act or fail to act, understanding that their conduct may pose a substantial and unjustifiable risk of harm to children. This would cover the situation where a person gives responsibility to another for the care of children aware that there is a risk of harm to children and who fails to take reasonable steps to protect children from that risk.

The Committee recommends that the Victorian Government introduces a criminal offence relating to child endangerment where:

- relevant wanton or reckless behaviour would occur when a person in authority is aware of and consciously disregards a substantial and unjustifiable risk that his or her acts or omissions place a child in a situation that might endanger the child’s life, health, welfare, morals, or emotional wellbeing.
• the risk is of such a nature and degree that disregarding the risk would constitute a gross deviation from the standard of conduct that a reasonable person would observe in the situation.

**Civil law reform—accessing the civil litigation system**

For many victims of criminal child abuse, the option of pursuing a claim through civil litigation is central to their desire for justice. Many told the Inquiry that civil litigation is not only an avenue to seek compensation, but also a form of acknowledgement and accountability for the harm they have suffered.

The Committee is firmly of the view that victims have a fundamental right to sue non-government organisations for damage they have suffered at the hands of representatives of that organisation. Court judgements provide a valuable and practically available form of public condemnation for criminal child abuse, and create a powerful incentive for organisations to change their practices to prevent such abuse.

No civil claims of criminal child abuse made against religious organisations have been decided by the Victorian courts. Civil litigation in these cases is generally resolved through private settlements.

There are significant legal barriers that can prevent victims from successfully pursuing civil litigation against organisations. The Committee makes recommendations to improve the path to civil litigation for victims.

**Addressing the legal identity of non-government organisations**

Victims of child abuse can find it difficult to find an entity to sue because of legal structures of some non-government organisations. In addition, the assets of some organisations can be difficult to access due to the use of complex structures, such as property trusts. In order to successfully establish a civil claim, a victim needs to identify a legal entity to sue for failing to take reasonable care to prevent their abuse. The Committee heard that for many victims the organisation they sought to sue was not a legal entity.

The Committee heard that some non-government organisations whose personnel had perpetrated criminal child abuse are not incorporated entities, and cannot be sued in their own name. This is more frequently the case with religious organisations. As a consequence (particularly when the abuse occurred many years ago and office bearers in the organisation have changed), a victim is left with no defendant to sue.

In view of these findings, the Committee recommends that the Victorian Government consider requiring organisations it funds or provides with tax exemptions and other entitlements to be incorporated and adequately insured. It also suggests that the Victorian Government work with the Australian Government to require religious and other non-government organisations that engage with children to adopt incorporated legal structures.
Removing limitations—claims arising from criminal child abuse

Many victims of child abuse do not disclose their experiences or act on them until decades after the abuse occurred. This fact has implications for victims who wish to seek compensation or pursue common-law actions. These implications relate specifically to the statute of limitations.

The Committee identified that the application of Victoria’s statute of limitations is currently at the discretion of the defence and judges. There is also evidence that non-government organisations have aggressively pursued the limitation defence in civil trials. The Committee heard that the limitation defence adversely affects the bargaining position of victims in settlement negotiations.

Statutes of limitations disadvantage victims of child sexual abuse because they typically take decades to act on the understanding of the harm arising from their abuse and to issue proceedings. The Committee therefore determined that it is necessary to amend the Limitation of Actions Act 1958 (Vic) to allow victims sufficient time to initiate civil legal action. It recommends that the Victorian Government consider amending the Act to exclude criminal child abuse from the operation of the limitations periods contained within it.

Vicarious liability and duty of care

Non-government organisations have a duty of care to take reasonable steps to prevent child abuse by members of their organisation through screening and monitoring systems.

The Committee identified that in the past non-government organisations have tended to take the approach that the responsibility for criminal child abuse in their organisation lies solely with the perpetrator of that abuse. While it accepts the attribution of responsibility to the perpetrator, the Committee nevertheless considers that organisations should also bear responsibility in these cases.

Non-government organisations are responsible for creating special relationships of trust between their personnel and individuals in the broader community. Organisations are aware of the vulnerability of children in their care and the fact that parents and others rely on the organisation and its personnel to look after the wellbeing of those children. The civil law in Victoria has not yet developed to recognise the liability of non-government organisations for the criminal abuse of children perpetrated by their personnel notwithstanding this development in international jurisdictions.

The Committee determined that these organisations should have a clear legal duty to take appropriate measures to minimise the risk of abuse that can arise because of the creation of relationships of trust for which they are responsible. They should be held vicariously liable for the acts of their personnel in the course of relationships they develop with individuals in the broader community.

