THE BUDGET

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, we are on the verge of completing action on the budget resolution for this year. The occupant of the chair knows well that tomorrow we will turn our attention to the final amendments. There will be 40 amendments in order on our side, some number on the other side, and we will complete action by 4 o'clock on Wednesday.

These are momentous decisions that have very important long-term implications. So I thought I would take a moment today to review where we are, where we are headed, and to propose an alternative I will be asking my colleagues to vote on tomorrow, so that we have a chance to describe in some detail what the elements of the Democratic alternative are to the budget being proposed from the other side.

Let me start by reviewing where we are and reminding colleagues that just 2 years ago we were told we had some $5.6 trillion in surpluses over the next decade. Now we know that if the President's tax and spending policies are adopted, instead of surpluses we will have $2.1 trillion of deficits over the next 10 years. That is especially important, given the fact that the baby boom generation is poised to retire in this 10-year period. In fact, the baby boomers start to retire in 2008. This is an extraordinary reversal that has occurred, $5.6 trillion in surpluses 2 years ago, $2.1 trillion in deficits now. That is a $7.7 trillion reversal.

Let's look at where the money went. This next chart shows where the money went. Obviously, some of it is because of the economic downturn, some of it is because of additional spending as a result of the attack on this country. The biggest reason for the disappearance of the surplus is the tax cuts that have been already passed and those that the President proposes. If you take those tax cuts and the associated interest costs, you see it is the biggest single reason for the disappearance of the surplus.

The second biggest reason is labeled here ''other legislation.'' That is primarily spending—spending as a result of the increases for national defense and homeland security. That is where virtually all of the additional spending has gone.

The third biggest reason is technical changes, primarily lower revenues—revenues being lower than anticipated, not as a result of the tax cut but because the economic models incorrectly predicted what revenue would be for various levels of economic activity.

The smallest reason for the disappearance of the surplus is the economic downturn, although it has clearly played a role, at 9 percent.

I think what is most sobering about where we are and where we are headed is this chart from the President's own budget. This is from page 43 of his analytical perspectives. It takes the long view. It looks from 2002, going out to 2050, if the President's policies are adopted, his tax cuts, his spending. What it shows is we never escape from deficit—never. And these are the good times; these deficits are the smallest as a percentage of our gross domestic product, even though they are record deficits in dollar terms. These are the largest deficits we have ever had in dollar terms.

This year, the deficit, not counting Social Security, will be over $500 billion on a $2.2 trillion budget. That is a very large deficit by any measure. But look at what happens if we adopt the President's plan. Those deficits get larger and larger and larger as we go forward because the cost of them explodes at the very time the cost of the Federal Government explodes and at the retirement of the baby boom generation.

Some are saying deficits don't really matter. Somehow, even people who, for their whole careers, believed deficits matter and that we ought to combat deficits are now saying, well, deficits don't really matter, that these are relatively small deficits in the percentage of GDP terms, and that we need not really worry about that.

Mr. President, I will say this. First of all, these are not small deficits: $500 billion deficit on a $2.2 trillion overall base is a deficit of over 25 percent. As a percentage of GDP, A $500 billion deficit on a GDP of $10.5 trillion is a deficit approaching 5 percent of GDP. That is in the range of the very large deficits we saw in the eighties.

Again, what I hope will be remembered is that these are deficits that are right on the verge of the retirement of the baby boom generation. That is when the cost to the Federal Government explodes. That is why these deficits are especially dangerous for the long-term economic security of the country.

For those who say deficits do not really matter, let's turn to Alan Greenspan who is the chairman of the Federal Reserve. He believes deficits matter. He said:

> There is no question that as deficits go up, contrary to what some have said, it does affect long-term interest rates. It does have a negative impact on the economy, unless attended.

This chart is especially important because it shows why this matters so much. This shows the moment in time we are in and why the previous chart from the President's analysis shows this could be the sweet spot. It is because the trust funds of Medicare and Social Security are right now producing hundreds of billions of dollars of surpluses. This year the Social Security trust fund alone will produce over a $160 billion surplus. That is the green bar on this chart. That is the Social Security trust fund. The blue bar, the smaller bar, is the Medicare trust fund. It is also producing surpluses, although substantially smaller than Social Security. One can see they are much larger in total than the tax cuts that are in place.

