

Graham Stanley BRIDGLAND,



Submission in regard to Issues Paper #7

SUBMISSIONS

Submissions are sought from interested individuals and government and non-government organisations on this issue. Of particular interest to the Royal Commission is:

1. What are the advantages and disadvantages of statutory victims of crime compensation schemes as a means of providing redress or compensation to those who suffer child sexual abuse in institutional contexts?
There is NO advantage for claimants to seek redress via Crime Compensation Fund. This only allows the Institutions and Church Groups to once again abrogate their responsibilities. Why allow them to use taxpayer's money to cover up their tawdry dealings.
2. What features are important for making statutory victims of crime compensation schemes effective for claimants?
Justices must not only be done, but also seen to be done by those who committed the disgusting events that have been covered up over many years.
3. Are there elements of statutory victims of crime compensation schemes, as they currently operate, that raise particular difficulties for claims by people who suffer child sexual abuse in institutional contexts? For example:
 - a. some schemes have time limits and discretionary provisions to extend the time limits to make claims;
Time limits are just another way of trying to evade responsibility.
 - b. all schemes have caps on payments;
How can a Fixed payment for abuse be deemed to fair, is RAPE not enough.
 - c. some schemes have lower caps on payments for offences committed earlier in time and one scheme does not apply to offences committed before 1971;
I might try that in Court next time I appear and seek justice,
 - d. some schemes require that the act of violence or offence be reported to the police, or require an explanation if not reported to police; and
This has also happened, the POLICE have not taken the claims responsibly.
 - e. most schemes require repayment of victims' compensation if the recipient later receives compensation from another source (e.g. via damages or settlement in civil litigation).
Compensation and Reparation are paid as an act of faith. Dishonest Governments have abused their responsibility and used FUNDS set aside for Victims of Crime not to be used by Churches and Governments to be allowed their responsibility.
4. What changes should be made to address the elements of statutory victims of crime compensation schemes that raise particular difficulties for claims by people who suffer child sexual abuse in institutional contexts?

The Royal Commission should set a fair & Just amount for compensation, lets argue for \$100,000 for the digital RAPE of a Child by an Adult, \$75,000 by an inmate at an institution, regardless of being Church or Governments, \$50,000 for less than RAPE but still serious cases of molestation or bastardry. \$25,000 would be a rate to allow compensation for other forms of abuse. The base level, should be \$10,000 should be for all claims that are not included in any agreement.

5. What forms of redress, including services and payments, should be offered through statutory victims of crime compensation schemes?

The Victims of Crime Funds should ONLY be used to compensate those victims intended, for eg, house breaking, street assault.

6. To what extent, if any, should those who suffer child sexual abuse in institutional contexts be eligible for additional or different compensation and services, compared to victims of other crimes? Why?

As a Victim of such abuse in both Government and Church Institutions. The ability to pay should not be a driver in deciding the payments. The Church here in SA still holds itself as the same as the Government, when \$25,000 was paid out to a few of the most serious cases. This was after being told by the Government that an amount of \$50,000 would be the figure to be paid by them. The Catholic Church tried that on my claim, I informed that I would never sign any agreement based on that figure, it was only after argument that a figure that I agreed to was put on the table that I was granted \$35,000 was transferred into my account. This was still much less that I thought, but at least it was an admission of guilt and that my claim should have been taken as genuine. The Church spent so much money in trying to disprove my story that I was willing to take them on in the media.

7. Are the levels of verification or proof required under statutory victims of crime compensation schemes appropriate for claims by those who suffer child sexual abuse in institutional contexts?

I am sure the Justice system would not allow the system to accept a lower base than that in a court of Law.

Submissions are welcomed on any aspects of statutory victims of crime schemes as they affect claims for compensation by people who suffer child sexual abuse in institutional contexts.

Submissions will be made public unless the person making the submission requests that it not be made public or the Royal Commission considers it should not be made public. That will usually only occur for reasons associated with fairness.

I Graham Stanley Bridgland, [REDACTED] do herby authorise the public release of any information in this report into the public reporting of the Commissions reports.

Electronically signed
Graham Stanley Bridgland
2nd June 2014
At [REDACTED]