

**MINISTRY OF DEFENCE & MILITARY VETERANS**

**NATIONAL ASSEMBLY**

**QUESTION FOR WRITTEN REPLY**

**2372. Mr B H Holomisa (UDM) to ask the Minister of Defence and Military Veterans:**

(1) With reference to the alleged legal dispute between the Department of Military Veterans and ZEAL (details furnished), and the march of the military veterans to her department on 6 April 2016 demanding health care (details furnished), how does she reconcile the return by her department of R234m to the National Treasury with the current reported expenditure of R67 million by end of the 2015-16 financial year under this sub programme;

**Response**

The matter is sub judice and therefore no further comment is possible at present in terms of Rule 89 of the National Assembly which says, “No member may reflect upon the merits of any matter on which a judicial decision in a court of law is pending.”

(2) whether a certain person (name furnished) or any official of her department involved in the alleged irregular contract has been called to any disciplinary enquiry given the devastating consequences of the dispute; if not, why not; if so, what are the relevant details;

**Response**

The Public Service Commission is busy with an investigation into this contract and the processes followed in awarding it. DMV is awaiting the outcome of the investigation.

(3) whether she has found that corruption might be the real reason behind the dispute and these serious allegations levelled against a certain person (details furnished); if so,

**Response**

DMV is awaiting the outcome of the Public Service Commission investigation and will act on its recommendations.

(4) has her department investigated these serious allegations of corruption; if not, why not; if so, what are the relevant details;

**Response**

DMV is awaiting the outcome of the Public Service Commission investigation and will act on its recommendations.

(5) whether her department provided protection for the whistle-blower in this matter as provided for in the Protected Disclosures Act, Act 26 of 2000; if so, (a) what steps has her department taken to ensure that the whistle-blower is not targeted and (b) what are her department’s plans to fight corruption? NW2708E

**Response (5)**

The investigation into the Zeal contract arises from internal processes of the department and steps I took as the Executive Authority in October 2015, after the matter was brought to my attention, to request the Public Service Commission to begin an investigation.

The Public Protector has confirmed in writing that an official of the DMV lodged a complaint to their office on 3 June 2016. As this disclosure was made long after I asked the Public Service Commission to investigate the matter, I am taking advice as to whether this can be considered a protected disclosure in terms of the Protected Disclosure Act of 2000.