

CHAPTER 20

SUPPORT NEEDS AND SERVICES

What is required is a set of policies and programs which embody a valued role, a place for young people in our society. Such a policy should provide families with assistance and a sense of purpose in working for that vision.'

INTRODUCTION

20.1 Throughout its hearings the Inquiry repeatedly received evidence concerning the importance of a range of 'support' services to the prevention and alleviation of homelessness among children and young people. Families may require support — by way of resources, respite care, counselling, or related services — in order to cope with their children and adolescents. They often require financial assistance to continue supporting their children (see Chapter 8, Families Under Stress, and Chapter 9, Family Poverty and Isolation). Children in substitute care require special services and programs to prepare them for independent living (see Chapter 10, Children in the Care of the State). We must emphasise the importance of such services in preventing the fracturing of family relationships and its frequent accompaniment — youth homelessness. Particular attention must also be paid to the needs of the young unemployed who, in many cases, are at serious risk of becoming homeless.

20.2 In Chapter 15, Youth Supported Accommodation Program, and Chapter 16, Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, we have referred to some of the cogent evidence received by the Inquiry concerning the need to provide many homeless children and young people much more than physical shelter and income support if they are to make a successful transition to independence. The best outcome for many will be reconciliation with their families. This requires early intervention, intensive counselling and, possibly, longer-term support to the entire family to enable it to successfully assume responsibility for the child(ren). Where return to the family is not an option, the services provided must be a good substitute if homeless children are to mature and grow towards independence and full participation in our society. The services required will be determined by the needs of each individual and by his or her particular history, age and maturity. Indeed, homeless children as a group are likely to require a wider range of services and more intensive support than adolescents living with their families, due both to the legacy of the reasons for their homelessness — physical or sexual abuse, neglect, rejection etc. — and to the trauma likely to have been endured since becoming homeless.

20.3 In this chapter we set out our recommendations on these matters -- directed to both State welfare authorities and the Federal Government. The former clearly have direct responsibilities for the protection of children which, in respect of homeless children, they have failed to honour. The Commonwealth, as we argue in Chapter 24, A Youth Accommodation and Support Services Program, is ultimately responsible for ensuring the enjoyment by all children of their rights to special protection, to adequate housing, and to protection from neglect, cruelty and exploitation.

20.4 Finally, we address the community as a whole. It is the Inquiry's view, based on the evidence and submissions presented, that it is the community itself -- adequately advised, monitored, funded, resourced and supported — which is in the best position to assist and support both families and detached children and whose support and assistance is most likely to achieve the best results for all concerned. There is a clear case for community building and a clear need for community involvement. Individual community-based projects and organisations can — if allowed to do so by governments --- develop flexible, individual services to meet local needs in a community context and to address the total needs of each child or family.

20.5 State intervention, where it has occurred, has generally failed both families and children, causing far too many children and young people to drift into homelessness and alienation. The State has, further,

failed to effectively address the most basic needs of thousands of homeless children and young people -- as this Report amply demonstrates. Governments, at both State and Federal levels, must, in the Inquiry's view, take increased steps to foster community initiative and responsibility and must examine and rectify the bureaucratic hindrances which deter or discourage community involvement.

PREVENTIVE SERVICES

20.6 The Inquiry heard evidence from a number of community and religious groups that much youth homelessness is preventable by appropriate and timely support to the family.

Most parents are needing some sort of reassurance. They need to understand that adolescence is a period of transition, there is some testing going on. Given that understanding and some support, we believe that a lot of the crises that erupt could be stopped.'

20.7 Unfortunately, too little emphasis is placed on preventive programs:

We are also concerned particularly that most of the programs around the place at the moment are picking up the pieces when it is too late. We are working to see a much greater emphasis on preventative programs. By way of example: programs that pick up on parenting needs, parenting skills, support, particularly support for parents and adolescents.'

One witness urged that, rather than focusing on 'family breakdown':

...we should talk more about the breakdown of supports to the family, to the parent or parents — extended family if you like, or the fact that the family circle has shrunk in radius significantly over the last few decades...Parents are stressed and under-resourced...We add on to this the new suburbs, the high mobility of the population, making it difficult for parents to establish local, secure and steady networks...⁴

20.8 Two fundamental reasons for the failure to provide adequate preventive programs are the still evolving attitude of the Commonwealth to its role in child and family services' and the tendency of State welfare authorities, in the absence of specifically identified Federal funding, to avoid the youth services field and to focus instead, almost exclusively, on babies and young children. The Inquiry was told, for example:

When I look at what we are doing in the community to see that if in fact a major reason in this group of children for homelessness lies within the family, the priorities that are given to basic family back-up and support are pretty low apart from such essential areas as, say infant welfare centres and services such as that. It would be mainly the non-government and community-based organisations that provide services for such families.'

