Hiding behind the past

Understanding historical abuse in out-of-home care

Kate Gaffney

This article addresses common misconceptions about the historic abuse of children in Victoria during the mid-twentieth century, including those contained in the 2006 official Victorian Government apology to state wards. The article has two aims – firstly, to consider allegations of abuse and some common reactions to, and explanations of, those allegations; and, secondly, to test the abuse allegations against the 1954 and 1960 Victorian Children's Welfare Regulations concerning the use of corporal punishment in Children's Homes. The author contends that historical relativism and the notion that abuse allegations can be explained as a feature of changing attitudes towards children and discipline do not stand up to scrutiny and inhibit useful examination of the causes and consequences of abuse in out-of-home care.

Kate Gaffney
Assistant Lecturer, Criminology
School of Political and Social Inquiry
Monash University, Victoria
Email: Kate.Gaffney@arts.monash.edu.au

Since the late 1990s, adult care-leavers throughout Australia have come forward through the courts, government inquiries and media to allege sexual, physical and emotional abuse while in the care of state and non-state Children's Homes. In August 2004, the Senate Community Affairs References Committee released *Forgotten Australians: A report on Australians who experienced out-of-home care as children.* The report was the third in a trilogy of Australian Government inquiries into the separation of children from their families, the preceding reports having examined the experiences of indigenous children (HREOC 1997) and child migrants (SCARC 2001). In the *Forgotten Australians* report, it was estimated that up to 500,000 Australian children were removed throughout the twentieth century, including over 100,000 Victorians (SCARC 2004, p. 394). The report also detailed allegations of 'horrendous levels of physical, sexual and emotional abuse' in Children's Homes (SCARC 2004, p. 181). The *Forgotten Australians* report followed the 1999 Forde Report of the Commission of Inquiry into Abuse of Children in Queensland Institutions and has been followed since by more recent state inquiries, including reviews in 2004 and 2006 by the Tasmanian Ombudsman (Ombudsman Tasmania 2004, 2006) and, most recently, the South Australia Commission of Inquiry into Children in State Care (Mullighan 2008). Together with media reports, care-leaver memoirs (Fletcher 2006; Golding 2005; Penglase 2005; Shayler 2001; Szablicki 2007) and litigation, the official reports reveal a dark history of child removal, neglect and abuse, including physical and sexual exploitation, in government and non-government Children's Homes across Australia.

Given the scale of child removal throughout the twentieth century, care-leavers may represent the largest number of Australians directly affected by twentieth century interventionist child welfare policies. This is an area of history that, as Tennant and Swain (2008) observed, 'can inform and complicate popular discourse'. Despite this, since the release of the *Forgotten Australians* report, and with the exception of a select few scholarly articles revealing the impact of removal and abuse (Hil, Penglase & Smith 2008; Mendes 2005; Swain 2007) or examining the ongoing consequences of past removals (Murray 2008; Murray, Malone & Glare 2008; Raman & Forbes 2008), older care leavers have largely disappeared from public and academic discourse. Exceptions to the silence are occasional media

reports that, as Penglase observes, often show a bias towards allegations of sexual abuse and ignore the ongoing emotional, social and psychological impacts of removal in general (Penglase 2005). This has meant that discussion of the causes of abuse has been lacking in recent years because there is relatively little discussion of historic removal and abuse in the first place.

This article first considers the allegations of abuse and some common reactions to allegations, particularly the Victorian Government's misplaced appeals to historical relativism. The author is concerned that there is a danger that invocation of historical distance will prevent modern observers from understanding that corporal punishment and abuse were separate and distinct phenomena in the mid-twentieth century rather than being two sides of the same coin. Moreover, while modern regulatory frameworks may function better to protect children in state care, there is nothing historically peculiar about child abuse – it can occur at any time and in any setting.

