

Second Session – Forty-First Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba
Standing Committee
on
Social and Economic Development

Chairperson
Mr. Doyle Piwniuk
Constituency of Arthur-Virden

Vol. LXX No. 10 - 6 p.m., Thursday, October 26, 2017

ISSN 1708-6698

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Forty-First Legislature

Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
ALLUM, James	Fort Garry-Riverview	NDP
ALTEMEYER, Rob	Wolseley	NDP
BINDLE, Kelly	Thompson	PC
CLARKE, Eileen, Hon.	Agassiz	PC
COX, Cathy, Hon.	River East	PC
CULLEN, Cliff, Hon.	Spruce Woods	PC
CURRY, Nic	Kildonan	PC
DRIEDGER, Myrna, Hon.	Charleswood	PC
EICHLER, Ralph, Hon.	Lakeside	PC
EWASKO, Wayne	Lac du Bonnet	PC
FIELDING, Scott, Hon.	Kirkfield Park	PC
FLETCHER, Steven, Hon.	Assiniboia	Ind.
FONTAINE, Nahanni	St. Johns	NDP
FRIESEN, Cameron, Hon.	Morden-Winkler	PC
GERRARD, Jon, Hon.	River Heights	Lib.
GOERTZEN, Kelvin, Hon.	Steinbach	PC
GRAYDON, Clifford	Emerson	PC
GUILLEMARD, Sarah	Fort Richmond	PC
HELWER, Reg	Brandon West	PC
ISLEIFSON, Len	Brandon East	PC
JOHNSON, Derek	Interlake	PC
JOHNSTON, Scott	St. James	PC
KINEW, Wab	Fort Rouge	NDP
KLASSEN, Judy	Kewatinook	Lib.
LAGASSÉ, Bob	Dawson Trail	PC
LAGIMODIERE, Alan	Selkirk	PC
LAMOUREUX, Cindy	Burrows	Lib.
LATHLIN, Amanda	The Pas	NDP
LINDSEY, Tom	Flin Flon	NDP
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	NDP
MARCELINO, Flor	Logan	NDP
MARCELINO, Ted	Tyndall Park	NDP
MARTIN, Shannon	Morris	PC
MAYER, Colleen	St. Vital	PC
MICHALESKI, Brad	Dauphin	PC
MICKLEFIELD, Andrew	Rossmere	PC
MORLEY-LECOMTE, Janice	Seine River	PC
NESBITT, Greg	Riding Mountain	PC
PALLISTER, Brian, Hon.	Fort Whyte	PC
PEDERSEN, Blaine, Hon.	Midland	PC
PIWNIUK, Doyle	Arthur-Virden	PC
REYES, Jon	St. Norbert	PC
SARAN, Mohinder	The Maples	Ind.
SCHULER, Ron, Hon.	St. Paul	PC
SELINGER, Greg	St. Boniface	NDP
SMITH, Andrew	Southdale	PC
SMITH, Bernadette	Point Douglas	NDP
SMOOK, Dennis	La Verendrye	PC
SQUIRES, Rochelle, Hon.	Riel	PC
STEFANSON, Heather, Hon.	Tuxedo	PC
SWAN, Andrew	Minto	NDP
TEITSMA, James	Radisson	PC
WHARTON, Jeff, Hon.	Gimli	PC
WIEBE, Matt	Concordia	NDP
WISHART, Ian, Hon.	Portage la Prairie	PC
WOWCHUK, Rick	Swan River	PC
YAKIMOSKI, Blair	Transcona	PC

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
Thursday, October 26, 2017

TIME – 6 p.m.

LOCATION – Winnipeg, Manitoba

CHAIRPERSON – Mr. Doyle Piwniuk
(Arthur-Virden)

VICE-CHAIRPERSON – Mr. Len Isleifson
(Brandon East)

ATTENDANCE – 11 QUORUM – 6

Members of the Committee present:

Hon. Messrs. Eichler, Wharton

*Messrs. Allum, Isleifson, Ms. Lamoureux,
 Messrs. Lindsey, Maloway, Michaleski, Nesbitt,
 Piwniuk, Wowchuk*

APPEARING:

Mr. Mohinder Saran, MLA for The Maples

Ms. Flor Marcelino, MLA for Logan

Mr. Rajesh Amilal, private citizen

PUBLIC PRESENTERS:

Mr. Chamkaur Brar, private citizen
Mr. Satnam Singh Bassra, private citizen
Mr. Amanpreetpal Singh Brar, private citizen
Mr. Iqbal Gill, private citizen
Mr. Indergit Singh, private citizen
Mr. Himat Singh Dhaliwal, private citizen
Mr. Harjot Dhaliwal, private citizen
Mr. Jattan Dhaliwal, private citizen
Ms. Nirmal Dhaliwal, private citizen
Ms. Navdep Bedi, private citizen
Mr. TJ Bedi, private citizen
Ms. Kiranjeet Bedi, private citizen
Ms. Manjeet Dhillon, private citizen
Mr. Harjinder Singh Dhillon, on behalf of
Nachhater Sangha, private citizens
Mr. Tebebu Telahun, private citizen
Mr. Inderpal Grewal, private citizen
Mr. Baljeet Kumar Sharma, private citizen
Mr. Simarjeet Brar, private citizen
Mr. Manoj Sharma, private citizen
Mr. Charnanjit Gill, private citizen
Mr. Barry Prentice, private citizen
Ms. Manjit Dhillon, private citizen
Mr. Zena Mussie, private citizen
Mr. Barry Homenick, private citizen
Mr. Devinder Saran, private citizen

Mr. Jaswinder Dhaliwal, private citizen

Mr. Harbans Takhar, private citizen

Mr. Balwinder Sidhu, private citizen

Mr. Baljinder Sran, private citizen

MATTERS UNDER CONSIDERATION:

Bill 30–The Local Vehicles for Hire Act

* * *

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Good evening, folks. We will the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development please come to order.

Before the committee can proceed with the business before it today, it must elect a new Chairperson. Are there any nominations for this position?

Mr. Greg Nesbitt (Riding Mountain): I nominate Doyle Piwniuk.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Doyle Piwniuk has been nominated. Any further nominations?

Okay, hearing no other nominations, Mr. Piwniuk, will you please take the Chair.

Mr. Chairperson in the Chair

Mr. Chairperson: This meeting is called to continue consideration of Bill 30, The Local Vehicles for Hire Act.

I would like to inform all attendees—'tendance' that the provisions of the rules are regarding the hour of adjournment. The standing committee meeting is considering a bill must not sit past midnight to hear the public presentations or to consider the clause by clause of a bill except for the unanimous consent of the committee.

In addition, the standing committee and social and economic development will meet again to consider Bill 30, if necessary, tomorrow, Friday, October 27th, at 10 a.m., and on Tuesday, October 31st, at 6 p.m.

I will now continue public presentations on this bill in accordance with the list of presenters before you.

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood): I move that, for this committee, any presenter be permitted to have a

person of their choice translate their presentation into English.

Mr. Chairperson: It has been moved by Mr. Maloway that—I move, for the committee, any presenters to be permitted to have a person of their choice to translate the presentation in English.

The motion is in order. The floor is open for questions.

Hon. Ralph Eichler (Minister of Agriculture): Just a clarification on the prepared motion that timelines will still be within the 10-minute presentation time.

Mr. Chairperson: Has—the motion was only done for the translator; it doesn't affect the amount of time. Each presenter has to—up to 10 minutes. Agreed? *[Agreed]*

Shall the motion pass?

Some Honourable Members: Pass.

Mr. Chairperson: The motion is accordingly passed.

Before we proceed with the presentations, we do have a number of other items and points of information to consider.

First of all, there is only—anyone else in attendance would like to make a presentation this evening, please register with the staff in the entrance of the room.

Also, for the information for all presenters, while written versions of presentations are not required, if you are going to accompany your presentation with a written material, we ask that you provide 20 copies. And if you need help photocopying, please ask one of the staff in attendance.

As well, in accordance to the rules, a time limit of 10 minutes be allocated to presenters, with five minutes allocated for questions from the committee members.

If a presenter is not in attendance with their name is called, they will be dropped to the bottom of the list. If the presenter is not in attendance when their name is called a second time, they will be removed from the presenters' list.

Prior to proceeding with these public presentations, I would like to advise members of the public regarding the process of speaking in committee. The proceedings of our meeting we—are recorded in order to provide a verbatim transcript. Each time everyone wishes to speak, whether it is an

MLA or a presenter, I first have to say to—that person's name. This is a signal that the Hansard recorder can return the mic on or off.

* (18:10)

Bill 30—The Local Vehicles for Hire Act

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your patience, and we will now proceed with the public presentations.

The first person on the list tonight is Chamkaur Brar, private citizen.

Mr. Brar, do you have any materials to hand out? Okay, thank you.

Okay, Mr. Brar, you can start with your presentation. Oh, just one second.

Okay, we'll get everybody materials around.

Mr. Chamkaur Brar (Private Citizen): Good evening, honourable Chairman and honourable—

Mr. Chairperson: Just one second. Just one second. We'll just wait.

Mr. Chamkaur Brar: Okay.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, you can go ahead.

Mr. Chamkaur Brar: Good evening, honourable Chairman and honourable members. My name is Chamkaur Singh Brar. I came in Canada with my parents in 1998. My sister sponsored me *[inaudible]* I start of my job as a janitorial cleaning. I worked very hard seven days a week, 15 hours of the day. I bought the house and sold my property back home and bought a taxi here. Now, I have two cars with Unicity. I have three kids, and they are studying in private schools. I want to give them a good education and values, and also I am helping my sister as well since she lost her husband. She has two kids; both are going to university, and she also has taxi income. It will affect their financial situation because they have only taxi income.

When I sold my taxi in 2007, I paid capital gains in 2007 and '08 year on \$75,000, and I bought the other cab in 2010 with the price, \$280,000. And I—in 2015, bought the—another cab for the price, \$450,000. And I have—still have a loan; you see there, \$197,000 in taxi. I bought a home 2005, only priced for 225. I still have a loan on my house, \$225,000, you can see there.

Because I took a loan for the taxi against my home, if the Bill 30 will come, maybe my taxi will be valued at zero. It will affect my financial

situation. After working hard 20 days, I will come have a feeling I'm at same stage where I started my journey in Canada.

I ask you question once. You guys have full-time jobs, on 20 years. Then the bill come and my job to be part time. What can we do? Where I go. You sent—throwing me out from the city. Where is my kids' future? Where my sister's kids' future? They don't have income. Can she do it?

Where those promises are before the election, the PCs made? Where those promises are, level playing field all in the cab industry with that? I met the—last year, I only put premium in the—in Victoria in a fundraising dinner from PC party. They said, don't worry, enjoy your evening. Uber can be come. Only they come on a level playing field. Where that promise at? Where I go? Where they're pushing to us? And I can't believe what can I—did, in the past, in 20 years, where is—where's my situation now. Feel like that me.

It's while I talking about the Bill 30, if Bill 30 mean is you are pushing to us to the City and open the door for everyone and come and do business here. If—I asking you where the—why do you guys not doing the—like, a farmer? Like, one farmer have one farm who—throwing two more, three more people over there. What can he do there? Where is his income? After two days, his income is \$250 and throwing, like, 400 more cabs and Uber everything, income going to where? That's the question I ask to all of the committee here. Where I go? Where does those guys are going? Where does those 1,200 families go? And 3,000 kids futures. Where they go? You pushing to us, leave the city. Why?

I want replace this bill—and replace this bill and then that was before 2015. That's a means that's needed here. They don't need anything that's not needed here.

I requesting to all of you please drop this bill. Please replace and then people vote. I requesting to all honourable Premier (Mr. Pallister), please listen to us. Is a 1,200 families' future. Please. That's all. Thank you, all of you.

Mr. Chairperson: Well, thank you for you presentation, Mr. Brar.

Now, we'll go for—does the minister want to have any questions—or, Mr. Maloway.

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood): I want to thank you for your presentation.

You have indicated that you had some understanding that while attending some Conservative Party fundraiser that you were promised a level playing field if Uber were to come. Like, who promised that and when did that happen?

Mr. Chamkaur Brar: This in June 25, 2016, in Victoria Inn. Fundraising dinner for PC Party. I meet there to the honourable Premier. He said—he showing like the hand like that he said, don't worry, enjoy the evening. You guys don't worry. This all I was bringing for you—going here.

Mr. Maloway: Well, sir, you should know that, you know, on that side of the table are the Conservative ministers and MLAs, and you know they were elected with a very large majority of 40 members. But they all meet every day with the Premier and so they will be reporting back as to, you know, what is being said tonight and stuff. So they're the people that you have to convince to withdraw the bill.

But it sounds like you really have a very, very good ally in the Premier if the—you're saying to me that the Premier on June 25, 2015 at Victoria Inn—*[interjection]* Yes, 2015.

Floor Comment: Sixteen.

Mr. Maloway: Sixteen. Okay, at a Conservative Party fundraiser the Premier himself told you that he promised a level playing field if Uber were to come in. Are you saying that's a fact?

Mr. Chamkaur Brar: Yes, I met the Premier with my—the board member and Unicity and Duffy, the fundraising dinner there last year in June, 25–June 2016. I consulted about the Uber agreement so we like to have. Don't worry guys, don't worry, enjoy the evening. Uber can't be come here.

Mr. Maloway: Were there any other people there with you when the Premier said this, when he made that promise?

Mr. Chamkaur Brar: Yes. This time with one of the PC members running with—in the—like Maples, Kaur Sidhu, he was with me and another thing, and also the Premier over there.

Mr. Maloway: Were there any MLAs, any Conservative MLAs there with—

* (18:20)

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Brar,

Mr. Chamkaur Brar: He—the other MLA like our area like he meet me, but not with the Premier that

time. Jim [*phonetic*] Curry. Yes, he meet with me and also I helped him with the election, and he meet me always.

Mr. Tom Lindsey (Flin Flon): Thank you for coming tonight and sharing your story with us. Just a little more follow-up on this conversation you had with the Premier (Mr. Pallister)—can you make sure that the names of the people that may have heard this conversation are fully given to us so that we can follow up with them, or are they planning to be here to make presentations? Do you know that?

Mr. Chamkaur Brar: I can't understand. Who's meet? Who's—I can't understand the question, but—

Mr. Lindsey: If possible, make sure the names that you just told us—make sure that the record reflects who they are.

Mr. Chamkaur Brar: I don't recognize their names now. I don't recognize their names. It's the PC Party; they thinking a lot of people. I meet a couple of people.

Mr. Maloway: I'm pretty pleased to hear all this information, because the fact of the matter is that everyone knows the Premier runs this government. Nothing happens in this government without the Premier's approval. And so, the fact of the matter is that you were talking to the very best person you could at that PC fundraiser because he's the boss, and he says what bills pass and when they pass.

And the question, now, I have is that you were talking to the head guy. You were doing better that night than you're doing here tonight. So, the question is, why do you think he would go and not honour his promise? Any idea why he would backtrack on that promise? Because that is a broken promise.

Mr. Chamkaur Brar: Yes, I shocked. I shocked then I starting on the news, and then they said on the news that the Taxicab Board withdraw all, and Bill 30 is come. I shocked. I said—I shout, I am taxi-driving taxi on that time. And customer say, what happen? I say, oh, no. I shocked, heard it on the news. I say, our Premier promise us—I'm sorry—our Premier's promise us then, and he say now, the Bill 30 came. Why? I'm shocked at that time.

Hon. Jeff Wharton (Minister of Municipal Relations): Mr. Brar, thank you so much for your presentation tonight and also providing us with this information as well. And I really appreciate you sharing that with us.

You had mentioned—the member from Elmwood was asking you about what—allegedly, the Premier had promised you a level playing field. What would you—be your definition of a level playing field, Mr. Brar?

Floor Comment: Level playing field?

Mr. Wharton: Yes.

Mr. Chamkaur Brar: Yes, it's like if the attacking about the concern over the taxi industry. And they showing, like, it's no—nobody come. Only they come, the level playing field. Nobody come.

Mr. Wharton: Okay. Because I guess a level playing field can be perceived in many ways. My understanding of a level playing field is simply if it means fair and competitive market for essentially all services including transportation services, so a level playing field would recommend—obviously, a fair market would be a good start to make sure that the market is fair, it's competitive, where the industry at large has an opportunity to grow and thrive. That would be my kind of understanding of a fair say or, essentially, a fair playing field.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, this last question—Mr. Brar, you can go ahead.

Mr. Chamkaur Brar: Yes, I have a question. One guy is doing same way, like \$1,200 insurance, and one guy doing \$11,000. When are these same? What's the—arrive there? You see, it's like \$8,000, \$9,000 difference. And also, the bill's not safety of the customer. Where the safety of the driver?

Mr. Chairperson: Well, thanks, Mr. Brar. That's—wraps up the time question for the questions now, so we'll go on to the next presenter, and I will call on—

Floor Comment: Thank you very much, gentlemen.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you.

Presenter No. 2, Satnam Singh Bassra?

Mr. Bassra, do you have materials that you want to hand out for the—for your presentation?

Mr. Satnam Singh Bassra (Private Citizen): Yes. Just on the safety.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay. Well, you can go ahead with your presentation.

Mr. Bassra: I driving in a few years already, about 34 years. Safety concern—a few word only.

Okay, I driving taxi on Selkirk Avenue about long time, was 1979 or '80 and with no shield in back

behind me. Somebody hit me with a beer bottle behind me, and I think so, the safety is now it's very important. And a good thing in the Gary Filmon government came a few years ago they bring in a safety camera, safety shield and different things. Appreciate that one.

And also, like, in before, two cab drivers killed. Gurnam Dhaliwal, and also Mr. Abdul. He beat up in Maryland Hotel and he's beat up very badly. He's in a wheelchair.

And I stopped working a few years ago. When I started Handi-Transit, I picked up Mr. Abdul in the wheelchair in Windsor Park area. I'm very bad for him. I start crying that day for—I see Abdul. I see now I don't who's—anybody next my brother driving taxi for anybody, you know, brothers or sisters. I think the safety is very important. I see that maybe shield and everything is safety's first for any *[inaudible]* safety's first.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay. Do you have any more—okay. Now, question from Minister Wharton.

Mr. Wharton: Thank you, Mr. Brassa *[phonetic]*, for your presentation this evening. Thank you for taking the time to come out this evening as well.

You had mentioned safety, and, of course, safety is an area that we're very concerned about as well and we've been hearing quite a bit over the last couple of nights about safety.

Just a question for you, sir, if I may: If this bill was to pass, essentially what would be your view on how safety would change if it went from the current regime to the City of Winnipeg?

Mr. Bassra: Yes. Taxi, like in Winnipeg, it's very bad. I don't think, like, any driver go on the Main Street and the Northern Hotel and the *[inaudible]*. I can do my taxi, go pick up 2 o'clock in the fare in the Northern Hotel and Yale Hotel. I don't think anybody go pick up fare at 2 o'clock in Northern Hotel and Yale Hotel. Any other company I think so. I driving 25 years night shift. I know the business in the North End. The safety shield are very important and any other company *[inaudible]* taxi industry. Safety is very important.

Mr. Wharton: And I agree totally. Safety is very important, you know. Obviously, the right equipment that you currently have is exactly what you need, absolutely. But what I'm saying is, though, if I may, Mr. Bassra, if tomorrow now you're under the City of Winnipeg under their bylaw and regime, how would

that change what you're currently doing today tomorrow morning in safety?

Mr. Bassra: What's with safety tomorrow's safety, tomorrow same thing we need tomorrow same thing like in today. Also, like, in my family, I just also make them whole family dependent on my taxi, and my mother. I used to be out working seven days a week; now I work only three days a week. My taxi brings—*[interjection]*

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Bassra, could I get you to move closer to the microphone?

* (18:30)

Mr. Bassra: I'm sorry. My taxi bring food and bread on my table. Only I'm sick man; I've got a *[inaudible]*. Even I been sick I didn't collect any money from government, and myself and my taxi bring money, a little bit, my driver work for me. Even my family are dependent on my taxi. Two drivers, they work for me, and also for myself. What if tomorrows—my taxi can break, I need take—where I supposed to go. I go kill myself? Everybody just jump in the river? Yes, Sir. What I'm supposed to do tomorrow?

I—last few years of working, I—all the money I spent on my kid. I give it good and—education, my kid. My son working. He got—he working at chartered accounting. Now, he school separate. My daughter, she got her own job. She working in the nursing. I don't know, tomorrow nursing—also very bad now. I don't know, tomorrow she going to lose job.

Mr. Maloway: I want to thank you very much for your presentation.

You should know that this particular bill says no promises on any shields or cameras or strobes or anything like that in the bill. Not only is there no safety in the bill, but they taking away your right to have compensation. And in Australia, every state in Australia has—dealing with this issue, they're providing compensation to the taxi drivers and owners. And, in fact, the State of Victoria is offering \$100,000 per cab for the first cab, \$50,000 for the second one. And there's a hardship fund included in there, as well. Total of \$494 million. They're a government, just like these guys. Just the same. And here, they put a clause that says no compensation.

Like, at least if they would eliminate that. We're going to try to take that out. But if you could at least eliminate that, that would allow you to sue.

Mr. Bassra: They don't listen to me. I do—like, and I go kill myself. This all I working, driving taxi last 35 years. I told you, I get nothing now. I get none. I got no job. Nothing. I can't work, like, can't work now anymore. Ask me with doctor. I have a C6 and C4 surgery already, my neck. I have three plates in my neck.

Mr. Chairperson: That concludes the question time, five minutes. So I want to thank you, Mr. Bassra, for your presentation.

Okay, we'll call the next presenter. Last name is—Mr. Brar. Amanpreetpal Brar? Thank you.

Mr. Brar, do you have any materials that you want to hand out for the presentation? Okay, you can go—continue with your presentation, Mr. Brar.

Mr. Amanpreetpal Singh Brar (Private Citizen): Honourable Manitoba legislative committee, the government of Manitoba saying we are just giving the power to the municipality to regulate the taxis, limousines and extra. They are misleading it. It is not the same bill. They are opening the doors for the Uber taxi.

Okay, the city will regulate the same. Okay, the taxis and Uber taxi. But they can't regulate their—Uber's fare because that's another misleading. Because the Uber always charge what they want. Rush hour? Different fares. Storm? Different. City can't regulate their fares. So how come the City regulate the Uber, too?

Okay. There's another misleading. Okay. If you look economically, small business is always the backbone of local economy. The impact of this bill, you get result after 10, 15 years. Look at that China, even ban on Facebook even. Anything that affect their economy, and now, what happen, Amazon, like, these all the stores. Sears, running out of business. Is right? Kill our economy.

Okay. Okay, I understand there's a \$500,000 deficit of Taxicab Board. I know that. I am worried about that, too. But I have some recommendations for you. Like, how can be turned profit. Just make some changes in the Taxicab Board. They have three Escape Fords, cost money, \$40,000 there sitting. They don't need trucks cost insurance, expensive. They need only one for patrol. Call the cabs there for inspections. If they need anyone to check, just phone in the office. Call there, save money. Let's do the paperless—saves a little bit more money.

Okay, so, charge on the transforming the licence. Every year, 15 to 20 licence transfer from one owner to another owner, and they can put the 5 per cent on that. They can get, like, 15, 20. They get \$100,000. Make, like—they can create \$100,000 from that.

Okay. And every year, they can do, like, put more 15 cars like a lottery system for the bid, and every taxi transferrable, they could easily sell thirty to fifty thousand dollars, and they can make \$500,000 every year. In 10 years, 150 more cabs on the road, like, and 300 full-time jobs, because 150 to 300 full-time jobs. And they create, like, in \$1 million in 10 years. Like, selling \$30,000 put the bad like 15.

They can put a dollar in the metre surcharge. And every cab driver approximately 1,000 trips in a year, so make create \$1,000 and 500 cabs can create \$500,000 in a year. And Taxicab Board not going in the deficit. It's in the profit. Like, in one year, it's \$1 million.

Okay. There's two benefit to put surcharges on the transforming the licence. One, like, they can get 5,000 if they sell 100,000 cab, \$500,000 in the—and 15 cabs are like around \$1,000 and like, you know? Oh, sorry—\$100,000 in the—and plus the price will be stay stable of the taxis because if there's a fee surcharge—transforming surcharge, they can make \$100,000 every year. Fifteen, 20 cabs always *[inaudible]* and selling 15 cabs, another—like, you know?

Okay. Look at the advantage of if this bill doesn't pass. Look at the advantage: make \$1 million in a year profit to the Taxicab Board. Keep full-time jobs—1,000 full-time jobs—out of 2,000, 1,000 full-time jobs. And 150 creating another 300 more jobs in 10 years—full-time jobs—300. Plus keeping the office, Unicity office, 40 people working and provincial people work in the Taxicab Board. They can save their jobs too.

Okay. All the jobs—you know how big impact of saving full-time jobs, you know, and the economy. I understand there's \$364 million in the Manitoba deficit. It will affect a lot, improve the economy.

What is the disadvantage if, suppose, we pass this bill? I'll tell you what is the disadvantage. This advantage of this bill is 400 families, they will bankrupt. They have a lot of loans. And 400 families, they will go burden on Manitoba government, financially, medically. And some of them probably wasting money left. Some of them probably wasting

money. And there's another disadvantage: full-time jobs, they probably going to the part-time jobs. A lot of jobs cut into full-time when the Uber came out goes into part-time jobs.

And, you know, government—Manitoba government adviser even did not consult with the taxi industry. They have a lot of loans on their cabs. Look at here, how much loans. This is all loans on the cabs, and they will get bankrupt. And the burden is on the government. And they didn't consult. They don't know how much—because, probably, that's why he didn't get the right advice, because he don't know there's cabs—there's a lot of loans.

* (18:40)

And this way, you can solve the problem in profitable. But when you pass the bill, Manitoba government will be going taking 400 families' burden on there. Does it make sense? Even I'm a taxi driver, I won't, like, still doing favours, like, how can cut in, changes in the Taxicab Board, how can make a profit and how we can, and nothing is there. It's not fair, like with Uber. Look at some countries; they are even banning, like, you know. It's not even good for the economy, our economy's not that cheap: 764 millions on Manitoba.

You see effect even more on our economy. It's not bringing any money or anything. It's affect our economy. Yes, when we get in the good economy, no loan on Manitoba, then this a different story, like, you know.

And you know, 400 people bankrupt. Look at here. This is the big loans on the cabs. And this—and another—they saying it's a fair, like it's a fair rule. No; one is paying \$1,000 insurance or \$2,000 in a year; one is paying \$10,000 insurance, over \$10,000 and plus all the expensive and everything, taxi insurance, safety, camera, everything. How much cost? You know how much cost to run the one cab? Office fees, administration fees, airport fees.

And these companies, they easily get bankrupt or maybe even nobody even buy them. Who'd suffer? Who—you—we, Manitoba, just take care of Manitoba people. Like, and let's prove that we care Manitobans.