The Committee recommends that the Victorian Government undertake a review of the Wrongs Act 1958 (Vic) to identify amendments that would ensure organisations are held accountable for their legal duty to protect children from criminal abuse.
**Retrospectivity**

There are difficulties in creating rights or obligations under the civil law retrospectively.\(^{12}\) It is only in very rare circumstances that Parliament would retrospectively create enforceable rights and obligations. This approach is based on the fundamental proposition that in a democratic society behaviour that was lawful under the criminal law at the time at which it occurred should not be retrospectively declared criminal. Similarly, if there were no rights or obligations under the civil law at a point in time, if these rights or obligations were introduced today, they should not retrospectively become the subject of civil liability.

The Committee accepts the legal foundation that, apart from the most exceptional circumstances, citizens should not be held liable under the criminal or civil law for conduct which was not prohibited at an earlier time. In the case of criminal child abuse, undertakings were provided by organisational representatives in the Inquiry hearings that they would reconsider past compensation payments to victims of child abuse. The Committee has made recommendations for alternative forms of justice to be made available to victims who are not able to benefit from new legislative provisions recommended in this Report. It trusts that the legislative changes proposed will assist future victims of criminal child abuse in achieving justice.

**Creating an independent, alternative avenue for justice**

There are a number of evidentiary, legal and practical barriers to challenging an organisation in court on matters of past criminal child abuse. Some of the practical barriers to litigation for victims include the lack of financial means and emotional resources to manage the typically lengthy delay in bringing cases to court. The emotional impact of an adversarial battle often acts as a deterrent to litigation for already suffering victims and their families.

Victims and their advocates requested that the Inquiry consider alternative forms of achieving justice. There is currently no alternative justice avenue for victims of child abuse in organisational settings that is paid for by non-government organisations and independently administered by the Victorian Government.

The Committee considers that it is important to develop such an approach alongside existing traditional civil justice avenues. It identified that Victoria needs an independent, alternative avenue of justice that is operated by the State and that can facilitate the resolution of child abuse claims relating to organisations.

Based on its evidence and additional research, the Committee determined that an effective alternative justice avenue for victims of criminal child abuse in organisations must have the following features:

- It needs to be independent and have sufficient authority to ensure that the right parties come to the table to resolve claims.
- It needs to respect and properly engage victims in the process and support them throughout by ensuring access to counselling support and legal assistance.
- It needs to have a strong focus on the needs of victims, families and communities, and not be bound by legal parameters in determining outcomes that respond to the multiple needs of victims.

---

\(^{12}\) See Chapter 1 for a full explanation.
As part of the process, relevant organisations need to take responsibility for delivering outcomes, including the funding of compensation and services.

It should be able to continue regardless of a parallel investigation by police.

There needs to be a clear avenue to appeal decisions.

The Committee recommends that the Victorian Government should review the functions of the Victims of Crime Assistance Tribunal (VOCAT) to consider its capacity to administer a specific scheme for victims of criminal child abuse in non-government organisations that:

- enables victims and families to obtain resolution of claims arising from criminal child abuse in organisations
- is established through consultation with relevant stakeholders, in particular victims
- encourages non-government organisations to contribute a fee to administer the scheme
- ensures non-government organisations are responsible for the funding of compensation, needs and other supports agreed through the process.

The Committee understands that many victims are likely to face a number of barriers in having their claims addressed through the new avenue, not least of which is the fact that many of those who have reached a settlement with a non-government organisation would have signed release papers as a condition, stating they had no further claim against the organisation. Nevertheless, the Committee is strongly of the view that, in light of evidence provided to this Inquiry, these victims should have an opportunity to have their claims revisited through the proposed new avenue.

The Committee considers the willingness of organisations to review these existing settlements will be a measure of how genuine their undertakings are to comply with the Inquiry recommendations and their implementation.

Beyond the Inquiry—responsibilities

Throughout its deliberations and in the pages of this Report, the Committee has endeavoured to accurately and faithfully reflect the voices of those people who were criminally abused as children (and their families) and who had the courage to come forward to help the Committee with its Inquiry.

While mindful of the limitations in trying to repair the sometimes irreparable, having confronted and exposed the truth of these experiences, the community cannot ignore its obligations to assist the victims of criminal child abuse in non-government organisations and to provide greater protection for children in the future.

The Committee’s recommendations are directed to the achievement of these objectives as far as reasonably possible.

The organisations and individuals who were at least morally complicit in the crimes with which the Inquiry has been concerned, cannot be permitted to make superficial and professionally constructed gestures of regret and effectively walk away.

Failure in either of these respects would constitute another reprehensible betrayal.
Inquiry recommendations

The criminal abuse of children involves extremely serious breaches of the laws of our community. Those who engage in it, or are in positions of authority and conceal such offences, should be dealt with under the criminal law. Non-government organisations must be expected to adequately protect children in their care and respond to any allegations of criminal offences by reporting to the police and relevant authorities. Victims of criminal child abuse should have access to appropriate avenues to pursue justice for the harm they have suffered.

