

Reyes, Jr., of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that Senators BLUMENTHAL, HIRONO, WELCH, and myself be allowed to engage in a colloquy on the Senate floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

U.S. SUPREME COURT

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, the subject of our colloquy is going to be the enormous, secret gifts that have recently been disclosed going into the pockets of certain Supreme Court Justices.

The first thing that is remarkable about these gifts is how magnificent they are—luxury trips on private jets, luxury trips on superyachts, paying for a Justice's mother's home, paying for private school tuition of dependents, \$500,000 donations to organizations that the spouse worked for, \$25,000 fees into a spouse's consulting firm, jet and fishing trips across the country. So it is all pretty rich stuff.

In Rhode Island, if you want to take a gift from somebody—let's say you are a municipal employee, and they want to take you to lunch across the street from city hall. It is 25 bucks. That is your limit, and you have to disclose it. You get to do that three times, and then you are all done. Then you can't even take the \$25 lunch if you disclose it. So in Rhode Island, people are really upset about these multi-hundred-thousand-dollar gifts.

It gets worse. It is not just the size of the gifts. It is the network. It is the web. The billionaires who are involved in giving these gifts overlap with an array of front groups that are involved with the billionaires and with the gifts, and there is a common "fixer" who ties many of these threads together. The trips very often involve the fixer and the Justices and the billionaires, and the whole mess is interwoven. The donations go through the front groups to the Justice from the fixer over and over. This thing is a web, and we are working hard in the Judiciary Committee to try to untangle it.

On Thursday, we will be taking up the question of subpoenas to the billionaires and the front group corporations that have participated in these different gifts to find out what really went on. How bad, really, was it? What we know already is bad enough, but there is more to discover.

With that, let me yield to my colleague Senator BLUMENTHAL, and then I will wrap up after Senator HIRONO and Senator WELCH have had their chance to speak as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I want to thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for his leadership on this issue—persistent, consistent, constant in seeking the truth; very simply, seeking the facts.

We are here about the authorization of a subpoena to three individuals—Harlan Crow, Leonard Leo, and Robin Arkley—who have engaged in, we know for sure, a pattern of gift-giving, including lavish vacations, private jet flights, school tuition, and even a luxury RV. These wealthy political activists have given those gratuities, we know for sure, but we know very little else because the Supreme Court has no code of ethics.

The U.S. Supreme Court could defuse a lot of the degrading rumor and speculation if it were simply to do as every other branch of government, as every other judge except for the U.S. Supreme Court does and impose a code of ethics. Its refusal to adopt a code of ethics lies at the core of our reason for being here today.

But, in my view, these subpoenas are part of an effort to save the Court from its own self-inflicted ethical crisis. It is an ethical conflagration of its own making. The Supreme Court Justices are the only Federal judges who are not subject to a binding and enforceable ethical code, and that leads to the next point.

The Judicial Conference is a creation of this body, the U.S. Congress. We are looking into what the Judicial Conference should be doing and what it may know and should be held accountable for knowing. Our investigative effort directly concerns a creation legislatively of the Congress. It is perfectly proper. It raises no constitutional issues.

All this stuff about the independence of the Supreme Court—yes, it is an independent branch of government, but it is not nonaccountable. Funds for it are appropriated. Rules of evidence are created. There are numerous ways that it, in effect, is held a part of an overall and overarching Government of the United States of America.

The small circle of individuals here who have engaged in these gifts—all of them far-right, wealthy donors; some of them having cases before the Court—raises issues that are profoundly important to the credibility of the Court itself. So, again, we are seeking to save the Court, in a sense, from its own potentially self-inflicted continuing degrading and diminishing.

The fact that the polls show the Supreme Court has plummeted in public opinion is not the reason for us to investigate, but they reflect a secrecy, combined with these potentially improper gifts, that is undermining the Court as an institution.

