

And to that extent, it provides the interrogator with some additional information that he can use to proceed further in the course of his interrogation. But the polygraph itself is not capable with any degree of certainty at all of determining the credibility of a man's testimony.

Mr. KING. Just as a practical matter, it seems to me that if a man had a really guilty conscience, he would refuse to submit. If he had a clear conscience, he would be happy to submit. So that if that be true, then you are sifting out and excluding immediately those in which the use of the polygraph would be the most fruitful.

I am a little puzzled here. It seems to me you are barking up the wrong tree. You say that it is entirely voluntary. You can't force a man to submit to the test, both because of your regulations and because of the very nature of the test. If the man doesn't want to answer he doesn't have to, and that ends it. So obviously it must be voluntary.

But I am still left with my question. It seems to me that those who have guilty consciences will uniformly elect not to submit to the test and those who have clear consciences will elect to submit to the test. So what have you gained as a practical matter?

Mr. SKALLERUP. I will not speculate as to the identity of those who will or those who won't take a polygraph examination. But I think we must recognize that the administration of criminal justice has been going on for a long time without the use of the polygraph and very likely will continue to do so.

Mr. KING. I think that is a correct statement. The problem confronting this subcommittee, of course, is whether the weaknesses, the negative aspects of this, are such as to more than outweigh what are obviously some benefits. I think we all agree there are benefits and we all agree there are disadvantages, and we are now trying to weigh the one against the other.

Mr. ARCHIBALD. Mr. Skallerup, is the Office of Industrial Personnel Access Authorization Review under your administrative supervision?

Mr. SKALLERUP. It is.

Mr. ARCHIBALD. Generally, what does it do?

Mr. SKALLERUP. As you know, in the Department of Defense there are a number of defense contracts that involve access to classified information. This means granting clearances to personnel in defense industry. The military departments and the newly established office in the Defense Supply Agency, which is taking over these responsibilities, are in a position to conduct the investigations and grant clearances. But they are not in a position to deny an individual a clearance or to take away a clearance. That authority was vested in this one office that you have mentioned—OIPAAR—and we call it "OIPAAR" for convenience.

So the function of "OIPAAR" is to review these cases and provide the party involved with a statement of reasons which sets forth in considerable detail why it is believed to be not clearly consistent with the national interest to grant a clearance. There is a hearing before an examiner and the Government is under an obligation to provide the applicant with the opportunity to cross-examine and confront those persons giving testimony adverse to the interest of the applicant.

The applicant can engage counsel, bring in his own witnesses and at the termination of the case, it is reviewed and considered by a central