Look what happens in the next year. Then the size of the tax cuts almost equal the trust fund surpluses. That is true the rest of this decade. Then look what happens. As the trust funds start to go cash negative in the next decade, the cost of the tax cuts explode. Let's reality test. We are already in record deficits now, the biggest deficits in dollar terms we have ever had. We are already in record deficit land. The biggest deficit on a unified basis—that means when we put everything into the pot, all spending, all expenditures, all revenue—the biggest deficit we ever had before was under the previous President Bush, $290 billion—$290 billion.

This year the deficit on a unified basis is going to be over $400 billion. Remember, that does not count the $160 billion that is being taken from Social Security trust fund surpluses. Put those together and we are over $560 billion.

What is ominous about this is that as we go forward, when the trust funds turn cash negative, the cost of the President's tax cuts absolutely explodes, driving us right off the cliff, deeper and deeper deficits, deeper and deeper debt. That is going to present a future Congress and a future administration with extremely difficult choices.

Here is what the CBO Director, the Congressional Budget Office, put in place by our friends on the other side of the aisle. It was their choice for the Director of CBO. CBO is nonpartisan, but they had the opportunity to pick him because they were in the majority. This is what he said:

> Put more starkly, Mr. Chairman, the extremes of what will be required to address our retirement are these: We'll have to increase borrowing by very large, likely unsustainable amounts; raise taxes to 30 percent of GDP, obviously unprecedented in our history; or eliminate most of the rest of Government as we know it. That is the dilemma that faces us in the long run, Mr. Chairman, and these next 10 years will only be the beginning.

That is what he is referring to there—only the beginning. This is going to get much more serious as the baby boom generation retires and as the cost of the President's tax cuts explode.

Some are saying: But this is a growth package, and we are going to grow out of this problem by more and more tax cuts. The so-called growth part of the President's tax proposal costs $994 billion. The $726 billion that is advertised in the newspapers forgets about the associated interest costs. If you reduce your revenue or increase your spending, that adds to your interest cost. When you take the whole cost together, it is $994 billion in this 10-year period, but the first year stimulus is only $40 billion. The President only has 4 percent of his package in the year in which we know we need lift to the economy. We know we need stimulus. He is only providing 4 percent of his package in that year. It does not make much sense really if we are trying to get the economy moving again and yet not add in the long term to the deficits and debt that will make our future choices more difficult and more dangerous.

This is an analysis of what the President's plan does to economic growth. It was done by Macroeconomic Advisers. This firm is under contract to the White House to do their macroeconomic analysis. They are also under contract to our Congressional Budget Office. Here is what they say. They say that the President's plan crowds out investment and slows the economy after 2004. It is not a growth package at all. It is a package that will hurt growth, will retire growth, will reduce jobs, will reduce opportunity. Why? Because they have concluded the President's plan and the tax cuts in it are offset not by spending cuts but by borrowing the money. You cannot borrow your way to prosperity.

What happens because of the President's plan? We go deeper into deficit—remember, we are already in record deficit now. You cut revenue and you raise spending, which is the President's plan; you go deeper into deficit. You go deeper into deficit and you reduce the pool of societal savings. That reduces the pool of funds that is necessary for investment. Less investment, less growth, that is their conclusion. But it is not just their conclusion.

We also have an analysis by Economy.com, Mark Zandi, the noted economist there, on the economic impact of the President's plan, comparing it to the plan the Democrats have offered.

What they concluded is the plan offered by the Democrats is about twice as strong, is about twice as stimulative as the President's plan. In 2003, the President's plan would increase growth by four-tenths of 1 percent; the Democrats' plan by seven-tenths of 1 percent, almost twice as much. In 2004, the President's plan would increase growth by half of 1 percent; the Democrats' plan by nine-tenths of 1 percent. But I think the most interesting conclusion is the conclusion for the entire 10-year period. He has concluded that the President's plan actually hurts economic growth for the 10-year period. From 2003 to 2013, he finds that the President's plan is negative.

Why? Well, he says because of this crowding-out effect. Because the President's plan creates more deficits. That means more borrowing; that means the Federal Government is in competition with the private sector to borrow money; that drives up interest rates. When interest rates go up, economic growth goes down. That is the fundamental problem with the President's plan.

