

*"Through social association  
and mutual acquaintance, the  
chief warrant and  
warrant officers of the  
Coast Guard may best  
advance their professional  
abilities, enhance their  
value, loyalty and devotion to  
the service, and promote its  
unity and morale."*

# History of the Chief Warrant & Warrant Officers Association, USCG

Chief Warrant & Warrant Officers



©1994 CWA. All Rights Reserved Worldwide

# Forward

This history's publication marks the 65th anniversary of the birth of the Chief Warrant and Warrant Officers Association. It is my sincere hope that you, a present, past or future member, may better understand the aims and efforts of the Association through this historical perspective.

The CWOA has always been working for *you*, and will continue to do so for years to come. We have a long and proud history of helping Coast Guard members, Congressional representatives and program managers in Coast Guard headquarters better understand important issues and policies concerning our warrant officer corps. In helping to shape policy and educate, we hope to offer better service to the Coast Guard, the country and the public.

After reading this book I realize that Ray Gillis' words remain true today, even more than 65 years later: the success of our Association depends upon *you*, the member. If, looking back upon a 20- to 30- year career, you find that you have devoted some small part of your time to helping guide a fellow warrant's path in our service, rest assured that you have followed in Ray's footsteps and helped pave the way for the next generation of competent professionals in the Coast Guard of the future.

GEORGE BORLASE, CWO4, USCG  
CWOA PRESIDENT, 1990-1994

## Dedication

*This book is dedicated to Raymond Gillis, CDR (ret.), first president of the CWOA.*

*Through his hard work and dedication to the warrant officer corps, Gillis nurtured and guided the Association through its first hesitant steps and early organizational obstacles.*

*He believed that the strength of the Association depended on its members, at different Clubs around the Coast Guard, and wrote, on Dec. 26, 1928:*

*“...the life of the Association depends upon the support each member gives to his particular Club.”*

*When Gillis turned over his tenure as Association president to Pay Clerk Carlin L. Brinkley on Sept. 19, 1930, there were more than 500 Association members and little more than 700 warrant officers in the Coast Guard.*

# Table of Contents

Forward.....	i
Dedication.....	ii
Table of Contents .....	iii
Introduction.....	1
Early history.....	9
First President & Founding Member.....	12
Towards a National Organization.....	14
Official Recognition .....	16
The National Organization.....	17
First CWOA Constitution .....	18
The Association in the 1940s .....	23
After the War.....	25
The Association in the 1950s .....	28
Association Communication Efforts.....	32
The Start of the 1960s.....	38
2,000 Members & Bylaws Changes.....	41
New Department & Promotion Opportunities .....	44
A New Decade, the 1970s .....	47
3,000 Members.....	48
50 Years of Service & the 1980s .....	51
Army Reconsiders W-5 Program.....	59
Further WOMA Developments.....	61
Coast Guard, Association WOMA Concerns .....	63
Into the 1990s.....	65
The Present Day .....	67
The Organization & You.....	72
References & Bibliography .....	74
Further reading.....	79
CW&WOA Seals.....	80
Past Presidents.....	81
Code of the United States Coast Guard Warrant Officer.....	82
List of Distinguished Members.....	83



## AUTHOR'S INTRODUCTION

The history of the CWOA is not documented, and has never been published.

Unfortunately too, most of the official records of the early history of warrant officers in the Revenue Cutter Service were destroyed in two 19th century fires at the Treasury Department in Washington, D.C. According to Dr. Robert Schiena, Coast Guard historian in 1985, it is "difficult to trace the evolution of warrants in the service."<sup>1</sup>

A number of Association committees have attempted to document our early years. One of the first, in 1963, drafted several pages of information summarizing early efforts at influencing Congressional legislation.<sup>2</sup>

Another effort, in 1969, led by then president CWO4 Fay K. Thompson, gathered numerous letters of recollections and anecdotes.

Unfortunately, no warrant or chief warrant officers who had a hand in the formation of the National Association now remain behind.

Historical fragments exist in the form of old newsletters, mimeographed minutes of meetings, and recollections of old members in exchanges of letters. The best collection of historical data now resides aboard the Association office, a houseboat moored next to Coast Guard Headquarters at Buzzards Point in Washington, D.C.

Many of the published articles, clippings from early magazines and typewritten handouts and pamphlets offer conflicting evidence and about the origins of the Association.

One pamphlet, written for the decommissioning ceremony of the CGC AGASSIZ, states "The date of the first Association of Warrant Officers organization is somewhat nebulous today. The Association as we know it now began in the latter part of the 1920's, though there were earlier predecessors of a local nature."<sup>3</sup>

What follows then, is my attempt to document the early years of the Association, and highlight some of the accomplishments of the CWOA in the following decades to the present date.

I must also thank Mr. Bob Lewis, past Association president, Distinguished Member, and current Director of Member Services. Without his invaluable assistance in organizing and assembling the existing Association files, this work would have been impossible.

*William H. Ball, CWO3 (INF)*  
*Washington, DC 1994*

## INTRODUCTION

Note: In order to understand the history of the Association, we must first look at why the rank of warrant was established.

The warrant part of the warrant officer's title comes from a German word meaning trust, care or guarantee. It is also the source of the modern word warranty. A warrant is actually a piece of paper — an authorization — just as a commission is a warrant granting power.

Warrant officers were not enlisted people who warranted or deserved to be officers. They were sailors who carried an authorization from a higher echelon. In fact, warrants were once some of the most senior officers in Britain's Navy. The same was true in the Revenue Cutter Service, and this, as you'll see, caused problems into the 20th Century.

The term "warrant" set sail in 1040 when five English ports built ships for King Edward the Confessor in exchange for certain privileges. They also furnished crews whose officers were the master, boatswain, carpenter and cook. Later, these officers were "warranted," or authorized by the king to sail under his name and ensign. They sailed and maintained the ships and were permanent officers of the navy, while captains were laid off or hustled ashore with the troops after each cruise.

Warrant officers were permanent members of the crew. While the seaman and the petty (from the French *petite*) officers were routinely discharged between sailings, officers holding warrants stayed on board as caretakers to supervise repairs and refittings.

Early in the 14th Century, the purser joined the warrant officer corps. Originally called the clerk of bursar, the purser cared for the ship's treasury and store. We still have disbursing clerks in the Coast Guard, and until only a few years ago [*about 1966 – author*], our warrant PERS specialty was called ship's clerk.

In the years that followed, the gunner, surgeon, chaplain, master—at—arms and schoolmaster warrants signed on.

Warrant officers were part of our Navy — and to some degree our Revenue Cutter Service — right from the start. We had warrant officers on Continental Navy ships in the Revolution. Congress, in 1774, listed as Navy Warrant Officers the sailing master, purser, boatswain, gunner, carpenter and sailmaker. There was also a warranted midshipman.

We haven't been able to figure out just when the Revenue Cutter Service shipped its first warrants. The confusion exists because warrant officers were considered to be petty officers. The term appears in Revenue Cutter Service documents almost interchangeably.

Petty officers were selected by and served at the pleasure of the captain from among the seamen, while warrant officers were supposedly selected and warranted by the Secretary of the Treasury, or at least the local Collector of Customs. Commissioned officers were commissioned by the President. Regulations issued in 1834 allow only for petty officers on Revenue Cutters, while cutter crew lists from the period before that show warrant officers serving on board. Later regulations allow for warrant officers, but make no mention of petty officers, except when they refer to warrant officers generically as petty officers. Our guess is that they were simply warranted petty officers.



By the early 1830s, there were nearly as many warrant officers as commissioned officers in the Revenue Cutter Service (57 commissioned and 35 warrants). On some ships, such as GALLATIN, the commissioned officers were outnumbered two to one.

Revenue Cutter Service regulations called for three classes of officers: those in command (captains or lieutenants commanding), executive officers (always lieutenants) and forward officers (warrant officers).

Warrants, not holding commissions, were part of the crew, and lived “up forward” with the seamen. They also wore the seaman’s uniform, with the addition of a few buttons here and there.

Navy warrants began wearing blue and gold stripes in 1853, but not on their sleeve cuffs, as they do today. The strips of lace adorned their caps. Two half-inch gold stripes were separated by a quarter-inch of blue cloth.

In 1899, Navy chief warrant officers started wearing a sleeve stripe of half-inch gold lace, broken at intervals by sections of blue thread a half-inch wide. In 1919, junior warrant officers also began wearing sleeve lace of gold broken by blue stripes.

The two grades of Revenue cutter warrants wore a more conservative single strip of unbroken mohair braid, one-inch wide, two inches above the cuff — until about 1921, when we switched to the Navy system of officer grades. Our warrants wore the same headgear as commissioned officers, but with a chin strap only a quarter—inch wide.

The Revenue Cutter Service ran into a problem when it was absorbed by the U.S. Lifesaving Service in 1915. What were they to do with the civilian station keepers? They had been performing the duties of at least junior officers, at a pay roughly equivalent to that of enlisted cuttermen. The answer was to make them all “Keepers Warranted by the Secretary of the Treasury” — warrant officers. The U.S. Coast Guard began life with 242 commissioned officers and 351 warrant officers.

The warrant keepers ranked just below master’s mates (also warranted, who commanded such vessels as GOLDEN GATE in San Francisco and DAVEY in New Orleans or small shore facilities such as the Depot at Baltimore, now the Coast Guard Yard). Warrant keepers ranked just above warrant boatswains.

In 1921, when we took on Navy grades, the three warrant specialties were combined into our present warrant boatswain specialty. The Navy complained heavily about the top heaviness of the Coast Guard, and many warrant keeper billets were reverted to chief petty officer.

According to regulations issued in the 1908, men could enlist or be rated by the Captain as Acting Warrant Officers, until they were appointed by the Treasury Department. Records before this time show that a captain could enlist or appoint a crew member as a petty officer.

**Author’s Note:** The above was “A history of sea service ranks & titles: part three: The Junior Officers,” by David L. Cipra, PACM (Ret.). Cipra was editor of the Commandant’s Bulletin, and published this article on Mar. 29, 1985.

## **BEGINNING OF THE USCG CHIEF WARRANT & WARRANT OFFICERS ASSOCIATION**

## **EARLY HISTORY & EFFORTS TO ORGANIZE**

As early as 1919, warrants were organizing. Local associations or “Clubs” sprang up all over the United States, usually composed of Lifesaving Service surfmen. One such club was organized at the Coast Guard Depot in Baltimore, MD, although 10 years later it was “disbanded and declared out of existence.”<sup>4</sup>

Some of the most interesting historical snippets of the Association’s early years come from letters, texts, and interviews collected by CWO4 Fay K. Thompson, who was president of the Cape Island CW & WO Club in the late 1960s.

In a letter and questionnaire mailed to 250 people on Mar. 25, 1969, Thompson appealed for any information about the Association’s origins, and hoped to find members stationed on either of the Division One or Two patrol vessels, or in the immediate Boston area during the late 1920s.

More than 100 warrant officers, former members and retirees replied, but not everyone agreed on exactly when, where and how the Association came to be.

However, despite these differences of memory and opinion, existing historical documents point to World War I military pay legislation, the Volstead Act, Prohibition, and the 18th Amendment as all having a hand in motivating the formation of the Association.

## **WARRANTS AND SMUGGLED LIQUOR**

In 1923 the Coast Guard started building patrol boats to help combat the liquor smuggling during Prohibition. At the same time, qualified people to man these boats were needed. On June 16-17, 1924, examinations were held at various places around the United States to hire additional warrant officers as Boatswains. Many of these Boatswain warrants were from maritime schools or the Merchant Marine, and a good many came from the Navy, because of cutbacks in naval personnel following World War I.

At this time, all warrant appointments were temporary, and according to LCDR John A. Heikel (Ret), one of the early temporary Boatswain warrants, and later a lieutenant commander, “This feature was the sole cause of many ills that developed in the warrant ranks and the prime reason for the Warrant Officers Association coming into being.” Heikel was commanding officer of the CGC AGASSIZ during and after its commission.

Some warrants were retained in a temporary commission status for up to 13 years, never knowing if at any time they would be busted back down to chief petty officer. On the other hand, Navy warrant officers automatically advanced to chief warrant after serving as warrant officer for six years. In the Coast Guard, personal conflicts with commanding officers could result in lengthy delays in achieving permanent or chief warrant officer status.

Many of the early temporary appointees were afraid of losing rank before being able to advance or gain permanent status. Jealousy grew among the warrant ranks between those who were advanced or placed in a permanent status.

## **EXAMINATION REQUIREMENTS**

In 1927, in order to become a warrant officer from within the ranks, a Coast Guardsman had to take an examination. Exams were held around the country for Boatswain, Gunner, Machinist, Carpenter, Pay Clerk and Radio Electrician. Only “permanently rated” chief petty officers with not less than one year’s service between the ages of 21 and 42 were eligible.<sup>5</sup>

Applicants had to send a letter requesting to be “designated for examination for appointment” in a temporary warrant grade. In addition, applicants had to get letters of recommendation from all former commanding officers currently in the Coast Guard.

