

have knowledge of postal operations. The suspect was left-handed, the man who took the money had also given indications of being left handed. The thief had reached into the window with his left hand and he had done other things with his left hand.

The suspect was unemployed at the time. He hung around 42d Street. The robber was supposed to have been wearing a gray suit. Two inspectors went up to the suspect's home. They talked to him. He showed them what clothes he had. The only suit he had was a gray suit. He was then partially personally identified—a qualified identification by the clerk.

Our detector examiner at New York gave the suspect a test on the B. & W. and the test showed he had no knowledge of the crime. On the basis of that, the inspectors let him go, even though they had the partial identification and circumstantial evidence.

Two months following that, on a Saturday afternoon, a man walked into our Washington division headquarters and gave himself up as the one who perpetrated this crime, someone entirely different from the suspect. This is a case where the machine was accurate about the suspect and was the means or cause of freeing him of any suspicion of this crime.

Mr. Moss. I think that is very interesting, but I would submit to you that that is not in any sense a scientific evaluation. You might have achieved the same result with a mimeograph machine. It is my understanding—and I will admit that my knowledge of this comes only from witnesses before this committee, and the reading that I have had to do in connection with preparation for this investigation—that not too much is known about the causes or the significance of the flow of electrical current over the skin. That is the only thing measured by the galvanometer.

Mr. Cleve Backster, and I believe, Mr. Baleiko, you would recognize him—

Mr. BALEIKO. I know him personally very well.

Mr. Moss. You would recognize him as being very active in the use and promotion of the use of polygraphs—

Mr. BALEIKO. And a very dedicated man.

Mr. Moss. And he expressed the judgment that the galvanometer was virtually worthless, before this committee. So the fact is that you have here a coincidence. To have scientific significance, it must be repeatable under similar circumstances, and you must undertake some research to establish whether it is or is not a significant fact.

Further investigation on your part might also have cleared the person and, in my judgment, would have been a more valid clearing than that arrived at as a result of the judgment of an operator using only a galvanometer.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Moss. Mr. Reuss.

Mr. REUSS. I don't want to be ungracious about this example, Mr. Montague, but while I think the testimony of all three of you gentlemen up to now reflects great credit upon yourself and the service, if I were in your position I wouldn't boast about this particular one because what really cleared the man was that later on you found the guy who really had done it. I would be appalled to think that for 12 years the Postal Inspection Department was letting people go and