Allegations of historical abuse should not be seen as historical aberrations or mere products of place and time. It is not a matter of standards being different 'back then' as is often suggested. Allegations of abuse should be viewed as symptomatic of regulatory and systemic failures by child welfare authorities. Blurring the distinction between abuse and discipline to suggest that modern observers have misinterpreted past discipline as abuse denies the legitimacy of abuse allegations and fails to grasp the impact and legacy of child removal and abuse.

The second aim of this article is to reframe historical abuse as a regulatory breach. I consider the 1954 and 1960 Child Welfare regulations in Victoria and examine restrictions placed on the use of corporal punishment at the time that ultimately failed to protect children in care. It is my contention that recent allegations of abuse should be understood in the context of these regulations, not in the context of some imaginary time when 'normal' child raising techniques included physical and sexual abuse.

ALLEGATIONS OF ABUSE

Of the care-leavers who made written submissions to, or appeared before, the 2004 *Forgotten Australians* inquiry, the majority (54.8 per cent) had been placed in care in the 1950s and 1960s (SCARC 2004). These figures may reflect the relatively recent timeframe and the fact that children removed in the 1950s and 1960s now range in age from middle-aged to elderly. From a Victorian perspective, the figures also reflect an increase in state ward admissions during the 1950s and 1960s that was unprecedented since the Great Depression (Barnard & Twigg 2004). For example, in Victoria the number of state wards more than doubled between 1950 and 1970, rising from 3,037 in 1950 to 7,045 in 1970 (SCARC 2004).

While witnesses to recent inquiries and reviews in Tasmania and South Australia showed similar age characteristics to the *Forgotten Australians* witnesses, reports of abuse were not unique to those placed in care during the 1950s and 1960s. The Commission of Inquiry in South Australia, which released its report in April 2008, heard evidence from witnesses placed in state care as recently as the 1980s (Mullighan 2008, p. 24). In Tasmania, the majority of witnesses to the Ombudsman's review were placed in care in the 1950s and 1960s, but 25 of the total 257 witnesses (nearly 10 per cent) had been born between 1970 and 1979, and 9 were born between 1980 and 1989 (Ombudsman Tasmania 2004, p. 11). Therefore, while abuse allegations might be concentrated among those coming into care in the mid-twentieth century, they are not limited to that timeframe.

Blurring the distinction between abuse and discipline to suggest that modern observers have misinterpreted past discipline as abuse denies the legitimacy of abuse allegations and fails to grasp the impact and legacy of child removal and abuse.

Much of the significance of the *Forgotten Australians* report lies in its national focus. The similarity of care-leaver testimony and the seemingly universal nature of their despair and trauma suggest that childhood removal and abuse share strikingly similar forms and impacts regardless of the state in which the removal occurred (Penglase 2005). All care-leavers who made either written or verbal submissions to the *Forgotten Australians* inquiry reported experiencing at least one form of abuse in addition to the trauma of separation from their families. The most common abuses cited were physical (35.5 per cent) and emotional (32.7 per cent), with sexual abuse the third most commonly reported form (20.9 per cent) (SCARC 2004, p. 410). Abuse in Children's Homes was not restricted to the use of excessive physical force against children. Care-leavers report neglect (both emotional and physical) and humiliation as standard features of the institutional experience (SCARC 2004).

EXPLAINING ABUSE

In 2003, I gave evidence to the *Forgotten Australians* inquiry. This was before the publication of the Tasmanian Ombudsman's reports (2004, 2006) and the South Australian Commission of Inquiry (Mullighan 2008) and four years after the release of the Forde Report (1999) in Queensland.

The issue of institutionalisation and child abuse was not in the public consciousness and I often truncated explanations of my research by describing it as relating to 'the white stolen generations'. Often when I told people of my research, and particularly of the *Forgotten Australians* inquiry, I received some memorable but all too common responses. The most common of these was the suggestion that standards of discipline were different in 'those days' and what is now considered 'abuse' was considered 'discipline' at the time. This idea, that what were once standard disciplinary measures are now viewed as abuse, is often invoked to explain away historical child abuse (Penglase 2005; SCARC 2004, p. 141). There is an element of truth to that statement insofar as social standards and attitudes towards children have changed significantly over the past fifty years. However, the 'discipline-to-abuse' argument does not explain abuse so much as it explains different approaches to discipline.

