Legislative Council
Hansard
Tuesday 27 October 2026

[excerpt]

MOTION

State Government Contribution to Construction of the Macquarie Point Stadium

[5.51 p.m.]

Ms WEBB (Nelson) - Mr President, I move -

That the Council -

(1) Notes in relation to the estimated total costs of the Macquarie Point Stadium (the stadium), and the estimated state government contribution towards the stadium's construction, the following:

(a) On 1 March 2022, when announced by then-Premier Peter Gutwein MP, the estimated cost for the stadium was $750 million;

(b) On 18 September 2022, when announcing Macquarie Point as the preferred new stadium location, Premier Jeremy Rockliff MP stated in a media release that: 'the government is firm that it will cap its investment at $375 million';

(c) On the 15 February 2024, prior to the March 2024 state election, Premier Jeremy Rockliff MP stated in a media release that: 'a re-elected majority Rockliff Liberal government will cap Tasmanian government capital expenditure on the Macquarie Point Stadium at the currently budgeted $375 million - and not one red cent more';

(d) When announcing the Macquarie Point Development Corporation (MPDC) had submitted the Project of State Significance application for the stadium to the Tasmanian Planning Commission on 18 September 2024, then-Minister for Sports and Events Nic Street MP reiterated: 'Our funding to this project is capped at $375 million';

(e) On 27 May 2025, then-Minister for Business, Industry and Resources Eric Abetz MP released draft enabling legislation for the stadium and also provided a revised total cost estimate of $945 million;

(f) On 18 September 2025, the government announced a revised cost estimate of $1.13 billion for the stadium;

(g) By the time the State Policies and Projects (Macquarie Point Precinct) Order 2025 was debated in the Council on 3 December 2025, Premier Jeremy Rockliff had committed to capping the state's contribution to the stadium at $875 million;

(2) Further notes:

(a) Global economic instability due to ongoing conflicts in the Middle East continues to pose risks of escalation of the total stadium project cost estimate, and therefore, also to the expected state contribution, including any interest payable on borrowings;

(b) Treasurer Eric Abetz MP on *ABC Drive Radio* on 27 July 2026 anticipated the cost of the proposed stadium could change by the end of the year and stated: "Until such time as we have a proper figure to announce the figure of $1.13 billion remains";

(3) Acknowledges:

(a) The commitment made by the Leader for Government Business in the Legislative Council during debate on the State Policies and Projects (Macquarie Point Precinct) Order 2025 on 4 December 2025, that: 'if additional funds are required, it would need to be appropriated and that would occur in an appropriation bill or a supplementary appropriation bill';

(b) Correspondence regarding the potential tabling of any revised stadium construction cost estimate following a motion passed by the House of Assembly, from the MPDC Board Chair to the Minister for Macquarie Point Urban Renewal dated 4 August 2026, and tabled during Public Accounts Committee hearings which states: 'If there are matters related to cost identified in the assessment process, I anticipate advice on this being provided to you at the end of September or early October';

(4) Recognises that in regard to parliamentary scrutiny of significant state-funded infrastructure projects:

(a) The usual approval process includes inquiry by the Public Works Committee, which routinely undertakes examination before the tender process has concluded and before any contract has been signed;

(b) In the Public Works Committee process, the onus is upon government departments to provide the committee with sufficient information about cost estimates to enable it to make public value assessments as part of its deliberations;

(c) While the Project of State Significance process excluded the Macquarie Point stadium project from Public Works Committee scrutiny, it should still be available to the parliament to scrutinise and assess public value at a similar stage in the progress of that project without jeopardising tender and contract negotiations; and

(5) Formally requests the government, at the completion of the stadium project procurement process but prior to the formal signing or completion of the contract process with any successful tenderer, to provide to this House:

(a) The highest likely cost of total project construction based on the successful tenderer's bid and the proposed final contract terms, whether it remains $1.13 billion or is a revised amount; and

(b) The estimated state contribution component of the total project construction cost as referred to in (5)(a), whether the state contribution remains $875 million or is a revised amount.

The text of the motion table is lengthy, for which I don't apologise, as it's intended to, in its detail, support and inform consideration of the two specific resolution clauses that comprise the final clause (5) of the motion. I'm going to speak through the motion in some broad terms and then get to those resolution clauses later in my contribution. Part (1) of the motion, in particular, documents the timeline of shifting financial sands. This is by no means an exhaustive timeline here in the motion. It also reflects the length of time this oppressive dark cloud has simmered on the Tasmanian horizon, casting a shadow over our political discourse, our community trust and confidence. Numerous elections and parliamentary debates have been overshadowed by this issue.

