

Building a More Competitive Economy Act, 2025

Resuming the debate adjourned on October 21, 2025, on the motion for second reading of the following bill:

Bill 56, An Act to amend various Acts

The Speaker (Hon. Donna Skelly): I recognize the member for Toronto–Danforth.

Mr. Peter Tabuns: Thank you, Speaker. I want to start off by saying that I'll be sharing my lead time today with the members from Oshawa and from Nickel Belt.

I will be mostly speaking to the environmental sections of this bill, but I do want to say that I find it extraordinary that this government is going to be removing photo radar. I mean, you've got to be kidding me, seriously. Just because your ministers and their limo drivers are getting speeding tickets for going through school zones is no reason to bring in this legislation. Seriously, you should be protecting kids.

I had a demonstration at one of the schools in my riding on Monday—William Burgess, a great school. A lot of parents were out; a lot of kids were out. They could not understand for the life of them why a safety measure for children going to school that's endorsed by police chiefs in Ontario, that's endorsed by the Hospital for Sick Children, is being ruled out. I guess there's an embarrassment at the cabinet table when you show up and you've got speeding tickets you've got to pay, but that shouldn't be the reason for changing this law.

Ms. Jennifer K. French: I'm glad to stand in this House as the official opposition critic for infrastructure and transportation and to speak to Bill 56, which is the so-called Building a More Competitive Economy Act. The basis of my debate today is going to be the changes in schedule 5, changes to the Highway Traffic Act.

The bill before us is an omnibus bill that has 11 different schedules. It makes changes to all sorts of acts. My colleagues have spoken about some of them: the Clean Water Act, the Ontario Heritage Act, the Endangered Species Act and many regulated health professionals and other acts. But as I said, it also makes changes to the Highway Traffic Act. So for the folks who have been quite interested in the speed camera conversation, this is that conversation. This is the bill that attacks safety cameras in our community and bans the use of automated speed enforcement.

Speaker, here is what is happening in schedule 5, as shared with us in the bill. Automated speed enforcement systems are currently authorized under the Highway Traffic Act and its regulations. These systems operate as municipal programs and rely on a legislative framework for owner liability for speeding offences, allowing tickets to be issued to vehicle owners rather than to drivers. These are the speed cameras that, when folks get the ticket, it goes to the owner of the vehicle, not necessarily the driver.

This schedule repeals that framework. It would end the use of automated speed enforcement systems across Ontario. Owner liability for speeding offences would also end. Municipalities would no longer be able to operate automated speed enforcement programs, and speed enforcement would revert to traditional methods, with police officers issuing charges to drivers.

If the repeal results in the early termination of the contract between a municipality and a vendor or supplier of automated speed enforcement equipment, municipal liability is limited, it says.

It also grants the minister the opportunity to install signs if the municipality doesn't do it fast enough. But we can get into that.

In this schedule of the bill, it gives the minister the power to order municipalities to install signs in school zones. School zones ought to already have signs, but I would say that a sign is not an appropriate substitute for speed enforcement. It can be an additional tool. I was discussing it with my colleague earlier. They've got signs in their riding, and it makes a difference. But why would we be removing a useful tool when we're talking about safety and, specifically in school zones and community safety areas, the safety of children?

The government talks about speed bumps, roundabouts, flashing lights. All of these things are good ideas—but in addition to, not instead of. Safer is better.

So how did we get here? This government brought in automated speed enforcement—I remember that—back in 2019. This government gave municipalities the ability to make decisions for themselves about whether or not to utilize this tool, automated speed enforcement, in their jurisdictions, in their municipalities. Any municipal or regional council that went ahead with this heard from constituents, and they continue to. They've been refining and fine-tuning and always improving, because if they don't, they're going to hear about it from their constituents.

But here we have the Premier of this fine province reaching again into municipalities, because he is the boss of them, it would seem. This is another most recent example of provincial overreach, because even though the Premier brought it in, now the Premier is taking it out. Why? I don't know. Ostensibly, as a favour—I'm not sure who has asked. The Premier calls them a cash grab, which is nonsense, and we'll hear more about that.

Speaker, I've been trying to figure out who this benefits. It would seem that at least 20 government ministers have gotten significant tickets from speed cameras, so I'm going to guess that they put their hands up that they would like to not have that happen again.

