

CHAPTER 10

CHILDREN IN THE CARE OF THE STATE

Indeed, coming into care, or attempting to have a child committed to care, provides a clear path to homelessness.

INTRODUCTION

10.1 As described in Chapter 8, Families Under Stress and Chapter 9, Family Poverty and Isolation, the assistance which State welfare authorities are providing to children generally, and to adolescents in particular, is dwindling. In this chapter we consider the finding that many homeless children and young people have had some contact with the child welfare and/or juvenile justice systems. The following evidence, received from one homeless young woman, was echoed in many experiences recounted to the Inquiry.

They just stuck me in Wilson [Youth Detention Centre] and said, 'stay there'... They put you in some place and you are not happy, so you end up running away again. So they put you in another place when they catch you. They don't sit down and say, 'OK, why do you run away?'... I'm not a criminal or anything but I was put in the watchhouse, I went to court and I went to Wilson... I have done nothing wrong. They're the ones that are doing things wrong. They are the ones that put people in places that they don't like. They should have a reason, but they don't — it is just something that they do. It is stupid — why should we go to court in the first place?

10.2 In 1984 the Australian Bureau of Statistics estimated that at least 30,309 Australian children were living in some form of substitute care (including adoption, foster care, relatives, friends, institutions, publicly-provided supported and unsupported accommodation, refuges and prisons).¹ In 1985 the Senate Standing Committee on Social Welfare noted several changes in the characteristics of children entering substitute care. They tended to be older (average age on entering care was 10 years rather than 6.8 as before), more likely to come from a broken or blended family, and more likely to have severe behavioural problems, emotional disturbances and disabilities.⁴ A survey of reasons for the admission of these children to substitute care found that 79% were admitted for reasons other than their own behaviour and beyond their own control, including family breakdown, homelessness, parents' inability to cope, child abuse or neglect and the like.⁵ It has further been noted that factors contributing to 'crises' leading to children's removal from home 'are generally related to a family's immediate economic and social circumstances'.⁶

10.3 In any one year approximately 3,000 young people, who may be wards as a result of offending or because they were in need of care, are discharged from State wardship.⁷ In the early stages of the Inquiry we became particularly concerned at the numbers of homeless children who were State wards. On making further inquiries we were disturbed to discover that little is known — at least by their (former) guardian, the State — of the fate of these children:

There are very limited data available at present about the number of children leaving guardianship orders, their age at leaving guardianship, the reasons for their discharge or the length of time they have been under guardianship, let alone about their subsequent careers. From the data available it is estimated some 3,000 children are discharged from guardianship annually. It is not known how many of these have families to which to return.⁸

At least another 3,000 children and young people are discharged each year from juvenile correctional institutions.⁹ There is similarly little follow-up of these young people.

10.4 A period of time spent in a child welfare or juvenile justice institution, or otherwise detached by the welfare system from the natural family, seems to increase significantly a child's chances of becoming homeless. A New South Wales survey of 100 girls, 64 of whom were or had been in the care of the State

and all of whom were 'at risk', found that most of the girls had experienced significant instability of accommodation, including while they were in 'care'. The 100 girls had experienced between them 802 independent moves (that is, without their parents).") In a study of 'runaway' youth conducted in 1982 in three centres it was found that over 50% had been through the children's courts and almost 30% had been institutionalised, either as offenders or as children in need of care and protection, at some stage of their lives." A Melbourne survey conducted in 1982-83 also found that prior institutionalisation could contribute to homelessness. For young people who spend significant periods in orphanages or homes, prisons or correctional institutions, or a series of foster placements, 'there is little element of choice in their leaving (or returning) — they grow too old for the institution, but there is nothing to provide the sort of back-up and support which most people receive from their family'.¹²

10.5 Similar evidence was presented to the Inquiry. It is quite clear that a substantial number of children and young people become homeless while still under State guardianship. In New South Wales the Inquiry was told:

...the Government also do not have resources. Just because you are a State ward does not mean the Government have come up with any other options and so they were housing them in youth refuges...'