Marks were then generated by an examining board, composed of commissioned officers, covering educational and professional qualifications and general fitness. The examination consisted of spelling 25 words, tests of simple rules of grammar, composition of a simple essay, arithmetic problems and questions on “well known facts than any intelligent man should know.”

While study courses were free for enlisted men, commissioned and warrant officers had to pay for official courses and textbooks for professional schooling. In 1928, costs for courses ranged from \$3.70 for “Good English,” to \$23.14 for the “Coast Guard Academy Preparatory” course. Even so, these mail-order classes were a bargain compared to commercially available courses, which sometimes cost 10 times as much.<sup>6</sup>

Once having successfully overcome these hurdles, new temporary warrants also had to face several other hurdles, including small numbers of advancements and an inequitable pay system.

For example, during 1927 there were more than 800 warrant officers in the Coast Guard, due to the increased number of positions to combat smuggling. Yet, only 25 warrants were selected that year for permanent commissioned status.

The Coast Guard also had a different pay scale than the other services. Prior to World War I, the Coast Guard’s pay schedule for commissioned officers was based on the Army’s, but not for warrant officers and enlisted men. Following the war, congressional legislation placed Coast Guard pay closer to the Navy’s, definitely improving the rates of pay.

Inequities in the pay system continued however. There were not only different rates of pay for warrant officers and commissioned chief warrant officers, but also between warrants on shore and at sea.

Different congressmen introduced new bills at different times in an effort to right many of the inequities introduced by the joint Service Pay Act of June 10, 1922. For six years, the military had no pay raises, and various bills tried to attack pay inequities and rate and rank structure in piecemeal fashion. Until 1928, the Coast Guard didn’t even have any admirals, and Coast Guard warrant officers, unlike their Navy counterparts, did not advance to chief warrant officer grade after six years as a warrant officer.

## **FIRST PRESIDENT AND FOUNDING MEMBER**

According to LCDR John Heikel, Chief Pay Clerk Raymond Gillis, (one of the first warrant pay

clerks appointed in 1920 by the Coast Guard, according to John M. Gray, one of Gillis' shipmates from 1913 to 1916), the disbursing officer of the district office in Boston, disbursing officer for the offshore patrol boats in division one and two, was instrumental in helping organize and pass the word about having a meeting to form a warrant club, group, or organization.

LCDR Heikel said that in January 1928, at Pier 10 in the Charlestown Navy Yard, Boston, MA, a number of Division One cutters were laying at pier following a snowstorm which had deposited two feet of snow on the city. According to Heikel, about 17 warrants met on the mess deck aft of the AGASSIZ. Most of those present were Boatswains and Machinists. Warrants from the CGCs ACTIVE, HARRIETT LANE, ALERT, ANTIETAM and BONHAM, the Division One cutters, were there.<sup>7</sup>

This is not the case, however, as the AGASSIZ log in the National Archives shows that the cutter was on patrol off Matinicus Rock Light, and at the end of January, cruised 103 miles for 12 hours, and finally moored in Rockland, ME for the evening. There was a storm, and the cutter had pulled in for shelter. The cutter was ordered back to base on Jan. 30th, and finally moored at 3 a.m. Jan. 31. (Another document in the Association archives says the meeting took place on the HARRIETT LANE.)

At the meeting Heikel recalled, Gillis was asked to attend and preside until a vote came up for a president. He accepted an invitation to become President Pro tem. Committees were appointed, and later, a legislative committee wrote a Preamble and a draft Constitution. The committee consisted of Everett Mills of the ACTIVE, Roy Clark of the ANTIETAM, and Charles Hannum of the AGASSIZ.

This meeting was mostly likely held on July 2, 1928. That day, chief warrant and warrant officers from 22 units met at the Boston Navy Yard. A temporary committee, headed by Gillis was elected to organize an association, and warrants were urged to "get in touch with Chief Pay Clerk Gillis and obtain from him data on how to organize local units."<sup>8</sup>

## **TOWARDS A NATIONAL ORGANIZATION**

Gillis later helped set up the Association, with the assistance of the originally missing Division Two warrants (who were out on patrol at the time of the first meeting), and formed a National Board of Controls, later to become the National Council. This board, in turn, later chartered District Clubs.

The name "club" was initially used to avoid any problems with the Coast Guard. In fact, no prior approval for that first meeting on the AGASSIZ was given, according to LCDR Heikel, because "we felt that the people above would take a dim view."

Certainly not every warrant would join the Association. Some feared joining would jeopardize his career, appointment to chief warrant officer, or retention within the Coast Guard. This was certainly the case, according to LCDR Floyd B. Cottrell, a charter member of The Golden Gate District Club at Base 11, Alameda, CA.

Cottrell said that in early 1929, several 125-foot patrol boats, transferred from the East coast for rum duty, were stationed in San Francisco bay. All the officers aboard were warrants, and eventually later that year, 18 signed up for membership. A club charter was issued Sept. 1, 1929 by Gillis from Boston, MA. But despite the initial 18 members and the charter, no warrant officers from the district office would sign, Cottrell said, because they were afraid of retribution from the Coast Guard.

Meetings were sometimes held in a member's home, occasionally on a ship's mess deck, or even in an empty office on base. According to Cottrell, the biggest problem was collecting dues. At the time, it was illegal to pay dues by allotment. Many clubs had members who had to go on regular monthly

rounds, down to the docks, and aboard each ship when in port, and visit different bases in the area to collect dues.

Seven months earlier, the New London Club had received its charter. According to LCDR Irv V. Beall, the first warrant officer assigned as a classroom instructor at the Academy, the first attempt to organize took place there in February 1929.

“I reported to the Academy on Feb. 9, 1929, and late that month a meeting was called for all warrant officers in the area to form a warrant officers ‘Social Club,’ as we were forbidden to attend any commissioned officers’ social affairs – not even a CWO was invited.

“So about 20 or 25 of us met in a corner of the Receiving Unit galley at Fort Trumbull one night late in February to form a club. Boston and New York already had clubs, and Chief Pay Clerk Ray Gillis came down from Boston to give us a pep talk and help us organize a club. Later he was transferred to HQ and we thought it was to get him out of the way of organizing W.O. clubs and [so] the big boys in Washington could keep an eye on him.

“But NOT so. Soon after his arrival there we got information that he planned to make clubs a National organization, with district clubs wherever possible and with the blessing of the Commandant RADM Frederick C. Billard, the only admiral in the Coast Guard at the time.”

Gillis is credited with doing most of the “missionary work” in encouraging membership and forming local clubs. He is known to have traveled throughout the northeast, visiting larger Coast Guard units to personally assist with meetings. Then suddenly, with help from Gillis in the form of local charters, and the formation of local clubs around the Coast Guard, the formation of the Association, in the words of Heikel, “mushroomed overnight.”

## **OFFICIAL RECOGNITION**

By October 1928, a year before the infamous stock market crash which heralded the Great Depression, there were at least 65 members in the Boston Unit of the Coast Guard Chief Warrant and Warrant Officers’ Association.

By that time, according to a news item on page 41 of the October 1928 Coast Guard Magazine, the Coast Guard had officially recognized the Association.

A letter from Rear Admiral F. C. Billard, then commandant, stated:

*“This office has no objection to the organization of an association intended for the purposes described, with the understanding that the activities of such association shall not be directed along lines that may be contrary to the policies of Headquarters.”*

As mentioned before, this was not the first time that the warrants had organized. There were already a number of service organizations in existence. In October 1928, there was an organization of Warrant Officers and Chief Petty Officers of the Coast Guard Stations in the Tenth District, in Grand Haven, MI. By-laws had been formed, officers were elected and business was conducted regularly, usually followed by all-hands dinners at local hotels or meeting places.

The Navy had a similar organization for chief warrants and warrant officers. Called CHANWOS, the organization was formed to “look after the interests, legislative and otherwise, of the Navy Chief Warrant and Warrant Officers.” CHANWOS was active at the same time during the formative years of the Association.

## **THE NATIONAL ORGANIZATION**

The Temporary National Committee started accepting charters in January 1929. By the winter of 1929, the National Association, headquartered in Boston, was in full swing. Seven charters had been issued; Boston, with 86 members, and New York with 98 members.

To get a charter, at least 10 warrant or chief warrant officers had to apply, along with \$2.50 dues from each member. The dues and application were then sent to Gillis, who sent back membership cards, copies of the Association Constitution, and a plan for organizing.

Each "Club" was designed to act as a "self-governing unit," without interference from the National Committee."

## **EARLY CHARTER REQUIREMENTS**

Many of the Association's early aims exist today. Back then the goals stated by the organization were:

- To support and cooperate with all Coast Guard activities.
- To encourage mutual interest and efficiency among the chief warrant and warrant officers, through closer association and greater activity in social and Service matters, thereby engendering an Esprit de Corps.
- To make annually a cash award (in an amount voted on) to an enlisted member or members in the interests of efficiency (such as acts of heroism).
- To confer honorary membership upon all retired warrant and chief warrant officers, "remembering them at the holiday season particularly with appropriate cards of greeting, and in other ways to bridge the gap that lies between active duty and retirement."

## **FIRST CWOA CONSTITUTION**

The Temporary National Committee issued the first constitution for the Association on Jan. 1, 1929. Its 31 pages details the organization, membership, election, duties, dues, and meeting rules for the Association.

This first constitution firmly established the Association as the official service and professional representative of Coast Guard warrant and chief warrant officers. Article II stated "The purpose of the Association shall be the betterment of the Warrant Personnel of the United States Coast guard along social, professional and materiel lines, consistent with the good of the Service."

All warrant and commissioned warrant officers were eligible for membership. However, only active duty Coast Guardsman were considered "active" members; retired warrants were considered "honorary" members.

District Clubs were allowed to be located depending "upon the representation of, and the interest manifested by, the eligible officers stationed in and around the various Coast Guard centers."<sup>10</sup>

Within a year, more than 700 Association newsletters were being mailed out to clubs in Sault Ste. Marie, MI; Boston, MA; New London, CT; New York, NY; Washington, DC; St. Petersburg, FL; Mobile, AL; Galveston, TX; San Pedro, CA; Oakland, CA; Astoria, OR; and Port Townsend, WA.

The following lists the club and date of the first charters:

Boston, MA.....	Jan. 1, 1929
New London, CT.....	Mar. 1, 1929
New York, NY.....	May 1, 1929
Astoria, OR.....	July 1, 1929
Port Townsend, WA.....	July 1, 1929
San Pedro, CA.....	Aug. 1, 1929
Oakland, CA.....	Sept 1, 1929
Mobile, AL.....	Mar. 1, 1930
Sault Ste Marie, MI.....	April 1, 1930
Washington, DC.....	April 1, 1930
Galveston, TX.....	April 1, 1930
St. Petersburg, FL.....	April 1, 1930

Less than a year later, on Jan. 1, another club in Norfolk, VA., would be chartered; but not by the National Board in Boston, MA.

Although the National Board started at Boston, MA, a vote was taken in July 1930, and it was decided that Washington, DC should be the “seat of government of the Association.” The Association then moved to Washington on Oct. 18, 1930<sup>11</sup>

Subsequent installation of Association officers were held in the board room of the YWCA at 17th & K Streets in northwest Washington, DC.

## SAVE THE COAST GUARD FROM NAVY OCCUPATION

The first of many advances to transfer the Coast Guard into the Navy began only six years after the service was formed as the Revenue Cutter Service. Up to 1933, 12 attempts were made without success. Each federal bill introduced in 1821, 1841, 1842, 1843, 1846, 1859, 1882, 1884, 1893, 1919 and 1920 met failure.

During 1933, the Navy hit on the idea of absorbing the Coast Guard officers corps within its ranks, probably in response to opportunities afforded by Congress after passing the “Economy Act” of 1933. This act, designed to cut costs in the federal government, also authorized the President to reorganize the Executive.

Much correspondence flowed back and forth between the Coast Guard, the Secretary of the Treasury, friendly and hostile forces in Congress, and industry leaders.

A joint committee, made up of Navy and Coast Guard officers, met and recommended that the Coast Guard be absorbed into the Navy somewhat like the Marine Corps. Indeed, there were as many opponents as proponents to the merge. Internally, however, the Coast Guard was opposed to the absorption:

*“Much of the Navy motive for the present transfer movement is not a disinterested purpose to increase efficiency and reduce expenditures, but is rather a selfish purpose on the part of certain Navy officers to provide an outlet to relieve the present overcrowded condition in the commissioned personnel of the Navy, a situation which on its face prophesies stepchild treatment for the Coast Guard functions and personnel under Navy management.”<sup>12</sup>*

The Association, or Clubs, were also, in the words of LCDR Augustus F. Pittman, (former BOSN(T), and first commanding officer of Division One’s CGC ALERT), “instrumental in keeping [the] Coast Guard from the Navy during 1933-1934.”

According to Pittman, the warrant corps was very strong politically, having hired a civilian counsel, and former Judge Advocate General of the Army.

“Our attorney at [the] above time was General Ansell, who sent a telegram to each warrant officer and chief warrant officer, requesting their utmost in a political manner to prevent same. I still have answers from congressman and senators — all favorable. I don’t have to tell you who did all the work during [the] ‘Rum War.’”

