would build and the older gateway bridge which had paid itself off at that time.

These actions had two consequences. First, the continuation of tolls on a bridge where the indebtedness had been retired; and, second, the perpetuation of the Clinton Bridge Commission which authorization would have gone out of business. The Federal Highway Administration feels that with as many bridge or river crossings as there are for Iowa, across the Mississippi and Missouri River, Iowa must probably continue to have toll crossings of the major streams on its highway systems. We would prefer, however, that the construction and operation of such bridges by a statewide authority, such as now exists in Iowa, is better than by individual toll commissions, as we have from a number of midwestern States at this time.

Accordingly, it would have been our preference to have had the Clinton Bridge Commission go out of existence after its bonded indebtedness was paid off in 1967 and to have had the Iowa State Highway Commission through its new toll authority undertake the needed construction of a new bridge to replace the Fulton Lyon's Bridge.

The Clinton Bridge Commission was successful, however, in selling bonds for a substructure for a new crossing, and that substructure is now under construction. I understand it is 35-percent complete.

The Iowa State Highway Commission indicates no present interest in taking over the affairs of the Clinton Bridge Commission. It appears, therefore, that realistically, the commission will remain in existence and will own the two crossings of the Mississippi River when the second bridge is finished.

Concerning H.R. 13221 specifically, we are not entirely clear as to the necessity for its enactment at this time. The bridge commission apparently has all of the necessary authorities to sell bonds and to continue in existence without the enactment of the new legislation. There may be technical reasons concerning the establishment of a construction fund utilizing tolls on existing structures to augment the receipts from sale of bonds to finance this second bridge.

There is a further time extension provision in H.R. 13221, which may have been needed at one time. It does not appear to be needed at this time. If it is the finding of the committee that new legislation is necessary to support the authorities which the Clinton Bridge Commission already is exercising, the Federal Highway Administration would have no objection to the enactment of H.R. 13221.

As stated earlier, we would have preferred to utilization of the toll authority set up under State jurisdiction.

That is all I wanted to say, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Blatnik. In about three or four sentences, do you recommend the bill?

Mr. Swick. We have no objections to the bill, would be a better way to say it. We do not understand the necessity for this bill. If there was a necessity for it, we do not have an objection.

Mr. Blatnik. We will hear further testimony from the Congressman. The method proposed involves no Federal financing, but they feel they ought to have or do need this authority to have alternative methods of financing the new bridge, is that not correct?

Mr. Swick. That I think is right, yes, sir. However, the toll authority has gone ahead and sold the bonds and begun the construction