

(THIS DOCUMENT IS THE PROPERTY OF HIS BRITANNIC MAJESTY'S GOVERNMENT)

S E C R E T

W.P.(43) 492

1st NOVEMBER, 1943

COPY NO. 33,

WAR CABINET

COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY INTO DETENTION BARRACKS

Note by the Secretary of the War Cabinet.

At their Meeting on 5th July, 1943 (W.M.(43)93rd Conclusions, Minute 8) the War Cabinet decided that an Inquiry should be held into conditions in Naval and Military Prisons and Detention Barracks in the United Kingdom and invited the Prime Minister to select suitable persons to conduct this Inquiry. As was announced in Parliament on the 20th July, 1943, (Official Report, Cols. 686 and 687) the Hon. Mr. Justice Oliver was appointed as Chairman of the Inquiry.

By direction of the Prime Minister, I now circulate (at Annex I) for the consideration of the War Cabinet, the attached copy of the Report which has been submitted to the Prime Minister.

It will be seen that the Report, as printed, does not contain the full statement of the evidence taken at the detention barracks themselves. This appeared as Appendix "A" to the original Report: a copy is attached at Annex II. It will be for consideration by the War Cabinet whether this statement of evidence should be published with the Report.

(Signed) E.E. BRIDGES.

Offices of the War Cabinet, S.W.1.,

1st NOVEMBER, 1943.



Report of the Prime Minister's
Committee of Enquiry into
Detention Barracks
1943

*Presented by
to Parliament by Command of His Majesty*

LONDON

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE

To be purchased directly from H.M. STATIONERY OFFICE at the following addresses:
York House, Kingsway, London, W.C. 2; 120 George Street, Edinburgh 2;
39-41 King Street, Manchester 2; 1 St. Andrew's Crescent, Cardiff;
80 Chichester Street, Belfast;
or through any bookseller

1943

Price net

COMMITTEE OF ENQUIRY INTO DETENTION BARRACKS

APPOINTED BY THE PRIME MINISTER

TERMS OF REFERENCE

" To enquire into and report on the treatment of men under sentence in Naval and Military Prisons and Detention Barracks in the United Kingdom, and whether it is in accordance with modern standards and satisfies wartime requirements.

" The investigation will cover *inter alia* the supervision and administration of discipline, medical care, training, welfare accommodation, feeding and the suitability and adequacy of the staff."

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE

The Hon. Mr. Justice Oliver, M.C., Judge of the High Court of Justice, King's Bench Division. (*In the Chair.*)

The Right Rev. Arthur Groom Parham, M.C., M.A., Bishop of Reading.

Dr. H. E. A. Boldero, M.A., D.M.B.Ch., F.R.C.P.*

* NOTE.—Lord Moran was originally appointed as a member of the Committee. In the event, however, it proved impossible for him to undertake the task and Dr. Boldero was appointed in his place (see paragraph 3 of the Report).

CONTENTS

| | Paragraphs. |
|---|---------------------------|
| PRELIMINARY | 1-6 |
| PART I | |
| VISITS OF THE COMMITTEE TO MILITARY PRISON AND DETENTION BARRACKS AND NAVAL DETENTION QUARTERS | |
| Method of Enquiry | 7-21 |
| Staff | 22-24 and <i>passim</i> . |
| Medical care | 25-31 |
| Training and Welfare | 32-38 |
| Feeding... .. . | 39 and 40 |
| Accommodation | 12, 17, 26, 30, 38, 44 |
| PART II | |
| Proceedings of the Committee in London | 41-48 |
| Summary of Recommendations | 50 |
| APPENDIX | |
| Summary of complaints heard in London | <i>cf.</i> paras. 41-48 |
| Group I) | <i>cf.</i> paras. 47, 48 |
| Group II) | <i>cf.</i> paras. 47, 48 |

PRELIMINARY

1. The facts which came to light during the recent trial at Maidstone Assizes of two warrant officers for the manslaughter of Rifleman Clayton at Fort Darland Detention Barracks profoundly shocked the public. A considerable section of the Press was for a time filled with articles, letters, and comments, many of which suggested that this was not an isolated occurrence but that brutality and so-called Gestapo methods were the rule and not the exception at military places of detention throughout the country. The suspicion that such might be the case was both natural and alarming. In these circumstances, this Committee was appointed by the Prime Minister to make a thorough enquiry into the administration of places of detention with a view to ascertaining as far as possible where the truth lay.