Safety plus indigenous people. They come because they can't use the service because, like, they're so—that's our part. Like, we have to—Manitoba government have to pay too because they won't depend—I talked to so many people with, like, I always in the North End; I say Uber. Oh, we can't

take that, Sir, we have to call a taxi. Because the prepaid Mastercard, credit card, and they—so, this way, you can go into profit, solving everything, problem solving and everything, like, you know, and—

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Brar, you have one more minute left.

Mr. Amanpreetpal Singh Brar: That's okay, I'm done.

Mr. Chairperson: Done? Okay.

We'll go with—on to questions, and Mr.—Minister Wharton has a question.

Mr. Wharton: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you, Mr. Sodhi [*phonetic*], for your presentation.

Floor Comment: Oh, sir, can you speak loudly? I can't—

Mr. Wharton: Thank you so much for your presentation tonight. Obviously, you've done your homework and research and you know your business very well. I'm a small-business owner as well, have been for over 30 years, and I can appreciate the work that you've put into crunching the numbers, and I thank you for that.

Question I have for you—I have a couple of questions for you, a couple of comments. You had mentioned about the licences again, and you'd thrown a couple of numbers around. There seemed to be a wide range. The last couple of nights we've been hearing the value of licences: \$90,000, 120, 400, \$500,000. Why such a discrepancy in the value of the licence when you transfer or purchase amongst, I guess, yourselves?

Mr. Amanpreetpal Singh Brar: Sir, because if the Taxicab Board, they charge the fees transfer, I mean, fees like any fees on that. Like, we bought the houses, like five—you know, it can even keep lower the prices on the—because I've heard of—because so many up and down licence transforming here, here and there. Like, you know, they can save and then the price will be also probably less, because there's the fees from that, like we house. We don't buy one house and another house, another house because they have to pay six, seven thousand dollars just to waste, like, right.

Mr. Wharton: So I guess to follow up on that, you're right. I mean, you don't buy four or five houses, absolutely not. But you had mentioned about no, I guess, consultation. You weren't consulted, the industry wasn't consulted, is that correct?

Floor Comment: I have a hearing problem.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Brar. Mr.—oh, sorry, Minister Wharton.

Mr. Wharton: Sorry, I'll speak up a bit. Sorry, can you hear me now? Okay.

You had mentioned in your earlier comments that you—the industry and you weren't consulted. Is that correct?

Mr. Amanpreetpal Singh Brar: I really don't understand.

Mr. Chairperson: Oh, you haven't heard it?

Minister Wharton.

Mr. Wharton: Okay, I'll try again.

Was there any consultation done? You had said there wasn't any that you're aware of from government? Consultation?

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Eichler, you want to just—Mr. Eichler, do you want to ask—

Mr. Wharton: He might not hear me.

Mr. Chairperson: He might not hear Minister Wharton.

Hon. Ralph Eichler (Minister of Agriculture): Sure.

Mr. Wharton: Thank you. Identify himself—*[interjection]*

Mr. Amanpreetpal Singh Brar: No, just my own research.

Mr. Wharton: Oh, okay, okay.

So, just for the record, just wanted to be clear because this has come up again over the last couple of nights. In 2015, the former NDP government commissioned a report by Meyers Norris Penny to essentially do a comprehensive review of the taxicab industry in Manitoba. So that was the former government, the NDP government that commissioned that report. That report went out into the public, and the public responses were overwhelming. Over 10,000 responses, including 500 telephone interviews and 9,200 online responses. There was a lot of consultation in the process. The NDP started the process in 2015 and, you know, I can tell you that we also met my former—my colleague, Minister Clarke, had also met with Duffy's and Unicity as well in their office and had very lengthy discussions and follow-up, as well.

So there was some consultation done, just for the record for yourself, sir. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Brar, do you have anything to add?

Mr. Amanpreetpal Singh Brar: Because according—like, you mean because little population increasing. Like, I don't mean like 15, little bit less. But I just—it's again, the revenue. How we can get the revenue. Like, how can we can handle, like, so I just. That's why I just recommend.

Mr. Maloway: Thank you for your presentation.

Minister's talking about—and we heard this yesterday, too—about a survey that was done two or three years ago. And they say they surveyed 10,000 people. Well, surveyed them about what? Did they ask about how fair it was to treat the taxicab industry the way they are right now? Did they ask them is it fair not to compensate, to just take their licences and drive the people out of business? Did they ask that question in the surveys? No, not at all.

You know, what just amazes me is the Conservative Party claims to be the party of small business. And, in fact, most of the MLAs over there are involved or have been involved in small business. And, you know, at some level, they got to know that this is wrong, that you can't treat people this way.

You cannot take an investment—if you own a house and the city's going to build a road through your front yard, they will compensate—

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Maloway, you—Mr. Maloway, do you have a question? We were running out of time, here.

Mr. Maloway: I'd like to—your comments on that.

Mr. Amanpreetpal Singh Brar: Yes, that's—we're seeing misleading all the bills and everything. It's not—the government is not totally unfair, because they did not even consult how much loan they have on their taxis, how much—how—like, you know, how they will suffer and how will it work. Because they just—I don't know how—they not even thinking what they, like, doing. They don't even, like—

Mr. Chairperson: The five minutes is up for the question that—for this presentation. So, Mr. Brar, I'm going to thank you for your presentation.

The next person on the list is Randhir Sodhi. Can I get—if he can come up? Randhir Sodhi? No. 4? Oh, that was—*[interjection]*

So we're going to be dropping—we're going to drop Mr. Sodhi to the bottom. And—Iqbal—Iqbal Gill is going to be—Iqbal Gill is the next person on the list. A private citizen.

Mr. Gill, we'll pass the material around.

Mr. Gill, you can start with your presentation. Okay, sure. Okay.

Mr. Iqbal Gill (Private Citizen): Do you want to wait for material?

Good evening, everyone. My name is—

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Gill, go ahead.

Mr. Iqbal Gill: Okay, it's all good. Good evening, everyone. Is—my name is Iqbal Gill, and I came to Canada in around 2000. And my profession is—back home is—I'm the mechanical engineer myself. When I came to the Canada, in 2000, I'm talking about—I'm looking for the job almost six months. No job. I don't know you can call a fortune or infortune. But my friend is recommend me to drive cab. Six month, I'm sitting at home eating from my family's food or whatever you can say. Then find the job as a taxi. Didn't choose my profession, but I have no choice.

* (18:50)

And I started and I did it with the profession. Even I'm not the type to the driving cab, or I don't have the professional backing or anything like that, but I did it. I made good money to survive my family, to feed them and feed myself and grown-up, and after five, six years, still couldn't find a good job because they have to send me the three years or four years back to the school to do the same job, whatever I'm doing back home.

And I'm asking you guys if you can answer me after that. If you study for six years in the college or university, and you're doing the same thing, and you did the test, and you passed the test, and they're telling you to go back and do the three years again for the same thing whatever you did, is that fair?

But I did it to profession through the taxi, and I did it, and I did almost 17, and I'm still doing it. I don't want to drive a cab as a profession and get assaulted every single night on the road, to get the F-words from the customers or everything. They're drunk; they do—you couldn't even believe it what they do to you when you sitting on the passengers, and I'm the driving—not for the money sometimes—or what—there is money involved to feed your family.

But now is—I passed you all—sorry, I'm not speaking on whatever I give to you is all the safety.

That's my main concern, is safety. Is that fair, is now—in 2001 is the Mr. Deol is killed. I came in that time is—just three months, and I started driving that time. And my cousin or my wife is telling me, are you sure you want to go drive? Just got that guy's killed in a few days ago, but I didn't have no choice.

But I still did it. I survived. I got many times to being stabbed, called cops many times. Nobody shows on the time. And the cops comes, and they ask you, are you safe? Yes, I am safe. I'm standing in front of you. But did I face safe from inside? Nobody answer, and they ask you, you want to give to the—whoever attacked on you, you want assault or not? You want to do the paperwork or not? What kind of answer is that to the cops, we're that weak. We—all the taxi drivers getting every single day those kind of things.

And you guys talking about the Uber now is—I'm not the favouring the Uber. I'm not the favouring the—it's totally up to you guys. You guys going to decided what are you going to do after that, but I just tell you the one thing I heard every day from outside: they're going to create the jobs. How they going to create the jobs? Sixteen hundred families, each family has three person, I say, minimum, and you can count. Where they going to go?

I have my taxi, and even I start from 2000. I still owe my money on the—to pay the loans. In two—17 years, I still didn't get paid off my taxi, because even my car—my—I have the house; they have the loan, and I have taxi; they have the loan. If I get my money, it's going to be cut off more than half. Who's going to pay? Where's the money going to come from?

My cousin, they came, two of them. They couldn't find a job for—I, six months; same thing, they didn't. And they bought the car. They don't want to drive. One is a computer engineer guy. One is a good family like the farmer. But they don't have the—no choice. I ask—give the answer to the respected. They asked, why'd they spend that much money? Because no jobs in Winnipeg or in Manitoba, you can see.

If we have the jobs, why don't we do the jobs? We can do the better jobs. But I'm not ashamed to—I'm doing the taxi driver. Even my kids say, Dad, you are a—I'm proud of it because it's going to feed my family.

I have lots of things to say. Now is to say—create the jobs. I'm going to come on there. Now is—Uber

is—they're doing the survey, and they're doing the fake city. They made the fake city. I hope everybody heard about the fake city. The Uber is doing—Uber made the fake city in the Pittsburgh, Almono. And they're doing the survey. They're doing the—like, the self-driving cars, self-driving trucks, Uber. But if somebody wants to look on there, the Google—you can google, it's the October 18th in the news. They're doing those self-driving cars survey in the Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, or something.

They have the mannequins going on the roads, and they're checking they're getting hit or not hit. If they creating a job. No, I think as Uber, feeding the family today—I can give you one example. Same thing. Like, I'm sitting in the ship, and now they're my coworkers, they're going to start making holes in the ships. Same thing we do now. The Uber people can—like, whoever going to drive for them? They gonna drive good right now. They going to make money maybe, maybe not. But one day the Uber going to make the business out of them, and they going to kill their jobs because they going to pull the self-driving cars on the roads. And it's happening right now.

Who's going to be responsible for that time? I have the question for everybody here. Now you killing us, okay, all the industries not making—we making effort money—or, good money right now. But maybe we make the same money, and now we driving two shifts in the day. Like the day and night. If I'm not going to make enough money, is the night driver or the night cousin, whoever, he's going to drive for me if he's not going to make enough money? Then I have to drive myself. Now I'm putting 12 hours a day. Now I have to put the 15 hours a day, then.

We came here for the good future, not for the dead future. I like to answer for, if you—if somebody can answer for me for those.

And the shields. Shields is mean is for safety; 2001—why we put the shield? Same time they put the shield, and we spend lot of money on the cameras, on the shields. Now the sudden no. Is Uber going to come for the big corporation? We don't need any safeties.

Are we going the forward, or we going the behind? I just like to know, I don't know. Is—my wife ask me every day, if it's the shield can now going to be there, are you going to drive still? I'm not going to let you go into work. My kids told me every day, Daddy, I hear all those kinds of things are going to

happen. Are you going to go into work? Are you going to come alive?

I understand, make the decision sitting on the bench and—to very easy. But, when you go on the roads, then you know how hard is it. And I like to make the comment on the MNP. They did the survey pretty good, sitting on the tables, asking everybody oh, you doing this okay. But, when you asked answer, you ask, sir, do they consult? Yes, they did consult, but when you ask the question, we don't know. Who's getting answer? Maybe City, maybe the municipal, we don't know. Same thing, sir. You ask me the why is the different is to the City? I'm listening to the question. I tell you what's different with the City, and I [*inaudible*] presentation, but I still like to—it is the big different. City doesn't even make allow—rules or anything. We don't know what they're going to put it in. That's why we worried.

That's why we came to your door.

Mr. Chairperson: You have one minute.

Mr. Iqbal Gill: That's why we came to your door. Your act is totally open. Is nothing say about the transfer or anything at all. It's a cancel. Your business licence going to be cancelled. I like to know who's going to tell me on this where it's not going to be cancelled, and that—at the 10(a) it say cancel on it. And that on—at the bottom it say if you go—10(a), No. 1—and if you go to the 10(a) to the bottom is a three columns. It does say if it's been expired or cancelled, your business licence is not activated. And I like to tell you how many business licences in there—involve in there.

I don't know which business licence you're talking about. One is licence we get from the City. That's called business licence from the City. And the second business licence you get from the Taxicab Board. That's the business licence they talking about, the taxicab business licence. And the third one—

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Gill, your time is up, and I want to thank you very much for your presentation.

So we have now five minutes for questions, and I'll have Mr. Isleifson to ask the first question.

Mr. Len Isleifson (Brandon East): Mr. Gill, thank you for your presentation. It's very informative. You make some very valid points, and I'm going to kind of start off where you were ending because that's where my question comes in.

You make some very valid concerns about safety. You talked a lot about Uber coming in. I will

note, though, that throughout Bill 30 there is not a mention of Uber, because that's not what this bill is about. You talked briefly about the powers going from the government to the City of Winnipeg, and that's what I want to talk about, because you do have some valid points.

* (19:00)

So, when we—when this bill, if it becomes enacted, your licence to run a taxi and your licence through the City of Winnipeg will all remain in force through the City of Winnipeg. So, whether they bring in Uber or not, that will be a discussion that they have.

So my question to you is: On your safety issue, on your Uber issues, have you started any type of dialogue with your local city councillor on what the City might do if this passes?

Mr. Iqbal Gill: Yes, we did, sir. We went to all the councillors' doors. You not going to believe which door we didn't knock in. We knock every single door whatever we can. Even before—in the Uber, we knocked the premier door before election, and he promised us it's with a fair field playing games.

He's not only the Premier (Mr. Pallister) there. Ron Schuler is there; Cathy Cox is there; Jon Reyes is there. Andrew Micklefield is there. Brian Pallister is the Premier—is there, and is not one person; is we are a hundred people there sitting in the hall and when he making a conversation to us, and maybe we are the recorded that one, too. If somebody want to prove, maybe we have to look for the proof that we provided to you when he said it there.

Mr. Maloway: And I want to thank you for a great presentation. I really have to get back to what you just said about this meeting with the Premier and Ron Schuler and other people.

Like, when was this? Where was it? Who was there, and what do you think that they promised you?

Mr. Iqbal Gill: Okay, thank you for that, but I can't tell you exactly date. I can dig it for you and I can find the date because it just came into my mind when somebody speaking about it. And I know it happened before election, is on Pembina, is the place called is Royal Punjab, and I don't think so is that exists anymore. But there, that there, is we've been the—promises made.

Mr. Maloway: Could you just explain this a little further? It was a—the meeting was called to discuss the taxi industry with you? Or you called the

meeting? They called the meeting? Who called the meeting and who was there?

Mr. Iqbal Gill: I don't know who called—sorry. I don't know who called that meeting, but I'm—I gone there's. I got informed somehow, but I don't want to make the promise—or not going to make any words if I don't know.

Mr. Mohinder Saran (The Maples): Yes, okay. Thanks for coming over here. And, okay, I think the government is running away from the real issue. The real issue is: Will government is ready to pay compensation? And, if the government pays compensation, then the—you mind if that's moved to the City? If that jurisdiction, that responsibility moves to the City but provided government pays the compensation? You will be—*[interjection]*

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Gill.

Mr. Iqbal Gill: Sorry, no—I thought maybe you're not going to say my name.

Thank you. Yes, for sure, we like to. We love to do that—not the love to; that's supposed to be happen, that time, that way, because we spend, because—you asked about the compensation. We don't want the compensation before; we want to work hard. We are the hard-worker people. But, if it's Uber cannot come or whoever you're going to bring it there, it should be the same fares. Pay ours—our price whoever spend that much money. Bring the Uber; we don't mind it. But can I make the—another comment on—but it's totally separate, please, if you guys allow me, for once a minute.

Mr. Chairperson: Yes, go ahead, Mr. Gill.

Mr. Iqbal Gill: Just Uber and the taxi is a big differ right now. Is MNP report says 600—no, 550 car cabs on the road. But I'd like to tell you exactly 652 cabs on the road. I don't know where you got the figures is 410; 410 is only standard cabs, and is 86, is the handi vans, and 105 is the limos and 120 is the seasonal cars, when it's the busy time.

And the 51 is accessible vans, comes with a meter. That means—it's 410 plus is 51, plus is 86. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay. Thanks you, Mr. Gill. Your five minutes of questions are up. So thank you very much for your presentation.

Okay. *[interjection]* No. Sorry—yes. Thank you, Mr. Gill. Yes. Thank you.

So, next person we'll call is No. 6 on the list, is Indergit Singh. Is he here today? Mr. Singh.

Number 6. Mr. Singh, do you have anything to hand out to the—for your—on your presentation or you're just going to present?

Mr. Indergit Singh (Private Citizen): No.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay. Mr. Singh, you can go ahead with your presentation.

Mr. Indergit Singh: Okay. I came in '81, so 14 years I have a factory job, then after have—got the layoff, then I got the licence, then I own the cab. Then—I—all put money on the cab. Then after a couple of years, we bought the house. We got the mortgage on the house. I have three kids. They go to school. One is going to university. Other thing, like, is—it's pretty hard to, like, give the payments, like, the stuff, because I working like 15, 16 hours every day or something. Because everything came—Uber came here, then it will be a big problem for the payments, like, the stuff. Other things, like, we have, like, driver safety—you know, like shields, cameras and training, like that stuff. Then strobe lights, like, the stuff; the other thing, they have nothing like that.

If they came, then it should be like same insurance, like same like safety inspection, like that stuff. That's it.

Mr. Chairperson: Are you—you're finished your presentation, Mr. Singh?

Mr. Indergit Singh: Yes, I'm done.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation, and we'll move on to questions.

And does anybody have any questions?

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you for coming out tonight, and I know for people to come to a committee like this it's quite daunting to stand up in front of people and make that kind of presentation. So I really appreciate you coming and doing this, as well as everybody else that's here.

Let's just talk a little bit about your thoughts on the safety of cab drivers going forward. If Uber or some other ride-sharing thing comes into being, are you concerned that the same level of protection for drivers may not be there?

Mr. Indergit Singh: Yes, sure, like, it should be—okay, it should be, like, safety reason, like—everybody should be, like, shields, cameras and then usual training, like the stuff, strobe light. Because

otherwise—like, one time, like, I take a cab, then I have the customer. That time, we don't have the shields. He punched me on the neck, then he grabbing on the, like, my [*inaudible*] cord, pulling like that. He said, give—the—all the money or something. And I get out, then I call, like, the police. Then after, police came after like two hours or something and they took my taxi. I driving for somebody else. They take the taxi away. Then next day, like, they find that guy, because it was dispatched trip, so that they—I know where we picked them up. Then they make the report. Then they said, like, you can, like, recognize the man? I said, yes. Then we go to the court, and then that guy, that time, they have mustache. Then after, they cut the mustache. But I don't know what they did after, like, that stuff.

Mr. Lindsey: I appreciate that. Thank you very much.

We've heard the government talk about—well, nobody's saying that that's not going to be. We're just going to take—and the Province isn't going to dictate what the rules are. It'll be up to the City. And I'm not sure if you're aware that some municipalities, cities outside of Winnipeg already make the rules for taxis. I know where I come from they do. And not one taxi has a shield, most of the cars are suspect.

And so I just want to get your thoughts on—without any guarantee that the City will legislate or mandate the same level of protections for cab drivers as are what are presently there with the shields and the cameras and all the strobe lights. Do you think it would be a giant step backwards to not have those things mandated by the rules that somebody can come in and drive a car that doesn't have that? Is that going to be fair to people that do have it?

* (19:10)

Mr. Indergit Singh: No, it should be, like, safety reason for everybody, not like me or—it should be Uber or anybody, Lyft or any company came, then it should be the same rules, you know. If it's a red light, then it's a red light for everybody not for some person. And then somebody have red light or they have green light or same thing like that. It's—it should be same for everybody, especially, like, cameras. You know, sometimes somebody forget in the taxi back seat or something like luggage or something. At least, they can check with the—like, which car have or something and then they report and we go to the police station or something. They check it out, like which one has it. If there are Uber or anybody, other

company, they have, like, no camera, how they going to find that out? Like, they have an honest driver, you know, he—they get them back or not. Or purse, like that, sometime mostly people lost a purse or cellular phone. They have the company, then we just to give to our company, and then, you know, they get from there—or they get them back, like that person, if he know.

Mr. Mohinder Saran: Okay, I would like to ask, this level playing field, government quite often being used and to me a level playing field will be if Uber also have to buy taxi on the ongoing price. And they also have all the safety features you already have. Will that will be a level playing field or only will be level playing field just as safety but on price, still your price will go down. So what do you think about that?

Mr. Indergit Singh: I think that should be like lots of people, they spend like \$500,000 or \$400,000, if they don't pay nothing, like, the—how we going to compare with that person? They should be have some like *[inaudible]* too, you know. They should be some price too, like licence price. If they have just buy the car, then licence fee, then that's not make sense. All their life, somebody spent, like \$5,000–\$500,000, then other one have the fee, like, fee licence, nobody can compete with them.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Singh. It's—the five-minute questions are up. So thank you very much for your presentation.

Okay, next on the list, we'll call No. 7—*[interjection]*

Mr. Maloway.

Mr. Maloway: We have three students in the audience, so I wonder if we could have unanimous agreement among the committee to allow the students to be moved ahead because they have to go—get up early for school in the morning. One is No. 133, Himat Dhaliwal, and the second one is 187, which is Jattan Dhaliwal, and the third one is 186, Harjot Dhaliwal.

Mr. Chair?

Mr. Chairperson: Does the committee agree to have the three people presented by Mr. Maloway to be put on the top of the list? *[Agreed]*

So we'll call No. 133, Himat Singh Dhaliwal—No. 33, Himat Singh Dhaliwal. Is he here? We'll wait. We're here 'til 12.

Mr. Dhaliwal, do you have any materials that you want to hand out to the committee?

Okay, Mr. Dhaliwal, you can go ahead on your presentation.

Mr. Himat Singh Dhaliwal (Private Citizen): First of all, thanks for giving me this chance to talk here. So I'm not going to waste too much time talking about the facts that we've been talking about the last two days. *[interjection]* Okay, better?

Okay, so I wasn't going to waste time talking about the facts that we've been talking about these last few days. Personally, this affects me because my dad has been driving a taxi since 1994, exactly. And we're three brothers, so he's been paying for us through university at the moment. And it's been about 20 years or more that he's been driving a taxi. So our whole family's income depends on it. And, currently, there's more than 400 taxis out there, and it's drove during day and night, which makes it 800 families that depend on taxis right now for the income.

With Uber coming there, the investments that they made for around \$500,000, which was the price of a taxi, at a point, would go to zero with the introduction of Uber. The thing with Uber is that they have a competitive advantage of coming into the market, because the costs that normal taxi drivers have to pay for safeties insurance, which I heard—that they have a liability coverage of up to \$5 million for Unicity. And, with Uber, they have none of those costs, which give them an advantage to provide service at a lower cost, which would drive taxi services out of business.

If you go online and search about the number of incidents that happened with Uber, you will get lists of them. Recently, in 2014, there was a seven-year-old girl that was killed by an Uber driver in San Francisco. That was when Uber was introduced. And not many steps have been taken to take care of those situations. Moreover, with Uber, if something like that happens, there is no liability. Whereas, what's—with taxis, we have liability insurance, which would—handle those things.

So my question is: Why Uber and other transport companies? It's a trend that is working out in major cities.

Recently, Uber has been taken out of London—banned in London. It's banned in BC. There's a reason it's banned.

The thing with Uber, also, is that if there's bad weather, they charge you extra money for that. Whereas, with taxis, it's a constant rate.

So—and another thing is, if we introduce Uber, it should be with the parallel pricing of taxis, which people have already paid so much money just to get into the business. So, with introducing Uber, we're increasing the number of cars out there, do—in the same business, which is not needed. We're finding a solution for a problem that doesn't even exist at the moment.

The number of taxis have already been increasing in the past few years. Just to go—just to provide the service at a better rate.

So I would just like to conclude saying that, with the introduction of Uber and dissolving the board, we're trying to solve a problem that's not even there. In result, we're creating problems instead of solutions. That's it. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Dhaliwal.

And, Mr. Lindsey has a question.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you for coming out and sharing your thoughts on this whole bill. And, really, what you're talking about is your family's ability to earn a living that will be impacted by whether it's Uber or some other ride-sharing company that comes into being.

If the rules aren't the same for every company that's offering a taxi-like business, regardless what they call themselves, then it's not fair. So, really, what you want to see is something that says that whatever's been in place for current taxi drivers like your dad, to keep him safe, to keep the fares proper, you want to see those same protections built in if some other ride-sharing thing comes into being. But, really, that's not what the whole ride-sharing thing is all about, is it?

Mr. Himat Singh Dhaliwal: Yes, if we put those same aspects into other taxis that they want to come into the market—what we also have to consider is the fact that the investments made by taxi drivers, such as Unicity, they're going to zero in a way, because at this moment, from what I heard, it was \$400,000 to \$500,000.

With Uber coming to market, even with those safety measures, those prices are going down. The market's still the same, but the number of companies providing the service increases. So the income goes

down, the costs are still high for the taxi drivers, whereas for Uber the costs are down and income goes high for them.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you for clarifying that with me. I'll admit I've—certainly don't know as much about this issue as I'm sure you do, because you live it every day, right.

So, if this government is bound and determined that they're going to bring in legislation that allows ride-sharing companies, would it be fair to say, then, that they should also introduce legislation, or at least remove the part of the legislation that says that current taxi companies won't be compensated for what they're going to lose? You'd like to see that part removed and compensation available for those taxi companies, again, to keep it fair.

* (19:20)

Mr. Himat Singh Dhaliwal: Compensation should not be negotiable. It's—people that bought taxis here come from back home by selling their land. And that—they put that investment into their taxis. So, without those—that 'compensation', we're robbing them of their money. And it's just a total waste.

Mr. Greg Nesbitt (Riding Mountain): Thank you, Mr. Dhaliwal. Are you aware that this bill does not address Uber, that it's only to transfer the regulating of the industry to the City of Winnipeg, which is like most major cities across Canada?

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Dhaliwal, go ahead.

Mr. Himat Singh Dhaliwal: That's just a direct way for Uber to come into the city. The issue we're trying to address is that the number of taxis is going to increase with the same marketplace. I—personally, this affects me because my dad has to put three of his sons through university. With those same costs, his income is going to go down. He couldn't make it here today because he came home after working a 12-hour shift just to provide for us.

Mr. James Allum (Fort Garry-Riverview): Thank you for coming tonight. That was a excellent presentation, I have to tell you.

So I just want to follow up on your—are you currently in university now? *[interjection]*

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Dhaliwal, go ahead.