Over four years since this travesty was first foisted upon the Tasmanian community in March 2022 when the then Premier Peter Gutwein stated the estimated total cost for the AFL-demanded stadium was $750 million. Throughout these last four years, the primary consistent element has been how hard the community, and this parliament, have had to work to essentially pull teeth to get anything resembling straight and consistent comprehensive answers from the government on this matter. Sadly, within the context of this AFL-demanded stadium, the main area of consistency has been a lack of transparency along with deliberate bamboozling and obfuscation from the government.

The other main element of consistency threading its way from March 2022 to the present is the fluctuating final estimated total cost of constructing the stadium, as well as the total amount of expected state contribution, which has also been rather fluid over time. There can be no argument that for many Tasmanians this stadium exemplifies the worst of an arrogant, out of touch government. They struggle to comprehend how this expense can be countenanced at a time of job losses, service cuts, and budget austerity.

The self-congratulatory back-slapping and wilful shrugging of shoulders when faced with the potential of ongoing cost blowouts beyond the extraordinary amount of $875 million before interest payments is a glaringly harsh juxtaposition to the experience of the daily lives of many Tasmanians - days where putting food on the table is a challenge, where payment of bills is a continual juggle of deciding what to do without; where essential community support services which Tasmanians rely upon are being increasingly cut, they're all thrown into sharp relief against the wilful and blinkered, almost fanatical, approach to pursue this AFL-demanded stadium at all costs, and that is not hyperbole. In the eyes of many despairing, bemused or downright angry Tasmanians, this myopic obsession is at any cost. It is at the cost of their fiscally sustainable future, their immediate access to timely mental health support services, sexual assault support services, legal services, ambulances arriving in timely manner, children having three square meals a day and an exemplary education system, a properly resourced community support sector, vibrant local arts and creative industries, and on and on the cost list goes.

It's worth remembering, Mr President, that at-all-costs approach includes the rejection of independent expert advice. The TPC expert panel which assessed the stadium on the apparent total construction cost estimated at that time of $945 million and, as we know, recommended the project did not proceed on the grounds it would damage Tasmanians economically, amongst other concerns. Yet, as we know, the government rejected that advice, as did this parliament. That is a broad contextual background that I'm just laying out to this debate. However, I do not intend to revisit the many arguments prosecuted over the last four years as to the fiscal recklessness epitomised by the stadium -

Ms Forrest - There's probably some good news in that.

Ms WEBB - Pardon?

Ms Forrest - I'm just joking. I'm glad you're not going to revisit all of it, it would be too tortuous.

Ms WEBB - Well, I'm now constrained and I'm not able to revisit all of it, so that's all right. However, I don't intend to revisit all of it; that's not what the motion is about, but it's the context in which we are having the debate today on this motion. It is appropriate that accountability is exercised by this place to remind the government that if you have deliberately decided to pursue a policy direction counter to the concerns raised by many, many Tasmanians about the immediate and future financial implications, you then have a clear responsibility to provide clear and timely pertinent updates. The final construction costs and the final estimated state contribution are clear examples of information the community deserves to receive.

If the government is happy to ignore independent expert advice, not once, but on multiple occasions, that the eventual costs of the stadium will be excessive, and is further happy to ignore broad community disquiet regarding those financial warnings then the government has a clear responsibility to be upfront and to disclose relevant pertinent updates such as the total estimated construction costs.

As previously stated, and I do not intend to spend too much time revisiting previous debates or well-known arguments prosecuting the concerns surrounding the AFL - demanded stadium itself, instead, the fundamental purpose of this motion is to provide a responsible

mechanism by which meaningful, timely and accountable disclosure of pertinent financial commitments entered into by the elected representatives in government is made to those who elected them and also in the broader public interest.

