It is good to be here tonight. Bill Grange and George Hartley wrote me a fine letter about what this event has come to mean to the community, but even their advance work hardly prepared me for the crowd and the interest I've felt already this evening. I'm very glad to be back in my State, my first trip since the President asked me to take a seat on the Federal Power Commission. My new duties are challenging, and I find the change most welcome; I'm still involved with resource development, but in a different way. I'm one vote in only five on important questions affecting the electric power and the natural gas businesses. I've come to Twin Falls while the memories of last Tuesday's election are still fresh. The analysis of that election are still pouring out.

Sixty-some million Americans voted last week; only about one-half of one percent of that number voted here in Idaho, yet as always the percentage of eligible voters voting was probably the highest in the Nation.

The general election, and the primary elections which preceded it, have cast up for us a mass of raw material, from which the columnists, the political scientists, the politicians and the man in the street, can find answers to the question of what the American people were saying as they voted in 1966.

One can prove almost anything, or one can find support for whatever answer he wants. Republicans won governorships in many States, but Democrats won in such historically Republican States as Maine and Kansas, and kept the Statehouse in storied Vermont. Forty-seven Democratic seats were lost in the national House of Representatives, including many of the freshmen whose fate was being so closely watched. But even here, there were surprises, as in Washington and New York, where the freshman Democrats did very well indeed. The so-called backlash factor was mixed. Florida and seemingly Georgia went one road; Maryland and Massachusetts the other.

Some old timers bit the dust in the House—Judge Trimble of Arkansas; North Carolina's Harold Cooley, the Chairman of the House Agriculture Committee; and Winfield Denton of Indiana, Chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee. Many others were either defeated in primaries, or didn't run: Joe Martin, Massachusetts, former Speaker; Judge Smith, Chairman, House Committee on Rules; Walter Rogers; and Paul Douglas.
Others, like House Interior Chairman Wayne Aspinall of Colorado, won big victories.

I could go on, but I owe it to you first to explain why I have dared start out with political-type comments. I think I can show you that all of this has something to do with FARM-CITY week observance in Twin Falls, Idaho, and particularly with the subject which has been announced for me—the development of the land and water resources of Idaho.

Farm and city interests are here tonight in common cause and in good fellowship. But everyone here knows that for the country as a whole, there are forces at work which divide them. In our population of 200 million, 70 percent live in cities. But a few decades ago, only 30 percent lived in cities. In another ten years, the ratio will be 80-20, according to all the predictions. Consider additionally that there is now a Cabinet post for the interests of the cities, and that the activities of the Department of Agriculture range far beyond the farm.

We've become a nation of city dwellers. In part, this is a product of nothing more remarkable than improved transportation—it is possible now, as it wasn't fifty years ago, to enjoy the amenities of city living, and still be in the farming business.

More fundamental, of course, is the technological revolution of farming—increased productivity, increased mechanization and related changes which have made agriculture a business. Farms are larger, and the capital requirements are ever greater.

All of this is generally understood. But along with these economic changes have come some political developments, not always discussed in connection with each other. The most important of these were the Supreme Court decisions which led to the redistricting of Congressional districts, and the re-structuring of State Legislatures.

On the national scene, this has meant already a perceptible shift in the make-up of the House of Representatives. The city-oriented flavor of the House is already established. The process is by no means complete, and the big story of 1966 was not just the 47 seats lost to the Democrats in November, but the extensive changes by retirement and primary losses months earlier.
Redistricting doesn't affect Senators, naturally, but changes in population patterns work the same kind of shift in the Senate. California's Senators are not Western Senators by the old stereotype of Hiram Johnson, Key Pittman and William E. Borah; not even like Mansfield, Church, Jordan, and Bible. Arizona and Utah are already dominated, politically, by the Phoenix-Tucson or Salt Lake-Ogden-Provo metropolitan population patterns.

I make no point that any of this is good or bad. In the sense that old inequities are corrected, it is good. The danger is that new inequities might be created. An even greater danger, I think, is that the American people may be pulled apart, and be caused to forget that economically and socially, the country stands or falls as a unit. There can't be industrial prosperity and farm depression, or the converse either. This country has learned this lesson in the past. I hope it does not have to relearn it as painfully. It is also relevant directly to the subject tonight, which is the further development of the natural resources of our State.

The reason can be stated explicitly, in these terms: development of land and water in Idaho requires action on many fronts. Private initiative and endeavor are requisite here the same as elsewhere. But political, as well as social and economic, action, is especially vital in Idaho.

Why? Because we are relatively undeveloped, and because Idaho's land is two-thirds in Federal ownership. Policies for the Federal lands, and the forage, timber and mineral resources of the lands, are constitutionally the province and the prerogative of the Congress. This is not to say that the executive role is not important--far from it. It is to say that the best chance for the people of Idaho to have a say about development policies is through their elected representatives.

It was just a year ago that I was in Boise for the All-Idaho Congress, which is meeting again right now. I tried then to relate these development questions which affect both the State and the Federal governments by emphasizing that it would be worth the effort to become thoroughly informed about how the various agencies of the Federal government formulate and execute their policies and programs.

By no means did I intend to say then, nor do I intend to say now, that we must hitch our wagon to the star of Federal programs alone. We've seen too many examples of local initiative
succeeding in working great wonders in the development of land and water resources—private effort has brought as many acres into cultivation under assured water in Idaho without the intervention of any Federal program in the last ten years, as in the great project of the Grand Coulee in Washington.