Mr. Himat Singh Dhaliwal: Yes, at the Asper School of Business right now.

Mr. Allum: And then—thank you, Mr. Chair—and your brothers are also in university now?

Mr. Himat Singh Dhaliwal: Yes, one's pursuing dentistry, and the other one's in accounting.

Mr. Allum: So it's quite ironic that down the hall there's a committee meeting just like this that's going to raise the tuition on all of you, and at the same time, in this room, they're going to put your family out of business. Do you think that's fair?

Mr. Chairperson: I just want to bring back the relevance of this committee room here.

Mr. Allum: I just did.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, Mr. Dhaliwal, go ahead.

Mr. Himat Singh Dhaliwal: I understand that. Both of my brothers were here today against Bill 31. It's the same thing. We're going to be paying more with our house income going down. In a way, both these bills affect us: Bill 30 and Bill 31.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, Mr. Lindsey, we have one more question.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you, again. It's interesting that really what we're talking about is undermining small, local businesses, right? That's what—your parents run a taxi; that's their business. And here's a government that supposedly is all about business and yet they're trying to undermine this business in the potential of attracting some other ride-sharing thing, that without providing anything to make that playing field level. Is that a fair statement? Would you agree?

Mr. Himat Singh Dhaliwal: One of the first things we learned is that we should provide local businesses to grow instead of other corporations that come from foreign countries into your country. With doing that, we're actually, like giving them a gateway, just to come here and open their own businesses, which undermines the business of more than 800 families here.

Mr. Chairperson: Great. Thanks, Mr. Dhaliwal. This concludes the five minutes of questions. And I want to thank you for your presentation.

Okay, so now we'll go to 186. Harjot Dhaliwal is the next person on the—to present.

Harjot Dhaliwal? Another student, 186. Yes.

Go ahead, Mr. Dhaliwal, go do your presentation. Do you have any written materials to hand out?

Mr. Harjot Dhaliwal (Private Citizen): No, this is just like—

Mr. Chairperson: No, okay, go ahead with your presentation, Mr. Dhaliwal.

Mr. Harjot Dhaliwal: Hello, good evening, everyone. Today I'm here to present my views regarding the Bill 30. There are, like, many disadvantages of the Bill 30 if it's passed in the future.

So, first of all, I'll talk about the personal impacts that is—that it has on my family. So, as my brother was right here, was talking about the same thing. So, like, if Uber, or, like, this bill is passed, the income of my household will decrease, which will have, like, many impacts on my family. For example, my dad, he's only, like, main source of income in my family, and then he's the only one who pays for my tuition fees, the other income that we need for our household.

And, like, if the Bill 30 is legalized in Winnipeg, so there will be, like, many other—like, it will decrease the income of taxi owners and will cause many problems for the owners too.

So, if we look at this issue as a—on a global basis, there are many negative impacts on the residents of Manitoba. We hear about many crimes happening in other places around the world. For example, a six-year-old girl was killed by an Uber 'drivell'—driver. And six people were shot by an Uber driver in Michigan. So, if crimes like this can happen in other places, I'm pretty sure there's a possibility that it can happen in Winnipeg too.

So not only for the passengers, but—like, safety is also important for their drivers too. Taxi companies like Unicity, Duffy's have—like, their own rules and regulations, which is followed by everyone here. And like, taxis have shields, cameras, panic lights for safety of the drivers and the passengers. If other companies do not follow the safety rules, it can have many consequences and like, it can cause danger for many of—like, families.

So, in the end, we can say that like, if the—Bill 30 is passed, it can has—have like many consequences on, like, micro—on a micro basis, like in families, and also, like, on a global basis. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Dhaliwal.

Questions?

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you for coming and presenting, and I appreciate the fact that you're a student. And congratulations to your dad being able to support you trying to get a better life in Canada by getting an education.

If I can just—really, what you'd like to see is the government do something with this Bill 30, either rip it up, throw it away, or make some changes to it so that it's fair for your dad and for other people so that they're not going to go broke, their businesses aren't going to go out of business, there's still going to be able to support their families. Is that fair?

Mr. Harjot Dhaliwal: So yes, like, that's just my personal problem, like—my dad. But like, I'm not only here for my family, right? But like also—like, many other families. Like, my brother totally has, like, more than 800 drivers, I think, here. And then they have their families, too, and then probably—like, all of them—like, their main source of income is taxis. So that's why, like, obviously it's going to affect the taxis' drivers more than everything else and their income—so, like, which will cause other problems too.

Mr. Isleifson: Thank you very much for the presentation. Very well-thought-out and well-articulated.

A question for you though. A lot of the conversation is around being fair. So right now, I'm not sure if you're aware that Winnipeg is the only major city in Canada, that does not regulate their own taxi industry. Every municipality in Manitoba already has this ability. So I—we truly believe this bill is making it fair, because they're all the same.

But a lot of the talk that I've been hearing comes from what may happen, depending on what the City does with Uber and things like that. That's all up to the City. So, when I look at the bill itself, I'm really—want to know why—and I know these folks on the other side of the table will knock this bill down, saying it's terrible. They say things are in the bill that aren't.

But I want to know, from you, what the big issue is of the bill not of Uber, because that's not in the bill—all of that stuff. The bill itself—transferring the authority to Winnipeg to be like all the rest of Manitoba. What do you think of that?

Mr. Harjot Dhaliwal: Like, as I said before, like, it has, like, many, like, personal effects and global—on like—effects on a global basis. So like, personal—it's obviously, like, the income and everything, like, it

goes—it decreases, and then on global-basis, like for the safety—the main thing is safety, right?

For like, the residents in Manitoba, like, everyone needs safety here. And if this bill is passed, like, companies like Uber, they don't have rules and regulations like Unicity and Duffy's, right? So like, it will affect, like, the safety too.

Mr. Lindsey: Just like to address some of what my colleague across the table said about—you know, we're just trying to keep it fair so that Winnipeg is treated the same as Brandon, as Flin Flon so that they can legislate what the rules are for taxis.

It—are you aware that taxis that operate in some of these other jurisdictions don't have any of the safety measures in place that the City of Winnipeg has in place, for very good reasons? I guess, that the City has those things in place to protect taxi drivers, and would it be fair to say that, really, if we wanted to keep it fair for all those different municipalities, that then they should be applying the same rules that are currently in place for the city of Winnipeg, so that those taxi drivers, those passengers are protected equally?

* (19:30)

Mr. Harjot Dhaliwal: Manitoba's like one of the top provinces with running the safety of our cabs, right? And if, like, those rules and regulations are not followed by other companies, that can be like—that are coming in the future, it can cause, like, many problems and, like, regarding the safety and then it could—it can decrease the safety and rules and regulations in Manitoba.

Mr. Mohinder Saran: Thanks for coming. My question is that if a government is not doing anything wrong, why they don't remove that clause where government can be taken to the court? If they are doing nothing wrong, it's very clear and they are clear in their mind why they're putting that clause?

Mr. Harjot Dhaliwal: So, like, I'm not really sure. Can you repeat the question, please?

Mr. Mohinder Saran: The clause is about the compensation that—sorry—the clause is about the compensation, that you cannot take government to the court for compensation. So they have put that clause in this bill. If they are very clear in their mind, they're not afraid of anything, why they're putting that clause? They should remove that clause, let the court decide whatever it happens.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, Mr. Dhaliwal, go ahead and answer, but our time is coming to an end.

Mr. Harjot Dhaliwal: Yes, so, like—

Mr. Chairperson: Go ahead.

Mr. Harjot Dhaliwal: If this bill is passed, right, they're going to, like it's going to have a lot of effects, and then for, like, for that we have to check the owner's income and everything. I'm not really sure, like, for the compensation, but, like, yes, like it has many personal effects too.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Dhaliwal. Your five minutes is up here, so I want to thank you for your presentation and thanks for coming out tonight.

And the next person on the list is No. 187, Jattan Dhaliwal.

You can come up.

Mr. Dhaliwal, do you have any materials to hand out?

Mr. Jattan Dhaliwal (Private Citizen): No, it's—

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, go ahead with your presentation.

Mr. Jattan Dhaliwal: So I am here—good evening everyone. I'm here to present my views and points on Uber—I mean, Bill 30, and so one of the most important effect is, like, affecting our families. There's about, like, 800 families, you can say, like, more than 800 families that's being affected due to this Bill 30. And, like, the income that's coming from taxis are going to decrease, and as you've already brought up, like, the Bill 31, they're increasing the tuition fees, and I, myself, am in university; I'm a student for sciences. And those two brothers, like, two guys that came in front of me, they were my brothers. So it's basically affecting, like, all of us, and we're not the only family here. Like, there's more families that's going to be affected due to this bill.

And not only personal issues, there's also, like, global issues, like, issues for, like, safety, like, there's a different safety concerns, such as like Uber doesn't provide any, like, shields or anything, like, not only Uber, but like if there's other companies that's coming in, the safety's also—always going to be a concern. And also, like, the drivers won't meet their, like, driving licences requirements and they won't have any, like, criminal checks or child abuse registry checks, which also affects the safety again, and there's—also there's no training given to any of

the drivers. So, like, it's, like, you can't really, like, train a—I mean, drive if—without training, right?

And also there's, like, there's other impacts that happen. Like, there was a six-year-old girl that was killed by the Uber driver. And also one of the reasons why Bill 30 is coming, like, I think, it is because to make Winnipeg more modern, but, like, there's developed cities such as, like London, that has banned and like BC, right? And it's like a fashion and a trend, as we said. So it doesn't really make it modern if we bring, like Bill 30 up, like, and, so I can just conclude that Bill 30 shouldn't be brought up and it should be the way it is right now.

Mr. Chairperson: Yes, thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Dhaliwal.

And first question will be Mr. Isleifson.

Mr. Isleifson: Thank you again for the presentation. Like your brothers, it's very well right to the point and a lot of good concerns.

You mentioned that there are a couple cities in the world—I think you said London and one in BC that have banned Uber. Normally, I wouldn't sit here and talk about Uber, because it's not part of the bill. However, there seems to be a concern that things may change if Uber comes in, and I certainly understand that.

So my question to you is: With this bill, it—should it pass, it will go to the City of Winnipeg. They must come up with a bylaw that addresses the safety and exactly what you're talking about.

Would you be prepared to go to City Council at that time, during their hearings, and ensure that the safety aspects and the aspects about fairness are addressed through the City when they create their bylaw?

Mr. Jattan Dhaliwal: Well, why should we bring it up, at first, because, like, it's already, like, safe? There's taxicabs and everything. Like, it's at a pretty, like, good level.

Well, bringing up other companies, like—I mean, sorry, bringing up the Bill 30 will bring up companies and it will decrease the safety of the companies. But, even if you bring up rules and regulations, it's just creating another problem and—like, more problems.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you for coming out, and I appreciate the fact that you're here and talking about this very important bill. And you brought an

interesting perspective that—you talked about that you get that they want to modernize and—but big urban centres like London are fairly modern and they've decided that this Uber, this ride-sharing is not the right answer.

Would it be fair to say that the taxi industry in Winnipeg has already started to modernize? I know I have a Unicity app on my phone that tells me where the car is and when it's going to be there. So, I mean, they talk about this app that Uber has that's the greatest thing since sliced bread. But, apparently, Unicity's already got that, right. So I don't understand why they think this is going to be something different. So, really, it comes down to it looks like it's going to be something cheaper. Can you comment on that?

Mr. Jattan Dhaliwal: Yes, so, like, it's already more, like, developing. Like, the Taxicab Board is already developing. Like, there—I've heard that they're bringing Wi-Fi and other stuff in taxis. And, like, app's already been developed. And, like, I don't think they're, like, Uber or any other company is more developed than other taxi core-board companies in Winnipeg. So it is already modernized—yes.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Isleifson.

Mr. Isleifson: No. No, thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Lindsey.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you. I just have a quick question. It's my understanding that many of these Uber drivers or ride-sharing drivers, whether it's Uber or Lyft or some other, are really not full-time drivers. They drive during the peak hours, that—the rush hours and really leave the traditional taxi drivers holding the bag, if you will, to try and cover the non-peak hours, which really, then, affects their ability to earn a decent standard of living. Is that your understanding as well?

Mr. Jattan Dhaliwal: I agree, like, with you, because if you think about it, most of the Uber drivers or any other company drivers are going to be working part-time, like, a lot, because—just at rush hours, and that's when the full-time drivers, like, are going to get affected, because of the income that they're going to make at rush hours. It's not going to be the same when other companies are going to come in.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Maloway. *[interjection]* Mr. Saran.

Mr. Mohinder Saran: Yes, okay. Thank you for coming out and over here.

Main thing is that every time that question's raised, other cities have the jurisdiction but only in Manitoba we are—Manitoba government has the jurisdiction in the city of Winnipeg.

Number 1, city of Winnipeg is total population of Manitoba—is 68 per cent. I think that's what I heard. Number 2, because, if taxi board is under Manitoba government, it can cover all the other cities, and that way they can make such rules, which will be uniform for everybody and all the citizens of Manitoba will be safe. What do you think about that?

* (19:40)

Mr. Jattan Dhaliwal: Well, as I said, like, bringing Bill 30 isn't really going to bring anything more modern or safety—right, like, more safety for, like, the Winnipeggers or anything. So, like, if you keep it this way and, like, just develop it for the Unicity or other companies that are already, like, under the Taxicab Board, it's just better to keep this way. And it won't affect the income of it. Like, of the income of the drivers. Instead of, like, increasing, say, other safety concerns by making more companies come into Winnipeg.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Dhaliwal, for your—answering those questions. And thanks for your presentation. We're over the five minutes, so we're going to the next—Mr. Maloway.

Mr. Maloway: I'd like to know whether we could have leave of the committee, I just have a couple more students that cannot be here tomorrow and have school in the morning. I have No. 145, Mr. Dhaliwal, Norvinder *[phonetic]* Kaur Dhaliwal; TJ Bedi, 179; Kiranjeet Bedi, 180; and Navdep Bedi, 178. And one more is Manjeet Dhillon, is 200. And these are all kids that have to not only get some sleep tonight, but they can't actually be here tomorrow because they're in school.

Mr. Chairperson: Is it the agreement of the committee to allow these individuals that were listed to come up for—earlier? To get to the top of the list? Agreed? *[Agreed]*

So we'll continue with No. 145, Mirmal *[phonetic]* Dhaliwal. Mirmal *[phonetic]* Dhaliwal. No. 45.

Ms. Dhaliwal, do you have any material that you want to hand out to the committee?

Ms. Nirmal Dhaliwal (Private Citizen): No.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, go ahead, Ms. Dhaliwal.

Ms. Dhaliwal: So my dad has been working in the taxicab business for 27 years now—

Mr. Chairperson: Do you want to get closer to the microphone so we can hear you?

Sorry, the person—could you keep—the individual that's standing beside you can't stand beside you. Okay, go ahead, Ms. Dhaliwal.

Ms. Dhaliwal: He came to Canada in 1990 for the sake of a better life. He has put his blood and sweat in the taxi industry.

My dad started off working in factories and cleaning big box stores, ending up investing thousands of dollars to build a business in this industry. He went from working long, long hours to night shifts so that he could save enough money to buy his own taxi. He did this for the sake of his family.

Seeing my dad's hard work, dedication and perseverance has showed me to do just that. Over the years, I've seen my dad work very hard in what he does. He is not only doing this for a job, but he is very passionate about what he does.

I am grateful for—the safety measurement regulations are in place to protect these hard-working drivers. These regulations like the cameras installed, the safety shields that have protected many people, and in some cases saved their lives. It is very important to have these safety measures for drivers and passengers. Also, the cameras are there to—that are put into taxicabs are not only for the safe of the—for driver and passenger safety, but this has also helped law enforcement catch others who have been involved in criminal activity.

Driver safety is just as important as passenger safety. My dad is required to do a up-to-date criminal record check and a child abuse registry. He is required to renew our Taxicab Board licence for a few—every few years. This is all-important when in an industry where you're transporting the public.

Many in the taxicab industry are small-business owners, since many of us—many of them are owner-operators. This industry is locally owned and supporting many Manitobans. It provides a steady income to those who operate a single-income household to families who have lost their loved ones who

used to work in the industry. This is something they rely on to put food on the table.

These taxicabs are retirement plans for others who have worked in the industry for 20-30 years. These taxicabs are more than just a monetary value for some people; they represent all the hard work and struggles they have faced.

A large majority of the taxicab drivers are men and women who have come from developing countries to provide a better life for their families. They were given a real chance to start fresh, something they may not have an opportunity to do if they hadn't moved to Canada. The government of Manitoba started the Manitoba nominee program many years ago. At one point, this program offered people a chance to come—become small business owners. These men and women sold their assets such as generational property and bought their—brought their life savings to Manitoba. They invested their life savings into taxicabs here, trusting that they could build a future for themselves and their future. They have put faith in the system, and left their countries behind.

They had so much at risk, but they still invested in the economy. To tell these people that their investments are now in jeopardy is truly heartbreaking. And I'd like to say that these investments are not just in monetary value, but they are proof of how hard so many people have worked.

Before introducing Bill 30, the government should have consulted the taxi industry. Everyone in this industry is an important part of the community. All we have to ask is for safety for the drivers and passengers, fairness, and serious consideration for what our community has at stake and what our community will undergo if this is passed.

I request the committee, the City of Winnipeg and the government of Manitoba, please consider our opinions before making any decisions. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thanks, Ms. Dhaliwal.

Mr. Lindsey, for the question.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you very much for coming. I know it's somewhat nerve-racking to come and make a presentation like this. It is for lots of us. So I appreciate that you're here, and, really, you've—you talk about some very important points that people have come to this country, invested in this city, invested in their business, and, really, the whole problem with this particular bill is is it may make

that investment worth nothing, which then is going to affect your family and other families' ability to earn a living and to survive. Is that basically what you're saying?

Ms. Dhaliwal: Yes. There are many families here, and mine, that depend on the taxi industry as an income to support their families. So this will truly affect many families.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you for that. The other thing you talked about as well was the safety of drivers and passengers and it's taken many years for the current regulations to really adapt and add in a lot of things of—a lot of things, like, shields came about after incidents happened and taxi drivers were hurt or killed. And the strobe lights, again, were not something that just all of a sudden happened.

So, by allowing the City to regulate taxis as opposed to the Province, really, there's no guarantee that any of those safety protections are going to be there, is there?

Ms. Dhaliwal: My concern is that if it is passed on to, like, the—if the City is in charge of this industry, that opens up doors to other companies that may not offer the same safety measures that there are now.

Ms. Flor Marcelino (Logan): Thank you, young lady, for giving us a very thoughtful presentation. Your father must be very proud of you. You are intelligent and you are caring.

Mr. Chair, this has bothered me and I said I'll bite my tongue. But I'm really bothered, and I'd like to ask you: The people who are in the taxi industry in Winnipeg, I don't know in other towns or municipalities, but, in Winnipeg, are predominately new Canadians. They were not born here. They immigrated here, predominantly from India.

Do you think if the owner-operators or these small businessmen, if they were non-immigrants, if they were born here and if they're not coloured, do you think this bill would ever even be introduced?

Ms. Dhaliwal: So you're asking if—can you just reword the question?

Mr. Chairperson: Ms. Marcelino, can you repeat the question?

*(19:50)

Ms. Marcelino: What is your sense, if the majority of the taxi drivers, owners, operators were white men, white people and not coloured people—

Point of Order

An Honourable Member: A point of order.

Mr. Chairperson: A point of order? A point of order on—Ms. Lamoureux.

Ms. Cindy Lamoureux (Burrows): I just want to say I can appreciate where the question is coming from and if you choose to answer, but it's your discretion. Do not answer if you are uncomfortable in any way, okay?

Mr. Chairperson: Yes, the member doesn't have a point of order, but we'll carry on.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: Ms. Dhaliwal—[interjection] Dhaliwal, go ahead.

Ms. Dhaliwal: In my opinion, I'm not here saying that this is happening because the majority are Indians. That's all I have to say.

Mr. Allum: Thank you so much for coming tonight, and as my friend said, it takes a lot of courage to come here, and so I just want you to know that I think all of us here feel very strongly about the courage that you've shown tonight.

You've said—you're—said that you're concerned that the rules of the game are going to change and so, if the rules of the game are going to change, do you think it's fair that at least your family and all the other families should be offered some sort of compensation if they're going to change the rules of the game after all the investment that's been made?

Mr. Chairperson: Mister—Ms. Dhaliwal.

Ms. Dhaliwal: I do think there should be something done for the families who've given up everything for this industry.

Mr. Isleifson: To the presenter, I want to apologize to you on behalf of the PC caucus that someone would even present a question to you that is both racist and discriminatory. So, on behalf of the government, I apologize for you even being asked that question and put in that spot.

Mr. Chairperson: Thanks, Ms. Dhaliwal. We're—

An Honourable Member: Point of order.

Point of Order

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Allum.

Mr. Allum: Mr. Chair, the member made an allegation that I don't think he is possibly able to

substantiate, about the line of questioning made by my friend from Logan. I think it would be very wise for him right now to withdraw that remark, as he himself is the one who's drawing that conclusion, and I don't think that's a conclusion shared by the rest of us.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Isleifson, on the same point of order.

Mr. Isleifson: Yes, on the same point of order. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was simply referring to the question that was asked by the member opposite who mentions about the possibility—asked this poor presenter a question based on a hypothetical, and I hate to say it, but she asked about the colour of somebody and that the bill was being written for that person, so I'm certainly not going to withdraw it, and you can certainly, you know, look at it and rule your way.

Mr. Chairperson: This is not a point of order. We're just—dispute on the facts, and we're going to carry on.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: So, we'll go to the next presenter. Thank you very much.

Okay, the next presenter is No. 178, Navdep Bedi.

Ms. Bedi, do you have anything to hand out or any—for the—

Ms. Navdep Bedi (Private Citizen): No.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay. You can go ahead with your presentation, Ms. Bedi.

Ms. Navdep Bedi: Good evening, everyone. My name is Navdep Bedi, and I'm here to present my thoughts in front of you, as a growing family, regarding Bill 30—

Mr. Chairperson: Sorry. Can you speak louder or speak right into the mic?

Ms. Navdep Bedi: Is this better?

Mr. Chairperson: Yes.

Ms. Navdep Bedi: Okay, I just want to present my thoughts regarding Bill 30, as a young growing family.

Mr. Chairperson: Hold it—can you just hold it up just a little bit higher? Yes, to your mouth, yes.

Ms. Navdep Bedi: How about that?

Mr. Chairperson: Perfect.

Ms. Navdep Bedi: Yes, okay. Sorry about that. It's hard to speak in front of the mic and in front of everybody.

Okay, so me and my husband have been married for almost 15 years, and he has been driving taxis before even we got married. We have worked hard to try to pay off our loans that we took to buy the taxi at that time. And we, as a growing family, we're thinking of paying off the debt on the taxi is more important than paying our house mortgage, because that was our business, which is bringing us the income at that time.

About six years ago, when my older brother got diagnosed with a brain tumour, I couldn't handle the emotional stress and got severely sick and ended up losing my ability to work. If we didn't have income from the taxi at that time, we weren't be able to survive on just my husband's salary only.

We did not contribute anything towards our RRSPs or RESPs for my children, thinking that paying off the debt of the taxi at that time, would be—work—would work as our retirement income and could help us use that toward my kids' future payments for their college and university.

My husband used to drive taxis for full-time basis at—and I had seen him working more than 12 hours everyday, for six days at week at least, and then on the seventh day too. He used to go, get up for a couple hours a day—or a few hours a day so that he can just save extra money for our kids'—my kids' extracurricular activities.

I still remember the day when he was doing his evening shift, and the regular time for him coming home was six in the morning and he didn't return. And about 8 a.m. in the morning I started feeling something is wrong, and I tried to get a hold of and I couldn't get a hold of him. I had no other ways—I tried to call his brother—he had—because he—they were switching shifts at that time. And he said, I don't even know where he is either. I can't get a hold of him either. And around 10 o'clock, I got a call from him and—saying that I'm at the Public Safety Building, which worried me even more, that why are you there?

And then he explained it to me. I'm there as a witness, because one of the customers that he picked up—as a dispatch trip, he ended up going there—and there was a guy with two of his other buddies, and he was shot. So they came in his cab and he said: Can

you please take us somewhere? We need help. And I—this guy is shot. He was full of blood and he said at that time, he had to make a quick decision, what to do. Save the guy's life or just take him to the police station. He didn't know what to do. So at that time, what he did was he took the guy, he made a decision that okay, driving him to the hospital is the priority, and at the same time, he wanted to dispatch, he wanted to let the office know what's going on.

So he had the two-way radio at that time. He called the dispatch, informing her what he's doing and then informed the police. And by the time he reached the Health Sciences Centre, police was already at the scene, and the emergency department was ready to take care of the man and the guy's life was saved at that time.

And I even know—I even remember that—him, in the news. When I—next morning when I went to the work, my work people were talking about this and said, do you remember? Do you know the cab guy who saved the life of a person at that time? And I was like, it was my husband. I was very proud of that, because that's something that you did as a human being: to go and save somebody's life.

But which ride-sharing company will be available 2 a.m. in the morning, to help you dispatch to the police, at the same time contacting with you, and arranging everything at that time for you? None of the sharing companies have that dispatch service except the taxi industry. They have the dispatch service 24 hours a day, seven days a week, 365 a day—a year. And none of the other ride-sharing companies have that dispatch service available right now—as far as I know, right.

* (20:00)

So that's something like—we are happy to serve the community and helping as a taxi driver. It's not only the person who is working as a cab driver. It's the whole family that is behind that person and telling him, yes, every day you go and do this work even though it is not safe. If you want to feel that way, you need to go sit with one taxi driver a day and just live his life for one day, because it's—you can never imagine. I can never know what your job is. You can never feel what the taxi driver job is until you go and sit with him and watch, even for one day, what they do in their regular life, how much abuse they take, how much they help people. People are there—and you don't find every day everywhere nice people. You do find very nice people, and you don't find not too nice people every day.

So you need to realize how important it is for everybody in the family and when—especially for nighttime when your husband is out at night and it's—I'm talking about only one incident—it's not only one incident that happens. And I bet you there's so many other taxi drivers who deal with this kind of situation every day, and their families are at risk. When you sleep at nighttime, your husband is out, you don't sleep peacefully—not every day, not even a single night. You're always afraid; your phone is always on; you don't know what kind of call you're getting. Six in the morning and you know your husband should be home. And, when he's not home, you don't know—you don't know.

And only thought that will come into your mind is what if something bad happened, right. You're never going to think about something good; it's always—and especially when you get a call saying that I'm in the Public Safety Building, like, what do you think? Something bad happened, right.

So I just want to say to you guys that I—we're proud of serving the community and helping, but, at the same time, our biggest investment is our taxi. And we pay—we try to paid our debt more than paying our house mortgage which, to most of the people, is their biggest asset in their life.

