

RECEIVED
18 MAY 2009

West Wickham,
Kent.

(E12)

14/5/2009

Dear Sir Christopher,

Jacqui Lait MP advised me to write to you regarding my concerns on the expenses that M.P.'s claim for travel and also who should qualify for a second home allowance.

I therefore enclose copies of the E-mails that I sent to her since they express my concerns.

Yours sincerely
B. Humphreys

Humphrys, B

From: Humphrys, B
Sent: 16 April 2009 13:58
To:
Cc:

Subject: RE: Bromley Times

Dear

I regret that I wasn't at the meeting when this issue was discussed and the minutes don't elaborate on the discussion.

I find two issues hard to understand.

Firstly:

An MP is employed (elected) by the Constituency to work in that constituency. There is no employer in the country as far as I know who pays their employee's expenses to get to their place of work. I know a number of people who have taken up jobs in Bromley or the centre of London who live a considerable distance away and have either spent hours travelling or have got digs in Bromley from Monday to Friday all at their own expense.

SECONDLY:

MP's second home allowance was I believe introduced for MP's whose constituencies were a considerable distance from the House of Commons so that they could stay away from their constituencies near London whilst Parliament was in session.

For London MP's or MP's with constituencies with in a short distance of London to claim for a second home actually in their constituency I find incomprehensible.

The most they should be able to claim is for their journey from the constituency to the House of Commons or for other journeys on Parliamentary business out of their constituency.

If the wording under Second home allowances is so loose as to allow for claims by London constituency MP's it should be changed as it certainly can't be in the spirit of the second home criteria, to help MP's from the far reaches of Britain to attend Parliament.

Regards,

B

Humphrys, B

From: Humphrys, B
Sent: 22 April 2009 08:17
To:
Cc:
Subject: RE: Bromley Times

Dear
The dilemma that you and . had is no different to that of thousands of working couples, when one of them is either offered a promotion in a National Company or is offered a new job which would advance their career away from their present area or indeed one of them loses their local job and finds a post away from home. None of these couples have the luxury as MP's have of being able to claim either travel costs to their new place of work or indeed costs of digs in the new area. Amazingly you claim for both.
What a great many people object to is that MP's have given themselves these expenses which no Company would dream of giving their employees.
Many people have to travel considerable distances to get to work or take up the option of digs in order to preserve their Home life on salaries less than an MP's with no prospect of lavish expenses.
Regards,
B

Humphrys, B

From: Humphrys, B.
Sent: 09 May 2009 10:10
To:
Cc:
Subject: RE: Bromley Times

Dear

Thank you for your letter of the 6th May Re MP's expenses and for Sir Christopher Kelly's E-mail and postal address.

I will as suggested forward my comments to his inquiry.

I agree that Gordon Brown's proposal that MP's should be paid for attending the House was rightly rejected. I however support the removal of second home allowances from London MP's but I believe that this should be extended to all MP's whose Constituencies are with in reasonable Commuter travel time from Westminster.

You like most of your colleagues say that your claims are with in the rules .The point that I and most of the Country are trying to get across to MP's is that THE RULES as laid down by themselves FOR THEMSELVES are open to such interpretation as to make them meaningless. I regret that I will not be at the constituency meeting on the 12th May.

Regards,

B