I say it sadly because I was a law clerk on the U.S. Supreme Court to Justice Harry Blackmun—who, by the way, would not even go to dinner with someone who might at some point in the future have a case before the Court. I have argued cases before them, before the U.S. Supreme Court. I have real reverence for the Court as an institution. So I am especially sad but also particularly angry that the Court is failing—totally failing—to take action

that it owes the American people and itself, because the Supreme Court as an institution will be diminished by its continued refusal to create an ethics code and the refusal to disclose the truth about these financial relationships. These twin refusals bring us here today.

Authorizing a subpoena is not a step that I take lightly. None of my colleagues do. But the weight of the Court's ethical crisis makes it necessary.

The American people deserve a Supreme Court that is ethical, impartial, and accountable. The highest Court in the land is not higher than the law. It is not above accountability. It may be independent, but it is not unto its own, as it seems to believe it is.

We are past Halloween. All of the charades and shams that have been offered as arguments are about as valid as the costumes people were wearing the other day, October 31.

The Supreme Court has a commitment and a promise under our Constitution. It has to deliver on that promise or its credibility will be further diminished, and the Supreme Court as a pillar of justice—and it must be a pillar of justice—will be eviscerated in the eyes of the American people.

I look forward to authorizing these subpoenas and helping to restore the reputation of our United States Supreme Court.

I yield to my colleague from Hawaii, Senator HIRONO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I rise today because I, like the majority of Americans, am increasingly concerned about the legitimacy crisis at the U.S. Supreme Court.

The Court consists of nine members who have lifetime appointments and can make decisions regarding the quality of the air we breathe; the exercise of free speech on the internet; the autonomy and control of our bodies; protection of our homes, cars, and cell phones from government intrusion. These are just a few ways the Supreme Court's decisions impact the lives of every single American every single day.

These individuals with immense power, shouldn't they be held to the highest level of ethical accountability—not because we disagree with some of the Court's decisions but because its legitimacy depends on Americans having faith that those decisions are arrived at fairly and objectively, not influenced by money or special interests. Yet, instead of having the strongest ethical rules—or any binding ethical rules, for that matter—the Supreme Court purports to follow a "collection of principles" that are both nonbinding and weaker than the rules for government workers, for Members of Congress, and for many private sector employees.

As we have seen, the Supreme Court's honor system for financial disclosures and recusals is woefully inadequate. This is not a partisan issue. Justices appointed by both Democrat and Republican Presidents have had ethical lapses.

The public is paying attention, and now it appears there are sitting Justices approved by both Democratic and Republican Presidents who are publicly supporting an official code of conduct for the Supreme Court.

The Supreme Court could have adopted such a code decades ago and could do so today if it wanted to; however, if the Supreme Court will not adopt a code of conduct for itself, then Congress has the constitutional power and responsibility to impose a code of conduct on it.

This brings me to the topic of subpoenas. For months, my colleagues and I on the Judiciary Committee have worked in good faith to gather information about gifts of luxury travel and other gifts made to certain Justices to understand whether ethical violations occurred and how and when. We sought information from the millionaires and billionaires who made those gifts about the kinds of access they may have gained as a result.

Despite lengthy negotiations, we have hit an impasse in our efforts with two of these individuals and their related corporations. Their refusal to provide the committee with relevant information leaves us no choice but to authorize subpoenas. We need information from these individuals to understand the extent to which Supreme Court Justices have failed to disclose gifts from parties with interests before the Court.

Congress has a responsibility to craft and strengthen effective, comprehensive Supreme Court ethics legislation going forward.

Some of my Republican colleagues say that issuing subpoenas to people who paid for luxury travel and gifts for Supreme Court Justices somehow undermines democracy. Those claims are preposterous. What undermines our democracy is Justices accepting gifts and appearing to use their office for personal gain.

If the Court had done the right thing decades ago and adopted a comprehensive code of conduct, we likely would not be issuing subpoenas.

We have a responsibility to ensure that the highest Court in the land adheres to at least—at least—the same ethical standards that apply to the other two branches of government and to pass appropriate legislation if it has failed to do so. Therefore, the committee should continue to exercise its constitutional oversight authority and authorize subpoenas.

I yield to Senator WELCH.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. I thank my colleagues tonight, and I thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for his work on this.

