

April 21, 1937

Dear Sir James,

Thanks for your letter. I should judge that, following their leader, the Times would not publish a letter so entirely contrary to their own view as one from me would be likely to be.

I spoke on the point last night at the Statistical Society, where Greenwood, at short notice, was opening a discussion on the question, which he did by deriding Royal Commissions in general, and implying towards the end that the existing information in official hands was sufficient for action, if a politician of sufficient vision cared to make use of it. Carr-Saunders followed him, and I spoke third. Naturally enough Carr-Saunders took the line that, though the present was not the right time for a Royal Commission, yet the time might come, when the facts had been sufficiently gathered and analysed (presumably by a rather amateurish employee called Glass, who has been <sup>preparing</sup> ~~airing~~ reports of this kind for the Eugenics Society). I said that I thought no Commission could add appreciably to our knowledge, or indeed to what was known 12 or 15 years ago, but put in a plea that between knowledge and action a stage devoted to the formation of policy and the consideration both of economic and eugenic consequences might

be very profitable. I do not know how the discussion continued, as I had to bolt for a train.

Do you think the opposition to an official enquiry emanates from the Ministry of Health? I am myself rather puzzled, as, without some such guide, I cannot see why the Times leader should take any notice of Carr-Saunders' Committee.

Yours sincerely,