

35. Library Books are available at certain hours in all establishments, and efforts are made to provide men who wish to study particular subjects with books bearing upon them. The Committee advocate an extension of these privileges as a reward for continued good conduct.

36. Opportunities for sport were found in some cases, though in view of the necessity for making life in detention less agreeable than life in the Services themselves, these are properly restricted, and have training rather than amusement as their object. Boxing is encouraged and well-equipped rings provided, and the men are taken out for route marches, in some establishments, with a marked effect upon their physique and fitness.

37. Welfare Officers are on the strength of all military detention barracks, who work in close collaboration with the Chaplains. But while appreciating the value of welfare services in detention the Committee are of opinion that these are frequently rendered too late. They desire to emphasise as strongly as possible the importance of good welfare work in the units from which the men come, as the principal means of saving men from getting into the trouble which leads to detention. They consider that if the admirable Notes for Officers issued by the Adjutant-General under the title "The Soldier's Welfare," were fully carried into effect, particularly by Company and Platoon Officers, perhaps as many as fifty per cent. of those who are now soldiers under sentence would never have had to be committed to detention.

38. Premises which can be used as a chapel are provided in all D.Bs., and D.Qs., and in most cases these are suitably and adequately furnished. The Committee wish to express appreciation of the work of the Chaplains of all denominations, many of whom are men of great experience in dealing with the particular problems they meet. The value of their personal contacts with detainees and of their frequent presence in the Barracks should receive full recognition.

Feeding

39. The Committee inspected the midday and afternoon meals at each place they visited. The food appeared to be of good quality and was well cooked. The main complaint made against the diet was that it is monotonous; (cf. paragraph 14) a few complained that it was insufficient. The Committee think that the main consideration is that the men should be in good health, and that they are is evidenced by their appearance and the fact that the majority gain weight while in detention.

40. At some of the Military establishments the diet tins presented a very unattractive appearance. Originally they had been of aluminium but these had been withdrawn for aircraft construction. They were replaced by tinplated receptacles. In the course of hard usage the tinning wears off and the metal below becomes stained with rust. This condition is not injurious to health but is unappetising to say the least of it. In spite of the exigencies of war production and the scarcity of tinning facilities the Committee consider that these diet tins should be rendered and kept bright /

PART II

Proceedings of the Committee in London

41. In this part of the Report the Committee only propose to examine the effect of statements made to them during their hearings in London and only such of those statements as alleged violence, ill-treatment and bullying in the past. The Committee believe that some of these and similar allegations formed the basis of the general agitation against "Glasshouses" which followed the Clayton case. (cf. Appendix, 2nd Group, No. 16.)

42. The steps taken by the Committee to secure the attendance of relevant witnesses were the following:—

- (a) The name and address of the Secretary were advertised in the Press.
- (b) The same information was broadcast by the B.B.C.
- (c) Editors of newspapers which had given prominence to allegations of brutality to and ill-treatment of soldiers serving in Military Detention Barracks were requested to put the Committee in touch with their informants. This they readily did after obtaining their correspondents' permission.

43. In so far as relates to abuse, bad language, and "chasing," the Committee are satisfied, without further particularisation, that these practices did exist from the earliest days and were worse at the beginning than they are now. In this connection it must be borne in mind that the detention machinery of the Army at the start of the war was just as backward as the rest of the country's military preparation.

44. It is not necessary to trace the history of places of detention which, of course, had to be greatly expanded during the last war. It is sufficient to say that at the outbreak of this war there was only one Military Detention Barrack and that was Aldershot. The instant and ever-accelerating expansion of the Army produced, of course, a corresponding expansion of the number of men under punishment. There were in the Service at the outbreak of war only forty-five trained Staff Warders. The Committee have already pointed out (paragraphs 22-24) the necessity of training, and the general difficulties of securing willing, capable and trained staff for this purpose. It stands to reason that as continually fresh places had to be opened the difficulties of staffing them with efficient personnel continually increased and Aldershot was the place from which in early days the cadres had to be drawn. Aldershot itself in early days was grossly overcrowded with soldiers in detention and the Staff was grossly over-worked. If then at Aldershot and other places instances of misconduct on the part of the Staffs in the early days were not uncommon it is hardly a matter for surprise. Perhaps also it should not be a matter for wonder if the most grotesque exaggerations and even inventions have been built upon this foundation. The ill-treatment of helpless human beings promptly and properly excites indignation, but for that very reason it is apt also to promote exaggeration.