This is from a Global News article entitled “‘Won't Happen Again': Minister Pledges No More Speeding Ontario Cabinet Vehicles”:

It said, “Ontario's transportation minister has promised vehicles assigned to Doug Ford's cabinet ministers won't be caught speeding again, after municipal cameras slapped them with more than \$3,300 in fines.”

It went on to say, “Vehicles registered to cabinet ministers were snapped speeding by cameras 23 times over the past three years, including one travelling at 70 km/h in a 40 zone....”

“The documents obtained by Global News do not disclose which ministers the vehicles were assigned to.”

It's so interesting; the Minister of Transportation has said it won't happen again. Yes, that's right. It won't happen again. Do you know why? Because they're ripping out the cameras that caught them. So maybe that's part of the reason.

Speaker, I want to talk about how responsible municipalities have been implementing—despite the way the Premier has been making this sound, calling it a cash grab.

Here's one example you can look at—but any of the 37 municipalities have online information about it. This is from the region of Durham; I live there: “Automated speed enforcement (ASE) is a modern tool used to help enforce speed limits in school zones and community safety zones—places where kids tend to walk, run, bike and play!” They list all of the locations where permanent automated speed enforcement cameras are now. So they have all of the locations. They have listed the intersections where the mobile automated speed enforcement cameras are while they're getting that feedback in data, before they become permanent. It's all right there. This supports Durham Vision Zero. All of us will be meeting with Good Roads. We know that Vision Zero—the vision is to have zero fatalities, safe roads. This is part of that. They are very accountable and explain it in the “frequently asked questions” on this website for the region. It is very clear. It explains what it is: “an automated system that uses a camera and a speed measurement device to enforce speed limits and help make roads safer for all road users.” They break it down. There's nobody hiding in the bushes with a speed camera set up. This is not “gotcha” enforcement; this is, if you speed, there's a consequence. It's not a tax. It's a fine for breaking the law.

So let's continue to have safe roads and accountable roads.

The retired chiefs of police—there's a letter here that they wrote: “In a letter to the Premier and his ministers ... retired chiefs of police from Peel, Halton, Niagara, Ottawa and beyond argued the cameras ... are ‘highly effective at changing dangerous driving behaviours and reducing collisions and serious injuries at problem locations.’”

They said, “The results are clear: When drivers know that automated speed enforcement cameras are in place, they slow down.... This means fewer tickets, lower costs, and safer roads for everyone.”

They go on to say, “Automated speed cameras reduce speeding, injury and death, allowing police to divert resources to focus on criminal activities plaguing Ontario communities such as auto theft and intimate partner violence.”

Former police executives have said that there are lots of priorities for police to focus on, and having them sit outside of a school zone in, as the government called it, the traditional method—is that the best use of police resources?

I'll tell you that the municipalities are very concerned about what will become a significant increase to policing costs in order to cover those safety zones. We all know that police do a remarkable job in our communities, and all of us have a list of things that are going wrong in our communities. They have said here that it frees them up to do other things—something to consider.

This has been a really interesting issue for all of us in our inboxes. I'm hearing from all sorts of folks about this issue. And this isn't just a click-and-add-your-name lobby email. This is people sitting down, taking the time out of their day and writing thoughtful letters on this issue—many, many, many. I know the government members are getting them too. So I would like to share the voices from my community and from some neighbouring communities about the importance of having safe roads and why this ban on speed cameras is a bad idea.

Carol from Oshawa wrote, “My mother and I would like to ask you to oppose the law Premier Ford is proposing to eliminate speed cameras across the province. We live near Durham

Hansard Wednesday, October 22, 2025
(Bill 55/Speed Cameras)

College and Ontario Tech University, and see cars exceeding the speed limits every day on Taunton Road and Simcoe Street. Since the Simcoe Street speed cameras were installed, speeding on Simcoe Street North near those campuses has dropped noticeably. Please don't let Premier Ford take away this system that is protecting students and others in Oshawa every day." Thank you, Carol.

Elizabeth writes, "I'm writing to urge you and the provincial government to protect the lives of children and pedestrians by reversing the ban on speed cameras.

"Police chiefs and hospitals agree that speed cameras save lives. Speed cameras reduce speeding, decrease collisions, and make our streets safer....

"If drivers don't break the law, they don't get fined. Why should the government allow reckless drivers to put children at risk on their way to school?" Great question, Elizabeth.

Carolyn writes, "I am writing to you to express my objection to the proposed legislation calling for a ban of the use of municipal speed cameras.