Evidence was presented that the proportion of State wards among residents of the Wollongong youth refuge was increasing.¹⁴

10.6 In Victoria the Inquiry received evidence of a recent dramatic increase in the proportion of homeless young people presenting at one service who were, or had been, clients of the Department of Community Services:

1983-84	29.2% average
1984-85	28.9% average
1985-86	29.9% average
1986-87	30.6% average
Oct 1987	64.0%
Nov 1987	52.0%
Dec 1987	36.4%
Jan 1988	48.5% ¹⁵

The Inquiry was told by another youth service:

Mostly the referrals that are coming of 14 to 16-year-olds are coming from the Department of Community Services, from offices all over Melbourne...¹⁶

And a witness from a Gippsland youth service stated:

...a high percentage of young people [at the refuge] have been in institutions, either because they were wards of the State or have been offenders..."

10.7 In Tasmania similar evidence was given and it was submitted in evidence in Hobart that the high proportion of wards and ex-wards among homeless young people 'indicates there is inadequate transition from the status of being a ward to being independent within the community'.¹⁸

10.8 In O'Connor's study of 100 homeless young people in Brisbane, Sydney, Canberra/Queanbeyan and the Gold Coast, slightly over one-half had lived in a child welfare home, a detention centre or both; 14 were currently State wards and another eight had at some time previously been under such an order.^o Moreover:

Young people's treatment by welfare authorities was often identified as a reason for their leaving home and, at later stages, lack of secure accommodation."

10.9 This evidence is a serious indictment of the State — which has not only the power to provide for these children but an obligation, and the resources, to do so. Wardship involves a transfer to the State, by means of a court order, of the rights and duties of the parents with respect to the child. The obligations of the State to the child who is made a State ward, therefore, are the same as those of parents.

10.10 The problem is not only one of homelessness. Captain David Brunt from the Salvation Army youth service in Kings Cross, Sydney, told the Chairman of the Inquiry that, in one week in August 1987, most of the young male prostitutes spoken to by his agency were current State wards." That is a grave indictment of dereliction by responsible State authorities.

10.11 The Inquiry was told of several 'typical' case studies, including the following:

...a young boy who was 2 years old when he first came to the attention of the Department.. His mother kept getting institutionalised in one mental hospital after the other. As soon as she came home, the child was returned. Then when she was institutionalised he was fostered, then returned, then fostered, then returned — ten, twenty times throughout his life. The child was referred to us [Independent Therapeutic Residences for Adolescents] when he was 13. By this time he had already shown violent sexual abuse towards other children, he was violent, he was a transsexual by this time because he had been sexually abused in institutions...This is a classic street kid who is going on to be a delinquent...n

In O'Connor's study, Liza was similarly mistreated:

Liza was 11 years old when she was removed from her family by the state, '...to give my parents a break'. [She had been bashed at home but was never placed on a protection order.] ...she was [happily] fostered for several months and then was returned to her family. [However, she ran away repeatedly back to her foster family.] 'So I stole a lot of money and they [her parents] just said they didn't want me anymore and they locked me up.'

During her incarceration Liza was admitted to wardship. She was then placed in a children's home, but after running away eight times in two weeks, was again locked up and charged with being 'uncontrollable'. This pattern repeated itself...until eventually, at the age of 15, Liza struck out on her own and moved to Sydney and a refuge. After a few turns on the refuge circuit, Liza found herself on the streets trying [but failing] to keep a job...

...At the age of 16 (and still in the legal guardianship of the state) Liza was forced into live-in work at a Kings Cross brothel."

10.12 The Inquiry received disturbing evidence from a number of witnesses that State and Territory welfare departments deal with many children and young people brought to their attention or even leaving State care by referring them to youth refuges. In Melbourne the Inquiry was told of:

...a belief by some agencies within the non-government sector that there is a tendency, particularly over the last 12 months, for CSV [Community Services Victoria] to discharge young people from guardianship and to not give them any support, and by this I mean that when a young person has entered into refuge accommodation, workers are saying that the next thing they hear from CSV is, 'Oh good. That young person is safe with you now. We will discharge that young person from guardianship. Good luck.' And that young person has often not been plugged into any State-wide supports, does not have information about access to employment, access to income support, and finds that private board subsidy has vanished.'

