

pay for the program a second time out of the funding allocated to their committee. That didn't make any sense so they fixed it.

That is an example—very narrow, bipartisan—and we are talking small numbers.

Let's turn to those issues over small numbers. Well, they aren't so small when you think about this in terms of our normal trip to the grocery store—\$73 million or less than \$200 million. One case in the Fiscal Responsibility Act—again, in a bipartisan, specific provision—is \$2.8 billion. What is this bill about? What is this fake baseline being used to hide in this case? It is \$37 trillion of additional debt.

Again, this is absolutely a crime against fiscal responsibility. It is blowing up the last two pillars from the 1974 Act: no additional debt or deficit past 10 years of any title; the honest use of numbers from the CBO and the Joint Committee on Taxation. It is taking a provision to allow the taking on of small ambiguities to be wrestled with in a bipartisan fashion and resolved—taking that flexibility—and using it in the wholesale destruction of responsible budgeting. So let's not do this.

Colleagues, the deficit now, annually, is sizable. It is about 6 percent of our gross domestic product. Remember the end of the Clinton administration? We were raising in revenue about 21 percent of GDP. We were spending about 21 percent. We were actually running a surplus. Now we are spending 6 percent more of GDP than we are bringing in as revenue. We are no longer bringing in 21 percent of GDP in revenue. We are bringing in 17 percent. We are no longer spending 21 percent. We are spending 23 percent.

This bill, by the way, will crank up that gap between revenue and spending even more as time passes. It is a pathway to not only destroying the current programs that my colleague from Massachusetts was talking about—16 million people losing healthcare, 4 million children going hungry to give tax breaks to billionaires. It is not only a pathway to destroy current programs, but it runs up debt to destroy the ability to provide fundamental programs in housing and healthcare and education for the next generation, and that is wrong.

That is why I say to you colleagues on both sides of the aisle: Let's be honest about the numbers. Let's not corrupt the process by bringing a measure that belongs in the regular budgeting world, not in the reconciliation world, in order to destroy reconciliation as a process that will not increase deficits after 10 years and will honestly convey the effect of each provision in the bill as to whether it raises revenue or spends money.

Preserve honest budgeting. Let's do that. It will serve us well. It will serve the Nation well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise at a late hour with few folks on the floor to talk about the most serious issue we could ever talk about on the floor of the U.S. Senate: the prospect that America may soon be in a war.

There is no part of the Constitution that is more important than the article I provisions making claim that the United States should not be at war without a vote of Congress. Yet the news of the day suggests that we are potentially on the verge of a war with Iran.

When I was elected to the Senate in 2012, having served as a Governor from 2006 to 2010 during a tremendous upsurge in the two wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, I visited our troops multiple times in the Green Zone in Baghdad and in Afghanistan. I went to the deployments and the homecomings; I went to the wakes and funerals, and I told myself when I came to the Senate that, if I ever had the chance to stop this Nation from getting into an unnecessary war, I would do everything I could to stop us from getting into an unnecessary war. I happen to believe that the United States engaging in a war against Iran—a third war in the Middle East since 2001—would be a catastrophic blunder for this country.

I think there are some in this body who have a different point of view than I on this point, but I think we should all be able to agree in the fundamental constitutional principle that says we shouldn't be in a war if Congress doesn't have the guts to debate it and vote on it; that we should all, in having taken an oath to the Constitution, at least support the principle that war is something that should be for Congress to declare.

Just recently—right before I walked on the floor—the New York Times published this article, and I am just going to read this to demonstrate the imminence of the threat that this country faces.

The article from the New York Times, dated today, reads "Iran is Preparing Missiles for Possible Retaliatory Strikes on U.S. Bases, Officials Say," and I will just read the first few paragraphs.

Iran has prepared missiles and other military equipment for strikes on U.S. bases in the Middle East should the United States join Israel's war against the country, according to American officials who have reviewed intelligence reports.

Fears of a wider war are growing among American officials as Israel presses the White House to intervene in its conflict with Iran. If the United States joins the Israeli campaign and strikes Fordo, a key Iranian nuclear facility, the Iranian-backed Houthi militia will almost certainly resume striking ships in the Red Sea, the officials said. They added that pro-Iranian militias in Iraq and Syria would probably try to attack U.S. bases there.