"The use of automated speed cameras helps keep pedestrians, cyclists, and children safe across Ontario....

"I am asking you to stop the ban of the use of municipal speed cameras and ensure that speed cameras remain available as a critical safety measure to protect Ontario communities." Good point, Carolyn.

Vaidehee writes to me and says, "I have worked for a speed camera vendor for more than one year now and know, for a fact, that the programs are effective at reducing speeding and changing driver behaviour. I am proud to be a part of the program that created safer streets in the community where I live. Most other residents agree that the cameras are a good thing."

He goes on to say, "I think it would be a mistake to ban the use of speed cameras, we should instead improve the programs. One improvement to the program would be minimum speed enforcement thresholds. The company I work for is known for implementing fair programs and recommends against ticketing anything under 11 kmph over the speed limit." Okay—thoughtful input. Thank you.

Josh is actually from Ottawa Centre, but Josh has written:

"Speed cameras are not just enforcement tools—they are proven traffic calming measures that save lives. Numerous studies have shown that ASE cameras significantly reduce speeding, especially in school zones and residential areas. These reductions translate directly into safer streets for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers alike. Importantly, the fines collected from speed cameras are reinvested into traffic safety initiatives. This ensures that those who violate the law contribute to the cost of making our streets safer, rather than placing the financial burden on law-abiding taxpayers."

Josh goes on to say, "If signage were truly effective on its own, posted speed limits would already be sufficient. The reality is that many drivers ignore signs unless there is a meaningful consequence, which ASE cameras provide." Thank you, Josh.

Ronald wrote to me and said, "I write to express my concern and disappointment that there is even a consideration to legislating the removal of traffic cameras and do so on several grounds.

"First, the decision should rightly be that of the local municipalities, not of the provincial government." Fair point, Ronald.

Ronald says, "Second, all research indicates that they are effective in reducing speeds. Is that not what we want?"

He goes on to say, "The only individuals that these cameras impact negatively are those who speed, in other words, those who break the law. Everyone who operates a motor vehicle should be able to read signs and adjust their speed accordingly. To fail to do so is to tacitly accept whatever consequence there might be, including incurring a fine. This is not a 'cash grab' on the part of the municipality; it is a cash handout on the part of the driver." Yes, good point. Thanks, Ronald. And the last thing he says that I'll add is, "The only ones opposed to the cameras seem to be those who wish to speed. That should tell us something." Yes, Ronald, it should.

Edward wrote to me from his iPhone, one line—and I can only imagine, Edward might have been listening to this on the news or saw a headline, but just took a moment on his phone to send one line: "I support the use of speed cameras in general and particularly in school zones." Thanks, Edward.

By the way, these aren't people I know. These are just people who have realized this is not the right course of action for this government and they are just motivated to share.

Mary says, "Why would anyone object to a proven way to improve road safety?"

"If you don't speed, you don't pay. Taxpayers aren't losing anything, but they may have safer roads for their children.

"Let's give demerit points instead of fines, if the objection is the cost of a fine." There's one idea. But this government isn't willing to consider ideas.

Here is another one from Anna: "As a long-time resident of Oshawa, I would like to express my support for the municipal speed camera program(s).... It is without a doubt that speed cameras placed around the Durham region have made our roads safer and provide an otherwise missing incentive for speeding drivers to slow down, especially in community safety zones....

"I was shocked to hear Premier Ford's announcement today regarding municipal speed camera programs and the misleading ways in which he framed the functionality and efficacy of these programs.... They enable places like Oshawa to collect lawful fines, which are not otherwise possible to collect due to the varied demands placed on our policing services. It is ridiculous, in my opinion, that any elected official at any level of governance would oppose the enforcement of clearly understood laws, which are long-standing and necessary for public safety. The claims made by Premier Ford, namely that the program is unsalvageable and ineffective, are specious at best. To argue that drivers should not be fined for speeding because they aren't going 'fast enough' would be laughable if it were not such a serious breach of his responsibility to maintain public safety." Thank you, Anna.

And James wrote to me from Scarborough. James has said, "I work in the transit and transportation industry. I'm a motorist who drives very large vehicles, normal cars, motorcycles and I also enjoy my bicycle. I live near several schools that are close to busy roads that seem to be used as raceways at times. Daily, I see drivers speeding, using electronics, passing where it's not permitted, running red lights and stop signs, all without any repercussions.

