

# Electric cars

The latest figures for battery car sales in the EU show them down 11% in March, with a market share down at 13%. The fall in Germany was particularly steep. This follows news of price cuts and poor sales at Tesla. The Tesla share price is 62% down from the peak. Tesla announced 14,000 redundancies.

This should be a salutary warning to governments and car companies. It is no good ploughing on with new products that too few people want to buy or can afford. Governments need to do more to deliver enough affordable renewable electricity before trying to force the pace on adoption of battery cars. Why try to sell more EVs when they need to be recharged with electricity from a gas power station?

Governments and international conferences have not been straight with the public. It is not green to scrap a petrol or diesel car early and make a new battery car to replace it. It is not green to run a battery car recharging it with fossil fuel electricity. If many people do get EVs governments will impose taxes on using them to replace lost petrol taxes. Using a battery car will not be easy until there are many more fast recharging points. Going electric requires a huge expansion of the grid and cable systems that serve us.

Car companies spend plenty of money on EV car ads trying to make them look the thing to have. They never talk about running costs. How much does it cost to recharge? What happens to insurance costs? What is the true range? How long will the battery last? How quickly does battery performance deteriorate? How easy is it to repair a damaged battery car? The ads need to be more informative. Many people have many good reasons not to buy a battery electric car. The rich can afford them and often have a petrol car as well for long journeys. Most people think they are too dear, difficult to recharge away from home and no use if you do not have a driveway or garage of your own.

---

## My Intervention on the Safety of Rwanda Bill amendments – Court challenges

John Redwood (Wokingham) (Con):

Many people share the Government's ambition to stop the boats. Would these Lords amendments not muddle the legislation in a way that, once again, would leave us open to an unnecessary court challenge? Can he reassure us that, unamended, the Bill will do the job?

Michael Tomlinson:

I know my right hon. Friend has taken a close interest in the Bill since the outset, and he is right. The amendments fall into two categories: those that are simply unnecessary and those that are worse than unnecessary. The second group are wrecking amendments deliberately designed to prevent the very things that the Bill was designed to do—namely, stopping the boats and getting the planes off the ground.

My hon. Friend the Member for Stone (Sir William Cash) has previously accused me of repeating myself from time to time—heaven forbid—but he is right, because our approach is justified as a matter of parliamentary sovereignty and constitutional propriety. Indeed, my right hon. and learned Friend the Member for South Swindon (Sir Robert Buckland) has even said that it is not unprecedented, and he is right. It also meets our international obligations.

---

## **The Bank of England should cut the losses**

I am trying to get more to put this case to the Treasury and Bank to stop the outrageous losses. Please use this text.

The Bank of England has received £49.4 bn in payments from taxpayers and the Treasury so far to cover its losses on holding and selling bonds.. OBR forecasts point to further substantial losses to come. They estimated these at £179 bn in the March budget papers. This year could see the need to pay the Bank of England a further large sum.

These payments increase the public sector deficit excluding the Bank of England, which is the figure used to assess how much headroom the government has to increase public spending and or reduce taxes. It is in everyone's interest to minimise these losses and to protect the taxpayer from the possible outcome forecast by the OBR.

There are three main sources of loss. Some of the bonds were bought at prices above the repayment value of the bond. These losses are unavoidable if the bonds are held to repayment. It is true if at some future date interest rates had tumbled and the price of the bonds have again risen above the repayment value you could then sell at a profit. We cannot assume that is going to happen anytime soon. Meanwhile there will be some losses as bonds mature.

The Bank is actively selling £100bn of bonds a year into the market, taking larger losses than if they held them to maturity, and taking the losses sooner than they need to. The Bank could stop selling these bonds, allowing them to be repaid in due course on maturity. Some mature quite soon, Others are long dated and can stay on the balance sheet. Stopping selling the

bonds would stop a large amount of the total losses.

The European Central Bank and the Federal reserve Board also bought lots of bonds at high prices and have considered what to do with them. The ECB has decided not to sell any prematurely into markets that are now so much lower than when they bought the bonds. They will allow them all to run off as they mature with lower losses. The Fed has been selling some Treasury bonds but has recently stated it plans to halve the rate of sale, and to place more emphasis on selling shorter dated bonds where the losses are considerably lower than the losses on long dated. When interest rates are pushed up as they have been losses on longer dated bonds are much larger than on short dated, because you have to wait so much longer to get your money back.

The third source of loss is the Bank receives a lower rate of interest on the bonds it has bought than the rate of interest it pays the commercial banks for the money they deposit with it. All the time the Bank keeps the base rate as high as today there will be losses on simply holding the bonds. The ECB has decided it will no longer pay interest on minimum reserves commercial banks have to hold with the Central Bank to cut these losses. The Bank of England and the Fed did not pay interest on reserves prior to 2006. The Bank of England could align its policy with the ECB.

