

really pertinent, is it? I am talking about those areas where these three things are used.

Mr. SKALLERUP. I am afraid I just don't get your point.

Mr. RUMSFELD. The Department of Defense issued a directive. It indicated that it was a departure from past directives and a change in policy. I asked what prompted this directive. You answered that you lacked standards in the use of the polygraph. So I asked, did you have standards, uniform standards, with respect to other things like the polygraph, that are used for investigative work or part of the employment process, a technique to determine whether or not you want to employ somebody. You indicated no. And then you proceeded to answer in greater length.

My question is, If the answer is "No," why is it "No," and why did you isolate out the polygraph from background checks or psychological tests or the other things that are apparently a normal part of the process that goes into investigating or employment? It seems to me to be simple. Maybe I am not making myself very clear?

Mr. SKALLERUP. We do have directives and standards with respect to all of those areas you mentioned.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Good. You answered "No" and that is what confused me.

Mr. SKALLERUP. Maybe I heard a double negative.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Okay. Let me read a quotation. It purports to quote Deputy Secretary of Defense Cyrus Vance. It says—no it doesn't, either. It is supposedly quoting Chairman Moss, it says "Moss hailed the directive signed by Vance as the first step taken by any Government agency to curtail the widespread use of so-called lie detectors."

For the purposes of the record, did you feel there was widespread use? Is that a good way to describe what was going on in the Department of Defense?

Mr. SKALLERUP. There is no question it was used in instances where it was not appropriate. This will tend to eliminate that type of examination.

Mr. RUMSFELD. This directive is attempting to avoid having the Government become polygraph happy and just issue permission to use them willy-nilly without a good reason?

Mr. SKALLERUP. It is very important that the polygraph not be used as a crutch any more than it has to, because it tends to make investigators lazy and the more we demand our investigators use old-fashioned, well-established investigative techniques the better investigators they will become.

Mr. RUMSFELD. So you don't feel there is any danger that this directive itself might swing the pendulum too far the other way and be too restrictive?

Mr. SKALLERUP. Well, we don't want it to be too restrictive. If it turns out that it is too restrictive in some areas, it can be changed, but this will depend on our experience under the directive.

Mr. RUMSFELD. In your statement, you say that the directive expressly authorizes polygraph examinations as an aid in determining eligibility of persons for employment or access to sensitive cryptologic information by the National Security Agency pursuant to regulations issued by the Director, NSA, with the prior approval of the Secretary of Defense.