

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 88, nays 11, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 176 Leg.]

YEAS—88

Alexander	Fischer	Peters
Baldwin	Gardner	Portman
Barrasso	Graham	Reed
Bennet	Grassley	Risch
Blackburn	Hassan	Roberts
Blumenthal	Hawley	Romney
Blunt	Heinrich	Rosen
Boozman	Hirono	Rounds
Braun	Hoeven	Rubio
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Burr	Inhofe	Schatz
Cantwell	Isakson	Schumer
Capito	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cardin	Jones	Scott (SC)
Casey	Kaine	Shaheen
Cassidy	Kennedy	Shelby
Collins	King	Sinema
Coons	Lankford	Smith
Cornyn	Leahy	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Lee	Sullivan
Cotton	Manchin	Tester
Cramer	McConnell	Thune
Crapo	McCally	Tillis
Cruz	Menendez	Toomey
Daines	Moran	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Wicker
Enzi	Murray	Young
Ernst	Paul	
Feinstein	Perdue	

NAYS—11

Carper	Markey	Warren
Gillibrand	Merkley	Whitehouse
Harris	Sanders	Wyden
Klobuchar	Udall	

NOT VOTING—1

Booker

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 88, the nays are 11.

The motion is agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Cloture having been invoked, the Senate will resume legislative session and consideration of the motion to proceed, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to S. 1790, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NOS. 27 to 48 EN BLOC

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the Foreign Relations Committee be discharged of the following resolutions: S.J. Res. Nos. 27 through 48 and the Senate proceed to their en bloc consideration; further, that the Senate debate the resolutions concurrently, and that at 11:30 on Thursday, June 20, the Senate vote on passage of the resolutions in the fol-

lowing order: S.J. Res. 36, S.J. Res. 38, and then vote on the remaining resolutions en bloc with no intervening action or debate. Finally, if the Senate receives a veto message with respect to any or all of the enumerated joint resolutions of disapproval, then, not withstanding rule XXII, consideration of the veto message be limited to 30 hours of concurrent debate for all messages and the Senate vote on passage of the joint resolutions, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding, in the following order if a veto message is received: S.J. Res. 36, S.J. Res. 38, all remaining joint resolutions en bloc. I further ask that the en bloc votes on passage and with respect to the override vote be shown separately for each resolution when printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the joint resolutions en bloc by number.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S.J. Res. 27) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom and Australia certain defense articles and services;

A bill (S.J. Res. 28) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services;

A bill (S.J. Res. 29) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services;

A bill (S.J. Res. 30) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services;

A bill (S.J. Res. 31) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services;

A bill (S.J. Res. 32) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services;

A bill (S.J. Res. 33) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services;

A bill (S.J. Res. 34) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services;

A bill (S.J. Res. 35) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services;

A bill (S.J. Res. 36) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Kingdom of Spain, and the Italian Republic of certain defense articles and services;

A bill (S.J. Res. 37) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Republic of France of certain defense articles and services;

A bill (S.J. Res. 38) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of certain defense articles and services;

A bill (S.J. Res. 39) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to

the United Arab Emirates and United Kingdom of certain defense articles, including technical data and defense services;

A bill (S.J. Res. 40) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to India, Israel, Republic of Korea, and Kingdom of Saudi Arabia of certain defense articles, including technical data and defense services;

A bill (S.J. Res. 41) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the Government of Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of technical data and defense services;

A bill (S.J. Res. 42) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the United Arab Emirates and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of certain defense articles, including technical data and defense services;

A bill (S.J. Res. 43) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services;

A bill (S.J. Res. 44) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed retransfer of certain defense articles from the United Arab Emirates to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan;

A bill (S.J. Res. 45) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services;

A bill (S.J. Res. 46) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the United Arab Emirates certain defense articles and services;

A bill (S.J. Res. 47) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services; and

A bill (S.J. Res. 48) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the United Arab Emirates certain defense articles and services.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolutions en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I am very pleased that we have been able to work on an agreement on the unanimous consent request that the majority leader just propagated that would provide for votes on these 22 joint resolutions of disapproval over the administration's proposed arms sales to Saudi Arabia and the United Emirates.

I thank the bipartisan group of co-sponsors of these resolutions. The majority leader and our staff are diligently working through an unprecedented process. I would also like to briefly engage the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator RISCH, in a colloquy. I thank the chairman for agreeing to quickly take up two priority pieces of legislation.