The Inquiry Was also told that 17% of referrals to the Wagga Wagga Youth Refuge in New South Wales in 1986-87 (32 young people) were from the Department of Youth and Community Services. Other government authorities, including the police, referred another 13% (25 young people)."

10.13 Yet it is absolutely clear that youth refuges are not designed or adequately resourced to cope with difficult young people, especially young offenders. Indeed, some refuges, notably some in Melbourne, have determined either to place a quota on the numbers of State wards accepted or to refuse access to State wards unless and until the Department of Community Services agrees to provide appropriate backup services.²⁶ This situation is a disgrace.

CHILDREN IN CARE .

10.14 Evidence presented to the Inquiry indicated that State welfare institutions, and State care in general, fail to socialise the young people for whom they have responsibility. In Sydney we heard that 'institutionalisation plays a large part in effecting homelessness by depriving these people of the coping skills they need.'" In Melbourne a witness from the Youth Accommodation Coalition stated:

Research and data collection from existing youth housing services indicate that over 30% of young people seeking accommodation have had extended stays in government institutions prior to becoming homeless and in need of crisis accommodation. This figure itself is a sad indictment on the effectiveness of large institutions. Not only are they expensive to maintain, they are also churning out a far disproportionate number of homeless people not capable of independent living. It is also the experience of most services that these institutionalised young people are the most difficult to support in services and the most difficult to relocate in alternative housing."

10.15 A recent review of a program for children in residential institutions" criticised the limited priority attached by State funding bodies to projects designed to prepare and equip older children in care with independent living skills. The Review further commented on the failure to extend the range of normal- life experiences to children in care. Such experiences as recreational, social, and community-based activities are essential for the development of self-esteem. The 'Children in Residential Institutions Program', which aims to provide such experiences to children in care, was opposed by some State funding committees."

10.16 Institutionalisation as a response to child abuse and neglect, or to juvenile offending, has been discredited to an extent and most Australian jurisdictions are exploring means of diverting most children and adolescents from the system or, for those incapable of diversion, a range of community-based accommodation and other service options. The Inquiry was told, however, that rates of detention remain very high in Western Australian and the Northern Territory.³ In all jurisdictions, Aboriginal children are grossly over-represented among children in care (see Chapter 12, The Situation of Aboriginal Children and Young People). Children with disabilities are also over-represented among children in substitute care, particularly those in institutions."

What is of deep concern is the connection between those children who are brought in because they are in need of care and protection in the traditional sense and who commit offences. In I 9S1 a departmental report found that a great majority of those children were likely to offend more than once. In that time there was a 160% higher probability that children who had been committed to the care of the department would reoffend than those who had not."

10.17 Moreover, in spite of the decline in the numbers of children being made wards,' State welfare authorities are still not able to provide adequate care and support for the remaining wards. The Inquiry was told that some State wards in New South Wales are inadequately accommodated by the State, especially after they reach the age of 16." In Queensland it was stated that 'sheer pressure of work' means:

...very many young people who are legally in the care of the Department of Family Services are not seen by their social workers or their child care officers., .not only are juveniles not offered consistent quality intervention, but on countless occasions childcare officers do not even know where the young person is

For these young people, in particular, the State authorities charged with their protection and support have seriously failed in their duties. The results inflicted on some children because of such official negligence have been quite horrific.

CHILDREN LEAVING CARE

10.18 Because of our serious concern at the situation of many State wards and because of a lack of available information, the Inquiry commissioned a study on children and young people leaving State care from the Brotherhood of St Laurence. This study revealed that State welfare departments do little, if

anything, to assist State wards leaving care into stable independent living situations or to divert them from homelessness.