These principles informed the Committee’s recommendations, which relate to the following five broad areas:

• reforming criminal law
• accessing civil litigation
• creating an independent, alternative avenue for justice
• monitoring responses by organisations to criminal child abuse
• preventing criminal child abuse in organisations.

The Committee considers that it is reasonable for the community to expect that non-government organisations will honour the undertakings they made during the course of the Inquiry and comply with the requirements of any new schemes established by the Victorian Government.

Reforming the criminal law

The Committee makes recommendations to reform criminal laws to strengthen the potential for perpetrators of criminal child abuse and personnel in organisations who conceal such crimes to be prosecuted and punished. It requests that the Victorian Government is mindful that while the recommendations have been considered in their application to the criminal abuse of children within non-government organisations, if implemented they may become of general application. In consequence, in drafting any legislation there needs to be consideration of any unintended implications for other groups and individuals.

Crime to conceal criminal child abuse offences and compulsory reporting to police—no requirement for benefit

Section 326 of the Crimes Act 1958 (Vic) currently requires proof that the person who concealed a serious indictable offence received a benefit. The Committee determined that failure to report knowledge of the commission of a serious indictable offence to police (including those relating to child abuse) and thereby concealing the offence should be punishable as a crime, regardless of whether any benefit is received.

Rec That the Victorian Government consider amending Section 326 Crimes Act 1958 (Vic) to remove the element of ‘gain’, to ensure that a person who fails to report a serious indictable offence involving the abuse of a child will be guilty of an offence. (Recommendation 23.1, Part G)
A new child endangerment offence—criminal responsibility for placing children at risk

The creation of this offence will impose criminal responsibility on those individuals in positions of authority in organisations who act or fail to act understanding that their action or inaction may pose a substantial and unjustifiable risk of harm to children, but they disregarded that risk and acted or did not act accordingly. This would cover the situation where a person gives responsibility to another for the care of children and is aware there is a risk of harm to those children and who fails to take reasonable steps to protect them from that risk.

Rec That the Victorian Government consider the introduction of a criminal offence relating to child endangerment in organisations that covers relevant wanton or reckless behaviour in situations:

* when a person in authority is aware of and consciously disregards a substantial and unjustifiable risk that their acts or omissions placed a child in a situation that might endanger the child’s life, health, welfare, morals, or emotional well-being
* where the risk is of such a nature and degree that disregarding the risk would constitute a gross deviation from the standard of conduct that a reasonable person would observe in the situation. (Recommendation 23.2, Part G)

A new grooming offence

The current Commonwealth and Victorian laws of grooming relate to grooming activity by way of various forms of telecommunication. New South Wales has extended its grooming legislation to cover a broader range of grooming activities. The Committee considers that Victoria should go further by recognising that grooming can occur in all manner of ways, including through conduct directed at family members of an intended victim of child sexual activity. A new offence of grooming should recognise that there are other victims, beyond those that are the subject of the substantive offence.

Rec That the Victorian Government give consideration to an amendment to the Crimes Act 1958 (Vic) to create a criminal offence of grooming.

The grooming offence should:

* not require a substantive offence of sexual abuse to have been committed
* recognise that in addition to the primary or intended child victim of sexual abuse, parents and others can be victims of this criminal conduct.

(Recommendation 22.1, Part G)

Improving access to civil avenues of justice

In recognition of the importance of civil litigation as an avenue for victims seeking justice, the Committee makes several recommendations to reduce the legal barriers to pursue claims through this avenue.
Addressing the legal identity of non-government organisations

Rec That the Victorian Government consider requiring non-government organisations to be incorporated and adequately insured where it funds them or provides them with tax exemptions and/or other entitlements. (Recommendation 26.1, Part H)

Rec That the Victorian Government work with the Australian Government to require religious and other non-government organisations that engage with children to adopt incorporated legal structures. (Recommendation 26.2, Part H)

Removing limitations—claims arising from criminal child abuse

Rec That the Victorian Government consider amending the Limitation of Actions Act 1958 (Vic) to exclude criminal child abuse from the operation of the limitations period under that Act. (Recommendation 26.3, Part H)

Rec That the Victorian Government consider amending the Victims of Crime Assistance Act 1996 (Vic) to specify that no time limits apply to applications for assistance by victims of criminal child abuse in organisational settings. (Recommendation 27.1, Part H)

Vicarious liability and duty of care

It should be recognised that non-government organisations are directly liable for harm suffered by children in their care given that the perpetrator has relied on the reputation and community’s trust in the organisation to offend against the child. This duty of the organisation to the child includes the responsibility to monitor and screen employees and other personnel and to take reasonable steps to ensure the safety of the child in their care. Additionally, an organisation should be held vicariously liable (on the basis of the existence of a deemed employment relationship with its agents, representatives or volunteers who it has permitted to act on its behalf) for acts committed in the course of that relationship.

