

for National and Community Service. And second, it will ensure that Indian Tribes remain eligible to compete for national service grants.

I want to applaud the Corporation for National and Community Service for recognizing the need for a tribal liaison over the past year. That office has helped make tribal communities more aware of the opportunities that the Corporation offers.

Making this position permanent will further increase tribal community in all national service programs. In addition, the office would collect information on challenges to tribes to better address tribal program needs.

The amendment places the designation of this position under the duties of the chief executive officer of the Corporation for National and Community Service and would greatly help to develop and enhance programming to address the unique needs of Indian tribes.

The second part of this amendment would ensure that tribal governments remain eligible for nationally competitive grants. Existing law allows tribes to compete for funds with states and national nonprofit organizations. The bill as currently written would remove tribal eligibility to compete for these grants. My amendment merely maintains existing law, and acknowledges Indian tribes as eligible entities for these competitive grants.

As my colleague from Alaska noted, many of the proposed Corps in this act address the very issues which are most critical in Indian Country. Grants under the activities and indicators of the Education, Healthy Futures, Clean Energy, Veterans and Opportunity Corps would provide many volunteers from tribal organizations, States, and national nonprofits numerous opportunities to work on reservations.

My hope is that the Corporation will continue to encourage the use of these Corps on Indian reservations though the proposed strategic adviser for Native American affairs in a way which will help tribal communities and individuals.

American Indians have the lowest level of educational attainment of any racial or ethnic group in the United States. Only 13.3 percent of Native Americans have an undergraduate degree, compared to the national average of 24.4 percent. Volunteers in the Education Corps who offer their time as mentors and tutors in Indian Country could help improve these numbers for our First Americans.

Moreover, the Health Futures Corps could assist with volunteers for individual American Indians who need help obtaining health services or navigating the health care system. The Clean Energy Corps might facilitate volunteers for Indian Country to assist with weatherization of homes on Indian reservations. The Veterans Corps is able to send volunteers to work with American Indian families who have a family member deployed overseas. Finally, the Opportunities Corps could provide

volunteers to increase financial literacy in Indian communities where this assistance is desperately needed.

In addition, organizations who participate in the national service programs, such as the Boys and Girls Club, are active through these national service programs in Indian Country and they provide a much needed positive environment where Native American youth can go to celebrate their culture and community.

I would like to reiterate how important these national service programs are to Indian Country and thank the Corporation for National and Community Service for recognizing that importance. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to the Serve America Act.

MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

The Senator from Georgia.

THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED BUDGET

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the President's proposed budget.

A real sense of unease is pervading the country right now, and it is not just the stock market or unemployment fears or the housing crisis. There is a genuine apprehension about where our Nation is headed financially.

In my travels throughout my home State this past weekend, I had the opportunity to talk to Georgians from Atlanta, to Waycross, to Blakely, to Macon, and to hear what is on their minds. One of their main concerns is the budget the President has sent to the Hill and the financial hole into which it will put this country, our children, and our grandchildren.

They are right to be worried. The independent, nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office released its analysis of the President's proposed budget on last Friday. Its assessment is very troubling. The CBO's estimate for the cost of this budget exceeds that of the Obama administration's estimate by \$2.3 trillion over a 10-year period. By borrowing and spending so much money, the CBO projects that the public debt—the amount we have to pay back to our creditors—will grow to 82 percent of GDP by 2019. The last time that happened, America was paying off a massive debt it incurred from fighting in World War II. According to the CBO, this year, 2009, the total deficit is estimated to hit \$1.9 trillion. By 2018, the CBO projects annual deficits to be more than \$1 trillion every year, and rising. Under the terms of this budget, the annual deficit, in 2013, is slated to be \$672 billion—or more than 4 percent

of estimated GDP. That is one of the largest deficits in American history, but it is actually the smallest projected deficit in this entire budget.