Broadly speaking, there are three elements to the stadium's financing. The first, those paying for the stadium's construction. In this instance, the federal government has committed to a total of $240 million; the AFL has committed to $15 million, and the last we heard, the Tasmanian government has committed us to paying out $875 million. Apparently, this will consist of $375 million plus the rest in borrowings. The second consideration is the total cost; how much we are all paying for the stadium and to whom. As we know, this is currently being negotiated with the announced preferred tenderer, BESIX Watpac. The third consideration is the unknown externalities, the most obvious being the current and ongoing global economic instability due to, among other things, the Middle East conflict and the impacts that's having upon fuel availability and costs.

The latter is beyond our control and beyond any crystal ball of this place. All we know is it will have an impact and the first indication we will have on the scale of that impact will be reflected in the transforming of the target construction price into a fixed lump sum, which in turn will have a potentially material impact upon the first element I mentioned, those paying that fixed lump sum.

We know that both the federal government and the AFL have stated very clearly that their contributions are their respective upper limits. That is the static ceiling; no more will be forthcoming from them, and as Part 1 of this motion demonstrates, should the overall total construction cost estimate increase ultimately that, by definition, so too does the state's obligation.

For example, despite repeated declarations that the state's contribution is capped at $375 million and not a red cent more, by the time the estimated total construction cost had increased to an estimate of $945 million by May 2025, and then a further revised cost estimate of a whopping $1.13 billion by 18 September that same year. We then saw the expected state contribution increased to that $875 million figure. Somehow, in its wisdom, the government signed Tasmanians up to a deal where it's our state's financial outlay that is the only contribution in play, which highlights why the nexus between the total expected construction cost - or what is now being referred to as the fixed lump sum by those reported in the media, such as the CEO of the MPDC - and the state's contribution is so fraught and so firmly entrenched in the upper forefront of the minds of so many Tasmanians.

As clause (2)(b) of this motion highlights, the Treasurer acknowledged in July this year that it is anticipated the cost of the stadium could change even further by the end of this year, stating:

> Until such time as we have a proper figure to announce, the figure of $1.13 billion remains. (TBC)

Whether and to what extent the final construction costs change, that $1.13 billion figure could have a very real bearing on the state's contribution either in payment and borrowings or even just in the interest payments on those borrowings over time.

I'll now touch briefly on clause (3) of the motion. This clause provides two salient examples of official recognition that the Tasmanian contribution could very well rise. Clause (3)(a) contains a statement made by the Leader in this place in December, clarifying the process by which further state funds would be provided. Clause (3)(b) references correspondence tabled during Public Accounts Committee hearings, written from the MPDC Chair to the minister stating that should there be further advice regarding costings identified during the assessment process, that advice is anticipated to be available 'by the end of September or early October.'

There are probably a range of other relevant citations I could have included from the evidence material to the Public Accounts Committee that make this same point, that not only was it expected that the costs would change throughout the procurement assessment process, which the state's budget process would then have to accommodate, but that such advice was expected to be available to the government by early October. While allowing for some slippage in timelines, it will not escape members that it is now late October - the last week of October, in fact - and I will return to that point of the timing of advice later in my contribution.

Moving on to clause (4) of the motion, these clauses are self-explanatory and are intended to provide an example of a relevant and comparable parliamentary process by which tender processes and costings are routinely examined. As members who have been or are currently on the Public Works Committee can attest, its core responsibility is to examine cost estimates in order to determine whether the taxpayer is receiving appropriate value for that publicly-funded investment. The Public Works Committee is not a performative rubber stamp - far from it. As stated in many of its reports, when assessing any proposed public work, the committee seeks an assurance that each project meets the criteria detailed in clause 15(2) of the *Public Works Committee Act 1914*. These criteria relate to the purpose of the works, the need for an advisability of undertaking the works and, crucially, whether the works are a good use of public funds and provide value for money to the community.

In order to be able to make that assessment, the committee requires the expected costings. A scan of the multiple reports of concluded Public Works Committee inquiries available provides a detailed range of such costings being provided as part of those processes. For example, the recent Rokeby Road-South Arm Upgrades-Acton Road Intersection report of earlier this year details P50 and P90 estimates for base costs, contingency costs and escalation costs, and all before the final contracts are signed and work proceeds.

I would be remiss if I did not also mention the efforts by the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee, the PAC, to drag out pertinent details on the stadium into the light of day, has been diligently working on this matter. I'm aware that members in this place who serve on PAC and in a better place to discuss those efforts may wish to reflect on that.

