

and proactively against our adversaries. Unfortunately, when red lines are crossed with no consequences and when groups like ISIS aren't treated as the serious threat they are, terrorism can make its way onto U.S. soil. Just consider the attacks in San Bernardino or the multiple attacks on our allies in Europe.

Unfortunately, as groups such as ISIS are getting stronger, our friends around the world are increasingly getting concerned that the United States doesn't have their backs. The White House prioritized its courtship with Iran, the No. 1 state sponsor of global terrorism, while choosing to ignore our friends and allies in the region. Turning its back on Israel to give Iran billions of dollars in sanctions relief was a hallmark of President Obama's tenure in the Oval Office, and Secretary Clinton said that she was proud to play a part in crafting that terrible nuclear deal. This simply is not good foreign policy. Why should we choose to reward those who have harmed us or threatened us while ignoring our oldest and strongest relationships? The result is what we would pretty much expect: an Iran that is ascendant in the Middle East and growing in belligerence with a nuclear program largely intact.

Our actions do speak louder than words, and right now our friends in the Middle East and around the world are losing faith in their relationship with the United States. This is simply a product of failed foreign policy under the Obama-Clinton leadership. I think it is telling that when former President Jimmy Carter, a Democrat, was asked about President Obama's policies on the world stage, he said, "I can't think of many nations in the world where we have a better relationship now than we did when he took over." This is President Carter on President Obama's foreign relations. He went on to go through a list of countries as examples of where, in his words, "the United States' influence and prestige and respect in the world is probably lower now than it was six or seven years ago." On that point, I agree with President Carter. The foreign policy of this administration is nothing to be proud of.

Our job now in the Senate is to reassure our allies that the military might of the United States has not fallen by the wayside. One way we can do that is by ensuring our military has the resources and funding necessary to remain a strong emblem of American strength for the rest of the watching world. After delays and obstruction from our friends on the other side of the aisle, I hope we can finally complete our work this week on the Defense authorization bill under the able leadership of Chairman McCain.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Texas for his very compelling statement.

Just one example of what the Senator from Texas has referred to is the whole issue of Qadhafi. I would remind my colleague from Texas that we got rid of Qadhafi without losing a single American and then walked away. We walked away from it, and now we see ISIS establishing a strong beachhead—a direct failure of leadership of the Obama administration and the then-Secretary of State.

There were many of us, including the Senator from Texas, who said: Look, we have to do a lot of things now that you have gotten rid of Qadhafi. This country has never known democracy; it has no institutions. For example, we could have taken care of their wounded. We could have helped them secure their borders. Instead, what did we do? We killed Qadhafi—or his own people killed him. But we set up a scenario that happened and just walked away—just as we walked away from Iraq, just as we are sort of walking away from Afghanistan while the Taliban is starting to show success throughout the country. This administration is very good at walking away. Unfortunately, the consequences are attacks on the United States of America and Europe.

So I thank the Senator from Texas for his very important statement.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, it is my pleasure to rise with my friend and colleague from Rhode Island to speak about the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2017.

For 54 consecutive years, Congress has passed this vital piece of legislation, which provides our military servicemembers with the resources, equipment, and training they need to defend the Nation. The NDAA is one of the few bills in Congress that continues to enjoy bipartisan support year after year. That is a testament to this legislation's critical importance to our national security and the high regard with which it is held by the Congress.

Last month, the Senate Armed Services Committee voted 23 to 3—23 to 3—to approve the NDAA, an overwhelming vote that reflects the committee's proud tradition of bipartisan support for the brave men and women of our Armed Forces.

I thank the committee's ranking member, the Senator from Rhode Island, for his months of hard work on the NDAA. It has been a great pleasure to work with him on this legislation, and I remain appreciative of the thoughtfulness and bipartisan spirit with which he approaches our national security. He is a great partner and a great leader.

I also thank the majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky, for his commitment to bring the NDAA to the Senate floor on time and without delay. It is a testimony to his leadership that the Senate will once again consider this bill in regular order with an open amendment process.