Earlier this year, I led a bipartisan group of Senators, including a number on the Foreign Relations Committee, in reintroducing legislation to hold Saudi Arabia accountable for its devastating actions in Yemen, gross human rights abuses, and the murder of American resident Jamal Khashoggi.

I understand the chairman has also been working on such legislation, and we have agreed to use his legislation as

a base text to which we will be able to offer amendments, including those that reflect the bipartisan consensus contained in my bill, the Saudi Arabia Accountability and Yemen Act.

Additionally, the chairman has agreed to a markup of the SAFE Act, which I believe will take place at a business meeting next week, which prospectively eliminates the ability of the President to use emergency authority to sell arms to any country that is not a NATO plus five member. These votes couldn't be more important.

I am happy to yield to the chairman.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator very much. I want to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished Senator from New Jersey. I thank him also for the cooperation he has shown in getting us a little further down the road on the Saudi Arabia bill.

The issues regarding this longtime ally of the United States are troubling. I don't think there is anyone on this floor who is adverse to the idea that action needs to be taken. Obviously, the relationship is not the same as it has been for a long time. Having said that, on a transactional basis, there are a number of things we are allied with Saudi Arabia on.

Also, having said that, some of the things that have happened cannot go unnoticed. There are certainly going to have to be repercussions, and we have been negotiating with all parties, including my staff and the staff of the ranking member, together with the State Department and with the White House. I think we are very close to having a bill that could actually pass the Senate, pass the House, and be signed into law by the President. I think this is a real step forward; I think it is progress on this issue; and I think the structure we have put together is in the best interests of all parties.

So I agree with my friend from New Jersey.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, with that and with the chairman's agreement that we will have a markup of these two bills moving forward, I thank the distinguished chairman, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, over the next few days, Senator REED and I will be leading the consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act for 2020. I consider this—and I think he would probably join me on this—the most significant bill of the year, and it is the most important bill.

There is an old document no one reads anymore called the Constitution, which says what we are really supposed to be doing here. No. 1 on the list is defending America, and now this bipartisan bill is more important than ever.

The world is more unstable and dangerous than at any time in my life-

time. The National Defense Strategy gave it to us straight. This is the document; the National Defense Strategy Commission put this together. It was made up of experts, equally divided, Democrats and Republicans. We have had several hearings on this. We have had meetings and discussed it with our Members. In fact, Senator Jon Kyl, during the brief time that he was back as a Member of the Senate, dropped out of this and then went back in. He is very active in this, and so are the rest.

None of the individuals here have ever been accused of being in any way partisan. What they put together is a defense strategy that is the best thing for this country, and they have done a masterful job of this and actually put it straight to us.

The strategic competition with China and Russia is something that is relatively new. During the last administration, China and Russia started surfacing, and they became more prominent and were challenging us in several areas.

The continuing threats from rogue countries are still important too. We are talking about Iran and North Korea and the other terrorist organizations.

New technology and new warfighting domains in outer space and cyberspace are things that in recent years have become very prominent, and we have to compete. Our peer competitors are out there even stating that they are ahead of us, not to mention the years of underfunding by the previous administration.

When you think about the last administration, if you look at using fiscal year 2018 dollars and you want to take the last 5 years of the previous administration, 2010 had appropriations using constant dollars of \$794 billion. In 2015, 5 years later, it was \$586 billion. So stop and think about that. I can't think of any bureaucracy that has taken that much of a dive in that period of time. We are talking about 20 percent.

So that is the reality we are facing, and this is what we are doing right now in trying to get our Defense authorization bill. Again, it will pass. That is one of the few things you can do that you know is going to pass. It has passed for the last 58 years, and it is going to pass this year too.

Yet we are facing a real national security crisis. There are real threats to our military and our way of life, and we are ready to meet and defeat these threats. We have to continue rebuilding our military, catching up with our competitors, and making strategic and holistic improvements to our national defense. I said catch up, and that clearly states that we are not ahead right now.

Using the National Defense Strategy Commission report as our blueprint, this year's NDAA pursues "urgent change at significant scale" to meet the needs of our Nation.

Our military leaders have said time and again that stable, predictable, on-

time funding is the single most important way Congress can help support a strong national defense. We did this last year, and we are going to do it again this year. It is incredibly important that we stare down the barrel of sequestration cuts that would, in the words of former of Air Force Secretary Wilson, "be absolutely devastating in scope and scale."

It is not just her. Others have come before us and said that if we were to be subjected to sequestration, it would undo all of the corrections that have been made in the last 2½ years. This would undo all of the work we have done to rebuild our readiness. I am talking about fiscal years 2018 and 2019.

