

Sent: 27 April 2026 at 00:48

**Open email - FAO The Chair, House of Commons
PACAC**

Dear Chair

**Re: Constitutional Paper - Request for PACAC
Engagement and Clarification**

I write further to my previous correspondence of 18 November 2025 and 10 December 2025, which were formally addressed to the Public Administration and Constitutional Affairs Committee and placed on record.

I now attach a further paper titled:

"The House of Commons Public Administration and Constitutional Affairs Committee - Does It Really Have Any Valid Purpose?"

This paper has been prepared in light of the Committee's non-response to the earlier constitutional correspondence and seeks to examine, in a structured and evidential manner, the practical operation of PACAC's oversight function when directly engaged on matters of constitutional significance.

For clarity, the paper does not advance new allegations. Rather, it draws together:

- the prior correspondence submitted to the Committee,
- the absence of substantive engagement in response, and
- the constitutional implications which arise from that absence.

The issue now is a narrow but important one:

Whether a parliamentary oversight body, when formally engaged on matters of serious constitutional concern, is under any practical obligation to respond and if not, what that means for the effectiveness of its function.

In that context, I respectfully invite the Committee to:

- Confirm receipt of this paper;
- Indicate whether it intends to engage substantively with the issues previously raised; and
- Clarify its position as to the scope of its role where formal constitutional concerns are placed before it but remain unanswered.

Given the cumulative nature of the correspondence already issued, I would be grateful if this email and its attachment could be treated as part of the same continuous constitutional record.

I remain available to provide any further material or to attend before the Committee should that be considered appropriate.

Yours sincerely

Ian Clayton

Lead Investigator

Ethical Approach UK

The House of Commons Public Administration and Constitutional Affairs Committee - Does It Really Have Any Valid Purpose?

Author: Ian Clayton

Date: 27 April 2026

Executive Summary

The Public Administration and Constitutional Affairs Committee (PACAC) exists to scrutinise public administration and uphold constitutional integrity within the United Kingdom.

However, where:

- formal constitutional correspondence is delivered,
- serious matters of law and governance are raised, and
- no substantive response is provided,

the question of purpose is no longer theoretical. It becomes evidential.

This paper proceeds on that evidential footing.

1. The Trigger: Formal Constitutional Engagement

On 18 November 2025, formal correspondence was issued directly to:

- the Chair of PACAC
- senior constitutional office-holders
- and key institutional leaders

The correspondence:

- set out allegations of systemic constitutional failure
- identified specific statutory and legal breaches
- required direct response within seven days

It was not informal, not speculative and not rhetorical.

It was a structured constitutional notification requiring engagement.

2. The Supporting Submission to PACAC

On 10 December 2025, PACAC was directly engaged again.

This second communication:

- identified evidence of a national non-recording practice by police
- linked that practice to Operation Talla and NPCC coordination
- raised clear statutory conflicts (including CPIA, NCRS, HOOCR and Victims' Code)

- posed specific, numbered questions requiring clarification

It explicitly invited PACAC to exercise its oversight function in relation to constitutional and administrative propriety.

3. The Response

No substantive response was received.

Not an engagement with the evidence. Not an answer to the questions posed. Not a request for further material.

Not an indication of inquiry.

Only silence.

4. The Constitutional Implication of Silence

Silence, in this context, is not neutral.

Where a parliamentary oversight body is directly notified of alleged systemic failure and that notification is supported by evidence and structured legal argument, failure to respond produces a constitutional effect.

That effect is this - the oversight mechanism does not engage when engagement is required.

5. The Function of PACAC Reconsidered

PACAC is designed to:

- scrutinise public administration
- examine constitutional issues
- hold institutions to account

But scrutiny requires:

- engagement with evidence
- response to serious submissions
- willingness to interrogate uncomfortable material

Where those elements are absent, the function alters.

It becomes passive rather than active.

6. The Critical Structural Deficiency

The issue exposed by these events is not procedural. It is structural.

PACAC has no obligation to respond, cannot be compelled to engage and faces no consequence for inaction.

Accordingly, its operation depends entirely on discretionary engagement.

7. The Practical Outcome

In this instance:

- constitutional issues were raised
- statutory conflicts were identified
- questions were formally put

And yet no scrutiny followed.

This produces a clear evidential conclusion - the existence of PACAC does not guarantee the exercise of its function.

8. Scrutiny Without Engagement

A body which:

- invites submissions
- receives them
- but does not engage with them

creates the appearance of oversight without its substance.

The distinction is decisive.

Substantive oversight engages, interrogates and responds.

Procedural oversight receives, records, but does not act.

On the evidence available, this case aligns with the latter.

9. The Core Question Revisited

The question is no longer abstract: ***Does PACAC have a valid purpose?***

The evidence reframes it: ***Does PACAC perform that purpose when directly called upon to do so?***

10. Conclusion

PACAC retains:

- a defined constitutional role
- a recognised institutional position
- and a theoretical oversight function

However, where:

- formal constitutional correspondence is issued,
- serious matters are raised,
- and no substantive response is provided,

the practical reality is unavoidable: Its function, in that moment, is not exercised.

Final Observation

A constitutional body is not judged by its remit.

It is judged by its response when engaged.

Here, engagement was made, evidence was provided, response was required, but none came.

That absence is not procedural - It is constitutional.