I am tremendously proud of the Senate Armed Services Committee's work on this legislation. This year's NDAA is the most significant piece of defense reform legislation in 30 years. It includes major reforms to the Department of Defense that can help our military rise to the challenge of a more dangerous world.

The NDAA contains updates to the Pentagon's organization to prioritize innovation and improve the development and execution of defense strategy. The legislation continues sweeping reforms of the defense acquisition system to harness American innovation and preserve our military's technological edge.

The NDAA modernizes the military health system to provide military servicemembers, retirees, and their families with higher quality care, better access to care, and a better experience of care.

The NDAA authorizes a pay raise for our troops. It invests in the modern equipment and advanced training they need to meet current and future threats. It helps to restore military readiness with \$2 billion for additional training, depot maintenance, and weapons sustainment. And it gives our allies and partners the support they need to deter aggression and fight terrorism.

This is a far-reaching piece of legislation, but there is one challenge it could not address: the dangerous mismatch between growing worldwide threats and arbitrary limits on defense spending that are in current law. This mismatch has very real consequences for the thousands of Americans who serve in uniform and sacrifice on our behalf all around the Nation and the world. Our troops are doing everything we ask of them, but we must ask ourselves: Are we doing everything we can for them? The answer, I say with profound sadness, is we are not.

Since 2011 the Budget Control Act has imposed arbitrary caps on defense spending. Over the last 5 years, as our military has struggled under the threat of sequestration, the world has only grown more complex and far more dangerous. Since 2011 we have seen Russian forces invade Ukraine, the emergence of the so-called Islamic State and its global campaign of terrorism, increased attempts by Iran to destabilize U.S. allies and partners in the Middle East, growing assertive behavior by China and the militarization of the South China Sea, numerous cyber attacks on U.S. industry and government agencies, and further testing by North Korea of nuclear technology and other advanced military capabilities. Indeed, the Director of National Intelligence, James Clapper, testified in February that over the course of his distinguished five-decade career, he could not recall "a more diverse array of challenges and crises" than our Nation confronts today.

Our military is being forced to confront these growing threats with shrinking resources. This year's defense budget is more than \$150 billion

less than fiscal year 2011. Despite periodic relief from the budget caps that imposed these cuts, including the Bipartisan Budget Act of last year, each of our military services remains underfunded, undersized, and unready to meet current and future threats. In short, as threats grow and the operational demands on our military increase, defense spending in constant dollars is decreasing. How does that make any sense?

The President's defense budget request strictly adheres to the bipartisan budget agreement, which is \$17 billion less than what the Department of Defense planned for last year. As a result, the military services' underfunded requirements total nearly \$23 billion for the coming fiscal year alone. Meanwhile, sequestration threatens to return in 2018, taking away another \$100 billion from our military through 2021. This is unacceptable.

While the NDAA conforms to last year's budget agreement at present, I have filed an amendment to increase defense spending above the current spending caps. This amendment will reverse shortsighted cuts to modernization, restore military readiness, and give our servicemembers the support they need and deserve. I do not know whether this amendment will succeed, but the Senate must have this debate and Senators are going to have to choose a side.

At the same time, as I have long believed, providing for the common defense is not just about a bigger defense budget—as necessary as that is. We must also reform our Nation's defense enterprise to meet new threats, both today and tomorrow, and to give Americans greater confidence, which they don't have a lot of now, that the Department of Defense is spending their tax dollars efficiently and effectively. That is exactly what this legislation does.

The last major reorganization of the Department of Defense was the Goldwater-Nichols Act, which marks its 30th anniversary this year. Last fall the Senate Armed Services Committee held a series of 13 hearings on defense reform. We heard from 52 of our Nation's foremost defense experts and leaders. The Goldwater-Nichols Act of 30 years ago responded to the challenges of its time. Our goal was to determine what changes needed to be made to prepare the Department of Defense to meet the new set of strategic challenges. As Jim Locher, the lead staffer on Goldwater-Nichols, testified last year: "No organizational blueprint lasts forever. . . . [T]he world in which DOD must operate has changed dramatically over the last 30 years."

