

Tim Godwin  
Acting Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police  
Broadway  
London  
SW1H 0BG

Albert Burgess  
15 Parliament Road  
Thame  
OX9 3TE  
6<sup>TH</sup> September 2011

Sir,

I think you should ask your legal department to look long and hard at this letter the original has gone to the Lord Chancellor. I can assure you the contents are based on extensive research into the English Constitutional and Common law. Higher Law! Which has consistently been broken by the House of Commons which has been on an illegal power grab for many years? Every holder of the office of Constable takes an oath to uphold the laws of this country without favour, fear, malice, or ill will. The new oath I have not mentioned because it is intrinsically treasonable as just another attempt by the commons to grab supreme power in this land a power the law quite clearly says they can not have.

Each house of parliament has a common law cognisance to run its own business, in its own way; neither house can by Common or Higher Law interfere in the internal working of the other house.

This is the constitutional settlement placed upon parliament by our forefathers, and described in the Prerogatives of the King by Sir Mathew Hale 1713 Chief Justice of the Kings Bench. And F W Maitland Late Downing Professor of the Laws of England in the University of Cambridge. At the university press 1908.

Sir Edward Coke Chief Justice of the Kings Bench 1628 ruled that parliament may some times pass a law which is repugnant or impossible to perform in which case the common law will intercede and strike it down. Giving the Common Law the status of higher law than statute law.

There are a number of cases of the cognisance of the commons to conduct its own business its own way, but I have not been able to find one case which deals with either house interfering in the running of the other house. Yet this is exactly what the House of Commons has done to the House of Lords, they started this process in 1661 after the restoration of King Charles II when the Commons told the Lords they could not amend a money bill only accept it or reject it, the commons were claiming without any legal authority, complete autonomy in all things financial. This was the commons interfering with the cognisance of the upper house to do its job of scrutinising legislation. For some inexplicable reason the Lords accepted this state of affairs. This was the precursor to all the subsequent parliament acts.

In 1910 Asquith put forward a money bill and the upper house being erroneously of the opinion that they had no authority to amend this bill rejected it. In fact the upper house had the common law right to amend it and return the amended bill to the commons for approval.

As a result Asquith put forward the first parliament act which limited the authority of the upper house, Asquith told the upper house if they did not consent to this bill he would put 500 new Peers into the house who would vote for its abolition, as a trained police officer you will be aware that this is the crime of blackmail and constitutes duress upon the upper house

to acquiesce in the commission of a crime of sedition. When this bill to restrict the upper house was submitted to King Edward VII he refused the assent on the grounds it was unconstitutional and removed a protection from his subjects. In fact it interfered with the cognisance of the upper house to perform its duties in the manner laid down by the constitutional and common laws of England, these laws are so good they have travelled to every common law jurisdiction in the world. Even Talleyrand our sworn enemy said when the English Constitution goes freedom goes.

King Edward VII fell ill and died, I did express an interest in the post mortem results on Edward VII to your predecessor, and on coming to the Throne King George V was told by a government minister he keeps all his prerogatives but may not use any of them unless he has the backing of a government minister. This principle is unknown to our constitutional or common law. The assent was given to the 1911 Parliament Act which effectively weakened the authority of the upper house but with no constitutional or common law authority for the commons to even contemplate such a move. The mere fact they are the elected house does not authorise their actions. Because at no time have the public been put in the constitutional picture, which would allow them to make an informed decision. As to whether they wish to weaken the upper house in this or any other way. In fact Asquith toured the country slanting the true position so much as to be an outright lie.

The 1948 Parliament Act was yet another interference with the cognisance of the upper house to perform its constitutional duties, as our forefathers set it up. Once again this was done without the benefit of law, nor is there any justifiable legal principle which can be quoted to justify the unjustifiable.

The 1998 House of Lords Act by the same token interferes with the cognisance of the upper house to determine itself who does or does not sit in the upper house. This is a clear breach of the constitutional arrangements of parliament and is contrary to constitutional and common law.

Each of the above acts has subverted the constitutional arrangements of parliament; this is the major crime of Sedition at Common Law, and at this level of Sedition an act of High Treason.

The letters patent as granted to a Baron of the realm are such as to be a clear and lawful order from the King, to the recipient of the letter patent to undertake certain duties on the Kings behalf, it is clear that the King can not possibly know or understand every thing put before him, he should have a good general understanding of his Kingdom, his subjects, and world affairs. But there will always be occasions when his knowledge or understanding will fall short of allowing him without assistance from reaching the right decision. In order that he has a ready source of advisors who are good and capable men, he uses those peers of the realm that he or his ancestors have appointed to Baronetcies, and the letters patent represent a lawful order from the King to the holder of the Letters Patent to undertake this work. They instruct the holder of the Letters Patent that he must sit in the upper house of parliament and scrutinise legislation passing through the parliament to ensure it is in the best interests of the country and his subjects, it further gives a lawful order to the holder of the letters Patent that he is to act as an advisor to the King. In short the King requires those with the best available knowledge and experience to advise him as to the best course of action under any circumstances.

England is a Monarchy and we all owe a duty of loyalty and obedience to our lawfully anointed sovereign, the letters patent are by our laws to be obeyed. For any one who ever they may be, whatever position they hold within the Kingdom be they farm labourer or Prime Minister to come between the King and the holder of the letters patent so as to prevent the holder from carrying out the lawful commands of the King is for that person to set himself above the King. That by our law is an act of High Treason contrary to the Common Law of England and the 1351 Treason Act.

I respectfully submit that is just what Anthony Blair did when he put through the 1998 House of Lords Act. He in effect set Her Majesty's lawful order to those hereditary peers sat in the upper house at nought thereby imagining the death of Her Majesty as a Sovereign Queen. Contrary to Common Law and the 1351 Treason Act.

He also removed Her Majesty's honour as a Sovereign Queen by assuming he had a greater authority in this Kingdom than Her Majesty. Contrary to Common Law and the 1848 Treason Felony Act.

No statute law passed since the 1911 Parliament Act has been passed by a constitutionally properly constituted parliament and as such has no legal validity in law.

I would request that for every hereditary peer removed from the upper house, under the 1998 House of Lords Act. A warrant should be issued for the arrest of Anthony Linton Blair one time Prime Minister of the United Kingdom on a charge of High Treason for imagining the death of the Anointed Queen of England Queen Elizabeth II Contrary to Common Law and the 1351 Treason Act. By setting at nought Her Majesty's lawful command to her Hereditary Barons to assist her in the management of her Kingdom.

By the oath you have taken to Her Majesty and before God you are required to assist Her Majesty to conduct the affairs of the United Kingdom by upholding her ability to give lawful commands to those of her subjects she feels best suited to assist her in the safe government of her Kingdom.

As no statute law since 1911 has any legal validity each and every EEC/EU Treaty is invalid and contravenes the Common and Constitutional Law of England, Her Majesty is not as John Major said a citizen of Europe. Her Majesty is the supreme governor of the United Kingdom and as such all her lawful commands must be obeyed.

I require you to undertake such enquires as are necessary to place on trial for High Treason any and all persons of whatever status in society who are still alive who have set about betraying Her Majesty's Kingdom by subverting the Constitution contrary to the 1351 Act of Provisors, the 1351 Act of Praemunire, and the 1351 Treason Act. The repeal of the first two major Constitutional Laws in 1948 and 1967 have no legal validity as the parliament which repealed them was not properly constituted. I further require you to undertake the enquiry into the High Treason of John Major one time prime minister for High Treason by attempting to make Her Majesty a vassal Queen to Brussels, contrary to the constitutional and common law of England.

Respectfully submitted

Albert Burgess