45. The Committee wish to emphasise once more that of the witnesses who dealt with these topics at the hearings before the Committee not one was a naval man and no allegation of any kind was made against the Naval Detention Quarters.

46. The procedure adopted was to ask every person who desired to appear before the Committee to send to the Secretary a signed statement in writing setting out the nature of the allegations he wished to make. When these had been received the Committee considered them and, in the case of all deemed

relevant to the Enquiry, appointments were given to their authors to appear in King's Bench Court No. 2. Their expenses and if necessary the value of their lost time were defrayed out of public funds.

47. The persons who so appeared before the Committee fell, in their opinion, into two quite different groups; First, those who were apparently telling the truth and whose statements bore investigation; and, secondly, and much more numerous, those who were palpably not telling the truth or who were, in the opinion of the Committee, utterly unreliable. In dealing with the former group the Committee desire to repeat that they are not asserting the accusations are true, for the reasons given earlier in this Report (*cf.* paragraph 9) but only that they may be true. The statements of these persons are summarised in the Appendix. The numbers which are given instead of the names of all the witnesses are the numbers assigned to them in the Committee's original list.

48. Several of the worst of the stories in Group II of the Appendix have been published in the Press and have gone before the public as examples of abominable treatment in these institutions. During the course of their local investigations, the Committee again and again came across evidence of the effect that allegations of this kind were having upon the lives and existence of the Staffs employed in military detention barracks. In some places, members of the Staff, wearing as they do a prominent red flash with "M.P.S.C." on their shoulders, cannot appear in public without the risk of aversion, insult, and assault. Many of the best of them keep within their own precincts rather than risk the unmerited obloquy incurred by mixing with their fellow-citizens outside. In this way men whose work is hard and thankless enough in the nature of things are deprived of even reasonable recreation and relaxation.

49. The Committee desire to acknowledge the unfailing courtesy and assistance they have received from the Admiralty, the War Office and the Commandants and officers of all the establishments visited. Their task was greatly facilitated by the transport arrangements readily made for them by the Air Ministry and the War Office. Finally they wish to express their appreciation of the valuable services rendered by their Secretary, Major J. R. Willis.

50. Summary of Recommendations

- (1) Establishment of M.P.S.C. training school—(paragraph 24).
- (2) General increase in staff at all establishments—(paragraph 22).
- (3) Existing Regulations against use of obscene language should be more strictly enforced—(paragraphs 22 and 43).
- (4) Appointment of another Commissioned Officer at N.D.Q. where the Captain is now the only one.
- (5) Additional Commissioned Officers at all Military establishments—(paragraph 14).
- (6) Appointment of whole-time M.O. for each establishment—(paragraph 27). Changes of such M.O. should be infrequent—(paragraph 29).
- (7) Provision of Sick quarters in all establishments where they do not exist—(paragraph 26).
- (8) Improvement of night sanitary arrangements in all establishments—(paragraphs 30 and 31).
- (9) That all diet tins be rendered and kept bright—(paragraph 40).

- (10) The rigours of Naval Detention in the three prisons make them unsuitable for offenders with long sentences. Such men should be sent to civil prisons after serving not more than 6 months in the N.D.Qs.
- (11) Facilities for general education and training should be extended—(paragraphs 6 (b), 32, 33 and 34).
- (12) The system of segregation of different types of detainees at present in force should be strictly maintained—(paragraph 16).

Signed:

ROLAND OLIVER, *Chairman.*

ARTHUR, READING, } *Members.*
H. E. A. BOLDERO, }

JOHN R. WILLIS, *Major, Secretary.*

11th October, 1943.

APPENDIX

SUMMARY OF COMPLAINTS HEARD IN LONDON

Group I

(*cf.* paragraph 47 of Report.)

No. 37 was a conscientious objector in detention from March–October 1940 for refusing to obey orders. He described having been assaulted on his arrival by two members of the Staff, one of whom told him that he had been specially sent to "deal with the likes of him." He was then forcibly undressed (as he refused to undress himself), during the process of which he was repeatedly struck in the stomach and when he fell was lifted up by his hair and struck again until his clothes were off. Later in the day his arm was twisted. He also said that he saw the injured condition of the witness next to be referred to (No. 36) after the latter had arrived. He further said that on another occasion two Staff Sergeants pushed a soldier into his (witness's) cell, turned him out of it, and when soon after they came out the witness went back to find the soldier lolling in a corner weeping.