"I feel that these cameras play a role as one of the tools that can be used to deter excessive speeding. While having a police officer constantly monitoring the roads would be ideal, it's something that just doesn't seem feasible in the current environment. Other alternatives to limit speed, such as speed bumps and other traffic calming measures, cost more to implement, create slowdowns for emergency vehicles, cause problems for snow removal and simply don't work for multilane situations. The suggestions that large signs or lights will have the same effect as the cameras is laughable." James has so much good stuff to say.

Speaker, we all received an open letter from John Creelman, who is the mayor of Mono. He has been a very vocal safety advocate for years. I've appreciated his thoughtful comments on a number of issues relating to transportation. But his open letter is based on—he said, "The following thoughts are informed by 34 years in public life, 15 years of which was as a justice of the peace, serving six years of those ... as a regional senior justice of the peace."

He lays out pages and pages of very thoughtful input, but I am going to just pick a couple: "Do not scrap a technology that works. It slows traffic down. Studies worldwide are conclusive about this. Over 20% of roadway fatalities can be attributed to speeding. The faster vehicles travel the more likely there will be serious injuries or death....

"Think about the implications of cancelling contracts between ASE providers and municipalities entered into in good faith."

Speaker, the Association of Municipalities of Ontario is opposed. Those are folks that the Premier normally has good conversations with, that the ministers generally have good relationships with. But they have said, "AMO is disappointed the Premier is taking steps to ban municipal ASE. There is strong evidence showing that ASE cameras work. People slow down, making our roads safer and protecting all of us—especially kids.... ASE also frees up police to focus on high-priority crime, which is what Ontarians want. Speeders—not taxpayers—pay the cost. If there's an issue of fairness or how the cameras are used, municipalities with AMO can work together with the province to address it.... We are also concerned about continued provincial overreach. This should be a local decision. Municipalities are an accountable, elected order of government." Hear, hear.

In the joint school board and trustee association statement on automated speed enforcement cameras in school safety zones, they have said, "As leaders representing Ontario's four publicly funded school board associations, we are united in our concern about the province's proposal to eliminate automated speed enforcement cameras (ASE) in school safety zones....

"We share the concerns raised by municipal councils, community leaders, public health experts, and law enforcement organizations about the potential loss of this important safety tool....

"Slowing drivers down around schools reduces the risk of tragedy and keeps students and their families safer.

"We call on the provincial government to improve and refine ASE, not eliminate it.... Our children deserve the strongest protections we can provide."

Parents across the province are rallying, calling this a horrible piece of legislation. This is some strange vendetta that the Premier has against speed cameras. I don't know whether it is because so many ministers got tickets. I don't know whether it's because a friend doesn't like them. It is a wrong-headed move that makes our roads more unsafe.

Mr. Stephen Blais: I appreciate the debate from my friends over here. I sat on Ottawa city council right as this government was creating the rules for automated speed enforcement, and I chaired the committee that passed our Vision Zero plan and had automated speed enforcement in community safety zones and in school zones as an important part of that plan, so this an issue that I care a lot about.

As the member quite rightly pointed out, it was this government that defined where automated speed enforcement could go, and it can go in community safety zones. What they didn't do is tell municipalities what a community safety zone should be. They gave municipalities carte blanche to designate any road they want as a community safety zone, and that is what has created many of the problems that we're facing today.

So my question to my friend is, given that the rules around these devices were created by this government and now they're going to undo the work that they did—in Orléans, en français, we call that “le flip, le flop.” I'm wondering if there is a word that comes to mind for you when this kind of back and forth happens.

Ms. Jennifer French: If en français, c'est « le flip, le flop », en anglais, c'est « flip-flop ».

I appreciate you taking us back in time. I remember, because I was serving here, in 2019 hearing from community members concerned about how this would happen. I have been very impressed with the regional municipality of Durham that has laid it out over time, that has pulled the data in, without issuing tickets, to figure out how best to curb the bad behaviour, the speeding, and how to make our roads safer.

One of the things from their website they say is, “All ASE devices are signed ahead of the device to promote transparency. The goal of this program is to slow drivers down through our most vulnerable areas, namely school zones and community safety zones, and improve safety.”

All of our municipalities are hearing from community members to fine-tune this. There is room for improvement. We should not be abolishing something that works.

Building a More Competitive Economy Act, 2025

Resuming the debate adjourned on October 22, 2025, on the motion for second reading of the following bill:

Bill 56, An Act to amend various Acts

The Acting Speaker (MPP Andrea Hazell): Further debate?

