

to question and it is possible to find arguments which would suggest that from social and economic points of view, such bridges are disadvantages to the local community. However, whether there is a net advantage or disadvantage, there is no doubt that most of the bridge communities have benefited financially and have probably come to depend on the bridge for a percentage of their revenues. In these circumstances, there seems to be little reason why the legislation should not instruct the authority to pay taxes, grants in lieu or some other form of grant to all municipalities having a bridge within their jurisdiction.

Since the authority would be operating on a quasi-commercial basis, there seems to be no reason why it should not continue the practice of providing those facilities required by Canada Customs and Immigration at bridge expense. The friction which now exists between private operators and these Government departments with regard to the provision of such services would presumably disappear but the legislation should define the authority's responsibilities in this regard.

The foregoing paragraphs should produce an authority capable of handling bridge matters on a quasi-independent basis, and meeting both the needs of the Federal and Provincial Governments.

The establishment of an authority and the implementation of legislation along the foregoing lines would inevitably have a direct effect on the role of the Interdepartmental Committee on International Bridges, since most of the problems which now come before the ICIB would be handled directly by the authority. The Committee might perhaps operate as a consultative group when the approval of the Governor in Council is being sought on any matter but the effectiveness of such a group representing widely differing interests is questionable and it might be preferable if responsibility passed to one Department, which would obviously discuss specific issues with other interested departments.

August 23, 1972