



Speech By
Mark Boothman

MEMBER FOR THEODORE

Record of Proceedings, 21 August 2019


APPROPRIATION (PARLIAMENT) BILL

APPROPRIATION BILL

Consideration in Detail (Cognate Debate)

Appropriation Bill

Innovation, Tourism Development and Environment Committee, Report

 **Mr BOOTHMAN** (Theodore—LNP) (12.54 pm): I too rise to make a contribution to report No. 18 for the budget estimates of the Innovation, Tourism Development and Environment Committee. I have participated in quite a few estimates hearings over the years. I must say that this was not quite like previous estimates we are used to, where the government would always try to highlight their accolades and achievements while obviously trying to rebut the questions of the opposition and crossbench. For the whole period of this estimates hearing it seemed that the government was in a damage control position. It seemed like somebody had let the seacocks out of the Queensland Labor Party before the integrity crisis enveloped the government. One of my residents recently said to me, 'Mark, how could a government possibly get into this kind of dilemma?' He agreed that the problem is—

Mr BAILEY: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. As fascinating as the member's ramble is, it is not related to the estimates process or the budget. On the grounds of relevance I ask him to come back to what we are debating.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Pugh): Thank you for your point of order, Minister. I would appreciate an explanation of what a seacock is because I was just wondering. I would ask you to come back to the topic we are debating.

Mr BOOTHMAN: It allows water to flood into a boat. I thank you for your guidance, Madam Deputy Speaker. It highlights the integrity issues surrounding this government. Look at what has transpired with the Fortress Capstone issue, which relates to the Premier's own chief of staff and \$267,500 worth of taxpayers' money. As I was saying, when governments are more interested in looking after themselves—

Ms JONES: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. This was covered at estimates. This has nothing to do with the innovation portfolio. This is a fund which is in the Treasury portfolio.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Minister. I would ask the member to return to the matter we are debating.

Mr BOOTHMAN: Again thank you for your guidance, but I do notice that this topic was discussed during the estimates committee—

Ms JONES: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. It was discussed, and at that estimates hearing I clearly said that it was not in my portfolio. You were there. It is not part of the innovation portfolio.

Mr POWELL: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will deal with the first point of order before I hear yours, member for Glass House. Minister, I appreciate your point of order but—

Honourable members interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you very much. I do not need any guidance from either side of the chamber. Minister, this is not an opportunity for us to debate the point of order. There is no further point of order. I will now hear from the member for Glass House.

Mr POWELL: The member is referring to the estimates report tabled by the committee which contains a reference to this matter; therefore, it is clearly relevant to the debate at present.

Mrs D'ATH: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. I understand that based on the information provided by the minister the chair ruled that this was not within the portfolio responsibility. Whether it appears in the report or not does not make it relevant when it was ruled as not being part of the portfolio.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Theodore, I hope that you can keep your future contributions relevant to the estimates report.

Mr BOOTHMAN: Thank you for your guidance again; I certainly can. Let us go to the issue of the Hot DesQ, which was a program that the government touted as a major investment to attract investment into the state through business. There was a Channel 9 report which highlighted that 52 overseas and interstate companies received taxpayer funds of \$50,000 to \$100,000. Of that, according to ASIC a total of 30 of these businesses—or \$1.125 million—have been deregistered and struck off. Furthermore, another seven of these businesses—a total of half a million dollars—left Queensland; therefore, it does highlight where taxpayers' money is being spent. It does highlight what benefit the Queensland taxpayer gets, especially when we are giving money to overseas companies. In this case, according to ASIC 13 of these businesses have been deregistered and struck off. One of my local constituents was very passionate when he saw the report. It upset him no end knowing that these funds were not being properly spent.

I will go back to the line of questioning. The shadow minister asked what will happen to Hot DesQ in the future. Queenslanders expect that the money will be spent in the best way to get the best bang for the Queensland taxpayer. I will wrap up now and keep my contribution to that. This government needs to be held to account to make sure the buck is spent in the best way for Queensland taxpayers.