So, if we didn't even get compensated of that—on that, we don't even know what do we do? Like, we could have paid our house by that time instead of paying the taxi, but we thought, okay, this is our retirement income, this is our income to pay our kids' future university bills and stuff. And I brought two of my kids with me, six and 11, and one of my kids is sick—he has fever, but we still wanted to show you guys that it's affecting everybody, not only the cab driver but from the youngest to the eldest in the family.

And, at the time of the previous elections, you guys had urged us to make the right choice and we did make the right choice at that time, and now we, same people, are urging you to make the right choice. And please, please make the right choice.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thanks, Ms. Bedi, for your presentation.

We'll go in for questions here.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you very much, and it certainly is nice to get another perspective again about why the safety of drivers is so very important and why the

rules that are in place now aren't perfect, but they offer more protection than having no rules at all. Nothing that says you have to have a shield or a strobe light. So, really, what you're—one of your concerns—you have more than that—but one of your concerns is to make sure that there's rules in place so that your husband can come home safe every day.

Ms. Navdep Bedi: Yes, sir. For sure, everybody—and it's not only me—every woman, if they're here or they are sitting at home right now, they have the same concern that your husband needs to be safe. And the dispatch is actually another way of communicating, too, right, because if the company has a dispatch system, the driver needs—and it's not only for the driver, too, right. Those—safety of those drivers, plus the passengers as well. I don't know how many ride-sharing companies does the same thing too.

If my husband didn't have a two-way radio to do the dispatch at that time, because he was trying to call the company from the cell and he said he wasn't available to reach because the phone lines were busy, but the drivers are provided with a two-way radio as well.

So that was the time that he used his two-way radio to dispatch, and the dispatch was the one who was talking back and forth to the police, back and forth, and the police then arranged the ER, and it's a big thing to save somebody's life. It's a human life, and, if it wasn't done at the right time at the right moment, that person wouldn't have been alive.

Mr. Chairperson: Minister Wharton, for the next question.

Mr. Wharton: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and Ms. Bedi, thank you so much for your presentation and sharing your story and the hardships that you—you know, waiting for your husband to come home every morning must be a challenge, and raising those two kids on your own for half the day is a challenge in itself. Being a dad of two and a granddad of four, so I can appreciate the challenges of the day-to-day life.

Just on the safety issue, and we've heard a lot of this over the last two days and again tonight it's continuing on, and it's becoming more along the lines of the No. 1 concern with—in the industry right now. And it seems like the current safety is strong, but it almost sounds like it needs to get stronger to protect you, your husband, your—the drivers in general and the customers. In your view—and this is important—in your view, how do you feel that could be

strengthened, potentially, under a new regime with the City of Winnipeg.

Ms. Navdep Bedi: To me, honestly, I think the system that we have right now is pretty protective. The only thing is when you are on the road, especially, the nighttime drivers, right, because not too many people, not you and me will be on the road at 2 in the morning every day, right? So, obviously, people who are on the road are not going to be in—I'm not going to use the wrong word here, but I'm just trying to say either they're drunk or they're just partying or doing, maybe, the jobs too. It's not that nobody just out there is in the right state of mind; everybody has different situations at that time, and that's why I'm saying that some people are nice and some people are not so nice at that time. So the system right now is pretty safe, but as long as we do keep it the same way, we don't want to take away the protection from the taxi drivers, whatever they have right now at this time.

Mr. Chairperson: Minister Wharton again.

Mr. Wharton: I can guarantee there'll be a lot of people in this room tonight going home at 1:30 and 2 in the morning, for sure.

But just furthermore on that, if, again, we're looking for ideas with respect to safety because it is a big issue and a big concern, and any ideas that come forward over the next day or two as we continue this very democratic process are much appreciated by I'm sure, by the entire committee tonight. So I thank you for that.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Lindsey, do you have a question?

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you again for coming out, and one of things that I've done in the past is I've volunteered for a thing called Operation Red Nose, which is a volunteer group at the Christmas season that volunteers to go out and drive people home and bring their cars home. Can—certainly one of the concerns that I always have is similar to what you brought up, that we don't know who we're picking up and we don't know what condition they're in, and we don't know what may happen. So one of the things that that volunteer organization has put in place is you have to have a driver and a co-pilot to take the people home in their own car and you have to have somebody else following you in the chase car so—I mean, that's over the top to expect that to be in place—

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Lindsey, can you hurry up with the question? We're out of time, so.

Mr. Lindsey: So I just want to really say I agree with what Mr. Wharton said. If you've got ideas about how to improve the safety and welfare of drivers, certainly, I'm sure that Mr. Wharton—that our other government officials would be more than happy to hear that, but, really, downgrading it to the City to look after with less resources than the Province, that wouldn't really be the right way to go, would it?

Ms. Navdep Bedi: Yes. So, to me, even if you are doing the ride sharing, the protection for the drivers for the ride sharing should be the same as the taxi drivers who are getting it right now these days: the shield, the dispatch, the ability to communicate with someone in case of danger because if the taxi drivers are being protective, whoever is going to do the ride sharing, if the ride sharing comes, then they should have the same protection as a driver as well, to be taxi drivers.

Mr. Chairperson: Thanks, Ms. Bedi. We're—the five minute for questions is up, so thank you very much for your presentation.

And now we'll call on the next presenter, No. 179, TJ Bedi.

Mr. Bedi, do you have any materials that you want to hand out?

Mr. TJ Bedi (Private Citizen): No.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, Mr. Bedi, you can go ahead with your presentation.

Mr. Bedi: I'm a 10th-grade student at the University of Winnipeg Collegiate, and it's only my dad that's paying for my tuition fees. So my dad has been driving a taxi for 18 years, and nine years ago he spent two thousand, six—\$268,000, and he bought his own taxi. He got this money from the home line, and he also took a loan from the bank. So he kind of had to pay a lot of interest. Now he still needs to pay the home mortgage, and the only one that has income is my dad.

* (20:10)

At home, we are a family of six—my grandparents, my parents, and my younger brother and me. My grandparents are old. My grandfather is a heart patient and my grandmother can't see properly, so they're both dependent on my dad. My—five years

ago my mother got sick and she got diagnosed with fibromyalgia so she had to quit her job.

My dad is the only one who had income but two years ago he got diagnosed with brain tumour. He had his first surgery in June 2016 and he had to stay home for six months. We thought he was fine but six months later he—the doctor contacted us and he told us the tumour had regrown. Even after the surgery he went and worked seven days a week and more than 12 hours a day. My parents wanted me and my brother to have a good future and they wanted us to become better citizens of this wonderful country, so they wanted us to have a better education.

If this bill goes through, the future plans will be compromised and our taxi is our backup plan for the future. My dad said, God forbid if something happens to him or if he is unable to work, at least we have our taxi income we can depend upon. Like last year, when my dad had to stay home for six months, the taxi was the only source of income to pay for our food and our daily needs. He also said that the taxi is his pension plan. He will—he thought that he would work until he could and when he got old, he could sell the taxi for his retirement, but what his—with the Bill 30, his plan for retirement and our future studies will become unstable.

So I request that you please rethink Bill 30.

Mr. Chairperson: Thanks, Mr. Bedi. We have now a question from Minister Eichler.

Mr. Eichler: I really don't have a question, but I want to thank you for your presentation and coming here tonight. I know it's getting late and you got school tomorrow but certainly thank you for coming tonight, very much appreciate it.

Mr. Lindsey: I, too, want to thank you for coming and talking about really some very important aspects of what's wrong with this bill and it—how it affects your family in a very personal way, but how it affects other families in the taxi industry as well.

So your family doesn't have a company pension plan or RRSPs. The taxi itself is your parents' retirement income. Is that correct?

Mr. Bedi: I believe so.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Lindsey. Mr. Bedi, did you—said yes?

Mr. Bedi: Yes.

Mr. Lindsey: I know it's hard for you to stand up here, and I appreciate how well you've done and I

wish I'd have been that brave when I was your age to stand up in front of a crowd and speak.

So really, one of the things that—if this government won't just make this bill go away, there really needs to be some changes to it so that your family can get properly compensated for the future loss, that that taxi was going to be your dad's retirement income. So, if that isn't going to be there anymore, there should be something that the government puts in place to take that place. Is that right?

Mr. Bedi: Yes. Yes, sir.

Mr. Chairperson: Any other questions?

Mr. Lindsey: Again, I appreciate that it's getting late and you've put on a very nice presentation and we certainly all appreciate what you've put into this. We've listened to what it means to your family, we've listened to your—saying that you agree that there should be some compensation, even though this bill particularly takes any chance of that compensation away.

So we talked about safety for your dad when he's driving or people that may drive for him. This bill may make all of that go away.

So, really, I guess in your family's opinion, the best thing to do with this bill would be to just take it and throw it away and not introduce it at all. Amendments could potentially make it a little better, but really the best thing would be just scrap Bill 30, withdraw it, and forget about it. Is that a fair statement?

Mr. Bedi: Yes.

Mr. Lindsey: Is there anything more that you would like to say about some of the things that we've talked about here tonight?

Mr. Bedi: No, thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Any other questions?

Mr. Bedi, thank you much for your presentation, and we'll continue with the next presenter. Thank you.

I'm going to call on No. 180, Kiranjeet Bedi.

Ms. Bedi, do you have any materials to hand out?

Ms. Kiranjeet Bedi (Private Citizen): No.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay. Ms. Bedi, you can begin your presentation.

Ms. Kiranjeet Bedi: Thank you so much, Sir.

Good evening, everyone. I'm here to present a story of my life, how Bill 30 is affecting my life.

My son just presented and I just wanted to share, in 1999, 18 years ago I came in this country. I came with two bags and \$100 in my pocket. Like many other drivers, they sold their ancestor's property from back home and they brought money.

For us, we work hard here. We work 12-hour shifts. My husband works 15-hour shifts. On the weekend he works 30-hour shifts, too. We work very hard. Nine, 10 years ago we bought our own taxi. That was \$260–\$2,060 something—\$260,000.

We work very hard to pay off that debt because that's our asset, that's our retirement plan. That's the only thing we have saved for our children, is to give them best future so they can study hard, they can work, and they can become a very better citizens for our country. That's the only thing we can give to our children is the better future, and that's why we were working so hard to pay off our taxi.

But, suddenly, with this Bill 30, now we are left with zero. All that we paid for \$260,000 is becoming zero now. So we work hard, 18 years—12-hour-long shifts, 15-hours-long shifts; 30-hour shifts, and now suddenly we are getting zero for it.

As a proud citizen of Winnipeg, Canada, I want a better future for my—not only my children, for every other children out there, so they can be better future, good citizens of the country.

But, with this all in the room here, all the taxi drivers, we don't have future with this because all our hard-working earned money is coming zero with this Bill 30.

So my question is: If that Bill 30 is not opening doors for—back door for Uber or ride sharing, what is the need to bring that and change, dissolving the Taxicab Board and changing all the procedures?

Mr. Chairperson: Thanks, Ms. Bedi, for your presentation. Are you done your presentation, or was that a question? Okay.

So I want to thank you for your presentation. We'll go into the questions, and does the minister have any remarks. Okay, Mr. Lindsey.

Mr. Lindsey: I want to thank you for asking really the best question we've heard here tonight, is if this bill is not about bringing in Uber, what's the point of it? And that's a really good perspective that you've

brought in, and I guess it's something that we now will have to ask the government in other forums, if you will, but I just want to talk about a little bit about the compensation end of things again, that if the government is insistent on bringing in this bill, would it make it more fair in your mind if the part that says there shall be no compensation to existing taxi drivers, if that part is withdrawn, would that begin to make this bill at least a little bit more fair?

* (20:20)

Ms. Kiranjeet Bedi: I would say that's what my point is. We work so hard. We paid off the taxi. That's our future plan, and we are left with zero with this bill.

My answer is, yes, for sure, we should compensate. We should get some compensation because that's our hard-earned money, and we don't want that to go to zero suddenly, like, from \$400,000, \$500,000 taxi is now zero. So where is that money gone, what we worked for?

We worked hard, we lost our lives—we lost our days of our lives, like, just working so hard we don't even know what was going on in our family. Our kids from 10 months and they are already 15 years old, and we lost those times—not seeing them, their first acts. We didn't hear that first talk what they were—the first word they spoke. We lost that time, and now—even we lost that time, and now we lost our money, what we earned so far.

So for sure there should be compensation and the fair—we are not opposed to Uber or ride sharing, but it should be fair deal. If they're coming in, they should be the same rules and regulations; they should be with same safety rules; they should go through all the 35-hour course. They should all do the criminal record check. Again, Uber is—we're hearing lot about Uber. Again, we shouldn't go through all that.

We're—that's everything on the Internet. We can find all the news, what's happening in other cities. Why we have to suffer and experience those bad things with our city—within our city to again realize that we made mistake. Why can't we learn from other cities? They did the mistake, and then why can't we learn and do better things?

Mr. Maloway: I want to thank you for an excellent presentation and the—one of the government members has said several times now that it's not about Uber. So I'm just wondering, I guess that Uber guy that was here two nights ago was lost. He just kind of found his—flew in from Toronto and found

his way into the Legislature but he was really going somewhere else, because he was here to talk about—nothing about Uber, evidently.

Now, if Uber comes here under this plan with the City, they will—the Uber drivers will not have to install shields, will not have to install cameras, will not have to install strobes. No panic buttons, don't know about the criminal record check, the child abuse registry, nor the 35 hours of training and so on that's required. Now, how could that be? Like, surely the members opposite, who—most of them claim to be small-business people or supportive of small business—how could a party like that be against—be supporting a bill like this?

Ms. Kiranjeet Bedi: Sure, sir. I wanted to say this is about Winnipeg. This is about our city. This is about our youth, and eventually those Uber drivers are Winnipeggers. So why don't we are—paying attention? Those Winnipeggers, they are just saying at the smaller part of the Uber coming that they can earn money, but the thing is, again, it's about safety.

Those Winnipeggers are our future, too—our students, and they are working for other people. They need safety as well. So they need cameras installed, they need shields installed, they need two-way system—radio system and strobe lights. Everything safety should be same. So if they are coming in Uber ride sharing, they should be with the same procedure as taxis, Unicity and Duffy's Taxi and other taxi businesses in our Winnipeg.

Mr. Chairperson: Great. Thanks, Ms. Bedi. Your question for five minutes is up and I want to thank you very much for your presentation, and thanks for coming out tonight.

Okay, we're going to the next presenter. We'll go back to the top of the list.

Okay sorry, we're going to go to 200, and the person's name is Manjeet Dhillon and private citizen. So if Manjeet, if you can come up?

Ms. Dhillon you can—do you have any materials to hand out?

Ms. Manjeet Dhillon (Private Citizen): I don't, no.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, thanks, Ms. Dhillon. You can proceed with your presentation.

Ms. Manjeet Dhillon: So I'm speaking form a different perspective. I'm not a taxi driver, I'm a daughter of a former taxi driver. My dad has been driving taxi for a really long time. Unfortunately, he

did pass away four years ago, and I'm 18 now. I have two siblings and I have a single mother that's here with me today.

With my dad passing away, our taxi left us an income. Although it wasn't a full income, it was still something to help my mom out and help me and my three siblings get through school. All three of us are in university. We attend the University of Winnipeg. My brother is in his fifth year, my sister is in her fourth and I'm in my first.

All these people here have come here for a better future. They sold their land—like many people have already mentioned, they sold their land, they've left their homes, and they've built their own business. The ground beneath these people's feet are shaking right now. Everybody feels like the business that they've built, the things that they've done is being stolen from them.

Not only would this bill change my life, it would also change the life of my family—not just my immediate family and the people that live in my house, but my families that live in other homes. If this bill passes, everybody in my family loses one income, and that's very terrifying.

For many people, this—if not the only income, it's the most dependent income. Everybody feels like their investments are going to garbage. They don't complain. These people work hard every single day, and they don't complain. After, you know, coming home from long shifts, they come back home, they go to sleep, and they go out there and they do it again. And they don't have any complaints, you know.

If something needs to be repaired, these people pull the money out of their own pocket to repair those things. All the safety matters, as far as the cameras and the shields go, it feels like a complete loss because all that money was taken out of their pocket to just bigger their investment and just make their company a little bit safer.

If we're saying that—what is there to, like, to be done to make things safer? If you asked anybody here to add—you know, like, everything's already safe enough with the strobe lights and the glass and the cameras and everything like that, so if these—if everybody here was told to add another thing into their taxi to make it safer, without a question, everybody here would do it, no questions asked. These people don't care about the money; these people care about their lives, their family and their, like, their income and their future. They're afraid.

These are courageous people. Day after day, they go out and they take the abuse that many people have talked about, and people have shared their stories. I've never been through it before, but when my dad would drive the taxi, I would also be afraid. I know my mom would be afraid and my siblings would be afraid. So let's not take a step back. Let's take steps forward.

If we're worried about safety, if everybody is saying that safety is No. 1, let's add more things to make it safer, because these people don't have a problem with doing that. Why are we taking away the cameras, and why are we taking away the strobe lights and the safety glass? What good is that going to do for us?

I think all of us can agree that almost everybody here that is driving their taxi is an immigrant. These people have come here today—obviously, these people are struggling to speak English, but they're here and they're trying to, like, make their point across this table that they don't have a problem with paying more, they don't have a problem with—they just want to keep their businesses. They don't want to lose their positions—that's it. And if there's nothing wrong, you know, they're not complaining about anything, then what's the need for change, right? That's my question: what's the need for change if all these people are okay with the way that everything is?

Like, earlier, the missus said that the dispatch service is 24 hours. That's very important for safety for the passenger and the driver. Compensation—yes, for sure. If this bill was to be passed, a 110 per cent, these people deserve compensation because these people have put their money—you know, it's an investment. They've put their lives in it. They depend on it. They deserve compensation.

And, if we're saying that the taxi business is gone, what jobs are these people going to have? People are already struggling to find full-time jobs that pay well to support their families. What are these people going to do, especially because they can't speak English that well? That's one of the main reasons why they're afraid, because they don't know what's going to happen after this.

And we don't want amendments; we don't. We just want to keep things at the way they are.

And do I think racism plays a role? I do. I do think it plays a role, for sure. I don't want to get too much into it because I don't want to get—I don't want

to offend anybody, but I'm just here because I'm saying that racism does play a role in it. And also how there was a little bit of a poll going on, should Uber come into the city or not: a lot—there are stereotypes about my people. There are, and we can't lie, and we can't sit here and say that there's not. And, of course, there's stereotypes about all people, but I feel like my people are being targeted right now. And I do feel like if another race majority was to drive taxis and own taxis, that would make a difference, that this probably wouldn't be happening right now.

Mr. Chairperson: Thanks. Are you—thanks, Ms. Dhillon, for your presentation, and I just wanted to make sure that you were concluded, okay. Thank you very much, and we'll start with the questions.

* (20:30)

Mr. Allum: Thank you for coming in tonight. That was really a brilliant presentation. And one of the things that I think—this is my first time at this particular committee—and one of the things that I'm learning tonight is how strong the community is and how family-oriented the community is and how important the small business is to the well-being of the family. So I wanted to, first of all, just thank you for educating, I think, all of us around the table tonight.

Now my friends across the way here, the guys actually responsible for this bill, will say that safety—if this bill passes, it'll go to the City and they may or may not make the same rules. But, oddly, if they really cared about safety, they would have built those rules into this law. Instead, they decided not to do that.

Why do you think that would be?

Ms. Manjeet Dhillon: I'm not completely sure why they have decided to take away the safety that took so long to become the safety to protect these drivers in their everyday lives. But all I have to say to that is you're taking a million steps back if you're taking all that safety away, because then there's no reassurance, you know that, like, every day it's a risk. Every single day it's a risk. Every single day you're going out to drive, you're sitting in that driver's seat, it's a risk. Your family is afraid, and the Mrs. said that also she stays up late nights waiting for her husband. She doesn't know when he's going to come home. You know, if there was nothing in the car to protect him, that would be horrible, because only bad thoughts would run through her head. If she knew that he at

least had the strobe lights, he at least had the two-way communication, it would be so much better.

So what's the point of taking that away? I really don't see the point of taking that away.

Mr. Lindsey: Mohinder had his hand up first.

Mr. Mohinder Saran: Thanks for coming. And I think I feel that way—perhaps you may confirm it. I think the mayor wants Uber, and this government want to give the mayor that chance. So don't you think there's collusion between two governments to put the taxi industry under bus?

Ms. Manjeet Dhillon: I definitely do think. I think that there should be a conclusion to all of this where both sides win, because right now only one side is losing, and that's completely unfair. I know we're talking about having fair safety and having a fair life, but this is really completely unfair, because there's no proper conclusion; there's nothing that everybody agrees on. And that's wrong, because these people have been here for so long. They've built their lives here and now it's just being taken away from them, and I don't think that's right at all.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you for coming. And, yes, I agree, a very powerful presentation. You'll do well going forward.

I just want to talk a little bit about—I guess we fail to understand, on this side, if the people introducing the bill think that the City of Winnipeg is going to introduce provisions that are exactly the same as what are presently there. Then I struggle to know why anybody would want to change who's issuing that. So your thoughts on that perhaps.

Ms. Manjeet Dhillon: Personally, I totally agree with you. Uber might be okay in some places in the world, bigger cities, but this is a very small city and this is a place that a lot of people immigrate to. It's somewhere that people come to make a home and, like, a taxi is, like, you know, it's a very—like somebody said earlier, they came here, they were looking for a job for six months and a taxi was what they chose to do. And that helped them out. Like, I really think that in Winnipeg, Uber would not be sufficient. In other cities, in other provinces maybe, but in Winnipeg Uber is not right for Winnipeg at all.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you for that.

I know, just from following along in the news, Quebec, for example, introduced some measures in an attempt to make Uber safer, that drivers needed a certain amount of training and Uber said they weren't

going to do that; they were going to pull out. So I really, along with you, struggle to see how the introduction of this bill will make it safer for anybody when really it doesn't have anything in there that talks about the City of Winnipeg is going to be in charge of developing the rules, but the rules have to be at least equal to what's there now. And, as you have suggested, perhaps there are ways to make it safer. I come out of a world, as a safety person, that you can always do things—

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Lindsey, if you could conclude your question.

Mr. Lindsey: —better, so would you comment on that?

Ms. Manjeet Dhillon: I think it's very odd that they wanted to make it safer, but then they pulled out. That really doesn't make any sense to me, but my final conclusion to this is if nothing's wrong there's no need to make a change to it and that's my final conclusion. There's nothing wrong here; everything is going fine. The city is performing well. Why change something if there's no need to change it? Everybody here is happy with the jobs and occupations that they have, so why are we trying to change that? There's no complaints.

Mr. Chairperson: Great. Thank you very much, Ms. Dhillon, for your presentation.

Okay, we're going to go on to No. 7 on the list and Nachhater Sangha.

Mr. Sangha, do you have any presentation materials? Okay. Mr. Sangha, is there—are you—is there a translator?

Floor Comment: Yes. I am a little bit nervous.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay. If a translator, yes; if you're nervous, we prefer you to do the presentation, unless you want to do the presentation for the individual. *[interjection]*

Okay, we were just informed that we can't have two people up here because Hansard is actually recording the person who's doing the presentation, so we have to have the one person doing the presentation, unless it was—it was registered as two people. Okay? So I would—Mr. Lindsey.

Mr. Lindsey: I'm not sure that he hasn't asked for a translator and we've already agreed to that.

Are you asking the other gentleman to be your translator?

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, go ahead, Mr. Sangha.

Floor Comment: Okay, I'm going to speak on behalf of Mr. Nachhater Sangha.

Mr. Chairperson: Can you present your name?

Mr. Harjinder Singh Dhillon, on behalf of Mr. Nachhater Sangha (Private Citizens): My name is Harjinder Singh Dhillon.

Good evening, everyone. So I just want to say really important thing before I start. All of you guys are very responsible because people chose you and I can see since last three days—we really respect in our culture for womans and we really love the kids, and everyone do that, I think, is supposed to do that, and it's very, very hard for someone to bring his wife, his kids, to came out to ask sympathy or mercy from anyone. Any culture, I think, we don't like that. So, when the womans and kids out asking rights for their parents, I think we need to know, we should understand, things are very serious.

So I'm going to start my presentation. Mr. Nachhater Sangha, he came in Canada 1989 with two old parents, mom, dad, and five sisters. In our cultures—and he's the youngest one. All sisters are older. In our cultures, men are responsible for family, and he was the one who was responsible for the whole family. Parents were old, they help him little bit when he came here, and five sisters. They all was unmarried and they want to go to school, and Mr. Nachhater Sangha was the only one to help the whole family.

* (20:40)

He start from cleaning, and I know him since last 25 years. He works so hard, days, nights, anytime. Even I work with him when I came here in 1994. We used to start in a Superstore, 9 o'clock at night. Next morning, came out 9 o'clock. On a weekend, used to be Superstore was closed 6 o'clock in the evening Sunday. And we were there 6 o'clock. Next morning, 9 o'clock, we came out. So seven days.

So, just in 2014, he bought a cab for around \$500,000. He put his whole savings in a cab, and, so far, he's working hard and he had a hope. Like, he's so hard worker. You can see he's a very simple man, but, when you going to see he's working, he's really honest and so hard worker. So since this bill came out, Bill 30, this is the main reason he can't even speak today. He came to me and requested me, speak behalf of him, because he's so nervous. Since last

month, he is—I met him a few times; he's very upset. So all speakers, they spoken before about the safety, about the compensation, and we are totally agree with them, especially he's agreed with them, same way—me, I'm in the same business, because this bill is not good for our industry.

So our concern—first of safety. I can't stress enough the hazards our industry faces on a daily basis: racism, accidents, robberies and assaults. Taxi driving is one of the most unsafe occupations in North America. Here in Winnipeg, driving taxi is a lot safer because of safety shields plus cameras, which makes one of the safest taxi industries. Our vision: safety, fairness, community. Why are we concerned?

There's a lot more in Bill 30 than just transferring jurisdiction for taxis from the Province or Manitoba to the City. It wipes out the existing licence structure. There's nothing to ensure the highest level of safety. It takes away our legal rights. It threatens to disrupt the taxi service that is there for all Winnipeggers. We oppose the Bill 30. There has been no consultation with industry. We ask you to withdraw the bill so that we can have input. You should take the time to get it right.

Still, if you proceed with the bill, there needs to be major amendments. What everyone should know: taxis are owned by individual small-business people. Our dispatch company is actually a company of local independent shareholders and operators. We are your neighbours, your family, your friends.

Safety must be key. Taxi driving is one of the most dangerous occupations in Canada. In Winnipeg, we now have one of the safest industries because of shields, cameras and training. We don't want to go back to the days when the taxi drivers were murdered in the city on a regular basis. This is what will happen if you water down the safety protection for drivers. Passenger safety at the risk.

