

June 30, 1934.

MEMORANDUM FOR MR. WIXON:Re: QUALIFICATION of new Border Patrol Appointees.

Present physical requirements are too lax and the reports of various medical examiners which are being accepted at their face value, are untrustworthy. Applicants with physical defects which should bar them from this Service are continually being passed by Public Health examiners. Possibly this is due to the lack of more rigid physical requirements.

In my opinion new appointees should be required to meet the following qualifications.

They should be not less than 23 nor more than 30 years of age; not less than 5'8" in height, nor less than 147 pounds in weight and should not be abnormally under or over weight for their height. There should be an absence of any organic or functional disease or limitation, or physical defect which would interfere with a high degree of activity and ability to undergo physical hardship; they should have good visual acuity without glasses and normal visual fields and color vision.

Those with large or sickly families or those with a large number of dependents should be disqualified in so far as it is possible, as these interfere with the desired patrol mobility and cut down the men's efficiency. Transfers and details away from home are destructive to the morale of patrol inspectors with large families or those in straightened financial condition. They become dispirited over the worries induced by their extra-service responsibilities and are unfit to perform their best work. Appointees should be chosen with a view to locating unmarried men in those districts where the Service requires numerous details and transfers. I have the Maine subdistrict particularly in mind.

The probationary period should be extended from six months to one year. Furthermore, it should be made less difficult for a supervising officer to get rid of probationary appointees whom he conclusively feels should not be continued in the Service, but in whose cases he has difficulty in showing strong grounds for discontinuance or in relating tangible

shortcomings. Oral examiners should be more "hard-boiled" than they have been and should not hesitate to turn applicants down on intangible evidence of unfitness for the work, and where possible officers who are qualified to properly examine applicants for the position of patrol inspector should be assigned to that work. It has been my observation that chief patrol inspectors and district supervisors of border patrol are much better qualified to assist in the oral examination of these men, than are the various inspectors in charge.

W. F. KELLY.