

Is it OK to say that I am mildly depressed by many of o...

Published: January 13, 2026, 1:48 am

I have noted Nick Clegg's comments today on who his party might support in the forthcoming hung parliament. [According to the BBC he has said:](#)

Lib Dem leader Nick Clegg says his party will not prop up any government "held hostage" by the SNP or UKIP, should there be a hung Parliament.

He also said that the party with the "greatest mandate", even if they have not won a majority, should be given the first chance to form a government.

This is a man who has been deputy prime minister. He must know UKIP will have little or no influence in the next parliament. What is he talking about?

Surely he also realises the most fiercely and dangerously nationalists party in the UK right now, who are set to have 97% of their seats in England after the election and who long ago ceased to have chance of any serious representation any where else.

And doesn't he know that no party can hold another to ransom at Westminster? It's ability is based solely on whether or not its members will obey the whip to go through a particular lobby, and all MPs have the right not to do so?

As for the 'greatest mandate', what is what? Most votes, seats, election funding, or what? I'd suggest that this should be a matter of political judgement as to who offers the best hope for the country: Nick Clegg simply seems to see it as a matter of sums.

As for the logic regarding the SNP, this is just bizarre. With a maximum of 50 or so seats the SNP cannot break up the UK from Westminster. That is impossible. Unless, of course, all the Westminster parties want it to happen. It is, of course, quite possible in a hung parliament for alliances to be made on different issues. Around 600 seats are likely to align on Scottish independence.

Am I in that case allowed to say that I find the logic Clegg and many politicians present to the electorate mildly depressing, at best?