20.9 The Inquiry received evidence in all States that State welfare authorities are under-resourced and under-staffed. Moreover, some evidence indicated that intervention by these authorities could actually increase a child's chances of becoming homeless (see Chapter 10, Children in the Care of the State). Evidence was also given of a reluctance to intervene, even in the interests of children (see Chapter 8, Families Under Stress). In Queensland, for example, the Inquiry was told:

More and more we find that the Department of Family and Youth Services in this State will neglect the care and the interests of young people over 13, 14 years of age.'

For some homeless children, the Inquiry was told, the State's only assistance involved referring them to a youth refuge (see Chapter 10).

20.10 It is the Inquiry's view that the seriousness and national scope of this issue means that the Federal Government must initiate programs to be delivered through community-based organisations and local government authorities, as well as State welfare authorities, which address the support needs of families with adolescents. At present, adolescents in need of care and protection are often being 'hidden' in abusing families (see Chapters 8 and 10) and a significant number of difficult children are being suspended or expelled from schools (see Chapter 22). If they leave home and become homeless (as many clearly do), they become the responsibility of the Federal Government, through its income support

provisions, and of the community sector under the Youth Supported Accommodation Program (YSAP). The States are usually only likely to become involved when a law and order' issue is posed by homeless youth. Indeed, the Inquiry was told that:

Far from protecting the rights of the child, the state oversees a process where the rights of these young people are ignored and violated.'

20.11 The States share with the Commonwealth the funding and administrative responsibilities for YSAP. Even here, however, the Inquiry was told that some States have failed to honour their obligation to match Commonwealth funding for this Program. It was stated in evidence in Tasmania that:

We have lost a lot of money that we really should have had. That is all of the SAAP services in this state. For the government to come on-line with the Commonwealth in 1989, we were aware that \$1.25 million needed to be put into the fund down here, they were so far behind. Technically speaking, they have run along the bottom of their input of moneys.'

A similar position was reported in Western Australia, where a witness commented:

The State government fares little better in that there is fear, in my understanding, in the youth work field, of a repetition of the days of the Youth Services Scheme or program where this State fell \$150,000 short of matching the one to one funding. That fear [was] revived by the fact that in the first year of SAAP funding, the State Government in WA intended to put no money in and we are nervous about the ability of the State government to catch up over the 5-year period..."¹⁾

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

20.12 The primary thrust of our recommendations concerning preventive services is towards strengthening the family so that it can retain its children and rear them successfully. Preventive services that have the effect of supporting parents in their function as caregivers and nurturers are vital at whatever developmental stage of the child they occur. Support programs for new parents, parents with toddlers and school-aged children, all play a part in reducing the results of family disintegration which can include detached and homeless adolescents. As Barnardo's Australia submitted to the Inquiry:

Family Support Services should be available to vulnerable families so that they are assisted with the tasks of child rearing. Such services should include adequate child-care, holiday, and afterschool programs and the use of respite care...

There is a need for services specialising in supporting adolescents and their families in staying together as a viable unit that can adjust to the changes that adolescence brings for both the teenage child and the parent(s)."

As a major secondary objective we seek the strengthening of our communities — both in their willingness and in their capacity to assist and support families in need and in times of crisis.

The Commonwealth's Role

20.13 There is an urgent need for all sectors in the welfare field to clarify their respective roles and responsibilities for the provision of preventive services. Before this can occur, the Federal Government must clarify its own responsibilities (particularly in light of the disturbing evidence referred to in Chapters 8 and 9), including the establishment of objectives and policy parameters, thus reversing the current trend to leave the field almost exclusively to the State governments.

RECOMMENDATION 20.1

- **The Inquiry recommends that the Federal Government re-enter the field of preventive and support services for families.**

20.14 Much more also needs to be done to alleviate child poverty. A substantial number of Australian children remain in poverty notwithstanding the introduction of the Family Assistance package in February 1988 (see Chapter 9, Family Poverty and Isolation). Special attention is required to the impact of housing costs on family poverty and, in the Inquiry's view, a greater degree of assistance to families with children with rent and mortgage repayments will be needed, particularly, in the major capital cities.