Other officials said that in the event of an attack, Iran could begin to mine the Strait of Hormuz, a tactic meant to pin American warships in the Persian Gulf. Commanders put American troops on high alert at mili-

tary bases throughout the region, including in the United Arab Emirates, Jordan and Saudi Arabia. The United States has more than 40,000 troops deployed in the Middle East.

I met the father of an Apache helicopter pilot currently deployed in Syria yesterday.

Finally, from the article:

Two Iranian officials have acknowledged that the country would attack U.S. bases in the Middle East, starting with those in Iraq, if the United States joined Israel's war.

We stand tonight as close to the potential initiation of a third war in the Middle East—the United States against Iran—as we have been during my time in the Senate. So, yesterday morning, when the Senate came into session, I announced and then I followed up with a filing of a War Powers Resolution in this body—a privileged resolution—that, by my clock, will mature and be subject to a vote on this floor because of its privileged status a week from Thursday. Ten days from the filing of such a motion, even by a single Senator, the Senate is required to take this matter up for an up-or-down floor vote about whether or not war should happen without a vote of Congress.

A little bit about the Constitution. Many in here have heard me speak about this over the years about the Constitution. The Framers of the Constitution grappled with the question about how wars should begin, and they grappled with the question in a most unusual way.

In the Constitution of 1787, the article I power is the congressional, the legislative power, and the article II power is the executive power. The Framers of the Constitution split war powers into a legislative responsibility and an executive responsibility. The legislative responsibility is clear: Congress declares war. It is in article I. The executive responsibility is to be the Commander in Chief. Once Congress—535 people—has declared war, you don't need 535 Commanders in Chief. That would lead to chaos. So a war once declared by a debate and vote by the people's elected body then gets handed to the President, who as Commander in Chief is responsible for executing on that declaration.

The Framers of the Constitution did understand one thing about the President's power, which is the President as Commander in Chief should defend the Nation. The President always has the ability to defend the United States without asking Congress's permission.

Back in 1787, Congress might adjourn and ride horseback back to Vermont. What if the United States were attacked? You couldn't wait for all of Congress to come back to enable the United States to defend itself. So a President has the inherent power under article II to defend the United States without asking for permission. But it has been the understanding since the very beginning of this Republic that, if it is more than defending the United States—if it is going on offense in any

way—congressional authorization is needed.

It is so rare. In other countries and at other times, war has been for the Executive. It has been for the King. It has been for the Emperor. It has been for the Monarch. It has been for the Czar. It has been for the Sultan. But in the United States, we made a very careful choice to do it differently, and that choice was described most eloquently in a letter from the main drafter of the Constitution James Madison to President Thomas Jefferson. Actually, he was not yet President. This letter was dated April 2, 1798, and James Madison described what were they getting at when they vested the power to declare war with Congress.

Here is what James Madison wrote:

The constitution supposes, what the History of all Governments demonstrates, that the Executive is the branch of power most interested in war, and most prone to it. [Our Constitution] has accordingly with studied care, vested the question of war in the Legislature.

Other countries don't do this, but the Framers of our Constitution in 1787 decided we are going to be different. Before we send troops into harm's way where they could be killed, where they could be injured, where they could see people they love and their colleagues killed and injured—before we are going to send troops in harm's way in war, we want to see the people's elected bodies—both Houses—have a debate about what the stakes are and whether we should force our troops into harm's way and potentially lose their lives, and that debate will be in full view of the American public so the American public can understand what is at stake, and then they can call their Representatives or write them a letter and tell them what they think about whether war is necessary and whether the sacrifice we ask of our troops should be the ultimate sacrifice that we are often asking of them in war.

That has been the Constitution since 1787. The Constitution has been amended, probably, in 25 or 26 amendments now. That has never been amended. That has never been amended.

In 1974, Congress grappled with a challenging problem and passed the War Powers Resolution of 1974. What was the problem?

The problem in 1974 was this: A President began war without telling Congress. In 1974, we were in the midst of the Vietnam war. Congress did know that, and Congress had passed some legislation at least appropriating funds for it and somewhat authorizing it during the Johnson administration. Congress knew about the war in Vietnam.

Obviously, there was a draft, and 56,000 Americans were killed in that war. But President Nixon, without informing Congress, extended the war and started bombing Cambodia—it was called the secret bombing of Cambodia—a new country that had not been covered by war authorizations. So

Congress stepped up and acted and passed the War Powers Resolution of 1974.