Instead of one great power rival, the United States now faces a series of transregional, cross-functional, multidomain, and long-term strategic competitions that pose a significant challenge to the organization of the Pentagon and the military, which is often rigidly aligned around functional

issues and regional geography. Put simply, the Goldwater-Nichols Act of 30 years ago was about operational effectiveness—improving the ability of the military services to plan and operate together as one joint force. The problem today is strategic integration—how the Department of Defense integrates its activities and resources across different regions, functions, and domains, while balancing and sustaining those efforts over time.

The NDAA would require the next Secretary of Defense to create a series of "cross-functional mission teams" to better integrate the Department's efforts and achieve discrete objectives. For example, one could imagine a Russia mission team with representatives from policy, intelligence, acquisition, budget, the services, and more. There is no mechanism to perform this kind of integration at present. The Secretary and the Deputy have to do it ad hoc, which is an unrealistic burden. The idea of cross-functional teams has been shown to be tremendously effective in the private sector and by innovative military leaders, such as GEN Stan McChrystal. If applied effectively in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, I believe this concept could be every bit as impactful as the Goldwater-Nichols reforms.

The NDAA would also require the next Secretary to reorganize one combatant command around joint task forces focused on discrete operational missions rather than military services. Here, too, the goal is to improve integration across different military functions and do so with far fewer staff than these commands now have. Similarly, the legislation seeks to clarify the role of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, focusing this leader on more strategic issues, while providing the Chairman greater authority to assist the Secretary with the global integration of military operations.

The NDAA also seeks to curb the growth in civilian staff and military officers that has occurred in recent years. Over the past 30 years, the end strength—the total number of members of the services—of the joint force has decreased by 38 percent. The number of men and women serving in the military has decreased by 38 percent, but the ratio of four-star officers—admirals and generals—to the overall force has increased by 65 percent. We have seen similar increases among civilians at the senior executive service level. The NDAA, therefore, requires a carefully tailored 25-percent reduction in the number of general and flag officers, a corresponding 25-percent decrease to the ranks of senior civilians, and a 25-percent cut to the amount of money that can be spent on contractors who are doing staff work.

The NDAA also caps the size of the National Security Council policy staff at 150. The National Security Council staff will be capped at 150. The staff has steadily grown over administrations of both parties in recent decades. Under

George Herbert Walker Bush, there were 40; more than 100 in the Clinton administration; more than 200 during the George W. Bush administration; and now there are reports of nearly 400 under the current administration, plus as many as 200 contractors. This tremendous growth has enabled a troubling expansion of the NSC staff's activities from their original strategic focus to micromanagement of operational issues in ways that are inconsistent with the intent of Congress when it created the NSC in 1947. It has gotten so bad that all three leaders who served as Secretary of Defense under the current administration recently blasted the NSC's micromanagement of operational issues during their tenures. Former Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta has come out publicly in favor of shrinking the staff, saying he thinks we can do the job better with fewer people.

In short, the NSC staff is becoming increasingly involved in operational issues that should be the purview of Senate-confirmed individuals in the chain of command, and doing so beyond the reach of congressional oversight. If this organization were to return to the intent of the legislation that established it, it could reasonably claim that its strategic functions on behalf of the President are protected by Executive privilege. If, on the other hand, the NSC staff is to play the kind of operational role it has in recent years—and I could give my colleagues example after example—if it is going to play the kind of operational role it has in recent years, then such a body cannot escape congressional oversight.

The purpose of the provision in the NDAA to cap the size of the NSC staff is to state a preference for the Congress's original intent in creating the NSC.

As I have said, integration is a major theme in the NDAA. Another one is innovation. For years after the Cold War, the United States enjoyed a near monopoly on advanced military technologies. That is changing rapidly. Our adversaries are catching up, and the United States is at real and increasing risk of losing the military technological dominance we have taken for granted for 30 years. At the same time, our leaders are struggling to innovate against an acquisition system that too often impedes their efforts. I have applauded Secretary Carter's attempts to innovate and reach out to nontraditional high-tech firms, but it is telling that this has required the Secretary's personal intervention to create new offices, organizations, outposts, and initiatives—all to move faster and get around the current acquisition system.