2. The Terms of Reference were:

“ To enquire into and report on the treatment of men under sentence in Naval and Military Prisons and Detention Barracks in the United Kingdom and whether it is in accordance with modern standards and satisfies wartime requirements. The investigation will cover *inter alia* the supervision and administration of discipline, medical care, training, welfare, accommodation, feeding, and the suitability and adequacy of the staff.”

3. The Committee was originally constituted with Lord Moran as a member. Early in August however it became necessary for him to travel to the American continent. The task of the Committee being long and urgent, it was considered imperative that at all events a start should be made. The Chairman and the Bishop of Reading agreed that nothing practical could be done without skilled medical assistance. The Prime Minister from Canada approved Dr. H. E. A. Boldero, Registrar of the Royal College of Physicians and Dean of the Middlesex Hospital, to act as a substitute for the time being, in the hope that Lord Moran would return sufficiently soon to join in the enquiry. This however proved impossible and the whole investigation was over before Lord Moran's return. Dr. H. E. A. Boldero, having done the whole of the work as a member of the Committee, was formally appointed by the Prime Minister to replace Lord Moran.

4. The Committee desire to put on record at the earliest possible moment that, after an investigation extending over five whole weeks, the nature of which will be set out in this Report, they are satisfied that at present at any rate and for some time past no brutality of the sort indicated is being or has been practised. They are less satisfied about the conditions prevailing in the early days of the war. The Committee are not saying that the system and its administration are, in their opinion, perfect. On the contrary, there are a number of matters which they think could and should be remedied in ways that they will indicate, but the main matter of public concern, viz. calculated brutality to men in detention, does not in their opinion exist.

5. It may be convenient at this point to offer a few observations on the general nature and object of punishment by detention, and to note that, as applied to the Services, while the word “ detention ” carries less stigma than the word “ imprisonment,” the treatment of persons sentenced to imprisonment and detention is in the main the same, the only difference being that some of the places of detention are in their environment more unpleasant than others. All legislation to be effective must be backed by what jurists call a sanction, that is to say, power to prescribe and inflict a penalty of some sort on the disobedient. Such sanctions in the case of civilians, except in extreme cases, take the form of fine or imprisonment. Good citizens would behave without such sanctions, but bad ones would not and there are and

always will be a small minority who break the law in spite of the penalties prescribed but who nevertheless must be restrained for the protection of society. A member of the Fighting Forces undertakes additional liabilities—the deprivation of a considerable part of his personal liberty, the obligation of obedience to lawful commands and the whole catalogue of duties summarised in the word “discipline.” Without discipline the Fighting Services would perish. In wartime the country would perish with them. Here again good Service men seldom offend. Such small transgressions as they commit can be and are dealt with domestically in their units, but unfortunately there is a proportion, large in number though very small when considered as a percentage of the whole, who have to be punished in such places as Naval and Military Prisons and Detention Barracks for offences such as desertion or long and/or continuous absence without leave, for disobedience, for violence towards their superior officers, and a host of other matters. The best of these are men who have transgressed more or less accidentally or because of some family trouble or other pressure. The worst of them are men who show by their conduct that they are quite determined not to serve in any event, but would rather spend their lives till the end of the war in detention or prison. They may be referred to as recidivists.

6. In these circumstances several considerations present themselves as reasonable:

- (a) Places of detention must not offer greater but less attractions than service with the unit. Conditions must therefore be strict and work and discipline hard. Complete loss of liberty is probably the strongest deterrent but additional penalties have to be provided to deal with those who refuse to conform to the discipline of the places themselves. These take the form of dietary punishments, loss of privileges, loss of remission, and the like.
- (b) In the case of all but the recidivists the object of these places should be rehabilitation, the training of a good sailor, soldier or airman, in place of a bad one, the building up of self-respect by discipline of the right sort.
- (c) In the case of the recidivist it is probably hopeless to try to convert him to better ways but at the same time, while he is unlikely ever to be of any use to his country in any capacity, it cannot be allowed to go forth that a man whose services have been demanded by his country can secure for himself exemption, while others serve, merely by refusing to perform them. This would only tempt waverers to follow suit.
- (d) And perhaps the most important. The strictest justice must be meted out to all in detention. Nothing in the nature of ill-treatment or injustice is to be tolerated. The discipline must be firm but humane.