Again, it is not just Chairman Greenspan. It is not just macroeconomic advisers. It is not just economy.com. Two hundred fifty of the most prominent CEOs in America, who head the Committee for Economic Development, came out 2 weeks ago with a detailed report that found the following: No. 1, current budget projections seriously understate the problem. In other words, the problem of deficits and growing debt is much bigger than has been acknowledged. No. 2, while slower economic growth has caused much of the immediate deterioration of the deficit, the deficits in later years reflect our tax and spending choices. No. 3, deficits do matter. No. 4, the aging of our population compounds the problem.

This is really a confirmation of everything I have been saying to my colleagues. Deficits do matter. Of course they matter, just like they matter to a family. A family cannot go out and spend more money than they have in income without it catching up to them at some point.

By the way, it does not happen right away. Just like to a family, one can run up those charge cards, spend more money than they have got coming in for awhile, but at some point it catches up to them. So, too, with nations, even great nations such as ours. We can spend more than we take in for awhile, but at some point the chickens come home to roost. We cannot have deficits that are growing as a percentage of our gross domestic product. That is what every economist will say. We cannot have deficits that grow consistently above the size of the growth of our economy, and that is the problem with the President's plan.

The deficits grow faster than the economy is growing—not just a little bit faster, a lot faster. That is what puts us in a very difficult circumstance.

Again, that is not just the opinion of the sources I have cited. From the Virginian-Pilot, Norfolk, VA, editorial:

> Our challenge is to allow Americans to keep more of their money, the President said in his speech Tuesday. That was a sound argument when the Nation was building up a surplus year after year. But our financial outlook has changed for the worse. There is no money left over to give us back.

Remember 2 years ago when the President had his plan for a big tax cut and he said, we are only giving back one out of every four surplus dollars. Remember, the surpluses are gone. There are no surpluses. Now all we see is deficits and red ink. There is no money to give back.

They continue:

> So the government will borrow billions to make good the President's IOU.
>
> Americans should be skeptical about the promise of something for nothing. It is your tax cuts but it is also your Social Security, health care, schools and roads. They all suffer when the government has to borrow to meet its daily expenses.

It is not just the newspaper in Norfolk, VA. The Deseret News, Salt Lake City, UT, says:

> Now is not the time to cut taxes. War is unpredictable. . . . A long protracted campaign that triggers counterattacks by terrorists and Iraqi sympathizers could be hugely expensive.

Boy, were they prescient because today we learned the President is going to come up this week and ask for another $75 billion for this year alone to wage the war in Iraq, not a dime of which is in the budget. None of that is in the budget.

> Coupled with giant tax cuts, it could send the budget deficit back into levels not seen in a decade or more, which would stifle growth and hamper investment.

Exactly the points I have been trying to make to our colleagues during this budget debate.

> Congress ought to put the President's tax plan on the shelf for awhile until it knows better how the men and women in uniform are going to be spending their year.

Let's look at the budget that has been proposed on the other side, because here is what we see: This year alone, the deficit will be somewhat less than the President has proposed, but still nearly $500 billion, and it never goes away. This is all red ink. This is all borrowed money. Not a single year is the deficit below $300 billion under the President's plan or under the plan that the Republicans are offering us in the Senate Chamber. It is truly stunning. Those are the biggest deficits we have ever seen.

It is not just deficits, but it is also the debt of the country. Two years ago, the President promised that under his plan he would virtually eliminate the debt by 2008. Well, we see that is no longer operative. If we enact the Senate GOP budget plan, the total debt of $6 trillion in 2002 will be $12 trillion in 2013, almost doubling in that period. Many of us think that would be a serious mistake.

This is what we see. This line across the chart at zero is baseline. That is if we do not change the revenue policy of the Federal Government, we do not change the spending policy of the Federal Government. That is the so-called baseline. If we adopt President Bush's budget, we can see $2.8 trillion of added debt during this period. The Senate GOP plan would add $2.2 trillion of debt. What is critical is that we are on the verge of the retirement of the baby boom generation. This is a time we ought to be paying down debt or prepaying liability. Instead, they are talking about dramatically expanding debt, either under the President's plan or the Senate GOP plan.

I am going to offer an alternative on behalf of Senate Democrats. These are the key elements of this plan: Instead of a $1.6 trillion tax cut, we will offer a tax cut much more modest, one that is at the front end to give stimulus to the economy, that would cost $61 billion. In terms of covering the costs of the Iraq war, there is no provision in the President's budget, no provision in the Senate Budget Committee's budget. We would provide the $80 billion the President calls for.

