

Although Senate hearings had been going on for 2 days before I arrived in Washington, I did find out that Alabama, Tennessee, Kentucky, and West Virginia filed briefs on behalf of Senate bill 1. The Municipal Association of Alabama, Tennessee, and Kentucky are actively supporting Senate bill 1, and Governor Patterson of Alabama and Governor Ellington of Tennessee filed personal briefs in support of the act.

We felt action should be taken in filing a brief on behalf of the Georgia Municipal Association for the following reasons:

1. The act, as drawn, would provide one-half the proposed appropriations to rural-small urban counties about the Nation. Under the criteria of need outlined in the bill 628 of the 663 eligible counties are in the South (94 percent). Georgia had 76 counties which would qualify for assistance in 1959. Probably there are more, now.

2. Fifty-three out of the one hundred and seventy-nine urban distressed labor markets are in the South.

3. Southern States will be eligible for 65 percent of the proposed appropriations.

4. S. 722, the Area Redevelopment Act, was passed by Congress last year, but vetoed by the President. However, both major parties put such a proposal in their platform, last year, with Mr. Kennedy making it a No. 1 issue. The fact that the Area Redevelopment Act has been labeled "Senate bill 1" indicates determination by President Kennedy to pass the act.

5. Vice President Lyndon Johnson voted for and supported S. 722 last year and campaigned for assistance for distressed areas during the recent election.

6. For the above reasons we believe that an Area Redevelopment Act will pass out of Congress and be signed by the President during the upcoming session. Therefore, we think S. 1 should be supported by southern legislators to assure that the rural-small urban provisions will be left in.

During the hearings, we heard testimony from the Republican minority on the Senate committee, voicing objection to the bill. One of these was Senator Bush from Connecticut, the State having the highest degree of industrialization per square mile within the Nation. Naturally, they are satisfied. They mentioned such things as "pirating of industry" by the South, etc.

We are attaching some information developed by Mr. Herbert Bingham.

Please advise us how to proceed from here. We feel we have our foot in the door, by filing our brief.

By copy of this letter, we are requesting the members of the board, together with other city officials to let us have their immediate views regarding support of Senate bill 1, in order that we may take action, if desired.

Very truly yours,

W. ELMER GEORGE,
Executive Director.

STATEMENT REGARDING SENATE BILL 1, THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, we wish to thank you for the privilege of appearing before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency for the purpose of presenting a statement on behalf of Senate bill 1, the Area Redevelopment Act.

My name is W. Elmer George and I am executive director of the Georgia Municipal Association which represents approximately 350 of Georgia's towns and cities and, through them, approximately 52 percent of our State's population.

The Georgia Municipal Association, through action by its executive committee, is on record as supporting a proper Area Redevelopment Act, with the following provision:

1. That the proposed legislation contain the essential provisions which were in S. 722, the version of the Area Redevelopment Act enacted last year but vetoed by the President. By "essential provision," we mean the provisions whereby eligibility areas of the Nation affected by this bill be, not only "industrial redevelopment areas," but "rural-small urban redevelopment areas," as well.

No Area Redevelopment Act would fully accomplish the general purpose of the effort to stimulate lagging economy in distressed areas of the Nation, unless it contained provisions to assist rural-small urban areas.

We realize, of course, that the Georgia delegation to the U.S. Congress have a record of opposition to the Area Redevelopment Act, and our appearance before this committee may appear somewhat inconsistent. However, we believe the