These actions would lead to a substantial improvement in the UK public sector finances excluding the Bank of England. The Bank would not suffer as a result, as it admits these sales are not crucial to its monetary policy. These proposals do not interfere with Bank of England independence. The Banks independence is over settling the Base rate and assessing inflation, which this does not change. The Bank says it acts as an agent for the Treasury over bonds. It needed the approval of successive Chancellors for all the purchases, and insisted on a Treasury guarantee against loss. As the Treasury is the guarantor it can also influence when these bonds are sold.

---

## [My Conservative Home article \(unedited version\)](#)

This century has seen a great growth in the powers and reach of so called independent public sector bodies. The four main parties in Parliament usually cheered on and engineered these moves. There was a general buy in to the proposition that experts were better than political generalists, and that you needed to take the party politics out of large chunks of the public sector.

The new settlement was always flawed and never adhered to. Whilst the Opposition parties were usually hot to expose any Ministerial interference in these bodies, they were also keen to blame the Ministers when there was a bad miscarriage by them. They clung to the idea that experts are always right, as the evidence mounted that there can also be wrong or bad

experts that can do damage if unchecked by commonsense and democratic accountability.

We have seen a long list of these bodies let people down, with hapless Ministers then held to account for the failings. The Bank responsible for the single main task of keeping inflation to 2% presided over 11% and blamed external forces and someone else. The nationalised Post Office imprisoned many of its honest and decent staff and plunged into heavy losses which taxpayers had to pay. Its independent supervisor UK Government Investments looked the other way and left Ministers to explain and rectify. The Water Regulator watched as water companies failed to invest in more pipes and capacity, leaving Ministers to explain how we could clean up our rivers whilst keeping water bills to realistic levels. The Environment Agency allowed the Somerset levels to flood, damaging farms, before Ministers stepped in to tell them to man the pumps and keep the ditches and rivers free flowing.

All of these regulators and nationalised industries have a so called sponsor department which is meant to monitor and guide them. The department needs to know how much they will cost taxpayers, negotiate over money, charges and performance going forward and be a critical friend of the body in government. When I did this job as a sponsor Minister I usually held an annual budget meeting with each of the important bodies to go through their need for public funds, their charging policy, their service quality and their general efficiency. I would often hold a meeting before the publication of the annual report to go over what they had achieved and to hear what their report would say. Their leadership was responsible for how they managed the operation, for the outcomes, and for recommending the way to achieve the stated objectives laid down by government and Parliament. I was responsible for reporting to Parliament on their successes and failures, so I needed to know how they were doing.

Today in the case of a nationalised industry like the Post Office or Network Rail there are three supervisors in the mix. There is UK Government Investments, there is a sponsor department and there is the Cabinet Office/Treasury complex. It would be good to establish a single lead in each case. It is difficult to see what value UK Government Investments adds, so why not wind it up.

It is strange when we see the disasters at nationalised HS 2 or the failures of the water and environmental regulators that the cry goes up we need more nationalisation and more independent regulation. There is no evidence that our main nationalised industries have done well and are a model to follow. I will continue to make the case for more choice and private capital in state activities where people pay for the product or service they use.

If we take the UK media sector the large presence of the BBC and the allied presence of Channel 4 as public sector broadcasters has marginalised the UK in the vastly expanding and fast changing media world beyond the UK dominated by the US majors Comcast, Disney, Charter, Netflix and Paramount. The combined turnover of these big five US media conglomerates is \$285 bn compared to just \$7bn for the BBC. The largest has a turnover 17 times the BBC. It is true some of them offer broadband services as well as entertainment and news, but this is now an integral part of broadcasting. Non UK BBC, where we ought to compete commercially, has a turnover of just \$1.4 bn. The BBC has a world non UK commercial company

which is tiny in comparison to the US success stories, held back by public sector financing and regulatory constraints. We could keep the licence fee and national programmes people like domestically whilst freeing BBC World to raise its own money and expand its service to compete more effectively with the modern media giants.

Whilst some people vote for more nationalisation, they express growing preferences for free enterprise US solutions to many features of their lives. They buy more and more US entertainment, shop at Amazon. use Microsoft software, search with Google, talk to friends with Meta and use Apple devices . The UK and the rest of Europe is falling behind in ways nationalisation and beefed up regulators cannot remedy.

---

## California Crossroads

I called in today as a local resident to refuel at the garage . The works I am told are now running behind schedule. The local businesses are suffering very badly. Turnover is massively down with many customers unable to get there or to park easily. We local users did not want the junction changed and certainly did not want roads closed for weeks on end. We want the local businesses to flourish and to be accessible. One business I was told had its electricity cut off without warning. Residential roads are clogged with cars trying to get round the closures.

Why didn't the Council listen to local opinion and the Opposition Councillors who warned them not to proceed? Why did they proceed with no plans to help the local businesses? Why is there no compensation for lost business? Why are the works over running? Why did the Council tell us it would make things better and that it was on schedule? Why do some Councillors who voted for it now want to blame anyone but themselves?