

LANDGATE OFFICES — SALE

**632. Dr D.J. HONEY to the Premier:**

I have a supplementary question. Was accepting the lowest value sales scenario with no tenant purposeful or a mistake?

**Mr M. McGOWAN replied:**

I do not understand the member's question. I will explain it to him again.

**Dr D.J. Honey:** Or was it deliberate? Did you deliberately know the valuation had no tenant?

**The SPEAKER:** Order, please! You have had your chance for the supplementary. We will just have the response now.

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** What is the member's allegation? Is he trying to suggest that the commercial party involved is somehow improper? Is that what the member is suggesting?

**Dr D.J. Honey:** No, I am saying Treasury didn't do its job.

**Mr M. McGOWAN:** I am just saying to the member that government experts in this area analysed it and advisers—major commercial property firms—looked at it and said there is an existing asset that is tired, old and under-utilised. They came up with a model that was cheaper than government having to do it and that was the model that was taken forward. That is what was accepted by government. The MLP process is designed to throw up innovative things. I know that the member does not support innovation—that is not the way that he thinks—but innovative and new ways of doing things is what the MLP process is designed to come up with. Industry across the state supports the MLP process. It wants the MLP process. I might say that it is very vigorous, and it can be time consuming and have so many probity checks that sometimes it can take a long time to get to an outcome, but I want to see it produce outcomes. It produced an outcome based upon all the advice, the hurdles and the probity checks within it that saves the government money. I would have thought that that is a good thing.