20.15 The Inquiry's findings concerning the inadequacy of welfare services in Australia reflect those of the Senate Standing Committee on Social Welfare in its 1985 report on children in institutional and other forms of care. That Committee perceived an urgent need for Commonwealth involvement in this field if standards and practice in the States were to be dramatically and speedily improved. The Committee recommended that the Commonwealth should:

...legislate for the establishment of a body at the national level that has responsibility first, for the development of policy and the provision of advice to the Commonwealth Government on matters affecting the well-being of children and the stability of the family and, secondly, for the promotion, through co-operation and consultation with the States and Territories, of a better planned and coordinated approach towards the provision of community services throughout Australia..."

The Committee described the various roles of such a body. They included (with respect to the welfare of children) the development of:

...a set of guiding principles that would formalise national standards and goals for their well being..."

20.16 The Inquiry is aware that these recommendations were made at a time when the Commonwealth faced severe economic constraints, making their implementation very difficult. However, several years later, this Inquiry has found that State welfare authorities have not improved their performances significantly and it is difficult to see how they will do so, unless there is a concentrated and determined effort at both State and Commonwealth levels to address this problem.

RECOMMENDATION 20.2

- **The Inquiry therefore recommends that the Commonwealth re-examine the recommendations of the Senate Standing Committee on Social Welfare on the upgrading of welfare services relevant to children in Australia — in conjunction with the recommendations of this Inquiry. We further recommend that this examination should be conducted by a task force comprising several members appointed by the Federal Government together with members of this Inquiry.**

20.17 Enhanced Commonwealth involvement is essential to the realisation of several major objectives identified by the Federal Government as being in the national interest. These include:

- the extension of special protection to our nation's children;
- the prevention of youth homelessness in particular;
- youth social justice; and
- prolonged school retention.

The prevention of a great deal of future dependence on social welfare will be a substantial additional benefit flowing from such early support programs (see generally, Chapter 7, The Costs of Youth Homelessness).

The Role of State Welfare Authorities

20.18 Family Support Services: Evidence to the Inquiry painted a disturbingly bleak picture of State welfare services in Australia, at least insofar as they are relevant to the needs of homeless young people and their families. State welfare authorities have unfortunately developed a negative image in the community — especially among their clients and potential client groups. They are not widely perceived as a readily available source of help and support. Such perceptions require long-term attention if they are to change. There is a need for some fundamental changes in operating procedures. A recent detailed study of community responses to State welfare services was undertaken in Western Australia by the Welfare and Community Services Review in 1984. Services recommended were to be enabling, preventive, accessible, participatory and non-coercive. The key program expression of these services was to be the local community house, a neighbourhood centre which was to be the focus of preventive programs.¹⁴ Similarly, in Victoria, State government funding has given new impetus to neighbourhood houses through a special funding program. In the short-term, therefore, State welfare authorities should focus on ensuring the provision of support services through non-government agencies by providing realistic levels of funding.

RECOMMENDATION 20.3

- **The Inquiry recommends that a network of support services to strengthen families, and reduce the need for welfare intervention leading to substitute care arrangements, be further developed — by State and Territory welfare authorities themselves and through funding to non-government agencies which may be better accepted by the community as truly supportive in this role.**

20.19 A major area of concern to the Inquiry is the distortion that has occurred in the provision of welfare services to children and young people as State welfare authorities have left this to an under-resourced and under-trained youth service sector. This sector must, as a matter of urgency, be better integrated into the existing welfare system, instead of being left to carry increasing responsibilities for support and treatment without the necessary resources and staff.

RECOMMENDATION 20.4

- **The Inquiry therefore recommends that State and Territory welfare authorities immediately implement their statutory responsibilities for the protection and ongoing welfare of adolescents — including, in particular, homeless youth. State welfare authorities must:**
 - **improve the professionalism of their own services by upgrading the qualifications and training of their field and supervising staff;**
 - **establish integrated planning to develop closer co-operation between existing departmental services and the youth sector; and**
 - **realistically resource the youth sector -- in recognition of the numbers of homeless young people presently unable to be effectively assisted and in view of the difficulties and pressures that youth workers face.**

20.20 Child Abuse Victims: State welfare authorities must strengthen their efforts for the protection of child and adolescent victims of abuse and neglect, and those at risk. The failure to protect adolescents from abuse must be urgently addressed in both policy and practice.^o