The questions of emotional, developmental and identity needs are critical and demand a continuity in services and relationships yet these seem to be given minimal priority in service provision for children leaving guardianship. Even the more 'visible' needs for housing, income support, education, training, and employment are not being met for a number of the children in question."

Only New South Wales and the A.C.T. have enacted legislative provisions specifically empowering the provision of material and financial support and other services to ex-wards. But even then, neither of these jurisdictions impose an obligation to provide such support."

10.19 No information is available about the extent of assistance given to former wards under the provisions of the New South Wales or A.C.T. legislation, either by way of general financial assistance or assistance with education and training. These powers are discretionary and the legislation does not specify an age at which they cease. In Tasmania, wardship can be extended and material and other resources provided by the Department for Community Welfare up to the age of 21 years if the ward's income and other support structures are manifestly inadequate. Departmental guidelines establish that the level of material support should be that which a normal parent would continue to provide. It would, therefore, vary from case to case. The welfare authorities in Queensland and South Australia are also authorised to provide some assistance to ex-wards. No information was available, however, as to the extent to which such support is actually provided."

10.20 In general, States and Territories do not have specific programs to assist children leaving care. Procedures on discharge typically involve a letter from the welfare department to the child or young person leaving guardianship and his or her parents. This may be pro forma or a personal letter and may, in some cases, suggest contacting the Department if future assistance is needed.^o In some States some ongoing contact and assistance may be provided for some former State wards by departmental officers on an individual basis. Some States claim not to distinguish between former wards and others in the provision of assistance to and programs for young people.^o

10.21 Young offenders who have been placed in correctional institutions are also, generally speaking, not assisted by special programs when they leave the institutions. One example presented to the Inquiry involved 18 young offenders in a Rivetina institution in October 1987. Only one was likely to return to a caring and supportive family upon discharge. Of the others, information available indicated that four would be looking for independent accommodation, six would return to a family with a history of breakdown and dysfunction and two would return to a home in which they had suffered constant physical abuse."

Quite simply, there are not enough resources — either physical or emotional — to help homeless young offenders reintegrate back into society."

10.22 In submissions to the Inquiry, some State and Territory Governments acknowledged the increased risk of homelessness likely to follow a period of wardship or detention. The Northern Territory Government, for example, stated:

During periods following detention young people will have an increased probability of becoming homeless. This is particularly the case where the family the young person is returning to is under stress.'

The Queensland Government submitted that:

A substantial proportion of homeless youth have records of involvement with law enforcement authorities, ..Many young homeless have been or still are subject to statutory child welfare orders for reasons of care and protection (after abuse or neglect), offending or because of status."

Finally, the Tasmanian Government submitted that 12% of homeless young people contacted in Hobart during December 1987 had been 'recently discharged from a young offenders centre .

DEINSTITUTIONALISATION

10.23 Deinstitutionalisation began as a rejection of large central institutions — for wards of the State, juvenile offenders, intellectually and physically disabled people and, most recently, people with psychiatric disabilities — in favour of decentralised small residential facilities in community settings. In the child welfare area this was accompanied by a strong emphasis on keeping children with their families unless, of course, they are in real danger.

This policy derives from studies demonstrating that children have usually come to greater harm in the care of the welfare system than by remaining with a family that the social worker might disapprove of."

10.24 Although deinstitutionalisation was seen by many as a preferred option to institutionalisation, it has been argued that in the last decade in Australia governments have sought, for financial reasons, to withdraw further from the provision of accommodation and support services for these people. The result has been an emphasis on return to the family or on fostering, adoption, community-based facilities and the like. The responsibility for the care of people in these special needs categories has been shifted by governments away from themselves back to the family and the community:*

10.25 Evidence presented to the Inquiry clearly indicated that deinstitutionalisation programs throughout Australia have not been accompanied by the necessary support to the families and communities expected to accept the burden of caring for the children and young people involved, nor to those individuals themselves. A New South Wales witness told the Inquiry:

Since 1970 we have been hastening the demise of large institutions in which we had placed wards, children committed to care, some orphans, as well as those children with special physical and intellectual needs, along, of course, with the young offenders. Often this has been done without the development of adequate new facilities and sometimes within an uncritical ideological framework which did little to individualise what was being done away with...Few would welcome a return to the large conglomerates which are certainly inappropriate for wards and children in care or children with special needs or almost any other young person. However, there should not be a dichotomy between the appropriate institution and other types of care."