That resolution did a number of things. It established some protocols for when the President initiates military action, providing notice to Congress so that there can't be a secret war; giving Congress some ability, once notice is provided, to try to withdraw notice if it thinks that the war is ill-advised.

But the War Powers Resolution also did something else: It gave the power to even one Member of Congress, one Senator or one House Member, if a President initiates war or is on the verge of initiating war—the War Powers Resolution gave to one Senator, one Congressman, the ability to file a resolution to stop a war before it starts or to stop a war once it started.

The War Powers Resolution over time has made that a privileged motion, meaning it can bypass committee and be brought up on the floor of the Senate for a vote within an expeditious period of time.

A privileged motion is one that sort of elbows everything else out of the way because Congress has judged that the matter is so important that it should take precedence over normal committee proceedings and it should be considered in a prompt fashion. It is a simple majority vote, not subject to filibuster and cloture. It can't be buried in a committee. It has to be debated on the floor. It is amendable. It can be amended.

But as long as you meet the criteria, the privileged criteria, under the War Powers Resolution of 1974, you are entitled to try to stop a war before it starts. The criteria that you have to meet to have the privilege are two:

One, hostilities between the United States and another actor nation—Iran in this case—have to either be underway or they have to be imminent. That has to be the case. You can't just say: I want to stop a war that no one has contemplated and nothing is happening. So you have to demonstrate imminence. You also have to show that there is no existing congressional authorization authorizing the United States to be at war—in this case, with Iran. That second criteria has been met.

We had a similar resolution on the floor a few years ago following the U.S. strike that killed the Iranian military leader Soleimani, and the ruling of the Parliamentarian and really the acknowledgement of the body was that there was no current congressional authorization authorizing war against Iran.

So the question is, Is the imminence standard met? I would argue that it clearly is. The United States is already using U.S. weaponry to knock down Iranian missiles. That is more than imminence; that is actual kinetic hostility.

The United States is being urged to enter the war. The United States is

moving military assets into the region and withdrawing diplomats from the region.

The Iranians are acknowledging that: If the United States enters the war, we have plans to go after U.S. troops, the 40,000 U.S. troops in the area.

Since Congress clearly wanted a Member to be able to file such a motion to be heard before a war begins, I believe the imminence standard is clearly met in this case with actual kinetic activity between U.S. weaponry and Iranians.

So over the course of the next few days, you will likely hear me talk more than once about the need for Congress to stand up and say there shall not be a war against Iran without a congressional vote. It is a pretty simple proposition: No U.S. war against Iran without a congressional vote.

Let me answer a couple of questions that colleagues of mine have asked about the resolution that I filed yesterday.

First, what about self-defense? What about if Iran does take action against the United States, the homeland, or at a U.S. base in the Middle East or at a U.S. consulate in Erbil in the Kurdish area of Iraq? What if Iran takes action against the United States?

The answer is pretty straightforward: Under the Constitution, the President can defend the United States, and the President doesn't need Congress to do that. So if there is an Iranian attack on the United States, the President can and has said he will—and I would strongly support him, as I know everyone in this body would—defend U.S. interests against an Iranian attack.

So the self-defense question is mentioned in the resolution. The resolution says: Nothing in this resolution will block the ability of the United States to take legal action to defend itself, and that is clearly contemplated by article II.

The second question I am asked is, What about the United States helping Israel defend itself?

I have been here since January of 2013. I have voted for every Israel defense package that has ever been before this body, and there have been many. Israel receives more defense aid from the United States than any other nation year after year after year with my support. And I have done more than vote for Israel defense aid; on a couple of instances, I have whipped votes to make sure that we found enough aid for Israel.

In April of last year, we passed a supplemental bill in this body that had billions of dollars of aid for Israel in the aftermath of the horrific attacks on Israel by Hamas on October 7. It was shortly after that vote that Iran launched a set of attacks against Israel.

The defense aid that the United States provided enabled us to knock down and assist Israel in knocking down Iranian drones and missiles. That was a good thing. Had those drones and

missiles landed in Israel, they would have not only killed and wounded tons of civilians, but they would have led to escalation in the region that would have been unhelpful for all countries in the region.