## HOW BOSN WARRANTS WERE “SENT TO THE WOODS”

The Great Depression, which affected all Americans, also forced severe cuts in pay and personnel in the federal government. Perhaps even harder hit were the military ranks. Early measures included pay cuts, hiring freezes, and even payment of food coupons in lieu of cash during payroll shortages.

As part of the efforts to scale back in personnel, nearly 200 Coast Guard warrant officers were faced with early separation. To many, this would mean extreme financial hardship, especially considering the current pay scales and pay inequities. Word came from headquarters in Washington, D.C. that unless otherwise directed, these warrants were to be separated.

A number of these warrants were Association members, and they complained bitterly about the possibility of losing their careers and livelihood. In letters and telegrams to the Association and their congressional representatives, the warrants appealed for help.



This was a very trying time. Many of the temporary appointees were former merchant mariners who depended on the Coast Guard for their livelihood. Being forced out, or reduced in rank would mean being either stranded or forced to face more hardship in the Depression economy of the mid-1930s.

The Association directed Counselor Ansell to lobby and appeal personally to friends on the “Hill” and in the White House.

Ansell’s efforts and the response from the Association and warrant corps finally paid off; the President sent 165 Coast Guard warrants off to work in the Civilian Conservation Corps. In many cases, those men were better off, as wages were higher for CCC workers than many servicemen pay rates.

## **HEART-WRENCHING EXPERIENCE**

“It was a heart-wrenching experience,” according to Everett E. Jackson, an SPCK-2, or Pay Clerk, stationed at headquarters in Washington, D.C. during 1933. Of the 165 warrants, some would stay with the CCC for a number of years. William W. Worcester, a temporary warrant during the period, was “one of those temporary warrants sent to ‘The Woods’ in 1933,” and remained in the CCC for five years until 1938. Another, Norman D. MacLellan, went for six years.

Other warrants, especially commanding officers aboard ships, faced even harder tasks, according to Chester L. Jordan, CO of the cable ship PEQUOT at the time.

*“I had five temporary warrant officers and orders to bust them to chief on a certain date, and to bust my chiefs to make room for them within our allowed complement. We were moored at Balto [Baltimore] at the time and through the officers in the National Council, proceeded [towards] a more equitable arrangement...”*

Several days before the effective date, the President was convinced of the inequity and signed an executive order to place the surplus temporaries in the CCC camp.

But the order originally only applied to the Army, Navy and Marine Corps! No mention was made of the Coast Guard. Luckily, when this was brought to the attention of ADM R. R. Waesche, the omission was corrected, resulting in the promotion of most of the warrant officers to temporary commission grades.

To meet the legislative pay inequities, and the hardships suffered by the military during the last years of the Great Depression, the Association continued to change and reorganize. In 1934, the National Council of the Association, made up of active duty and retired members living near or stationed at Coast Guard Headquarters, was established as the “governing board” of the Association.

This change ensured that there would always be a concerned “core” group of members in the nation’s Capitol.

## THE ASSOCIATION IN THE 1940S

As the Association moved into its second decade, there were a lot of accomplishments to be proud of. Carlin L. Brinkley, CWOA president in 1934, described a number of achievements, including:<sup>13</sup>

- Raising of the moral of the warrant corps.
- An increase of respect for the corps and an “elevation” of their position.
- The elimination of assignment of warrant officers to minor clerical duties at Headquarters.
- Saving of retired pay of Coast Guard officers.
- Prevention of the Coast Guard being put into the Navy.
- Obtaining an Executive Order continuing the temporary warrant officers in the War Department, after they had received the “walking papers.”
- Getting temporaries made “permanent.”
- Getting medical treatment available to families.

One of the first amendments to the Association By-Laws in the 1940s, was to allow warrants with temporary commissions (ensign and above) to hold office in the Association.

Congressional bills to amend military pay were introduced every year during the federal budget process. In 1941, at the onset of World War II, the Association paid extremely close attention to any new or proposed legislation.

Details of pay scales, showing increase or loss of pay were drafted by the Association and distributed to members. While the pay may seem miniscule today (a CWO over 18 years service received \$392 per month pay and allowances; a WO over 21 netted \$304.21), promotions were rampant. Nearly one-third, or over 200 chief warrant officers were promoted in 1941. Any CWO with more than six years was promoted to lieutenant; the rest were promoted to lieutenant junior grade.

One of the major advancements for Coast Guard warrants came on Jan. 8, 1941. On that day, all warrants in temporary grade received permanent commissions.

As the war progressed, the Association regularly made changes to the By-Laws, strengthening language concerning the rights of members to organize, the benefits of Clubs, and further defining how a member could suggest change.

Curiously enough, one change, enacted in 1943, closed membership of the Association to only former members or warrants applying before Nov. 5, 1943. This was done, according to then president F. J. Bennett, because of the “rapid expansion” of the service during wartime.

*“Due to the expansion of the Service, we have admitted quite a few new members into the Association from both the Reserve group and those which received temporary promotions. In certain cases those officers did not remain Warrant Officers long enough to become familiar with the spirit of the Warrant Corps. This rapid promotion from Warrant Officer grade to the Commission grade will continue to be rapid for the duration of the war and your Association can offer nothing to Warrant Officers of either the Reserve or those holding temporary promotions except the stipulated death benefit.”*

## AFTER THE WAR

Following World War II, one of the biggest questions facing warrants was when members would revert to their permanent ranks. Many had been advanced temporarily, and, thanks to then commandant, ADM Waesche, were paid at the rank held.

Association representatives regularly held meetings with the Reserve Officer Association, National Guard Association and congressmen (there were no women congressional representatives at the time) concerning active duty and retirement pay.

Congress proposed that the Coast Guard have 1,400 chief warrant and warrant officers following the war. One important piece of legislation being tracked and strongly supported by the Association at the time would allow those eligible to retire at the grade served during the war. The House version also detailed that a member must have 30 years of service to receive 75 percent retirement pay. This was eventually signed by the President on Feb. 21, 1946.

Under this law, a CWO with 30 years service would receive 75 percent retired pay, or \$225 per month.

Along with the retirement authorizations, were mandates for demobilization. It's interesting to note that of the commissioned officers in the Coast Guard, the reductions included:

Admirals .....	38 percent
Captains .....	27 percent
Commanders .....	32 percent
Lt. Commanders .....	70 percent
Lieutenants.....	70 percent
LTJG & Ensigns.....	70 percent
Warrant officers .....	5 percent

Also, as part of the Coast Guard's efforts to reduce personnel and demobilize, all chief warrant and warrant officers had to take a two-day examination to "assist in determining potential aptitude for permanent commissioned and warrant grade."<sup>14</sup>

The late 1940s also brought a first to the Association. In June 1946, a full-time Secretary was hired: William A. Skeen, LCDR (ret.). One year later, the Association rented a one-room office at 1105 K Street, NW., about a block from Coast Guard Headquarters on Pennsylvania Avenue.

Questions concerning membership and who was entitled to be an Association member also cropped up in 1948. Apparently, according to the by-laws, a member could continue membership when serving under a temporary commission, but when accepting a permanent commission above the rank of chief warrant officer, was forced to quit the Association.

## **PAY INEQUITIES CONTINUE**

Pay continued to be an issue through 1949. Historically, while Coast Guard warrant officer pay sometimes tracked with Navy, each military service had different pay scales for warrant officers. In 1942 the Pay Readjustment Act changed pay for warrant officers. Before 1916, chief warrant officers in the Navy and Coast Guard had only one base pay. In the interim, pay was according to “periods,” or time of service in grade.<sup>15</sup>

The system was still not equitable, however. In 1946, the base pay for a CWO was \$2,520 per year for under 10 years of commissioned service. However, pay for CWOs and WOs was capped at \$550 per month – so there were members capable of earning more, but unable to, especially those in the fourth period, or those with 20 years commissioned service.

One inequity was that warrants in the Army, originally from the Mine Planter Service, were given separate pay scales in 1916 and 1920, until the changes in 1942.

During the post-War period, the Association would regularly take draft bills and other legislative pieces, then critique or suggest on aspects of the legislation, and send out copies to congressional representatives.

In 1949, M. M. Hymer, Association president, sent Rep. Pat Sutton a detailed letter outlining changes concerning legislation aimed at “righting” inequities in warrant officer pay across the services.

Hymer drafted changes aimed at protecting warrant officer retirement pay at 20 years and ensuring that warrant pay would be Congressionally determined, not determined by the President and political appointees, or “needs of the service.”

Sutton later went on, in testifying before the Senate Armed Services Committee, that the inequities in pay, advancement and classification for warrant officers between the services be addressed, and included many of Hymer’s recommendations.

Despite Congressional interest, the pay inequities and advancement differences continued through 1949 and into the 1950s.

## **THE ASSOCIATION IN THE 1950S**

The first sessions of Congress in 1950 and 1951 supported warrant officer promotions based on “permanent” status, and only for those with six years service as a permanent warrant officer. Also at the time, advancements for W-2 to W-3 were proposed to be based through qualification by a board of officers.

The Association did not support either of these proposals, but instead pointed out that promotions based on permanent status would exclude many Coast Guard warrant officers from promotion, and that promotions should be based on the former Secretary of the Treasury’s limitations of 3 percent and 7 percent for the W-4 and W-3 pay grades (only 10 per cent of the warrant corps could serve in the W-3 to W-4 pay grades).

The Association also recommended that warrant officers should be promoted to commissioned or chief warrant officer after three years service as a warrant officer, and that promotions within the Coast Guard be based on time in service, not vacancies.

In the decade following WWII, the other services faced limitations on advancements and limitations on the number of warrant officers based on percentages. The Department of Defense stopped promoting warrant officers based on time in service and board qualification and instead used funding

availability to determine personnel positions. The Army and Air Force could also not have more than 40 per cent of their warrants in the top three pay grades.

On the other hand, the Coast Guard faced a period of slight expansion in the officer corps in the early 1950s. Many warrant officers were given the chance to apply for ensign and lieutenant junior grade positions, and more than 500 officer billets were expected to be filled.

Meanwhile, many temporary warrant officers and enlisted personnel still faced long times between promotions. In 1951, the average W-1 had 18 years of service. Many faced retirement not knowing if another promotion was right around the corner.

Indeed, one chief petty officer with a date of rank of July 1944, was still wondering in 1951 if he was due to be advanced. The other services also did not fare well; in fact, the Air Force and Army only allowed one W-4 retirement each during an 18-month period from 1950 to 1951.

One way to ease the transition into retirement, for those whose time in the Coast Guard was drawing to an end, was to save up leave time. In 1950, warrants could not only save leave and carry more than 60 days on the books, but could sell up to 60 days leave before retiring. Many considered the lump payment a “tidy sum.” According to the pay charts at the time, a W-1 with 30 years service received \$223.71 a month after retiring.

In 1951, the Navy allowed temporary promotion to chief warrant officer after 3 years as a warrant officer. However, the Coast Guard did not follow that policy, and instead, promoted on the basis of vacancies of billets; in 1951 there were 135 W-3s and 31 W-4s.

One little ditty published in the CWOA newsletter at the time was called the “Warrant Officer's Lament”:

*What have you done for the W-1?  
What can you do for the W-2?  
What will it be for the W-3?  
There ain't no more for the W-4!*

## CONGRESSIONAL TESTIMONY

In October 1951, the Association's counsel, Daniel S. Ring, a Washington, D.C. attorney, testified before a congressional subcommittee on the inequities of the Coast Guard's promotion system. At the time, nine out of 10 Coast Guard warrant and chief warrant officers belonged to the Association.

Ring told the House Armed Services subcommittee members that the Coast Guard had failed to act on authorized promotions, and asked that Congress set the standards and rate of advancement for warrant officers, as was done for all other officers in the services.

Congressional members would take Ring's recommendations seriously because such a high percentage of active duty members belonged to the Association; they knew that the Association's voice was not just part of a fragmented minority, but truly represented the wishes of Coast Guard warrants. Ring reported:

*“We are the general counsel of the Warrant and Chief Warrant Officers Association of the United States Coast Guard ... That is an organization with approximately a membership of about 850 to 900. Its purposes are stated in the preamble, which declare their first loyalty, of course, to the Coast Guard and to the United States, and they believe, they say, that through social association and mutual acquaintance the Chief Warrant and Warrant Officers Association*

*of the Coast Guard may best advance in their professional abilities, enhance their value, loyalty and devotion to the service, and promote its unity and morale.*

*“It is with these propositions very clearly in mind that the organization has asked me to attend these hearings whenever the opportunity arises.*

*“There are several things that are a little hard for the warrant officers to understand. I had better say that I think this is the only organization of warrant officers in existence. The others might be able to come before you here and speak as individuals, but this group is approximately the vast majority of warrant officers that are in the Coast Guard.*

*“I think they are the only ones that can speak for a unified voice.”<sup>16</sup>*

Ring went on to endorse Congressional action to make all W-1s warrant officers, and W-2 and up as chief warrant officers and commissioned officers on first appointment.