Innovation cannot be an auxiliary office at the Department of Defense; it must be the central mission of its acquisition system. Unfortunately, that is not the case with the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, also known as AT&L. It has grown too big,

tries to do too much, and is too focused on compliance at the expense of innovation. That is why the NDAA seeks to divide AT&L's duties between two offices—a new Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering and an empowered and renamed Under Secretary of Management and Support, which was congressionally mandated 2 years ago.

The job of research and engineering would be developing defense technologies that can ensure a new era of U.S. qualitative military dominance. This office would set defense-wide acquisition and industrial-based policy. It would pull together the centers of innovation in the defense acquisition system. It would oversee the development and manufacturing of weapons by the services. In short, research and engineering would be a staff job focused on innovation, policy, and oversight of the military services and certain defense agencies, such as DARPA.

By contrast, management and support would be a line management position. It would manage the multibillion-dollar businesses—such as the Defense Logistics Agency and the Defense Commissary Agency—that buy goods and services for the Department of Defense. It would also manage other defense agencies that perform other critical business functions for the Department, such as performing audits, paying our troops, and managing contracts. This would not only enable research and engineering to focus on technology development, it would also provide for a better management of billions of dollars of spending on mission support activities.

These organizational changes complement the additional acquisition reforms in the NDAA that build on our efforts of last year. This legislation creates new pathways for the Department of Defense to do business with nontraditional defense firms. It streamlines regulations to procure commercial goods and services. It provides new authorities for the rapid prototyping, acquisition, and fielding of new capabilities. It imposes new limits on the use of so-called “cost-plus” contracts. The overuse of these kinds of contracts and the complicated and expensive government bureaucracy that goes with them serves as a barrier to entry for commercial, nontraditional, and small businesses that are driving the innovation our military needs.

Another major reform in this year's NDAA is the most sweeping overhaul of the military health system in a generation. This strong bipartisan effort is the result of several years of careful study. The NDAA creates greater health value for military families and retirees and their families by improving the quality of health care they receive, providing timely access to care, and enhancing patient satisfaction—all done at lower costs to the patients by encouraging them to seek high-value health services from high-value health care providers.

The NDAA incorporates many of the best practices and recent innovations of high-performing private sector health care providers. For example, the NDAA creates specialized care centers of excellence at major medical centers based on the specialized care delivery model in high-performing health systems like the Cleveland Clinic. The legislation also expands the use of telehealth services and incentivizes participation in disease management programs. Finally, the NDAA expands and improves access to care by requiring a standardized appointment system in military treatment facilities and creating more options for patients to get health care in the private sector.

Taken together, these reforms, along with many others in the bill, will improve access to and quality of care for servicemembers and their families and retirees and their families, and they will improve the military and combat medical readiness of our force and reduce rising health care costs for the Department of Defense. This entails some difficult decisions. The NDAA makes significant changes to the services' medical command structures and right-sizes the costly military health system infrastructure, and, yes, the NDAA asks some beneficiaries to pay a little more for a better health system.

Let me make three brief points.

First, Active-Duty servicemembers will not pay for any health care services or prescription drugs they receive, and the NDAA does not increase the cost of health care by a single cent for families of active-duty servicemembers enrolled in TRICARE Prime. There will continue to be no enrollment fees for their health care coverage. All beneficiaries, including retirees and their families, will continue to receive health care services and prescription drugs free of charge in military hospitals and clinics.

Second, the NDAA does ask working-aged retirees, many of whom are pursuing a second career, to pay a little more. Increases in annual enrollment fees for TRICARE Choice are phased in over time, and there are modest increases in pharmacy copays at retail pharmacies and for brand-name drugs through the mail-order pharmacy. It is important to remember that 68 percent of retirees live within the service area of a military hospital or clinic where they will continue to enjoy no co-pays for prescription drugs, and all military retirees have access to the mail-order pharmacy, where they can access a 90-day supply of generic prescriptions free of charge through fiscal year 2019.