We also know that continuing resolutions are no way to do business, especially for our military. We have had the military in hearings we have had. We have traditionally—this year—two very long hearings on defense authorization in our committee. Each witness who comes in talks about how devastating it would be if we were to move back to sequestration or if we have to undo the improvements that we have made.

I know this firsthand. When I go out and visit military installations in Oklahoma, across the country, and around the world, it is true that we sit down with the commanders and the base leaders. But also—and I know my good friend Senator REED does—we go and sit down and eat in the mess halls with our kids out there on the frontlines and talk to them. I have to tell you, they know what is going on. They know when we are dragging our feet on efforts that we have to fund our military. They know who is doing it, who isn't doing it, and they are the best source of getting that information.

The NDAA is the first step in the process of getting them that military funding. This year, we provided a total of \$750 billion to ensure our troops have the resources they need to defend our Nation. This represents a bare minimum. People talk about \$750 billion, but stop and think about it. This report says that until we get back to the point at which we have the military where it should be, we are going to have to increase each year, during this timeframe, somewhere between a 3 and 5 percent increase—net increase—each year. That is in this book here, and that is considered to be a bare minimum. Ironically, that is the same figure that our military uses. The NDAA aligns our defense resources and policies with our National Defense Strategy, which is found in this book.

Fully funding our military at \$750 billion means we will be more ready to address great power competition like China and Russia. We are seeing our military lose ground. Anything less would keep us from regaining our combat advantage and our duty to deter aggression. I am using the words carefully. When we say regain, that is what we need to do, because we are not there

now. We can't plan to fight the wars of tomorrow with the weapons and equipment of yesterday.

The NDAA fully funds the Nuclear Modernization Program at or above request, including the nuclear triad, and directs funding to procure critical equipment.

The Nuclear Modernization Program has been suffering for a long period of time. A lot of people look at the triad system and assume that somehow that is a redundancy. It is not. It talks about systems that can project a nuclear weapon, and there are three different classifications. That is what the triad is all about. It is not as if you can take one or two out of it and still do the job.

In this bill, we have 94 Joint Strike Fighters, 12 new battle force ships, 105 naval aircraft, new aircraft for the Air Force, including the 15 KC-46As, and new helicopters for the Army, including 9 new Chinooks.

We also have to be prepared to meet challenges in new domains. Space is one of those. General Raymond, who is nominated to lead the U.S. Base Command, told our committee when we were having a hearing on this that our superiority in space is questionable. It is not guaranteed. That is work that has to be done. That is what we are finding in this bill that we are going to ultimately be voting for in the next few days.

Our society relies on satellites and space technologies. We need to address this problem now before it is too late, and I am glad President Trump has made this a key initiative.

We took President Trump's directive to establish a space force and came up with a bipartisan plan to establish a force that meets our needs in space. Our bill would stand up the U.S. Space Force in the Air Force. This will create a cohesive strategy to protect our interests in space, improve how we acquire space assets, and improve our space warfighting culture.

People say: Of all the things we are doing right now, we are doing a lot of things in space. What does this do that we are not doing currently? My answer is nothing. We are doing it all now, but this would allow us to do it better. Our plan prevents additional costs and bureaucracy and gets us off on the right foot to better fulfill our mission in space.

The legislation also implements policies that would change the way the Pentagon is run, allowing it to respond more nimbly and effectively to the current defensive landscape.

Last, but arguably the most important, the NDAA makes our all-volunteer force—the backbone of our national defense—the biggest priority.

I happen to be one of the few people—in fact, I think I am the only one in this Senate Chamber who is a product of the draft. That was back in the days when we didn't have an all-volunteer force. I came here absolutely convinced that was the best way to go until I

started seeing what we have out there. When you see these kids and what they are doing, it is amazing how effective they are. They are truly the backbone of our national defense. Even though our military advantage may have been diminished, what hasn't changed are our troops. They are still the best in the world. We have to continue to look out for them. It is one of the biggest ways we stand apart from our adversaries or actors like Russia or China. They don't care about their people. We do.

A lot of times people ask me: Why is it we have to spend so much money on defense? We are spending more money than Russia and China.

That is easy. Our largest single expense to putting together a military is its end strength. It is the people.

It is the people. We care about the people. We make sure we are doing things that are good for the people. I remember we had this big discussion on the privatization of commissaries not too long ago. That was something where that is a benefit. It doesn't cost us any more, I contend, but that is a great benefit for those people—the spouses and members of the military—in remote places. That is where they go. That is where everybody wants to go. So it is true that it costs more, but that is because Russians—it goes without saying, Russians and the Chinese, they don't really care about the people. They are going to tell them to go out and fight. They have to do it. That is the largest single item. They don't have that; we do, and we are better off for it. That is what this is all about. It will put us back to where we are on top. We are not second in any of these areas.