No. 36 was a conscientious objector who was sent to detention in June 1940 and was for a time there with No. 37. He said that when he arrived, because he refused to pick up his rifle and equipment he was struck and his head was violently and repeatedly knocked against the wall and that, as he still refused to obey, he was assaulted and punched about the face and body by a number of the Staff and actually kicked in the eye. He said that the medical officer refused to assist him against the N.C.Os. concerned and that he was eventually paraded before the Assistant Commandant and charged with attempted violence against a N.C.O. and, after the evidence had been heard, was punished. The Committee has by enquiry found support, other than No. 37, for the fact that he made the allegations at once and that his head and face bore marks of violence.

(NOTE.—The demeanour of the above two witnesses very favourably impressed the Committee.)

No. 8 was a witness with twenty years Army service and four years Prison service. He was on the M.P.S.C. staff from December 1939 to June 1940. He said that there was unnecessary shouting and bullying by the Staff, one or two of whom were really bullies and used filthy language. He said that a man who had fainted was slapped in the face by a Staff Sergeant who, in his opinion, was bullying him and not assisting him, although he added "He was trying to bring him round." He mentioned another case where a man who had fainted was dragged along the corridor to the washhouse by a member of the Staff who put his head under the tap. He said that he had protested against this treatment to one of the senior N.C.Os., but that next day he was transferred to another Detention Barracks. He made no allegations of ill-treatment of prisoners there.

No. 32 had been serving a sentence in detention during January 1940. He said he himself was never physically assaulted, but that on many occasions he had seen men kicked by warders and that he had also seen men pushed about and punched in the back for lagging on parade, and that such things were done quite openly, and anyone could see them. There was no ill-treatment when commissioned officers were about; which, however, was not often.

(NOTE.—All the above cases, Nos. 37, 36, 8 and 32, relate to the same place and none of them is later than June 1940.)

No. 13 was a conscientious objector who had served twenty-eight days in detention during April–May 1941 for refusing to obey orders. He said that after being chased upstairs by members of the Staff, another member of the Staff opened a cell door and the witness, not knowing what he was expected to do, stood still. He was then pushed violently into the cell, but did not actually fall. He said he warned the N.C.O. that he would report him if he broke King's Regulations, and that the N.C.O., after blustering, became reasonable and intimated that he did not like the sort of work he had to do. The witness said that was the only instance of physical violence he had seen or experienced.

Group II

(*cf.* paragraph 47 of Report.)

No. 9 was a man of a very neurotic type. He had submitted a statement covering seven very closely typed foolscap sheets. He had been in detention for four weeks in August and September 1941. The Committee thought that his statements bore such obvious marks of exaggeration that he was quite unreliable. He said that in the Army he had been originally posted to W.T. (wireless telephony) and so was exempt from guard. He had volunteered for Intelligence, but as he had Communistic views was not accepted, so he absented himself and procured a false identity card in order to indulge in political activities for a time before rejoining. After being arrested and doing a term in Cardiff Prison he was returned to the Army. He was put again on to W.T., but was later removed from this work and ordered to go on guard. He refused and was sent to Detention. He said, amongst other things, that men were frequently tripped up by the sergeants when running at full speed. On being asked if they did not injure themselves, he said he did not think he had ever seen one fall down. One of his stories was to this effect, that a squad of fifty men were made to do hard P.T. (physical training) for nearly two hours without a break culminating with marching and countermarching in the "knees bend" position (the attitude sometimes assumed by Russian dancers). Half the squad fell out. Those who did so, including men of over fifty, were then ordered to do fifty "press-ups" from the floor. When they reported having done that, the instructor said "Go on, do some more, I cannot count so well as you," and that in the end men were lying all over the place being kicked and buffeted by N.C.Os. He ended up by saying that he had later interviewed an officer who is now the Commandant of what the Committee thought on the whole was the best of all the military detention barracks and who is obviously a courteous and patient gentleman. When asked if he had mentioned his matters of complaint to this officer, he said "I unfortunately did not." It appears that the voluminous written statement which he had presented to the Committee had been composed by him in 1941 with a view to publication in the Press. The Press had declined to publish it. The Committee are not surprised.