Rec The Committee recommends that the Victorian Government undertake a review of the Wrongs Act 1958 (Vic) and identify whether legislative amendment could be made to ensure organisations are held accountable and have a legal duty to take reasonable care to prevent criminal child abuse. (Recommendation 26.4, Part H)

Creating an independent, alternative avenue for justice

In making its recommendations, the Committee is aware that there are limitations in the civil justice system that the recommendations will not overcome. These include:

- the practical barriers that arise from the financial and psychological position of victims of child abuse and evidentiary issues relating to historical events
- the non-retrospective nature of law reform and the sometimes limited outcomes that the civil litigation system offers (see Chapter 1).
In recognition of these limitations, and in preference to internal organisational systems for resolving claims, the Committee has recommended an independent, alternative avenue for justice for those victims who are not in a position to pursue civil claims in the courts for practical, evidentiary and legal reasons.

Rec The Committee recommends that the Victorian Government review the functions of the Victims of Crime Assistance Tribunal (VOCAT) to consider its capacity to administer a specific scheme for victims of criminal child abuse that:

- enables victims and families to obtain resolution of claims arising from criminal child abuse in non-government organisations
- is established through consultation with relevant stakeholders, in particular victims
- encourages non-government organisations to contribute a fee to administer the scheme
- ensures non-government organisations are responsible for the funding of compensation, needs and other supports agreed through the process.

(Recommendation 28.1, Part H)

Improving organisation responses to allegations of criminal child abuse

The Committee determined that there needs to be improved responses to allegations of criminal child abuse in organisations and greater scrutiny and monitoring of how organisations respond to such allegations. It also determined that it is appropriate for the Victorian Government to identify the most relevant statutory authority to assume responsibility for overseeing such responses when it is in the public interest, when there are systemic problems and when complaints are raised about an organisation’s handling of a matter of criminal child abuse.

Rec That the Victorian Government authorise an independent statutory body with relevant powers and legal and operational resources to:

- oversee and monitor the handling of allegations of child abuse by relevant government departments, religious and non-government organisations
- undertake independent investigations into systems and processes in the context of allegations of reportable conduct and/or reportable convictions
- scrutinise and audit the systems and processes in non-government organisations for handling allegations of child abuse
- monitor and report on trends associated with allegations by collecting relevant data and report to the Parliament on an annual basis
- build the skills and knowledge of personnel in relevant government departments, religious and non-government organisations to ensure they have the capacity to competently handle allegations of suspected child abuse.

(Recommendation 18.1, Part E)

Rec That the Victorian Government review the current Department of Education and Early Childhood Development (DEECD) procedures for responding to allegations of all forms of criminal child abuse within all Victorian schools and
identifies a benchmark that could be applied more broadly to non-government schools. (Recommendation 16.1, Part E)

**Improving the prevention of criminal child abuse—organisation and their duty of care to children**

The Committee determined that the prevention of criminal child abuse is critical and that organisations need support, guidance and greater accountability to exercise their duty of care.

**Effective selection of suitable personnel (paid, voluntary, religious)**

Rec In regard to the operations of the *Working with Children Act 2005* (Vic) (WWC Act), that the Victorian Government:

* clarify the requirements for religious organisations to ensure ministers of religion have a current Working with Children check (WWCC)
* institute a system of compliance monitoring and investigation of the operation of the WWC Act similar to the equivalent system in New South Wales
* ensure that all relevant non-government organisations are required to report any allegations of misconduct relating to children to the Victorian Department of Justice WWC Unit
* raise the awareness of organisations about the importance of regularly reviewing the status of WWCC by personnel, the need to adopt a range of screening tools, and to not over rely on the WWCC. (Recommendation 10.1, Part D)

**Managing situational risk**

Rec That the Victorian Government review its contractual and funding arrangements with education and community service organisations that work with children and young people to ensure they have a minimum standard for ensuring a child-safe environment, including the following principles:

* a statement of zero tolerance of criminal child abuse
* principles to guide decisions
* procedures on the employment of new personnel
* a risk management approach
* processes for reporting and responding to allegations of criminal child abuse. That the Victorian Government consider the potential for extending a standard for child-safe environments to other organisations or sectors that have direct and regular contact with children. (Recommendation 12.1, Part D)
Support, guidance and oversight—prevention systems and processes

Rec That through the relevant statutory body or department the Victorian Government should:
  • identify an effective approach or model for supporting peak bodies to build preventative capacity in sectors that interact with children
  • identify ways to encourage smaller organisations or activities to be affiliated with peak bodies to enable access to capacity building opportunities. (Recommendation 13.1, Part D)