So I stand strong for Israel's right to defend itself, and I stand strong for the United States in providing Israel support so that they can defend themselves, but that is a different question. That is a different question than whether the United States should go to war with Iran.

In my view, there is no compelling security reason for the United States to go to war with Iran.

The last question that I want to ask and sort of reflect upon before concluding is this: What about diplomacy? What about diplomacy?

The pages are here. You have a lot of time on the floor. Sometimes there are speeches, and sometimes there aren't, and I imagine you have looked a lot in this room and what is in the room. One of the things you have noticed is that in the panels—all around the room, the blue panels—at the top of the panel is the seal of the United States. That seal of the United States was designed and embraced by the United States in 1782. The seal of the United States is also in the skylight in the ceiling of the Senate Chamber, and that seal has essentially been constant since 1782. There is a seal of the President of the United States that has changed a little bit, but the seal of the United States that Congress has used has been constant since 1782.

One thing that is very notable about the seal is the eagle and two claws holding the arrows of war and the olive branches of peace. But since the very beginning of this Republic, the eagle's face has been turned to the olive branches of peace. It was designed that way to send a symbol that the United States always prefers peace, always prefers diplomacy, and only uses war as a last resort when diplomacy fails.

We had a diplomatic deal with Iran that was entered into in 2015 that was limiting their nuclear program—peacefully, without having to bomb them, without having to kill civilians, without having to assassinate scientists.

The United States, together with other nations, used the power of congressional sanctions—Congress did this well—to leverage an agreement whereby Iran agreed—in the first sentence of the first paragraph of the first page of the agreement, Iran reaffirmed that it would “never seek to purchase, acquire, or develop nuclear weapons.”

In the body of that agreement, Iran agreed to a whole series of limitations upon nuclear research, nuclear activity, centrifuge construction, and the percentage of enriched uranium it was allowed to have. Also, Iran agreed to the most comprehensive inspection regime of any nation on the planet, overseen by the International Atomic Energy Agency, to ensure that they were meeting their requirements that they

would never seek to purchase, acquire, and develop nuclear weapons and that they would abide by their limits on centrifuges and the limits on enriched uranium and other activities.

The agreement was working. Don't take it from Senator KAINE; the International Atomic Energy Association said the agreement was working. The allies and adversaries—Russia and China—were part of this deal, as were the UK and France and Germany. Those who worked on the deal said the agreement was working. It wasn't turning Iran from a bad actor to a good actor. It wasn't stopping all of Iran's bellicose behavior. But it was limiting the very nuclear program that is now trying to be bombed out of existence. We had an agreement that was working.

President Trump became President in January of 2017, and he said: I don't like the agreement that President Obama did. I want to get out of it.

President Trump's own Cabinet—his Secretary of Defense Jim Mattis said: Don't get out of this agreement. It is working.

His Secretary of State Rex Tillerson said: Don't get out of this agreement. It is working.

His National Security Advisor H.R. McMaster, a former general, said: Don't get out of this agreement. It is working.

For God's sake, we have used diplomacy just as we are supposed to—by preferring peace and diplomacy first—to deprive Iran of a path to a nuclear weapon. Shouldn't we prefer diplomacy rather than putting at risk the lives of American troops, the 40,000 troops who are in the Middle East?

So what happened to the diplomatic agreement? President Trump started to talk about abandoning it.

I wrote a piece in *Time* magazine in 2017, and I said: If you abandon this agreement when it is working, what will Iran do? They will go back to developing nuclear weapons, because if the United States backs out of it, they will as well.

If you abandon this agreement, North Korea will never do a nuclear deal with the United States because why do a deal with the United States if the United States is going to abandon the deal even when it is working?

President Trump didn't listen to me. He didn't listen to his Secretary of State. He didn't listen to his Secretary of Defense. He didn't listen to a lot of people in his administration. He tore the deal up. What a tragedy.

You have Israeli civilians who have been killed in the Iranian missile attacks who have nothing to do with the military and Iranian civilians who have been killed in missile attacks who have nothing to do with the military. They would be alive today and 40,000 U.S. troops in the region would be safe today if we had decided to act in accord with our values and put diplomacy first and put peace over war.

That is water under the bridge. But the question for this body that we will

grapple with over the course of the next couple of weeks is whether the United States should be in another war in the Middle East—in particular, whether we should allow a war to start without us, whether we should hide in the tall grass rather than exercise our constitutional responsibility under article I.