My purpose on putting in the motion a reference to the Public Works Committee is not to suggest that we undertake a process analogous to the Public Works Committee. It's just to point out the fact that a process of parliament has, under normal procedures around Public Works Committee, the availability of cost estimates before contracts are signed and work commences in order to make some scrutiny of public interest and public value. We know that the stadium project is not going through the Public Works process and I'm not making an argument that it should, I'm simply pointing to the fact that parliament, as a representative of the community, has a role to play in scrutinising the expenditure of public money of major projects and that that scrutiny in other circumstances can and does occur at a point in time of

the project where contracts have not yet been signed necessarily and works have not commenced and receiving broadly information about cost estimates for projects in order to do that scrutiny is a normal part of those processes.

Mr President, as I've outlined, Clauses 1, 2, 3 and 4 of the motion seek to highlight in a clear and factual manner why the nexus between the final total expected construction costs of the stadium and the state's financial contribution propels both into the realm of genuine public interest. Further, the text of the motion also seeks to present a comparable parliamentary example of such fiscal scrutiny of estimated costs against public value for money criteria being undertaken in the public interest as a matter of scrutiny of the parliament.

Any genuine and effective leadership which is more than just a title by name is that which brings people along with you as you engage partners in an endeavour in a respectful and inclusive manner. We all know that Mr President. In this instance, it's a measure of genuine leadership whether those who will be required to pay for the stadium will be actually paid the courtesy of being told upfront how much they will be paying and under what terms before they're locked into that arrangement and whether they'll have the opportunity for their parliament, the representatives they've elected to represent them in that parliament, will have an opportunity for scrutiny of that, which brings us to Clause 5 and the crux of the motion.

Clause 5 presents a formal request from this House to the government that, and I quote: (TBC)

> At the completion of the stadium project procurement process but prior to the formal signing or completion of the contract process with any successful tenderer, to provide to this House:
>
> (a) The highest likely cost of the total project construction based on the successful tenderer's bid and the proposed final contract terms, whether it remains at $1.13 billion or is a revised amount; and
>
> (b) The estimated state contribution component of the total project construction cost, as referred to in 5(a) whether the state contribution remains at $875 million or is a revised amount.

Mr President, that procurement process was completed prior to the announcement on the 15 October that BESIX Watpac had been selected as the preferred tenderer, therefore, timing - wise, this motion is prescient. Between now and the eventual finalisation and signing of the contract is the opportunity for parliamentary accountability to be exercised and government leadership to be demonstrated, a genuine opportunity for government to demonstrate transparency, honesty and openness to the Tasmanian people on a matter of significant public interest.

I mentioned previously I would revisit the matter of timing. Clause 3(b) of the motion references the fact that in August this year, the MPDC board chair anticipated any updates related to costs arising from the assessment process by the end of September or early October. Later on Friday, 16 October, the MPDC chair, sorry CEO, states on ABC Local Radio that Stage 2 is a, 'relatively short stage' and that they are 'only really a few weeks away from finalising the final lump sum costing for the for the contract.'

A *Pulse* news report of the 15 October states more specifically that the MPDC CEO said: 'that stage would end around mid-November' after which the corporation will assess the price and take it to the government with the aim to sign the contract before the end of December. It's also important to note, the *Pulse* news article also reports the Premier as saying: 'As we have committed to, we will detail the cost to the Tasmanian people prior to the signing of that contract.'

Mr President, that's a statement I'm sure we'd like to take at face value. However, I do hear, and I must acknowledge, concerns raised that, yes, the community will be told, but potentially that will be at the eleventh hour. Potentially, it's going to be something like Christmas Eve, a minute before the contract is signed and well past the time that parliament has an opportunity for scrutiny or for discussion on behalf of the Tasmanian people who elected us to be here. Cynical or not, it can be no surprise that people are so jaded that they would not put such an action past this government to leave it to the eleventh hour just before ink goes on the page. A sleight of hand where technically a commitment is met, but not in the spirit of being open and accountable to the Tasmanian people or via this mechanism, the parliament, on behalf of the Tasmanian people.

Instead, this motion presents a mechanism by which both the intent and the spirit of that public disclosure commitment can be met in full by the government, should they choose to do so. There are two joint sitting weeks in the second half of November, during which the government could provide to this House and the other place the final highest likely cost of total project construction, otherwise known as the final lump sum, and whether the estimated state contribution component has been revised from the previous $875 million. We also know the MPDC expects to have that final lump sum price by around mid-November. Again, if that schedule remains on track, then that information should be available to be provided to the parliament while it is in session and prior to any December signing of the contract. There should be no impediment to the timely provision of the final expected construction costs to this House, to this parliament, in fact.

