

government but as the thug who is holding a gun to the government's head. That is a very strange situation. I am sure that when he reflects on it he will appreciate that it is exactly as I say and he will come around to my point of view. If the member for Schubert is serious about this, then he is playing politics, not me, because he knows damned well that we should all be standing shoulder to shoulder on the side of the victim, which is the South Australian government, which is being subjected to an act of constitutional thuggery by the federal government in relation to this very important issue.

The sooner we identify that and say in unison to the federal government, 'It is time to stop,' the better. That would be good for all of us. Let us not forget that the barley growers of South Australia are only one of a disparate coalition of the afflicted, a group of individuals from completely diverse industries all being afflicted by national competition policy. It is about time that a little bit of integrity was brought into the debate. I close on this point: this is constitutional blackmail, pure and simple. Let us nail the infamy for this on the door of the person to whom it belongs: that is, Mr Costello.

CHILD ABUSE

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): A lot of shots have been taken in this place at people who are not able to defend themselves. The history of child abuse in this state is something which I do not think any member of this place should use for political gain. People have said that there have been a number of arrests over the last week or two. We have also had two suicides. Trial by media must stop; this issue has to be treated much more seriously.

I have been liaising for many months with parents of children who attended St Ann's Special School, and I have asked the Premier to seek the Catholic Church's report into the abuse of children at St Ann's School and table it in this house. As yet, despite having written to the Archbishop and having received a letter from Monsignor David Cappelletti that the Archbishop was away and that he would get back to me, I have not received a response from the Archbishop. I have not seen a copy of the report via the Catholic Church, but I do have a copy of the report. The Premier has not sought to raise this report in the house, and I will leave members to draw their own conclusions as to why. I refer to a letter that I have received from the parents of a child who attended St Ann's Special School. It states:

Dear Duncan,

We have listened to Premier Rann speak strongly in public in the past week or so concerning the report from the Anglican Inquiry. We are exasperated that no similar statements have been made by him about the Report from the Inquiry into St Ann's, considering its findings are also damning. It is as though it has been completely ignored.

Last Friday (18 June) [this person] rang Peter Chataway, Premier Rann's Adviser to ask if the Premier had been provided with a copy of the report as he seemed to be unaware of its contents. [He] felt that Peter replied rather defensively, explaining that the Premier had previously asked the Archbishop if he would provide a copy of the Report for presentation in Parliament. He went on to explain that if the Archbishop did not supply the Report then there was nothing the Premier could do.

We attended the Anglican Synod last Saturday 19 June and have a copy of a statement by John Collas, Anglican Administrator in which he states on page 2 that on 'Friday 28 May, the Premier's Office rang indicating that they wished to table the Report in parliament on Monday 31 May. Arrangements for this were put in place and for Archbishop George to respond. Over that weekend, many of the people identified in or associated with the Report were advised of its public release'. The rest is now history.

These two examples of cooperation are in complete contrast. Is the Premier reluctant to request the Report to be made public or is the Archbishop stalling? Both are being particularly coy. We also understand that you have never received a response to your request for a copy of the Report. We wonder just what needs to be done for this Report to receive the same sort of public scrutiny that the Anglican Report has received. As you are aware from our previous notes to you, we have particular concerns that should be addressed. We wonder if the Catholic Church in Adelaide is so powerful that it has become untouchable.

Is it appropriate for a question to be asked again of Mr Rann whether he has received the Report to be tabled in parliament. If not, has he asked the Catholic Archbishop again if he is willing to provide the Report to parliament as he did with the Anglican Church? If the Archbishop refuses to provide a copy of the Report, what are his reasons.

The report is some 30 pages long and it raises a lot of questions. Questions have been raised by parents of the children who are the subject of the report, which was compiled by Mr B.R. Hayes QC. For example, why did Mr Hayes work from draft terms of reference rather than the official terms of reference for this report? The parents have major concerns about Mr Hayes' instructions from his instructing solicitor, Mr Tony Fuller of EMA Legal, who I understand is employed by the Catholic Church. No records were signed. Mr Hayes did not seek or speak to anyone about these statements and it was not even part of his brief to do so. No statements were given on oath. Persons making statements have not been examined to test their veracity. Mr Hayes can only report 'upon the facts provided to me', to use his words. These parents believe that Mr Hayes has been given a very limited brief on which to report to the Archbishop with a deal of inconsistent and contradictory information provided to him. They were appalled at the unprofessional nature of the interviews. They say that there has never been a police station at Mitchell Park and wonder whether it had anything to do with the photographs in police evidence. It goes on and on. It is a very unsatisfactory report.

FLOREY MEDICAL RESEARCH FOUNDATION ART SHOW

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): Art plays a very important part in our lives. Not only does it inspire the soul and enhance the senses but it can also raise money. A very special art show will open on Saturday 26 June at the Busby Hall in the National Wine Centre at 6.30 p.m., preceded by an opening night cocktail party at the same venue, to raise funds for the Florey Medical Research Foundation at the Medical School of the University of Adelaide. There has been an overwhelming response from art schools, commercial art galleries, art teachers and kindies, as well as amateur and professional artists, and humbly I must inform the house that I, too, have been approached by the Florey Foundation and contributed a piece, my first acrylic and my first effort in the art area since leaving school, ably assisted in the production of same by a fine and respected local artist, Mr Mick O'Shea. I understand that over 400 paintings are involved, and every one will be offered for sale at \$250. All are unsigned, so you will either get a really good bargain if you choose something by a professional artist or something that you like. Either way, you will be supporting and providing the much needed funds for research for the Florey Foundation.

I must acknowledge the work of Robert Pontifex and his staff in preparing the exhibition, and also the recent award in the Queen's Birthday Honours to the former Florey Research Foundation stalwart, Mr Frank O'Donnell. Never has so