Third, while some military retirees will pay a little more, the guiding principle of this reform effort is that we would not ask beneficiaries to pay more unless they receive greater value in return—better access, better care, and better health outcomes. The NDAA delivers on that promise. Modernizing the military health system is part of the NDAA's focus on sustaining the quality of life of our military servicemembers, retirees, and their families.

The NDAA authorizes a 1.6-percent pay raise for our troops and reauthorizes over 30 types of bonuses and special pays. The legislation restructures and enhances leave for military parents to care for a new child, and it provides stability for the families of our fallen by permanently extending the special survivor indemnity allowance. No widow should have to worry year to year that she or he may not receive the offset of the so-called widows' tax. If this NDAA becomes law, he or she will never have to worry about that.

The NDAA also implements the recommendations of the Department of Defense Military Justice Review Group by incorporating the Military Justice Act of 2016. The legislation modernizes the military court-martial trial and appellate practice, incorporates best practices from Federal criminal practice and procedures, and increases transparency and independent review in the military justice system. Taken together, the provisions contained in the NDAA constitute the most significant reforms to the Uniform Code of Military Justice in a generation.

Among the many military personnel policy provisions in the NDAA, there is one that has already attracted some controversy. That, of course, is the provision in the NDAA that requires women to register for Selective Service to the same extent as men beginning in 2018. Earlier this year, the Department of Defense lifted the ban on women serving in ground combat units. After months of rigorous oversight, a large bipartisan majority in the Armed Services Committee agreed that there is simply no further justification to limit Selective Service registration to men. That is not just my view but the view of every single one of our military service chiefs, including the Army Chief of Staff and the Commandant of the Marine Corps.

There will likely be further debate on this issue. As it unfolds, we must never forget that women have served honorably in our military for years. They filled critical roles in every branch of our military. Some have served as pilots, like MARTHA MCSALLY, who flew combat missions in Afghanistan. Some served as logisticians, like the Presiding Officer, Senator JONI ERNST, who ran convoys into Iraq. Others have served as medics, intelligence officers, nuclear engineers, boot camp instructors, and more. Many of these women have served in harm's way, and many women have made the ultimate sacrifice, including 160 killed in Afghanistan and Iraq.

As we uphold our commitment to the well-being of our servicemembers and their families, we must also uphold our commitment to American taxpayers. As part of the committee's comprehensive effort to root out and eliminate wasteful spending and improve the Department of Defense acquisition system, the NDAA imposes strict oversight measures on programs such as the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter, the B-21

Long Range Strike Bomber, the Ford-class aircraft carrier, and the littoral combat ship. These provisions will ensure accountability for results, promote transparency, protect taxpayers, and drive the Department to deliver our warfighters the capabilities they need on time, as promised, and at reasonable costs.

The NDAA also upholds America's commitment to its allies and partners. It authorizes \$3.4 billion to support our Afghan partners as they fight to preserve the gains of the last 15 years and defeat the terrorists who seek to destabilize the region and attack American interests. The legislation provides \$1.3 billion for counter-ISIL operations. The NDAA fully supports the European Reassurance Initiative to increase the capability and readiness of U.S. and NATO forces to deter and, if necessary, respond to Russian aggression. It also authorizes up to \$500 million in security assistance to Ukraine, including lethal assistance. We should give the Ukrainian people the ability to defend themselves. Finally, the legislation includes \$239 million for U.S.-Israel cooperative missile defense programs.

As we continue to support allies and partners against common threats, the NDAA makes major reforms to the Pentagon's complex and unwieldy security cooperation enterprise, which has complicated the Department of Defense's ability to effectively prioritize, plan, execute, and oversee these activities.

This legislation also makes sure we are not providing support to adversaries like Russia. The United States' assured access to space continues to rely on Russian rocket engines. Purchasing these engines provides a financial benefit to Vladimir Putin's cronies, including individuals who have been sanctioned by the United States, and it subsidizes the Russian military industrial base. This is unacceptable at a time when Russia continues to occupy Crimea, destabilize Ukraine, menace our NATO allies, violate the 1987 Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty, and bomb moderate rebels in Syria. That is why the NDAA repeals a provision from last year's Omnibus appropriations bill that furthered dependence on Russia.