10.26 The Victorian deinstitutionalisation program was roundly criticised by a number of witnesses because the support required to make the transition to independent living is not provided.

The kind of young women that we are looking at now coming out of [Community Services Victoria] homes are young women with very few skills, who are products of broken marriages and lots of problems at home. It is very difficult to know what to do with them and the institutions are not helping any either because at the moment the big word is deinstitutionalisation — that means throw them out onto us who have nowhere to put them.. We cannot support them. We cannot put them into any kind of housing because of their lack of skills. I think the Government needs to.. recognise that we in the community cannot support that concept [of deinstitutionalisation] unless there are some ways to help us with that. ..Independent living to me means you have to give them some skills and some support to begin that independent living at least, and perhaps to monitor somewhere along the way.'

10.27 In Victoria, too, considerable youth homelessness was attributed to the deinstitutionalisation policy as it affects children and young people in the care of the State, young offenders, and young people with social and psychological disabilities. One witness stated:

...substantial numbers of young people who would have originally been cared for by State welfare authorities are now being cared for in the homeless system.'

A witness from a Gippsland youth service told the Inquiry:

Through the deinstitutionalisation program, we are getting actually some young people who have been in smaller hostels, have been evicted there and we actually had young people staying in the refuge because they could not stay in that hostel.⁵²

10.28 The children's clinic of the Victorian Health Department also expressed serious concern about the lack of suitable accommodation for offending and/or 'uncontrollable' adolescents. These young

people can be rendered homeless when their behaviour does not warrant a sentence or w order yet the parents feel they can no longer manage them at home. Whereas previously young people with intellectual disabilities would be accommodated by the Victorian Office of Intellectual Disability Services, the deinstitutionalisation policy means that even these young people can find themselves homeless.'

10.29 In Adelaide the Inquiry was told:

One particular development that is causing concern and placing additional stress on services is the process of deinstitutionalisation. This process has occurred in the past and is accelerating rapidly. It seems that adequate resources have not been made available to replace the services and accommodation once provided by institutions?'

It was even suggested that any 'improvement' in welfare services that occurs when they are provided by community organisations will be primarily due to the fact that State-provided services were so grossly inadequate."

10.30 The lack of alternative supports is, according to evidence presented to the Inquiry, directly and substantially contributing to youth homelessness. A Kings Cross youth service identified New South Wales government policies of deinstitutionalisation in the child welfare system, with the consequent reduction of institutional beds, as a potential cause of homelessness due to the lack of alternative options and resources." Youth refuges are now finding that they are increasingly asked to accommodate children and young people who previously, whether as offenders or as children in need of care and protection, would have been the responsibility of the Department of Family and Community Services.

10.31 It is interesting but disturbing to note that the Senate Standing Committee on Social Welfare made a very similar finding in 1985. The Senate Committee noted that:

While there was general agreement on the value of child and family welfare policies and programs emphasising principles of deinstitutionalisation, normalisation, restoration of the child to the family and prevention, evidence received by the Committee suggested that these initiatives may be giving rise to certain negative 'program effects' manifested in other welfare problems. Examples include the increasing number of homeless youth requiring different forms of government intervention..."

Thus:

...the recent decline in the number of children in both protective and corrective care does not necessarily reflect a decline in the number of children living in precarious circumstances..."

The Senate Committee described the results of the approach of State welfare authorities as follows:

for certain children from poorly functioning families, State intervention under present policies and practices may have merely been deferred until the children leave home of their own volition, often becoming homeless youth."

The Inquiry, three years later, makes the same finding as did the Senate Committee, namely that:

...while the number of children in substitute care is falling, evidence shows that the number of homeless children requesting refuge accommodation is increasing.w

The major difference in what we must sadly report is that this finding now applies to many more children and young people.

