

not examining them any more because one of your 15 galvanometers disclosed no erratic skin reflexes, since we have had testimony that the thing is substantially worthless as a practical crime detection device.

This makes me wonder about how many participants in the Plymouth robbery, for instance, may be walking the streets today because an instrument said they were innocent.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The deceptograph, which is a three-phase machine, was used by Inspector Baleiko at Plymouth—

Mr. REUSS. Leave Plymouth aside, but take the 12 years in which these 15 one-phase machines were going strong. If you were closing the file on people because they didn't display a positive reaction, I would recommend that you go back on some of those unsolved crimes and apply normal shoe leather police methods.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Congressman, I cited this case only to show that at least in this instance the lie detector was correct. In any instance, whether it shows positive or negative, it is not conclusive evidence, whether it is a one-phase or three-phase machine. You have to develop your evidence outside of the lie detector. That is, the evidence you present in court. You don't present anything that you get from a lie detector in court or any place else. It is only an assist in an investigation. It isn't used only to try to show you who the guilty person is, but it is also used to show you who the innocent people are.

Mr. REUSS. I don't want to prolong this, but this was my fear. I am interested not only in protecting the civil rights of the innocent, but seeing that the guilty are found. I have several times during our investigation been surprised at the blitheness with which law enforcement officers, after giving somebody a lie detector test, which discloses no positive findings, then sort of call off the investigation, or at least don't pursue it very vigorously.

I suggest that these lie detectors, in addition to other damage that they may do, may actually impede rational criminal investigation because they lull into a false sense of security the inspectors and officers who are supposed to pursue these people. But we each have our views on it. I just wanted to express mine.

Mr. HARDY. I think I would observe that I had a reaction similar to yours, Henry.

Mr. Montague, I noted one comment that you made about this illustration that you gave. You said it relieved the man of suspicion, I think. If it did that, it surprises me that any investigator would accept that as conclusive. The thing that it did, as far as I would be concerned, would be to demonstrate that it hadn't given a thing extra to go on. But certainly the fact that he happened to pass the galvanometer test wouldn't relieve him of suspicion.

He might have had one gray suit. He might have been lefthanded, but in the absence of something else, you didn't have anything that you could press a case on anyway, did you?

Mr. MONTAGUE. No; it was all circumstantial evidence.

Mr. HARDY. That is exactly right. He wasn't relieved of suspicion. You just didn't have anything further to go on, or at least that would seem so to me.

Mr. MEADER. Didn't you say that the clerk who handed over the money identified him?