PART I

Visits of the Committee to Military Prison and Detention Barracks and Naval Detention Quarters

7. After very careful consideration the Committee came to the conclusion that the best way to begin their task was to visit personally each * Military

* The two small institutions in the Orkneys and Shetlands, housing respectively about fifteen and six detainees, were not visited as it was felt that the time and expense involved would not be justified. Owing to an unfortunate misunderstanding for which the Committee feel themselves to blame Carrickfergus Barracks in Northern Ireland were not visited, as when they were in that neighbourhood (Glasgow) the Committee were under the impression that these barracks were not used for United Kingdom detainees.

Prison and Detention Barracks (M.P. and D.B.), and in the case of the Navy the Naval Detention Quarters (N.D.Q.), and make investigations on the spot. After these inspections it was decided to hear relevant statements and complaints from those who wished to make them at The Royal Courts of Justice, London. Starting with the M.P. and D.B. and N.D.Q. presented the great advantage that the Committee would familiarise themselves by personal observation with the working of the various institutions and the system as a whole. The Committee further felt that while the past is beyond recall the conditions of the present are vital. The public anxiety in this matter, of course, would most acutely affect parents, relations, and friends of the men now under detention. Nevertheless the Committee have also felt bound to investigate, so far as they were able, allegations relating to the past as being obviously germane to the purpose of the enquiry as a whole.

8. This Report will therefore first, in Part I, review the conditions which the Committee believe now exist; and secondly, in Part II, will deal with evidence of abuses which may have existed since this war began and which depend almost entirely on statements made during the hearings in London.

9. The Committee desire in this Report to emphasise that they are not in a position to find that specific allegations of brutality are true. Before this could be done the persons accused, often not available, would have to be heard in their defence. Furthermore, inasmuch as physical brutality to men under sentence is not only a gross breach of discipline but also a criminal offence, the Committee could not hold any such offences proved without doing the gravest injustice to persons who would in law, before being convicted, be entitled to trial by jury or court-martial. On the other hand, where the Committee are of opinion that such charges are obviously false or quite unreliable they have felt it their duty to say so. Finally on this topic the Committee have for reasons which should be obvious, refrained from mentioning the names of individuals whether they are accusers or accused.

10. In approaching their local investigations the Committee considered that three matters were of great importance for the purpose of obtaining a true insight into prevailing conditions: First, that their visits must be unannounced and unexpected. Secondly, realising as they did the reluctance of men under restraint to make complaints to the knowledge of their superiors, the Committee yet felt that every man at each of the institutions visited should at least have the opportunity to complain to them if he desired. Thirdly, still bearing in mind the reluctance last referred to, the Committee felt that they should devise some additional method to supplement that of inviting complaints on a parade ground.

11. In order to give facilities for unexpected and unannounced visits, and to save time, an aeroplane was provided for the long journeys and cars for local transport. The first week's work was spent visiting the institutions within reach of London. These were: Colchester D.B., Fort Darland D.B., Canterbury N.D.Q., Aldershot M.P. and D.B. and Portsmouth N.D.Q. No one but the Committee themselves knew beforehand where they were going, and it was often not decided until they actually got into the car. At the request of the Committee passes had been provided in advance which enabled them to enter at once any institution on arriving at its gates. The second week was similarly spent, using Manchester as a base and inspecting Stake Hill D.B., Sowerby Bridge D.B., Chorley D.B. and Preston N.D.Q. The third week was occupied, using Glasgow as a base, inspecting (on the way North) Northallerton M.P. and D.B., and on arrival at Glasgow, Riddrie M.P. and D.B., Coatdyke N.D.Q., and Mossbank D.B.

