

powers. If the advantage of an overall authority is to be achieved as far as financing is concerned, it is necessary that the bridges should collectively be economically viable, even if some individual bridges are not.

An overall bridge authority appears to satisfy all the guidelines with the exception of (b) and as indicated in Appendix III, this guideline may be of limited importance in its present terms. The existence of an overall authority would, of course, permit efficiencies of scale, particularly in regard to the development of specialized skills and centralized planning and operating capability. Moreover, since management would be centralized, there would be a clear focus of responsibility which would simplify the maintenance of a more direct relationship with the provincial and federal governments than is possible with individual bridges. An added advantage would be that an overall authority would not be subject to purely local pressures. On the debit side, because of the nature of bridge operations and the location of the various bridges, there would be no real economies of scale and little to be gained from centralized purchasing, and there would probably be increased costs arising from an additional level of management. Another problem which could arise in the management of an operation of this nature would be over-centralization with the overall authority attempting to solve problems on a uniform basis without adequate knowledge of purely local conditions and needs. The problem of management at a distance has been observed on the U.S. side of the Blue Water Bridge where the senior local person appears to be at the foreman level and all decisions are made in the State capital.

Some form of overall authority is obviously more acceptable to the Government of Ontario than separate bridge arrangements, since this is what their proposal advocates. As pointed out earlier, at the present time an overall authority could only