On homeland security, the President and the Senate budget are in the $22 billion to $26 billion range for the 10 years. We would provide $80 billion for homeland security, because we think it is necessary.

On a prescription drug benefit, both of them would provide $400 billion during this 10-year period. We would provide $594 billion for a fuller prescription drug benefit. Make no mistake, this is no Cadillac plan. To give the American people the plan that we as Members of Congress have over that period would cost not $594 billion but $1.8 trillion. To give the plan to the American people that our military has would cost $2.2 trillion over that same period. So it is important to understand that while we are putting more money into prescription drugs than the President's plan or the Senate Republican plan, it is a long way from being generous. As I have indicated, $594 billion is about one-third of the cost of giving the plan that all Federal employees have to the American people.

On education, there is no additional money for IDEA. That is the promise we made to States and local communities when we passed the Disabilities Act legislation for our schools. We said we would fund 40 percent of the costs. We only do half as much. To keep the promise to phase it in over 10 years costs $73 billion. We provide for it. Neither the President nor the Senate GOP plan does.

On transportation infrastructure, the President actually cuts $18 billion below the baseline, below level funding. The Senate GOP plan also cuts, but now it has been amended by a floor amendment, so they bump it up $27 billion. We would provide $71 billion over 10 years above the baseline. Why? Because, No. 1, it is stimulative. You start building roads and bridges. Those are good-paying jobs.

More than that, it increases the efficiency of our economy. If anyone doubts that, go to the Wilson Bridge tonight at 5:30 and see what is happening. Look at the people going nowhere. That has an economic cost to our society. Go out on Route 66 tonight and see what is happening there. Absolute gridlock. It is not just in the Washington metroplex, but all across America.

In my State of North Dakota, which is not heavily populated, we have a substantial part of our road and bridge network that needs repair. Many of the bridges in this country, something like 40 percent, are substandard. That will cost money to fix. If a bridge goes out, that creates lockjaw in the whole economic system of that area. That is something we ought to tend to.

There is no additional money in the President's budget or the Senate Republican budget for our Nation's veterans. We provide $13 billion over the baseline to say to our veterans: We honor what you do to defend this country, and we believe the promise that has been made to you on your health care and on your treatment ought to be kept. Virtually everyone knows the baseline budget for veterans is insufficient. We try to address that with those additions.

The difference in deficits? The President adds $2.1 trillion to deficits; $1.6 trillion under the Senate GOP plan as amended; ours is $863 billion. The difference between our plan and the President's plan is over $1.2 trillion. We have $1.2 trillion less in deficits than the President's plan. Our plan has $750 billion less in deficits than the plan proposed by the Republican majority.

The President's plan never balances the budget. The Senate Republican plan balances in 2012, perhaps 2013. We balance in 2011. That is a wiser course for America and what we should do.

I very much hope that our colleagues give close consideration to this alternative budget when we vote. I will put more descriptions and detail of our alternative into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so it is available to our colleagues, so when we vote tomorrow on this alternative, Members will have a chance to make their own judgment and to compare very directly what we have proposed, what the President has proposed, and what the Senate majority has proposed. I hope very much that our colleagues will take a close look at what we are suggesting: $1.2 trillion less in deficits than the President's plan; over $750 billion less in deficits than the majority has proposed.

Yet we have also tried to address the war cost, which is not included in either the President's budget or the budget from the majority in the Senate. We have tried to address keeping the Federal Government's promise to local subdivisions on education funding.

We have also tried to address the transportation gridlock in the country by providing more funds, and the health care needs of America, by some additional funding on prescription drugs. And, of course, the other difference, the additional funding for our Nation's veterans, something we believe is especially called for in this time when they are sacrificing so much, half a world away in the battle with Iraq. Again, a budget is about choices. That is what we are doing. We are making choices on behalf of the American people.

What is the future going to look like? I believe the budgets proposed by the President and the Republican majority are dangerous for this country. I believe that deeply. They are pushing us deeper and deeper into deficit and debt right on the eve of the retirement of the baby boom generation. The cost of the President's tax cuts explode at the very time the cost to the Government explodes because of the retirement of the baby boom generation.

Remember, we are already in record deficits, and the retirement of the baby boomers is not 20 years away, it is not 10 years away; the leading edge of the baby boom generation starts to retire in 5 years.