Even when historic abuse is acknowledged by politicians, there is evidence that it is relegated to the history books as distance is evoked to highlight supposed differences between past and present policies and attitudes towards children and youth.

I included my personal, anecdotal observations in my written submission to the *Forgotten Australians* inquiry. At the time, I took issue with the inherent hypocrisy of the response, observing:

> The acts which it has been alleged to have occurred in institutions were the very same standard of acts which, if perpetrated by a parent or relative, would have resulted in the child being taken into state care in the first place (SCARC 2004, p. 141).

Addressing the idea that allegations of physical abuse reflect changing attitudes towards children, the *Forgotten Australians* report described the abuse as going 'way beyond the sort of corporal punishment which was acceptable at the time' (SCARC 2004, p. 101). Describing the punishments as 'extremely severe physical violence' and 'criminal assault', the report chipped away at the myth that 'standards were different back then' (SCARC 2004, p. 101).

The 2004 Tasmanian Ombudsman's report observed that while sexual abuse of children is regarded with 'universal abhorrence and is unacceptable by any standards of human behaviour', attitudes towards emotional and physical abuse are less clear-cut (Ombudsman Tasmania 2004, p. IV). The report commented on the 'general tendency to partially excuse' physical and emotional abuse due, in part, to a belief that such abuses were normal physical discipline of children and unremarkable child rearing techniques (Ombudsman Tasmania 2004, p. IV). The view that physical and emotional abuse can be explained through recourse to the past standards of child rearing does not explain the abuse uncovered by the Tasmanian Ombudsman's review, nor, I suggest, allegations raised in the Forde Report (1999), the *Forgotten Australians* report (SCARC 2004) and the South Australian Mullighan Report (2008). The Tasmanian Ombudsman's review went on to dismiss such appeals to history:

> It is not possible, however, to be dismissive of the allegations of physical and emotional abuse as simply reflecting the social and cultural mores of the day. This view did not stand up to scrutiny. The Review revealed too many credible instances of sadistic and intolerable cruelty to young, helpless children to be simply indicative of changes in the way that society disciplines even its most difficult young people (Ombudsman Tasmania 2004, p. IV).

However, the argument about historical distance persists and can be discerned in both the Victorian Government's submission to the *Forgotten Australians* inquiry and in the Victorian Government's formal apology to state wards in 2006. In its submission to the *Forgotten Australians* inquiry, the Victorian Government summed up allegations of abuse with a statement about the individual nature of abuse and recent changes in community and professional attitudes:

> If physical or sexual abuse occurred it was a product of the actions of individual staff rather than an institutional phenomenon ... The major exception to this, by modern standards, might be the use of physical discipline which would now be viewed as too harsh and potentially harmful (Victoria Government 2003, p. 19).

Leaving aside the qualification 'If physical or sexual abuse occurred' which might cast doubt on the veracity of abuse allegations, the idea that what is now viewed as abuse was considered normal discipline at the time is a deceptive one. This attitude also challenges the validity of abuse allegations by seeking to justify the abuse as somehow normal and unremarkable for the times in which it occurred.

The notion that 'standards were different back then' may also hold some subtle emotional appeal as it lessens the impact of abuse allegations and protects the reputations of alleged abusers. Perhaps, most importantly, it protects the reputations of those community service providers still involved in the provision of child welfare services. This approach also invokes historical distance and helps modern observers distance themselves from the actions of past generations.

ABUSE AS HISTORICAL CURIO

Even when historic abuse is acknowledged by politicians, there is evidence that it is relegated to the history books as distance is evoked to highlight supposed differences between past and present policies and attitudes towards children and youth.