No. 4 was a man who had been in detention between January and August 1941. He said that he had seen a Canadian carried face downwards by four of the Staff, one holding each limb; that a Staff Sergeant P. was kicking the Canadian in the face—"He was holding the Canadian's left hand; I remember that vividly"; that another Staff Sergeant C. was in the meantime hitting the Canadian in the face with his fist; that it was daylight and he was in a room that was less than two yards away when he saw the man being carried; that he saw him carried about fifteen yards, but he did not see any blood on the man's face or on the floor. In his written statement to the Committee he had clearly stated that the man who was kicking the Canadian was not one of those who were carrying him. Furthermore, the Committee did not believe that any man would be striking in the face with his fists a man whose face must have been quite near the ground, nor, if he was being kicked in the face on one side and hit in the face on the other, that there would have been no blood on his face or on the ground. The Committee came to the conclusion that this story was false and they therefore need not further examine a second story which this witness told which also varied from the story he had written in his statement.

No. 10 was a man who had been a professional boxer in civilian life some years ago. He had been in detention in 1940 and again in 1941. He had eventually been discharged from the Army suffering from psychoneurosis. Having regard to his obviously neurotic condition and general demeanour, the Committee considered he was quite unreliable. In this case also his story in one particular entirely departed from the written statement with which he had supplied the Committee.

No. 18 was a man who had at one time been in the Military Provost Staff Corps and had served on the staff in a military detention barracks. He said that on one occasion a number of men acting together had escaped at 2 A.M., and several were caught by the Staff in the act of going over the wire:—

“These men were taken into a small tent set aside, and handcuffed to the pole and beaten up in this tent.

Q. Taken into the tent?—A. Yes, My Lord.

Q. Were you in the tent or did you look in?—A. I looked in.”

He proceeded to say that the R.S.M. witnessed the beating up though he took no part in it.

“Q. Was he in the tent?—A. Yes, but I did not see him strike.”

He later said that the men made a certain amount of resistance to the beating up. On being asked how they managed that, if they were handcuffed to the tent pole, he changed his whole story and said that there was no beating up in the tent at all and that the beating up took place between the wire where they were originally caught and the tent to which they were taken, and that the handcuffing was to prevent them escaping again. The above detail has been given because this man's demeanour was rather impressive. The Committee, however, being aware that a man who is telling the truth speaks from his recollection and not from his imagination, recognise that whilst he may be mistaken in his recollection he will always make the same mistake and not tell two utterly contradictory stories within a minute or two. They conclude that this story is false. They do not therefore think it useful to discuss any of the other statements he made.

No. 19 was a young man of twenty-one who had served a term of detention in December 1940. His written statement to the Committee, which was couched in very exaggerated language, did not allege any specific act of violence. He himself had a most unattractive demeanour. After having made to the Committee allegations about the insults and obscene language used by the Staff, he was asked if he had any other complaint. He then complained of the food. Again asked for further complaints, he complained that the water was cold and no proper time given to wash. Again asked if he had any further complaint, he said his room was damp and over-crowded and, on the same question being put to him again, he paused for a considerable time. He was then asked directly: “Did you see or experience any act of physical violence?” and he said “Yes, I both saw it and experienced it.” He then made two allegations of very trifling violence which the Committee did not believe. He ended up as follows: “I think Hitler would find some enthusiastic supporters in the detention camps and I shudder at the thought that I am wearing the same uniform as they wear.”

No. 26—this man had been in detention for twenty-four days in January 1943. He had declined to supply the Committee with a written statement, but had said that he wished to address them for an hour. He was indeed a very loquacious person. He made some exceedingly vague and general allegations of “pushing around,” kicking, and abuse, all done quite openly for everybody to see. The Committee who had visited the detention barracks in question not very long afterwards and seen the régime there did not believe this witness.

No. 17—this man had been in detention in November 1941. He said: “I once tried to complain of the food. I was told I was lucky to get it. I then asked to see the Commandant, but did not see him. Two of the Staff came to my room, got me outside and hit me.” In answer to questions he said that he was hit on the back with the flat of their hands and that it did hurt. It was pointed out to him that he had not mentioned that or anything about it in his written statement to the Committee. He replied that he had said it in a statement he had made to a newspaper and this statement was later obtained by the Committee. The relevant

part is this. After making no reference whatever to his complaint about the food, the statement runs:—

“I, standing in my barrack room, happened to speak at the wrong moment. I was taken outside and beaten (not with fists and away from any witness).”

The Committee did not believe him.

No. 33—this man had been in detention in February 1943. After making various uncomplimentary references to the régime of the detention barracks, which did not, however, include allegations of violence, he said that a soldier, after reporting sick and being given no treatment by the M.O., died in his dormitory of diphtheria. The most serious part of this allegation, of course, would be the leaving of a man in such an infectious condition to die among his comrades. The Committee are informed from the Records that on the day this man reported sick he was removed to the Camp Medical Reception Station and some days later to a hospital, where he died of diphtheria. The Committee regard this as a striking example of mendacity.

