

While there are certain aspects of bridge operation which require uniform handling on both sides, there are also areas where interests differ sharply, and it is difficult to see how any sort of joint authority could reconcile the differences. This would be particularly true when the bridge is being used as an instrument of economic policy, and differences between the two jurisdictions should properly be settled at the foreign policy level.

The greatest objection to a joint international authority would, however, seem to be that it would not be subject to the Canadian Government (or for that matter, to the U.S. Government) and there could be problems in fitting its policy into the highway policy in each country. Moreover, government might find that it would be held accountable for actions of the authority, over which it had no control.

While these arguments suggest that a joint authority is neither desirable nor practical, there is no doubt that close cooperation is required between the Canadian and U.S. authorities. Such cooperation is clearly needed in establishing speed limits, controlling traffic, policing, surface marking, sign posting, maintenance, toll collection, and numerous other activities. This could be achieved by one management reporting to two national authorities or by two managements working in cooperation.

There is, of course, no reason why cooperative management should not cover a group of bridges such as the Niagara Falls Bridges or the St. Lawrence River Bridges if there are obvious advantages in such an arrangement.

- c) When applicable, bonds issued to finance the construction of a bridge must be issued and be payable in Canada as well as in the United States.

It is difficult to see what this guideline was intended to achieve. Certainly, it can have no significant effect in