

Mr. Moss. It seems to me if the Government is going to use anything with the fallible characteristics of mechanical devices to determine truthfulness, it should undertake—through some appropriate inshop research or evaluation—a study to know whether the device is worth the dollar it costs.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What we have put in, moneywise, is very nominal, I feel. The machines which we are currently using cost about \$7,080, altogether.

In our report to your committee, we listed 16 inspectors as having been polygraph examiners, but we showed that they devoted about 3 percent of their time to this work. Overall, this would be about half the time of one man for a year being devoted to such work.

Mr. Moss. I realize that. The inspection service has not invested a lot of money. But this seems to be a growing field in Government. The committee's responses from the departments and agencies indicate that we are now reaching near the \$5 million annual cost figure and that we continue to acquire new and more costly devices.

Thus far, in the course of the investigation by this subcommittee we have found no agency which has undertaken the type of evaluation which, in my judgment at least—and I do not presume now to speak for the committee—should have been made and should be currently made, if we are to continue to acquire these devices and expand the use of them.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Our cost for our present program, was \$7,080 for the machines, in the neighborhood of \$2,000 for instruction expenses, and I think that we will not spend over \$10,000 a year for the polygraph program.

We gave about 475 polygraph tests in fiscal 1963, but that was a much larger number than normally conducted because of the Plymouth, Mass., investigation. Normally, we would probably run in the neighborhood of 300 or less tests in a year, and it would take, overall, about half the time of one inspector. The program is nominal, as far as our Service is concerned. Results are not used as evidence in court. They are used to clear up areas which will help us to get the investigation completed.

For example, in some instances, and we use the machine only in cases of more than average importance—I would think that the majority of our cases involve registered mail, as did the Plymouth, Mass., case. As there, you have employees who know that they are supposed to handle the mail in a certain way, and when the inspector asks, "How did you handle that piece of mail?" some will say that they did it according to the way the instructions require.

You don't suspect them of doing anything wrong, but you want to test their memories as to whether or not they are positive they actually handled it that way, because this could be crucial in the investigation. If they handled it that way, then you are going to go in one direction of your investigation. If they made a mistake and handled it some other way, you are going to go in another direction in your investigation.

This is what some of the tests are for. They are not always to show if a man is guilty or innocent. This is part of the criminal investigation, and it is to eliminate some of the avenues that you might be led up without any beneficial results.