

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is correct. He identified a picture as being the man, and then in a personal view of him gave a qualified identification. I said it was circumstantial evidence.

Mr. HARDY. Actually, I have known some people who are so proficient in lying that I think the machine would react if they told the truth.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Montague, you testified that the postal service does not use two-way mirrors in its polygraph work; is that correct?

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is correct.

Mr. REUSS. It is a fact, however, that the postal service does use two-way mirrors to observe postal employees in the washroom, is it not?

Mr. MONTAGUE. You are referring to lookouts in post offices, I believe.

Mr. REUSS. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think you are narrowing the field, Congressman. Lookouts are in post offices so that if a depredation is occurring an inspector can go in and observe the handling of the mail.

Mr. REUSS. Isn't it a fact that in many postal stations you have two-way mirrors so that a postal inspector or someone under his control can observe employees while they are using the toilets?

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is correct. The reason for that is that sometimes thieves put letters in their pockets and then go into the toilet rooms, open the letters, put the money in their pockets, and flush the envelopes down the toilets.

Mr. REUSS. I appreciate the problem you have: A rifler of the mails at a post office has the problem of what to do with the envelope and the toilet is always an attractive way of solving this.

Let me ask about this a little further. Do your inspectors maintain surveillance over the ladies' washroom?

Mr. MONTAGUE. No.

Mr. REUSS. They do not?

Mr. MONTAGUE. No.

Mr. REUSS. Do you have matrons who do that?

Mr. MONTAGUE. No.

Mr. REUSS. Are you familiar with the matter which I understood existed in the post office for a number of years involving the Hilltop Post Office in the city of Milwaukee?

Mr. MONTAGUE. No, I am not.

Mr. REUSS. That involved this practice, and I was particularly disturbed. Not only was there a two-way mirror in which the male employees of the post office were observed as they used the washroom, but there were no barriers at all between the toilets. Furthermore, this room gave upon the employees lunchroom, which I found unethical and pointed out to the post office. At that time, I urged the post office to continue, if it wished, its surveillance of employees, but to have the peephole at a level which would permit the use of the normal wooden barrier between the toilets so that there could be some privacy and let the inspector look down from above.

Finally, something was done. But I wondered what the practice was today. Was any reform achieved by this?

Mr. MOSS. We will have to have order.

Mr. REUSS. This is an important matter.