We have screening of drivers for criminal records, child abuse and other issues. There's an English language proficiency test and interview. Training—we have strict zero tolerance in the industry for people accused for anything. This is very different from Uber, which has limited screening, training and, in many jurisdictions, has ignored passenger-safety-related issues.

We have a lot of frustrations about what is happening with the taxi regulations in the province. The Province is bringing in Bill 30, which wipes out

the existing licence structure and paves the way for the multinational corporation that has broken laws and regulations around the world and set a new low standard in the taxi industry. The provincial government did not have the courtesy to consult the taxi industry before bringing in the bill.

People in the taxi industry have invested hundreds of thousand dollars in their licence, their vehicle and much more. They follow the rules; they are taxpayers. Our community—but what you are doing is wiping our licence and wiping out our livelihood. This value is our taxis—the value of our taxis has dropped, and it's now virtually impossible to sell a licence. You are taking away our property rights and our legal rights with Bill 30. We cannot go to court to challenge Bill 30, seek compensation for our losses.

Our industry services every part of the city. It serves the disabled. It's there for all Winnipeggers. We provide service throughout the city, 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. We are paid when it's plus 35, when it's -45°. We also serve very—serve every community in the broader community in Winnipeg.

Uber does not do this when it sets up operation. Insurance is an issue. We pay more than \$10,000 a year insurance. We cannot allow another vehicle—you cannot allow another vehicle-for-hire operation—

Mr. Chairperson: Just want to remind you that you have one minute left.

Mr. Dhillon: Okay, so in one minute, I just want to tell you the concern. We want safety, fairness, community for our industry, for Winnipeggers. So, about this simple man: he have three sons in the University of Manitoba, and one of them, the youngest one, he's playing for soccer Canada teams. So this is our main concern, how he can afford three sons in the university without having a business.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay. Well, thank you very much for your presentation. I would like to have your name written down so that we can identify you when it comes to Hansard.

Okay, you've got some questions.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you for your presentation, and I know it's very nerve-racking, particularly if English isn't your first language, to be able to make a presentation and ask questions.

So, really, some of the things you're concerned about is that by the introduction of this ride-sharing bill, which allows unregulated companies to start

operating vehicle for hire in this city, that, really, it's going to destroy the income and the future of this gentleman's ability to earn a living. Is that a fair statement? *[interjection]*

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Dhillon.

Mr. Dhillon: Sorry—yes, this is going to be the big impact on his life, really big.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you for that.

One of the things that—talked about in the presentation was safety. The other thing is that you'd talked about was that if this government is so insistent that they're going to bring this in, that, really, there has to be some kind of compensation involved to make up for not just the loss of income that he's likely to lose driving a cab, but also, more importantly, or as importantly, is the loss of income that the value of that licence is going to plummet, which is his pension, if you will.

* (20:50)

Mr. Dhillon: Yes. So, this is the main reason, actually, we are fighting for it. We are no worried about any competition. So the situation is going totally awkward. Somebody's running with two legs, and somebody's running with one tied leg. This is going to be the situation with the taxi industry, or if this bill is passed, that goes to the City, and the City is very welcoming, openly. Mr. Mayor, he's saying he's welcoming Uber.

So this is going to be the situation, and industry's going to be the—demolished. It's very, very clear.

Mr. Allum: Thank you so much for making a presentation and convey that, as well, to the gentleman beside you.

One of the things that has become pretty clear is that there was very little, if any, consultation with the industry or the small businesses involved. Were you consulted at any point on any of the things that are in this bill?

Mr. Dhillon: I think this is the best answer I can give you, better than another one. Because I am in the board of—in Duffy's Taxi, and we had a—so many meetings. We had a—one of my brothers, he told you already we had two, three meetings with the Premier (Mr. Pallister). We had three, four meetings with the ruling party ministers. And every time, there was a sugar-coat candy. I can say that. Very openly I can say that. Every time they said that we are working with you, we are doing this, we are doing that; you

don't have to be upset. We will—it's going to be fair, level playing field. This is a promise by Mr. Premier. And we trusted.

And then, all of a sudden, this Bill 30 came out.

Mr. Maloway: I want to thank you very much for your presentation.

Mr. Brar—Chamkaur Brar, I believe, our first presenter of the evening, talked about a Conservative fundraiser and where the Premier was approached and the Premier told him that it was going to be, like, a level playing field here. And, you know, the—now you mention that there were two or three meetings? So we're not talking about the same Conservative fundraiser here.

Could you explain when each of these three meetings happened, and, roughly, you know, who was there and what promises were made by the Premier?

Mr. Dhillon: Okay. The same thing, whatever he told. I was actually with him the day when there was—before election was—the campaign was going on and Mr. Premier—he was not at that time, he was not premier. And he promised—very openly promised, he said you guys don't have to be worried. If anything is coming in Winnipeg, it's going to be level playing field. This is my promise.

And after that, personally, I met and there, the—same friend of mine at a PC gala, and he gave us the same answer. Same answer. And I don't know what happened after that.

Mr. Chairperson: Well, thank you, Mr. Dhillon and Mr. Sangha, for your—the presentation. The five minutes is up for the questions, so thank you for your presentation and have a good night.

Okay, next person on the list is No. 8, Mohammed Paracha. If I can get Mr. Paracha to come up? Mr. Paracha is not here, so we'll put him on the bottom of the list. So we'll go on to No. 9 presenter, Tebedu Telahun. Mr. Telahun is a private citizen.

Mr. Telahun, do you have any materials that you want to hand out? Okay, you can—Mr. Telahun, you can proceed with your presentation.

Mr. Tebebu Telahun (Private Citizen): My name is Tebebu Telahun. I think there is a spelling error, can correct, as T-e-b-e-b-u.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, but the last name's spelled right?

Mr. Telahun: Yes, exactly. Okay.

Mr. Chairperson: You can continue, Mr. Telahun.

Mr. Telahun: Okay. I just want to read something here.

Thank you for the opportunity that you, you know, provide any of time to and very democratic way to—

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Telahun, can you speak into the mic so we can hear you better? Yes, lift it up too. That's better.

Mr. Telahun: Okay, where I come from, I've never seen—where I brought up, I've never seen like this democratic way to listen to people. It was when I—born and raised in a communist country, and then there wasn't like this, and I appreciate the fair that you listen us and I am positive this all voice has impact and will bring something—solution, because Bill 30 is opening for our frustration and that's why we—a lot of my—like, or my work co-worker, they were mentioned their frustration and because of the opening, big door for destroying the existing industry.

There is something that I want to read here. I cannot believe what happening without any consultation. You are taking away our industry. You are taking away our future. I want to support some of the things our company said about what is happening.

First, our company is actually a company of local independent shareholders and operators. We are your neighbours, your family, your friends.

Second, we provide service throughout the city 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. We operate when it's plus 35° and when it's -35°. We don't just serve the downtown business district but we also serve every community in the broader community of the Winnipeg.

Third, we have a lot of frustration about what is happening with taxi regulations in this province. The Province is bringing in Bill 30 that wipes out the existing licence structure and paves the way of multinational corporation that has broken laws and regulations around the world and set a new low standard in the taxi, a standard that has put back taxi service decayed around the world.

What is very frustrating is the provincial government did not have the courtesy to consult the taxi industry before bringing in this bill. For the people in the taxi industry have invested hundreds of

thousands of dollars in their licences, their vehicles and much more. They follow the rules, they are taxpayers in our community, but what you are doing is the three things to wipe out their licence and wipe out their livelihood. That is not good. Mr. Tarlochan Gill pointed out of that the value of our taxi has dropped, and it is now virtually impossible to sell a licence.

Fifth, this is happening through one of the worst violations of property rights and legal rights we have seen this province in many years. The Province is taking away our legal rights with Bill 30, taking away our property rights. Now, at the city, you haven't even given us the courtesy of being involved in that development of taxi regulations.

Six—first of all, safety must be key. Taxi driver is one of the most dangerous occupations in Canada. In Winnipeg, we now have one of the safest in industry because of shields, cameras and training. We cannot and we must not go back to the days when taxi drivers were murdered in the city in a regular basis. This is what we happen and you watered down the safety protection for drivers.

Seventh, insurance is an issue. We pay more than \$10,000 a year for insurance. You cannot allow another vehicle-for-hire operation to come in and not have the same insurance requirement. This is unfair.

* (21:00)

And yet we have regulated prices. It doesn't matter if it's the middle of summer or New Year's Eve. When you get in a Winnipeg taxi, you know the rates you will be charged is standard.

Uber uses model of the surcharges—prices that can result in dramatically higher prices during certain periods.

I would add that there are 1,600 jobs in the industry that are mostly full time. We work many hours. We follow the rules. Now, you are charging at—the rules for Uber. You are wiping out the value of our licence and taking away our legal rights. You are putting safety at risk. This is a bad deal. Like our company has said, like the new coalition has said: this is about safety, fairness and community. Please listen to us. Stop this bill. Protect our safety. Keep our legal rights.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thanks, Mr. Telahun.

Now, questions from Mr. Lindsey.

Mr. Lindsey: First off, let me thank you for coming. Same comment I've made to several of the presenters: it's a little nerve-racking the first time you come to a committee like this to make your views known, but it is democracy in action, and I appreciate that you recognize that. And part of the whole democratic action is to hear citizens like yourself and have the government, the people that are planning to impose these rules, really listen to what you've got to say.

We've heard other people say that there hasn't been any consultation that they're aware of. Are you aware of any consultation, that the government has come and talked to taxi drivers themselves about some of these changes?

Mr. Telahun: Personally, I haven't heard before, and nobody approaching me and discussing with me about what's going on. Then, for myself, I don't know. Then, I don't know.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you for that.

Can you think of any real reason why the Province would think getting rid of regulations that are in place now that are working and turning it over to the City to come up with something—can you think of any logical reason for that other to just make a company like Uber, and there's other ones as well, to try and let them get a foothold in the market? Can you think of any other reason for the Province wanting to do that?

Mr. Telahun: I believe for the better service, for public; then I believe they're doing for—they collect the compliments, and they collect the survey and they're—they try to do a better service on the City. But my opinion is: we can handle, and then we can more expand and work hard and in a better way as well. We have tools. We have everything in our hands. And then we have a very great, hard-working people. And then, if someone approach us and what we can do to serve the community or the public in a better way, a hundred per cent I'm sure we can do a better job.

Mr. Lindsey: Well, thank you for that. That really is a good attitude, I think, is—as opposed to scrapping what's in place now, what you're suggesting is maybe there is some way to make what's there better, that you're not opposed to improving things that would make it safer for taxi drivers, you're not opposed to introducing things that would make it safer for passengers, you're not opposed to things that would

make it more efficient for yourselves in the industry. But, really, this bill doesn't do any of that, does it?

Mr. Telahun: I think so.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you for that.

Do you think it's fair that this bill, very specifically, denies taxi owners any compensation when it's well recognized by pretty much every presenter that's been here that the introduction of this bill will drastically impact the value of their business? Do you think it's fair that the government has decided no compensation?

Mr. Telahun: I believe it's not fair, because it's a property. Once it's a property and that property's built up—it's not overnight—it's a paid price and years and years. And I would like to put into consideration the efforts that we made and a lot of things that we need to examine, and to consider. And I believe it's really—it's fair when each and every shareholder, when you compensate the value.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Telahun.

The five minutes for questioning is expired, so I want to thank you for your presentation tonight.

Mr. Maloway: I have one last student, who has to go to school tomorrow morning, can't be here, and it's No. 161. So would it be okay to hear him, then he can go and get ready for school in the morning?

Mr. Chairperson: Is there agreement from—of the committee to make this person go ahead? Okay, so we'll continue with No. 161? [*interjection*] Inderpal Grewal.

Mr. Grewal, do you have any material that you want to hand out?

Mr. Inderpal Grewal (Private Citizen): No.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, Mr. Grewal, you can continue with your presentation.

Mr. Grewal: Good evening, everyone. Thank you for—

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Grewal, can you put the mic closer to your—speaking up—or speak louder too, please? Yes, that's probably—

Mr. Grewal: Good evening, everyone. Thank you for letting me speak.

Hi. My name is Inderpal Grewal. My dad has been a taxi driver for 22 years. His job is everything to us. He has been able to feed our family and give my sister and I everything we need, either it be for

school, birthdays or celebrations. His job pays for all of the financial needs and necessities.

My mom and dad both work to pay for six members in this family. On top of that, my sister will be going to university next year, where my dad will need to pay for her tuition. Two years later, I will be going to university, where my dad will have two tuitions in his hand to pay for.

When my dad came here, to Manitoba, he got a job as a taxi driver, and because of this, he was able to bring my grandparents and my mom. He brought them here since he knew he would be treated equally as everyone else, no matter your skin colour or your background.

I may not know much about this bill, but what I do know is that if the Bill 30 passes, there will be a great loss in jobs, especially my dad's and other taxi drivers.

My dad works six days a week and sometimes even seven, with each day him working 12 hours. He works so hard and he tries to do his best so he can support us. But all of the hard work and dedication will go nowhere if Bill 30 passes.

This bill does not just have an effect on my dad's life and his family's; it changes our life. My mom will have all the financial payments thrown at her, and there won't be anyone to help her.

If the bill does pass, it needs to be a fair playing field between taxis and Ubers. Taxi drivers shouldn't be the only ones going through all these procedures, because if it—if they are, there is no equality in this province. There should be fairness in the playing field: insurance, safety procedures and the classes that need to be taken in order to become a driver.

Uber should also have to go through all these procedures that taxi drivers went through to ensure safety for the driver and the passenger.

* (21:10)

My dad's health is not the best right now. And, if the bill gets accepted, the effects of it for taxi drivers might give my dad more stress, which will be harmful to his body and mind. He's going to have stress over how he will pay the house bills and how will he pay for his kids' educations.

This is the only job he can do, because when he came here, he started driving right away since he had to start making money to buy a house. He also needed to have a job for when his parents and my

mom would arrive in Canada. He had no financial support when he came here, so he could only drive a taxi and he wasn't able to go to school to continue his studies.

My dad cannot do any other profession, because he does not have much education or a degree in anything. This job is all he has, and our family is dependent on it. And we will not let anything bad happen to his job.

I request to the PC government that they do not pass this bill, because it will affect not only my family but thousands of other families.

Many parents will lose their jobs if this bill is passed.

I do not wish to see my family and many other families go into financial debt. Think carefully about the families that will go into trouble if the bill is passed. And I hope that it will not be passed.

Thank you for listening.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Grewal.

We'll start with Mr. Lindsey with a question.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you very much for coming and making that presentation. It's always interesting to hear young people come out and participate in the democratic process.

And you've talked about what impact passing this bill will have on your family. Do you think that the best thing that could possibly come out of this is for the government to stand up right now and say, we're going to withdraw that bill?

Mr. Grewal: Yes, I do think it's—we should do that because, like, this is our family's main source of money. Like, my mom—if this does pass, my mom will just have all the financial thrown to her and she won't be able to handle it. So I believe we shouldn't pass this bill.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you for that.

I—earlier tonight—I don't know if you were here—we talked about some possible amendments to try and make it better, but those amendments may very well come up short, particularly if there's no guarantee that you're going to let the City of Winnipeg be the regulator as opposed to the Province. There's no guarantee that they're going to put any of that protection in if the City's the regulator. Is that correct?

Mr. Grewal: Yes.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you.

So, really, your parents' ability to provide for you hinges on this bill and, really, it hinges on this bill getting pulled off the table and the government really apologizing for suggesting that this is the way to go. So I guess I'd just like to have you reiterate the importance to you and your family of stopping this, if you would, please.

Mr. Grewal: Like, we do want this to stop, because it's giving stress to my mom, my dad and myself. Like, it's hard for me to do school work, because that's what I think about. I don't want my dad to be in this kind of stress, because he's already in stress because of his health. I just want—I just don't want the bill to be passed.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you for that.

And I'm going to turn the floor to over Ms. Marcelino, and let her ask you a question.

Ms. Marcelino: Thank you, young gentleman, for being here tonight.

It's quite late, but you persisted and patiently waited for your turn and, for that, we commend you and thank you.

And I, too, am a parent. I'm an immigrant like your dad, and, just like your dad, we want the best for our children. We came here. We left a home—our home country because we believe our children, like you, will have a good future here. And you work—and we're not afraid of hard work. I'm not afraid of hard work, just like your dad.

And your dad raised you very well. You're a very intelligent, caring young man. And you're a pride and joy of your family. So your care, your concern for your dad and for your family shows with—in your language. And with children like you, you're the treasure of your family.

But we do know that this bill would really bring stress to your dad, and to many, many families who will be affected. Do you think—what do you think could—in your young mind, what do you think could be—what should be done to have this present government change their course and do away with this bill? Do you have any idea what could be done?

Mr. Grewal: Well, like, I believe, like, everyone here spoke. Like, that shows everyone's dedication here. And no one wants to—wants the bill passed. And even people who can't speak English, they still

come here because they want to send a message. So the government should see the—how important this job is to us, and we don't want it to go.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Grewal, our five minutes for a question is up, and I want to thank you very much for your presentation. And thanks for coming out tonight.

So we'll continue with the list. Baljeet Kumar Sharma is the next person up. No. 10.

And, Mr. Sharma, do you have any materials you want to hand out to the committee?

Mr. Baljeet Kumar Sharma (Private Citizen): Yes, I do.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, we'll get them handed out.

Mr. Sharma, we'll just wait until the—we get these reports sent around.

Okay, Mr. Sharma, go ahead with your presentation.

Mr. Baljeet Kumar Sharma: Good evening, my name is Baljeet Kumar Sharma, and I am working with the Duffy's taxi as a shareholder. And I would like to first of all thank the members of Legislative Assembly and audience and members of the media outlets, and the scribes if there are any, and thank you for allowing us to express our thoughts and concerns relating to the controversial Bill 30.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson in the Chair

If at all—this bill is passed, this bill will be remembered as a black Bill 30 in the history of cab industry. That's what I feel. This bill has the potential to jeopardize the lives of hundreds of Winnipeggers, if not thousands. The unprecedented haste and missionary zeal on the part of our politicians to push this bill through is a matter of grave concern among us. All of us present are adversely affected by this decision. There are politicians who cannot wait any more to jump on this ride-sharing bandwagon. They are working overtime to push this Bill 30 through by all means.

Let us have a glimpse of the events—that sequence of events that unfolded in quick succession. Namely, introduction of Bill 30, dissolution of cab board—that was considered a major hurdle in the way of so-called ride-sharing companies in Winnipeg, approval for ride-sharing companies to have a free run in this city. At once, for mission of committee and various working groups by City Hall, by framing bylaws that, even—not before this bill is passed, the

City Hall is bubbling with overenthusiasm to lap up the ride-sharing companies.

* (21:20)

It is a well-known fact that the so-called ride-sharing companies are well known for their back-door manoeuvres to push their agenda and override and manipulate anything that comes in their way, to destroy the existing cab industry. It is amusing to witness how quick so-called ride-share companies have become media darlings overnight.

It is sad to know how our politicians are succumbing to pressure of this billion-dollar giant and blatantly flouting all laws and going out of the way to favour these ride-sharing companies. Nobody can deny the fact that it takes courage, conviction and spine to challenge this influence of power of this billion-dollar giant.

We all know no human institution is infallible and, hence, politicians are no exception. Innovation has become a buzzword nowadays. This word innovation is being uttered time and again to justify the ride-sharing companies. I'm amused the way the word has acquired different connotations.

Another catchphrase that is likely to make rounds in the City Hall is level playing field. It will be interesting to watch, in the coming days, how this phrase is going to be misinterpreted to justify the favours which are likely to be extended to these companies.

Our politicians are hiding behind the word, phrase-catchphrase innovation. That is being used time and again to push this bill through by-at any cost. One always wonders: What is the motivation and driving force behind this move? Our politicians are supposed to represent us in the City Hall and the Legislative Assembly, but they have-appears to become a mouthpiece or a spokesperson of the ride-sharing companies.

It doesn't require rocket science to figure out what's going on. Nobody's so naive to figure out you cannot defend the indefensible. The more you hide, the more obvious it becomes. Lately, the intensity and the frequency with which our distinguished mayor is uttering the word innovation is known to us all, and the message is loud and clear behind the words innovation is too 'vious.'

We appreciate the individual loyalty and compassions which are best known to them to advance their cause and/or relation close to their

heart. But, at the same time, we'd like to reiterate that it should never have happened at the cost of the existing cab industry. We cannot afford to look the other way. We cannot afford to look the other way when our livelihood is at stake.

This innovation can be best described as a technological unemployment. In a lighter vein, and I quote, in a lighter vein, I would like to say: That day is not very far, mark my words, when innovation will invent an application that will replace all of our MLAs, all of our city councillors, and then there will be no need to having the battalion of these people here. And I cannot wait to see that happening.

I can imagine their reaction when they will have nothing to do the next day, as is going to happen to us if this pass-bill passed-bill is passed.

We are to keep in mind the ground realities of the cab industry, and one interesting thing I want to mention here before I conclude, I would like to thank all standing committee members and giving us an opportunity to offer my suggestions or concerns, whatever, this day-I would like to quote this quotation: I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend the-defend to the death your right to say it, a famous quotation, unquote.

I live in St. Vital. I was expecting that at least my MLA would represent me here, will stand beside me in the hour of this crisis and speak in favour of me. But it is a paradox that my MLA-she's not right here now-she was there-I witnessed that-closed-she had chosen to speak for a company that is based in USA, California.

I would thank all the MLAs who do not belong to my riding, but still standing beside me. Kudos to them.

Rest assured, the way events are unfolding, like controversial bill black 30, job loss in health-care sector, and business leaving the province, and sad commentary on the functioning of this government-this all will translate into negative words in the coming elections. Voters are not coming from the California or USA; they're-these Winnipeggers. They will stand beside you.

Please listen to us. This is our living, and please don't compromise on the safety; don't compromise on the conditions which are right now in the industry. If you want to bring the Uber, sure, do it. But the level playing field, in letter and spirit, if it's safety-and another thing: that you have taken our

legal right to go to the courts. Please remove that clause, if you are really determined to do that.

And what about the compensation component? That has to be addressed. This billion-dollar giant, they have a lot of money. They can pay us if they want, if there's a will—and, if there's a will on the part of my politicians who are representing me here. And I urge upon them, please do something. We live here. That's our living. Every day we work. We like it, we love it. We love Winnipeggers.

And may God give you wisdom to do the right decision. Thank you very much.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Thank you very much, Mr. Sharma.

Is there any questions?

Mr. Allum: Thank you—coming—tonight. It's a very passionate presentation—

Floor Comment: It goes to my heart.

Mr. Allum: I can tell that it comes from your heart, and I think all of us around the table will recognize that. And you were right, I think, to throw a blanket over all politicians. In some ways, there are some of us, though, on this side of the table who oppose this bill, and there are some on that side of the table who support this bill.

For those of us who oppose it, we would prefer that the government withdraw it.

Do you think, though, that we can—there is possible amendments to this bill that would improve it, or is it your opinion that the bill should be withdrawn completely?

Mr. Baljeet Kumar Sharma: Well, if—I think why you need this bill? Everything is going hunky-dory. Why you need to fix which is not broke to anyone? Who brought this idea? What is—you—look [*inaudible*] the wheels. Look at that. Why there was a need to introduce that? So many people are sitting here, they are working day and night. This time, they should be at home. There's marathon, they wait. These discussions are going on. Our kids are our—here, here. People's wives are here. And I feel sorry for those people who have to come to defend the livelihood of their parents. Things that—going to that extent. The sorry state of affairs. And we work in the city day and night. Working nights. My fellow driver there, working the nights. In this city. and, you all

know, today, after work, 22nd homicide. Can you imagine?

What—that's what need to be fixed. Don't go after people who work—hard-working. That's my humble request. Please don't take us wrong. We are here to level as good citizens helping each other, taxpayers. And we need our politician to help us. If tomorrow, comes at my door, and so please vote for me—I will remember that. These are not very far. Nobody's coming from California.

Ms. Marcelino: Thank you for being here, even at this late night, to give us your presentation there. Not only it comes from the heart, but it is so informative for all of us, especially for the other side of the House, our colleagues from across the—this table, who are for this bill.

I have on three occasions, and on two different countries, took Uber exactly to find out what's in it, because I knew this bill is coming. That was in July and in September. And I noticed that their ordinary cars—I'm used to taxi that, has, you know, those shields and the camera—they do have, for communication, just a smartphone, the Uber, because their app is there. No camera, no shields, no strobe light. So I asked, if something happens in this trip, am I covered? Or is your insurance covering me? And the driver cannot answer me, that—can't—don't have an answer. Didn't tell an answer.

My question is, do you think when Uber comes, would those safety standards that we now have in the taxi industry, because it's a regulated industry—do you think those Uber drivers who are independent, who most likely will do it as part-time, and will use their vehicles regardless of the type of vehicles—van or sedan or whatever—do you think those drivers will have the safety gadgets that our taxi—your taxi has?

* (21:30)

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Mr. Sharma, you may go ahead and answer, please.

Mr. Baljeet Kumar Sharma: It's a good question and well phrased. And I think they have to answer it, and they don't have to be doing that. In the entire discussion, this question has been asked so many times. Safety is the prime concern. That needs to be there, if at all that they are determined to do that. And they have to address that: that they make sure—that everything isn't perfect.

I hope I answered the question, sir.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Thank you very much, Mr. Sharma.

Time for questions is over. I thank you for participating in this process. Thank you.

Next, we'd like to call presenter No. 11, Simarjeet Brar.

Mr. Brar, do you have any material for—to be shared or just the presentation?

Mr. Simarjeet Brar (Private Citizen): Just the—

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Feel free to begin.

Mr. Simarjeet Brar: First of all, I'd like to thank everyone here for giving me an opportunity to talk and give my opinion on Uber or any other ride-sharing companies.

So my father, every morning, he goes to work before I leave for school, and every time I come home—like, I'm a full-time student. Every time I come home, my father's not even home yet, because he works his 12-hour shifts. And, like, he's the main source of income for my family. And, like, if any other ride-sharing companies or Uber or Lyft or anyone comes, it's going to become, like—it's going to affect every single family not only my family. Like, there's more than 400 cabs in all of Winnipeg. That's about 800 families that are going to be affected by this—so, yes.

Taxis have, like, shields, cameras, radios, panic lights, and it's all safeties, and even with all those safeties, attacks happen. And, like, Uber drivers don't even have any of those types of safeties. With all these shields—like, in 2001, a cab driver was killed with a knife. Like, his throat was cut off. After that, shields were, like, brought on for safety, and since then, 79 per cent of the crime rate went down. And Uber drivers don't have any type of safety like that either. And—like, if anything happens to the customer that's riding, each cab driver has a liability of about \$5 million, I think, and Uber drivers, they don't have, like, no insurance at all.

And since Uber is being called a ride-sharing app, it's not really a ride-sharing app. It's more of a taxi, because they use meters as well. And, if they're being, like, called taxis, they should purchase the licences at market price like every other person here has bought.