Raising awareness of criminal child abuse in non-government organisations

Rec That the Victorian Government expand on its response to Recommendation 10 in the Cummins Inquiry report to ensure that non-government organisations are equipped with high quality information and advice about the prevention of criminal child abuse in organisations. (Recommendation 13.2, Part D)
Inquiry findings

Part B: Victims experiences, impacts and their pursuit of justice

Victims and the impact of criminal child abuse

- Children subjected to criminal abuse in organisations often experience lifelong impacts that include mental health problems, addiction issues, relationship difficulties, issues with anger and difficulties with life skills, education and employment.
- Children who suffer criminal child abuse in organisations can experience specific consequences from being abused by a trusted person in the community, such as the loss of spirituality and having problems with authority.
- There are frequently significant effects on the families of victims criminally abused by personnel in organisations, including the fragmentation of families and the intense guilt felt by parents at not having protected their child.
- The impact on local communities of criminal child abuse in trusted organisations, particularly religious organisations, can be deep and divisive.
- While the actual costs associated with criminal child abuse in organisations are unknown, there are significant economic and social costs associated with child abuse in Victoria.

Achieving justice

- Victims often want an opportunity to restore their lives and to repair the damage they experienced as a consequence of being criminally abused by personnel in a non-government organisation.
- Victims frequently wanted to see consequences for the perpetrator of the criminal child abuse—to be stood down from their position, the allegation reported to the police and the perpetrator prevented from continuing to criminally abuse children.
- Victims often want to receive vindication from the organisation for the injustice they suffered and acknowledgement that the organisation failed in its duty of care to protect them.
- Many victims, families and communities felt a lack of justice and a sense of ‘unfinished business’ with non-government organisations, particularly the Catholic Church in Victoria, for the following reasons:
  * double betrayal—inconsistent approaches to victims and offenders
  * hypocrisy—claims of moral authority
  * lack of accountability—refusal to accept responsibility.
- While not within the Terms of Reference, a number of victims, particularly those in the care of the State, felt betrayed by authorities, such as the Government and the police, for the following reasons:
  * lack of supervision—inadequate government inspectors and monitoring of the non-government institutions in which they were placed
lack of intervention—the police often escorted those who escaped back to the non-government institution.

Part C: Context

Child abuse in organisational contexts

- Due to a lack of accurate data, the prevalence and incidence of criminal child abuse in the community is currently unknown, which has implications for the development of evidence-based interventions and preventative frameworks in non-government organisations.
- There has been minimal research into criminal child abuse in organisations and the majority that has been undertaken relates to child sexual abuse, with less known about physical abuse and multiple forms of child abuse.
- There is no typical offender of criminal child abuse, and many child sex offenders often appear as regular community members with good intentions.
- There are many types of organisations in which criminal child abuse occurs, and over many decades the nature of the services and programs provided by these organisations have evolved to meet the changing needs of children and the community, including services commenced following the closure of institutions providing out-of-home care.

Past handling of allegations of criminal child abuse

- There has been substantial criminal child abuse in the Catholic Church over a long period of time, perpetrated by priests and other members of religious orders in Victoria.
- The environment in institutions, schools and parishes, particularly from the 1950s to the 1980s, gave perpetrators or representatives of religious or other non-government organisations the opportunity to exploit vulnerable children in their care.
- A culture existed in religious organisations that allowed for the occurrence of systemic criminal child abuse.
- The initial formal response to criminal child abuse that the Catholic Church in Victoria and in Australia more broadly adopted in the early 1990s was influenced by its previous approach. The response continued to conceal rather than expose criminal child abuse in the organisation.

Part D: Prevention—duty of care to create child-safe organisations

Effective prevention

- There are a number of focus areas for preventing criminal child abuse in organisations, including preventing offending, raising children’s awareness, ensuring child-safe environments in organisations and empowering the broader community to respond to criminal child abuse.
- Situational crime prevention has considerable potential as a model for prevention of criminal child abuse in non-government organisations through its focus on social and physical environments that reduce opportunity for crime and increase the risks to perpetrators associated with criminal behaviour.
There are three core elements that are central to the prevention of criminal child abuse in organisations:

- effective selection of suitable personnel—including paid, voluntary, ministers of religion and contractors
- managing situational and environmental risks
- creating child-safe organisational cultures.

Commitment to prevention of criminal child abuse is crucial, but equally essential is the effective implementation of systems and processes through adequate knowledge, skills and awareness and appropriate oversight.