To summarise, for over four years, the Tasmanian community has not received the honesty or the timely, transparent disclosure regarding decision-making surrounding this stadium from their political leaders. In fact, we've just begun to see some more of that come to light today. I know there's been discussion in the public domain and in the other place around the fact that we are now, it would seem, subsidising the non-successful tenderer for this project above the $250,000, I think it was, initially indicated in the tender process that was going to be reimbursed by Tasmanian taxpayers. It quietly now comes to light, that that got rounded up - perhaps that is a facetious way of putting it - to now a $2 million reimbursement, potentially, of the non-successful tenderer. That's only come to light through persistent questioning by people representing the Tasmanian community who have concerns in this area. It didn't come to light because the government was voluntarily open and clear about it with the Tasmanian people. It's another example of these things being dragged into the light of day. It's a shame. This could be a turning point for the government. This motion that I'm putting forward is nothing nefarious. It's simply presenting an opportunity to take a step in the right direction when it comes to openness and accountability and transparency, and to allow the parliament to do a job on behalf of the Tasmanian people by providing it with information while there is potential opportunity for scrutiny, or, at the very least, questions put in the Chambers.

Clearly, we still have a long way to go. We have a persistent pattern of obfuscation and hiding of information, rather than openness and transparency from this government. Despite

being told the long-held dream of a Tasmanian team in the AFL did not have strings attached - that's what we were told initially, remember? We all woke up one day in 2022 to be told that in fact a backflip had occurred and now the promise of the team was tangled so tightly in the strings of a new stadium that transparent public debate risked being strangled to death by those over-tight strings. Despite being told there were a range of potential location options for the new AFL-demanded stadium on 18 September 2022, the community were informed the Macquarie Point site was the designated preferred location. This was despite taxpayers already footing the $45 million bill for the Macquarie Point Development Corporation's site master plan 2017-2030, and its reset plan which incorporated the MONA-proposed vision and which complied with the Sullivans Cove Planning Scheme and had already received Hobart City Council permission along with broad community support. No matter those previous community-driven processes and decisions. They were unilaterally overridden by the AFL's preference and on 18 September 2022 the community were also told by the Premier the state's contribution towards the new stadium would be capped at $375 million. That brief timeline recap serves to highlight exactly how and why the government has considerable credibility catch-up to make with the Tasmanian community on this topic.

Too often throughout this saga, Tasmanians have been told one thing, only later to be told another, and as a fait accompli. Time and time again they have entered or watched community engagement or independent processes only to see their respective outcomes overridden by the government. Utterly disrespectful every step of the way. It cannot surprise anyone that there is now an extremely sizeable trust deficit, which is why this motion in essence says, 'okay, we hear you government, Premier, minister, when you say you recognise the public interest in knowing the final construction costs and that will be revealed in due course', but we have some stipulations on how and what we are told and when. This motion says that we, the parliament, are not going to be fobbed-off any more on this matter. We will not accept the ongoing withholding of this critical detail which effects current and future Tasmanians. In all of our electorates, there's sizeable numbers of constituents who are deeply interested in this. Putting off critical details about fiscal security for our state until some vague point in time which benefits the government to release in a manner that's overshadowed.

No doubt if it occurs in December outside of the parliament sitting overshadowed, potentially we can maybe even use our imaginations, by some hi-vis vest-clad good news announcement or perhaps just by Christmas, quite frankly, as we've discovered recently, Christmas can provide all manner of politically convenient distractions in this state.

This motion says we request the expected total cost to be provided to the parliament and within a certain timeframe. Though, as I discussed earlier, this motion does not attempt to pluck a date out of the calendar by which we would require the costings total to be released to the parliament. It's not about trying to set up a 'gotcha' moment for the government to fail because the required deadline does not correlate with the procurement negotiation timeframe. That's not the intent. Instead, this motion is trying to work with the procurement process, not to override it.

Stage 1 of the procurement process is complete with the formal selection of the preferred tenderer announced on Thursday, 15 October. Stage 2 of the request for tender process is now under way or could even be nearing completion, based on public comments made. This stage involves, amongst other things, resolving the final fixed costing sum. At the conclusion of stage 2, the government will have two choices.