12. Of the four Naval Detention Quarters, Portsmouth, Canterbury and Preston are adapted civil prisons, and Coatdyke is a converted Territorial drill hall and outbuildings surrounded by barbed wire. Of the nine military institutions three are prisons, viz. Aldershot, built originally as a military prison and commonly called "The Glasshouse," and Riddrie and Northallerton which are disused civil prisons. The remainder—Colchester, Fort Darland, Stake Hill, Sowerby Bridge, Chorley, and Mossbank—are either hutted camps or converted mills and in one case an industrial school, with more or less spacious grounds surrounded by barbed wire. The comparatively few R.A.F. detainees are provided for at the military establishments. Some naval ratings and marines are at Fort Darland. Out of upwards of 5,200 occupants seen by the Committee about 750 were naval ratings and marines, only about 300 were R.A.F. personnel and the rest were soldiers. Speaking broadly, until very recently the Navy and the R.A.F. have had the first pick of recruits, the Army receiving the rest. The Committee consider it a very striking fact that the higher the standard of education the lower the percentage of men under Service punishment. We were given to understand that the number of soldiers was roughly three times the number of airmen, yet the number of soldiers in detention was roughly fifteen times as great as the number of airmen.

13. The Committee adopted the following procedure: On first arrival they interviewed the Commandant and called for nominal rolls of all the men in detention and then from each section they picked at random certain names, taking care to select mainly men who had been in the place for a considerable time. The men thus selected were brought to rooms for a private interview with the members of the Committee. As it was considered that they would be less embarrassed and more likely to speak freely to one person than to three, the selected men were interviewed alone by one or other of the Committee. At the start of each interview the man was asked to sit down and was told who we were, that we had no connection with the Services, and that we would promise absolute confidence as to what was said to us, in the sense that no one would ever be told the name of the man in connection with what he said to us, and it was further pointed out that inasmuch as it was we who had asked to see him and not he who had asked to see us no one could ever suspect that he would be complaining at all. The man was then questioned closely as to whether he had ever suffered any ill-treatment or any injustice or had seen any inflicted on any other man. What the man said was then written down and the result of these interviews is summarised below (*cf.* para. 14). The Committee could think of no better way of getting at the truth as to the general treatment of the men in the various institutions, and none has been suggested by the various witnesses, whom we later saw in London. These included four Members of Parliament, who were good enough to give up their time to assist the Committee.

14. In this manner the Committee separately interviewed 211 men. Every single man, in answer to direct questions, stated that he had never either suffered or witnessed violence or ill-treatment at the institution in which he then was. Two of them said they had seen acts of violence some time ago in other places where they had been in detention before. One of these said he had seen a man struck in April 1942, and named two N.C.Os. no longer in the Service. The other, who volunteered that he had been sentenced to eighteen months' imprisonment at the Old Bailey a few years ago (which could hardly have been his only conviction), said that at a detention barracks where he had been before, he had seen an N.C.O. strike an airman who had upset a bucket over him. Twelve complained in various terms that there was too much shouting and "chasing" and bad language

by the Staff. One said that he had actually been threatened with violence, but he was a man whom the Committee disbelieved for reasons given in Appendix A, No. 65. One man of a somewhat unusual type complained that he had been searched on insufficient grounds under suspicion of having stolen some cigarettes. They were not found on him, but he admitted quite naively that he had in fact stolen them. Twenty-three complained of the food, as the Committee thought without justification. The Committee doubt if any system of institutional feeding receives the approval of everyone to whom it is administered. Twelve complained, and the Committee think with reason, of some of the sanitary conditions. Three complained of the severity of the discipline. Six naval men complained of the absence of bedding (*cf.* para. 17).

15. Apart from the above there were no complaints at all and a quite unexpected measure of praise. A very common phrase ran in this sort of way, "It is up to you; this place is perfectly all right if you behave yourself; if you don't, you get into trouble," and, when further pressed as to what getting into trouble meant, "You get reported and punished by the Commandant."