You know, the question that is facing, I think, all of us and is troubling Americans is an erosion of confidence in our institutions. We are seeing that with a lot of erosion of confidence in the legislature, which is here to serve the interests of the people we all represent. It is also sometimes with the Executive—huge battles there. And, of course, January 6 was an indication that the norms that have guided us throughout our history—that is, the peaceful transfer of power after the people of this country make a decision about who shall be their elected leader—have all been challenged.

And now we have the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court has an incredibly important role in the preservation of our democracy because it has the capacity to make decisions about legislative actions and whether what the legislature did fits within the parameters of the Constitution, and it is an awesome responsibility.

As my colleagues have said, I have an enormous amount of reverence for the institution of the judiciary, and I have an enormous amount of reverence for the particular role of the U.S. Supreme Court.

I have immense respect for the individuals who have achieved that status of being a member of the U.S. Supreme Court. They serve an important institution. They have a very important job. But they are not more important, as individuals, than any other American. They are not. They have more responsibility. They have a special obligation as Justices of the Supreme Court, but they are not above the law.

This is not exactly about whether there are legal questions involved. It is about whether they accept the responsibility that goes with representing an institution that must maintain credibility for the American people in order to have the people whom they serve respect their decisions.

We have a situation in the Supreme Court now. Within our judiciary, we have 850 judges at all different levels. Every single one of those judges is subject to rules that are designed to try to instill public confidence. Those rules require those judges to make financial disclosures. That includes whether they have been the beneficiary of gifts. There are nine people in this country who are in the judiciary who don't adhere to those rules, who don't believe it is their burden to share and disclose with the American people what gifts they have received, and those are the nine Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court. That is outrageous.

You know, when I talk to Vermonters about this and I say: Do you think that a justice of the Vermont Supreme Court or a Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court should be required to let you know—let the public know—if they got private jet travel to a location to get on a private yacht to take a private vacation? They have an obligation to disclose that.

And Vermonters look at me in dismay and they say: Peter, are you serious? They can do that?

This is not about disclosure. This is astonishment that somebody in a position of authority who they know—and every Vermonter knows—is getting that offer of a free jet travel, who is getting that offer of a free yacht trip and vacation in the Indonesian islands. It has nothing to do with who they are as persons. It has to do with who they are because of their responsibility and role as U.S. Supreme Court Justices. Vermonters can't believe it.

So this question of gifts and the bare minimum of having to disclose it, how is it even a question?

You know, I served in the House, as you know, and, in 2011, I and several of my colleagues wrote a letter inquiring about these gifts and why is it that they didn't have to be disclosed. This has been going on for far too long.

There is another matter of personal respect. The Supreme Court Justices, all of them, have the highest position in the judiciary, and all of those other 850 judges under them, are they not entitled to expect that what is required of them will be accepted by those nine members?

I have to confess enormous dismay that the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, who is in the position to bring those other eight Justices together and say, "Hey, let's deal with this; why are we creating this problem when it does so much to undercut public confidence in what it is we are trying to do?" hasn't done it—hasn't done it.

So we have to do it. I believe that the judiciary—not just the 850 members of the judicial branch but 859 members of the judicial branch—should all be subject to the same disclosure rules. And let me tell you, if they disclose these gifts, maybe they won't take these gifts—because, actually, what is the point? I mean, really?

This is where I go back to the Vermonters I talked to who say: Peter, what is the deal? You literally can take an all-expense-paid vacation, and this person thinks it is not going to influence them? And they want to know what I have been smoking—seriously.

So what we are doing here is pretty modest, bare bones, but even if it is bare bones and modest, it is absolutely essential to the first step that we take in our effort to restore confidence to the people of this country—Republicans, Democrats, Independents—that our judiciary is all about serving them, not benefiting individually by their positions.

I yield to my colleague from Rhode Island, Senator WHITEHOUSE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, first, let me thank my three colleagues for joining me on the floor today. A word that came up repeatedly was "reverence," and I want to start with that word because I think we all do share a reverence for the institution of

the Supreme Court. And that is what makes it so bitter, to see how badly the Supreme Court is failing us now and to see the paths that billionaire influence has led it down.