I believe we will be condemned in history for failing to face up to our responsibilities and our obligations if we do not recognize what is right over the horizon. That is not a part of the projection. That is a matter of simple fact. The baby boomers have been born. They are alive today and they are going to be eligible for Social Security and Medicare. We know exactly what is going to happen.

The cost to the Federal Government of having twice as many people eligible for Social Security and Medicare in the years ahead can only do one thing: It will drive up dramatically the cost of Social Security and Medicare. And at the very time those costs expand and explode, the cost of the President's tax cut will expand and explode and put this country in deep deficit, in deep debt, and fundamentally threaten the economic security of this country.

I fear some of our colleagues actually intend to shred the programs of Social Security and Medicare. I don't know what other plan they can have in mind. These details, these projections of the spending and revenue of the Federal Government are very clear.

Some have said, well, if the economy grows more strongly, won't that help? Yes, it will help. But understand that all of these numbers assume strong economic growth. They assume the kind of economic growth we have had in the past.

Let me also say some will look at the plan that I have provided and say, gee, Senator, you have some more spending than the Republican plan. Yes, I do. I pay for this war. I increase funding for homeland security. I increase funding for our veterans. I increase funding for education and prescription drugs—just in those areas. The rest of the budget and domestic affairs we hold to a 4-percent increase. That means other parts of the budget are actually having to be cut in order to provide for the priorities for education and prescription drugs. Other parts of the budget are having to be cut.

Let me show a final chart with the long-term spending of the Federal Government from 1981 through 2013. The peak of Federal spending as a percentage of gross domestic product occurred in the 1980s when we were at 23.5 percent of gross domestic product going to the Federal Government. That has come down markedly, to less than 20 percent. Now we have had a jump back up because of the increased defense spending and increased homeland security spending.

Look at the difference between my budget and the Senate GOP plan. There is very little difference. We wind up at 19.3 percent of gross domestic product under the plan I am proposing, down from 23.5 percent in the early 1980s; the Republican plan goes to 18.8 percent, a one-half of 1 percent difference. That one-half of 1 percent is important because it is a matter of priorities. It is a matter of choices.

The budget I am proposing puts in the $80 billion to fund this war in Iraq. Our friends on the other side do not have any money to fund the war.

No. 2, we provide additional funding for our Nation's veterans, $13 billion, not a lot of money over 10 years, but it is meaningful to them. It means we can keep promises we have made to them.

In the other major areas of difference, I have provided some additional funding for prescription drugs—again, a plan that is very modest compared to what Members of Congress and Federal employees have. I have also suggested additional funding for transportation because we need it. We need to improve the efficiency of our transportation system in this country.

Those are the choices that are going to be before our colleagues. The plan I have offered today is a plan that will produce, as I have indicated, $1.2 trillion less in deficits than the President's plan; over $750 billion less in deficits than the Senate GOP plan. That is important. That is critically important. I hope my colleagues will take a close look at this plan. I welcome their support. I urge them to give full consideration to it.

Finally, the other major difference is on education. The plan I have offered would move us toward keeping the promise we made to States and local jurisdictions all across America when we passed the IDEA act. We promised we would provide 40 percent of the funding. We are doing half of it. That is not good enough. When the Federal Government makes a promise, it ought to be kept.

Tomorrow, under the rules of the Senate, we will not have time to discuss these options. We will not have much time for debate at all. There will be a minute a side before the vote is called. But all of us will be held accountable for the choices we make tomorrow. They are choices not just for tomorrow and not just for this year, they are choices for the next decade.

There has rarely been a more important decade in terms of the choices being made. What we are about to see is something that has never happened in this country before, a circumstance where we have this baby boom generation that almost overnight is going to double the number of people eligible for our retirement programs in this country. Nobody will be able to say 10 years from now, when the crunch really hits, gee, we had no idea this was going to happen. Our colleagues are on notice. They know.

We have presented now, over and over, in great detail, where we are headed. The choice is ours to make. I hope we make it wisely.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

The minority leader is recognized.

INDIAN HEALTH AMENDMENT TO THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, through treaties and Federal statute, the Federal Government has promised to provide health care to American Indians and Alaska Natives. Sadly, we haven't come close to honoring that commitment. Tomorrow, I intend to offer an amendment to the budget resolution to rectify this situation.