Mr. Stephen Blais: I thank my colleagues for that rousing applause for my introduction. I'll be sharing my time this afternoon with my friends from Beaches–East York and Ottawa South.

It's important to remind people, and perhaps remind the government, that it was, in fact, their government that created the rules around photo radar in Ontario. They wrote those regulations in 2019 after having been elected. They told cities to use technology and to use that technology responsibly in school zones and in community safety zones. Community safety zones are near parks and playgrounds and schools: That's where we know and we expect children and families to be walking, to be riding their bike, to be playing.

And now, six years later, they're tearing it all out, just as the evidence shows that it works. That is not leadership, Madam Speaker. I think many of us might consider that to be a case of whiplash.

The government is, in fact, running away from their own success. And why do we know it's been successful? Because there have been studies, Madam Speaker. A peer-reviewed study from the Hospital for Sick Kids here in Toronto and Toronto Metropolitan University showed that school zones and speed enforcement in school zones in Toronto has worked: a 45% drop in speeding vehicles; a 10-kilometre-per-hour reduction in average speeds; an 88% drop in extreme speeding of 20 kilometres an hour or more.

If you think about school zones, at least in Ottawa, most schools have a 40-kilometre sign in front of the school. So if you're going 20 kilometres over, so 60 kilometres or more over in front of a school, you're actually exceeding the speed limit by 50%. That is an enormous speed in front of a school, Madam Speaker, and it shows an 88% drop in that extreme speeding. When cameras were removed, the speeding rates returned to previous levels.

In Ottawa, the results were also clear: High-end speeders also fell dramatically. Overall compliance at some locations quadrupled within three months of deployment.

There have been international studies. There have been at least 35 separate international studies about automated speed enforcement. Across those international studies, average speeds fell by 15%. In some places, it fell by as much as 70%. In addition to speeds coming down, guess what else we saw? Correlating accidents and injuries fell at the same time—anywhere from 14% to 25%.

So it's clear. The science is clear. Slower speeds lead to fewer collisions, lead to fewer injuries. Speed cameras encourage people to drive slower. And if we're driving slower through sensitive areas, near schools, near parks, where kids and families are expected to be walking and playing, that makes our communities safer.

Speaker, you can't debate physics. A pedestrian hit by a car or a truck at 30 kilometres an hour—more often than not, you will survive. At 50 kilometres per hour, that same person is eight times more likely to die. Every five kilometres an hour over can mean the difference between what is a close call and what is a tragedy. That's what this debate is actually about. Not fines, not revenue, not tax grabs; it's about saving lives and the potential to save lives.

Madam Speaker, this government's own Preliminary 2023 Ontario Road Safety Annual Report spells it out pretty clearly. Speeding, according to that report, caused 21.3% of all traffic collision fatalities. Drinking and driving—anyone take a guess? It was 7.5%. Speeding now nearly kills three times as many people as impaired driving. Yet this government's response is to ban the one tool that we have proven to slow people down. It's like banning the breathalyzer test because they think it will make drunk drivers nervous. It's reckless. It's backwards. It's dangerous and it will make our communities more dangerous.

Now, when we deployed photo radar as part of our Vision Zero program in Ottawa, we took a very responsible approach. I was the chair of the transportation committee at the time when we launched that road safety action plan. It was a serious, data-driven effort to cut fatal and major injury collisions by 20% by 2024 and to reach Vision Zero by 2035.

At the time, in that first year, we invested \$31 million. We installed cameras where they mattered: near schools and near parks and busy places where kids and families would be known to be walking and playing. The results spoke for themselves. As I mentioned earlier, compliance jumped from 57% to 81% over the three years of the program. That's not a punishment. That's not a tax grab. That is progress. That is progress on making our neighbourhoods and our communities safer.

It's easy to think that neighbourhoods and communities are just roads and houses and the things that you see but, really, what we're talking about is the people: our neighbours, our family members, our kids, our parents. That's who we are trying to make safer by ensuring that our roads are safer and that vehicles travel the posted speed limit.

In Ottawa, every dollar in fines from automated speed enforcement went directly into road safety programs. It helped fund crossing guards. It helped pay for new signals for pedestrian crosswalks. It helped pay for better lighting. It helped pay for safer intersections. It helped pay for building the roundabouts the Premier is talking about. It helped pay to physically change roads and sidewalks and the internal workings of communities to make it safer so that the amount of speeding would actually go down over time because of those physical changes and, again, we could make pedestrians and cyclists and motorists safer while travelling through our communities. It has saved lives, and it pays for itself.