10.32 The Senate Committee called on State welfare authorities to:

...reappraise present substitute care policies and funding priorities for services to assist children who leave home of their own accord, who are unable to support themselves, who need a more sheltered and stable environment than can be offered by youth refuges, and whom most State welfare departments are now reluctant to bring before the authorities as being in need of care and protection and place in other forms of care."

10.33 While most witnesses before the Inquiry approved the general thrust of deinstitutionalisation programs, evidence was given in some States and the Northern Territory concerning a clear and continuing need for residential facilities for some young people.

As far as institutions are concerned, I believe that we have been guilty yet again of chucking the baby out with the bath water. Deinstitutionalisation, in my view, was started to save money rather than because it was felt that the services provided were actually inadequate to meet the need. I personally do not favour large institutions and certainly not of the Dickensian variety that some of them were, but I do believe that there is a place for a residential facility, providing that facility provides 24-hour residential care of a therapeutic type.. with the ultimate objective to place them back either with their families, if that is appropriate, in foster care or in group homes or independently back into the community, hopefully with a job."

PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN LEAVING CARE

10.34 Barnardo's Australia, in a submission to the Inquiry, recommended that provision should be made for the adequate support of young people leaving welfare care.

This group is particularly vulnerable to homelessness and is a group to whom society owes special responsibility...In particular the housing and job training needs of children leaving care must be addressed."

10.35 There are a small number of State programs. An important new initiative is the South Australian Community Welfare Department's Adolescents at Risk program which commenced in February 1988 with regional Adolescent Support Teams. The program provides intensive counselling and support, group work, community development projects, support of non-government agencies such as youth shelters and also has a co-ordinating role. The target age group is 10 to 18-year-olds at risk of physical or emotional harm. Services can also be provided to 18 to 21-year-olds. The client population includes girls pregnant at an early age, and suicidal, abused and self-mutilating young people. The evidence outlined in this and previous chapters is underlined by the fact that it is estimated that 30% of young people in this program are State wards or ex-wards.'

10.36 In Victoria, the Youth Support Branch of the Department of Community Services has responsibility for programs for young offenders, some of whom are under guardianship orders. These programs include the Improvement of Life Opportunities for Youth program which addresses the needs of youth aged between 12 and 21 years who are wards, probationers, youth trainees, and parolees. One of the projects involved is the Employment Access Program which is described in Chapter 23, Job Training and Employment Programs. In the Northern Territory, there is a government program specifically for children aged 13 to 17 while they are still under guardianship: the Community Care Program. This is:

...a scheme where the Department of Health and Community Services, Welfare Section, trains, supports and pays members of the community to share their homes and families with adolescents who need help...

Caregivers assist young people to achieve life skills which will enable them to return to their families or move on to 'independent living'.¹⁵

10.37 The Queensland Department of Family Services funds a community agency 'Friends from Care' which works specifically with children discharged from care. Self-support groups of children who have been in care are established and the organisation also provides counselling, assistance with finding jobs, accommodation, living skills, advocacy, and other assistance. The organisation has expanded recently to provide some accommodation and a drop-in centre and does help other young people as well as former wards.'

10.38 While a variety of non-government programs exist which may include children who are leaving guardianship orders, few have this group as their major, let alone exclusive, concern. Friends from Care in Brisbane would seem to be the program most specifically designed for this group. A number of agencies provide residential care for children including wards. Some of these organisations provide living skills programs for residents, some provide after-care on an individual basis to former residents and a few provide some form of semi-independent accommodation for former wards. Other services provided include supported accommodation, employment skills programs, volunteer friendship programs, street-based advocacy services and pregnancy support.'

10.39 One non-government agency which has a specific after-care program is the Parkerville Children's Home, a residential facility in Perth. This agency maintains after-care contact on a needs basis for many years if necessary. The social worker retains the case, keeps files open and sees the young person regularly either at home, in foster care or independent living. Also as part of after-care, finance is provided for further education and work is guaranteed for any past resident. If former wards are unemployed and alternative employment is not available they will be employed at award wages by the agency either at the Home or the associated farm. There are also two houses for emergency accommodation for past residents. The agency has adopted the philosophy that it really is the guardian of the child and should see him or her through to independent living."