You guys say Uber is being brought in for competition. If it's being brought in for competition,

why not bring competition into, like, dairy farming? Like, Dairy Farmers of Manitoba, they all get paid the same amount no matter if their farm is big or small. Why not bring competition into that? They all make fair pay—no competition. Back home, I could guarantee you there's many farmers here. If you could bring competition into that, they would have jobs, too, but it's just more competition. Why isn't there, like, a bill made for that?

Anyone?

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Thank you. Is—do you have more, or is that your presentation, sir?

Mr. Brar, go ahead.

Mr. Simarjeet Brar: Yes, so, another thing is, you say Uber is being brought in to more, like, develop the city. London is one of the most developed cities. Why would they ban Uber, then?

Yes, that's all.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Okay, thank you very much for your presentation, and we'll open the floor for questions.

Mr. Mohinder Saran: Yes, thanks for coming. And my question is that, like, we have our Agriculture Minister here. Maybe he understands about the dairy farmer situation. If every household is allowed to have one cow, some chickens, and what will happen with the dairy farmers who have a dairy farming business?

And similarly—but do you think they are doing to this community because we don't—when I said we, because I belong to this community as well—we don't have that many numbers, and that's what—if that's what democracy all about, don't you think democracy is failing?

Mr. Simarjeet Brar: Actually, yes, I do because, like, dairy farmers, like, they all get paid the same; there's no competition for them at all. It's—no matter if you have one cow or 1,000, everyone's getting paid the same amount, unlike here, it's like taxi drivers here, they pay everything, like, for insurance, shields and all sorts of safeties, while Uber drivers could just come in and become an Uber driver just like that.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Thank you very much.

Mr. Maloway: I want to thank you for your presentation. Now, I don't know much about the chickens and the cows, but I don't want to get into the weeds there because we got the Agriculture Minister here, and I could be in big trouble.

But I will say this, that this bill has a section No. 10, and it specifically says that there's no compensation payable. Now, when they were drafting the bill, the government were drafting, they'd know every piece of legislation. They have floor-crossing legislation that one of their former members, Mr. Fletcher, has challenged in court already and had thrown out, and it was judged to be constitutional back in 2006. So they knew that this bill was going to be challenged and they would maybe lose. So they put this clause in here that said no compensation is payable.

Now they did all of this being supposedly a pro small-business government when we know that the Quebec dairy farmers—and we get back to these cows now—the Quebec dairy farmers are being taken care of under the CETA agreement. The Canada-European free trade agreement just signed in the last six months is providing for 10 years of compensation for losses that the Quebec dairy farmers are going to have because of dairy products coming in from Europe.

Mr. Chairperson in the Chair

So I ask you this: If it's okay for the Quebec dairy farmers to be compensated for losing their livelihood, why can't they do the same for cab drivers when, in Australia, every straight-state in Australia is providing compensation, Victoria being the best with \$100,000 per cab, \$50,000 for the second cab. Why the inconsistencies here, that's what I want to know.

Mr. Simarjeet Brar: I totally agree with you, sir. Like, why would you dissolve someone's property and, like, you dissolve someone's property and you pay them compensation, like, you wouldn't bring a bill against them, would you?

Mr. Allum: A previous presenter said, and I'm quoting, quote: Our politicians are hiding behind the catchphrase, innovation, that is being used time and again to push this bill through at any cost, unquote. Do you think that—I seem to think that the taxi industry has been quite innovative lately. Would you agree with that? And if so, how have they been innovative?

Mr. Simarjeet Brar: So everything's working, like, very efficiently, and, like, it's an old saying: if it's not broken, why try and fix it, you know.

Mr. Wharton: Thank you, Mr. Brar, for your presentation. You, obviously, like everybody tonight, has a very good story and a true story about how

you've gone through the industry with your family and grown up in the industry, and I mentioned earlier to one of your colleagues that same thing: we had—my wife and I owned a family business for 30 years, and our kids, our two daughters, grew up in the business, so I can certainly appreciate the passion that you bring tonight, and along with your colleagues.

I just wanted to make sure that the record was straight, though, regarding a comment that the member from Elmwood, from the NDP party, made earlier on CETA, and he's drawing—trying to draw a comparison on compensation when it comes to CETA. And I do, and I'll quote: These programs are designed to provide grants to dairy producers for targeted investments in farm technologies and equipment. They are not a compensation package and are not tied to a loss of income or declining asset values. That is the facts based on CETA. The issue—or the comments that the member from Elmwood are making are false. I just wanted to make sure that was on the record. And, again, thank you so much for your—for coming tonight, and I really appreciate your story. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Brar. Your—like, the five minutes for questions are up and I want to thank you very much for your presentation and thanks for coming out tonight.

Okay, we'll get on to the next member—presenter, and No. 12, Manoj Sharma.

Mr. Sharma, do you have any material that you want to hand out?

Mr. Manoj Sharma (Private Citizen): No, thanks, I—

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, Mr. Sharma, go ahead.

* (21:40)

Mr. Manoj Sharma: Good evening, gentlemen. I just want to tell that my name is Manoj Sharma and I just came—I just bought a taxi licence last year and I spent so much money and I borrowed from my family and I borrowed from the bank, and today this Bill 30, bringing the clause with no compensation, and they're bringing other ride-share companies that they're going to share the business. They are driving for the money, not for the free, so it's going to affect our lives, livelihood.

So I just want to tell, like, if this bill is—to me, it's a discrimination. So I don't think why this bill is going through, and there should be more changes

into the bill and there should be fully compensation to the company if you are bringing this kind of—because we are up-to-date technology and we are providing the cheapest rate in North America for our citizens.

And we provide services all year round and on the same rate. We don't like jack up our prices every day or in rush hour or like that things, and the insurance we are paying, they should pay the same, and either you should lower the insurance if you want to do something good to us. Like, we are already full-time workers, and there are already so many educated people are losing jobs, nurses, health cares, and where we going to look for the jobs, next jobs. We going to lose our jobs and we're going to lose our investments and this is not good to us.

So I think this bill is not right for us, and it should be given as a second thought. And one of the governments should take responsibility, either provincial government or city or the ride-share company that they're going to come and share the business without any big investment. And they can provide a lower rate than us then, of course, without any investment, and there's no safety. And we are invested so much money in the safety 'equiments' and they're going to be all wasted. And tomorrow we going to drive without any shields and—to compete with Uber, and if someone, us or our citizen passengers, they get hurt, and who's going to provide them compensation? They're going to sit at home and who's going to provide them money, because they're working and they're driving and they get injured because of no safety, then who's going to—responsible for that thing?

So I think if you are doing these kinds of things we will keep our safety 'equiments'? with us, but if anybody gets injured tomorrow because of lack of safety, then who should be responsible for that and to raise his family and pay his bills?

So there should be more time for the bill to think about it and make some changes to the people. That's all.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Sharma.

Mr. Allum: Thank you for your presentation and I—it's hard to imagine that you just invested in your licence a year ago, and here we are today having the rug pulled out from underneath you. Tell the committee what kind of anxiety or stress that must have caused you.

Mr. Manoj Sharma: I have to pay the bills, I have to pay the interest on those loans I took, and I have to pay back to my family. I borrowed money from my relatives. So the thing is that how I'm going to pay. Like, I'm 30 years old and 10 years I'm going to suffer.

It's not about me. It's like none of the drivers, not Uber drivers, not we, are going to make any money. We are going to make—we are already making less than minimum wage. The job I chose because I was working in the service industries, like one of the restaurants—I don't want to name it here. So I just work for them and I was getting eight, five, six hours. So I chose 12 hours to do, so at least I can make minimum wage and I can make little bit more money. But now I don't think so. I'm going to make even minimum wage, which is like totally discrimination to us. So—and none of the Uber drivers are going to make money.

I think you should do more research on those topics, like how much Uber drivers are making, they're making fair wage or not. I heard most of the time they're not even making fair wage. So, which is not good to us. They are not going to make nothing; we are not going to make nothing. So only the money is making the Uber companies in North America, because they're taking the commission. So that's not fair to anyone, I guess.

Mr. Allum: Thank you for that. Because you just invested so heavily in building your own business, I think, is a way of describing it, because that's what it seems like to me as I listen to you and all of the people who are here tonight—you've invested so heavily. At a minimum, don't you think that the bill should at least include some form of compensation so that you are not out of pocket for an investment you made in good faith to build your own business?

Mr. Manoj Sharma: Yes, they should be fully compensation. That's what I say, but it's up to the government what they will think. And it's also—if they are bringing Ubers, they should bring our rate to the Uber drivers. Because there's no guarantee that it's going to work, full time or part time.

Mr. Allum: I've asked this of other people and so I want your advice on this, and I think the committee needs to hear it.

Our view is that the best option for the government, at this point, having listened for several nights to people who are genuinely and deeply affected by this, that—our view is that the—probably

the best thing they could do is pull the bill and start over with proper consultations. *[interjection]*

Is that what you would like to see?

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Sharma, go ahead.

Mr. Manoj Sharma: Yes, I think they should start over and they should first figure out how is Uber working in some places and how the drivers are suffering. And it's not all—like Uber drivers, all the taxi drivers are suffering. They are not making any minimum wage.

And I have one more thing. Like, the government also support, like, big companies when they are going out of business. They give them millions of dollars—tax rebate. But they're screwing up the small businesses. They're paying taxes. They don't care, like, if small businesses go bankrupt and the guy is, like, tied to the banks. And this is not, like, you know, the good way to do, because you're supporting big companies and giving them tax rebate. We are paying already, like, we are already making so much less money than we should, and it's—like, we are already the—everything, taxes included in, like, GST, in—out of the fare. We are paying to the government. And I don't think so Uber is paying those kinds of costs. And we are paying our staff, like, to run this business.

So, like, we have to give the lay off to the staff, we have to, like, lose—loss of drivers going to suffer for sure, and we're going to lose our investment for sure. So I think there should be a big compensation for that. And then bring the Ubers for the level-ground competition, or lower our rates or costs of operating. So that should be the best way to compete, for a healthy competition, that's what I call.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Sharma, for your presentation. And the question of five minutes is up. So I just want to thank you for coming out tonight. Okay, thanks.

Mr. Isleifson: Mr. Chair, earlier this evening, we all received a document from a previous presenter that had some financial information in it which we found useful during the conversation.

However, the information provided also contains a lot of confidential information with his account numbers and such and so were—so I'm just wondering if I could request leave of the committee for all of us to return our documents to the clerks for proper disposal so that it's not out there.

Mr. Chairperson: Is everybody agreed to give up—back the information? *[Agreed]* Okay, thank you. So we'll just pass it on to the Clerk.

Okay, we'll continue with presenter No. 13, Carnajit Gill *[phonetic]*.

Mr. Gill, do you have material for—to hand out? Okay. Mr. Gill, you can proceed with your presentation.

Mr. Charnanjit Gill (Private Citizen): Good evening, gentlemen. I have just like a same story, like the same as all my friends.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Gill, could you just speak right into the mic? Or, just bring it up a little bit more? Yes.

Mr. Charnanjit Gill: Yes. My name is Charnanjit Gill. So I just came in Canada in 2009. So I just—when I just came here, I did lots of jobs, but some jobs, like, they shut down. Like, stores are shut down. Some are not giving good hours, some are not paying well. So after that, I start my job in the cab drive—as a cab driver. So I'm out most driver as four years, and after that slowly, slowly, I think I will decide to buy my own car so then maybe in future I will invest slowly, slowly and cover up and make my future at then.

* (21:50)

So last three years before I buy a car, a Duffy's car, so I almost paid \$220,000 for half-share. And I spend my whole savings. I bring money from back home, but still lots of loan. I have to pay, like, my mortgage, house mortgage, my car mortgage. So everything. But right now, the Bill 30, I think it spoils my whole dreams and even—because my wife, she's not working, she's a housewife. I have two small kids, so she takes care of my kids, but right now I don't know what's happening in the future. So—but Bill 30—and if you guys, like, allow to Uber in Winnipeg, so Uber and Lyft, I don't think it's fair with us because, first of all, when I just came to Canada, my uncle say, yes, welcome to a clean and safe city. I don't know where's the safety. If you guys came to—like allow to Uber in my city, I don't know where the safety is because we are paying lots of insurance. Almost more than 10 grand per year, and it will be cover my life, it will cover customer's life.

And same thing, like—lots of happening in Uber too. So that's why the current city of London, they ban to Uber. So we have a chance to still think about why we allow to Uber in city. So in—because in

Uber, not safety for the driver, not safe for the rider too.

Even just like last night, I got one customer to drop at airport. She forgot her purse in my car, and after that she called right away to my company, and she say, I forgot my purse in one of your cars. I have important documents, like everything. So she called to the company, and the company called to me and I will go right away and give her purse.

If the Uber is here, like, what happens, like, if somebody forget their important document, where will they call? I don't know. They call to company or where? I don't think so; nobody is responsible for that. Like, so, I don't think so, like, we will be need to be Uber here because we still have time to think about why did this kind of dangerous—the guy there sitting in the other countries, they just making money with the app, and we are just survive for too. That's the main thing. So please be—think about and withdraw Bill 30.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Gill, for your presentation. We'll proceed with questions.

Mr. Allum: Thank you for coming. I want you to know and I want everybody to know in this room we're so glad that you came to Winnipeg and chose our city and our province to make your home. And I think it takes great courage to make the kind of investment in building what we're all learning is a small—is really a small business that—but that can be good for you and your family.

I'm guessing this has probably caused your family quite a bit of stress. Has it?

Mr. Charnanjit Gill: Yes. I think last—more than six months, it will be controversy, so, yes, sure. My—even my kids—I'm still thinking about, like, even when I'm driving, I'm still thinking about what happens in future, like, what's going on so—because too much loan on that cab, so too much on my house too. I don't think so I will be able to afford after that, and so that's why we are very—not me, like, my whole friends. It's almost—everybody says 1,600 jobs, I don't think so it's 16. It's 16 and to at least one driver have their wife with two kids multiplied by four. So, lots of people.

Mr. Allum: I think all of us around the table understand that it really does affect not just the individual driver, but a multiple of four, as you say, and maybe even larger for all we know.

You said that you have to pay insurance, and as my sister from Logan pointed out, it's uncertain whether—or quite likely the Uber guys don't have the same kind of insurance. I'm sorry, could you just tell us again how much you pay in insurance each year?

Mr. Charnanjit Gill: Per year, 10—almost 10 grand, more than 10 grand. More than 10 grand.

Mr. Allum: So more than 10 grand a year to insure not only yourself but to insure your passenger or passengers, as the case may be, and I take it from listening to you that you—I'm sure you'd rather pay less than 10 grand, but you are okay to pay that if that makes sure that you have insurance and also that your passenger has insurance.

My question is, you don't mind really paying that, I suppose.

Mr. Charnanjit Gill: Yes, we are okay to pay that because it's, like, a reason for safety for my life, safety for customers, safety for customers' luggage too, right? Everything is insured in my cab. Like if we are 'droving' cab, everything is insured, even your luggage, even customer life, even my life. But, in any normal car, I don't think so.

And one thing more—reason—is like, if somebody's allowed to drive Uber, just like me, if I just came to Canada today, maybe within four or five days somebody gets licensed—class 5 licence. What do you think? They will be able to drove like that kind of weather? No, I don't think so.

They need to be a professional, so.

Mr. Allum: Thank you for that.

One of the things that the bill doesn't include as they passed this off to the City, and the government passes it off to the City and washes their hands of the whole industry and says it's somebody else's issue, and somebody else's problem, they don't put any provisions here in the bill around insuring that there's safety procedures in any bylaws the city passes or anything like that.

But they did go to the trouble of making sure that there would be no compensation provided to you in the event that this bill passes. I think we, on this side, of the table find that troubling. Would it be fair for the government to at least include in this bill—to amend the bill so that there's compensation for you, even if they wash their hands and send it off to the city?

Mr. Charnanjit Gill: I don't think so, it's like—we do good, if they're, like, go washing their hand because they have to think about all these—like, me and my—all these friends. We will buy the cab, like, we would think about it like my own business. We will—spending money, we invest the money.

If we are not like, had—needed to pay, like, then supposed to be company-shared, right? So we need to be compensated for—then it's something's good, then we can pay something to my bank. So, yes.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Gill, thank you very much for your presentation and your—the answering these questions and coming out tonight. Thank you.

Okay, next person on the list is No. 14, Sanjeev Mehta. Is Sanjeev Mehta here tonight? No? Okay, we'll put him down to the bottom of the list.

Okay, so we'll go down to No. 14, Dr. Barry Prentice—15.

An Honourable Member: Yes, I have 14.

Mr. Chairperson: Oh, 14, we put him down to the list.

Mr. Prentice, you can—do you have any material here to hand out?

Mr. Barry Prentice (Private Citizen): I do, indeed.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, so we'll get one of the staff to hand it out.

Mr. Prentice, you can continue.

Mr. Prentice: Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak.

I've been here now three nights. I think I'm the only person who doesn't have a vested interest in this outcome and, in fact, I perhaps speak for the other 750,000 Winnipeggers who don't have a vested interest in this outcome, because all you've heard so far are people who do have a vested outcome—outcome—outcome of this proceedings.

What I've also heard is a lot of emotion. I've heard sadness, I've heard fear, I've heard anger, I've heard pride and I've heard betrayal. A lot of emotions, but emotions don't make good policy and, in fact, your job is to make good public policy—what's in the public interest, not necessarily what's in the interest of a vested group.

I'd also say that part of this problem is the government. It was a long time ago, but it was an emotion that we heard a few days ago of a current

government—at the time, after the war—which had an emotion of gratitude for veterans, and it set up this system and it set up this quota system and a cartel for taxis.

I can tell you as an economist there is absolutely no economic justification for limiting the entry of vehicles into the taxi industry. It will not self-destruct, places that have allowed free taxi entry, find—to operate just fine. Ireland, New Zealand, and a number of other places can be pointed to that have this.

* (22:00)

So there is no justification. However, it was done a long time ago, and this industry and these people invested in good faith, based on the rules. However, the government has made the situation worse.

If you refer to our report—this is one of three reports that I have authored. They're academic papers; they're online; they're available for everybody to examine. I've studied Ottawa, Toronto and Winnipeg. What you'll see in this example is a study we did to look at what is the linkage between rate increases and the value of taxi licences. If you look at that period of time we examined, when inflation was basically running way below 2 per cent, sometimes zero, you'll see increases of 6 per cent, 8 per cent and higher all the way through. Well, this inflated the value of taxi rides, and it is capitalized into the value of the taxi licences. That's why they have such a high value.

Isn't it amazing to you that somebody would pay half a million dollars for the right to have a job that pays below-average income or, in fact, pays a minimal income? Doesn't that seem a little strange to everybody in this room? How do we explain that? Well, part of it is that this is an industry that is actually returning a return to the licence value itself, and that licence has to be paid for with the rates that people pay for taxis. Now, you may wonder, again, why is there an interest in Uber and the other net transportation—sorry, network transportation companies, which is their proper term? Well, it's because they offer lower rates, and they don't just offer lower rates because they don't have to pay for a big licence fee, but that's part of it.

That licence fee has increased the cost of all the taxis in this city and over time, whereas we should have been increasing number of taxi licences. I hold the NDP government responsible for this. The taxi

industry should have expanded; it would have kept those licences from going so high, but the people who own the licence, they didn't want them expanding because they knew it would dilute the value of their property. So, instead of accommodating the market, they kept it to themselves. As one driver said, greedy behaviour, and now they're paying the price for that greedy behaviour because technological change is threatening their cozy relationship. I would submit to you that the government is responsible, maybe not this current government, partly the previous government, but a government a long time ago that set this up, and to simply cut these people loose is something that you have to reconsider.

Should they receive compensation? Well, they will get compensation. If they have a capital loss, they can write it off against their taxes. If their licence is worth less than they paid for it when they sell this licence again, they will get a capital deduction and less taxes. So they get some compensation. I think the real problem is that a lot of people went out and borrowed money and bought these licences, and now they're facing the possibility of lower rates and the inability to pay for these licences, and if that's the case, there is some hardship. I don't know if you can fit this into your bill; perhaps you don't need to or want to, but there should be some consideration for maybe loan guarantees for those people who apply for it so you give them a transition to accommodate the change which is coming, because they do see the writing on the wall.

Compensation in total, however, is a different matter. Are we going to compensate the newspapers for losing money because advertising went to the Internet? Are we going to compensate Sears for going out of business because Amazon is taking their dinner? Are we going to compensate everybody who has a technical change? Well, if you do that, my taxes are sure going to go up, as are yours and everybody else's, because we don't have that money. We can't compensate everybody who makes a decision in business, and that decision doesn't work out the way they wish. We understand that.

But we still have to deal with the problem, and I think, again, in good faith, I would ask the government to think about how you might deal with people who are caught in an awkward position of having invested in good faith—they followed the rules as the rules were written. We can't argue against that, but I don't necessarily think they should be compensated

for the loss of licence value. That's a different matter altogether.

With that, I will stop and I'll be happy to take any questions.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Prentice, for your presentation.

We'll continue with questions here with Mr. Lindsey.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you for your presentation, certainly a different point of view, I guess, than what—at least, I've heard in this evening's presentation.

So, if I understand what you've said correctly, that you don't believe this introduction of these ride-sharing companies will impact current standards, as far as safety of drivers and safety of passengers? Is that correct?

Mr. Prentice: What you're asking is: Are we talking about two different markets?

For one thing, the way the transportation—sorry, network transportation companies operate, they already know who they're going to pick up. They already see the face of the person they're picking up. The person who's being picked up knows who's picking them up. That's the way the system works. You're not picking up any strangers.

So, as a result of that, you have greater confidence of who you're picking up. Moreover, you don't just get to get Uber if you don't have a good reputation. And, if you have a bad reputation, do something wrong, you are out like that, so you never get a second chance. So the safety issue you're talking about is a different one.

And I would also submit the following: that the taxi industry is not going to disappear. Let's be frank about this. They can compete. They compete in other places. They haven't disappeared in Edmonton; they haven't disappeared in Toronto. They're not going to disappear here. And there's a lot of people who don't qualify for Uber or Lyft or any of these other network transportation companies. They're still going to need service and they will get it.

But let me point out to you, it also is the case that every place these network transportation companies have come in, total ridership has increased because they are offering better rates and people will take the service at a better rate.

Let me just also, if I could, add one point. When we restricted the number of taxis, we have created another problem. And that has to do with the seasonality or the period differential of taxi use. The peak demand is on the weekends, so there's never enough taxis to look after everybody on the weekends because there are limited numbers. As a result, where do the taxis congregate? Well, they congregate downtown where the rides are. You get less service out in the suburbs, it would be the case.

People who'd have too much to drink have a choice: do I bring my sleeping bag and toothbrush, or do I drive home after a few drinks, maybe more than I should have had? There is evidence and literature—New Zealand and also in New York, where they can observe that this change has reduced the amount of drunk driving.

And the taxi industry has to face that as one of the realities. When you short the market, people do the alternative things.

Mr. Isleifson: Dr. Prentice, thank you very much for your presentation.

I have a question for you. In your professionalism with the transport institute, I'm looking here that a lot of this was done because of an MNP report that had gone out. And I know in that report it talked about municipal jurisdiction. And I know the City of Winnipeg is looking at an entire municipal transportation strategy.

Who do you feel would best look at the future of that strategy, the provincial government or the City of Winnipeg itself?

Mr. Prentice: It's a difficult question, in the sense that I think the pressures for change are the same whether it's a municipal government or a provincial government. The vested interests are always going to want to limit this—the demand—or, the supply, I should say, and increase the rates. As long as you have limited entry and you restrict entry, you're going to have this problem. It's a real question of whether the vested interests can concentrate their efforts on a few individuals of city council and get their way versus a provincial government.

I do recall talking to somebody in Calgary who made the point that, in fact, the city council's more vulnerable to the pressure of a group than is a provincial government. But, that being said, you know, it's really going to not matter too much as far as I can see which way it goes.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, we have time for one more question and very quickly.

* (22:10)

Mr. Maloway: I want to thank you, Barry, for your presentation.

You know, in the other committee tonight, the government was having hearings regarding red tape reduction. You know, that's one of their big focuses, reducing red tape. And yet in this bill the government, provincial government, wants to turn this over to 137 municipalities. Do you not think that's creating a lot more red tape and going against what their desire is?

Mr. Prentice: If your statement was accurate, I'd say maybe. But your statement's not accurate. There's 136 municipalities already control their taxis. Only Winnipeg is controlled this way. And you might ask the question, more to the other side: Why Winnipeg? Why is it special? Why is it different? And I don't see any particular difference in it.

Mr. Chairperson: Well, Mr. Prentice, it was—very—thank you for your time, for your question—answering these questions and your presentation, and I want to thank you for coming out tonight.

Okay, next person on the list is Manjit Dhillon—Is No. 16. Is Manjit in today?

Okay, we'll go on to No. 17. Oh, No. 16 will be dropped to the bottom of the list now.

And Mesfin Abraha is the next person, No. 17. *[interjection]* Okay, just one second.

Just wanted to clarify. We named out two different names, so I just wanted to make sure—can you just say your name in the mic?

Ms. Manjit Dhillon (Private Citizen): My name is Manjit Dhillon.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, so we're back on No. 16 here.

So, Ms. Dhillon, you can go ahead for your presentation.

No. 16—we're going back to 16.

Ms. Manjit Dhillon: Yes, but I want you to know I listen. We go through the—this is like a law, No. 30, 30 bill, you know, that affect our life, right. I'm a single mom. I lost my husband with cancer long time ago. Then I go school to improve myself, get all training licence. Then I drive taxi. I bought share in

the company, I invest my money, and now if Bill 30 go through, let Uber come, big-time effect, not only me as, like, a single mom, but other ladies too, you know, who husband lost. You know, they die. And, like, they depend on the taxi—to drive taxi, eh? To the now, ladies never work outside. They depend on the taxi business. They're raising the children. They're living—and if I want to go to welfare, I can collect on welfare, I no need to struggle. I—now at 20 years, I driving taxi. I struggling to make income while living. That have too much effect on us, on our life. How we can afford if no income, like, how can we afford our house, how can afford our living?

So many—so many—people depend on, you know. It's a big mortgage, you know, company expensive. If no business, how we can afford? Too much, too hard for us, you know. We not as like those kind of people stay home, sit on government money and relax. We hard work, you know. There's big loss if I do not—income go on zero, right. My money go in the garbage; my job security and also my old age and also other people too.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Ms. Dhillon. Do you have more to add, or—I want to thank you for your presentation, and we'll go with some questions now.

Mr. Allum, can you—

Mr. Allum: Thank you for coming tonight. Were you finished your presentation? *[interjection]*

Mr. Chairperson: Ms. Dhillon, you go ahead. We have to identify you first.

Were you finished your presentation?

Ms. Manjit Dhillon: Pardon?

