

There is an old saying that the Law must not only be done, *it must be seen to be done*. The reason this is so is, of course, that first, people tend to trust the witness of their eyes over anything else: "I'll believe it when I see it". As a result, if people are constantly witnessing others flouting the rules of the road, they are strongly tempted to conclude that those rules are not being enforced, even though significant numbers of traffic citations *are* in fact being issued. Obviously, if a person concludes a rule is not being enforced they are much more likely to ignore it. It is easy to see how this can have a snowballing effect. In addition, it is human nature to like to gamble and it is also human nature to react against perceived discrimination. The way we see this play out on the road is that people who see others *getting away* with rule-breaking tend to ask themselves the question, "if they can get away with it, why can't I?" This is quickly followed by the impulse to gamble: "since they didn't get caught, there's a good chance I won't" Of course, the thing that underlies all of this is that most rule-breaking has a pay-off. Were it not so there would be no need for the rule and it probably not exist. People these days are in a big hurry and love to save time. People also love to experience the sense of power they get from controlling huge amounts of speed and acceleration.

What do these simple observations tell us about how we need to respond to skyrocketing rates of accident on the roads? Everyday I see certain certain groups breaking the rules of the road with near-total impunity. Sports motorcycles doing 0-60 in under 6 seconds (exaggeration? Not in the least. Many of these bikes produce over 200 hp while weighing under 300 kg including the rider!) 'Light' trucks jacked-up far beyond allowable limits and competing with Harley Davidsons and the like for who can make the most noise. Heavy commercial trucks going way above what would be a safe speed for something of that size and weight. Even City Transit are pushing the limits. The list goes on and on. The fact is, enforcement is extremely lax and far too focused on 'target' people/offenses. Ignoring the enforcement of some or many rules while enforcing others may have some efficiency but it is not effective overall because it leads, as I have suggested above, to a bad attitude.

If this is so, how can enforcement be improved (and with it, attitudes), given the fiscal limitations that exist? I suggest that detailed analysis be carried-out by a neutral party (eg. the university) and if automated systems like photo radar can do the job within the budget, they should be put in place at the earliest possible time. If this will not work, more police officers need to be deployed across a much broader spectrum of 'interest'. That is, in other words, infractions of the rules *in general* need to be cited, not just this rule and that rule. **The latter only leads to disrespect for the law**

Bottom line. Enforcement is not the answer EXCEPT when it is used in such a way as to fundamentally alter the ATTITUDE of drivers.

Simple starting point: on the highways, enforce the speed limits as posted. If they need to be raised, raise them but do not have a situation where people are free to gamble on how much above the limit they can go before getting a ticket.

Final Thought: End the practice of issuing the same fine regardless of the financial status of the perpetrator. A \$200. speeding ticket is no deterrent to someone with a six-figure income, especially if they think they have to rush to get to a meeting or close a deal. It certainly has no where near the impact that it would have on someone earning minimum wage, yet the offense is the same. Fine Option is only useful for the unemployed; there is no fairness for the working poor.

**Respectfully,
Allan Kirk, 654 McTavish St., Regina, SK. S4T 3T5 Tel. 586-6099**