The IHS is the only source of health care for many Indians, and is required to provide that help and that support, yet funding has never been adequate.

The chronic underfunding has grown even worse in recent years, as appropriations have failed to keep up with the steep rise in private health care spending.

While per capita health care spending for the general U.S. population is about $4,400, the Indian Health Service spends only about $1,800 per person on individual health care services. The Government also spends considerably less on health care for Indians that it spends for Medicare beneficiaries, Medicaid recipients, and veterans.

This level of funding is woefully inadequate to meet the health care needs of Native Americans—who have a lower life expectancy than other Americans, and disproportionately suffer from a number of serious medical problems. Indians have higher rates of diabetes, heart disease, sudden infant death syndrome, and tuberculosis. There is also a great need for substance abuse and mental health services.

More funds are needed at the IHS to provide necessary health care services to Indians.

The current shortage of funds has startling and disturbing results. Native Americans are often denied care that most of us would take for granted and, in many cases, consider essential. They can be required to endure long waits before seeing a doctor and may be unable to obtain a referral to see a specialist. As incredible as this may seem, many Indians and Alaska Natives seeking health care are subject to a literal ''life or limb'' test; that is unless their life is threatened or they risk losing a limb, their care is postponed. Others receive no care at all.

This rationing of care means that all too often Indians are forced to wait until their medical conditions become more serious—and more difficult and costly to treat—before they may have access to health care. This is a situation none of us would find acceptable. Yet today this is the reality in Indian country.

Last year, Gregg Bourland and Harold Frazier, then the chairman and vice chairman of the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, sent a letter to the IHS. This is how they describe the situation in Eagle Butte, SD:

> In January and February 2002, the Eagle Butte Service Unit on the Cheyenne River Sioux reservation has been swamped with children with Influenza A, RSV [Respiratory Syntactical Virus], and one fatal case of meningitis. There are only three doctors on duty, one Physician Assistant, and one Nurse Practitioner. The only pediatrician is the Clinical Director who will not see any patients, even though there is a serious need for the services of a pediatrician.
>
> Several of these children have presented with breathing problems, high fever, and severe vomiting. The average waiting time at the clinic has been four and six hours. The average time at the emergency room is similar. Most babies have been sent home without any testing to determine what they have and with nothing but cough syrup and Tylenol. In at least three cases, the baby was sent home after these long waits two or more times with cough syrup, only to be life-flighted soon thereafter because the child could not breathe.
>
> The children were all diagnosed by the non-IHS hospital with RSV [Respiratory Syntactical Virus]. No babies have died yet, but the Tribe sees no justification for waiting until this happens when these viruses are completely diagnosable and treatable.

It is absolutely unacceptable to put the lives of these children at risk. And we can do something to help. On more than one occasion, I have heard horror stories of pregnant mothers delivering children in circumstances that no expectant mother or child should have to endure.

For example, right now the service unit at Eagle Butte in South Dakota does not have an obstetrician. The Eagle Butte service unit is funded at 44 percent of the need calculated by the Indian Health Service. The facility has a birthing room and 22 beds, but there are only two to three doctors to staff the clinic, hospital and emergency room. Naturally, as a result, many children and expectant mothers do not receive the care they need and deserve. Due to budget constraints, the IHS policy is to allow only one ultrasound per pregnancy. The visiting obstetrician is available only every couple of weeks.

The story of Brayden Robert Thompson points out how dangerous this situation is. On March 3, 2002, Brayden's mother was in labor with a full-term, perfectly healthy baby. Brayden's umbilical cord was wrapped around his neck, but, without ultrasound, that went undetected. The available medical staff didn't know what to do about his lowered heartbeat, abnormal urinalysis or the fact that his mother was not feeling well. Despite the symptoms, IHS refused to provide an ultrasound or to send her to Pierre to see an obstetrician. Bryden was stillborn.

This tragic death was completely preventable, but tough choices are being made every day at IHS facilities throughout the country because there simply isn't enough money to provide the care that every American deserves.

The Pine Ridge Indian reservation in my State of South Dakota built a beautiful new hospital and health care center. In many ways, they are equipped to provide state-of-the-art, coordinated care. But they cannot retain healthcare professionals because of low payment schedules and inadequate training opportunities for local people.

Their shiny new labor and delivery rooms, surgery rooms and even dental