At this time, the biggest issue facing the warrant corps was the arbitrary percentages assigned by the Secretary of the Treasury to the number of warrants allowed in the service. Although other services were promoting warrants, the Coast Guard, under the Department of Treasury, suffered no such advantage. Many warrants had more than six years service as W-1, or W-2, but could not get promoted. Part of the proposal also included the following schedule of advancement for warrants:

W-1	to	W-2	—	three years
W-2	to	W-3	—	six years
W-3	to	W-4	—	six years

One month later, following the testimony, the Secretary of the Treasury rescinded the percentage distributions and authorized promotions for warrants based on time of commissioned service. Unfortunately, W-1s, who at the time earned less than chief petty officers, were still not promoted following three years service, and had to wait until serving six years before receiving W-2.

This time in service was not reduced to three years until late 1952, but further disincentive to advance to W-1 occurred with the 1952 pay scale, when a W-1 with 14 years made \$25 less a month than a PO1 with the same amount of service!

## **ASSOCIATION COMMUNICATION EFFORTS**

Throughout the entire post-war period, the Association used many means of trying to communicate with members, the Coast Guard, and Congress. These efforts included:

- Tracking new members and publishing their names.
- Tracking member retirements and deaths.
- Tracking promotions and transfers.
- Compiling statistics about Association membership and warrant corps strengths in the Coast Guard and other services.
- Publishing congressional testimony about service-related issues.
- Highlighting new Coast Guard personnel policies and offering comments or suggestions for improvement.
- Continuing to have professional counsel lobby and testify before Congress as an official

representative.

- Polling and balloting members for opinions on important issue, and then publishing the results.
- Reporting on the efforts of and formation of new clubs around the country.
- Drafting letters and articles for publication in service-related magazines.
- Holding social functions such as dances or picnics to offer members the opportunity to share in fraternal camaraderie.

But perhaps the most effective means of communicating new needs and ideas were the Association's presentations to the Coast Guard Commandant. CDR Theodore LeBlanc, president from 1937-1941, wrote more than 30 years ago:

*"I recall one occasion in the late thirties, when we were told that the Warrant Officers' Association was the most effective service group ever organized; and a great measure of its success was due primarily to the presentations of its problems, varied as they were, to the Commandant."*

But LeBlanc was also writing about the future efforts of the Association too:

"As I see it, the Association must never operate as a protection for any individual, but on the premise that it operates to achieve such material benefits which the Corps feels are due them, and which benefit the entire group. It strikes me that the Association currently should be striving to improve the status of the Warrant Officer as such, with particular reference to new Warrant Officers being appointed.

"In order that the Association be attractive to the newly-appointed Warrant Officers, it should have a program with some benefits for them, administered by officers who have committed themselves to conducting the Association for the benefit of the entire group and not any single category. If the Association is to grow, as I hope it will; and if it is to remain an 'ever green organization,' plans must be developed continuing benefits for the new members, who by the mere passage of time will ultimately become older members and the guiding hands of the group."

## **ORGANIZATION, ADVANCEMENT & LEGISLATION**

Association efforts to sponsor new clubs around the country continued. In September 1952, the Groton-New London CWOA club was formed, and four officers elected. A year later, the New York district club (Third Coast Guard District) was reactivated.

In 1952, the average Coast Guard warrant officer had nearly 17 years service with more than four years service in the corps. The average chief warrant had more than 21 years service with more than 10 years as a warrant and chief warrant. One of the hopes of the Association was to be able to help its members to be able to retire as a W-4 with 30 years service.

There were also opportunities for advancement. One program offered warrants, 36 years old or less, the chance to attend a 16-week officer training course at New London, CT, and graduate as a lieutenant (junior grade). On May 1, 1953, CDR Neils P. Thomsen became the first member of the Association to attain the rank of captain (he was promoted on the retired list).

It wasn't until 1954 that Congressional legislation aimed at rectifying the differences between warrants in the service was finally introduced.

Known as the "Warrant Officers Bill," it was designed to, according to the Association newsletter

to: provide uniform grades, define grades and pay grades; get rid of differences in the service appointment processes; offer common promotion systems; provide for a uniform system of warrant officer attrition; provide for severance pay for warrants and generally revise and modernize laws pertaining to warrant officer programs in the services.

When finally passed in May 1954, the bill finally defined time in service for promotions through the warrant ranks; three years for W-1 to W-2; six years from W-2 to W-3 and another six years from W-3 to W-4. The bill also created uniform retirement for all service warrants, and provided for severance pay: two months' basic pay for each year of active service, with a limit of two years basic pay.

Retirement became mandatory for all warrants who reached age 60, but allowed service beyond 30 years if approved by the service secretary.

There were many other aspects affecting warrants in the bill, especially in the area of promotions and retirements.

The law, finally known as the Warrant Officer Act of 1954, (Public Law 379, 83rd Congress), also created the now-familiar collar devices, shoulder boards and sleeve marks for warrant officers of all the services.

The law's effects can still be seen even today, as warrant officers are the only rank with similarity of uniform markings across the services.

Because of the complexity of the bill, and the role the Association played in helping Congressman Leslie C. Arends to "pilot" the bill through Congress and to presidential signature, the White House sent the Association the pen used by President Eisenhower to sign the bill into law.

The pen and letter from the White House still hang on a wall in the Association office in Washington, D.C.

## **NEW CLUBS**

In 1956, the New Orleans Club organized and held its first meeting, with the local district commander, RADM J. A. Kerrins, as the guest speaker. Club meetings around the country served as focal points for warrant officer gatherings, were usually held as social dinners, and often included local celebrities and government opinion leaders.

In one meeting that year, the Boston Club held a dinner with music by Rudy Vallee, and speeches by the governor of Massachusetts, a Mr. Herter, a Mr. Hynes, the mayor of Boston, and a future president of the United States, then Senator John F. Kennedy.<sup>17</sup>

Clubs continued to meet around the country. In the eastern United States, warrants met at the Groton-New London Club at the USCG Training Station in Groton, CT, the New York District Club at USCG Base St. George on Staten Island, NY, at the Norfolk Club in Norfolk, VA, and at the Boston District Club at USCG Base, Boston, MA.

Elsewhere in the United States, members in the Midwest met at the Great Lakes Club, usually in Cleveland, OH. In the southern United States, local members met at the New Orleans Club. Cape May Club (later renamed Cape Island Club) members met at the USCG Receiving Center in Cape May, NJ.

And out in the West, there was the Mid-Pacific Club in Honolulu, HI. Members also met at the Golden Gate Club at the USCG Air Station in South San Francisco, CA, where at a Mar. 1, 1957 meeting, the club's original, 28-year-old charter, missing for a number of years, finally turned up. Dated Sept. 1, 1929, it was signed by R. N. Gillis as president, and J.J. Hinton as secretary-treasurer, and



was issued from the CWOA in Boston, MA. (The name of the club changed in 1958 to the Golden Gate Warrant Officers Club.)

In Washington, DC, the Association continued to serve from its offices at 13th and Pennsylvania Ave. in what was then known as the Pennsylvania Building. Attorney Dan Ring continued to serve as counsel, and helped create and distribute "Survivors Benefit Kits," containing legal forms and instructions for widows of Association members. Ring also continued to track and interpret legislative trends from Capitol Hill, and highlight items of interest as they developed through congressional subcommittee.

The death gratuity benefits for members with over 16 years membership was raised from \$300 to \$500 in 1957. Members who contributed full dues for 200 months also became eligible for half dues. And that same year, an Association pin was proposed by CHMACH H. J. Harris, adopted for use, and distributed free to all members.

Even more importantly, Coast Guard chief warrant and warrant officers became eligible in 1957 to retire in the highest commissioned grade previously held, correcting an unintentional inequity in the Warrant Officer Act, which omitted Coast Guard WOs and CWOs from this benefit.

## **THE START OF THE 1960S**

By 1958, there were 1,444 Association members, with nearly one-third retirees from active service. By 1961, this number would jump to 1,679.

The next several years would bring a number of changes to the corps in the Coast Guard. One of first changes, presented, approved and sheperded by the Association became what was known at the "2-4-4" program. Coast Guard warrant and chief warrants, with the approval of then Commandant A. C. Richmond, now became eligible for promotion from W-1 to W-2 after two years service; from W-2 to W-3 after four years service, and W-3 to W-4 after another four years service. It should be noted, however, that this time frame was for *temporary appointments*; permanent appointments were based on a 3-6-6 time frame.

This promotion schedule was also important because of near pay inequities following the creation of the "super-enlisted" ranks of E8 and E9. Even though warrant promotions were now based on regular examinations held each May, many turned down warrant officer appointment, viewing the pay inequities of warrant promotion as less desirable.

The Commandant, along with other dignitaries, regularly attended Association meetings. Mr. Bruce Sundlun, a new attorney representing the Association from the firm of Amram, Hahn and Sundlun, also regularly invited other Washington decision-makers, such as Sen. Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island, who spoke at a February 1961 Association meeting at the Coast Guard's Washington Radio Station.

Luncheons were often held at famous meeting places in Washington, D.C. One month after Pell's speech (Pell was a member of the Coast Guard Reserve), the assistant secretary of the Treasury, A. Gilmore Flues, met with the Association president, vice-president and secretary at the National Press Club to discuss Coast Guard issues.<sup>18</sup>

These meetings, arranged because the dignitaries were formerly in the Coast Guard, or interested in the Coast Guard, or held because of the contacts and influence of the Association's counsel, were extremely important for the Association and its members to stay in touch with the status and movement of pending legislation.

Congressional dinners were held regularly. Usually present were assistant secretaries from the

Treasury Department and Coast Guard admirals from the Office of Personnel.

The federal legislative process can take months to years for drafting, approval, passage or defeat of military related bills. Separating fact from fiction, and informing elected officials and their staff of important needs or wording can make the crucial difference in inclusion or omission of text in a law, which can then greatly affect members' benefits. Sorting through congressional testimony, drafts of subcommittee reports, and revisions of proposed bills for leads to important information concerning the Coast Guard warrant corps is sometimes like searching for a needle in a haystack.<sup>19</sup>

By 1963, the Association membership had grown to 1,847. The youngest member was 26 years old and the oldest, obviously a retiree, was 83 (the oldest retired Coast Guardsman, a non-member, was 99; not until 15 years later would the Association would have a senior member 100 years old<sup>20</sup>).

Members' interest in Congress focused mainly on pay bills, with the Association submitting testimony to the House Committee on Armed Forces to support equality of pay for W-1 through W-4 on a par with O-1 through O-4 pay. Part of the inequity in pay continued with the E-8 and E-9 scales, in which these CPOs would earn more than the warrant officers they worked for. Part of one such document submitted to Congress read:

*"The Coast Guard Warrant Officer carries responsibility with his rank equivalent to that of higher officers in the Armed Services. Warrant Officers in the Coast Guard serve as commanding officers of certain types of buoy tenders, lightships, and harbor tugs. They also serve as commanding officer of supply depots, radio stations, group commands, and lifeboat stations. Yet for all this responsibility under the present pay status they are compensated at far lesser rates than those of individuals serving in the Armed Services holding comparable commissioned grades. Although commissioned officer grades and the corresponding Warrant Officer grades have identical entitlement to quarters allowance and weight allowances for shipment of household goods, the Warrant Officer is discriminated against in the pay scales. For although the individual assignment and responsibilities generally are the same as higher ranked officers both in the Coast Guard itself and the other services, his rate and pay is significantly less."*<sup>21</sup>

## **2,000 MEMBERS & CONTINUAL BYLAWS CHANGES**

At the same time the Association focused efforts on remedying pay inequities, efforts were also underway to modify the By-Laws to allow those members who had received temporary commissions and who were former members, to be allowed to continue their Association membership. Changes were also made to allow inactive Reserve warrants entry into the Association.

Changes were also made to hire a full-time Secretary for the Association. Compensation for travel and mileage was updated, and moves were made for reacceptance of officers who were disenrolled following acceptance of commissions.

By 1964, only 137 out of more than one thousand active duty warrants were not members of the Association, and the membership topped the 2,000 mark.

The Association continued to offer life insurance to all members, and while never operating in a deficit condition, there were numerous studies conducted during the 1960s to examine whether members would be better served through a group life insurance policy, rather than a straight payment through funds held in investment by the Association. Costs for death benefits climbed to \$12,000 for

1964.

While life insurance posed the greatest potential liability (nearly \$60,000), there were other costs too. For example, by the mid-1960s, the annual cost for the Association counsel reached \$6,000. The annual cost of running the Association, including death benefits, rent, the permanent Secretary and mailing and printing costs, topped \$33,800 in 1964.

Income came in the form of dues for active duty members, which could be collected by monthly allotment, but upon retirement, members had to pay the lump sum costs of membership each Sept. 1. The majority of Association funds held, \$56,330, were kept in government bonds, which were shifted to different bonds occasionally to receive higher yields.

Actuarial studies in 1964 showed that to be financially sound the Association needed more than \$97,000 held in securities or investments.

New members paid a \$5 initiation fee (although this was dropped a year later). After 16 years and 8 months (paying \$375), members were eligible for payment of half dues. After another 8 years and 4 months, they became dues free.