It has to correct, and if it is not going to correct itself, then Congress is going to have to correct it.

As Senator BLUMENTHAL said, the problem here is that there is no ethics process for the Supreme Court. There is a perfectly good code of ethics for all of the Justices and for all of the Federal judges, but there is no way to enforce it for the Supreme Court.

If you have a complaint about a Supreme Court Justice, there is nowhere to file it. There is not even an inbox, and if there were an inbox and complaints came through, there is nobody on the other side of the inbox to screen out the nutty ones from the legitimate ones. And once you have a pile of legitimate ones, there is no staff attorney to do the basic research into what are the facts here. At the end of the day, when you have the facts determined and the judge or Justices have their say, then you have the factual predicate to compare with the ethics standard and a neutral decider to decide whether or not it comports. That is the basic structure of U.S. due process, and the Supreme Court will not allow that for itself. That is the problem that we have.

So none of the questions that deserve to be answered about all of these secret gifts and about all of this billionaire influence—none of them—have even been asked over at the Supreme Court, let alone answered. So we have an absolute obligation to go forward with answers.

And we have tried. We have asked very nicely. We have sent lists of questions. We have gone forward with the people who would know about all of this.

And we have received two answers. One was that this is unconstitutional, and so we are not going to participate with you at all. You get nothing. You don't get a single answer.

That, as Senator BLUMENTHAL said, we believe to be a complete sham and a complete charade because the disclosure rules—right? We are talking about disclosure of gifts to Justices. They went undisclosed.

So the question is, Should they have been disclosed? And there is a rule about disclosure that just happens to be a law passed by Congress. And there is a related law passed by Congress that relates to recusal, and recusal relates to gifts because, if you take big enough gifts from someone, you then have to recuse yourself as a judge from their cases. And the recusal rule is also passed by Congress.

So you have a disclosure law passed by Congress, and you have a recusal law passed by Congress, and you have what Senator BLUMENTHAL described—the Judicial Conference, which is the administrative body that oversees the administrative side of the judicial

branch, and that body was also created by Congress.

So the argument that is being made to us is that Congress has no authority to oversee how an Agency that Congress created is implementing laws Congress passed. That argument is, on its face, preposterous, and that, in turn, suggests that there is a lot to look at when we get a chance to look under the hood of all this mischief.

And they really don't want us to see it, and they are going to manufacture completely preposterous arguments just to try to throw us off the trail.

Another recipient of our questions said: OK, it is unconstitutional, but I will offer you a few things. You know, in good faith, I will offer you a few things, but you can only go back 5 years.

Well, we happen to know, with respect to this billionaire, that they were giving gifts to Justices way more than 5 years ago. So they are not even allowing us to ask into the known gift-giving conduct between the billionaire and the Justice, which, by the way, was undisclosed at the time.

So the 5-year rule is just nonsensical, just picked out of the air—picked, actually, out of a criminal statute, as if that had a bearing on a congressional investigation.

Then they said: We will only give you documents that you already have. For everything else, we will just give our lawyers narratives about what took place.

Well, anybody who has ever tried a case knows perfectly well that if you rely on the other side's lawyer's narrative, you are getting no place.

Discovery means you see the documents. You do your real homework like lawyers do. So for one lawyer to suggest to another: No, we are not going to show you the documents; we have them, but we are not going to show them to you; we are just going to give you a narrative of them—there isn't a lawyer in this country who would accept that as a condition in discovery in a case.

The third one is that, once we have answered your first round of questions and given you our phony-baloney narrative for the 5 years that is all we will let you inquire about, no more questions. You waive your right to ask us any more questions forever.

Again, there is not a lawyer in the country who would accept that as a condition of a discovery order. You get to ask the second question. "One and done" is not a thing when you are doing an investigation.

So all of these theoretical accommodations that were offered were just completely fake. We cannot proceed that way—not with any kind of professionalism and not with any kind of ability to get to the truth, which is, at the end of the day, what we really need to do here.