16. Before and if necessary after these interviews the Committee carefully inspected the food; the medical accommodation; the sleeping, washing and sanitary arrangements; the chapel; the lecture rooms; the information room; the technical training room; the punishment cells; the parade and exercise grounds and, in fact, the whole premises. In the course of their inspections the Committee observed two matters in particular. First, that conditions in the military prisons are far less pleasant for their occupants than in the detention barracks. The men in the prisons live mainly in separate cells and are surrounded by prison walls. Although in some of the cells three men are accommodated and for three periods of twenty minutes in each day all are allowed to meet and communicate with each other, confinement is largely solitary. The detention barracks, on the other hand, are places in rural surroundings with no encircling wall. There are, of course, barbed wire barrages for security reasons. The men sleep in large dormitories housing from twenty to seventy in each where they can freely converse provided that reasonable order is maintained. They have far larger and more pleasant exercise grounds and life is altogether more tolerable. The Committee were assured and believe that the prisons are kept for bad cases of the recidivist type. They consider it most important that this distinction should be strictly maintained. It is true that recidivist cases are also dealt with in the barracks because the prisons will not hold them all, but the regulation is that they are kept in rooms separated from the better type of detainee and the young soldiers.

17. The second matter for observation was that at three of the four Naval Detention Quarters the discipline and general life of offenders are in many respects far harder even than in the military prisons. For instance, each man is housed in a separate cell. He has during his term of sentence no communication with his fellows at all. They exercise and drill together and that is all. Moreover, until he has earned 112 good conduct marks the naval offender has to lie at night on bare boards without blankets, though in cold weather this latter is mitigated. As it takes fourteen days to earn 112 marks, if the maximum is earned, this is in itself a somewhat drastic punishment. Again, the naval offender is not allowed to write or receive a letter for a similar time and then only one until he has earned another. This rule also may be relaxed by the Captain on compassionate grounds. As has been pointed out above, even in the military prisons an hour's communication a day is permitted, men are given bedding from the start, they are allowed

to receive at once as many letters as are written to them and to write a letter once a week. Some of the above observations as to N.D.Q. do not apply to Coatdyke where the building is not a prison and the men are associated in rooms. They get a wire bed and blankets from the start. Such naval ratings and marines as are sent to Fort Darland are treated in the same way as the military detainees.

18. The Committee consider it an astonishing fact that in spite of the comparative harshness of the Naval Detention Quarters there has been no public outcry at all against them; whereas there has been a very violent one against the military institutions. This may be to some extent accounted for by the very hardness of some of the conditions of Naval sea service, but the fact remains that the Committee have not heard a suggestion of violence or brutal treatment against the N.D.Q. Staff and not a witness has applied to be heard by them in London in relation thereto. Many witnesses, on the other hand, have come forward to make such allegations against the military prisons and barracks. The truth may be that the exposure of a scandal like the Clayton case and the public indignation justly aroused by it have united to stimulate the imagination of some persons of the exhibitionist type, and to cause others to exaggerate their impressions and in some cases to tell downright lies. (cf. Appendix, Group 2.)

19. In the afternoon of each visit, at the request of the Committee, every man in the place was paraded. They were then addressed in the presence of the Committee, care being taken that every man could hear, as follows:—

“ This Establishment is being visited to-day by the Committee appointed by the Prime Minister to enquire into the conditions prevailing in detention barracks. Any man having any complaint of ill-treatment or injustice here may make it now to the Committee who will hear it in private. No man so complaining need fear any victimisation.”

Such men as complained, ninety-one in all out of the 5,200, were then heard by the Committee sitting together. The vast majority came, as the Commandants frequently warned us they would come, from men of the recidivist type who are, as might be expected, the trouble-makers at these places. Some “ complaints ” were not complaints at all. Many were trivial. Many more were, in the opinion of the Committee, quite unjustified. [

]

20. On the totality of the evidence gained from the above sources alone, the Committee were satisfied that there is not now nor has there been for some time past any violence or physical ill-treatment practised upon men in detention. But further, this conclusion received striking confirmation from some of the witnesses who appeared before the Committee in London. No less than five conscientious objectors who had been, at various times between November 1942, and July 1943, detained at Chorley, Fort Darland, Sowerby Bridge and Riddrie, said that they had never experienced nor seen any violence towards prisoners on the part of the Staff anywhere. One of them said he had been struck on the back by a medical officer at Riddrie to call attention to the fact that he was speaking to him. The Committee did not take this seriously.