Luckily, Association membership continued to increase, with new revenues also made possible by the addition of a club in Miami, FL, in March 1965. But the potential for financial problems continued to loom in the future, despite the fact that membership had more than doubled in the last 10 years. One interesting fact was that in 1965, while the average American's life expectancy was 70 years, most Association members only lived 56 years!<sup>2218</sup> More than 45 percent of the membership were on the retired rolls.

There were now 13 district clubs of the Association:

Boston District Club .....	Boston, MA
Groton-New London Club .....	New London, CT
New York District Club .....	New York, NY
Cape Island Club .....	Cape May, NJ
Norfolk District Club.....	Portsmouth, VA
Miami District Club .....	Hialiah, FL
New Orleans District Club .....	New Orleans, LA
Great Lakes Club.....	Cleveland, OH
St. Louis District Club .....	St. Louis, MO
Southern Calif. District Club .....	Long Beach, CA
Golden Gate Club .....	San Francisco, CA
Pacific Northwest Club .....	Seattle, WA
Mid Pacific Club .....	Honolulu, HI

Three years later, three more clubs would be established:

Yorktown Club.....	Yorktown, VA
Juneau Club .....	Juneau, AK
Far Out Club .....	Viet Nam <sup>23</sup>

## TOWARDS THE END OF THE 60S

From time to time, each of the services increased or decreased warrant corps strengths. For

several years during the early 1960s, the Marine Corps nearly phased out its warrant ranks, and at one time had less than 2,000 warrant officers on active duty.

The Navy too, had considered reducing its ranks of warrant officers several years earlier. But the Army was the service with the greatest number: more than 14,000, and indeed, planned to increase that number 4,000 more in 1966. It was about the same time that the Army also indicated interest in expanding its pay grades to include a W-5 and W-6; this idea would bear fruit almost 25 years later.

Meanwhile, the Coast Guard warrant ranks, while still about 25 percent of the officer corps, continued to suffer because of pay inequities between the W-1 and E-8 or E-9 ranks. Many enlisted turned down the opportunity to advance because of pay and potential retirement pay cuts when advancing to warrant officer.

To address this problem, the Association polled members, and asked a number of active duty personnel what could be done to rectify the situation. In July 1966, the Association appealed to the Commandant, ADM Willard J. Smith, citing the following:

*“... failure to entice these experienced personnel to accept appointment may result in a lowering of the standards of the warrant corps of the Coast Guard.*

*“A study by the Association reveals the reason for the lack of interest is the pay differential which now exists between the warrant and the E-8 and E-9 enlisted grades. It is true that over a period of time, about 12 years under the present 2-4-4 time-in-grade policy, a warrant officer’s cumulative gross earnings will overtake the earnings of the E-9 for the same period. When they consider the loss they must suffer in monthly pay, our enlisted men are reluctant to make this monetary sacrifice for promotion at a time when their financial responsibilities are the greatest.”<sup>24</sup>*

The Commandant replied, acknowledged the problem, formed a personnel board for an in-depth study, and promised a reply with the study results.

## **NEW DEPARTMENT & PROMOTION OPPORTUNITIES**

The next biggest move for the Coast Guard was into a newly created department. After having spent more than 177 years under the Treasury Department, the Coast Guard now found itself under new management. The last few years had brought new rules, regulations and laws that had to be enforced, as well as new ships, such as the 210-foot medium-endurance and 378-foot high-endurance cutters. These new duties and ships required greater technical expertise, along with experienced management.

Obviously, a program was needed to increase the number of officers with technical experience in the middle grades.

Three months after asking the Commandant to look into the current pay inequities and promotion time frame for the warrant corps, the Association again wrote the Commandant to ask for consideration of a Limited Duty Officer, or LDO, program for the warrant corps, and suggested that if the current warrant grades were to be eliminated, that warrants be given the opportunity to serve in the corresponding officer grade (e.g., W-1 as O-1, W-2 as O-2, etc.).

Several months later, the Coast Guard created the Warrant to Lieutenant program, although the Association did not take credit for influencing this action. The initial quota of 45 candidates allowed W-2s eligible for promotion to W-3, W-3s and W-4s to apply. Each warrant had to have at least 16 and not more than 25 years service (a year later, this was revised to 22 years). Further quotas were

promised for the next year.

### **NEW PROMOTIONS FOR WARRANTS**

March 1967 brought a big change to the warrant officer promotion system. Following the Association's request and a Coast Guard study, the Commandant approved the following:

- Upon initial appointment to W-1, an immediate promotion to temporary W-2.
- Promotion to temporary W-3 after four years following temporary W-2.
- Temporary W-4 after five years after becoming temporary W-3.
- All W-1s were immediately promoted to temporary W-2, with promotion to temporary W-3 four years after the W-1 appointment and temporary W-4 nine years from W-1.
- Specialties were dropped from the address.
- Another study was to be conducted to look into changing the names of warrant specialties.
- Seek legislation to get a uniform allowance for an E-6 appointed to warrant.<sup>25</sup>
- Seek legislation to eliminate the required promotion physical.<sup>26</sup>

This certainly made a lot of W-1s happy! These new policies were a big step in helping to rectify some of the pay inequities in order to entice more enlisted personnel into accepting warrant officer appointments.

### **CWOA'S 40TH BIRTHDAY**

The Association celebrated 40 years of service to the Coast Guard warrant corps in January 1969.

In looking back on the early formation of the Association, then President John A. Keller admitted that "some of our early history has been lost through the demise of our early members."

Indeed, the first president, Chief Pay Clerk Raymond N. Gillis, had passed over the bar, as well as the first president in Washington, D.C., Pay Clerk Carlin L. Brinkley, who served from 1930 to 1933, and who was installed at the D.C. YMCA on Oct. 3, 1930.

In 40 years, the Association had grown to 15 District Clubs and more than 2,500 members. And, when the Coast Guard moved to the new Department of Transportation Building (the Nassif Building), the Association also moved, occupying new quarters at L'Enfant Plaza on Oct. 25, 1969.

### **A NEW DECADE, THE 1970S**

The early 1970s would bring further expansion of the Association membership to more than 2,600 members, and the formation of two new clubs: one in Astoria, OR, called the Columbia River Club, and another, called the Oklahoma City Club, in Oklahoma City, OK.

The Coast Guard's next commandant, ADM Chester R. Bender, now best known for the "Bender Blues," our current uniform, was first feted at a dinner in the Washington Navy Yard in Washington, D.C. The first request made by the Association of the new commandant was to ask for a review of policies concerning the requirement that temporary LTs must serve 4 years before being eligible for

retirement, the requirement that W-2s through W-4s must serve 2 years active duty before becoming eligible for retirement, and the fact that a retirement request had to be submitted six months in advance of a retirement date.

At the same time, the Department of Defense conducted numerous studies on the complex issues of service retirement and disability benefits. The Association responded by letter to a direct request from the assistant secretary of Defense, Robert T. Kelley, and then followed up by attending a series of meetings at the Pentagon.

While the Association was able to represent the majority of Coast Guard warrant officers, there were also other service-affiliated organizations that could also have a large, if not greater, impact or influence on executive or congressional decision-making. Several years earlier, in 1969, the Association joined the Council of Military Organizations, COMO, made up of 17 different military organizations and at the time, 600,000 members. At the time, there were more than 1,250 Coast Guard warrants, with another 29,200 in the other services.

### **3,000-MEMBER MARK REACHED**

By 1974, the Association membership had climbed to 2,914. A year later, membership would top 3,000 members. Four new clubs were formed: the Greater Jacksonville Area Club in 1972, the Elizabeth City Club in Elizabeth City, NC in 1972, a club in Kodiak, AK in 1970, and the Redwood Empire Club in Petaluma, CA in 1971.

New issues concerning the warrant corps arose, were addressed by the Association and brought to the attention of Coast Guard program managers. The Association, after meeting with ADM Bender was able to define and clarify a number of policies:

- Stabilization of warrant tours.
- No transfers between 27 and 30 years duty.
- Geographic longevity would determine which warrant would transfer first.
- Normal tour lengths would be 3 to 4 years.

Other issues also pursued included parity pay for W-1 to W-4 and O-1 to O-4; command at sea pay for commissioned warrants, and a permanent promotion schedule based on 2-4-4, vice the current 3-6-6.

Following ADM Bender's retirement, and the appointment of ADM Owen W. Siler as commandant, the Association focused on the following long-range goals:

- Allowing deep selection of warrants.
- Reducing the time from W-3 to W-4 from 5 years to 4.
- Purchase of a townhouse for the Association offices to lower costs.
- Educational programs for personnel.
- Responsibility" pay for warrants serving as COs.

### **TIME IN GRADE REDUCTION**

Within 18 months, on Oct. 15, 1976, ADM Siler released ALDIST 257, which reduced the time-in-grade requirement for W-4 from 5 years to 4 years. However, Siler vetoed any consideration of deep selection for warrant officers because he was not “convinced that the service and Warrant Officers will benefit by deep selections.”<sup>27</sup>

While pay, promotion and retirement continued to be the focus of attention, the Association started several new programs, the first aimed at augmenting health benefits by offering supplemental medical insurance. Members were polled in March 1977, and asked to fill out a questionnaire to determine health needs.

The Association also started a college scholarship program in 1977, aimed at helping members’ dependents enrolled in an undergraduate program. Funds were raised through raffles, solicitations for donations, and contributions from local clubs, which now totalled 23 around the country. Nearly \$3,000 was awarded in the first two years of the program. By 1981, the Association Scholarship Fund, because of local club contributions, would grow to more than \$7,500. The Fund would eventually become known as the CWO John A. Keller CW&WOA Scholarship Grant. Three grants, presented each August, award a first, second and third place to students seeking schooling beyond high school. Ten years after being started, this Association program would help more than 30 students, and in 1987, award nearly \$7,000 in grants.

## **NEW DEVELOPMENTS**

In 1977, the Office of Personnel created a study group to look at new directions for the warrant corps. The study was to consider:

- An Officers Indoctrination Class for warrants.<sup>28</sup>
- Courses of indoctrination instruction for new warrant officers.
- A revision of the warrant officer examination.
- More selective, rigid competition for promotion.

The Association was asked to join the study, and the president, CWO Dave T. Daniels, joined the group, along with five other warrant officers. Nearly 1,200 questionnaires were mailed to Association members, and 900 came back within two weeks.

According to Daniels, most Association members agreed that the examinations should undergo revision. Nearly all members wanted to advance past W-4. Many members (mainly retirees with the benefit of hindsight) also mentioned that the 30-year mandatory retirement restriction should be lifted, saying that they found themselves forced out of a job after 30 years, usually at age 50, and then found many employers reluctant to hire them.

Daniels also stated that many supported the idea of an officers indoctrination course, with the aim of preparing warrants for broader responsibility.<sup>29</sup>

Personnel statistics on warrant retirements compiled for the study showed two interesting facts: in the last seven years the number of warrants retiring as W-3 had more than tripled; while the number of W-2 and W-4 retirements were down 50 percent.

There were also new avenues to advancement open to warrants. The warrant to lieutenant program, started in 1967, had been discontinued five years later. However, in 1978, the program was

started again, this time “very limited and tightly controlled.”<sup>30</sup>

Applications were once again considered from CWO3s and CWO4s, except this time only from members with 18 to 26 years service. Initially, 10 warrants were given the chance for promotion, but over the next three years 14, 17, and then 18 chief warrant officers were appointed to lieutenant. At the same time, the study group recommended, and the Office of Personnel approved, changing Officer Candidate School age limits for warrants – eligibility until the age of 40!



## **50 YEARS OF SERVICE & THE 1980S**

In 1979, the Association was 50 years old. Membership reached 3,179; a year later this number would climb to 3,302. The annual meeting and 50th Anniversary celebration was held Sept. 27-29 in Washington, D.C. at Coast Guard Headquarters and the L'Enfant Plaza Hotel. One month later, a Cadet Review at the Coast Guard Academy, with more than 100 warrant officers and Association members, also celebrated the anniversary.

Additional clubs would be formed or organized during the upcoming year – the Philadelphia Club, chartered in late 1980, the Space Coast Club in 1980 at Merritt Island, FL and a group of 11 warrants wanting to reissue the Columbia River Club at Group Astoria, OR. By 1981, there was also the South Texas Club in Corpus Christi, TX.

There were concerns in the early 1980s about the retention of warrant officers in the Coast Guard. When the armed services changed over to an all-volunteer force following the Viet Nam War, all services redoubled their recruiting and retention efforts. In the Coast Guard, the Office of Personnel sponsored several study groups; the Association was represented in these studies by the president or members stationed at Headquarters.

The CWO to lieutenant program was still in effect, and other programs, aimed at higher education for selected warrants were started. In 1981, a program for Personnel and Finance & Supply warrants was started. Three warrants were given the opportunity for a free two-year college education.

## **THE CIVIL SERVICE & RETIRED PAY THREAT**

The early 1960s also saw a potential reversal of retired pay compensation policy for all retired military officers working for the federal government. Originally, retired military officers, including warrant officers, were barred from working for the federal government. The earliest law prohibiting service dated back to 1894, and was generally known as the Dual Office Act. The only exceptions allowed were officers elected to public office, or appointed to office by the President, “by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.”<sup>31</sup>

More than 30 years later, the Economy Act of 1932 would specifically prohibit commissioned officers from receiving military retired pay when the retired pay and federal salary exceeded \$10,000.

