

168. Many former Child Migrants have reported secondary abuse from these meetings. In one instance, a child migrant was told by the head of a religious order: '*We've heard this all before*' and you are '*taking our pensions.*' These encounters carry very real risks of re-traumatisation.
169. Over the years, former Child Migrants have had little choice about re-engaging with the institutions if they wanted to access their historic records, reunite with childhood friends, or seek redress through institutional processes even though these lack any external or independent accountability. CMT has frequently heard complaints of present day interactions with the institutions where former Child Migrants felt powerless or experienced denial that triggered childhood trauma.
170. In relation to redress matters, such as the Catholic Church 'Towards Healing' programme, many former Child Migrants have reported they felt coerced to accept minimal redress through a 'take it or leave it' attitude that belies the title of that scheme. Indeed, some felt a sense of *déjà vu*. Just as their childhood institutions lacked care, so they now struggled to feel any genuine sense of healing through this process. These are important considerations in relation to any role the institutions might play in a future redress scheme. The continuing imbalance of power remains a toxic factor for adult survivors of historic child abuse.
171. Since 1987, we have been attempting to obtain redress for those deported under the child migration schemes. There have also been various attempts by child migrants to obtain redress in different jurisdictions. The primary responsibility of the damage and harm caused to the Child Migrants rests with the Government. However, the redress has been patchwork and, in many cases, the law with its statutes of limitation has worked to prevent former Child Migrants from obtaining justice.
172. In 1993, Slater & Gordon lawyers brought an action in Sydney on behalf of around 250 claimants. I was not involved in this litigation but was issued with a subpoena for the records of my therapeutic work with child migrants who had been given assurances that these discussions would be confidential. This was a case in the Australian Supreme Court but a worldwide subpoena had been issued for the casework records which were in Nottingham. I engaged a lawyer to protect the integrity of my commitment to my clients. The penalty I would face if I did not comply was a period of imprisonment. The subpoena was eventually withdrawn at the last minute, wasting precious time and limited funds which should have been devoted to reuniting families.