

introductory sentence to the guidelines seems to imply that a U.S. corporate body would be acceptable. It should, however, be pointed out that the idea of a non-government agency was developed before questions of national sovereignty, foreign ownership and citizen participation in decisions on major projects had assumed their current prominence, and presumably a U.S. corporation would no longer be considered to be a "public authority" to run the Canadian part of a bridge in the public interest. There are other valid reasons for believing that the type of authority originally envisaged would no longer be acceptable, and that some form of government agency is required. Perhaps the most significant reason is to be found in the very nature of international bridges, as integral parts of the publicly owned highway network. Decisions concerning the location, construction and operation of bridges are closely tied in with general highway decisions, and since social need must be considered as well as economic viability, more direct public control seems desirable. Admittedly, international transportation services are more usually provided by private enterprise, but international bridges may be considered exceptional because of the fact that their public service aspect is paramount.

The need for some form of government agency rather than a private body also reflects changes in the political climate. Since the guidelines were enunciated, we have moved into a situation where almost every major public structure is the object of violent opposition from interested groups, and government is required to accept responsibility for and justify decisions which would formerly have been considered its undisputed prerogative. In these circumstances, it seems desirable that government should retain control over decisions concerning international bridges, so that it will be in a position to answer for its actions.