

17 June 2009

E600

Dear Sir,

This is a belated submission for your enquiry as I have only just established that you were seeking comments from the public. Please consider if you can accept the views set out in the following paragraphs.

Two of the issues to be addressed are documented as :

*"8. What is the best way of providing recompense to those MPs who inevitably have to spend time away from their main home on Parliamentary business? and*

*9. How much discretion should the system allow about issues like the designation of second homes? "*

These statements seem to assume that a second homes allowance is already accepted whereas feel this assumption should be challenged.

Working from the underlying principle that MPs should only be entitled to any tax allowances or expenses that are available to any other citizen or business, the concept of a second homes allowance should be inadmissible. Constituents, faced with a new job in another geographic location, have the option to move to the new location or to stay put and commute to their new work location. However, their employer may grant them some form of removal allowance or help with travel expenses for a limited period.

MPs, when elected, could choose to live either in their constituency or in London. Should they choose to move house then relocation expenses, as for other government employees, could be provided. In either case, time spent in their alternative work location could be covered by travel and subsistence expenses for the time necessarily spent away from their home. This is how most other businesses work. The level of travel and subsistence payments enjoyed by MPs should be no higher than those received by civil servants of a suitable equivalent grade.

I appreciate that this is a late comment but I feel most strongly that MPs should not have payments, allowances or have taxation benefits that are denied to their constituents.

Regards,

C Flint

Ipswich

17/06/2009