The Association would continue to seek the same entitlements for warrants as enlisted members concerning retired military pay and a federal salary. Mark B. Sandground, the Association counsel in 1961, argued:

*“The severity of the prohibition is clear when one considers the nature of the warrant officer’s duty and his financial position at retirement; a warrant officer is a specialist in a very limited field. Upon retirement, sometimes it is exceedingly difficult for him to find private civilian employment because of his specialization during the years he devoted to government service.”*

The Association “was instrumental in introducing” a 1961 House Resolution, H.R. 6637, which would have exempted retired Coast Guard warrants from the Dual Office Act.

Two years later, following an intensive letter-writing campaign urged by the Association, some of the more restrictive covenants of the Dual Office Act were repealed. In its place, however, remain several statutes and public laws with provisions not for cutting “earned salary,” such as that made by federal employment, but reductions of retired pay, based on federal salary:

- 5 USC 5532, reductions of military pay due to federal employment
- 5 USC 5533, limits on pay entitlement
- 5 USC 5536, prohibitions on civilian employment of active-duty military

Eventually, all retired officers were forced to give up a percentage of retired pay in return for the privilege of working for the federal government (a practice which continues today). There were also very strict regulations and stiff penalties for any retired officer who was involved in the sale of goods to the government within three years following retirement.

Additionally, warrant retirees also faced an additional cap on pay, based on the rate of basic pay of level V employees under Executive Schedule. That meant, that at least as of 1990, retired warrants were denied full retired pay if the combined retired pay and federal salary exceeded \$78,200.

The Association had always supported the idea of allowing retired warrants to serve and then retire from government service as civilians without penalty; after all, they had worked and endured many hardships to earn their first retirement, hadn't they?

Apparently, the Civil Service, its constituents, and a number of elected officials didn't think so. In June 1981, a House of Representatives Post Office and Civil Service Committee voted to reduce the federal salaries of all military retirees (retired enlisted did not have to forfeit any retired pay, again, a practice continued today) by the full amount of retired pay!

The Association bitterly opposed this action, and urged its members to contact their representatives with their feelings about this move. Some members of Congress viewed military retired pay as a "pension," and not "earned deferred compensation," as the Association did, and does today. The proposal died in the House.

Other changes to retired pay included caps on cost-of-living adjustments, and computing retired pay based on the highest three years of base pay.

## **REDUCTIONS IN FORCE**

Besides staying in touch with last-minute legislation moving through Congress, the Association continued to stay in touch with other service warrant officer organizations. In Sept. 1981, the Association president, Theodore J. Falter, met with Army and Navy warrant corps representatives at the Warrant Officer Division of the U.S. Army's Officer Personnel Management Directorate in Alexandria, VA.

Some of the issues discussed included:

- Limited Duty Officer, LDO promotions.
- CWO selection criteria.
- CWO prestige.
- Assignments.
- CWO, E8 - E-9 pay and proposed pay.

In 1981, President Ronald Reagan proposed sweeping reductions in the budget, pay and personnel strengths of various federal agencies, but not the Department of Defense armed services. Part of these

cuts, coming down through the Department of Transportation, meant an extremely lean budget for the Coast Guard.

There were even discussions by staffers in the Office of Management and Budget and DOT about dismantling the Coast Guard (although, according to at least one published news story, Deputy Transportation Secretary Darrell Trent denied that any group in DOT had “considered dismantling the Coast Guard”).<sup>32</sup>

In February 1982, Association President Lewis J. Tolleson wrote a letter to President Reagan to make him aware of the impact of these cuts, and to urge consideration of moving the Coast Guard to the Department of Defense.

The Commandant, ADM John B. Hayes, responded for the President, and agreed that the cuts would have an impact, but did not agree that the Coast Guard should move to DoD.

In response to protests from the Association and other friends of the Coast Guard, several bills were introduced in Congress to provide the Coast Guard money, not only to carry on its business, but for an increased budget (from little over \$2 billion to \$2.55 billion)!

At the same time, Tolleson also signed a joint document with 14 other members of COMO to protest proposed cuts in military and retired military pay. Thank-you letters of support were received from a number of Coast Guard active and retired admirals, as well as several members of Congress.

The Association had a number of legislative “objectives” in the early 1980s, and in May 1982, published a list:

- Prevent harmful changes in military and retired pay.
- Improve the Survivor Benefit Plan (a plan which allows for monies for widowed spouses of military retirees).
- Retirement credit for enlisted reserve service.
- Eliminate reductions in Social Security annuities of federal employees with military service.
- Get recomputation of retired pay that was below the current levels.
- Fight for appropriated fund support of com-missaries.
- Provide severance pay for enlisted personnel involuntarily separated with less than 20 years service.
- Permit concurrent receipt of VA disability compensation and military retired pay.
- Broaden CHAMPUS to include dental care.
- Eliminate the discriminatory Dual Compensation Law.

The Association continued to monitor Executive and congressional actions, frequently sent letters, telegrams and mailgrams, and urged members to contact their elected representatives.

## **IMPROVED FINANCES**

Another change came to the Association in 1981. Members dues were raised to \$3 per month. Active duty and retired members could have their dues paid by allotment. Membership continued to grow modestly, and hovered around 3,500 for several years. The financial outlook of the Association improved, although there were considerable costs for leasing the office spaces (\$27,000 per year by 1985). By 1983, there was \$88,500 income from dues, \$18,000 from dividends and \$100 from

donations (Other donations came from allotments, bequeaths, and Scholarship Fund donations).

The Association continued to be represented and included on important studies and panels in the Coast Guard. Three members served on the 1983 Uniform Board, helping to make decisions such as allowing umbrellas for the service, requiring swords for women officers, allowing dark blue baseball caps, discontinuing tropical whites, authorizing the Air Force wooly pooly, creating Winter Dress Blues and standardizing on black gloves for all members.

The Little Club on the Prairie in Topeka, KS was formed in 1983. Then another new club, the San Diego Club, was chartered in September 1984 to bring the total number of clubs to 28. By 1984, there were 1,470 Coast Guard CWOs. The Association membership remained around 3,500.

### **NEW FLOATING OFFICE FOR THE ASSOCIATION**

In 1985 a Building Fund was established, with \$1,200 by the year's end.

Office space costs continued to mount, forcing the Association to look at other options. At one meeting, a suggestion came up, mentioning that instead of paying more than \$27,000 per year on an office lease, that a mooring slip in the marina next to Coast Guard Headquarters could be rented from the National Park Service for \$1,500 a year.

According to CWO Dee Sadler, of the Relocation Committee, nearly "200 persons and organizations made contributions. Seven of them were for \$500 or more."<sup>33</sup>

A large plaque of names for the first 125 contributors of \$50 or more, and a large plaque for contributions made in the "Memory Of" remains on display in the Association office.

After consideration and approval, a 42-foot Trident houseboat with a galley and 1,100 square feet of office space was ordered for \$100,000, with delivery slated for August, and the move-in for September 1986. The new office would become known as "THE BARGE."

Two years later, in 1987, there would be more than \$14,000 in the Building Fund, thanks to generous contributions from members, clubs and other organizations.

### **U. S. ARMY RECONSIDERS W-5 PROGRAM**

That same year the U.S. Army was again investigating the creation of a W-5 warrant officer rank, along with tighter controls on selective retention of warrant officers past 20 years service. The Army wanted a more "progressive development" system for its warrant officers, along with billets and responsibilities tied to a particular rank; in other words, a W-1 or W-2 would not have as much responsibility as a W-4 or W-5. The Army anticipated its W-5s to have at least 20 years warrant officer service.

RADM Bell of the Office of Personnel, flatly denied any Coast Guard interest in the program.

Speaking before a CWOA meeting Sept. 19, 1985, he said "... forget it baby! ... I don't know what problems the Army has, but if they have the correct solution to it, so be it. I don't think we have a problem and we have not tried to mirror the other services in their warrant officer corps. We all have different responsibilities between the services in respect to how the warrant officers are assigned and the role they play. Unless there is a need that you can demonstrate, I can't see going to the W-5s."

### **PAY, PROMOTION & RETIREMENT**

Coast Guard chief warrant officers still had promotion opportunities. The Coast Guard had continued the CWO to lieutenant program, and had also started a CWO College Program, offering postgraduate studies to several warrants from selected specialties each year.

Warrant officers were also ensured of command afloat opportunities for the BOSN speciality; 15 were commanding black hull cutters. Two years later, when the Coast Guard introduced the 110-foot cutters, two warrants were slated for commanding officer. Unfortunately, while officers in pay grades O-3 to O-6 were eligible for responsibility pay, warrant officers were left out of the U.S. Code, and did not receive the pay, although serving in similar positions of responsibility.

The Association wrote then commandant, ADM Paul Yost in 1988, pointing out this inequity. ADM Yost wrote back:

*“Your point is well taken and I agree that the level of compensation for warrant officers commanding Coast Guard cutters deserves investigation. I have asked the Chief of the Office of Navigation Safety and Waterway Services to review this matter and, if appropriate, initiate a proposal of legislation amending 37 USC 306.”*<sup>34</sup>

ADM Yost later approved the Association’s proposal, which would also benefit O-2s with command afloat responsibility.<sup>35</sup>

An important retirement pay benefit was reinforced in 1987 when the Board for Correction of Military Records allowed that a lieutenant could retire with the pay of a CWO4, even though retiring as an O-3, and never serving as a CWO4, but having been selected to CWO4. This decision was based on the fact that the member would have received *lower* retirement pay for having chosen to answer the Coast Guard’s needs for lieutenants, even though eligible for the lower grade of CWO4 with higher retired pay.

The next year, the Coast Guard also improved the CWO to lieutenant program. The minimum time in service for eligibility had been 18 years, but was then changed to 13 years. The maximum amount of time in service was 22 years, but was increased to 26 years. According to the Office of Personnel, the minimum time in service was changed to allow CWO to lieutenants the opportunity to reach the rank of commander. The decision was also made to increase the number of CWO to lieutenant selections by a third.

There were also changes in the Association. In 1988, a change in the By-Laws formed a Board of Directors, consisting of the Association officers. The Association also became incorporated in 1988, and a new computer system to assist with filing, correspondence and office paperwork was installed. Additionally, two new clubs, the Southern New England Club at Air Station Cape Cod, MA and the Rocky Coast Club in Portland, ME were chartered in December.

## **FURTHER WOMA DEVELOPMENTS**

The Army continued pursuing the Warrant Officer Management Act in 1989. While the Association tracked service and legislative developments concerning a new W-5 rank and associated control over warrant officers, the Coast Guard started studies in two directions: a Warrant Officer Management Project team to plan for implementing any new warrant legislation and a Workforce Planning study of the warrant corps.

Some of the questions about the program revolved around billets, promotions and whether the Coast Guard could afford a W-5 rank. The Association sent a questionnaire to all members, and the Coast Guard sent a 30-question task analysis to each active duty warrant officer.

This new program galvanized a response from all warrant officers. Nearly 500 responses were received from Association members, along with more than 100 requests for membership. The majority of members agreed that:

- The Coast Guard should not adopt the program unless each speciality was given an opportunity for selection to W-5.
- The current promotion schedule of 0-4-4, which had taken nearly 30 years to acquire, should not be affected.
- Billets should not be re-designated from CWO4 to W-2, W-3, W-4 or W-5 if promotions became dependent on vacancies.
- The CWO to LT program should be continued to offer promotion opportunities, as it is a separate career path.
- The Coast Guard should concentrate on ensuring that CWO Officer Evaluation Reports (OERs) reflect *actual* performance, rather than setting selection levels for promotion.

While Congress shelved WOMA until 1991, the Coast Guard's Workforce Planning Division continued its studies of the warrant corps. In July 1989, the study published the following recommendations:

- Only E-7s with one year in grade be allowed to compete for warrant officer appointment.
- Establishment of a training course for newly appointed warrant officers.
- Clarify the difference between warrants and senior enlisted.
- Do a work measurement study of all CWO billets.
- Grade W-2, W-3 and W-4 billets if the size of the speciality and job allow.
- Replace the current warrant officer examinations with the Officer Aptitude Rating test used to screen OCS candidates.<sup>36</sup>
- Appoint new CWOs to permanent CWO2, to allow a "best qualified" selection for temporary CWO3 instead of the current "fully qualified" selections.

The Association closely tracked any developments inside or outside the Coast Guard concerning changes to the warrant corps. In 1989, nearly a third of all Coast Guard officers were chief warrant officers. There were nearly 30 CWO-to-lieutenant appointees in 1990.

## **COAST GUARD, ASSOCIATION WOMA CONCERNS**

In 1990, the Association announced definite opposition to WOMA, despite the creation of a warrant W-5 rank, and stated that "the risks inherent in the Bill outweigh its benefits."<sup>37</sup>

Some of the risks included removal of the requirement for annual selection boards, removal of the requirement for promotion selection of at least 80 percent of eligible warrants, the provision for the ability to involuntarily retire warrants with at least 20 years service, the abolishment of temporary warrant grades, and allowing each service to devise an individual promotion system.