Mr. Chairperson: Were you done your presentation?

Ms. Manjit Dhillon: Kind of.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, so we'll go with questions.

Mr. Allum: I just wanted to be sure that you had said all you wanted to say before we started to ask you questions. I think all of us want to say we're sorry for your loss, and we admire what you've done.

Did I understand you to say that you drive the cab?

Floor Comment: Yes. I'm share the work with other driver.

An Honourable Member: I'm going to ask you a question and then the Chair's going to ask you—say your name before you reply.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Allum.

Okay, Ms. Dhillon, go ahead. Answer the question.

You can go ahead—Mr. Allum.

Mr. Allum: How long have you been driving the cab?

Ms. Manjit Dhillon: For more than 20 years.

Mr. Chairperson: Sorry. Mr. Allum, ask the question again.

And you just have to wait until I say your name.

Mr. Allum: We're going to try it one more time. How long have you been driving your—the cab?

Ms. Manjit Dhillon: I driving more than 20 years.

Mr. Allum: And do you feel safe driving your cab now with all the changes that have been made?

Ms. Manjit Dhillon: Yes.

Mr. Allum: We're going to work this out. Don't you worry about it. We've had many people who come, and this format, this way we do this is kind of different. So we'll work it out.

Did you have to pay out of your own pocket for all those safety improvements?

Ms. Manjit Dhillon: Yes, we do.

Mr. Allum: Could you tell us how much you invested, how much it cost you for those safety improvements over the years?

Ms. Manjit Dhillon: We have, you know, like we put a new computer because the public new generation like us to use app, right? We bring the new computers, and I don't know exactly amount, and every month, I don't know, we pay to the company and not that expensive.

Mr. Allum: So, in addition to investing in your licence, you also have had to pay a lot of money for improvements to be innovative; to make sure your customers are able to get in touch with you and that you feel safe and they feel safe. So it's cost you quite a bit of money to invest in your taxi over the years, I guess.

Ms. Manjit Dhillon: Yes, you know, like, we have camera in there, we have shield and, you know, it's

most, I concerned with the safety. When I—then I also listen news, you know, like, I don't know, like, Uber driver did rape this woman, this young woman, you know, and we, you know, like, much safe in—to know, like, to be working with the company.

Mr. Allum: Thank you.

So assuming this bill is going to pass, and unless the government comes to its senses soon, I think it is going to pass, at least do you feel like you deserve to be compensated for all of the investments and all the money you spent on trying to build your business?

Ms. Manjit Dhillon: Yes.

Mr. Allum: And do you know how much—how much that—how much would that—how much would the government or someone else have to compensate you for it to be fair?

Ms. Manjit Dhillon: For more than 20 years, you know, I invest my money in the company. I work hard. I pay all of the, you know, like, bill to that company, reputation, everything, you know. And the—you know, we—you know, like, if Bill 30 pass and you know, like, we bigtime we get damage, you know, so our money is, I don't know, almost going in the garbage. And we deserve something if they want to bring Uber to their mind, to competition, right, and—but equal fare.

* (22:20)

Mr. Chairperson: Ms. Dhillon, thanks a lot for coming out here tonight and presenting today. And I know it's tough and sorry again for the loss of your husband. And thanks for coming out tonight. Thank you.

Okay, the next person on the list is No. 17, Mesfin Abra. *[interjection]*—Abraha? Okay, we'll put this person down at the bottom of the list.

The next person is Alex Ignat, No. 18. Alex Ignat? Okay, so we'll also put Alex Ignat to the bottom.

The next person is Zena Muhhie *[phonetic]*, No. 19. Is that how to pronounce it? Or—you could correct me.

Mr. Zena Mussie (Private Citizen): They make it wrong, when I say. It was Mussie: M-u-s-s-i-e.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, so it's spelled wrong.

Mr. Mussie: Last name, Mussie. Yes.

Mr. Chairperson: *[interjection]* Okay.

Mr. Mussie, you can go ahead with your presentation.

Do you have any materials to hand out first?

Mr. Mussie: No, sir.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, Mr. Mussie, go ahead.

Mr. Mussie: First, I would like to say thank you for the committee for giving me the opportunity to express my concern regarding Bill 30. My name is Zena Mussie. I'm married. I'm a father of three boys and my oldest son, Abel *[phonetic]*, he's a third year engineering student in University of Manitoba. My second boy, Simon *[phonetic]*, he's grade 12. He told me that when he graduates, he wants to join the army and serve his country. And my third boy is Zan *[phonetic]*—is in grade 6.

Ladies and gentlemen, I came in this country 1989, with only \$125 in my pocket. And, once I arrived in Canada, it didn't take me too long to find a job. And I was working in the service industry, in a factory, in construction, in a convenience store, and, at the same time, I'm going—I was going to school to upgrade my education.

So I work, like, sometimes two jobs and managed to save some money. And I always have this ambition that one day I have to own my own business, so I worked very hard and saved some money and bought a cab. Got a loan and bought a cab. So I work so many hours—sometimes six, seven days a week, 15, 16 hours—and this is the only investment that I have.

Now, Bill 30 came in the picture and that takes all my investment—zero; basically, zero. My only retirement money that I have, I think, is my cab. One day, when I retire, I'm going to sell my cab and, you know, retire. But the way I see it, it's not going to happen.

This Province of Manitoba encourages a lot of immigrants to invest in Manitoba, and encouraging people, you know, this is the place to live. This is the place to raise a family. Invest in Manitoba. Most of my colleagues behind me sold all their lands in India, invest their money in Manitoba, because they thought Manitoba is home.

But the way I see Bill 30, we get treated like a second-class citizen. A couple of ministers on the right-hand side said a couple of times that Bill 30 has nothing to do with Uber. I'm sorry to say that that's hogwash. Bill 30 is everything to do Uber. You are

opening the floodgates to bring Uber in the city. We know that. That's the fact.

We're not afraid of Uber coming in the city. We're not. We are law-abiding, hard-working citizens of this country. We have every right. It's in the constitution of—Canada's constitution. We have a right. But they are taking that right from us.

We are just asking just a level playing field. We're not asking a favour from you guys. We're asking a level playing field. We are heavily, heavily regulated by the government of Canada, the province of Manitoba. We have a camera, a shield, mechanical inspections, child-safety spot check. Even we have a spot check. We have a letter sealed by the government.

Now Uber wants to do the same business, but they don't want to say that they are doing the business like us. They said ride-sharing. What the heck is ride-sharing? They are doing the same business that—they are trying to do the same business that we do.

A Taxicab Board act clearly states that if you drive a person from A point to B point and collect money, that falls in the category of taxicab. What is Uber trying to do now? The same thing, trying to drive people from A point to B point and collect money. So, is anybody telling me what is the difference between Uber and a taxi? There is no difference.

We're just asking if Uber wants to come in the city, if you want to pass that Bill 30, why don't you put a safety on that Bill 30? There's—Bill 30 doesn't say anything about safety, because we know that once we pass this Bill 30, Uber's going to be on the road; that's for sure. That's the fact.

What's happen if you pass Bill 30? What's—is going to happen if you pass Bill 30 is that it's going to be a lot of houses foreclosure; that's for sure. A lot of people behind me, my colleagues, we have heavy, heavy mortgages. If we lose our jobs, we won't be able to pay. So it's going to be a lot of houses foreclosure. What's going to happen if you guys pass Bill 30? It's going to be a lot of bank loans, so a lot of people will file bankruptcy. Hundreds of hundreds people will be unemployed. A lot of family will destroy, this bill, not to mention the lose of income that we brought in this city.

So, the future of the taxi industry is on the hands of the PC government, the current government right

now. You pass this bill, you're killing a lot of families. A lot of families will be destroyed.

If you drop this bill, we will go back to work and serve the people of Winnipeg like we did the past 16, 17–60, 70 years. So, our 'livelifood'—future is on the hands of this current government.

* (22:30)

Let me talk about safety. Safety is a very, very important thing in the taxicab business. I'll tell you one story before I finish. In 1998, I picked these two young men from somewhere in West End. They flag me; they hop in my car. I—they told me to drive to somewhere in [*inaudible*]. So I was driving; it was, like, midnight in December—month of December, and before I know—

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Mussie, you have one more minute left.

Mr. Mussie: Okay. Before I know, there was a knife in behind my back, and I was told to drive. At that time, we don't have a shield or a camera. I remember we have a strobe light. So what I did was I turned that strobe light on, and the strobe light was flashing and somebody, that passerby, saw that strobe light and called 911. Two minutes later, I was surrounded by the cop cars. And the losers got caught.

What I am trying to say is that strobe life—that strobe light saved my life. Today, I'm standing before you because that little strobe light saved my life. So that's what—how important safety is in this industry.

So, when you go in a couple of weeks to make this decision, please be open minded and see all these families. Think about these all families. That's all I want to say. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Mussie, your time is up.

Okay, thank you for your presentation, and we'll do five minutes for questions.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you for your presentation. An earlier presenter seemed to indicate that he didn't think that Uber or things like that would have a problem, because, by the sounds of it, they wouldn't really be picking people up in the inner city and they would be kind of focusing on the cream of the crop, if you will. So the safety issue, he didn't think, would be a big deal. But, clearly, you're telling us something different, that for anybody that's picking people up late at night, or even during the day for that matter, safety is an issue. And, while you may

not be opposed to competition, you're opposed to competition that has an unfair advantage. Is that correct? *[interjection]*

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Mussie, go ahead.

Mr. Mussie: Yes. I'm not opposing competition, but what we are saying is that if you want to bring business, same business what we are doing, make it a level playing field and see who's going to last in this business long. We're not afraid.

Mr. Mohinder Saran: Thank you for coming. Well, I would ask—previous speaker said it was government's fault. He said it was NDP's fault, but I seen it was PC's fault, it was NDP's fault, it was again PC's fault.

Government let that price go up, and if this government is at fault, don't you think they should compensate? Does not matter which government—it was NDP or PC—doesn't matter which government was there, but at least if government let it happen, other—if government don't want to it happen, they should not have made those licences transferrable. And that's what is so—now it's government's responsibility. I don't care it's a PC. I don't care it's NDP.

When 1979, I wanted to put my share in it; it was \$25,000. So, since then, it went up. Gone through Gary Filmon's government, gone through other governments, and all the governments are responsible. So I think they—if they have really kind of a fair thinking, they should compensate. Don't you think they should do that?

Mr. Mussie: It's a no-brainer. I mean, the government encouraged us to invest in this city, and we invested our money. And then they just wash their hands and, you know what, it's nice to do business with you guys, and then all of the sudden, throw us in the city—to the City. Of course, we have to be compensated. We are encouraged by this government to invest; we invested. And then what will we get? We get betrayed. We get betrayed by this government. So I think it's a no-brainer that each and every cab has to be compensated.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you for that, and you've made that pretty clear. One of the things that you talked about—I think it was you anyway; I've listened to a few presentations—is what's the difference between Uber and a taxi? And, at the end of the day, there is no difference. They're the same thing, so they should be treated the same way. Is that correct? *[interjection]*

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Mussie.

Mr. Mussie: I'm sorry. That's all we ask. Uber says that ride-sharing—they just—don't be fooled by Uber. Uber says that ride-sharing, they know that if they say that we are doing a taxi business, they will go in the proper channel and apply to the Taxicab Board in order to do business. So what they do is they use that loophole in the back door and say that, no, no, no, we are not doing a taxi business. We are a middleman. We are connecting people who own a vehicle and people who wants a ride. We are middleman. We are connecting people. We are not doing the taxi business. That's hogwash. They are doing a taxi business.

So, if they want to do the taxi business, they should go through what we have been through. Put a camera each and every Uber. Put a camera. Put a safety shield. Put a strobe light. Child safety. Criminal record. Meters sealed by the government. We have a meter. When you get in my car, you pay \$3.50. And then every 90 metres, you pay 10 cents, and every 90 seconds, you pay another 10 cents. It's a safe price, and it's locked by the government. It's sealed. We can't tamper that meter. What Uber wants to do: they don't have a set of price.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Mussie, thank you very much. The five minutes is up for your questions, and thanks very much for your presentation and coming out tonight.

Mr. Maloway: We have Mr.—No. 84, Barry Homenick. Barry has evidently been here three full nights now, and he has a medical appointment tomorrow, so we're supposed to be set up here tomorrow morning at 10 a.m. and he is not going to be able to make it because he's at a—his medical appointment. So if we could—

Mr. Chairperson: Is it agreed to the committee to bring forward to next—*[Agreed]*

Okay. No. 84, Barry—Barry Homenick.

Okay, so it's all been agreed, and we'll call on the next speaker—presenter, is No. 84, Mr. Barry Homenick.

Mr. Homenick, do you have any materials that you want to—

Mr. Barry Homenick (Private Citizen): Nothing.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay. Mr. Homenick, go ahead with your presentation.

Mr. Homenick: It's a pleasure to speak to you people this evening, and I'm speaking on behalf of the taxi board. Myself, I mean, as being as-part of the taxi industry. I was in the taxi industry longer than a lot of you guys have ever been in the taxi industry. It's been in my family since 1940 when the taxi board was formed by my dad. I wasn't invented 'til '48, but he'd started in 1940. Him and a guy named Russ Duffy [*phonetic*] started Duffy's Taxi. Then it materialized with another guy, Peter Kapusta and all the other guys, McCosky [*phonetic*] and that, and they formed other companies: Moore's, with the Moore's Grosvenor and Yellow, became the Unicity Taxi later on in the venture. And then Grosvenor. I mean, Red Patch. But what I'm arguing about is this. They—my dad said to me, it will always stay in the government. It will never go to the city, because the government rules and the government can handle the rates for out-of-towns and everything else, and the tourists and that. I agreed. My—agreed to my dad said. I believed in it, every ounce.

In 2007, my dad and I were presented with an award from the Province of Manitoba for our services throughout the industry. If you wanted to see it, I'm going to send it around to you guys right now.

Mr. Chairperson: Sorry. We can't do exhibits, sorry. We can only do handouts.

Floor Comment: The guy's got to get up and go around and bring it back to me. It's the same thing, isn't it? Show it, look at it—bringing it around, everybody look at it, bring it back to me, that's all. You can't keep it unless you had a lot of money to buy it. And that's more than Uber can afford to pay for it.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, go ahead, Mr. Homenick.

Mr. Homenick: All right. Now, this Bill 30, the compensation portion of it is because the people paid and the cab—when he bought the cab industry, when my dad [*inaudible*—he could not afford to buy RSPs and all the sort of stuff that were going around. So they bought the cab as an insurance policy for retirement. I agreed. It wasn't a bad idea. So my dad stayed in the industry, and in 2007 they asked him very politely, what do you think of the government? The government works terrific. But, as long as it stays with the Province of Manitoba in the Parliament hills, we have no problem with the government and running the taxi industry, including everybody else. Terrific.

* (22:40)

Now we've got safety shields. We've got—it has strobe lights, we've got all the safety factors to keep the cab industry flowing. Leave it where it is; don't wreck the system.

Now, what are you going to do with—guys going to do, you guys—these guys have get compensated. You say there's no compensation in the C-10, okay fine. There's no compensation. What are they going to do for a—for your pension? Now, what about—these gentlemen sitting on this side of the table, and these people sitting on this side of the table. You guys get compensated when you guys retire. You get pensions in the government. They get nothing, but you're getting a pension. You guys are going to retire with a pension—a healthy pension, sit back and relax in your golden age. But these guys won't be able to because you're going to take it all away and pull the rug out from under them. What are they going to live on? Ice in wintertime? You know, that's really—not really, really right—the proper way of handling it, with these people.

I cannot tell you—I'm in this industry, I've been here since 1966 with the industry. I still consider the—all these people out here—every last one of these people—my brothers, my sisters and my working public. I don't care who they are, whatever they are. When you cut yourself, you got to come over, red blood. We're all equal.

So let's get to down to brass tacks. We don't need these guys in town, No. 1. We need the people that work with the people, work with us. Leave it in the government. Why is it, a guy makes a promise in 2007—my dad died in 2009—and he said we'll always stay in Parliament Hill. And now they were going to pull back and throw out the city? My over—he's dead; he'd be turning over in his grave if he heard that. And, if he was alive, he'd be in here stamping on top of your heads because you had made a promise, and I want this promise kept. Because to me, it means a lot.

It's not what you guys—you think that, you know, oh, well, yes, well, you guys get one year in parliament, one year, and then you're out and you get a pension, you sit back and relax. These guys live on it every day of the 'whear'. Every day these guys go out, 16 hours a day. I worked for the company. I've been with her for 40 years at Duffy's. I still go out at night to make sure the cars are clean. And you can ask—and even there's a guy here that knows exactly what I used to do. And I still go out and wander

around with my lady. We go out to the casinos and then I make sure the cars are clean. I don't care what company it is. I'll phone them up, say, that car's not worthy to be on the road. Wash it. And I ain't scared to. Believe me. You think not, ask any one of these guys behind me. They think they were going to get by me, good luck.

Now, I think that the Bill 30 is really, really—sure, no compensation? Well, that's their compensation. You guys get pensions. That's their formal compensation. You know? And if they say they bought it for \$200,000, they sell for \$400,000, there's \$200,000 profit. Who gets first kick? You guys. Because, you know why? Because you guys go for capital gains. And that all comes back to the government again. So it's all the same money. Taking it from here, putting it there, putting it back there again. Why? You take capital gains, it goes back to the government, right? Am I right? If a guy buys a cab for \$200,000 and sells it for \$300,000, there's \$100,000 profit. Right? If you can accommodate the 'directification' for it, Revenue Canada takes 42 per cent right off the top. And they get first count. Where is the money? In the government. It's always in the government. Not within here. You guys are all here in parliament. Leave it in the parliament buildings, here. Golden Boychuk can gladly take care of our business. I really think that you guys are a joke.

You've got the wrong approach. These guys with this Uber—Uber 'doober', balloon—who cares about these guys? They're just out to take your credit card, rip you off. And I tell you, I can tell you two instances. My daughter was in the States and she's forced to use them. They told her the fare was going to be \$24. When she got there, there was found there was a missing clock behind it. They want to be \$28. Okay? Now, when she go on back again, the fare was \$45. Why? Because, oh, we're short of cars. You have to pay the—a surcharge for it to come back again. Do you think that that's fair? That's not, that's double dipping. And ours—our meters are sealed, our people are—the thing—the cars are clean, the drivers are well-mannered and they'll bend over backwards to help you. They'll get out and help people. Those guys don't. They honk the horn. I've seen it in Grand Forks, Fargo. They just honk the horn when they pull up the front door. Sure, you can catch them on an app. Not here. You got an app.

You're talking about an app. He gets his trip on an app and he knows where he's got to go. Is it not illegal to have a cellphone in your hands when you're

driving? That's what you got in your car in Uber, a cellphone. It's in your hand. On the taxicab, there's a regulation that allows us to have a meter on, the thing on top of the dash that tells you what a trip is, and it's locked in there. The driver only sees it once and he carries to the trip. He does not have to go through—watching a maze how to get there.

Now what is he going to do, [*inaudible*] Uber drivers: oh, I'm sorry we can't give you a ticket for working with a cellphone because you're an Uber driver. But, yet, they'll give one of our drivers a ticket if he's sitting there and he's answering a phone on the sidelines with his four-way flashers on because he's got an emergency phone call.

Where's the double standard? Think about it. The meters are on the dash. There's provisions made in the act for these guys, have these meters on the dash to answer the radios, to get their trips and to book in. If they've got a safety factor, hit it now. You're in an emergency situation—emergency situation. What do you got? In Duffy's we got 190 cars. That computer is in trouble, it's blanked out. The rest should just go out to all the rest of the drivers in the area. Who's faster to get to the place where the driver's in trouble? Well, one of our own drivers. Police can't get there in five to seven minutes, but four or five other drivers can get there and help him out.

What kind of safety licence is Uber going to have?

You guys have to really think about this. Really, I really think that Uber is not the answer, and I think any of this is the answer. Take this Bill 30, throw it out the window.

Mr. Chairperson: Coming up, you have one minute remaining.

Mr. Homenick: Okay.

I've close my thing here. I close my case. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. And I really put my point forward that these guys are my brothers and sisters and I think they bust their behind to keep the industry clean. The cars are well-maintained and the service—where do you get inspectors twice a year and you get cars regulated on a regular basis. We have three safety features: the shields, and everything else we have—strobe lights, you know, and the cameras, and the cameras have been updated. Now they can even go to voice.

I'm finished with my comments. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Homenick, for your presentation and for coming out here tonight.

We'll start with questions, and Mr. Lindsey has a question for you.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you for coming out and certainly you've added a lot of perspective that we haven't heard yet to the whole conversation.

So, really, in your opinion, I guess, if I could summarize the whole point of Uber or similar-type ride-sharing things, is really to just undercut the industry, to not have to follow the same rules, the same standards and really not offer the same service. Is that a fair statement?

Mr. Homenick: Yes, it's not supplying the same service but, also, you're not also helping the people. You know, like, they tell you to go 245 Spence, back door at night. You go there—you can't go. Our regulations states that after sundown, no cars go in the back lanes. They will because they're looking for the buck.

Mr. Lindsey: I think what we heard from an earlier presenter was that perhaps they're not going anywhere unsafe because that's not their method of operation. They're going to kind of take the cream of the crop and leave the inner city, if you will, to the traditional taxi drivers, which, again, is unfair—it's unfair competition, it's really not playing on the same level. Is that correct?

Mr. Homenick: It's true, but in one condition; all you people here have people who work nights. Your kids go to school, they have part-time jobs. The staff are being delivered home at night by taxi. They ain't going to be out after midnight to take the people home—your kids home or your wife home if she's working someplace after midnight. We do. Unicity, Duffy's, every other company does this. But, no, what are you going to do? How's your wife going to get home? She's going to phone you, hey, come and get me. You know, it's not a playing field and if you guys wanted to make it a playing field, leave it in the government, allow the drivers to use the diamond lanes between 7:00 and 9:00, and 3:30 to 5:30, and when you do that, you'll increase it because the drivers will get to the—get their destination and dropped off faster, and they'll have faster to get to your house. We don't need the other guys to come in to take the business during the rush hours. Our own people will handle them, these people behind me.

Mr. Lindsey: You've been involved with the taxi industry for a number of years, to put it mildly. Did

anybody ever come to you or somebody that you know and talk to you about any of this deregulation or changing who's—*[interjection]*

* (22:50)

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Homenick, sorry, I have to go ahead, Mr. Homenick.

Mr. Homenick: No, I had not been asked in any form because, like, let's say, I'm low-key, I'm close to retirement, I'm 69 years old. But I'm willing to help the guys out. I used to do all the training for all the drivers at Duffy's Taxi. I used to make them come to me, they sat down, they did the—I explained exactly how the city—how our system works. What you can do, what you can't do, when you can do it. And I also said to them: I got a surprise for you guys. Here's 10 spots. You've got 30 days to come back with those 10 spots and show me that you took one on your cellphone. If you don't come back, I suspend you licence until you come and see me. And I got everyone back. And every one of my drivers will—if you ask me right now, a lot of you guys call me Mr. Boss, but I'm not the boss. I make sure the customer is the boss—the people who phone and ask for my taxi. And any company—regardless of what company you are, we supply the call to service, the two big companies.

Mr. Lindsey: I guess that's one of the things we've heard about most recently is in Quebec. The government there told Uber that they had to train their drivers, and Uber said, well, maybe we'll just pull out of Quebec.

So I'm glad to hear you talk about the fact that you trained drivers and, really, that's another thing that this ride-sharing model undercuts: is that drivers could be anybody. There's not necessarily trained. Certainly, not to the same standard that you would train your drivers to, correct?

Mr. Homenick: It's true. We train the drivers. We train them to be polite and to the point. We don't allow them to call before they get to the front of the door, because you can see the—what kind of person is coming out of the door and, if you'd see that they are too badly inebriated, you can tell them to sleep it off; we'll come back and get you later. That's one.

These drivers—these people that phone for taxis, they're just happy drunks; they want to get from point A to point B and just get home. You know, we don't have to worry about that. We supply to call—to a thing called service. And as—what—where are you going to get guys when you down to the city, they

are going to have taxi inspectors out there at night in the Manitoba Taxicab Board, on the road, checking the vehicles and catching the odd ones to make sure that they are properly equipped with all the stuff? You won't.

And the taxi inspectors do a lot of these—a lot of good jobs. Those guys on the taxi board on excellent. Their cars are well maintained. They make sure they all have their vehicle inspections. The cars are clean and there's not a scratch here and there.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Homenick, thanks again for your presentation and the questions to answer. The five minutes is up. So I want to thank you for coming out here tonight.

Okay, so we'll go back to the order of the list. Number 20, Mr. Devinder Saran.

Mr. Saran, do you have any materials that you want to hand out?

Mr. Saran, go ahead with your presentation.

Mr. Devinder Saran (Private Citizen): Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I—

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Saran, could you just maybe talk in the mic? Yes, just bring it up a little higher.

Mr. Devinder Saran: I finished my university in India, in May 1979, and I came to Victoria, BC, in July '79. We stayed there for a couple of months and then we came to Winnipeg.

Over here, I find a job in the garment factory—all those—in those stock—in those buildings there was used to be many, many garment industries. Like, I used to work for Mr. Kaufman, Canadian Sportswear as a presser. I worked there 'til 90—to '92, starting in 1979.

In those days, they closed down all those factories—garment industries, they was almost gone, they closed the factories. Then I started driving cab as part time in 1986.

And driving—in my driving experience, I had broken all my ribs and I had many safety—we have listed many, like, safety issues, but none of our drivers explained the serious situation when it comes. Like, when we measure safety or taxi safety, depends on when—if the things happen, is different. And, like, for example, when we talk about the safety, I used to drive in the evening. In those days, there was no cellphones. And I was coming south on McPhillips Street and stayed in front of that casino, and a lady was standing at the bus stop and she

flagged me down. And I was going home, driving south—I used to live in the North End by the Maryland Hotel there—so I thought, I'm moving in same direction. And so I pick her up, she give me some address on Sherbrook Street. And I—and she just lay down on the seat. And when we reach at the place, there's no such address. Then I spoke to my supervisor, Brenda, and explained to her the situation. She said, don't touch her; you could be charged, and take her to the police station on Princess Street, which I did.

I went there. Three police officers are sitting behind the desk, and I explained them my problem, and they said, we can't help you in this case. Take her to the drunk tank, which is on 70 Martha. I went there and request them my—explained them my problem, and one lady, supervisor, and two officers came out and they opened the door and look at her and they said, we can't help you because she is too much.

I said, what should I do? Take her to the Princess police station safety building. That's where I'm coming from. While we was talking, the police cruiser came there, and I request the officers of my story, and they said we have one—somebody in the back seat already and we can't help you much. So what should I do, call the ambulance? We called an ambulance., and the girl and boy, they—like, she grab her from here, and she was looks normal, and, like, things like that can happen anytime.