Back in 2004, before he was the President's Director of the Office of Management and Budget, current OMB Director Peter Orszag wrote that repeated deficits of 3.5 percent or more will put this country on an "unsustainable path" and would result in "a related loss of confidence both at home and abroad." He was right. But we are feeling that loss of confidence among Americans now, much less among those whom we are looking to to buy that huge debt we are creating.

To put it plainly, people are worried. These are people such as Phil Perlis, who owns a family clothing business in Tifton, GA. Phil's family has owned The Big Store for almost a century, and it employs approximately 20 people. I know Phil and his family very well. Phil said this is the toughest year he has ever had. He has been "squeezed in every place imaginable." The days of feeling comfortable about making a profit no longer exist, and he simply hopes to be in business this time next year. His confidence is shaken. And given the business climate and the economic issues in Washington—and despite his positive attitude—Phil predicted to me the other day that very trying times are ahead for his store, as well as all other small businesses across America.

He is not alone. Americans, despite the optimism that is our birthright, already feel a sense of disquiet about the direction our Nation is headed economically. As an example, the national savings rate has gone from zero in 2005 to 8 percent today. For the good of their families, Americans are trying to hold on to what they have, not throwing caution to the wind and hoping for a future financial miracle. For the good of our country, our children, and our grandchildren, our Government should do the same.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.
I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURRIS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE BUDGET

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, next week the Senate is going to take up the budget. The budget, of course, is one of the most important documents the Congress considers each year. It is really the blueprint for spending. At the end of that debate in the Senate, hopefully the budget will pass and the same thing will happen in the House. The two Chambers will come together and agree on a spending pattern for the

next fiscal year, which begins October 1.

It is an elaborate process, a lengthy process, many times a divisive process, but one that is absolutely essential because this budget book really reflects who we are and where our values are. That is why we spend so much time thinking about it and planning it. We have to look ahead, and not just to the next fiscal year from October 1 of this year through September 30 of 2010 but to what the budget will mean in the outyears. What will it do for the following year? What do we anticipate will happen?

Some of it is speculation. There are great speculators, and people paid a lot of money to speculate on what is going to happen to the economy, and they come up with different conclusions. I was thinking the other day, when the Congressional Budget Office came out with different projections for economic growth: I wonder if any speculators on economic growth 2 years ago would have predicted we would be where we are today. I do not think so because there would have been a race for the exits, with people selling their stocks and mutual funds and liquidating as fast as they could. We did not receive fair warning this was going to happen, although there were some storm clouds that really should have been heeded.

Well, when this President came to office, he inherited quite a situation. We started the year 2009 with President Obama in the midst of a crisis unlike any we have seen in our lifetime. As the Budget Office book indicates, our economy is in deep recession that threatens to be deeper and longer than any since the Great Depression 75 years ago.

More than 3.5 million jobs were lost over the past 13 months, before President Obama came to office—more jobs than at any time since World War II. Another 8.8 million Americans who want and need full-time work have had to settle for part-time jobs. Manufacturing employment has hit a 60-year low. Capital markets are virtually frozen, making it difficult for businesses to grow and families to borrow for a home, a car, or the college education expenses of their kids. Families are struggling to pay their bills and make their mortgage payments. Trillions of dollars of wealth have been wiped out. There is hardly anyone with a savings account or any kind of investment who has not seen it diminished by this economy over the last year. That is just a fact.

It is in that environment and in that context that we discuss what to do in the next budget. What should the Federal Government do in light of these economic realities?

Well, the first thing we did for this President was to pass a recovery and reinvestment package, the stimulus bill. The President came to us and said: Here is the fundamental problem we run into. People are worried. When their confidence is low, they stop

spending. And if they are not spending on basic appliances and cars and things people spend money on, then, of course, there is no demand for goods and services. Without that demand, businesses start contracting and shrinking, laying off employees, and the situation goes from bad to worse.

So the President came to us and said: I am asking for \$800 billion in a recovery and reinvestment package to try to breathe some life back into this economy, to create jobs and save jobs, so people will have a paycheck they will spend for goods and services, which will invigorate businesses across America.

