

Even if the existence of malingering were suspected, a bona fide medical officer could have been able scientifically to determine if one or more heart attacks had occurred and if damage to the heart had occurred.

Any well-informed physician will substantiate the statement that this fact is determinable with a considerable degree of accuracy, but that the determination does not include a psychological inquiry.

We agree heartily with the representative of our lodge who informed us of this case that it was not only humiliating but degrading as well and scarcely of the type of official action that produces satisfactory relationships between employer and employees.

Another instance of psychological or personality testing that has come to our attention involved an employee who had worked for the employing agency for 14 years. For varying periods of 10 days on one occasion and 2 weeks on two other occasions this employee was hospitalized in a Government hospital, with chest pains and a back condition.

Following his discharge from the hospital, the employee was directed to see a psychologist on the staff of his agency. About a week later he was sent to a psychiatrist.

This employee later was hospitalized in a city hospital for about 10 days and was treated there by a private physician for hypertension and arthritis of the spine and muscle spasm. Earlier this year, the employee received a written memorandum from a supervisor that any further use of any sick leave would require a physician's certification.

And what about the psychological examination which had been given earlier? It was concerned with what has come to be a gruesome pattern for this type of inquiry.

The employee stated that it concerned his home life, sex life, and financial affairs. What this type of examination had to do with chest pains and a back condition has yet to be explained.

Another agency in recent months employed a consulting firm to propound to its employees various questions of the type under discussion. One such question which in this instance caused more hilarity than irritation was: "Do you like tall girls?" The significance of a yes or no answer has yet to be explained.

So far as it is known, no employee of the agency was actually required to take the test. It is suspected, however, that a refusal would not expedite the promotion of the employee who declined.

These few instances to which I have referred, Mr. Chairman, in our opinion clearly indicate that a most disturbing practice has been developing in the Federal service, a practice which is not only shocking in its possibilities but one that is plainly illegal and completely unworthy of the Federal civil service.

This sort of inquiry is, in our opinion, indefensible. If it were characterized in some instances only by its stupidity, it would be undesirable. The type of questioning and the insistence and compulsion which have typified such testing are evidence of a sadistic viewpoint rather than a trustworthy effort to devise tests which can serve a good purpose.

We urge the subcommittee to recommend firm and positive action to end these practices.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The Chair wishes to thank you for a very excellent statement and also to thank you and your organization for the cooperation you have extended to the staff in the past.