CONCLUSION

10.40 The failure of State welfare and health authorities both to provide appropriate and timely assistance to families in need and to provide appropriate nurture and support to children committed to, and leaving, their care, is a serious indictment of the willingness and capacity of those authorities to properly discharge their legal and social responsibilities. Our findings support those of the Senate Standing Committee on Social Welfare set out above. As to the Committee's call for a reappraisal of existing approaches, it is clear that little has been done in this direction in most States. Children between 12 and 15 or 16 years of age are particularly ill-served. The States are ill-equipped or unwilling to offer appropriate services and the Commonwealth regards the matter as a State responsibility. These children, in particular then, fall through the nets of support, inadequate as they may be, extended by the State and Federal Governments.

10.41 In the view of the Inquiry, it is simply unacceptable that this situation should continue. Steps must be taken urgently to ensure that the substantial and growing numbers of homeless children who are, or have been, State wards are given the 'care' to which they are legally entitled.

Notes

1. I. O'Connor. *Most of us have got a lot to say and we know what we are talking about': Children's and Young People's Experiences of Homelessness (1988)*, at 80.
2. Young woman, aged 15, quoted in S.115, Youth Advocacy Centre Brisbane.
3. Senate Standing Committee on Social Welfare, *Children in Institutional and Other Forms of Care* (Parliamentary Paper No, 32411985) para 1.8.
4. *Id*, para 1.14.
5. *Id*, para 1.20.
6. *Id*, para 1.25.
7. No figures are available from WA or the NT. In the period 1 July 1986 to 30 June 1987 the following numbers of wards were discharged in other States:

NSW	463
Vic	795
Qld	1,448
SA	229
Tat	82
ACT	58
Total	3,075
8. J. Taylor and O. Burston, *Children and Young People Leaving Care* (Brotherhood of St Laurence, 1988) at 17.
9. These figures are much harder to derive as no figures are available from Qld, and NSW, WA and Tasmania keep figures only of the total number of discharges (shown below in brackets) and not the number of people discharged: i.e. there could be considerable double counting:

NSW	1,001 admitted 1986-87 (1,448 discharges)
Vic	250 approx. discharged 1986-87
SA	84
WA	1,581 admitted 1986-87 (3,214 discharges)
Tas	130 discharged 1986-87
NT	86
ACT	190
Total	3,322
10. NSW Women's Co-ordination Unit, *Girls at Risk* (1986) at 42.
11. R. Lincoln, Australian Institute of Criminology, *Transcript* at 561.
12. NJ. Low, B.W. Crawshaw and S. Mathews, *No Fixed Address* (Outer East Youth Needs Group, 1984) at 72.
13. N. Clay, Wollongong Youth Refuge (NSW), *Transcript* at 1804.
14. *Id*, at 1804.
15. D. Saltmarsh, Melbourne City Mission, *Transcript* at 920. See also, H. Ryan, Open Family Box Hill Inc. (Vic), *Transcript* at 1172.
16. H. Ryan, Open Family. Box Hill Inc. (Victoria), *Transcript* at 1182.
17. E. Gray, Central Gippsland Youth Refuge (Victoria), *Transcript* at 1099-1100.
18. P. Beyers, Housing and Young People's Outreach Hobart, *Transcript* at 1450.
19. O'Connor, *op cit*, at 28.
20. *Id*, at 65.
21. Meeting between Commissioner Burdekin and Captain David Brunt, Salvation Army, in Sydney.
22. M. Podnieks, Independent Therapeutic Residences for Adolescents (SA). *Transcript* at 1373.
23. O'Connor, *op cis*, at 80-81.
24. K. Walker. Street Work Project (Vic), *Transcript* at 984.
25. S.21, NSW Department of Youth and Community Services, Riverina Regional Office, Appendix A.
26. Personal communication, M.Cafarella, Co-ordinator, Wombat Youth Accommodation Services Group Melbourne, 23 Sept 1988.
27. J. Brown, Sydney City Mission, *Transcript* at 139. See also, S.64, Barnardo's Australia, at 9.
28. D. Otto, Youth Accommodation Coalition (Vic), *Transcript* at 906.