Additional private efforts, however, are being frustrated as the Federal interest in the land and water of this State becomes a necessary ingredient. Then policies like the acreage limitation principle of reclamation law, carried over to desert land law by interpretation, become critical to further development efforts.

These questions are in the arena of politics, by definition. Mastery of their complexity is a prerequisite to their rationalization. This is where we must come back to the make-up of the Congress.

We must start with the premise that public land questions of the kind I've mentioned are Western questions. The twelve States which care, because they are directly affected, still represent 24 percent of the Senate, but a decreasing percentage of the House. So how these questions are synthesized and presented to the Congress will depend on how the Senators and Congressmen who are directly affected can enlist the interest and attention of their colleagues. They naturally will get the most attention from those of their colleagues whose States have equivalent problems, and we are thus back to where we started. By the political changes being effected, there are fewer of these.

It isn't only the land, but the water developments too, which require political action. Sometimes this action is affirmative, like getting a new project authorized. Sometimes it is negative, such as blocking a project which would have an adverse impact (such as a diversion of a region's water).

Again I could go on, but I have mentioned enough I think for you to see that if Idaho is to develop, it must not only have good plans for its own development, but must also be able to work effectively with political resources which by definition are of declining influence—declining, that is, if the issue becomes drawn on a straight rural v. city issue.

As I have said before in this State, Idaho must have a thorough understanding of the ground rules under which the game
of development of Idaho is played: the laws, rules and regulations of the Federal agencies which have responsibility over much of its land and water, and the nature of the process by which decisions in this area are made and affected.

Under the leadership of Congressman Wayne Aspinall, there is now functioning an organization which was specifically designed to bring together the whole subject-matter of public land and associated resources for the drawing of a legislative blueprint of the policies for the retention or disposition of these lands and their resources.

The last few days the Public Land Law Review Commission has been meeting in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Earlier meetings in Salt Lake City, Boston, Massachusetts, and Denver have explored in depth problems much like those of our own State.

That Commission is made up of 19 members—six Congressmen, six Senators, six members appointed by the President, and a Chairman elected by the 18. Each Governor is entitled to name a representative to sit and work with the Commission, and a 25-member advisory council, appointed by the Commission itself from people experienced in all the uses of the public lands—mining, lumbering, oil and gas, irrigation, recreation and others—augmented by representatives from Interior, Agriculture, Defense, Federal Power Commission, Justice, Atomic Energy Commission (all the agencies concerned with public lands) work with the Commission toward its statutory objective of studying all the laws, rules and regulations affecting the public lands, and recommending legislation to the Congress as to what to do about them.

The Congressmen and Senators must be from the Interior Committees of the two Houses, half Republicans and half Democrats.

This is a vitally important activity. Let's see how Idaho is represented on it:

Until next January 10th, when the new Congress is sworn in, Idaho has two members on the Commission, Senator Jordan and Congressman White. The Governor's representative from Idaho is Dr. Theophilus of the University. Lloyd Haight, General Counsel of J. R. Simplot Company, Boise, and A. B. Bert Curtis, Mayor of Orofino, are both members of the 25-member national advisory council to the Commission.
Until my own job changed, I was Interior Department's representative on the council, and I've kept my place there as the representative of the Federal Power Commission. I claim to represent also my State, so far as I properly may do so.

What kinds of Idaho problems will the Commission's work affect? The list is long: desert land law application to the new agricultural developments; criteria for classification of public lands for multiple use; tenure for grazing users; timber cutting policies; sharing of revenues, or in lieu tax payments to States by reason of public lands; access over public lands for recreation, hunting, fishing, etc.; the so-called reservation doctrine affecting water on the public lands; and many, many others.

You can see why it is vitally important that we have people in Congress who are knowledgeable about, and care about these matters.

This is not his District, so I guess it would not be improper for me to express my regret about Congressman White's leaving the Congress and the Commission. This is not to say that Jim McClure will not care as much, or work as hard. But let's take a political fact of life that I think was overlooked by the people of North Idaho. White's spot on the Commission will go to another Democrat, not to Jim McClure--there is no Republican vacancy. And who are the three Republicans? They are good men, but they are from Pennsylvania and Maryland, besides Laurence Burton of Utah.

Lest I be accused of partisanship, I can hasten to add that if Len Jordan had been defeated, the exact same situation would have occurred on the other side of the fence. Harding could not have taken Jordan's spot on the Commission, and Idaho would have lost a valuable member of that Commission in that case, too.

Naturally these can't be controlling issues, particularly when people are choosing their Congressmen or Governors or Senators. My plea is for a broader, and I think fundamentally non-partisan consideration--the further development of our State. In this, we need all the experienced talent we can get.

So I have some specific suggestions. Become informed about the work of this Commission; talk to your Congressmen
and Senators and to your Governor about it, and tell them you think it is important and why.

For I can tell you that development of our land and water will not "just happen." As never before in the history of our country, development is no longer accepted as automatically a good thing. Because some areas are overdeveloped, the pressures will be to restrict the further development of those areas who have not yet achieved their potential. Naturally, in the heightened state of our resource sophistication, we can be more careful in the future than we have in the past, but in the matter of bringing this rich soil of ours under water, we are not often colliding with aesthetic values. Well tended farm land is never a mar upon nature, anyway.

Formidable obstacles face us, most of them closely associated with the fact of Federal ownership. Overcoming these obstacles will take skill, information, cooperation, and political finesse.

The overriding importance here is not development as such. Much more vital is that this country of ours not be pulled into warring camps—-not black v. white, not city v. country, not development v. lock-up. We must all work together for the common good. I am sure we can.