That, to me, was just fundamental. I took some economics courses in college way back when, and we basically learned what was known as Keynesian economics; that is, if you do not have enough aggregate demand in your economy, you can create that demand in three different ways: consumer spending, investment, or Government spending. Well, we cannot get people to invest because they are afraid of the stock market. Consumer spending is down because people are worried about the future. That leaves you one option: Government spending.

A lot of people say: Well, how can we spend money—\$800 billion—Senator, when we have all these deficits? You are just piling up more debt for our kids to pay. There is truth to that, but it does not tell the whole story. If we do not turn this recession around, if we do not put people back to work and businesses back in business, then, sadly, the recession gets worse, the overall deficit gets worse, and the prospects that those kids of yours or grandkids will even find a job are diminished. So our investment in the recovery plan is a basic investment to try to create more consumer demand for goods and services and get the economy chugging forward again.

The budget the President proposes, the one for the next fiscal year, for our Government that we will be debating next week on the floor of the Senate, is a smart, fair, and responsible budget. The President has proposed—and he described it last night in his press conference—to restore fairness for middle-class families, reestablish responsibility in the budgeting process, and make smart investments for America's future. I think we have to do all three.

The Republican response to this on the other side of the aisle is that the President's budget just spends too much money. It taxes too much. It borrows too much.

The President's increase in what we call nondefense discretionary spending—that is outside of the mandatory programs such as Social Security and Medicare and Medicaid and other programs, veterans programs, and defense spending—all the rest of the budget is relatively small in comparison. But it is true that the President calls for increased spending in that area—but in two specifics: one, more money for veterans. You cannot visit a veterans hos-

pital or meet with veterans today without realizing that the promise we made to them has to be kept, and it will cost money. I had a hearing today where two generals spoke to us from the Air National Guard and the Army National Guard and they talked about returning veterans and the problems they face, and we know there are many. Some come home with terrible wounds from war and have a long period of time ahead of them for rehabilitation and recovery. Some, however, come home with invisible wounds, psychological wounds, posttraumatic stress disorder and the like. LTG Vaughn from the Army Guard and Reserve said that suicide rates are up 140 to 150 percent. The same thing is true with the air guard returnees. It is an indication that we have an obligation that needs to be met. We need to spend money to make sure these veterans get the kind of care we promised, to put them back in a position in life where they can proceed to get a job and build a home and a family and have a good future. They served us. They risked their lives for America. We promised we would stand by them. President Obama keeps the promise in this budget.

When the Republicans on the other side say cut spending, I wonder if we will see any amendments from the Republican side to cut President Obama's requested increase in spending to help our veterans. It is one of the highlights of his budget. I don't think they will offer that amendment. They may complain about the spending level, but I doubt if they will stand up here and say we are spending too much money on our veterans.

The President, of course, puts money into education, as he should. President Obama understands that a lot of middle-income families are struggling to keep their kids in school. Sometimes they are not making as much money at home as they used to. Some kids have been asked to come home from the campuses and not go back to school for awhile until things get better. Well, that interrupted education is not good, and we want these kids, these young men and women, to have a bright future. President Obama's budget spends money in providing financial and tax assistance to students in school. If that isn't a smart investment for our future, I don't know what is. It is critically important.

So to my Republican friends who say we spend too much, I guess my basic answer to them is: Please show us your budget. Unfortunately, what we have heard and what we have seen from the Republican side of the aisle is the same old politics and the same old policies—policies that brought us into this economic mess, and they still cling to them. Unfortunately, they don't reflect the reality of where America is today.

They say, of course, on the Republican side that the President taxes too much—taxes too much in his budget. Well, since 95 percent of Americans would receive a tax cut and any tax increases are for the richest Americans—

those at the highest level of income—then apparently the Republicans are complaining because those who are well off might end up paying more in taxes.

