

Buying defence equipment

Yesterday in the House the government made a statement on what had gone wrong in trying to buy 589 fighting vehicles for the army. So far very few have been delivered and those that have been have not met noise and vibration standards. This has raised hearing issues for some who have worked in them.

The Minister and the review are both critical of procedures. The Minister is leading the work to get the matter rectified by the contractor. He assured the House that the contract was at a fixed price of £5.5bn and the government's intent is to secure the delivery of 589 working vehicles that meet the required standards.

It is most important for the army and taxpayers that he succeeds. There have been too many cases of procurement overruns on time and budget and on the need to remedy or change specifications during the roll out of a programme. Let us hope the MOD can now find new ways to offer value for money and to secure the high quality vehicles, vessels and other equipment they need.

My support for the Government's new policy to ensure that the Post Office properly apologises and compensates every post master wrongfully convicted

Sir John Redwood (Wokingham) (Con): I am grateful to the [Minister](#) for changing the policy. I have been a long-standing critic of past Governments and Ministers for not telling the [Post Office](#) to apologise and pay up, and I encourage him today to ensure that the Post Office apologises properly, and pays up quickly and generously.

Parliamentary Under Secretary for the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (Paul Scully):

My right hon. Friend is absolutely right. We will ensure that we lean into the [Post Office](#) to ensure that they deliver all compensation schemes quickly and equitably so that we can get this issue sorted out. [The Post Office](#) has acknowledged that it has done wrong, but the inquiry will detail the questions that it needs to answer over the next few months.

My intervention in the Armed Forces Bill supporting the Government's effort to improve home ownership for armed forces service personnel

Sir John Redwood (Wokingham) (Con): I will be supporting the Government, as they have made welcome progress on creating better conditions and support for our armed forces, but I would like to press the [Minister](#) on housing. When we wish to recruit and retain the best people in the future as we have in the past, it is important that we provide something better on housing than we traditionally have. It is a disgrace if armed services personnel, after providing substantial service to our country, cannot afford to buy a house of their own, and instead have to scramble to get rented accommodation, which they often find difficult.

I hope the [MOD](#) can do more through its potential and current schemes to promote home ownership, and to promote buying property nearer home base, for example, so that people leaving the armed forces have a property of their own. If service personnel are not able to do that, a surrogate scheme is needed so that when they leave the armed forces after holding important jobs and earning reasonable money, they are not debarred from the private housing market and they do not come to see their service career as a gap in making those contributions and building up savings in a house of their own. They should have as much opportunity to own their own property as the rest of the community.

Yes of course we need an expeditionary service and service personnel may need to serve in a variety of places abroad, but that should not get in the way of either having a home of their own with their family or having the wherewithal to have a home of their own when they leave the armed services. I hope my hon. and gallant Friend the Minister will sympathise and do more to make sure it can be true. I do not think we need a legal requirement, but we need a firm pledge of intent from the Government.

Now what?

Winning a difficult vote will come as an unsurprising relief to the government. They had to rely on the Opposition and on this occasion it worked. It does not however solve the underlying problems.

If the virus continues to spread the government will be told by its ever cautious scientific advisers to lock down more. They are bound to say that as

it is the safest thing to say if your one task is to curb the disease. The measures taken this week are unlikely to arrest its progress. Indeed one of the main arguments against the vaccine passports is vaccinated people can get and pass on the virus so how does it help as a device to control Night clubs and large events?

If the virus turns out as some think to be milder so there is no surge in serious cases the governments critics will claim the measures were needless.

More seriously Ministers have to rebuild trust with a large number of MPs who voted against, abstained or wanted to vote against but responded to persuasion or coercion. Ministers need to grasp both the scepticism about some of the forecasts and measures proposed, and the concern that every time a new variant appears there could be more lockdowns.

Government needs to balance freedoms and economic needs against pandemic control. It needs to recognise that anti pandemic rules can cause more mental health problems, loss of jobs, businesses and income and damage to the social life of communities. There needs to be more evidence about which measures do most at least collateral damage to contain the spread of the virus.

We could do with more information on what progress has been made with air extraction and cleansing in public buildings, more information on approved and potential treatments and more on disinfection.

Government also needs to ensure extra resources going into the NHS can be used to tackle the many non covid health problems that do not go away because of the virus.

[A non answer to a simple question!](#)

Question:

To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, for what reason the total budget allocated to housing illegal migrants in hotels is commercial in confidence when that total would not reveal the contract terms of individual suppliers. (86524)

Tabled on: 03 December 2021

Answer:

Kevin Foster:

The Rt Hon. Gentleman's question appears to relate to a Freedom of Information (FOI) response. Responses to all FOI requests are handled in line with the legislation, including applying relevant exemptions where applicable.

The answer was submitted on 14 Dec 2021 at 10:31.

COMMENT

This was a question further to a previous Parliamentary Question! It has nothing to do with FOI.