No. 39—this man had been in detention in October–December 1941. He said that “bullying and punching” of detainees was general—happened every day innumerable times. Every soldier under sentence must have known it. Officers did not stay long on parade—the knocking about never took place in front of them. Before leaving the Army he was sentenced by court-martial to 146 days for falsification of accounts. He did not plead guilty, but gave evidence on oath and was disbelieved. The Committee thought his account obviously very greatly exaggerated and considered him quite unreliable as a witness.

No. 16—the Committee desire to call particular attention to the evidence put forward by this witness, as it seems to them to present a striking example of the manner in which the public has been misled regarding the conditions in Detention Barracks. The witness submitted a signed statement which included the name and the unit of a man alleged to have been subjected to gross ill-treatment. The relevant part of the statement omitting names is as follows:—

“There was one soldier in that room I knew in civilian life and he was a decent fellow, clean and everything. Well they gave us three minutes in the bath every Friday afternoon and he didn't get the proper bath he should have had and he was found to be dirty about the knees and feet so the Staff Sergeant took him out and scrubbed him with a hard scrubbing brush which peeled the skin from his body and he was screaming in agony when he was brought back to the room, and the next day he felt ill and told the men in the room he was afraid to report sick; anyway he went out and did a day's work navvying with a pick and shovel and did not look too well, so I was pushing the barrow he was filling and I saw how ill he was, I reported it to the Staff Sergeant who told me to mind my own business or I would be clipped over the ear, the following day I went to see the sick man at the far end of the room, and he told me he was too ill to get up, so I told the cleaner to tell the Staff Sergeant, who immediately said “He will have to get up,” and came in and tipped him out of bed on to the cold concrete floor and he lay there for half-an-hour helpless, and I dare not pick him up or I'd know about it, at last the Medical Officer came and said he had a cold and to leave him in bed for two days and put him on a milk diet, and I could see the man had a temperature and nothing was done by the M.O. or Sergeants to find out what his temperature was, and he lay there from Monday to the following Sunday on a milk diet, and that's not much to live on, on the Sunday a Vicar came visiting from ——— and without a Sergeant with him. I saw my chance and reported the sick man to him immediately, and he found out he had laid there for six days with pneumonia and he got out of the room and had him removed to an emergency hospital.”

This statement had previously been published with other matter under flaring headlines in a newspaper and it must have been read by thousands of people.

The Committee felt that these terrible allegations must be thoroughly investigated. They, therefore, asked the War Office to trace the man said to have been the subject of this abominable ill-usage, and he was found to be in detention again. The Committee obtained from him a statement regarding the treatment he had received at the Detention Barracks named during his sentence there, the exact text of which (with the omission of names is as follows:—

“On the 16th May, 1942, whilst I was serving a sentence of 156 days detention, I was with four other S.U.S. at the baths. When we had finished the

other men went and left me behind as it was tea time. The N.C.O. in charge called me back and asked me why the place was left in a dirty condition. I told him that the other men had gone first and left me to clear up the mess. He then ordered me to clean up the place and told me to hurry up as it was tea time so I did not finish but went into tea. After tea the N.C.O. whose name I think was _____ sent for me and told me to finish cleaning up. While I was doing this he threw four buckets of water over me. I was sent back to my room where I changed my clothes and intended reporting the matter to the Commandant on the Monday as the incident occurred on the Saturday.

"During the night I was taken ill and at lunch time on the Sunday the M.O. visited me. I was sick in room until the Thursday when I was taken to _____ Hospital. I went to _____ Convalescent Hospital on the 26th June and returned to my unit on the 10th July.

"Apart from the above incident I was treated quite fairly and I have no complaint to make.

"I hereby declare that the above statement is true in every detail and that the dates are correct to the best of my knowledge and belief."

The Committee examined witness No. 16 in London; the following are extracts from the transcript of evidence:—

Q. Now this incident which you describe—I will just read to you what you said about this man who was found to be dirty about the knees and feet—
" . . . so the Staff Sergeant took him out and scrubbed him with a hard scrubbing brush which peeled the skin from his body and he was screaming in agony when he was brought back to the room." Is that literally true or is that exaggerated?—A. It is a little exaggerated but not much; he came back into the room.

