the productive agricultural economy of the State. About what time were those lands inundated and taken off the tax rolls?

Senator MUNDT. The project was authorized in 1944. One of the first things that they had to do when the project was funded was to get title to the lands. They began a series of negotiations, trying to get land by voluntary agreements. In some cases they could; in most cases the corps was not able to offer enough to make the landowner feel he was being adequately compensated.

So with the exercise of the right of eminent domain, the citizen has a right to take it into court or before some judicial body, which they did. In virtually every instance where they did take it into court, the courts ruled that the money offered by the corps was inadequate and they increased it. But unhappily, most of the increase did not go to the landowner. It went to the attorneys and the costs involved in taking it into court. So we have had a loss in some instances, I suppose, between 1945 and 1950.

Senator JORDAN. Then your State has been deprived of tax revenues which before that date accrued to the State from this land?

Senator MUNDT. For between 15 and 20 years, that is generally correct.

Senator JORDAN. So in essence, this project as presented to us today, is a partial restoration of that tax base that was taken from you by the lands that were inundated.

Senator MUNDT. Right. For 15 of the 20 years there has been a loss, though some compensation was given to the landowner.

In most cases, from the standpoint of the recipient, in virtually all cases it was inadequate. Now we make available through this project about 1 acre for every 2 that was lost, but in the long pull South Dakotans are glad to do this because of the multipurpose benefits and because the floods which in the main were not in South Dakota, were costly in life and costly in dollars.

Our people enthusiastically support the Pick-Sloan plan, even though they had to forgo part of the tax base.

Senator JORDAN. But the interim effect on the State and local tax resources was negative, as has been testified to here today?

Senator MUNDT. You are exactly correct.

Senator MCGOVERN. If the Senator will yield, it has been estimated that it is costing us about $20 million a year in farm income that we have lost in revenues as a result of the lands under the reservoirs that have been flooded.

Of course, that has resulted in enormous savings to the downstream States in the prevention of flood damage, which in some years ran many times that amount.

As Senator Mundt has said, I don't think very many people in South Dakota regret that investment we are making for the future, but it would, of course, be a cause of great disappointment if we couldn't now move ahead and complete the project and realize a return on that sacrifice in the form of these irrigation benefits.

Senator JORDAN. I think that is a significant point. In effect, South Dakota has been the good samaritan throughout the years and now you want a partial restoration of what you sacrificed for the benefit of the whole Nation.