I will conclude by going back to where I started. The reason that we need to follow this process of getting

subpoenas so we get answers to our questions is because of two failures: one, the failure of the Supreme Court to even ask these questions itself. If there were a viable process going forward, using the basic due process investigation standards that everybody in government has to face for ethics, except these nine Justices, we wouldn't need to do this. But the Supreme Court won't allow questions to be asked about itself. So we can't go to them for a proper investigation. They refuse to do it.

When we asked the participants in this gift scheme what they were up to, they told us, as the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, I think, rather artfully summarized, to go pound sand. Well, when Congress has a legitimate inquiry into how an Agency that it created is implementing statutes that it passed, "go pound sand" is not a legitimate answer. So the next step is to move to authorize these subpoenas, and we are going to do that.

This business of the Court not answering obvious questions is really a problem. The question of whether Justice Thomas should have recused himself from the January 6 cases depends on a single fact: what he knew about his wife's involvement in insurrection activities. If he knew absolutely nothing at all, OK. Then it is probably OK for him to recuse himself—maybe a little bit of appearance of impropriety. But if he actually knew of her involvement in those matters, then he absolutely should have recused himself.

The question "Justice Thomas, what did you know, and when did you know it?" has never been asked and never been answered. That is not a tenable way for a Court that purports to represent due process and enforce due process to conduct itself with respect to a conflict of interest.

It is the same thing with these gifts. There is no Federal judge in the country who is receiving multihundred-thousand-dollar vacation gifts, who is getting huge half-million-dollar checks sent in to a spouse's small private company out of which she takes money. This behavior of free private jet travel—at beck and call, it seems—nobody else does that. It is not OK. But looking at it to find out what actually took place and why and when is a basic responsibility of the Judiciary. In any other court, these claims, these charges, these circumstances would be properly investigated. We would know the facts, and we are entitled to know the facts.

The last is that, in the context of our investigation, one of these lawyers made up what I consider to be a sham argument that we can't ask any questions because it is unconstitutional. I have addressed that. It is a congressionally established entity applying congressionally established laws. Yes, we do get to inquire about that kind of job. Because, perhaps, that argument is so weak, so sham, that lawyer actually recruited a Supreme Court Justice to

go into the editorial page of the Wall Street Journal and offer an extrajudicial opinion—not an opinion of the Court, just his own personal opinion—that we had no business investigating.

That violates a ton of stuff. That violates the rule that they are not supposed to offer opinions on matters that might come before the Court. That violates the rule that you shouldn't be engaging as a Justice in an ongoing dispute, sort of like a de facto expert witness for a party in an ongoing dispute. In this case, the dispute is over access to information.

The lawyer's client in that is one of the people involved in this scheme, Leonard Leo. Leonard Leo has a personal relationship also with Justice Alito. He is described as his friend. None of that is disclosed. He just offers his opinion on behalf of the lawyer for his friend.

At the end of the day, the inquiry looks at free gifts, undisclosed, received by Justice Alito. At the end of the day, the lawyer for Leonard Leo was able to recruit a member of the Supreme Court, Justice Alito, to offer a private—I should say a public opinion but a nonofficial opinion, a personal opinion, in the Wall Street Journal editorial page to prop up the argument that says we can't look into gifts that Leonard Leo, the client, organized for Justice Alito, the recipient. That is a tangled mess of ethics violations, and nobody can look at that. Nobody will look at that. That can't be.

So, with the Court looking at none of this scandalous behavior, it is entirely incumbent upon the Congress to do its job and get to the bottom of what went on. That is what, under the leadership and guidance of our Judiciary chairman, DICK DURBIN, we will do.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR ANDREA L. MAY

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I rise today to honor a great American and an exceptional member of the U.S. Air Force, Maj. Andrea May.

As an Air Force Senate legislative liaison officer, from June 2021 to May 2023, Andrea performed her duties with exceptional professionalism during the 117th and 118th U.S. Congresses. Andrea distinguished herself through her pro-

fessional character and dedication by serving this Nation in uniform, leading the division's collaboration with the Senate Space Force Caucus, coordinating six events critical to educating Members and their staff on the Department of Defense's newest service, and helping to advocate for Space Force priorities. Her efforts helped solidify the establishment of the U.S. Space Force, ensured the confirmation of the 26th Air Force Secretary, and secured the Department of the Air Force's support of the national defense strategy in our return to Great Power Competition.

