Mr. Brooks. We recovered none of it?

Mr. Montague. Correct.

Mr. Brooks. Do you have any idea where this man you indicted has

escaped to or vanished to? Do you think he is alive?

Mr. Montague. There has been some speculation that he is no longer alive but it is only speculation. As far as we are concerned he is a fugitive from justice and we are looking for him.

Mr. Brooks. When they indicted him, was he picked up?

Mr. Montague. He was arraigned; yes, sir, and released on bail.

Mr. Brooks. How much bail? Mr. Montague. \$25,000 bail.

Mr. Brooks. A million and a half cash missing and \$25,000 bail. He

could afford to leave. [Laughter.]

Why did they set the bail so low? It seems a bit low for that type of loot running around somewhere.

Mr. Montague. As you are aware, this is something out of our juris-

diction. I don't know.

Mr. Brooks. Does it seem low to you?

Mr. Montague. Well, apparently the commissioner thought that having attorneys and being known, that \$25,000 would be enough to make them available on the date the trial was to start or whenever they might be needed.

Mr. Brooks. The commissioner knew of course that the items stolen

were an unmarked million and a half in cash.

Mr. Montague. Yes, sir.

Mr. Brooks. How many postal inspectors are now assigned to this? Mr. Montague. At the present moment the case is assigned to our Boston division. We have one inspector who devotes all his time to it. Others are used as necessary.

Mr. Brooks. Do you still have some hope of recovering that money? Mr. MONTAGUE. We never lose hope, Congressman. Since the statute

still has 4 years to run, the State statute, we do have hope.

Mr. Brooks. Thank you very much.

General, I wanted to ask you about a matter that is a sticky one for all of us. I receive letters from constituents objecting to having received unsolicited advertisements of an obviously obscene nature.

A few weeks ago a constituent forwarded me such an advertisement that was so revolting as to be indescribable. The advertisement hadn't been solicited by the recipient and he was pretty much concerned about the possibility of it falling into the hands of his young son. With all the legal problems the Post Office might encounter in this area, is there anything that can be done and is anything being done to prohibit the transmission of such material by the postal service?

Mr. Watson. To my knowledge there is not anything being done to prohibit this type of mail going in the mail except in this particular type of case, a new law went into effect April 14 of this year which will allow this lady to notify her postmaster that she no longer wishes to receive correspondence from the person or firm sending this type of mail and therefore she will no longer receive

it