RECOMMENDATION 20.5

- **The Inquiry recommends that State and Territory welfare authorities improve the level and quality of their services to adolescent victims of physical, emotional and sexual abuse and those at risk of such abuse (including by improving the training and supervision of staff). Responses to this problem may need to be different to those already developed for younger abused children and States may need to reflect this by implementing appropriate changes in policy and new programs — particularly in the areas of education and prevention.**

20.21 State Wards: The Inquiry found that State welfare authorities have failed in their duty of care both to State wards living in State-run or financed institutions and to wards living elsewhere. When the State takes over the parental responsibility and control of a child there must be a resulting and tangible benefit to that child in the form of a high standard of care and, where necessary, a high standard of professional services to assist him or her according to individual need (including psychological difficulties, educational deficits, poor social and vocational skills). It is of critical importance that welfare authorities develop mechanisms whereby the individual young person's co-operation in the program of services developed can be encouraged. It is also important that all assistance to children 'in care' be provided in a personalised and sensitive manner rather than in a 'bureaucratic' fashion. These standards of care must start at the point of entry into the State system and continue until the child is placed in satisfactory family care or in an independent living arrangement. State governments should note that the present failure of 'care' and its consequences point not to a need for prison-like secure residential establishments for children at risk but to a need for more professional, better supported and more appropriate services, in both institutional and non-institutional substitute care.

RECOMMENDATION 20.6

- **The Inquiry recommends that State and Territory governments urgently review the quality of care being provided to State wards and other children in State care programs, to ensure that they adequately protect their rights. (These rights are those explained in Chapter 4.)**

20.22 Children Leaving Care: The Inquiry received evidence of a high rate of homelessness among children leaving State care. State authorities have abandoned many young people who have been in care, often for many years, to the vagaries of a society where their sources of support and emotional help are tenuous. The States duty of care in these circumstances must extend beyond the legal termination of wardship, and until such time as the young person is established in a supportive and viable lifestyle.

RECOMMENDATION 20.7

- **The Inquiry recommends that State and Territory governments ensure that relevant departments and institutions give youth in their care timely and continuing assistance in planning post-institutional living arrangements and in supportive after-care services. The practice whereby State wards are simply provided with a letter on 'discharge' must, where it occurs, cease immediately.'**

• **SUPPORT NEEDS OF HOMELESS CHILDREN**

20.23 It should be obvious that it is not enough to provide children and young people, detached from their families, with short-term accommodation and a small measure of income support and expect them to move quickly into independence. Yet, even though YSAP links 'support' to 'accommodation', the Inquiry established that, for most, this Program offers little more than a roof, a bed and (some) meals for a very short period of time (see Chapter 15, Youth Supported Accommodation Program).

20.24 Staff shortages at refuges and the discouragement of longer-term integrated services by YSAP committees mean that many children in need of intensive counselling and support are instead forced to move from refuge to refuge in quick succession — if they are lucky enough to find refuge accommodation at all. Thousands don't (see Chapter 15). It is clear that not only does this Program deny most homeless children the special protection which is their right, but it is, itself, guilty of neglecting their needs — in contravention of the Declaration of the Rights of the Child.

20.25 It is clear, in our view, that where family relationships have not been severely or permanently damaged through abuse, neglect, or other causes, children and young adolescents are much better off remaining within the family. But equally clearly there is a serious lack of family support services to enable this to **Occur**. The gap between what governments hope will happen in the way of family reconciliation and the current reality was summed up by a Victorian witness to the Inquiry:

So what we have got is a very interesting process. We have got the government saying young people should live in the family, and at the same time we have got young people being asked to move out of the family because the parents cannot cope with the young people. It is a very interesting process, but at the same time we have not got the resources...to cope. ..because there are not the support services, such as community placements for time out and the workers there to support those community placements."

20.26 Governments, and sometimes our community at large, have unrealistic expectations of the capacity of many families to cope — and of the capacity of the youth service sector to assist families. The resources to do the job, in terms of staff time, training and facilities, are minimal. Given such a state of affairs it is not surprising that in many refuges and other youth accommodation services reconciliation cannot be given a high priority. Refuges and other youth services need the resources, or access to the resources, such as detached family counsellors, in order to undertake family reconciliation in a professional and sustained manner.

20.27 The Inquiry was told that an attitude that sees the family as pivotal to the future of the young person is vital to the success of reconciliation efforts. One non-government agency summed up its own approach as follows:

The whole time that we have them.. .we encourage the contact with the father and mother, whether it is just a phone call a week to say, 'Yes, hello dad, I am alright'. We encourage the parents or the guardians to come and visit the houses where they live. If there is a confrontation between the two of them we always make certain there is a member of the support team or one of the committee there to see how it goes.