Q. Wait a minute. "The description of the man who was scrubbed is a little exaggerated." Now, before you go on, would you mind indicating in what way?—A. He was not actually screaming, Sir.

Q. "He did not actually scream?"—A. While he was in the ablutions being scrubbed we heard him screaming there, but when he came back into the room he was in tears.

Q. It is not an exaggeration to say he was screaming in agony—you mean he was not screaming when he was brought back into the room?—A. Yes, Sir.

Q. Screaming came from the bathroom?—A. Yes, Sir.

* * * * *

Q. Did you see that the skin had been peeled off his back?—A. Yes, Sir.

Q. You actually saw it?—A. I did not actually see it; he was in bed very ill he could not get up afterwards.

* * * * *

Q. You do not think you have exaggerated it at all?—A. No, Sir.

The Committee then sent for the man alleged to have been ill-treated and he was brought to London under escort and appeared before them in private. He was cross-examined regarding his statement reproduced above and the following are extracts from the verbatim report of this examination:—

Q. Do you remember being ill when you were in _____?—A. Yes, Sir.

Q. Have you any complaints to make about your medical treatment during all that time?—A. No, Sir.

Q. You do understand that you are perfectly free to talk to us here, do you not?—A. Yes, Sir.

Q. You can say just what you like and you need not be afraid. No one will ever know you have said it. I am not encouraging you to say anything that is not true, but you can tell us the truth without hesitation. You will do that, will you not?—A. Yes, Sir.

Q. You are not afraid?—A. No, Sir.

Q. You say "I have no complaint against my medical treatment." Do you think, for instance, that the Medical Officer neglected you while you were lying in bed in your room or did he look after you well?—A. He visited me every morning, Sir.

Q. Did he appear to take an interest in your condition?—A. Yes, he gave me good examinations every morning.

* * * * *

Q. Just give us your own account of what happened on the Saturday evening. Is it just as you have written it down in your statement?—A. Just as I have mentioned it.

* * * * *

Q. Are you quite sure that the only complaint the Staff made to you in the ablution room was that you had not finished the task; the other men had gone and he accused you of leaving the place dirty?—A. That is correct, Sir.

Q. Did he not say anything about your being dirty yourself in your own person?—A. No, Sir.

Q. And did he not make any attempt at all to wash you-himself, scrub you, or anything like that?—A. No, Sir.

Q. Nothing like that ever happened?—A. No, Sir.

* * * * *

Q. Would it be true to say that the very morning you were ill the Sergeant came and tipped you out of bed on to the cold concrete floor and left you lying there for half-an-hour?—A. I beg your pardon, Sir.

Q. You remember that first morning you were ill, would it be true to say that that morning the Sergeant came and tipped you out of your bed and made you lie on the cold concrete floor for half-an-hour?—A. No, Sir. He did not let me lie on the cold floor.

Q. That is not true at all?—A. No, Sir.

The Committee have thought it necessary to go into these details regarding the evidence of witness No. 16 because the incidents which he alleges have received a wide publicity. The Committee could not conceive of the man denying such ill-treatment if it had happened, and came to the conclusion that No. 16 had been utterly untruthful.

The Committee do not suggest that it was anything but highly improper for a Staff Sergeant to throw water over a soldier under his charge, if this did in fact take place. The man, however, did not suggest that the wetting caused his illness and medically it is unlikely that it did, though the possibility cannot be excluded. The point to which the Committee wish to draw attention is the way in which this incident, if it did occur, has formed the precarious foundation on which has been built a sensational story of savage and calculated brutality such as must have shocked and horrified everyone who read it.

GLOSSARY OF ABBREVIATIONS

M.P. and D.B.	...	Military Prison and Detention Barracks.
N.D.Q.	Naval Detention Quarters.
M.P.S.C.	Military Provost Staff Corps.
S.U.S.	Soldier under sentence.
C.O.	Commanding Officer.
M.O.	Medical Officer.
R.S.M.	Regimental Sergeant-major.
N.C.O.	Non-commissioned Officer.
P.O.	Petty Officer.
P.D. 1.	Punishment Diet No. 1.
V.D.	Venereal Disease.
P.T.	Physical Training.

ANNEX II(Appendix A of the Report as submitted)COMPLAINTS HEARD AT M.P. AND D.B. AND N.D.Q.
c.f. PARA. 19.No. 1

Fifth time in detention for absence, impudence and disobeying orders. Complained of being jeered at by the Staff for effeminacy. Always in trouble in detention camps; can't do anything right. No-one will help him, not even the M.O. Was punished once for having cigarettes in his overcoat and it wasn't his overcoat that they were found in. Feels weak and has lost weight.