In August 2006, then Victorian Premier, Steve Bracks, made a formal statement of apology to former state wards (VPD 2006). The official Victorian Government apology was long anticipated and, according to some, overdue (*The Age* 9.8.06). Two years had passed since the Senate Community Affairs References Committee had released the *Forgotten Australians* report and the Victorian Government had not implemented a compensation scheme or a formal inquiry into historical abuse in that State's care system. Bracks appealed to historical distance by contrasting historic abuse with modern child welfare practices:

> The government is working hard to ensure that those unacceptable past practices are never ever again experienced by any Victorian child (VPD 2006, p. 2672).

The Community Services Minister, Cheryl Garbutt, also spoke, as did the leaders of the Opposition Liberal and National parties. Garbutt also emphasised the historical nature of allegations stating:

> This form of institutional care is now a thing of the past. Victoria no longer operates these institutions (VPD 2006, p. 2672).

Three years earlier, when asked about the Victorian Government's response to the commissioning of the *Forgotten Australians* Inquiry, Garbutt had also emphasised the historical distance between past and present welfare practice, stating in part:

> Many children were separated from their families and placed in large institutions, large children's homes. Thankfully, we have ceased that practice; we do not operate that way these days (VPD 2003, p. 1131).

While deinstitutionalisation policies of the 1980s and the accompanying move towards community-based care undoubtedly spared countless children and young people the trauma of institutional care, it did not, in and of itself, prevent physical, emotional or sexual abuse of those children remaining in institutional care or being placed in foster care. It is understandable that an official apology would clarify the historical nature of allegations, but no one should be deceived by the idea that sexual and physical abuse of children was simply more common in the past and that, by moving away from institutional responses, such abuse is automatically curtailed. It must be said that historical attitudes can be invoked to explain why reports of abuse were not acted upon and why workers within the child welfare institutions were trusted to care for children and were not subject to police background checks as modern workers are. However, the era in which abuse occurred did not create the abuse; it may have aided in its concealment and in turn exacerbated feelings of isolation, guilt and shame experienced by victims, but it did not cause it.

History can explain the use of institutions for out-of-home placements that were inherently emotionally damaging to children and may have reduced the detection of abuse. But these are *symptoms*, not causes, of the silence surrounding child abuse. Focussing only on the historical nature of abuse allegations distracts from difficult questions about the facilitation of abuse and why abuse continued beyond the 1960s and 1970s. The Mullighan Commission of Inquiry in South Australia heard evidence from witnesses placed in state care as recently as the 1980s, and 51 witnesses to that inquiry were aged eighteen years or less at the time of giving evidence (Mullighan 2008, p. 24). In Tasmania, while the majority of the 257 witnesses to the Ombudsman's review were born between 1940 and 1969 (189 in total), 25 were born between 1970 and 1979, and nine were born between 1980 and 1989 (Ombudsman Tasmania 2004, p. 11).

Emphasis upon the historical timeframe of abuse allegations also fails to consider the issue of how physical and sexual abuse were able to continue despite legislated requirements for government inspections and, later, regulations prescribing acceptable and unacceptable forms of discipline.

While the majority of witnesses to recent inquiries and reviews were placed in care in the mid-twentieth century, the matter of abuse in out-of-home care cannot be said to be a solely historical phenomenon. Examination of the regulatory regime in place, at least in Victoria, reveals that the 'things were different back then' defence is at best weak and misguided and at worst wilful fantasy. Abuse was not historically peculiar nor is it restricted to the institutional settings in which thousands of children found themselves in the post-war years. Emphasis upon the historical timeframe of abuse allegations also fails to consider the issue of how physical and sexual abuse were able to continue despite legislated requirements for government inspections and, later, regulations prescribing acceptable and unacceptable forms of discipline. It is to the latter that we now turn our attention in order to understand just what was and was not considered acceptable discipline of children.