Choice one is to withhold that final agreed total cost until after parliament rises for the year and perhaps just prior or even just after the ink is dry upon the contract are being signed. This choice clearly benefits the government, intent on protecting its back and seeking to control the public narrative around what, I think most of us would inevitably imagine, is going to be a final cost that's higher than the one we've been given to believe over 12 months ago now.

Choice two is to disclose to the parliament on behalf of the Tasmanian community the agreed updated final fixed costings before the contract is signed and while parliament is still able to undertake a scrutiny role on behalf of the community. There should be no procedural or legal impediment to that choice - it's as simple as that. It's available to the government to step up and do that.

One choice is driven by what may work best for the government, the other choice is driven by what is best in the public interest and in the spirit of a transparent and accountable government. Therefore, this motion states that parliament would like a say regarding which option the government chooses. The motion states parliament chooses the public interest as the best option going forward. We cannot impose a public disclosure date as we are not privy to the expected timeline of stage 2 negotiations under way, so the motion doesn't try to do that. But we can require another step be included in the overall process, which is at the conclusion of stage 2, prior to the final stage of the signing of the contract, that the parliament is informed formally of the expected total cost we are signing up to, as well as any changed estimation of the state's contribution towards that final cost. How could that possibly be considered contentious? It's really beyond me to imagine. It's just standard accountability to a parliament.

The motion also ensures that such an expectation is transparent. Neither party to the negotiation underway can claim the requirement to disclose the final construction cost has come as a shock and is counter to their understanding. It would be utterly disingenuous anyway for such a spurious argument to try to be mounted, given the other place's previous debate earlier this year and the broader ongoing public discourse on this matter, including the media's questions at the press conference announcing BESIX Watpac as the stadium builder. Everyone's interested in this piece of information. Yes, it's politically potent, but it's also taxed by our money that we're signing up to and it's a reasonable request of the parliament to be able to undertake scrutiny of that on behalf of the Tasmanian people.

To recap, before I close my contribution, the CEO of the Macquarie Point Development Corporation informed the public via an ABC Radio interview on 16 October that stage 2 is occurring under and I quote, 'a relatively short' timeframe and they are, and I quote, 'only really a few weeks away.' So, there is every likelihood that information will be available by, or during the parliament's final sitting sessions this year, with the two November sitting weeks and this Chamber's December sitting week available. In short, there's no good reason for the final expected total construction cost to be withheld from Tasmanians at the conclusion of stage 2 negotiations prior to the final signing of the contract. It's clear and responsible public interest consideration. In fact, we also know that, as part of the tender process, those organisations putting forward for the tender had to propose a total cost for the stadium, so there's nothing that's mysterious or particularly unusual here about everyone having clarity on that.

The only reason not to disclose is because the government doesn't want to wear the actual parliamentary scrutiny that should ensue on behalf of the Tasmanian people when information about a major public project using taxpayers' money and entering into borrowings that taxpayers in Tasmania will be paying for decades to come and that that should be something

that is under scrutiny by the parliament before contracts are signed. It's clear and responsible, it's in the public interest for this to occur. The ongoing secrecy and disrespect shown both to the public and to the parliament regarding this project since 2022 has, sadly, tainted the prospect of the Tasmanian AFL team, which should, I think we all still agree, have been a milestone all Tasmanians could celebrate, and it has severely corroded the public trust and confidence that we should have been sharing about that outcome.

One motion will not fix what has occurred or undo damage that's been done in terms of public trust and confidence. I appreciate that; it's not what I'm attempting to do with the motion. But, it does make it even more important for the parliament to now stand up and say that we have a democratic responsibility and hold a fiscal duty to those who elected us to require complete, genuine openness and transparency on this matter which will have such enormous material impact upon our current and future economic, social and cultural fabric in this state. On that, I hope members will recognise this motion as something that's pretty standard and reasonable. It's something that we all pledged we would be doing when we spoke about the stadium as the order came through. It's about undertaking the standard parliamentary role of scrutiny. It doesn't ask the government to do anything other than something that may cause it some political discomfort, which is to be open and honest and available for scrutiny on what is now the final expected cost of the stadium, prior to contracts being signed and while the parliament is still in session.

I commend the motion to the Chamber.

Motion agreed to.