Over the last several weeks we have heard quite a bit about how some of the wealthiest people in America are getting by and being compensated. I recognize that every wealthy American hasn't contributed to the decline in our economy, and not every wealthy American pulls down a hefty AIG bonus each year, but we are in this together. If we are asking sacrifice from average working families—and we are—is it too much to ask those making over \$250,000 a year to pay a little bit more in taxes? People making over a quarter of a million dollars a year will have to pay a little bit more under President Obama's budget. That is a fact. Their taxes will go up. The complaints from the other side must be about those tax increases, because the overwhelming majority—95 percent of American families—will see a tax cut, the President's Making Work Pay tax cut.

Some of my friends on the other side of the aisle seem to have no problem asking middle-class American workers—people making \$35,000 or \$40,000 a year—to make wage and salary concessions when they renegotiate their contracts, but if you ask those on the other side of the aisle whether people making over a quarter of a million dollars a year or half a million a year or \$1 million a year should pay a little more in taxes, they say it goes too far, it is fundamentally unfair. I disagree with that point of view. What the President has proposed is smart, fair, and responsible. Ninety-five percent of Americans will see their taxes go down, as long as those tax cuts are paid for.

To those who say that raising taxes on anyone is a sure way to ruin the economy, look back to how our economy performed in the 1990s. Most Americans would gladly trade the prosperity of that decade for today's economy. No one in America will pay more taxes under the Obama budget than they would have paid in the 1990s under the Clinton administration. This budget takes a fair, responsible, and targeted approach to the current imbalance in our taxes.

Then, of course, there is the criticism on the Republican side that President Obama's budget borrows too much, borrows too much money. Well, let's reflect on history for a moment. Eight years ago when President George W. Bush took office, he inherited a surplus from President Clinton, a 2-year surplus when we were generating more revenue than we were spending in Washington. It hadn't happened in 30 years, but it happened under a Democratic President. George W. Bush inherited this. At the time he came to office, the sum total of the debt of America, from the days of George Washington through the Clinton administration, was about \$5 trillion. President George W. Bush inherited a budget

with a surplus and a \$5 trillion mortgage on America. At the end of 8 years, what did President George W. Bush and the Republican administration leave us? The largest annual deficit in American history—\$1.3 trillion—and a doubling of the national debt. In 8 years, President George Bush doubled all the debt accumulated by America in the entire history of our Nation.

That happened on the watch of the Republicans who supported that President's policies. Now, this President, 65 days into his Presidency, is being accused of borrowing too much money, inheriting an economy flat on its back, trying to spend money and get us moving forward, and the criticism from the other side is he is going to have to borrow money.

Where was all this worry about borrowing too much when nearly all the Republicans voted to permanently repeal the estate tax, a repeal which would cost the American taxpayers \$1 trillion—\$1 trillion—in order to provide a tax break to the wealthiest three-fourths of 1 percent of Americans? I can tell my colleagues, many of the same Senators who were crying copious tears over the thought of going into debt were the first to step forward and say, Give a tax break to the wealthiest people in America and we don't care what debt it incurs. I think their priorities are wrong.

Where was this worry about borrowing too much when the Bush administration turned that Clinton surplus into the largest pile of debt this Nation has ever seen? Remember Vice President Dick Cheney's favorite quote: "Reagan proved deficits don't matter." Well, I don't agree with that view. They do matter, to our kids and our grandkids. But those who should have been worrying about our deficits over the past 8 years turned a blind eye to them. They went along with Vice President Cheney. They said deficits don't count. They refused to do anything, while our national debt doubled under the last Republican administration, and we built up enormous debts we still owe to China and Japan, OPEC, and many other nations. They refused to act when our economy was growing and could have easily absorbed the necessary change. Now, when our economy is struggling and we need to spend the money to move forward, these same Republicans have decided that deficits are bad news. They have suddenly gotten a new brand of religion and they want us to end the deficits they supported in the first place. They were wrong then and they are wrong now. If we want to turn around the economy, now is the time for smart investments that pay off over the long term. We want to make sure we create jobs and business opportunities, investing in things that will pay off for a long time to come. The President spelled them out last night.