ABUSE AS REGULATORY BREACH

Witnesses to the *Forgotten Australians* Inquiry, the Queensland Forde Report (1999) and the more recent Tasmanian Ombudsman's report (2006), as well as those care-leavers who have taken legal action against the Victorian Government in recent years, have not alleged they were subjected to discipline or corporal punishment alone. Care-leavers have alleged they were subject to abuse, and it is this point that should remain a central focus of research into removal and abuse. It is relatively simple to test whether the alleged abuse was discipline or excessive punishment and abuse according to standards of the day, and resort to modern definitions of abuse is unnecessary. The key lies in the regulations that governed the administration of welfare legislation. From this perspective, much of the alleged physical abuse and certainly the alleged sexual abuse constituted a breach of government regulations and criminal law.

In Victoria, in the latter half of the twentieth century at least, abuse occurred in spite of regulations and legislative requirements for annual inspections of state wards and approved, non-government institutions. Even prior to the 1950s, provisions existed for the inspection of Children's Homes and the suspension or denial of government funding for Homes that failed to meet expected standards (Barnard & Twigg 2004; Jaggs 1986). In Victoria, Government inspections of Children's Homes were introduced in 1874 under the Neglected and Criminal Children's Amendment Act. Inspections of voluntary Homes had been carried out by the Charities Board (later Hospital and Charities Commission) since the nineteenth century but applied only to Homes registered with the Board to receive funding for capital works. These inspections also focused on the physical and structural conditions of the institutions in which the children lived, rather than the emotional or physical health of the children themselves (Barnard & Twigg 2004). However, the fact that Home facilities were expected to meet reasonable standards suggests that there were minimum standards in mind, even if these were not strictly prescribed in legislation.

With regard to the regulation and inspection of Children's Homes, Shurlee Swain (2007) has rightly observed that a central weakness in child welfare practice in Victoria for the first half of the twentieth century was that acceptable standards of care in Children's Homes were not explicitly spelled out in legislation and departmental regulations. The absence of didactic instruction on acceptable and unacceptable standards meant it was left to Home management and staff to determine the practical minimum standards of food, hygiene, dress, medical care and education for all children in their care, including state wards. The absence of a legislated regulatory regime prior to the 1950s belies successive, if sporadic, attempts by the Children's Welfare Association to establish minimum standards of care in voluntary Homes, including those that accommodated state wards (Barnard & Twigg 2004; Jaggs 1986).

The 1954 Children's Welfare Act was expressly intended to overcome weakness in the 1928 Children's Welfare Act which had included no provisions for inspections of non-government Children's Homes (VPD, 5 May 1954, p. 500). The 1928 Act had also lacked any effective regulatory framework concerning discipline and conditions in Children's Homes (VPD, 5 May 1954, p. 500). Therefore, while the regulations and provisions of the 1954 Act did not specify clearly enough all the acceptable standards of treatment for Victorian Children's Homes, there *were* regulations in place. It is the apparent failure of those regulations to adequately prevent abuse that should occupy scholarly and public discussion, not whether or not historical relativism justifies or fully explains mistreatment of children.

While it is important to contextualise abuse allegations as occurring in particular historical periods in order to identify causal, aggravating and mitigating factors, it is ultimately unhelpful and potentially harmful to hide behind history when confronted with allegations of past abuse.

From 1954 onwards, Victorian children's welfare regulations limited the use of discipline and prohibited the use of 'corporal punishment' in government and approved non-government Children's Homes such as those run by churches. The 1954 Children's Welfare Act regulations expressly prohibited the use of corporal punishment against state wards and specified what constituted acceptable discipline:

> Corporal punishment shall not be imposed on any ward placed in an approved children's home or juvenile school (Social Welfare Act 1960, Regulations, Section 55).