(NOTE: Because of this last statement the Committee had him weighed and he was found to be a few pounds heavier than when he was admitted. Enquiries about the cigarette episode elicited that the coat concerned was opposite his bed, that it fitted him (an exceptionally tall man), and would not have fitted the neighbouring occupants of the room, and that every other man in the room had his own overcoat.)

No. 2

In detention before. Complained that he suffered from hydrocele and was not treated but was marked "Fit for duty" and to be taken off working parties. He had refused the treatment (tapping) which the M.O. had recommended because the hydrocele had been tapped previously elsewhere and had recurred.

(NOTE: The M.O. had taken him off working parties and is watching this disability with a view to deciding whether it is necessary to send the man into hospital for operation. The man also complained of Urethritis and Balanitis. There was no evidence of either of these two conditions.)

No. 3

In detention before. Complained about the monotony of the food and the apparent dirtiness of the tins in which it was served. Had just finished an eight months' sentence in Wandsworth Prison where the food was better.

(NOTE: Many of the tins which were inspected by the Committee at this place had become rusty owing to the tinning wearing off. This matter is dealt with in para. 40 of the Report.)

No. 4

In detention before. Complained, "rice tastes like starch, cocoa does not taste like cocoa, tins are not clean enough" (See No. 3). Didn't like complaining because at another place of detention a man who complained was never given any rest afterwards. He was not assaulted but "kept on the lines" the whole time. Had done two detentions at another place, and thought the treatment was pretty good. The last time when he was on his way out

from there he saw a serjeant push a marine who was also in detention and that when he and the marine started to "take the matter up" another of the Staff intervened and quietened things down. Apart from this he had not at any place of detention seen any violence of any kind. The C.O. was a very experienced and humane man.

No. 5

Complained: suffers from headaches as the result of concussion ten years ago. When he complains to the M.O. he says "Buzz off". He can't do the work properly but the N.C.O's are reasonable about things he can't do.

(NOTE: This man is mentally below standard. There has been no medical negligence.)

No. 6

Had vomited on parade. The first time the M.O. didn't examine him because he said "his X-ray sheets were all right". The second time N.C.O. took him to the M.O. who examined him and gave him medicine. The third time he reported sick and was given medicine. "My complaint is that I am not fit for the Square. I want to join the Merchant Navy".

No. 7

Complained that he was given three days P.D.I.* and lost marks on the charge of trying to escape. He proceeded: "I ran off parade openly; it was my nerves. I was so angry at being sent here unjustly that I tried to escape".

No. 8

A type very similar to No. 1. Had been in detention before. Said, "Whatever I do I get into trouble. I don't do things right. When I go to the M.O. he says 'nothing is the matter'. I asked to see a specialist and was allowed to see one. I report sick once or twice a week".

(NOTE: He had been seen by a psychiatrist who had reported that he would never be fit for military service: he has presumably by this time been transferred to something else.)

No. 9

Two previous periods of detention. Complained of insufficient time for washing in the morning. Doesn't like the food nor the way it is served. "It's worse than in a civil prison".

No. 10

In detention before and had also done eighteen months in a civil prison for stealing, so had been away from the Army for a very long time. Complained that three weeks ago he was "put in for draft" (active service) and then

* Punishment Diet No. 1 - bread and water.

taken off again "for no reason stated".

(NOTE: The Committee enquired about this and were told that the reason for his being taken off the draft was that he was insufficiently trained for active service.)

No. 11

In detention before. Complained that he had bad feet and varicose veins and couldn't do much on the Square. Had been checked for being lazy and threatened with being put on report. Had complained to the M.O. this morning but had not been given treatment nor excused any duties. He also complained of the washing conditions.

(NOTE: He has very slight varicose veins in the left leg, which do not amount to a disability.)

No. 12

Appeared before the Committee partly undressed. Said he was a Conscientious Objector and had been exempted. He had later joined the Guards having reconsidered his decision to be a Conscientious Objector. After six weeks training he came to the conclusion that he was a Conscientious Objector after all and had refused duty. He further complained that the food was poor, blankets filthy and the hygiene was bad; not enough time for washing and not sufficient access to latrines.