This is fundamentally a debate about Congress being true to its oath of office and actually also being true to the obligations we have to our public.

The Framers put this in the Constitution so that we wouldn't be at war without a debate in front of the public. They had a view about the morality of war, and I think their view was basically this: There would be nothing more publicly immoral, in the public space, than to send troops into harm's way, risking death, if Congress was too chicken to have a debate and vote about whether the war was in the national interest.

If we had that debate and we decide that war is in the national interest, then the troops go into war knowing that the civilian leadership of this country have had the hard debate in view of the American public and decided that the stakes are sufficient to ask people to make the ultimate sacrifice.

But how dare we—how dare we—and I say this as the father of a U.S. marine: How dare we ask people to make the ultimate sacrifice if we don't have the guts to have a debate and decide whether a war is in the interest of this country?

I know what the American public thinks about this. There was a poll that was released today, and this is completely consistent with what I have heard from Virginians. And Virginia is one of the most pro-military States in this country. I am on the Armed Services Committee. One out of every eight Virginians is a veteran. That is not one out of every eight adults; that is one out of every eight Virginians is a veteran—and you add Active Duty, you add the Guard, you add the Reserve, and you add the civilian DOD and the military contractors and their families. We train all the Marine officers in the world. We have the biggest shipbuilding enterprise in the world. We have the Pentagon, the largest military office in the world. We have been the site of more battles on U.S. soil than any State in this country, in Virginia: the Revolutionary War, the Civil War, the attack on 9/11 at the Pentagon.

We are as pro-military a State as there is, but I can tell you this: Virginians do not believe the United States should be in another war in the Middle East. Neither do Americans.

A poll today suggests 16 percent of Americans think the U.S. military should get involved in the conflict between Israel and Iran—one-sixth, 16 percent—60 percent say we should not; 24 percent are not sure.

We need to have this debate in front of the American public and let them

watch us debate the stakes of this. And it might be that colleagues in this body or in the House think a war with Iran is a good idea. Let them put a war authorization on the table. Let's debate that. Let's debate that in front of Virginians and Kansans and Californians and hear what our constituents have to say. Let's debate that in the full view of people whose spouses are in the military or whose kids are in the military. Let's have that debate in front of them and hear what they think before we cast a vote that would be one of the most serious votes that you ever cast on the floor of a body like this.

But we should not allow a war of the magnitude of this to begin with Congress hiding from the responsibility that was put on Congress's shoulders in 1787.

I will be asking my colleagues to support my simple resolution as early as next week: No war without a vote of Congress. I will be asking my colleagues to support it and uphold the oath we have all taken to support the Constitution that established that most unusual principle, most unique principle, that is part of what makes this Nation special.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M.
TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:19 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, June 18, 2025, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. CASE A. CUNNINGHAM
LT. GEN. JOHN J. DEGOES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

CATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. ADRIAN L. SPAIN

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS VICE CHIEF OF THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU AND FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 10505:

To be general

LT. GEN. THOMAS M. CARDEN, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE POSITION INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 7037:

To be judge advocate general of the United States Army

MAJ. GEN. BOBBY L. CHRISTINE

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS VICE CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF AND APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 154:

To be general

GEN. CHRISTOPHER J. MAHONEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. BENJAMIN T. WATSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM J. BOWERS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. DAVID L. ODOM

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. STEPHEN E. LISZEWSKI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. GREGORY L. MASIELLO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JAY M. BARGERON

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS, AND APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 8033:

To be admiral

ADM. DARYL L. CAUDLE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. FREDERICK W. KACHER
REAR ADM. ELIZABETH S. OKANO
REAR ADM. CURT A. RENSHAW
REAR ADM. MICHAEL P. DONNELLY
REAR ADM. THOMAS M. HENDERSCHIEDT

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

CHAD M. HENDERSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

LILY M. DIAKHATE
JEFFREY B. KUSYJ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

To be major

PATRICIA L. MASHBURN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

PETER I. BELK

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 2101, AS PERMANENT COMMISSIONED OFFICERS:

To be commander

KEVIN P. CARMICHAEL

To be lieutenant commander

MICHAEL G. CARMAN
NICHOLAS P. ZIESER

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 17, 2025:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

OLIVIA TRUSTY, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2025.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

GARY ANDRES, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.