Photo radar isn't just safer; it's smarter, and it is cheaper. In Ottawa, CTV News reported that the public service has shown that every new photo radar camera is about \$72,000 to design and install. That's a one-time investment for a device that works 24 hours a day, seven days a week. It never calls in sick. It never draws a pension. We never have to buy it a squad car.

They say that they're fighting cash grabs, but what they forget to mention is that the only people paying are the people breaking the law. Instead, they're asking all Ontarians to use the very limited tax capacity that the province and municipalities have—to use our collective money instead. So instead of asking people who are actually the ones causing the danger to pay for it, they want all of us to join together and pay for it, to subsidize the people who are breaking the law. That's not a cash grab. Photo radar is a life-saving investment, but I guess as we've come to learn, the government doesn't see it that way.

You can't tell parents and their kids that they're safer because you banned one thing slowly. They're not going to be safer simply because you make some physical changes to the roadway. It has to be backed up with proper enforcement, and that's what photo radar helps us do.

We should give municipalities flexibility, and we need to put people over politics at the centre of our transportation, and certainly our transportation safety policy.

Madam Speaker, it's about common sense. It's about the child who is walking to school, the senior who is crossing the street, the cyclist who is returning home from work as it's getting dark. Every one of those people deserves a government that values evidence over optics, that values safety over slogans and lives over talking points.

Mr. John Fraser: I'm pleased to be standing up to talk about Bill 56 today, because I won't have to talk about skills development for a few minutes.

Automated speed enforcement cameras are about protecting; they're about keeping our kids safe. That's why we have them. They keep other people safe. Roads are not just for cars and

drivers. They're for moms and dads, sons and daughters, grandmothers and grandfathers. They're for pedestrians. They're for people on bikes. So I do not understand, when our primary job in this place—and I hear it from the Premier all the time, and other ministers—is public safety. Violent crime—public safety is not just about violent crime. Our roads kill more people than anything else. Public safety is on our roads. So why in God's name would we take out a tool that's getting people to drive slower and saving lives?

I'll just talk about my riding.

Heron Road—Marie-Curie school on one side; a seniors' centre on the other side. It's a four-laner. It's a highway. There's a camera there. People drive slow now. It's safer for the kids.

Smyth Road—Vincent Massey Public School, Hillcrest High School, La Cité collégiale, all within a block—another four-laner, another highway. People drive slower now.

Alta Vista Drive: It's not a highway; a two-laner, 40 clicks—St. Pat's high school, Ridgemont High School, Charles H. Hulse. People drive slower there right now. Three schools—thousands of kids in what I have described.

Walkley Road—Marius-Barbeau—a four-lane highway. People drive slower there right now. You can see it.

When Ontario's chiefs of police, the people we trust to lead the forces that protect the people we represent, say to the Premier, "Don't do it, Premier," why does the Premier do it? I wish he would stand here and explain that to all of us in question period.

No one likes getting a ticket. But I know people who have gotten tickets, and they understand now, and they say, "I want to keep the cameras." It's not just moms and dads. I'm not trying to jam you all up. I know you hear this. I know that you care; you wouldn't be here, otherwise. You know, because there are people in your community—and they're not crazy people. They're not people who are far on the left or far on the right or out there in the streets. They're people who are saying, "Don't do it." Why are you doing this? You hear it. I know you hear it. It's not just us over here hearing it; it can't be. It's not because all the people in our ridings who are like—and then we're making a big deal of it. People are talking about it, folks. They're scratching their heads—reasonable, thoughtful people who aren't political. Many of them have families.

SickKids hospital did a study; my colleague described it. SickKids—not the people who are there to protect public safety, but the people who are there to take care of our kids, to take care of our kids when they get hurt, who are concerned about the safety of our kids. When they come out and say, "Give all this information," and they say, "Don't do it," why does the Premier do it? Tell me why. I hope that someone will stand up with the question and give that explanation, because I can't figure it out.

It doesn't make any sense to me why, when you've got those two groups, one protecting us, all of us—and they're in charge of road safety; the leadership is saying, "Don't do it." And when the people who spend their lives caring for our kids—preventing injury, thinking about that, wanting to make lives better for children—say, "Don't do it," and when our educators say, "Don't do it," why is the Premier doing it?