**Effective prevention**

- To ensure the appointment of suitable personnel, organisations need to adopt a combination of recruitment and selection, screening and checking processes.
- The value in background checking—such as referee checks and Working with Children Checks (WWCC)—is that past behaviour can provide an indication of possible future behaviour.
- The Victorian WWCC is an effective screening tool but has some limitations—including a reliance on individuals to update their WWCC card, a lack of monitoring to ensure compliance and a lack of clarity regarding whether ministers of religion need to undergo checks before their appointment.
- The majority of organisations have WWCC processes in place, but can unknowingly over-rely on them as a tool for preventing the appointment of unsuitable personnel.
- Registration systems for professionals and offender registers provide an additional checking process to ensure suitable personnel are appointed to specific professions or organisations.

**Managing situational risk and ensuring a child-safe culture**

- Managing internal situational risks involves assessing risk to the organisation, establishing behavioural expectations of personnel, providing ongoing support, supervision and training and considering risks in the physical environment.
- Identifying high risk activities and children’s varying needs is important, yet there is minimal guidance to assist organisations to assess and mitigate risks specific to criminal child abuse.
- Organisations need to establish clear behavioural expectations and boundaries for personnel interacting with children without creating an environment of undue suspicion.
- A number of organisations indicated that education and training are strategies they use to ensure their personnel are informed about child safety, yet there can be inconsistencies in the nature of the training provided by organisations.
- Non-government organisations that provide activities and services for children would benefit from greater awareness of how to use regular supervision and performance monitoring to identify concerns regarding the conduct of personnel interacting directly and regularly with children.
There is a need to build the capacity of leaders and managers to increase their awareness of how to create an organisational culture that ensures children are reasonably protected from criminal child abuse.

**Policies to protect children from criminal child abuse**

- Many non-government organisations have given consideration to the need to develop policies to protect children from criminal child abuse, but these are often basic and fragmented across other policies.
- Those organisations that voluntarily participated in the Inquiry had often considered policies for protecting children, while those directly requested to participate were less likely to have adequately considered their duty to take reasonable care to ensure children are safe with their personnel.
- The level of knowledge and the degree of action in establishing and improving child safety policies varied greatly, ranging from proactive to inactive.
- Funded organisations and registered professionals are expected to meet standards relating to child-safe practices that vary considerably across sectors such as early education, teaching and community services.

**Improving preventative systems and processes**

- Some organisations indicated a willingness to be subjected to higher levels of accountability through accreditation processes that involve both self-assessment and external scrutiny of prevention systems.
- Sector peak bodies potentially have an important role in supporting their members to become child-safe organisations and many are well positioned to promote child-safe practices by their members.
- Children should never be responsible for protecting themselves from the harm of criminal child abuse, and prevention approaches that target children should be focused on initiatives that build their awareness.
- Many organisations have a poor understanding of criminal child abuse and often people find the issue too confronting to acknowledge, respond to or address.

**Part E: Responding to reports and allegations of child abuse in organisations**

**Importance of effective processes for responding to allegations of criminal child abuse in organisations**

- Processes for handling allegations of criminal child abuse need to be simple, transparent and easily accessible for children, adults and personnel within the organisation.
- An effective process for responding to allegations of suspected criminal abuse of a child should:
  - clearly state what types of conduct should be notified, who can or should make notifications and who they should notify in the organisation
• make it clear what next steps need be taken, including ensuring the child is safe, and reporting suspected criminal abuse to police and relevant authorities
• provide guidance for responding to the outcomes of a report of criminal child abuse, including disciplinary processes, ongoing support for the victim and the review of internal policies and processes.
• Internal and external processes in response to an allegation of criminal child abuse may occur in parallel, which requires transparency and communication across all relevant bodies to ensure internal processes do not impede on any criminal investigation in progress.
• Written processes are not always implemented effectively and it is important that there are oversight and monitoring systems to enable scrutiny of an organisation’s handling of criminal child abuse if there are concerns.

Encouraging disclosure and appropriate initial response

• Very few organisations indicated that they had simple, accessible processes that help children to understand what to do if they need to disclose behaviour that makes them feel unsafe or uncomfortable and that may constitute criminal child abuse. This may prevent children from telling an adult if they have concerns.
• Some organisations appeared progressive in their guidance to personnel regarding what they should notify and who to notify if they observe or suspect conduct of concern.
• Many policies used by organisations are complex and unclear regarding the responsibility of personnel to notify, including the person in the organisation they should notify, if a child discloses concerning behaviour or if they have a concern about the conduct of other personnel. This may discourage some individuals and personnel in organisations from reporting or disclosing abusive behaviour.
• A number of organisations provide guidance on how to respond to a disclosure made by a child, yet very few make reference regarding how to ensure the child is safe and receives appropriate medical and other professional support.