The 1954 regulations restricted acceptable forms of discipline to include fatigue duties, deprivation of privileges, variation of diet and temporary isolation (Children's Welfare Act 1954, Regulations, Pt V, Section 46). Dietary restrictions and isolation were limited to twenty-four hours with any extension requiring the approval of the Home's medical officer (Children's Welfare Act 1954, Vic Regulations, Pt V, Section 46). Under the regulations, strapping or slapping a child on the hand or buttocks was not

considered to be corporal punishment. In respect to strapping, dietary restrictions and isolation, public attitudes have changed over time, but it is important to remember that these are the only forms of legitimate discipline allowed under the legislation.

Approved Children's Homes – those that received state funding for each state ward they accommodated – were subject to more stringent regulations which prevented the use of isolation for any more than twenty-four hours (Children's Welfare Act 1954, Vic Regulations, Pt VI, Section 55). In 1955, the regulations were amended to remove dietary restrictions as an acceptable form of discipline for a state ward in any Children's Home in the state (SCARC 2004).

In Victoria, the 1960 Social Welfare Act replaced the 1958 Children's Welfare Act and continued the prohibition on corporal punishment of children under the age of ten (Social Welfare Act, Regulations, 1960 Part V, Section 38 -a).

a) Corporal punishment shall not be imposed on girls, or on boys under the age of ten years.

b) Corporal punishment shall not exceed six strokes on the hand or breech with a leather strap of a length, width and texture approved by the Director-General, and shall only be administered in private by an officer detailed by the Superintendent or Matron, and in the presence of another officer acting as witness.

Under the 1960 regulations, smacking a child with an open hand on their hand or 'breech' was acceptable. However 'boxing' a child about the ears or any punishment other than those explicitly permitted in the regulations, was prohibited (Social Welfare Act, Regulations, 1960 Part IV, Section 38, a-d). Regulations governing the use of isolation were also altered under the 1960 legislation. These allowed for isolation only in a child's own room for no more than two hours at a time (Social Welfare Act, Regulations, 1960 Part IV, Section 36, d).

Regardless of how vague the Regulations may have been about the daily administration of Children's Homes, Home managers and staff were still expected to abide by the laws of the time. For example, sexual abuse of children was illegal in the 1950s and 1960s just as it is illegal today. With this in mind, it is difficult to dismiss modern concerns about historic abuse as a case of modern viewers judging past disciplinary regimes by modern, more genteel standards of child rearing.

CONCLUSION

This article has addressed some stubborn prejudices and misunderstandings about historical abuse in out-of-home care. To continue to view abuse allegations with the assumption that 'standards were different back then' is an injustice to survivors of that abuse. It also prevents the progress of informed discussion and debate about institutional abuse and past welfare policies. Moreover, to understand past abuse as historically peculiar ignores evidence that abuse of children under State care can and does continue to occur, as evidenced by witnesses to the Tasmanian and South Australian Inquiries.

As allegations of past abuse continue to emerge, it is important that historical distance not be invoked merely as a tool to silence, dismiss or mitigate allegations. Understanding historical child abuse involves understanding the regulatory structures in place and why they failed to protect children. Misplaced and convenient historical relativism only clouds the issue and distracts researchers and commentators from identifying the true causes of abuse.

The regulatory structures established under the 1954 Children's Welfare Act would not compare well with modern standards of child welfare. However, they show that acceptable standards of discipline did not include the sorts of abuse that has been alleged. While it is important to contextualise abuse allegations as occurring in particular historical periods in order to identify causal, aggravating and mitigating factors, it is ultimately unhelpful and potentially harmful to hide behind history when confronted with allegations of past abuse. ■

REFERENCES

HREOC—*see* Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission

SCARC—*see* Senate Community Affairs References Committee

VPD—*see* Victoria, Legislative Assembly

Barnard, J. & Twigg, K. (2004) *Holding on to hope: A history of the founding agencies of Mackillop Family Services 1854-1997*, Melbourne, Australian Scholarly Publishing.

Briggs, F. (2007) 'Child sexual abuse and the legal system,' *Children Australia*, 32, 2, 4-7.

