

I understand they can put many more channels on it and all they do is to bring to the operator's attention the fact that the body is functioning. So we really have had in the postal service up to this point no real training program.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I can't agree with that, Congressman, because it was on-the-job training, and we had some very capable and qualified men. It has not come to my attention that they made any mistakes. If they had been unqualified, if they had not been doing their job, there would have been indications along the line somewhere of mistakes.

Mr. MOSS. What objective analysis has the inspection service made of results obtained either from the B. & W. the deceptograph, or the Keeler machine?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Do you mean with respect to operation in our own service?

Mr. MOSS. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We have not had opportunity yet to evaluate the operation of the new machines. We will do so. But with regard to a test formerly being given on a B. & W. machine, or the new machine for that matter, the postal inspector in charge of the division would know about it. An inspector, when he finishes his investigation, has to make a report on the case, to tell what was done.

So the inspector in charge not only knows that an inspector is going to give the test, but he is probably personally informed as to the outcome and what occurred. Then there is a postaudit through the report.

In every investigation we make, there is a report. So we also have this control and this evaluation of what is being accomplished.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Baleiko, have you ever given a B. & W. test with negative results to a person subsequently found to have been implicated in a crime involving the postal service?

Mr. BALEIKO. Not to my knowledge; no, sir.

Mr. MOSS. Have you ever analyzed the records of the inspectors to determine whether such has occurred? Have you ever objectively sought this information?

Mr. BALEIKO. None was brought to my attention. I did not act as a coordinator in the sense that I reviewed others' reports; no, sir.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Montague, has the inspector service ever made an analysis?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not think I understand the question, Congressman.

Mr. MOSS. You apparently regard the use of this device as fairly infallible?

Mr. MONTAGUE. No, I did not say that and I do not mean to.

Mr. MOSS. You know of an instance where an innocent individual gave a positive reading, and your associates know of no instance where a guilty individual gave a negative reading. This must have been the judgment arrived at because of some study or evaluation.

Has such study or evaluation been made?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have no knowledge of such an evaluation having been made. With regard to my mention of a mistake, I feel quite certain that if an injustice had been done to anyone in connection with any of these tests, we would have known about it, we would have heard about it, and I have not heard about any cases.