No. 13

Sixth time in detention. Had been punished for crimes which the Staff "practically forced me to commit". He named two N.C.Os. Had seen the Staff threaten men but never seen anyone struck. The discipline here (Fort Darland) is stricter and the work is harder than it was last January (before the Clayton case).

(NOTE: An unreliable man of the recidivist type.)

No. 14

In detention six times. Complained about the food - "I would get better in the swill bin at home. It is served dirty". He also objected to the sanitary conditions at night. "During the last five months (i.e. after the Clayton case), the treatment by the Staff has been better". (This was also Fort Darland).

No. 15

In detention before. Complained, "They won't give me a fresh razor blade and I can't shave properly. They have stamped my card that I had a blade when I hadn't. We are not given enough soap".

(NOTE: He was excellently shaved).

No. 16

In detention before, in 1941. Complained: Not enough time or water for washing in the morning. Further complained that potatoes were not washed before steaming

and were mixed with other vegetables. "This place is better now, there is no pushing around by the Staff as there used to be". (This was Fort Darland, c.f. Nos. 13 and 14). He also complained of the difficulty of getting razor blades.

No. 17

First detention. Complained: Not enough water in the morning and that it's turned off too soon. Complained also that the potatoes were mixed with rice and had no flavour. Found it difficult to see the C.O. to get compassionate leave.

(NOTE: The Committee were satisfied there was no substance in his last complaint.)

No. 18

In detention before. Complained: Broke his leg on assault course and was sent to hospital against his wish; in this way lost his remission and on return was put to sleep again on boards. This was a N.D.Q. Had been excused P.T.

(NOTE: The Committee satisfied themselves that his time at the hospital counted as part of his sentence.)

No. 19

In detention twice before. Complained: Suffers from rheumatism in both hands. Asked M.O. for treatment. M.O. said he had not got rheumatism but gave him medicine.

(NOTE: This man stated that his rheumatism commenced fourteen months ago. Never severe enough to go to hospital. There was nothing abnormal to be seen in his hands.)

No. 20

In detention before. Complained of having to sleep on boards (this was a N.D.Q.) and not sufficient opportunities to wash. "Our o'clock in the afternoon is the last time we get food". Then, in answer to a question, "We get a piece of bread at seven. We are not allowed to go to the latrines after four o'clock." He asked permission last Sunday and was not allowed. "I don't know the name of the officer who refused me and I should not recognise him if I saw him."

No. 21

In detention before. Just finishing a two years' sentence, most of which was served at another place. Doesn't feel as fit as when he started. "I object to having to come to attention for a Petty Officer and to calling him "Sir" when he is on the lower deck like me. The food is not enough for the work we do". Had reported to the M.O. on arrival that he had been on light duty at the other place. The M.O. had said, "Carry on, you are all right".

(NOTE: The Committee consider that the M.O. was correct).

No. 22

Never in detention before but had been in a civil prison. Complained of having no bed or bedding for fourteen days. (This was a N.D.Q.) "That is my only complaint; the treatment otherwise is first-class."

No. 23

Twice in detention before. Complained: "I can't do so much doubling". (This man is 21). "There is nothing the matter me. I don't like the Navy. The food isn't up to the work. That's all".

No. 24

In detention "about four times before". Says he has V.D. and has so reported to the M.O. "He did not examine me. He saw me stripped and said there was nothing amiss. He gave me no treatment".

(NOTE: We saw him on August 20th and there had been no symptoms since May.)

No. 25

In detention before. Had been punished for two strands of rope found on the deck below his deck. "I had not put them there but they might have got there by accident."

No. 26

Twice in detention before. Complained that his gums bled and he had reported to the M.O. for dental treatment. The M.O. had told him to wait till he got out. He further complained that one of the men had had his breakfast stolen by one of the others and the Petty Officer had called them "scum of the earth". He also complained of having no bedding for the first fourteen days and inability to sleep.

(NOTE: This man has most excellent teeth; one small patch of redness on one gum indicates a slight degree of pyorrhoea.)

No. 27

In detention before. Complained that he told the M.O. that he thought he had T.B. His mother, sister and brother had all died of T.B. but he had not told the M.O. that. "You can't tell him anything". "I complained about a pain in my back and said I had coughed up blood. He examined me three times and said there was nothing the matter. He told me to keep a specimen if I coughed blood again".

(NOTE: No evidence of pulmonary tuberculosis. M.O. will keep him under observation).

No. 28

First time in detention. Had deserted when he was on a draft. Complained of having no bedding (a N.D.Q.). Says