During December 1989 and January 1990, the Association wrote the Coast Guard Chief of Personnel and Training, along with congressional representatives concerning these issues about

WOMA, a House of Representatives bill called HR-2979, and asked that the Coast Guard be exempted.

According to the Association letter, sent to Rep. Charles E. Bennett (D-FL), who introduced the bill, WOMA amended “Titles 10, 14 and 37 of the U.S. Code relating to promotion, separation, and mandatory retirement of warrant officers of the Armed Forces.”

The Association did not object to WOMA’s use by the other armed services, but stated that it viewed *“it as being potentially harmful to our corps. Consequently, we seek to have the Coast Guard exempted from this legislation, and to retain our current system of promotion and retirement contained in Titles 10 and 14, U.S. Code.”*<sup>38</sup>

On the other hand, the Coast Guard not only supported WOMA, but wanted the bill for “greater flexibility for the management of warrant officers,” according to RADM G. D. Passmore, chief of the Office of Personnel and Training.

However, RADM Passmore, in replying to the Association letter, acknowledged some of the potential problems for warrant officers.

*“Your concern about the removal of the 80 percent floor on the opportunity of selection and the possible pass over of significant numbers of warrants in the 15- to 17-year range is a genuine issue.*

*“This was also a problem my staff noted when they reviewed the original package. If a fixed grade structure was imposed and promotions were by vacancy, the change could be a problem,”* he wrote.<sup>39</sup>

The reply went on to say, that although certain avenues of warrant officer management in the area of promotions and retirements would be legally available to the Coast Guard, they would not be used.

*“To use a low opportunity of selection and pass over significant numbers of warrants prior to retirement, as a cost saving measure, is not useful or desirable and we would not do it,”* Passmore wrote.

Basically then, the WOMA issue boiled down to a matter of trust. Could the Association back WOMA based on current service needs and policies?

Although Congress later shelved WOMA from the 1990 Department of Defense Authorization Bill, and planned separate hearings, the Association’s position remained opposed to the legislation for the Coast Guard.

The Association now had 3,254 members. The majority of active duty warrant officers were members of the Association, and were genuinely concerned about WOMA.

## **INTO THE 1990s, WOMA POSITION SOLIDIFIES**

The Association position revolved around major and minor concerns about the Act’s potential effect on the Coast Guard. The major concerns were about the new W-5 pay grade, funding, billet vacancies and promotion, W-5 opportunities for each specialty, early retirements, and careers beyond 20 years. The minor concerns were about the potential loss of annual selection boards and the loss of the 80 percent floor on promotions.

In June 1991, the Coast Guard reviewed and made several changes to warrant officer promotion, evaluation and appointment. Further changes were expected with passage of WOMA. Chief warrant officers were to be considered for promotion after their second year of service. After seven years, a warrant would be considered for promotion to temporary W-4, and seven years later, for permanent

W-4.

A Coast Guard study group was formed to look at regulations, policies and methods of enlisted selections for warrant appointment. The Coast Guard definition of a warrant officer became:

*“Chief Warrant Officers (CWOs) are commissioned officers of the Coast Guard who serve in those grades as established by law and have authority commensurate with this status.*

*“CWOs are mature individuals with appropriate education and/or specialty experience who have shown, through demonstrated initiative and past performance, that they have the potential to assume positions of greater responsibility requiring broader conceptual, management and leadership skills.*

*“While administrative and technical specialty expertise is required in many assignments, CWOs must be capable of performing in a wide variety of assignments which require strong leadership skills. Enlisted and officer experience provides these officers a unique perspective in meeting the roles and missions of the Coast Guard.”<sup>40</sup>*

Other important changes involved the appointment process, and included: Initial training for newly appointed CWOs; First Class petty officers, in order to become eligible to apply for appointment, now had to appear in the top 50 percent on the eligibility list for advancement to CPO; temporary officers were no longer allowed to compete for appointment to CWO; and the Warrant Officer Selection Battery, (WOSB), was replaced with the Officer Aptitude Rating, (OAR).

If WOMA were enacted for the Coast Guard, the following was planned:

- All warrant billets would remain W-4.
- Initial appointments would be to permanent W-2.
- Promotion to permanent W-3 or W-4 would be after 4 years time in grade.
- Current temporary grades would be converted to permanent grades.

## **WOMA SURPRISE**

As part of the 1992 Defense Authorization Bill, WOMA passed the House and Senate. The Act created the W-5 rank, but only the Army planned to implement it. The law provides for selective forced retirement of warrant officers with more than 20 years service.

But the Coast Guard was not included in WOMA.

The Association told the Coast Guard it was opposed to WOMA because most members were against it. A separate Coast Guard survey of active duty warrant officers found the same opinion. According to the Association, congressional staffers understood that the Coast Guard did not plan to implement WOMA in fiscal year 1992, so the Coast Guard was left out of the Act. If the Coast Guard wanted to be included in WOMA, comprehensive amendments to Title 14 U.S. Code would be required.

By the end of 1993, the Coast Guard would again seek to be included in WOMA.

## **THE PRESENT DAY**

The decade leading up to the year 2000 would bring new challenges and changes to the Association. First, improvements were made to the Association office, the “Barge,” with an improved



floating dock and canvas canopy. Although serving for more than five years as an office, the Barge was only considered a temporary, though cost-effective, solution until a permanent building could be acquired. The Building Fund for a new office, supported with contributions from many of the 3,300 Association members, would reach \$40,000 in 1993.

### **LONG-RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE**

In 1992 a long-range planning committee was formed and met at the annual meeting in Washington, D.C. Its purpose was to review how the Association does business to ensure meeting members' needs, and to establish goals for the Association for the next five years. This would help provide stability to an ever-changing board of directors.

The committee was comprised of five members. Of the five members, one was retired and a distinguished member; one was retired, a distinguished member and past president of the Association; two were current club presidents; and one was a past vice president of the Association and past chairman of the National Council. This committee proved to be a success and plans are to continue to convene a long-range planning committee on a two-year cycle.

### **CWO INDOCTRINATION SCHOOL**

As far back as January 1930 members of the Association have been concerned that there was a need for some type of indoctrination training to assist in the transition from enlisted to officer status. This need was discussed over the years a number of times; however, no action was taken to institute this training.

In April 1984 CWO4 Robert L. Lewis, the Association President, wrote to the Chief, Office of Personnel for the Coast Guard and requested that the Coast Guard conduct a "needs analysis" to determine what type of training was needed for newly appointed chief warrant officers.

The Coast Guard responded that they shared the Association's concern about the transition from enlisted to warrant officer status. Indoctrination training was added to the list of topics to be studied by the Offices of Research and Development, and Personnel and Training. Unfortunately, because of lack of funding or other priorities this study was never started.

In 1990, the then Association President, CWO4 George W. Borlase, Jr. started a four-year odyssey of meetings and correspondence with the Commandant, ADM J. William Kime; the Chief of Staff, RADM Robert E. Kramek; the Chief, Office of Personnel and Training, RADM James M. Loy; and the Chief, Training and Performance Improvement Division, CAPT Gregory L. Shaw and their staffs in an effort to have this training instituted. These officers were very supportive of this initiative and immediately recognized the need for this training.

### **FIRST ATTENDEES**

In August 1991, the Coast Guard sent two chief warrant officers to evaluate the U.S. Navy LDO/CWO Indoctrination Course at Pensacola, FL. CWO2 (PERS) Charlotte B. Broga and CWO2 (ENG) Thomas R. Hummer attended the course. Their report recommended the adoption of the Navy training for newly appointed chief warrant officers, with modifications to the basic Navy curriculum of Coast Guard-specific information.

The Coast Guard approved the training and sought funding for fiscal year 1992. Once again, due to funding problems, the training was not started. Over the next two years, CAPT Shaw researched the funding requests from the Navy, and negotiated a cost that the Coast Guard was able to meet out of current training funds. In 1993, the Chief of Staff, RADM Kramek, approved the funding and provided instructor billets.

All newly appointed Coast Guard chief warrant officers are to receive four weeks of officer indoctrination training, with the first class convening April 18, 1994.

### **OTHER CAREER DEVELOPMENT EFFORTS**

In another effort to raise professional standards and offer opportunities for career development, the Association sponsored the first of what were hoped to be annual professional development seminars for warrant officers. A day-long seminar was held April 23, 1992 at Coast Guard Headquarters, and covered evaluations, budgets, women's issues, transfers, promotions and more. Representatives from personnel, law enforcement, marine safety, legal, and engineering gave talks about new program developments and current policies. More than 60 warrant officers from Coast Guard units in the Baltimore-Washington area attended.

On March 4, 1992, two new warrant officers were appointed to a specialty without warrants since 1961. CWO William G. Carson, of Training Center Cape May, and John W. Banker, of the Cadet Band at the Coast Guard Academy, New London, CT became temporary W-2s on May 1.

Another issue pursued by the Association was responsibility pay for O-2 and below. On November 4, 1992, the pay was approved, and the Coast Guard Pay Manual was revised.

The Association also developed a Code for Coast Guard Chief Warrant Officers, based on the Army Warrant Officer Code, and now sends a copy to each new chief warrant officer appointee.

The Military Coalition, a group of 25 military-related organizations formed 1985 to fight for Cost of Living Adjustments, and which now works on all military personnel issues, continued to be an important focal point for Association issues. Legislative fights about COLAs are extremely important to military and federal civilian retirees.

The second Coast Guard Chief Warrant Officer Professional Development Seminar was held April 13, 1993, again at Coast Guard Headquarters. The seminar featured an address by ADM J. William Kime, the commandant, and speakers on retirement, benefits, acquisitions, health, personnel, evaluations and training.

### **WOMA AGAIN**

As 1993 drew to a close, the 1994 Defense Authorization Act was nearing approval in Congress. The Act, which provides a military pay raise against the wishes of the President, also contains readiness measures, a repeal of the restriction preventing Navy and Marine Corps women from serving on all U.S. Navy ships, monies for property maintenance, financial assistance for military spouses, along with other measures.

The Warrant Officer Management Act, which the Coast Guard did not originally participate in, again came under official scrutiny. Faced with budget and personnel reductions, the Coast Guard sought input from the Association, while at the same time, initiating legislation to be included under WOMA. In September 1993, a comprehensive survey was mailed to all Association members, asking

for opinions not only on WOMA, but health care, retirement and working life issues.

For fiscal year 1995, the Coast Guard will actively pursue adoption of WOMA as part of budget and appropriations legislation.

## **THE ORGANIZATION & YOU**

By 1994, the Association had developed a number of member benefits in insurance, educational assistance, death benefits, publications, and other-organization memberships.

- Supplemental insurance, covering the difference between CHAMPUS or MEDICARE and reasonable medical costs, providing low-cost term life insurance, providing accidental death and dismemberment insurance, or group insurance health benefits is now available to Association members.
- Educational assistance, in the form of annual \$750 grants from the CWO John A. Keller CWOA Scholarship Grant is available to member's dependents. (Six grants are awarded every year.)
- A death benefit, based on the years of membership, is paid to designated beneficiaries.
- A 50 percent discount on annual membership for the Boat Owners Association of the United States.
- A monthly newsletter, containing important military and legislative information of interest to active duty and retired members.

## **SUCCESS**

By any measure, the Association has been successful in supporting Coast Guard chief warrant officers. With a proud history of 66 years of service and social spirit, the Association has always worked to bring out the best in its members by instilling personal, professional and patriotic pride. But the success of the Association is not due to its National Council, individual presidents, chapters, or military association affiliations.

The real success of the Chief Warrant & Warrant Officers Association over the last, and the next 66 years depends on *you*.

## REFERENCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

<sup>1</sup>Coast Guard memo "Warrant Officers," dated 7 August 1985, from Coast Guard historian to Coast Guard chief of staff.

<sup>2</sup>This first effort was prompted by the reading of a letter from the retired CDR Raymond M. Gillis to retiree LCDR William Skeen at the April 1963 National Council meeting.

<sup>3</sup>"The History Of The Formation Of The Chief Warrant And Warrant Officers Association," pamphlet from the 19 Sept. 1969 decommissioning of the Coast Guard Cutter AGASSIZ, Training Center Cape May.

<sup>4</sup>Coast Guard Magazine, volume 1, number 1, November 1927, page 30.

<sup>5</sup>Coast Guard Magazine, volume 1, number 12, December 1927, page 20. The one years service requirement was for Navy or maritime personnel.

<sup>6</sup>Coast Guard Magazine, volume 2, number 11, September 1928, page 18.

<sup>7</sup>Heikel, who would eventually retire as a lieutenant commander in 1955, was present at the AGASSIZ decommissioning ceremony Sept. 19, 1969 in Cape May, N.J. LCDR Heikel passed over the bar Jan. 31, 1985.

<sup>8</sup>Coast Guard Magazine, volume 1, number 10, August 1928, page 12.

<sup>9</sup>Beall's anecdote is from portions of a letter published in Newsletter 9-79, CWOA.

