

ACA REVIEW

Sir Thomas Legg KCB QC

Rt Hon Frank Field MP
House of Commons
London SW1A 0AA

6 November 2009

Dear Mr. Field.

Thank you for your letter of 2nd November.

On housekeeping, you will recall that my provisional conclusion was that you should repay the excess allowance unless you were able to demonstrate what other allowable services were provided. My colleague understood you to say on the telephone that housekeeping included shopping and other errands; and book-keeping. I am not aware of any other MP claiming the ACA for such purposes, but I would not rule it out on that account.

However, on that basis, you would have been spending more than a thousand pounds a year in three of the five years concerned on these particular services, in addition to cleaning and garden maintenance. May I ask you to confirm that your contention is that this was allowable and, if so, whether you could provide some further details of the services concerned. I will then willingly reconsider my provisional conclusion.

On petty cash, there seems to be some misunderstanding between us. The ACA has never at any stage been properly payable to provide petty cash. If on any occasion the Fees Office did so, it did so improperly. It is not an issue on which the Fees Office could have a policy one way or the other (although in fact the Fees Office have now confirmed to me their agreement on this). That is the basis of my provisional conclusion on this heading.

I quite understand your point about the telecommunications claim, and I know that you have already sent in a payment for the duplicated payments separately mentioned. My final conclusions will mention that fact.

Yours sincerely

Tom Legg