Once the nine Russian rocket engines allowed by the past two NDAs are expended, the Defense Department would be required to achieve assured access to space without the use of rocket engines designed or manufactured in Russia. In testimony before the committee, the Secretary of Defense, the Director of National Intelligence, and the Secretary of the Air Force each confirmed that the United States can meet its assured access to space requirements without the use of Russian rocket engines.

We do not have to rely on Russia for access to space. Given the urgency of eliminating reliance on Russian engines, the NDAA will allow for up to half of the funds for the development of

a replacement launch vehicle or propulsion system to be made available for offsetting any potential increase in launch costs as a result of prohibitions on Russian rocket engines. With \$1.2 billion budgeted over the next 5 years, we can cover the costs of ending our reliance on Russia while developing the next generation of American space launch capabilities.

Finally, the legislation takes several steps to bolster border security and homeland defense. It authorizes \$688 million for Department of Defense counterdrug programs. It enhances information sharing and operational coordination between the Department of Defense and the Department of Homeland Security. It provides additional support for the U.S. Southern Command, and it continues support for the U.S.-Israel anti-tunneling cooperation program, which helps to improve our efforts to restrict the flow of drugs across the U.S. southern border.

I say to my colleagues: This is an ambitious piece of legislation, and it is one that reflects the growing threats to our Nation. Everything about the NDAA is threat driven—everything, that is, but its top line of \$602 billion. That is an arbitrary figure set by last year's budget agreement, having nothing to do with events in the world, and which itself was a product of 5 years of letting politics, not strategy, determine the level of funding for our national defense. Former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs GEN Martin Dempsey described last year's defense budget as "the lower ragged edge of manageable risks." Yet here we are 1 year later with defense spending arbitrarily capped at \$17 billion below what our military needed and planned for last year. I don't know what lies beneath the lower ragged edge of manageable, but this is what I fear it means—that our military is becoming less and less able to deter conflict and that if, God forbid, deterrence does fail somewhere and we end up in conflict, our Nation will deploy young Americans into battle without sufficient training or equipment to fight a war that will take longer, be larger, cost more, and ultimately claim more American lives than it otherwise would have.

That is the growing risk we face, and for the sake of the men and women serving in our military, we cannot change course soon enough. The Senate will have the opportunity to do just that when we consider my amendment to reverse the budget-driven cuts to the capabilities of our Armed Forces that are needed to defend the Nation. I hope we will seize this opportunity.

We ask a lot of our men and women in uniform, and they never let us down. We must not let them down. As we move forward with consideration of the NDAA, I stand ready to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to pass this important legislation and give our military the resources they need and deserve.

Again, I note the presence of my esteemed colleague and friend, the rank-

ing member of the Armed Services Committee, without whom this legislation would not have been possible. It happens to be a source of great pride to me—and I hope to Americans who believe that we are bitterly divided—that as an example of defending this Nation and providing for men and women whom we send into harm's way, the Senator from Rhode Island and I have developed a partnership that I believe has been incredibly productive. Without the kind of partnership that I have enjoyed with my friend from Rhode Island, it would not have been possible to produce this legislation, which is obviously the most important obligation we have, and that is to defend the Nation.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to proceed to S. 2943 is agreed to.

The clerk will report the bill.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2943) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 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 Senator from Arizona.

AMENDMENT NO. 4206

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I call up amendment No. 4206.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN], for Mrs. FISCHER, proposes an amendment numbered 4206.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To modify the requirement that the Secretary of Defense implement measures to maintain the critical wartime medical readiness skills and core competencies of health care providers within the Armed Forces)

On page 423, strike lines 16 and 17 and insert the following:

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (c), not later than 90 days after submitting the report required by subsection (d), or one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever occurs first, the Secretary of Defense

On page 425, strike lines 10 through 18 and insert the following:

(5) The Secretary shall ensure that any covered beneficiary who may be affected by modifications, reductions, or eliminations implemented under this section will be able to receive through the purchased care component of the TRICARE program any medical services that will not be available to such covered beneficiary at a military treatment facility as a result of such modifications, reductions, or eliminations.