Chamley, W. (2006) 'An apology is not enough Mr Bracks', *The Age*, August 9th, viewed 9 August 2006, <http://www.theage.com.au>.

Commission of Inquiry into Abuse of Children in Queensland Institutions (1999) *Report on the abuse of children in Queensland's institutions*, (L. Forde, commissioner), Brisbane, May

Commission of Inquiry into Children in State Care (2008) *Report into allegations of sexual abuse and death from criminal conduct*, (E.H. Mullighan, commissioner), Government Publishing, Adelaide, SA.

Fletcher, A. (2006) *Brutal: Surviving Westbrook Boys' Home*, Sydney: New Holland.

Forde, L. (1999)—*see* Commission of Inquiry into Abuse of Children in Queensland Institutions (1999).

Golding, F. (2005) *An orphan's escape: Memories of a lost childhood*, South Melbourne, Victoria: Lothian Books.

Hil, R., Penglase J. & Smith, G. (2008) 'Closed worlds: Reflections on institutional care and child slavery in Australia', *Children Australia*, 33, 1, 12-17.

Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission (1997) *Bringing them home: National inquiry into the removal of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Children from their families*, Sydney.

Jaggs, D. (1986) *Neglected and criminal: Foundations of child welfare legislation in Victoria*, Melbourne: Phillip Institute of Technology.

Mendes, P. (2005) 'Remembering the "forgotten" Australians: The Care Leavers of Australia Network and the Senate Inquiry into Institutional Out-of-home Care', *Children Australia*, 30, 1, 4-10.

Mullighan, E.P. (2008) — *see* Commission of Inquiry into Children in State Care (2008).

Murray, S. (2008) 'Where are they? Who are they?' Reuniting with family of origin after leaving care', *Australian Historical Studies*, 39, 2, 229-244.

Murray, S., Malone, J. & Glare, J. (2008) Building a life story: Providing records and support to former residents of children's homes', *Australian Social Work*, 61, 3, 239-255.

Ombudsman Tasmania (2004) *Listen to the children: Review of claims of abuse from adults in state care as children*, Hobart: Ombudsman Tasmania. (O'Grady Review) November

Ombudsman Tasmania (2006) *Review of claims of abuse from adults in state care as children: Final report, Phase 2*, Hobart: Ombudsman Tasmania. (O'Grady Review), June.

Penglase, J. (2005) *Orphans of the living: Growing up in care in twentieth-century Australia*, Fremantle: Curtin University Press.

Raman, S. & Forbes, C. (2008) *It's not too late to care: Report on the research into life outcomes for people brought up in institutional care in Victoria*, Melbourne: Centre for Excellence in Child and Family Welfare.

Senate Community Affairs References Committee (2001) *Lost innocents: Righting the record: Report on child migration*, Canberra: Senate Printing Unit.

Senate Community Affairs References Committee (2004) *The Forgotten Australians: A report on Australians who experienced out-of-home care as children*, Canberra: Senate Printing Unit.

Shayler, K. (2001) *The long way home: The story of a homes kid*, Milsons Point, NSW: Random House.

Swain, S. (2007) 'Traces in the archives: Evidence of institutional abuse in surviving child welfare records', *Children Australia*, 32, 1, 24-31.

Szablicki, R. (2007) *Orphanage boy: Through the eyes of innocence*, Sydney: New Holland.

Tennant, M. & Swain, S. (2008) 'Editorial', *Australian Historical Studies*, 39, 2, 147-149.

Victoria Government (2003) *Submission to the Senate Inquiry into Children in Institutional Care*, Melbourne.

Victoria, Legislative Assembly (1954) *Parliamentary Debates*, 5 May 1954, 499-502.

Victoria, Legislative Assembly (2003) *Parliamentary Debates*, 29 April 2003, 1131.

Victoria, Legislative Assembly (2006) *Parliamentary Debates*, 6 August 2006, 2672 –2673.