21. The force of this testimony is threefold. In the first place, these were all men of good character, education and intelligence. In the second place, it is in the nature of things that a conscientious objector is fearless about expressing his opinions, and therefore would not hesitate to make a

complaint. Finally, it would be difficult to imagine a type of man more calculated to arouse the fury of a brutal N.C.O. than a conscientious objector who refuses to obey orders and sometimes even to dress. In view of the suggestion that has sometimes been made that Fort Darland was only reformed by the Clayton scandal, it is right to point out that of these five men two were at Fort Darland, one before and the other at the time of Clayton's death.

With regard to shouting, "chasing" and bad language, the Committee feel sure that a certain amount of this does go on. In any body of men in authority, such as N.C.Os., amounting to many hundreds as is the case with the Staff under consideration, a few bullies will almost inevitably be found.

Staff

22. The Committee consider that there are not enough commissioned officers at these places and that there ought to be enough to ensure that all exercises of the men together should be under the direct supervision of a commissioned officer; and, furthermore, that at frequent and irregular intervals and unannounced commissioned officers should go through the quarters themselves. Not one complainant or witness who made statements to the Committee has suggested that any kind of bullying ever took place in the presence of a commissioned officer. A good many have said that they hardly ever saw one. The regimental sergeant-majors at the Military institutions and the warrant masters at arms at the Naval Quarters were, from our observation, quite admirable people who knew their work and did it thoroughly and sympathetically; but the staff below them varied a good deal in quality and were not sufficient in number. Some of them were past the work. Others were insufficiently trained and some were constitutionally unfitted for the task. To be a really efficient warder of people in confinement a man needs many qualities, including besides firmness and technical knowledge and military skill, tact and, above all, patience. It should not be forgotten that many men in detention are most difficult, unwilling, insubordinate and insolent. A few are dangerous. The Committee have noted the fact that whereas in civil prisons corporal punishment may be inflicted upon offenders who seriously assault their warders no such punishment is permitted either in Military or in Naval detention institutions. They have also noted that the Departmental Committee which shortly before the war advised the abolition of corporal punishment for all civil offences, expressly excepted from its recommendations the case of serious assaults on warders in civil prisons and advised that for such acts corporal punishment should be retained. The position disclosed seems anomalous having regard to the fact that under conscription the Services necessarily include some men of criminal type and antecedents who would not have been recruited in times of peace.

23. The whole problem of securing really efficient and trained Staff for these places is beset with the greatest difficulties in these days of shortage of manpower and especially of efficient manpower. The qualities of a capable warder referred to above are the very qualities of an efficient N.C.O. with a combatant unit, and for obvious reasons such men should not be advanced in years. It is further apparent that they should be volunteers. It would not be easy to believe that a man who was compelled to take the position of a warder against his wish would make a good one.

24. The present method of training men for the Military Provost Staff Corps (M.P.S.C.), is to send them for a few weeks to Aldershot and then to distribute them as required. The Committee consider that some central

school should be established forthwith, probably located at one of the existing establishments other than a military prison, where a thorough training could be given for not less than two months, and that such men should not be passed out to serve unless they attain a definite standard of efficiency. The Committee have it in mind that even after the war is ended it may be necessary to keep a large Army mobilised for an unknown period. The ideal "warder," of course, would be a man who, in addition to his training as a warder, is skilled to give instruction in arms and military training, yet a man might be a good warder without that special knowledge. As the combination of qualities required makes it very difficult to obtain sufficient good M.P.S.C. Staff, the Committee consider that the question of relieving the M.P.S.C. of instructional duties should be fully explored. Special instructors would then be attached for duties, in the same way as Physical Training Instructors now are.

Medical Care

25. The Committee were on the whole very favourably impressed with the medical arrangements which they found existing at the present time.

26. The accommodation and facilities available for the medical officer were in most places good; in one or two they were better than this, while in a few they fell short of the desirable standard. In the last group the deficiency lay in the absence of a room or rooms that could be used for looking after men who require to be kept in bed for a few days only. It is undesirable that such cases should be cared for in their usual sleeping accommodation, particularly when that is a barrack room. Nor is a neighbouring hospital the ideal solution.