20.28 Complete reconciliation and return to the family will obviously not always be a realistic goal. The Inquiry was told that:

...in many instances, perhaps most, that [the possibility of reconciliation] is not the case and we simply seek to put them in a position where they can reside separately but with reconciled relationships with the family, if that is at all possible.^o

Moreover, return to the family is not the answer for all homeless young people. In supporting the provision of greatly increased resources for effective reconciliation services, the Inquiry stresses that children must not be counselled or forced to return to abusive homes.

20.29 As detailed in Chapter 15, Youth Supported Accommodation Program, not only does YSAP neglect the full range of needs of homeless children and young people, it is also ill-equipped to respond to groups of children with special needs — victims of physical or sexual abuse, young people with physical or intellectual disabilities, addicts, the mentally ill, Aborigines, people from non-English speaking backgrounds — and is certainly not flexible enough to deliver individualised services. This is not to say that individual YSAP services, relying on unpaid overtime and voluntary labour, are not able to respond in these ways. Some are able to do so, but there is little encouragement offered and coverage is patchy. In general, homeless children and young people are offered 'crisis' accommodation — a bed for a night, or a few nights, or a few months. The lack of places in longer-term services and the lack of options in the general market, including public housing, mean that most children never move out of the 'crisis mode'.

20.30 The provision of crisis accommodation to children, then, is an extremely short-sighted policy. The value of the early provision of intensive support services in a stable environment was highlighted in the Salvation Army's submission to the Inquiry:

Chronic homelessness is the result of a long process whereby each level of a person's support gradually deteriorates. A young person either leaves their family or is forced out. They move in with friends who eventually reject them, a process which repeats itself until local community support is eroded and community services have no answers. They are then forced to move on until transience becomes a way of life and the skills of developing and maintaining relationships are lost.²⁰

20.31 Governments and non-government welfare agencies must ensure that existing support services for homeless youth address the process of detachment and alienation of homeless children and young people in an effective manner. Where services are under-resourced, there is the definite possibility that they are actually contributing to the detachment of the young person from the family or, at the very least, are irrelevant to the difficult task of 're-attaching' the young person to social institutions and a supportive personal network. As the Inquiry was told:

I mean young people and especially young street people, it is the personal touch that is the most important thing. If you can get some sort of personal impact going there between them and a resource person, then perhaps they will get somewhere...²¹

20.32 The Inquiry is also concerned about the role of the State welfare authorities in the lives of our homeless children and young people. As described in Chapter 2, Government Responses to Youth Homelessness, although the welfare authorities clearly have the power to intervene in order to protect homeless children, they have neither the resources nor the appropriate placement options which would make intervention possible or suitable. The Inquiry is pleased to note that most State and Territory welfare authorities have now promulgated guidelines for staff confronted with children wishing to leave their homes or actually homeless. Officers are advised that leaving home is to be seen as a last resort for a young person and, wherever it is appropriate, officers should encourage young people to enter into negotiations with their parents with a view to reconciliation. Officers are advised, however, that they must be alert to the possibility that formal grounds may exist for intervention for the protection of the child from abuse or neglect." The Inquiry is concerned, however, that not all welfare officers have the training and skills required to offer personal support services to homeless children. Those resources which the authorities do have — notably emergency aid funds — are often not provided to children in need, being reserved for needy families.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

20.33 The Inquiry is concerned that existing arrangements for the delivery of services to homeless children and young people are not conducive to the quality of service that these young people need. The goal is not to baby-sit or 'warehouse' them in refuges but to have an impact on their lives that will stop the process of personal fragmentation and despair that this Report has chronicled. The youth sector is clearly overburdened in terms of the resources it can presently devote to both the range of personal and social problems and the depth of problems that homeless young people have to cope with. Homeless children and young people require a greater range and intensity of services than is presently available.

RECOMMENDATION 20.8

- **The Inquiry recommends that the Commonwealth, State and Territory authorities responsible for services for homeless youth review existing programs with particular regard to the quality of interpersonal support and counselling that they provide.**

20.34 The Inquiry is well aware that it is impossible to locate, in every refuge or accommodation facility, every kind of service that a young person may need. This reality highlights the fundamental need for service networking and for the youth sector to be effectively integrated into existing mental health, health and welfare services.

