

Mr. MOHR. Yes. Any admission during the polygraph examination would be admissible evidence.

Mr. KASS. Is there an opportunity for the defense counsel to find out the nature of the confession and how the person confessed and the circumstances surrounding it?

Mr. MOHR. If counsel is representing the individual, why, the individual obviously could tell him the fact he submitted to a polygraph and what the circumstances of the interview were.

Mr. KASS. Does the defense counsel have an opportunity to cross-examine or to examine the FBI agent?

Mr. MOHR. The one that conducted the polygraph examination?

Mr. KASS. Yes.

Mr. MOHR. Normally he does not, because that would not be admissible in evidence.

I can conceive of a hearing, however, where a judge might require the presence of the examiner and he would be made available.

Mr. MONAGAN. If you got to the trial and go to the point where the confession or the question of the admissibility of the confession was raised, then it is conceivable, as a preliminary question, the agent might be called?

Mr. MOHR. Yes, certainly.

Mr. MONAGHAN. He might be required to testify?

Mr. MOHR. That is right. In other words, I can conceive of a hearing, usually before a judge, as to the admissibility of the confession and I can conceive where the polygraph examiner would be called to testify, and he would appear.

Mr. KASS. Has this ever happened?

Mr. HERNDON. In a few instances.

Mr. KASS. Mr. Conrad, turning to the training program, could you describe your agency's training program for polygraph operators?

Mr. CONRAD. Yes. Basically our training program is tailored to meet the needs of the FBI, and to the existing qualifications of the trainee candidates, from whom we have to draw.

No. 1, we have already a very highly selective source of trainees in the agent personnel of our organization. These men are college graduates; they have undergone a very thorough field investigation as to character, suitability, maturity, and so forth. Each of them whom we bring in for this training has had at least from 5 to 10 years of actual field investigative experience, and the selection is based on factors which Mr. Mohr has previously outlined here, but which specifically include aptitude for interrogation procedures.

With this type of individual to train, we have found that 2 weeks training of an intensive academic nature, followed by approximately 1 year of closely supervised on-the-job training in the field, gives us men fully qualified for our work.

Mr. KASS. Now, you say 2 weeks intensive training. What does that intensive training include?

Mr. CONRAD. We have furnished to the committee a curriculum summary. It includes a review of Bureau policies relating to the use of the polygraph—

Mr. KASS. Mr. Conrad, on policies do you mean the type of things we have discussed prior to this?

Mr. CONRAD. Yes. It also includes a résumé of the history and background of polygraph development.