

Joanne Peacher

I want to add from my personal view some issues and things that are being discussed in the survivor community.

- 1) The people who are eligible to apply to the scheme.

This in general is ok but child abuse is abuse there's thousands of children now adults that have been abused in other settings.

- 2) The Bill's definition of abuse.

Again the definition is ok

- 3) The dates used in the Bill to define 'historical abuse'.

This is ok but abuse has also happened after these dates and needs addressing.

- 4) The Bill's definition of 'in care' and the places in which that care took place.

Please add boarding schools hospitals even young offenders institutions. Foster carers adopted parents this is huge for child abuse. Mental health institutions.

- 5) The process of applying for redress and what advice and support applicants might need, particularly in relation to the waiver scheme.

I hope the process for applying wont harm the person claiming as they are still living with the trauma with out needing to prove they lived in a certain establishment as in church settings the priests and nuns often changed their names Nazareth houses are a good example of this. I was sent documents then I sent them to my solicitor and the inquiry now they have disappeared. We need a easier less court room style to the claims. I think any legal help or support by a worker could be paid for out of the scheme and not the victims compensation.

Example a victim gets £20000 less solicitors fees of 20 percent they actually only get £16000 less the exchange rate if they live overseas and bank charges leaves them with approx. £14500 the exchange rate also and bank charges need to be paid by the scheme.

A victim should be able to also sue for damages as well in the courts less what the scheme gives them.

The advanced payment scheme should of been available to all or at least the most vulnerable for eg those who have never worked in their lifes those who have had life time social workers and psychiatrists . The wait adds to the pain and the closure of the abuse.

- 6) The level of payments offered to survivors.

This is very fair but its worried that the smaller payment will only be offered to all.
Some people like me have suffered mentally since the 1970s

- 7) What you believe to be a 'fair and meaningful' contribution to the scheme from organisations responsible for abuse.

As in any court and any one guilty 100 percent contribution of damages and costs to solicitors helping clients then may be survivors will agree the idea that they cant sue. The institutions need to show really they are sorry.

- 8) The process for dealing with applications to the scheme from people who have serious convictions.

The convictions if caused due to mental health issues and a good criminal history otherwise should be let off in full.

If a repeat offender then they need some type of warning or contribution say community work to help survivors victims really should not have to pay any price any penny if there health was the reason for the criminal activity This is my story and I had a clean record the fact mental health was ignoring me then and now made me worse. The cica scheme has stopped many survivors getting a payment blamed on criminal activity.

- 9) The process for family members to make an application on behalf of a survivor who has since died.

This is ok and should remain easy also adults with a mental illness learning issues there carers family should also be able to apply.

- 10) A institution should apologize to each victim who has come forward individually by placing a advert in the newspapers by sending them a personal letter as well.

Survivors really hate the name the redress scheme after being raped and undressed the government will redress them after years of being naked and alone the name needs changing surely.

Let Scotland get in their first and show they support survivors.