

Theoretically, there is no reason why any level of government should not set up a public authority to construct or operate a bridge, but this would have to be done under federal legislation, and it seems that this may be an inhibiting factor.

Any amendment of this guideline should centre on a more precise definition of a public authority, and there should also be some clear indication that such an authority can only acquire its powers under Federal legislation.

- b) The bridge shall be governed by a joint authority with equal representation of members to be appointed by the appropriate governments on either side.

A bridge is clearly a unit, and in the case of an international bridge it is desirable that although two jurisdictions are involved, the two halves should be handled uniformly to the greatest possible extent. The guideline is an attempt to simplify this by establishing a single authority, but it is probably overly idealistic. The U.S.A. has not given any indication of interest in the idea of joint authorities and up to the present time there has been no case of a joint authority being created. Indeed, in three cases, there have been developments which make any form of joint international authority unlikely. The bodies running the Prescott/Ogdensburg, Thousand Islands and Peace Bridges have merged with larger authorities running airports, harbours and other facilities, and therefore a joint bridge authority is out of the question.

At first sight, it might appear that the governing bodies of the four bridges across the Niagara River satisfy the requirements of this guideline, since in each case the governing body has equal representation from both sides of the border. However, these bridges are owned by the U.S. bridge authority, and executive power is in American hands, so that equal representation on the board does not seem very significant.