



## House of Assembly

Thursday 5 May 2011

### QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

#### CITY STADIUM

Mr PICCOLO (Light) (14:28): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure. Is the minister aware of comments regarding a stadium for football and cricket in the city, and can he tell the house of them?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for State/Local Government Relations) (14:28): Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I hope—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I haven't said anything yet. I do hope that the opposition will show some courtesy because I am going to do them the courtesy of telling the house about their comments on a stadium for the city. Of course, we go back to that former leader, Martin Hamilton-Smith, who we have to say—

Mr Pengilly: The member for Waite.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: —the member for Waite—has always been a

strong supporter of this concept. He said, way back on 27 October 2008:

I think this is an idea whose time has come. There's an overwhelming demand for it from the people—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: These are your words, please have the courtesy of listening to them.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I continue:

There's an overwhelming demand for it from the people who go to see sport, not just soccer but Aussie rules, concerts, a range of codes, World Cup rugby. Sooner or later we are going to have one. It's my vision that we have one by 2018 and that is what we are committed to doing and it just must be done.

Of course, the former leader was handed the exploding cigar by the member for Unley, and so no longer is in that position, but by April 2009 the new leader had put out the Liberal plan for Riverside West. It said:

Our vision...involves a cultural and entertainment precinct that would transform the city. This must include a world-class stadium, either by renewing Adelaide Oval or, if this proves untenable, by creating a new purpose built facility. Both of these options will deliver a world-class stadium besides a new and exciting city pulse. Every other mainland state has created such a place—why can't we?

Why can't we, indeed? She went on to say, 'It is not a question'—this is Isobel Redmond, the Leader of the Opposition—'of whether—'

An honourable member: What was the date?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: April '09.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Point of order.

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Madam Speaker. I want to save the minister from both embarrassing himself and misleading the house. The current Leader of the Opposition was not the leader in April 2009.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: Well, he is obviously using a dodgy document that he has got from somewhere.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: They may have misdated their own document, but I assure you it is theirs. She went on to say this –

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for MacKillop!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: If they think I am misleading the house they can take the point. The document went on to say this, 'It is not a question of whether we should have a world-class stadium, it is a question of when.'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, Leader of the Opposition!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: 'This infrastructure –'

The SPEAKER: Point of order, member for MacKillop.

Mr WILLIAMS: I am wondering what responsibility the minister has for an obviously doctored document to the house.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: They go on to say that what was in their Liberal document –

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: 'This infrastructure –'

The SPEAKER: Order! Members on my left will be quiet! I can't hear a word.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: 'This infrastructure project,' they said, 'is important to the state's long-term economic future.' We admit that the Liberal Party does not always get along with itself or see eye to eye on issues. That is why –

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: No, wait for it. That is why the man with three votes –

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Davenport!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: That is why the man with three votes said –

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Madam Speaker, I am not extending question time for this rabble if they continue to interject.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: What did the man with three votes say in July 2009? He said:

I think Martin did get sucked in a little bit on the stadium, insomuch as I don't know that the Liberal Party ever had a policy that we were going to build a stadium.

I have to say, that is becoming clear, isn't it? Of course, by December 2009 Isobel Redmond was back believing that you needed it, but she no longer believed in Adelaide Oval. Why not? Because we proposed to put football at Adelaide Oval, so it was therefore no longer a good idea. She said instead on 4 December 2009, 'We have reached a conclusion that Adelaide Oval needs to—'

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Davenport!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: You knew it was coming.

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: You knew it was coming.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Davenport, you are warned for the second time.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I quote:

We have reached a conclusion that Adelaide Oval needs to remain as a viable working oval, but there needs to be an inner city roofed stadium close to public transport.

They went to the election with that, but why wouldn't they support Adelaide Oval? They said, 'The fact is, the Rann government was panicked into action on a stadium—'

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: —no, no, wait for Nostradamus over here—'and has forced football into a deal it doesn't want and looks unlikely to ever come to fruition.' My God! You would take her stock tips, wouldn't

you? You would take her stock tips! Nostradamus!

In June 2010, still, this incredibly important project for South Australia they need to have a stadium. She said:

...why isn't it better to actually leave the Adelaide Oval intact...and build a purpose-built stadium for football which is FIFA-compliant? Because bear in mind this new oval will not be still FIFA-compliant—

which is another one of their lies. Basically, the opposition relied on its fond hope that, firstly, they could derail it through football—

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Point of order, member for MacKillop.

Mr WILLIAMS: The minister is now clearly debating his answer. He has given a 10-minute answer for which he has no responsibility to the house. He is abusing question time and now he is debating.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Sit down. The minister can answer the question as he chooses, and I am sure he is getting towards the end of his time.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: With the greatest respect, I am merely saying things that you people have been saying.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The question was very open.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: He says it is debating for me to say that they relied upon the fact that they didn't believe football would agree. Here is what Iain Evans said in February 2010:

It's pretty obvious that the two parties still can't agree after 15 months—

The SPEAKER: Order! Point of order.  
The member for Stuart.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Two points of order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: You can't have two points of order; you do one at a time.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Standing order 123: it is the fourth time the minister has used a member's name rather than addressing them by seat.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I would direct the minister to address people by their seat.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The member for Davenport, one of the welter of former leaders—

The SPEAKER: Order! The second point of order.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Standing order 104: he should be addressing you, and he knows it very well.

The SPEAKER: Yes, he also is slightly cross-eyed.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Madam Speaker, I address my comments through the chair. The member for Davenport who as I said is one of the welter of former leaders of the opposition said this in February 2010:

It's pretty obvious that the two parties still can't agree after 15 months. I guess it goes to show you that when you try and remarry the same party after a 40-year divorce, it's going to be pretty difficult.

First, they relied on the fight between football and cricket to undermine this idea. Then they relied on a SACA vote, campaigning against that.

They said that the reason they wouldn't support it is because football didn't like it, it wasn't the right thing and you needed an inner-city stadium, but what do we know now from the opposition, because the most recent comment from the member for Davenport—again, not entirely correct, or some would say not honest, but I will just stick with 'correct'—says the government is still not justified by its pouring more than \$600 million into two of the richest sports in this state. This is what we need to know, because now apparently the position of the opposition is no money for no stadium for football, after telling us that it had to be done and it was not a question of if, it was a question of when.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I'm sorry—apparently it's a waste of money—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Well, what do you say then? Should we have a stadium?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Member for Davenport, should we have a world-class stadium—simply, yes or no? Come on, you weaklings. Yes or no?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The people of South Australia deserve to know—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Bragg, you are warned.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The people of South Australia deserve to know if the opposition has deserted its longstanding platform of an inner-city sports stadium, because apparently

the latest position, cricket having done the right thing, football having done the right thing, everyone wanting to go to Adelaide Oval, is that it is a waste of money to spend money on the stadium. So, what is their position?

Can they explain why 'it had to happen'? 'Why can't we?' they said. Why can't we have one? What is their position? Will they support this or will they build another one or are they now saying, 'To hell with football, to hell with cricket, let them suffer, let them die because we will not do anything that gives the Labor Party a win, and that is what it is all about'?

The SPEAKER: Point of order, the member for Finniss.

Mr PENGILLY: I am unsure whether the minister has finished his diatribe, but quite clearly he is debating. The question related to statements that have been made and every now and then we are getting a small statement and then we are getting a heap of absolute—

The SPEAKER: Alright, you made your point, sit down.

Mr PENGILLY: —what the Premier referred to on the radio.

The SPEAKER: Sit down, you're debating the point of order. Minister, have you finished your answer?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Yes, thank you, ma'am.