would seem that the principles expressed in the guidelines reflect current Canadian attitudes on matters such as sovereignty and foreign ownership, and therefore the need is to do something positive with the guidelines rather than to drop them.

While the guidelines might prevent a repetition of problems, they have by their very nature, no practical value as far as the correction of existing problems is concerned and these problems will persist, perhaps in increasingly aggravated form, until some effort is made to solve them. Since it is unlikely that many new international bridges will be built in the near future, the philosophy implicit in the guidelines cannot be made effective until the problem areas are cleared up. Appendix II lists the major outstanding problems and examines possible solutions. Some merely require Canada to make a firm decision on a certain course of action, while others require legislation. Other problems arose from differences between Canadian and U.S. policies, but are only significant when bridges are operated entirely by U.S. bodies. An example of this would be the reluctance of a U.S. bridge authority, operating a complete bridge, to pay municipal taxes in Canada when it is not required to do so in the U.S.A.

Appendix III contains an analysis of the guidelines, indicating weaknesses and suggesting areas where they could be improved. It should perhaps be mentioned at this point that while the guidelines were approved by Cabinet, they were never generally published and as a result, the various bridge authorities and the three interested provincial governments have been largely unaware of Federal Government thinking on international bridge matters. Any revision of the guidelines to reflect changes in the social and political climate with regard to national sovereignty, foreign ownership and citizen participation should presumably be adequately publicized to ensure that all interested parties are made aware of the future which the Canadian Government sees for international bridges.