Recognising criminal child abuse and reporting allegations to authorities

• Responding to a notification of concerning behaviour and forming reasonable grounds to believe that a crime may have occurred is complex and requires a skilled and sophisticated level of judgement.
• Some organisational policies reviewed by the Committee for responding to allegations of criminal child abuse were narrowly focused on child sexual abuse rather than all forms of criminal abuse.
• Organisations providing services funded by the Department of Human Services are required to report all physical and sexual assault of clients by staff to the police, yet the inconsistent implementation of this requirement indicates that not all personnel in organisations have the appropriate skills and knowledge to determine suspected criminal conduct.
• Catholic and independent schools are not expected to meet the same requirements as government schools in responding to suspected sexual assault of children and there is no clear guidance for any schools regarding other forms of criminal abuse.
• A number of policies used by organisations that provide services in unregulated sectors do not make it clear that all staff have a responsibility to report allegations of criminal child abuse to police, and some policies suggest that the onus is on victims to do so.

• Organisations in regulated sectors have requirements to report critical incidents to a funding or relevant body and can be subject to review if they do not handle allegations of criminal child abuse appropriately.

• Organisations that provide services in unregulated sectors have no overarching requirements or oversight to ensure they report all suspected criminal child abuse to police and relevant authorities and are not subject to any external review of their responses if they do not handle allegations appropriately.

**Internal processes and systemic review**

• Most organisations have disciplinary processes in place for breaches of their code of conduct, but in practice find it difficult to make the decision to stand personnel aside when they are subject to an allegation of criminal child abuse.

• Few organisations indicated that they undertake systemic reviews of their systems and processes to identify any internal factors that may have contributed to an incident of criminal child abuse, and those that do are often expected to have such processes in place through contractual arrangements with funding bodies.

• Organisations contracted by government to provide out-of-home care services can be subject to external review of their systems and processes if concerns are raised about the quality of care they provide. The education, recreation, religious and other sectors are not subject to any external review of their systems and processes.

**Improving monitoring, oversight and capacity building regarding reports of child abuse**

• There is a need for independent scrutiny of the systems and processes organisations have in place for preventing and responding to allegations of criminal child abuse and ensuring the safety of children.

• Many organisations are seeking guidance in developing the skills and knowledge necessary to respond appropriately to allegations of criminal abuse and to report to police and other authorities.

• The New South Wales Ombudsman has a system for independently scrutinising and monitoring the systems and processes of organisations in the handling of allegations of criminal child abuse. The model also provides training and assistance to personnel in building their knowledge and skills in managing allegations of criminal child abuse and has resulted in improvements in the systems and processes of organisations in NSW.
Part F: Responding to reports and allegations of past child abuse in organisations

Case studies—processes of religious organisations for responding to allegations of past criminal child abuse

- The processes that have been adopted by non-government organisations to respond to complaints of criminal child abuse are varied. Some organisations have very detailed and documented policies whilst others are less formal. The purpose of these policies is to meet the needs of victims and to provide them support.

Analysis of processes for responding to allegations of past criminal child abuse

- The internal systems adopted by religious organisations reviewed by the Committee, revealed the features listed below, which, whether considered individually or in combination, have contributed to the ongoing dissatisfaction of victims and their families with the organisation’s response to allegations of criminal child abuse:
  - the processes for responding to complaints used by non-government organisations are not truly independent of the organisations
  - there is no existing recognition of or support for secondary victims of criminal child abuse in the systems used by organisations to respond to allegations of such conduct
  - the approach to financial compensation by the organisations reviewed often did not provide a clear explanation of the basis on which an organisation makes a financial payment, how the amount awarded was determined and obligations regarding confidentiality
  - organisations rarely encourage participants in the process to seek independent legal advice before reaching any agreements that might affect their subsequent legal rights
  - organisations tend to provide generic apologies that do not focus on the specific circumstances of the individual and the role played by both the perpetrator and the organisation in regard to the damage suffered by the victim
  - not all organisations provide counselling support, and some that do tend to provide inadequate counselling for a number of reasons, including limited sessions offered, counselling services not tailored to individuals, or counselling services operated internally within the organisation
  - some organisations demonstrated a reluctance to implement effective disciplinary processes for offenders in their organisation, such as standing them down from their duties, removing their title or their membership to the organisation.
- The dissatisfaction with the internal process of an organisation was influenced by the manner in which the organisation supported the perpetrator of criminal child abuse.
Part G: Law reform and criminal justice

The criminality of grooming

- Treating grooming as an aggravating feature of a sexual offence does not sufficiently recognise the damage such conduct causes to those who are the subject of such behaviour, categorised as secondary or passive victims. The criminality of the conduct of grooming should be recognised as an offence, and in addition to the primary victim, parents and others should be recognised as victims of grooming.

- It is recognised that grooming can occur in many contexts other than via telecommunications which are currently covered by legislation. Perpetrators of sexual offences against children often engage in grooming behaviour directly with the child cultivating a friendship through personal contact and the criminality of that conduct should be recognised.