We know if we invest in health care in America to reduce the cost so that individual families and businesses,

State and local governments, as well as the Federal Government, have a reduced increase in the cost of health care each year, it will help us balance the books. President Obama is dedicated to doing that. It will not only be good from a budget viewpoint, it is good from a health care viewpoint. It makes health insurance more affordable. It makes health care more affordable. It will mean that by modernizing and computerizing health records, we will have a better diagnosis and we will avoid the medical errors that frequently occur when information isn't gathered correctly and completely. So that investment in health care is part of President Obama's spending, spending to bring us out of the recession the right way: investing in our future.

He also invests in energy. It wasn't that long ago we were captives of the oil cartels that decided how much we would pay for gasoline. It went up to about \$4.50 in the Midwest. In Illinois, where I am honored to be Senator, people were hurting. Filling a gas tank was a big deal. I remember pulling my little Ford pickup truck into a gas station in Springfield to fill it up on the weekend and it was 60 bucks and I couldn't believe it. I had never paid 60 bucks to fill up that little truck, ever. That is what happened. For other folks, they had to fill up every other day to get back and forth to work. We were the captives of these oil cartels, these dictators, who were draining off hundreds of billions of dollars from families and businesses in America for overpriced oil—\$120 a barrel and beyond. President Obama wants to bring that to an end. He wants us to move toward energy independence.

He wants to invest in making certain we have green energy sources, renewable and sustainable, right here at home. Is that a good thing for the long term? I think it is one of the best investments we can make. It is the kind of smart investment we need in a budget which many of my friends on the other side of the aisle have rejected. They were the first to complain about gas prices. They are obviously the last to sign up for changing our energy economy.

The third area, of course, is education. I wouldn't be here today without it. Most of us have profited from education that has given us chances we never dreamed of. President Obama can tell that story personally and many others can as well. His investment in education is to make sure we have better teachers, better classrooms, new libraries, laboratories, buildings that will service us in the 21st century. These are investments that will pay off for a long time to come as our kids get the education they need to compete in the 21st century.

We will hear a lot about the budget debate next week. There will be a ton of amendments. There always have been. Everybody has their favorite issue, their favorite amendment. But when it gets down to the bottom line,

the question is what that budget will say about who we are and what we value. President Obama has proposed a budget that will make critical investments in our Nation's highest priorities at a time when America needs them more than ever. This budget would provide a little bit of help to hard-working families who desperately need it: tax cuts, as long as we pay for them, education assistance, health care, and alternative energy investments. That is what this budget is all about. The budget restores fairness, re-establishes responsibility.

Incidentally, we are finally going to put in this budget the real cost of Iraq and Afghanistan. For 8 years the Republican administration ignored it, wouldn't count it, said it was some mystery emergency spending. We know better. This budget is more honest.

We also realize to make smart investments—and this budget will make a lasting impact on our country by improving our economy, that will benefit our children and grandchildren for many years to come.

When the time comes next week, I hope my colleagues will step forward, be part of a new era of responsibility, be part of renewing America's promises, promises we have made that we will show good stewardship in leading this country out of this recession into a bright day tomorrow.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NATIONAL SERVICE REAUTHORIZATION ACT—Continued

AMENDMENTS NOS. 691, 712, 695, AS MODIFIED,
AND 696, AS MODIFIED

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, notwithstanding the pendency of H.R. 1388, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the Senate to consider the following amendments and that, where applicable, the amendments be modified with the changes at the desk; that the amendments be agreed to, as modified, where applicable, and that the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc: amendment No. 691 and amendment No. 712; that amendments Nos. 695 and 696 be called up for consideration, and that each amendment be modified with the changes at the desk; that the amendments, as modified, be agreed to and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc.

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

The amendments (Nos. 691 and 712) were agreed to.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask that amendments Nos. 695 and 696 be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], for Mr. BURR, proposes amendments numbered 695 and 696, as modified.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 695, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To provide for outreach to high schools with low graduation rates)

On page 19, line 22, strike "identified for school improvement under title 1" and insert "not making adequate yearly progress for two or more consecutive years under section 1111."