It provides the 3.1-percent pay raise for our troops, and that is the largest we have had in 10 years.

We improved the quality of life for our troops and their families, making sure our troops have quality healthcare and a solid roof over their heads.

Just a few months ago, our committee became aware of some really serious problems in housing. This is only just about last February. This is something—frankly, I was one of the guilty parties because we privatized housing some time ago. That was something that—yes, in a way, it sure makes it easier for us. It makes it easier for the military. All of a sudden, we found ourselves in a situation where we sent out bids. We had contractors who were bidding to do the housing work. Then we found out that—it worked fine for a couple years, but then, as time went by—this is human nature—people got careless. I think the contractors got a little bit greedy. So all of a sudden, we found out we had housing for our people that had mold and all kinds of serious problems. So we had a hearing on this. Actually, we had two hearings on this. One was to listen to the tenants all throughout America who were talking about how deplorable that condition was, and the other one was we

brought in the contractors and talked to them. The thing that impressed me was, during the second hearing of the contractors, they admitted there was a problem. They said: There is. We have become a little too relaxed. They started to clean up their act, but just in case they did not do that, we actually put a lot of those provisions in this bill that we are going to be considering now. It includes a Tenant Bill of Rights. We weren't going to do this until the end of the summer. We were going to have another hearing and talk about what we needed to do to correct the problem, but we already know. They went out there, and they looked.

So in this bill, we have a Tenant Bill of Rights. We have private housing partners being held accountable, ensuring each installation has the right personnel to conduct oversight. Overall, we make sure our military has the infrastructure to support it. Within the funding for military construction, \$3.6 billion is set aside to replenish funds that may be used to build a wall. There has been a lot of criticism. People are saying: Well, you used some military funds—maybe some of the funds that were going to be used for military construction. If that is the case, we have \$3.6 billion set aside here to replenish any funds that might have been used to build a wall. So they don't have that argument anymore.

As I said before, this legislation is legislation that all of our colleagues from both sides of the aisle can support. Defense needs to be our No. 1 priority. We may not agree on everything, but we can definitely agree on that.

The Senate Armed Services Committee approved the bill on an overwhelming bipartisan basis—25 to 2—in only 6 hours. This is kind of interesting. Each year it falls this way—I guess, intentionally. On a Wednesday, we get together at 9 in the morning. The Defense Authorization Committee and the Senate Armed Services Committee meet. We go over what we are going to have to do in terms of this bill, and we get it done. We got this done actually in 6 hours. I thought that was a record, and we did it in a little less than that time this time, but we had a product that was 25 to 2. Only two people voted against it. We completed this work quickly—less than 2 months after receiving the administration's budget request. It was my goal to get this done as soon as possible. I thank the committee and the staff for helping to get this done.

We all understand the importance of this bill. This is the most important bill of the year. I think most people understand that and agree to that. On this committee, we considered 433 amendments and approved nearly 300 of them. Our markup took 6 hours just because of our shared commitment to working together.

So I want to thank, particularly, the ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Senator REED, and every member of the committee

working to pass this critical legislation. I want to thank the majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, for his leadership and for continuing to fight for a budget deal that includes a strong top line for our defense.

I look forward to continuing this fair, corroborative process on the floor in the coming days. We are going to consider amendments. Both Senator REED and I want an open amendment process. Then we are going to pass this bill for the 59th straight year in a row. For nearly 6 decades, Congress has understood the necessity of a strong, capable, lethal force. The main reason America is the leader of the free world is because of our military might. Our Armed Forces are the very best in the world. Our leadership values pave the way for liberty, prosperity, and security across the globe. We preserve peace through our strength. Who else said that? Ronald Reagan talked about the necessity to be strong so we can avoid the very type of threats that are out there. Freedom isn't free. We understand that. We want to preserve this vital role—a role that guarantees a future of freedom and democracy for our children and grandchildren. We have to prioritize our national security. That is what we have been doing with this NDAA, and that is why we are going to continue to do it with the passage of this bill.

Again, I want to express my appreciation. It is a tough bill, and we have spent a lot of hours together, Senator REED and I, and I think we have something now that is going to be going through. We do have an amendment process. It is an open amendment process, and we plan to do that and get that done.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I have a unanimous consent request that the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 1790.

