

Mr. GRIFFIN. I see. It doesn't preclude the development of information which could later be checked by other investigative methods?

Mr. SKALLERUP. That is correct.

Mr. GRIFFIN. How many schools for polygraph examiners do we have? Do each of the services have a separate school?

Mr. SKALLERUP. No; the Navy trains its own, and the other services use the Army Provost Marshal General School at Fort Gordon, Ga.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I am not arguing for this necessarily, but just to explore the question, is there any possibility that there ought to be just one school? I don't know how many examiners are involved or whether the schools operate the same kind of a training program. I would think that they would. Has that possibility been considered?

Mr. SKALLERUP. At the time it did not appear desirable to establish a single DOD polygraph school, because the bases for selecting examiner candidates were fundamentally different. The Navy was of the view that it would be wasteful for them to send their polygraph examiner candidates to the Fort Gordon School because the candidates generally, almost without exception, would be considerably older and much more experienced as investigators, and so that much of the training that was received at the Fort Gordon School would not be necessary.

They also believed that the kind of supervision that is given to the Navy examiner candidates is more effective in producing a better examiner than running them through the Fort Gordon School.

There are a number of things that, I would say, are loose ends in this directive, and this is one of them. It appeared desirable really to issue the directive without resolving that particular problem of training. It is intimately tied up in the question of selection, and it raises other questions that are not treated in the directive at all.

For example, how many examinations should an examiner conduct to maintain his proficiency? There is a wide variety of opinion in this area. But it appears that the more active an examiner is, so that if he is doing one or possibly as many as two a day, his proficiency and his expertise is apt to be one of great skill, whereas an examiner who does it only occasionally is not apt to develop the same kind of expertise.

We are looking into this as a possible criterion to use in providing us with some assurances that when polygraph examinations are conducted, they are conducted by well-qualified and highly skilled examiners.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Do I understand from your statement that polygraph is used under the directive for employment purposes only with respect to the National Security Agency; is that right?

Mr. SKALLERUP. The intent of the directive is to limit the use of the polygraph and to preclude its use as a general screening device. It is recognized that there are instances, isolated instances, apart from the NSA, where a polygraph may be given in connection with employment. For example, in connection with recruitment of foreign scientists there are some instances where it will be used.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I would think there would be other situations.

Mr. SKALLERUP. There are occasional situations.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I should think there would be other occasions where it would be just as sensitive as in the Defense Department.