AMENDMENT NO. 696, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To clarify references to high school graduation rates)

On page 49, line 15, insert "(as defined in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(vi) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311(b)(2)(C)(vi)) and as clarified in applicable regulations promulgated by the Department of Education" after "graduation rate".

On page 59, line 9, insert "and as clarified in applicable regulations promulgated by the Department of Education before "; and".

On page 69, line 14, insert "and as clarified in applicable regulations promulgated by the Department of Education before the semi-colon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments, as modified, are agreed to, and the motions to reconsider are laid upon the table.

The amendments (Nos. 695 and 696), as modified, were agreed to.

FLOODING IN NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, Senator CONRAD and I and Congressman POMEROY, our two colleagues from Minnesota, Senator KLOBUCHAR and Congressman PETERSON, met with President Obama just a few moments ago in the Vice President's Room behind the Chamber to talk about the flood threat in our region. This is today's NOAA flood warning map of our country, and you will see that North Dakota is entirely green. The green represents the flood warning areas in our country. We have an entire State under a flood watch.

The headline in our State today is "Blizzard Blasts The State." We have a raging blizzard that has gone on now for the last day and a half. It has closed the interstate highways. We have had up to 18 inches of snow in some areas, and then we have unbelievable flooding threats up and down the Red River and the Red River Valley of North Dakota. Now we have an urgent flood threat that exists in Bismarck, ND, as I speak.

I think it would probably be helpful just to show a few of the scenes. This is piling sandbags. They have had nearly 3 million sandbags filled in a very short period of time with college and high school students and National Guard and others in the Red River Valley filling sandbags. As I said, 3 million sandbags in a very short period of time.

This is the North Dakota National Guard filling sandbags inside the Bismarck Civic Center. Just in the last 24 hours we have seen a threat to the capital city—a very significant threat—and that threat is described in this photograph. This photograph shows what is called an ice jam. There are two ice jams at this point on the Missouri River and the Knife River that flows into the Missouri River. This shows an ice jam. As I speak, they are trying with explosives to deal with this ice jam. There are two ice jams, and if this happens in the wrong way, and one ice jam gives at the wrong time, we will see the entire south side of the capital city of Bismarck, ND, with a substantial amount of water.

Evacuations are underway as I speak in portions of that city. The mayor and the Governor and others, the Corps of Engineers, virtually everyone is involved, and this is a very significant flood threat that just really in the last 24 to 48 hours has developed as a result of significant ice jams.

This is a city that has not had substantial flood threats since the dam was built on the Missouri River about 60 miles north of Bismarck, ND. But these ice jams have completely changed the calculation and pose a serious threat to the city of Bismarck today. There is a great deal of work going on in the city. I say to all of them how much we admire the work they are doing. They are heroes. There are so many in the military and volunteers who are filling sandbags and doing the work that is necessary to fight that flood.

The Red River Valley flood—this is volunteers in the Fargodome filling sandbags. As I said, several million have now been filled. It appears that this flood could very well top the estimates of the 1997 flood. In 1997, in the Red River Valley, Grand Forks, ND, a community, then, of about 45,000 to 50,000 people was completely evacuated. I rode down the streets of Grand Forks in a boat in a community that was completely evacuated. In the middle of that flood, the center part of that downtown city caught on fire, and we had the spectacle of firefighters in the middle of a flood trying to fight a fire in a downtown area that had been completely evacuated.

This is the Red River Valley. It is completely flat, as flat as a table top. You can't see a hill in any direction. So because of unprecedented amounts of moisture—snowfall and rainfall—and because all of that occurred on top of ground that last fall, when it froze up was completely saturated, we now see, once again, the threat of record levels of flooding.

This is sandbagging outside of Fargo homes in the last day or two.

This is flooding in Beulah, ND.

This is 70 to 80 miles north and west of Bismarck, ND.

This is a feed lot in Mandan, ND. You can't see any feed, and you can't see a lot.

All you can see is water. This is a flooded yard in Fargo, ND. This is the