27. At each of the Military Prisons and Detention Barracks and Naval Detention Quarters, the Commanding Officer expressed himself as satisfied with his Medical Officer. At some of the places where only a part-time Medical Officer is appointed there was some apprehension that he would not quickly be available in an emergency. In practice no instance of such an occurrence was reported as having arisen in recent times. But the possibility is obvious. It is desirable that a whole-time Medical Officer should be appointed to each Detention Barracks. However, the shortage of medical men is known; moreover the most important aspect of these appointments is that the man should have a particular aptitude for this rather specialised and difficult type of work.

28. On their visits to the various Detention Barracks the Committee received a considerable number of complaints against Medical Officers. On investigation all of these could be attributed to the man's desire to be excused the harder parts of his routine or to the fact that time spent sick or in hospital counts as part of the sentence. This is a real difficulty for the Medical Officer and where such exists there must always be a chance of a mistake. The onus on Medical Officers would be lightened if days spent comfortably in hospital did not count towards the completion of the sentence.

29. The present Medical Officers seemed to the Committee to be well suited to their work and to be rendering good service. However, it is proper for the Committee to make the criticism that in some instances far too frequent changes of Medical Officers have occurred. It is hoped that this practice will not be repeated; nevertheless it would not be right to keep a young man at this work year after year.

30. With regard to sanitation and hygiene the Committee were very much dissatisfied with some of the sanitary arrangements at the majority of the Military institutions they visited. To start with the Barracks, in these

the men are shut up in their rooms at some fairly early hour; half-past six in the evening was the latest we heard of and four-five o'clock the average. From then till the following morning between six and seven o'clock the men are locked into their rooms. The only sanitary arrangements in the rooms consist of buckets, and sometimes only one, sometimes two, closet seats. These are in many cases in the sleeping rooms themselves without any flushing arrangements and in some cases not even screened from the rooms. The result needs no elaboration and, in the opinion of the Committee, forms a real hardship for the men who have to endure it. The Committee feel strongly that immediate steps should be taken to provide proper water-closets, not in the rooms themselves but outside the rooms and with their own ventilation. At Fort Darland the Committee understand this is already being done. At Colchester, Stake Hill, Sowerby Bridge and Chorley the conditions need immediate attention. In this matter the Committee have the support of the Adjutant-General and of all the Commandants concerned.

31. It is realised that separate night water-closets cannot be provided for the cells of Prison Establishments. The Committee therefore recommend that in these places additional latrine parades, including one just before "Lights out" should be arranged. The attention of the Committee was frequently drawn to the inadequacy of the time allowed for latrine parades and they recommend that additional time be allotted.

Training and Welfare

32. If the purpose of detention as a method of rehabilitation as well as of punishment is borne in mind the importance of using the period of a man's sentence as an opportunity for education is obvious. A surprising number of soldiers and sailors under sentence are in varying degrees illiterate, and many are in one way or another anti-social, with distorted ideas of the meaning of citizenship and with a remarkable ignorance of world affairs and lack of general knowledge. The Committee consider that much more effort could be made to occupy the men's minds and improve their characters while they are undergoing detention by an extension of facilities for general education as well as for training in technical military subjects.

33. Far more is being done in connection with this aspect of detention in the Army than in the Navy, where very little seems to be attempted. In all the Army establishments without exception there is an Education Room, sometimes more than one, and frequently an Information Room as well, excellently arranged with cuttings from the illustrated papers, war maps and so forth. Use is made of the cinema and of wireless for educational purposes, and in many places there are regular courses of lectures on current topics, the "Brains' Trust" method of imparting information is employed (at one Detention Barracks the Committee observed a "Brains' Trust" in operation with three officers and three soldiers under sentence conducting the questions), and the "Padre's Hour" has its place in the educational scheme.

34. On the military training side, all the better equipped establishments have assault courses and in some cases miniature ranges, workshops with machine and motor sections and a tactical study room with a sand table. The proper idea behind all the technical instruction given in detention was well expressed by an enthusiastic Sergeant Instructor as being "to turn men out to help to win the war." The Committee welcome the evidence of this attitude which they found in the best conducted establishments as contrasted with the merely punitive conception, traces of which still survive in some places.