29. J. Ward et al, *A Review of Children in Residential Institutions Program: Report to the Commonwealth Schools Commission* (Macquarie University, 1984).
30. See also, J. Jariah (ed.), 'Child Welfare: Current Issues and Future Directions' (1983) 34 *Social Welfare Research Centre Reports and Proceedings*.
31. M. Rayner, *Transcript* at 637-638.
32. 8.6% of Australians were 'handicapped' in 1981, according to the Australian Bureau of Statistics Survey of Handicapped Persons. 4% of the 166,700 handicapped people aged 19 years or under were in substitute care: Senate Standing Committee on Social Welfare, *Children in Institutional and Other Forms of Care* (Parliamentary Paper No. 324/1985) para 1.17.
33. M. Rayner, *Transcript* at 639.
34. *Children and Young People Leaving Care, op cit*, at 15.
35. S.50. Come-In Youth Resource Centre (NSW), *No Vacancies*, at 23-25.
36. R. Daniels, Brisbane College of Advanced Education, *Transcript* at 272-273.
37. *Children and Young People Leaving Care, op cit*, at 51.
38. Children (Care and Protection) Act 1987 (NSW), s.92; Children's Services Ordinance 1986 (ACT), s.115.
39. *Children and Young People Leaving Care, op cit*. at 29-32.
40. *Id*, at 20, 25.
41. *Id*, at 32. There is a general power to provide welfare assistance - not specific to wards or former wards - in most jurisdictions: *Community Welfare Services Act 1970* (Vic), s.86; *Children's Services Act 1965* (Qld), s.41; *Community Welfare Act 1972* (SA), s.10; *Child Welfare Act 1947* (WA), s.66C; *Community Welfare Act 1983* (NT), s.8.
42. S.21, NSW Department of Youth and Community Services, Riverina Regional Office, at 1.
43. S.42, C. Whiteford, at 2-3.
44. S.120E, Northern Territory Government, at 15.
45. S.120A, Queensland Government, para 4.9.
46. S.120F, Tasmanian Government, para 2.6.
47. 5.64, Barnardo's Australia, at 4.
48. L. Bryson and M. Mowbray, 'The Reality of Community Care', 1 June 1983 *Australian Society* at 13; G. Guy 'Community-Based Care: Deinstitutionalization or Transinstitutionalization?' (1985) 32(3) *The Exceptional Child* 137, at 138.
49. P. Tynan, Centacare Newcastle (NSW), *Transcript* at 1917.
50. G. Watkinson, YWCA Dandenong/Western Port (Vic), *Transcript* at 1123.
51. G. MeLimont, Homeless Persons' Council (Vic), *Transcript* at 954.
52. E. Gray, Central Gippsland Youth Refuge (Vic), *Transcript* at 1099-1100.
53. S.73, Victorian Health Department, at 1.
54. D. M.ugford, Ingle Farm Adelaide, *Transcript* at 1320.
55. Bryson and Mowbray, *op cit*, at 13.
56. S.50, Coine-In Youth Resource Centre (NSW), *No Vacancies*, at 23-25.
57. *Children in Institutional and Other Forms of Care* (Parliamentary Paper No. 324/1985), para 8.4.
58. *Ibid*,
59. *Id*, para 8.5.
60. *Ibid*.
61. *Id*, para 8.7.
62. S. Healey, NT Education Department, *Transcript* at 1632.
63. S.64, Barnardo's Australia, at 2.
64. *Children and Young People Leaving Care, op cit*, at 34-35.
65. *Id*, at 37.
66. *Id*, at 45.
67. *Id*, at 38.
68. *Id*, at 43.