With that, I yield the floor.

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

The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleague Senator INHOFE to discuss the fiscal year 2020 national defense authorization bill. I want to begin by thanking Senator INHOFE for his leadership and bipartisanship throughout the drafting of this bill.

Like you, Senator, I was living through the draft period, but when you join the Army at 17, you don't worry about the draft at 18, but we share that in common also.

The Armed Services Committee, as the chairman indicated, held a series of very thoughtful hearings that greatly informed the shaping of this bill. During last month's markup of the bill, we had a day of good discussion and debate, and the bill was voted out of the

committee by a strong bipartisan vote of 25 to 2. I hope we can now have an equally productive consideration of this bill on the floor. I know Senator INHOFE and I are interested in having votes on amendments, including as many cleared amendments as possible.

I believe this bill contains many provisions that will benefit the Department and our servicemembers. There are a few areas I want to highlight, and then I look forward to turning to the consideration of amendments.

Several months ago—again, as the chairman indicated—this committee became acutely aware of a crisis in quality and safety of privatized military housing. After many weeks of visiting these houses, talking with the affected families, and holding two hearings, the committee included 32 separate provisions in this bill, addressing housing concerns. Several provisions address the need for increasing transparency, providing better controls on incentive payments to companies, requiring standardized leases and satisfaction surveys, and creating a discrete resolution process.

In some instances, the Department has already begun implementing some of the provisions, such as instituting a Tenant Bill of Rights.

Privatized housing is still a long way from where it needs to be in terms of providing quality homes for our military families, but this bill will begin to hold private companies accountable and ensure that the military services have new tools and capabilities to exercise oversight so we can all honor our commitment to our warfighters and to their families.

The bill includes a number of other provisions that support the quality of life for our military personnel, including a 3.1-percent pay raise, \$40 million in supplemental impact aid for federally impacted local school districts, and \$10 million in impact aid for severely disabled military children.

Unfortunately, the bill does not authorize additional funding to support pay raises for the Department's civilian workforce, as the administration proposed a pay freeze for the Federal Government civilian workforce for 2020.

I hope that as we move through this bill and the appropriations bill, we can rectify this error. The gap between the military pay raise and civilian pay raise has never been greater than what the administration has proposed in this year's budget. This is a shortsighted measure that will ultimately harm our national security.

We cannot hope to recruit and retain highly qualified individuals into the civil service and our military departments if salaries do not keep pace with the private sector or inflation. The Department's civilian workforce is a critical component of the total force and across the government a vital component to our national defense and national security.

SEXUAL ASSAULT PREVENTION

Mr. President, the committee continues to enhance sexual assault prevention response efforts in the military. Over the years, we have enacted more than 100 provisions to address sexual assault. This year, we require the GAO to examine all sexual assault provisions enacted since 2003 to help us determine how they have been implemented and if they are making a difference.

This year's bill pays particular attention to prevention of sexual assault. It requires a comprehensive policy to improve education, training, empower and enhance the role of noncommissioned officers in the prevention of sexual assault, promote healthy relationships by addressing behaviors across the continuum of harm related to sexual assault, and foster the social courage to promote interventions.

This provision also addresses alcohol abuse, which is commonly associated with sexual assault.

Although the issue of sexual assault is a national problem—not just a military problem—we remain committed to ensuring the military is at the forefront of combating this scourge.

If the problem of sexual assault in the military is not adequately addressed, it will continue to undermine good order and discipline in our Armed Forces.

In the area of acquisition reform, the bill continues to improve the Pentagon's ability to build and buy the technologies and systems it needs to protect our national security while responsibly spending taxpayer money. For example, the bill mandates that the Defense Department continue to streamline acquisition and contracting processes, including through the use of small, focused teams, in accordance with the recommendations of the GAO.

The bill also seeks to ensure that the Defense Department is aware of the state of its industrial base and has better knowledge of the contractors with whom it works. The bill includes a provision that directs the Department to establish processes by which it can determine the actual ownership of the companies with which it signs contracts. We have seen instances where Chinese and Russian interests are the actual owners of some of the companies in our defense supply chain, raising grave concerns with the security and reliability of those contractors. We need to take steps to make sure that industrial base is secure.

The bill also strengthens the Department's ability to secure fair prices and good value from its contractors. The bill directs the Department to ensure that contractors supply accurate information on the price of goods, technologies, and services, and to report instances where contractors are not providing required pricing information. It also directs the Department to engage the academic community in order to develop more streamlined and data-driven methods to determine fair and reasonable pricing.