<sup>10</sup>Constitution of the U.S. Coast Guard Chief Warrant and Warrant Officers Association, Jan. 1, 1929, Article V, Section 1, pg. 4.

<sup>11</sup>Based on information in the 3-66 CWOA Newsletter.

<sup>12</sup>internal Coast Guard memorandum, dated Nov. 23, 1933. (CG Historians Office)

<sup>13</sup>letter to a "Mr. Humphreys," dated May 14, 1939 (CWOA archives)

<sup>14</sup>Commandant's Circular No. 28-46, July 1946.

<sup>15</sup>Retired Officer Association comments on Hook Commission, 1949.

<sup>16</sup>Newsletter 9-51, CWOA.

<sup>17</sup>Newsletter 7-56, CWOA.

<sup>18</sup>Newsletter 4-61, CWOA.

<sup>19</sup>*Author's note:* Congressional testimony occasionally yields some historical perspective. For example, on May 16, 1961, the following narrative, "*A Brief History of the Warrant Officer Corps in the Coast Guard*," compiled by Mark B. Sandground, was submitted for the Congressional Record by Rep. Robert F. Ellsworth of Kansas:

"The vessels of the original Revenue Marine, founded in 1790, were small cutters carrying three commissioned officers and from 12 to 20 men and boys. To almost the end of the 19th century there was no intermediate rank or grade between that of commissioned officer and the enlisted members comprising the crew. Rates of pay in general paralleled the current wages for like services in the merchant marine.

"As cutter sizes increased and with the advent of steam propulsion, the traditional sailing ship rates of boatswain, gunner, carpenter, cook, as well as specialist engineering ratings (oiler and water tender) had been added.

"However, it was not until 1898 that the status of these specialists was definitely fixed. During that year three General Orders were issued raising boatswains, carpenters, gunners and machinists to a status above enlisted grades. These officers were 'warranted' by the Secretary of the Treasury and authorized to be addressed as 'mister.'\*\*\*\*

“Distinctive uniforms were prescribed. By the Act of May 26, 1906, further recognition was given by designating their status as ‘warrant officers’ and, in addition, higher rates of pay and retirement benefits were granted. The Act of April 16, 1908, required that candidates for warrant appointments must qualify by examination for promotion to that grade, rather than adhering to the older practice of being appointed by recommendation of Commanding Officers. It was not until 1920 that the officers and men of the Coast Guard attained parity in pay with naval pay scales (Act of 18 May 1920). Since that time there has been a gradual movement toward making the Coast Guard warrant corps as much like that of the Navy as the mission of the Service and essential differences between permit.”

\*\*\*According to Association President Lee Green, CWO4, “The first man to be promoted under this General Order was BOSN George R. D’Orange aboard the Steamer FORWARD homeported at Charleston, SC on August 2, 1898 (Newsletter 2-79, CWOA).” Seventeen years later the Coast Guard was designated a military service, on January 28, 1915, in Title 14 (Section 1) of the U.S. Code. Crew lists for the Cutter EAGLE exist for December 31, 1809 (National Archives Record Group 36, E-802.2), in which a warrant boatswain and carpenter are listed.

<sup>20</sup>In 1978, CWO Freddie G. Gillikin, 100, of Marshallburg, NC was the oldest living Coast Guardsman and Association member, having served 41 years after joining the U.S. Life Saving Service in 1900.

<sup>21</sup>Newsletter 3-63, CWOA.

<sup>22</sup>Newsletter 3-63, CWOA. This figure would climb to 62 years a year later.

<sup>23</sup>The club was headquartered in Saigon and a charter was issued September 15, 1967, with 12 original members (Newsletter 11-79, CWOA).

<sup>24</sup>Newsletter 8-66, CWOA. Letter from CHSCLK Lee R. Green, CWOA president.

<sup>25</sup>Enlisted members accepting appointment to warrant grade were finally authorized an initial \$250 uniform allowance under the Coast Guard Omnibus Bill (Public Law 91-278) of June 12, 1970.

<sup>26</sup>The requirement for physicals prior to promotion was eventually removed May 13, 1971, and allowed warrants to retire in the grade selected for promotion in the case of being forced to retire for physical disability.

<sup>27</sup>Newsletter 10-76, CWOA.

<sup>28</sup>Leadership and management training was available to warrants through service schools at Yorktown, VA and Petaluma, CA, but the school curriculums did not contain officer-specific skills and were aimed at raising the standards of the enlisted workforce.

<sup>29</sup>In 1994, the warrant corps would finally get mandatory three-week officer indoctrination training for all new appointees at the U.S. Navy Training Center Limited Duty Officer/Warrant Officer Indoctrination School in Pensacola, FL.

<sup>30</sup>Newsletter 6-78, CWOA.

<sup>31</sup>Newsletter 12-57, CWOA.

<sup>32</sup>Newsletter 3-82, CWOA.

<sup>33</sup>Newsletter 1&2-87, CWOA.

<sup>34</sup>Newsletter 2-89, CWOA.

<sup>35</sup>The Coast Guard would later submit the proposal as a Fiscal Year 1991 legislative initiative to Congress in the annual Authorization Bill.

<sup>36</sup>This recommendation was adopted a year later, in 1990.

<sup>37</sup>Newsletter 1-90, CWOA. Letter from CWOA to Rep. Charles E. Bennett, January 12, 1990.

<sup>38</sup>*ibid.* Letter from RADM Passmore to Association, Jan. 4, 1990.

<sup>39</sup>Newsletter 6-91, CWOA.

#### **FURTHER READING**

All Hands Magazine, "A Long and Happy Navy Tale of WOs," December 1953, pp. 12-15, U.S. Navy.

Navy Times, "Warrants: proud breed of 'experts,'" February 19, 1990, pp. 14-16.

Army Aviation Magazine, "Crusty Old Warrants – Our Technical Experts," article by CAPT W.D. Hobbs, USAFR, date unknown.

U.S. Navy, "Rules for the Regulation of the navy of the United Colonies of North America," 28 November 1775.

Naval Personnel Bill, 3 March 1899 (commissioned warrant grades introduced.)

"Naval Rank: Its Inception and Development," Chief Gunner Lawrence Fasano, NY, 1936.

U.S. Senate document, "Warrant Officers; United States Navy," No. 160, 55th Congress, 2nd session, 1898.

Brooklyn Times article, August 9, 1899; newspaper clipping about warrant officers.

"We've Been There," Esther V. Stormer, (Sequim, WA, 1992), 74 pp.; contains various anecdotes about life in the Coast Guard, including many from warrant officers.

"Warrant Officer History Compiled," October 1st & Nov. 1st 1960 issues of the Register & Defense Times, p. 43.

## PAST ASSOCIATION PRESIDENTS

Raymond W. Gillis .....	1929
Carlin L. Brinkley.....	1930-33
William A. Skeen.....	1934-37, 1942-43
Theodore LeBlanc .....	1938-41
Frank J. Bennett.....	1944
Alexander Smith.....	1945
Joseph J. DeCarlo.....	1946
Stacy Y. Hammond.....	1947
Earl L. Coleman.....	1948
Melvin M. Hymner.....	1949
Paul J. Schonwald.....	1950
Lionel Van Winkle .....	1951-52
Morris J. Eagerton.....	1953
Milton H. Bradley.....	1954-55
Walter R. Terry.....	1956-57
Roy L. Daisey.....	1958-59
Hubert Craven.....	1960-61
Harry S. Hayman.....	1962-63
John A. Keller.....	1963, 1968-69
Lee R. Green.....	1964-67
Joseph W. Carawan.....	1970
John H. Liedke .....	1971-72
Archie C. Yano.....	1973
Ervin S. Whitaker.....	1974-76, 1986-87
Richard L. Mosely .....	1977
David T. Daniels .....	1978, 1983
Carl B. Seale .....	1979
Theodore J. Falter.....	1980-81
Lewis L. Tolleson.....	1982
Robert L. Lewis .....	1984-1985
Victor R. Mauldin .....	1988
Michael J. Fisette .....	1988-1989
George W. Borlase, Jr. ....	1990-94
C. William Mattoon.....	1994-1997
George W. Borlase, Jr. ....	1997-

## Code of the United States Coast Guard Warrant Officer

The following code is promulgated by the Chief Warrant and Warrant Officers Association, United States Coast Guard. It is a formulation of principles and precepts adopted as a guide to our conduct and actions.

### **Coast Guard warrant officers shall conscientiously strive to:**

**W**illingly render loyal service to superiors, subordinates and peers in every organization of which they are a member.

**A**lways set an example in conduct, appearance and performance that will make others proud to know and work with them.

**R**eliably discharge all duties with which they are confronted, whether such duties be expressed or implied.

**R**eadily subordinate their personal interests and welfare to those of their organization and their subordinates.

**A**ccept responsibility at every opportunity and acknowledge full accountability for their actions.

**N**ever knowingly tolerate wrong-doing in themselves or others, whether by commission or omission, design or neglect.

**T**each other people in a way that will effectively expand and perpetuate the scope of their technical competence.

**O**btain breadth of perspective and depth of understanding beyond the limits of their specific responsibilities.

**F**aithfully adhere to their oath of office in all respects, upholding and defending the nations constitution by both word and deed.

**F**orcefully take the initiative to stimulate constructive action in all arenas requiring or inviting their attention.

**I**mprove themselves both physically and mentally, professionally and personally, to increase their own abilities and the value of their services.

**C**ontribute their past experience, service and knowledge to a dedicated effort for a betterment of the future.

**E**arn an ironclad reputation for the absolute integrity of their word.

**R**eflect credit and inspire confidence in themselves, the Warrant Officer Corps, the military services of the nation and the United States of America.



## **DISTINGUISHED MEMBERS**

LCDR William A. Skeen (Deceased)  
LCDR John A. Heikel (Deceased)  
LCDR William E. Holmes (Deceased)  
LCDR Lionel M. Van Winkle (Deceased)  
CWO4 (CHRELE) Milton H. Bradley (Deceased)  
CWO4 (CHPHAR) Walter R. Terry, USCG (Ret)  
CWO4 (CHELEC) Roy L. Daisey, USCG (Ret)  
CWO3 (CHSPCK) Harry S. Hayman, USCG (Ret)  
CWO4 (CHSCLK) Hubert Craven, USCG (Ret)  
CWO4 (PERS) Lee R. Green (Deceased)  
LCDR Eilott F. Lowrie (Deceased)  
CWO4 (CHSCLK) Milton M. Midgette, USCG (Ret)  
CWO4 (CHBOSN) Curtis J. Olds, USCG (Ret)  
LT Carlyle J. Dennis (Deceased)  
CWO3 (CHMACH) Henry J. Harris (Deceased)  
CDR Kenneth E. White (Deceased)  
LCDR Albert D. Stumpff (Deceased)  
CWO4 (CHGUN) Michael K. Opsitnik, USCG (Ret)  
CDR Joseph J. DeCarlo (Deceased)  
LCDR Stacy Y. Hammond (Deceased)  
CWO4 (CHSCLK) John A. Keller (Deceased)  
CWO4 (PERS) Dallas W. Palmer (Deceased)  
CWO4 (CHRELE) Fay K. Thompson (Deceased)  
CWO4 (F&S) Gerald D. Huskey, USCG (Ret)  
CDR Harry A. Oest (Deceased)  
CWO4 (F&S) John M. Howarth, USCG (Ret)  
CWO4 (CHBOSN) William H.A. Herbst, USCG (Ret)  
CWO4 (ELC) Archie C. Yano, USCG (Ret)  
CWO4 (F&S) Everett J. Matteson, USCG (Ret)  
CWO4 (PERS) Ervin S. Whitaker, USCG (Ret)  
CWO4 (CHSPCK) Norris D. Hickman, USCG (Ret)

CWO4 (BOSN) Charles J. Wood (Deceased)  
CWO4 (F&S) David T. Daniels, USCG (Ret)  
CWO4 (F&S) George M. Bruner, USCG (Ret)  
CWO4 (PERS) Harold C. Wadey, USCG (Ret)  
LCDR Richard C. Motter, USCG (Ret)  
LCDR Berger Benson (Deceased)  
CWO3 (CHSPCK) Alvin R. Rutz (Deceased)  
CWO4 (MAT) Damian T. Sarchiapone, USCG (Ret)  
CWO4 (CHSPCK) John H. Liedke, USCG (Ret)  
LT Alfred R. Marsh (Deceased)  
CWO4 (F&S) Tony M. Robinson, USCG (Ret)  
CWO4 (F&S) George V. Stauffer, USCG (Ret)  
CWO4 (PERS) Charles M. Tomarchio, USCG (Ret)  
CWO4 (ELC) Theodore J. Falter, USCG (Ret)  
CWO4 (PERS) David C. Orolfo, USCG (Ret)  
CWO4 (CHSCLK) Claude M. Hutchins, USCG (Ret)  
CWO4 (PERS) Carl B. Seale, USCG (Ret)  
CWO4 (PERS) Robert L. Lewis, USCG (Ret)  
CWO4 (PERS) John C. Crawford, USCG (Ret)  
CWO4 (MAT) George W. Borlase, Jr., USCG  
LCDR Charles O. Boll, Jr., USCG