

appears to have adopted whatever course would avoid any acceptance of federal responsibility in the international bridge field. However, the problem of insufficient revenue might increase in the future if anti-pollution measures lead to increases in public transportation and reductions in private automobile traffic since a major part of international bridge revenue is derived from private automobiles. In these circumstances, there is a need for a clear statement of responsibility and of the extent to which the Federal Government is prepared to provide financial support for bridges which are no longer economically viable. This responsibility might perhaps be effectively shouldered by an overall authority with powers to use funds from profitable bridge operations to offset unprofitable ones.

6. Lack of clear policy concerning local taxation of bridges.

The present situation with regard to the payment of local taxes is extremely confused. In some cases, taxes are paid by the bridge authority, in other cases, payments are made in lieu of taxes by either the Federal Government or the Provincial Government. It would, however, seem logical that where a bridge is a revenue-producing entity and occupies an area which would otherwise produce tax revenue for the local community, it should make some form of contribution to the municipal coffers. The form which this contribution should take would be a matter for further study, but it seems desirable that there should be consistency in the approach. This might be at variance with U.S. policy in general, but problems only arise when the entire bridge is run by a U.S. bridge entity. There is, however, no reason why Canada should not require payments to be made according to some appropriate formula.

7. Difficulty of maintaining C.T.C. jurisdiction over tolls.

If tolls are collected at the U.S. end of a bridge and particularly if there is no Canadian company against which