RECOMMENDATION 20.9

- **The Inquiry recommends that a high priority be given to forming links between the youth sector and a range of support services, including counselling, psychiatric services, recreational outlets, remedial education and vocational support.**

20.35 The quality of support services will be improved where existing services for homeless youth can access (either by employing — perhaps on a part-time, consultative basis — or through inter-agency networking) the services of professionally-trained social workers, psychologists and psychiatrists to provide consultation and input on the development of individual programs for homeless youth. It is not enough, however, to expect an already overworked youth sector to engage in such outreach unaided. At many points the existing framework of State support services is not sufficiently responsive to youth needs or structured in such a way that the young people who are in need can use the services.

RECOMMENDATION 20.10

- **The Inquiry recommends that existing youth services urgently review their methods of operation in relation to the support needs of young people. In consultation with the youth sector, they should refine their methods of service delivery to make them more relevant to homeless youth and a more effective part of a network of services.**

20.36 There is also a need for professional training, advice and support for refuge staff to enable them to be of more useful service to young people and to be aware of their own needs — so that they do not confuse them with those of the young people. Professional training, support and consultation for youth workers will also assist them to cope more effectively with the excessive emotional demands placed on them, reducing the high rate of burn-out in staff and the discontinuity this means for young people in their growth and development.

RECOMMENDATION 20.11

- **The Inquiry recommends that Federal, State and Territory and governments urgently review the funding and availability of professional training and support services for youth workers.**

Notes

1. F Maas, Australian Institute of Family Studies, *Transcript* at 916.
2. M. Henley, Service to Youth Council Adelaide, *Transcript* at 1265.
3. *Id.*, at 1261.
4. G. Davies, Uniting Church Community Youth Services (WA), *Transcript* at 716.
5. See, in particular, Chapter 9, Family Poverty and Isolation, and Chapter 24, A Youth Accommodation and Support Services Program.
6. G. Gregory, Berry Street Child and Family Care Melbourne, *Transcript* at 1013.
7. P. See, South-East Queensland Youth Accommodation Coalition, *Transcript* at 249.
 - 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 15.
9. B. Johnson, Karinya Young Women's Shelter Launceston (Tas), *Transcript* at 1573.
10. G. Davies, Uniting Church Youth Services (WA), *Transcript* at 725.
11. S.64, Barnardo's Australia, at 2.
12. Senate Standing Committee on Social Welfare, *Children in Institutional and Other Forms of Care* (Parliamentary Paper No. 324/1985) at 81-82.
 13. *Id.*, at 82.
14. J. Carter, *The Wellbeing of the People: The Final Report of the Welfare and Community Services Review in Western Australia* (WA Government Printer, 1984).
15. There is growing evidence that abuse of adolescents is a significant problem: see generally, Chapter 5, The Experience of Homelessness, and Chapter 8, Families Under Stress. See also, J.L. Powers and J. Eckenrode, 'The Maltreatment of Adolescents' (1988) 12(2) *International Journal of Child Abuse and Neglect* 189.
16. See generally, Chapter 10, Children in the Care of the State, and US Institute of Medicine, *Homelessness, Health, and Human Needs* (National Academy Press, 1988) at 147.
17. I. Vett, Inner East Youth Accommodation Support Service Project (Vic), *Transcript* at 1006.
18. S. McLoghlin, Open Family Box Hill Inc. (Vic), *Transcript* at 1178.
19. *Id.*, at 1181.
20. S.156, Salvation Army (Vic), at I.
21. A. Crow, Kings Cross Youth Resources (NSW), *Transcript* at 175.
22. NSW Department of Youth and Community Services, *Contact by Departmental Officers with the Parents/Guardians of Runaway Young People Under 16 Years* (Circular No. 87/105); Qld Department of Family and Youth Services, *Policy, Practices and Procedures Memorandum to Staff* (Circulation Group 5, No. 87/2); SA Department for Community Welfare, *Standard Procedure Covering Youth/Parent Conflict* (SP No. 501/9, 1981-83); WA Department for Community Services, *Administrative Instruction No. 13* (1971); Tas Department for Community Welfare, *Children Leaving the Custody, Care and Control of Parents* (nd), *Accommodation at Youth Shelters and Other Supported Accommodation Out of Home* (nd), *Under 16's Accommodation at Youth Shelters* (nd).
23. For example; in New South Wales an informal survey has indicated that, apart from social workers in residential care and child protection units, only about 2% of Department of Family and Community Services District Officers, front-line field or case workers, have social work qualifications. Only 9% of case-work supervisors have such qualifications. It appears, however, that other States make a greater effort to employ social workers in field positions.