A motivated leader and thoughtful relationship builder, Andrea expertly conveyed Department of the Air Force positions on the Air Force Future Design that included the future bomber, tanker, and fighter force. Andrea's direct support provided the U.S. Senate critical information necessary for two National Defense Authorization Acts. Additionally, Andrea served as a liaison between the Department of the Air Force and 19 U.S. Senate offices, including mine. When I had concerns, she was the airman with whom I spoke to address them. Andrea helped ensure that the airmen and guardians of North Dakota were well cared for and that their concerns and interests were known to the leadership of the Department of the Air Force.

In her role as a liaison for the Air Force, she also coordinated responses to more than 200 requests for information and led delegations for 70 Senators, Representatives, and congressional staff on visits to showcase Department equities across the United States and abroad, to include the bicameral Reagan National Defense Forum. Andrea's significant efforts led to successful engagements between this governing body and senior Department of Defense officials, including the Secretary of the Air Force. All of these engagements helped U.S. Senators understand defense equities and their impact on national security. Due to her direct involvement and stewardship, Members of Congress were able to make informed decisions and ensured the Department of the Air Force was properly resourced and funded.

Lastly, Major May was also responsible for helping prepare the Secretary of the Air Force, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, the Chief of Space Operations, and other senior leaders for more than 80 engagements with Senators and their staff and three Senate Armed Services Committee hearings. After serving in this crucial role and becoming a fixture on Capitol Hill, Andrea recently moved on to serve as a pilot in the 89th Airlift Wing at Joint Base Andrews.

I am thankful for Andrea's service and her work with my office and the Senate over the past 2 years on issues of vital importance to the United States. I salute this American patriot whose selfless work has kept our country safe and strong. I join countless others in thanking her for her service.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO DR. PETER JENSEN

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Dr. Peter Jensen, an AARP 2024 Purpose Prize honoree. This national honor recognizes individuals who are using their life experience to make a positive difference.

Seeing a problem with mental health care access for children, Dr. Jensen founded the REACH Institute in 2006. This nonprofit organization ensures effective and scientifically proven care reaches children and their families. REACH trains primary care providers, therapists, and other health professionals to diagnose and treat young patients.

As a result of this innovative way to connect providers and patients, more than 6,000 pediatricians and physicians in all 50 States have been trained to be "first responders" to children with mental health needs.

Dr. Jensen's health challenges as a child shaped an interest in psychology and inspired him to pursue a career in medicine. He earned a medical degree from George Washington University School of Medicine and has served in leading research and education roles including for Child and Adolescent Research at the National Institute of Mental Health, the Mayo Clinic, and a professor at Columbia University and the University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences.

Arkansas is fortunate to have an exceptional, selfless leader like Dr. Jensen who identified a problem and implemented a solution to improve patient care and outcomes. His passion and commitment offer an excellent example for others to follow.

I applaud AARP for recognizing Dr. Jensen's work to build a better future. Dr. Jensen demonstrates what it truly means to go above and beyond for others. I congratulate him on this well-deserved honor and his positive impact. His remarkable achievements offer a model of success that will help patients for generations to come.●

TRIBUTE TO MASTER SERGEANT BOB AMMONS

• Mr. TUBERVILLE. Mr. President, most servicemembers come from a military family like MSgt Bob Ammons of Ozark, AL. Born on an Air Force base to a career airman, Bob decided to follow in his dad's footsteps. He enlisted in the U.S. Air Force as an air freight specialist.

Bob did 14 assignments in 32 different countries during his 24-year-career. His skills in developing safety strategies ensured many American airmen returned home safely from their missions overseas. Bob climbed the ranks to becoming a senior munitions inspector and missile inspector, where he was in charge of ensuring all missile systems were ready for combat.

After retiring from the military in 1998, Bob decided to make Alabama his