Reporting abuse and the response of the criminal justice system

- Improvements in techniques adopted by Victoria Police in investigating criminal child abuse have resulted in increased satisfaction with complainants and their involvement in the criminal justice system.

- Given that criminal child abuse is a very serious offence against the criminal law, failure to report or concealment of an offence is more appropriately dealt with under the criminal law than under the welfare/child protection regime.

- Section 326 Crimes Act 1958 (Vic) currently requires proof that the person who concealed a serious indictable offence received a benefit. The failure to report to police knowledge of the commission of a serious indictable offence (including those relating to child abuse) and thereby concealing the offence should be punishable as a crime, regardless of whether any benefit is received.

- The creation of the offence of child endangerment will impose criminal responsibility on those who act understanding that their action may pose a substantial and unjustifiable risk of harm to children, but who disregard that risk and act accordingly.

Part H: Civil justice reform

- Non-government organisations that appeared before the Committee undertook to comply with any Committee recommendations that would improve their processes for responding to child abuse claims.

What are the different forms of civil justice?

- There is no existing independent avenue in Victoria for the resolution of claims by victims of criminal child abuse in organisational settings that is paid for by non-government organisations.
Why is access to civil litigation important?

- Victims of criminal child abuse have a fundamental right to sue non-government organisations for damage they have suffered at the hands of representatives of that organisation. This course is an important avenue for some victims of criminal child abuse to achieve justice.
- Court judgements provide a valuable and practically available form of public condemnation for criminal child abuse, and create a powerful incentive for organisations to change their practices to prevent child abuse.
- No civil claims of criminal child abuse made against organisations have been decided by the Victorian courts. Instead, civil litigation in such cases is usually resolved by private settlements.
- Victims can be at a disadvantage in private settlement negotiations, due to their lack of resources and the evidentiary, legal and practical barriers of challenging an organisation in court. The emotional impact of an adversarial battle also acts as a deterrent to litigation for already suffering victims of criminal child abuse.
- Barriers to litigation for victims of criminal child abuse in organisational settings include:
  - lack of financial means
  - lack of emotional resources
  - practical limitations associated with the typically lengthy delay in bringing cases to court
  - family considerations.

Legal barriers to claims against non-government organisations

- The Victorian Government has an important role to play in reforming the law to reduce the barriers to litigation faced by victims of criminal child abuse.
- In Victoria, most not-for-profit non-government organisations are incorporated. This means they have a legal identity independent of their members and can be sued in their own name. However, not-for-profit organisations are not required to incorporate.
- Trusts are used widely in Victoria in the for-profit and not-for-profit sectors. Amending specific statutes that establish trustee corporations for some organisations is unlikely to resolve the issue of establishing the legal identity of unincorporated associations and ensuring appropriate governance structures to address civil claims for criminal child abuse.
- There is no evidence that non-government organisations have deliberately been structured to avoid liability for criminal child abuse claims. However, the lack of incorporation by non-government organisations that work with children can make it difficult for victims of abuse in organisational settings to identify an appropriate entity to sue for damages.
- The application of the statute of limitations is currently at the discretion of the defence and judges. However, there is evidence that non-government organisations have aggressively pursued the limitation defence in civil trials. There is also
evidence that the limitation defence adversely affects the bargaining position of victims in settlement negotiations for victims.

• Statutes of limitations disadvantage victims of child sexual abuse because these victims typically take decades to understand the harm arising from their abuse and to act on that understanding and decide to issue proceedings.

• There is no public policy justification for applying limitation periods to civil cases relating to criminal child abuse.

• Because reporting in cases of criminal child abuse is typically delayed for several decades, it is necessary to amend the Limitation of Actions Act 1958 (Vic) to allow victims of criminal child abuse sufficient time to initiate civil legal action.

• Because perpetrators of criminal child abuse in organisational settings derive their credibility from their association with the organisation, there is a need to recognise the legal obligation of organisations to reasonably ensure the safety of children who come into contact with their members. This includes implementing effective employment controls and adopting best practice in relation to risk management and prevention.

An alternative to civil litigation—the Victims of Crime Assistance Tribunal

• VOCAT provides a viable alternative to civil litigation for victims of criminal child abuse because of its ability to provide an independent acknowledgement of harm, its non-adversarial approach, and the supports provided for victims.

• Limitations of VOCAT include the application of a two-year time limit on claims, limited compensation available and the lack of ongoing financial support for victims.

An independent alternative justice avenue for criminal child abuse victims

• The elements of a successful alternative justice approach include:
  * independence and authority
  * respect, engagement and support for victims
  * contribution by non-government organisations
  * opportunity for appeal and review.