And I used to drive a taxicab—like a Handi-Transit, and I was awarded a certificate of the best driver of the year. And, like, driving a cab, for me, my customers are my best and more important because they are my living when I drive a cab, and I try to do my best.

In those rush hours, certainly, there is a problem. Like, cabs are—like, that's our busy time. We should be running to do those—pick up those person instead of we are walking on one leg. Basically, what I'm trying to say, we cabs don't move. We don't go nowhere. Once we are going behind in our—paying our fares, then more issues start coming up. Sixty per cent chance is you won't get your fare. And we are, like, circling around in the traffic rush hours. We should do something like these kind of problems, and when it comes—like, demand and supply, we—Taxicab Board did a review two years ago. Do we need any cabs on the road? They said that we have enough cabs on the road in that study.

So, when, actually, the government should support the industry to improve these transportation availability to the cabs. And I can guarantee this committee the shortage of cabs will be 99 per cent solved, and this shouldn't be a problem.

And when we—like, when we talk about Uber, for them it's a nice try, what is a big challenge to the industry, because to run a cab our overheads are too much. We talk a lot about insurance, but also we pay our concessions like, for example, to the airport; we pay more than half a million dollars a year. Then we pay all our concessions, which are—like, approximately we pay about \$1,000 every month dues, like expenses.

And to make those \$2,000, if you calculate by 15 per cent gas, which is about \$300 more add up. To make those \$2,300, this is your cost whether you drive, whether your car is in the garage, whether your car is in the paint shop, whatever, whether your car is involved in the accident and not doing business for seven days. What your overhead—those overheads are still there. You have to pay. And then to pay that, you drive another week to—just to cover those costs. We have so many issues like that.

And, like, companies like—if we talk about Uber, they—for them, it's their time to come in the back—from the back trying to sneak from the back room—back door. And they don't have no cost for them. It's a nice try, but the cab industry, it is a big challenge. And I don't know how we can survive, one person doesn't have no overhead, and one person have \$2,000 overhead whether he works or not, whether his car is running or whether his car is not running. Like, how can we compete?

And government should support us on this issues like that to survive, to make our families and our kids to make survive. That's my request to all the gentlemen and ladies. Please consider it sincerely. It is a sincere matter. A lot of families are at stake. They're, like, child, their life, their retirements. Like, it's not easy seeing [*inaudible*]. And that's all what I wanted to say.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Saran. We'll start with questions for five minutes, and we'll start with Mr. Lindsey.

* (23:00)

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you very much for your presentation and just—I want to ask you a couple of

questions about if this bill does pass. Do you believe that drivers should be—[*interjection*]

Mr. Chairperson: Oh, sorry, Mr. Saran.

Mr. Devinder Saran: Sorry, Sir. Sorry.

Mr. Chairperson: Go ahead, Mr. Saran. Oh, Mr. Lindsey.

Mr. Lindsey: If this bill was to proceed, do you believe that drivers should be compensated for the fact that they're going to lose hundreds of thousands of dollars in the process?

Mr. Devinder Saran: Well, my point of view, we shouldn't talk about compensation here, we should help the industry to improve our services, to improve our businesses and, like, our job is to serve public and we should do our best to do—and that's what we do to—we do our best to do, like all the way to our customers are our lives. Like, it's our living and we do our best to serve them.

And we don't need—in my view, we don't need this bill to be passed or amended. We should just scrap it. We don't need it. We have Taxicab Board. They do all their studies, they have their own ways to control the industry, they have to—they have their own ways to control the drivers and companies have their own rules and regulations and everything is working fine. Only issue comes once in a while is like demand and supply and that—like, we have enough cabs. I can guarantee to this committee. Just improve our movement and those rush hours.

Like, there is those days when schools are closed, school buses are closed, even some transports or regular buses are not moving. Cabs and drivers are still being blamed why their cab is not coming, nobody's there to explain them the situation. I used to drive a—for Handi-Transit and they have their system so good. I have never experienced any of my customers staring at me, even I am 45 minutes late. I have never been abused by any customer because the Handi-Transit, when they call them back, where is my cab, they explain them what why the cab is late, because the problems there on the roads. Like, we have so many issues like that, so—and please consider it seriously and it's not a easy business to run and there are many, many safety issues.

We used to experience almost every serious crimes, like, for good people—looks like everybody's good, but the world is getting dangerous. World is getting clever; world is getting, like, scary. Too many things like that, and we need the government's

help to support us to run like, let us serve the—our customers properly and we need government's help instead of unnecessarily changes like this Bill 30. In my point of view, we don't need it. Thank you.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you again for your answer, and really, I get what you're saying, that we don't need this Bill 30 at all, but you're not opposed to perhaps making some improvements or suggesting things that could be done better—*[interjection]*

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Saran, sorry. We had a conversation here so, sorry about that. Go ahead, Mr. Saran.

Mr. Devinder Saran: We are, I think, if the committee considers them we need to some—do some changes but consider it seriously. It's a very tough business. It is very expensive business. It is like—I am driving since 1986 and I still drive six days a week, 12 hours a day. That's always my living. I have to support my kids. My kids go as university, my daughter is going Red River doing RN and my son doing MBA. Like, so many expenses, like so much overheads on the cabs. Please consider all those issues.

Like, when we talk about Uber, for them, it's a nice try. They're trying to sneak through the backdoor. If they get through, fine, if they didn't get through, fine, too. And they're not very welcomed in all over the world. Like, I'm pretty sure a safety issue will come for sure even if they are allowed to come here. There is no way it won't come. It will—based on my experience, it certainly will happen. Safety issues certainly will come.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Saran, thank you very much for your time and the five minutes is up, and thank you for your presentation and coming out tonight.

So we'll continue with the next presenter. No. 21, Bhurinder *[phonetic]* Thind. Mr. Thind?

Okay, if he's not here, we'll put him to the bottom of the list and we'll go on to No. 22, Darren Gibson. Darren Gibson here today? Okay, so we'll—Darren Gibson? Calling once. Okay, twice?

Okay, now we'll go to No. 23, Harnek Sandhu. Is Harnek Sandhu in today? So we'll bring—put him down to the bottom of the list.

Paramjeet Muhar? No.

Okay, we'll try No. 25, Mr. Diwinder Randhawa. Is Mr. Randhawa here? Can you identify yourself?

Because we went through a whole bunch of names, we just want to make—can you identify your name?

Mr. Rajesh Amilal (Private Citizen): Rajesh Amilal.

Mr. Chairperson: Can you repeat again?

Mr. Amilal: Rajesh Amilal.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay. No. 24. Okay, go ahead, Mr. Muhar.

No, which number?

Mr. Amilal: One ninety-three.

Mr. Chairperson: Oh, you were already called, actually. No, you were—sorry, we didn't call you. So we'll just wait for—is Diwinder Randhawa here? Oh, he's in the parking lot, that's where. He's parking his car. *[interjection]* Okay, we'll do that.

Jaswinder Dhaliwal. No. 26. Mr. Dewal—Dehal. Go ahead.

Mr. Jaswinder Dhaliwal (Private Citizen): Hi, my name is Jaswinder Dhaliwal. I came to Canada three years ago for the better future, for the better life. I almost sold my assets in India for the better life.

Like, here in Canada, like—

Mr. Chairperson: Just want to make sure, if you move—speak into the mic, bring it closer to your mouth. Yes.

Mr. Jaswinder Dhaliwal: Like here, in Canada, like most of my friends, like, my relatives in the—in this field. Like in the cab business, so they recommend me and I like it.

I'm a quiet socialized person. That's why it works for me. I like to help, I like to serve. I have a handi-van and I love to—and I have a—regular customers like cancer, we can say, who are suffering from cancer or are handicapped. And I was really enjoying before this we can say Bill 30 or anything.

It's not an easy job as people think, because safety is the biggest matter in this field for the driver and the customer, too.

* (23:10)

I had a few incidents, like, not only me; other drivers. Like, punching, stabbing, or we can say robbing. A lot of my friends have injuries too. Recently, like, on Salter and Flora, there's a

7-Eleven, and my friend who was driving in the nighttime, he has, like, eight stitches in his head.

Sometimes I think to quit, but I can't because I invested a lot. My family depends on it. Not only my family, these—all peoples.

So I request to the committee: There's a big need of research on this matter to make a new steps, please. Hopefully, you will think about it, because every person matters. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much, Mr. Dhaliwal, and we'll start with questions by Mr. Lindsey.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you very much for coming out and thank you for your patience for being here. I know it's a long night.

In your opinion, will some of these ride-sharing things—Uber or Lyft—will it be safe for them? Will it make it safer for you as a traditional cab driver, or will it cause more hardship for yourselves?

Mr. Jaswinder Dhaliwal: Like, it's a big difference in Uber and like a cab industry. We are professionals. We had—we—I took, like all these guys took, like, training programs, for two weeks, like, for the rules and regulations, for geographically. We passed exams with 70 per cent marks. So I don't think so—like, you can't compare Uber with us.

Uber can drive anybody—anybody—or any ride-sharing like Lyft or anything can drive anybody. You have no need to be professional.

Like, while training, they train us how to help, how to serve, how to make quick routes—everything. Like, the ride-sharing, I think they follow the just an app, like, with a—they just look on the app, like, where they are going. Or—they have no need to—they have no pressure on their mind, like, because they don't know the customer service.

I know—a customer who is going with me, he's my responsibility. If he wants to, like, reach quickly to their destination, I can help him. But a ride-sharing can't, because they have to follow the app, the route which was given by the app.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Wharton has a question.

Mr. Wharton: Thank you, Mr. Dhaliwal, for sharing your story with the committee tonight. We appreciate you providing us with input, particularly around public safety and safety of yourself and your colleagues.

Just a further question on that. It sounds like there's been a lot of incidents, and you just started two years ago. Is that correct?

Floor Comment: Yes.

Mr. Wharton: It sounds like there's continued and still issues going on with concerns around safety, not only for your clients but yourself, too, and your colleagues. What would you suggest or is there any opportunity to look at enhancing that safety for you and, of course, your colleagues?

Mr. Jaswinder Dhaliwal: Yes, according to me, like, while training, they told us, like, how to use the, like, a panic button or everything. But I think the ride-sharing has nothing. They have just a phone or nothing but we have a panic button, we have a strobe light. So, we have the options.

Mr. Wharton: So just trying to find out if there's any other suggestions that you would have around enhancing the current safety with the strobe light, the panic buttons, the shields, the radio. Was there anything else that you and your colleagues have talked about as far as enhancing safety on a go forward?

Mr. Jaswinder Dhaliwal: Yes. It's not for, like, in the future, my daughter can drive, like, a ride-sharing and in any other city. So not in Winnipeg. All a way in the world, the safety is a big issue. So I recommend to the—to you guys also, please, every person matters. Please, think about it. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Well, thank you very much.

Sorry, Mr. Lindsey, the time of five minutes is up.

And want to thank you very much, Mr. Dhaliwal, for coming here today to present and answer these questions. Thank you very much.

Okay, the next presenter will—must be—No. 27, if they can come up. Mr. Harbans Takhar.

Mr. Takhar, do you have any material that you want to hand out?

Mr. Harbans Takhar (Private Citizen): No.

Mr. Chairperson: No. okay, Mr. Takhar, go ahead.

Mr. Takhar: Good evening to all of the respected members.

I am Harbans Takhar, residence of Winnipeg since 1978. Ten years I worked at Canadian Tool and Die and go I up to supervisor's job, and I did, for two

years. Then the boss called a slowdown and they laid off so many people. I was one of them.

Then I bought a few houses, fixed them and put them on rent. But rent collecting is not an easy job. After two years, I sold them and make a little bit money. In 1989, I got the taxi licence and bought a taxi in 1989.

One time, couple roll me; lucky they did not stab me. I scared and I sold my cab. I tried to find a job, but I could not because I have no professional papers.

After one year, I bought a cab again. Then, again, it happened that two people tried to stab me, and I saw the knife coming to my neck. I lucky I opened my door and rolled myself out of the car and the car go straight into the gas station fence and stuck there. But I get hurt. But, lucky, I saved myself.

* (23:20)

I sold the cab again. I worked very hard. It was very hard to make a living, driving the cab for somebody else. Then, again, about in 19–no–2008, I bought the cab, spending all my savings, \$430,000. And now I am a heart patient and retired person. I am 68. Two people driving for me, and they making their living and me too. And I got thinking to sell the cab, but there is no price now at all. Nobody likes to buy. And that is my—all savings there, so what I will do now? I was thinking I can do that money in my retirement in the old age. I did hard work, build honestly for the Manitoba. Please protect us.

The government like to bring Uber cab industry in the city. That will not good for the present cab industry and for the people's safety. The government like to put the cab industry under the City. I think they already did—from March 2018.

I don't know why they're doing that. If they did, I will like to bill them. If the City can control the industry—to control the City, there should be the same bylaws the taxi board have already, and they should—and create only that much numbers as the survey is done.

The laws should be approved by the court so nobody can do their own—to put how many cabs they like to put. If it's not going that way, then the government should compensate us not less than about \$400,000 each car. And then they can try the way they like, and—at the level cost and the level of all the rules and regulations, the cars should look as a

taxi, not anybody can start his car and go to make money as a taxi. But the—there should be decals on the car, there should be safety device, same like the surviving industry. The government is elected to protect the people, not to kill the small businesses.

So, again, I like to appeal the government and honourable, responsible people to think over again and again and give us justice with honesty. Don't take our rights away. I hope the best, and you will do it. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, we'll start with—thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Takhar.

We'll start with Mr. Lindsey, with a question.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you very much for coming out and sticking with us. I know you've been here for quite a while. You've talked about compensation, because what this bill does, really, is it destroys a lot of private business. And I'm told that there is a history in this province of governments doing that for other businesses when the government puts some things in place that really negatively impacted some business.

So do you think you should be treated the same as what has been done in the past? *[interjection]*

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Takhar, go ahead.

Mr. Takhar: Yes, I think if the government likes to go at the land or anything, they always give the over price than the—by the—this price. So, if they're not—they can't give us over price. Actually, taxi already sold for 535. So we are just demanding the request that if not 535, at least around 4,000 so we can live with that, and after that, if any kind of other industry comes in, we can compete. We are hard-working guys. Not all, but don't kill our savings, what we have and what we've spent and what so many people brought the money by selling their land from the back home. And I already told my story that what I had, the savings, I put in and now I have debt. How I can get back it? The other industry comes in, there will be shortage of drivers, and I am a heart patient. Then I have to go, because there will be no driving and nobody will make money and nobody will give me money. So what I can do? I have to push myself.

Mr. Chairperson: Ms. Lamoureux, do you—had any question? *[interjection]* Okay.

Mr. Lindsey.

Mr. Lindsey: Again, thank you for your answer. If there's another company that wants to start a cab

business, which, really, that's what Uber or Lyft—all these ride-sharing, they're cab companies, right. So, you believe that if they want to start a new company and compete with the existing companies, that, really, they should come in under the same rules and compete on a fair and equal basis that provides the same level of safety and security and all the rest of it?

Mr. Takhar: First off, my request is that the government should compensate us, because we will never get our money back. It's already going.

And then we can come in the competition—no doubt, because we have surviving industry and we did everything for the industry and the safety. As long as the camera came in from that time, lots of robbing or other kind of actions stopped. But still, once in a while, bad apple comes and it happens.

Mr. Maloway: And I want to thank you very much for very good presentation.

You know, Premier Schreyer, he's the third picture down, when he set up Autopac in 1971, there were a lot of insurance agents who were demonstrating against the government of the day and what the premier did was set up a fund of, I think, 1 and a half million dollars, \$2 million—today, around \$15 million—and offered all those insurance agents who did not want to sell Autopac, and there were a lot, they offered them compensation. So you have Manitoba government, just 1971, did the right thing and offered compensation to all the Manitoba insurance agents who did not want to sell Autopac or did not want a contract.

Now, don't you think that that was the right thing to do and that they should do the same thing now for your situation?

Mr. Takhar: Yes, same thing I am requesting and all other my fellows are requesting, that please give us a fair deal. Compensate us and after that, if you like to get them all the industry, if you think that way's justice, you can do it. Otherwise, leave us in the competition and let them come and don't put the number of cars—how many do you guys want only.

As the survey guys said, 50 cars or 25 cars, every [inaudible] or 20 cars, go that way. So that was request.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Takhar, thank you very much. Thanks for answering the questions, thanks for your presentation. Thanks for coming out for

tonight and we'll go on to the next speaker. Thank you.

* (23:30)

So next, No. 28, Balwinder Sidhu.

Mr. Sidhu, do you have any material that you want to pass out? No? Okay. Mr. Sidhu, go ahead.

Mr. Balwinder Sidhu (Private Citizen): Good evening, everybody. Let me start off by introducing myself. My name is Balwinder Sidhu and I am part of the Unicity Taxi industry.

I moved to Winnipeg back in January 2006, and I have been part of the taxi industry since September of 2006.

For a newcomer to Canada, it is a struggle to establish themselves. It takes a lot of hard work to become a fully trained taxi driver. There are lots of requirements that we have to meet, such as meeting all the licensing requirements, obtaining satisfactory criminal record check and Child Abuse Registry check, going through interviews, passing on—passing an English-language proficiency test and, finally, going through a training program.

I remember going to full-time work in a factory in the morning and coming home and work on achieving my taxi licence in the evening. It was a huge struggle for me and as well as my—for my family.

When I came to Canada, I invested all my life savings and provident funds and [inaudible] off my back in my country, from my job. And I—that I earned from back home to start a taxi business and to buy a taxi, which was—bought that in 2008, it was \$125,000 for a half share at that time.

This is not just my story, but hundreds of my other colleagues who are in this business with me. Most of us are the breadwinners in our households.

Manitoba's current taxi industry is highly based on great customer service. The following are few of the many goals that our taxi industry carries: providing best customer service, high security to customers, is easily accessible to Manitobans with low and same pricing, et cetera. However, if we talk about Uber, their main and only goal is to earn profit. The best example to prove this point up—this point is by looking at Uber's surge-pricing policy. We charge customers with the same fair price, no matter what the situation is, whether it is peak time, busy time, icy road, snowy, raining, et cetera, we charge the

same. Whereas, Uber do the surge price, taking advantage of people by charging them huge, unfair amounts for a basic taxi service at various peak times of their business. It will also negatively affect many Manitobans who don't—do not have credit cards due to various reasons.

As per my information, Uber is starting air taxis too. In other countries, like, Dubai and US—something like that.

Now, my question is to you: Is in future, would you allow Uber to bring in—bring their air taxis in Manitoba too? The answer will be absolutely no. Why? Because bigger companies like Air Canada invest here. It will never allow this to happen.

We all believe that Bill 30 is being pushed on us, just because of the fact that the taxi industry is dominantly owned, run by visible minorities. On one hand, Manitoba government promotes employment for designated groups, including visible minorities, encouraging them to apply for jobs. On the other hand, in this situation, the government is taking away own—taking away our already well-established businesses. This is not fair; it is contradictory.

Uber will not be benefit to common Manitobans, including taxi industry nor Manitoba government, as it is the US-based company, which means money is going outside Canada rather than staying inside.

To conclude my points, all we are asking is to be able to have money to fulfill the basic needs of our families, which is everyone's right. In behalf of all my colleagues, we oppose Bill 30. If Uber comes to Manitoba, it will be unfair to all Manitobans, as our taxi's first priority is to provide best customer service, with all-equipped taxis, including installed security cameras, taking care of passengers' liability by paying more than \$10,000 as insurance; whereas, Uber works like any other regular car running on the road, compromising with customers' security and liability.

I would like to thank you all for listening to our concerns. Hope our invested time and money will pay off and Manitoba government will understand our issues.

I also hope that all of our life investments will be secured and will not be wiped out. Thanks very much.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Sidhu, for your presentation, and we'll start with Mr. Lindsey, and then we'll go on to Mr. Saran.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you very much for coming out and talking to us tonight and thanks for sticking with us. Sometimes democracy takes a long time to happen, but, hopefully, between yourself and the other presenters, the government will begin to listen to really what you're saying, that by destroying your industry, by destroying your livelihood, you're really doing more harm than people think that bringing this Uber in will save them some money. But, at the end of the day, you pay taxes, and, if your business is destroyed, you're not paying taxes anymore. Is that fair that that's really what's going to happen here?

Mr. Sidhu: Of course, if our business will go away, right, there's no income. We will—there's less income and we will pay less taxes, that—like, loss of government, too, includes our families, our children, everybody, our community. So it's big—like, big loss of our industry.

Mr. Lindsey: The reason I ask that kind of question is sometimes our friends opposite understand if it affects their bottom line. So, if it affects the government's bottom line, that there's less revenue coming into the government, which clearly there will be if Uber or someone, other ride-sharing company, comes in and undercuts the entire industry, puts hard-working, tax-paying citizens out of work or lessens the amount of income they can earn, then clearly the government is going to earn less money too.

So that's really where I'm trying to help point to these guys, that they're cutting off their own source of income in the process of destroying your income. So is that a fair statement?

Mr. Sidhu: There's another option is, like, I can say, like, compensate. Compensate our loss and, No. 2, Uber can't compare with—Uber can't come, like, what as we do in our business. Like, all the efficient workers here, right, all the drivers are fully trained, everything. And there are all the—people already told you, like, there are many. A simple man, a simple driver kind of like, will dream, like, drive the Uber, right. So there will be many—they will create many problems, in our community, in our city. So it's the lost of all of, like, of our industry, right.

So do—we don't want to destroy our business and destroy our industry. So there are many solutions, so I'd request all you guys, respected guys, so you can take solution, like, you can consult our industry. So, after that, there are many solutions. So every—any—everything can be solved, right. There are many

problems, so everything can be solved. But you should consult our industry too.

Mr. Mohinder Saran: Yes, thank you, Mr. Sidhu, for coming over here.

Actually, I wrote letter to premier; I'd been—when this started and, like, copied to some of the ministers. And I also provided a solution—solution is that: Let it go on supply and demand. And what you do, either if Uber or doesn't matter which company comes, either they can buy ongoing price from the market, or they can buy from the taxi board on the ongoing price. And after a year, you can, again, adjust the price after year.

* (23:40)

So, in that way, government will be making money as well. And also, the price will be stabilized.

And I hope premier or minister, they'll listen about it and instead of destroying so many people's livelihood. And I'll do it that we can—it's hard to say—I don't want to say it's a discrimination, but anyway, it is, because this community is being attacked and people are just listening, but they are not really thinking about it. I hope the government think about that: that's really devastating for the whole community.

What do you think about that?

Mr. Sidhu: Yes, this is the best solution to save our industry, too, and the government can—like earn millions and millions—billions of dollars if government think about this, like, good suggestion and of our industry also, the—can save. Like, our business is also saved, prices also can be, like, saved as it is, right. And the government can earn the money, and they can put some other plates—this is also a solution, right. And they can earn the money, they put—like, sell, like, set price, like \$200,000, \$250,000, \$300,000; something like that. And government can earn the money and issue the plates. And they can solve this matter.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Sidhu. The—I guess the five minutes is up for questions, and thank you very much for your presentation, and thanks for coming out tonight.

Okay, before we continue, I would like to inform the committee that since this is our third evening, that this committee has met to consider this—the bill. No further registrations are accepted after midnight, pursuant of rule 92.6.

Okay, so we'll go on to the next presenter. No. 29, Chashan Toor. Chashan Toor? Okay, so we'll put this person—individual down to the bottom of the list.

And the next person, No. 30, Sewa Gill. Sewa Gill? Not here? Okay, we'll put that person down to the bottom.

And the next person is No. 31, Baljinder Fran [*phonetic*]. Baljinder Fran [*phonetic*]. Mr. Fran, do you have any materials to hand out? Okay, Mr. Fran [*phonetic*], you can proceed with your presentation.

Mr. Baljinder Sran (Private Citizen): Hi. Good evening, honourable committee. Thanks for having me here.

My name is Baljinder Sran; it's not Fran [*phonetic*]. So I would like to correct you all on the last name.

Mr. Chairperson: How is it spelled? Can you—

Mr. Sran: S-r-a-n.

Mr. Chairperson: S-r-a-n. Okay.

Mr. Sran: Yes, sir. Okay, so I want to talk about—

Mr. Chairperson: Sorry, Mr. Sran. Okay. Go ahead.

Mr. Sran: Okay. Sorry.

I want to talk to you guys about where we—who we are, the people that are driving taxis, the owners, the drivers, our story. Many of us are immigrants to Canada. We came here for a better future for ourselves and our families. You'll—you probably heard a lot of us invested money in taxi industry. Some of us brought the money from back home, selling our properties back home, so that we can have a better life here.

Some people came—even came as business immigrants to invest in the taxi industry that others have invested, mortgages their houses by taking out loans. That's how you build a small business like a taxi. But there's another thing you may not realize; just ask our drivers that are people in the taxi industry that are driving taxis, who came from back home that are doctors, lawyers, engineers and other professionals. Why they are driving taxi? Because in many cases, they're unable to get their professional qualifications recognized. Some of—are eventually successful; we have doctors in the city who started out in Canada as taxi drivers.

This is something else. As well, taxi industry has been stepping stone for many of people who are

newly immigrant to Canada. It helped many of us bring in family members over, people from our community back home.

Here in Manitoba, we are proud now that we have a growing population. Much of that comes from immigration. The taxi industry is a classic example of why we are having that kind of growth.

What is going to happen now? What type of message does it send about taxis to other potential investors in anything in the province if government is just going to wash out their hands like this?

If you can take away our rights as a taxi owners, if you can prevent us from having any opportunity to go to court to ask that we be recognized as having an 'propriation' move that will destroy our investment, what message does it send out? What message does it send to other potential future immigrants?

Canada has the reputation as a country where there is the rule of law, a country in which the government cannot just do what they please. So what are you doing to the taxis? What is the rule of law? You won't even allow us to go to court to argue our case; that is shameful.

If you are not concerned about the impact on immigrants, what about on other Canadians? If you can do this to taxis today, who's next? Business owners, farmers, individuals that own land or property? What if—I find very surprising in this—in that it's a Conservative government that is doing this. I've been told that when you were in opposition, you talked a lot about the property rights of farmers having their land by Manitoba Hydro. They, of course, had compensation, but you felt that the process was unfair. Perhaps there wasn't enough compensation, so what are you doing now you are in government? You are a Conservative government that talked about property and illegal rights before and is now taking away our rights, our property rights, our legal rights.

Does anyone believe that if we were a group of farmers with a dairy or fisher with a licence that would be in this situation? I personally not want to seek compensation. I want a taxi system it is fair to me and other people who are invested in this interest that doesn't wipe our whole value.

I would rather be in a position to sell my licence at some point in time and at least get back what I invested. I would like to be in a position to do that, so I—so that I can have a pension when I retire. But

you are talking—taking all my rights away from me. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Sran.

Ready for questions? And Mr. Lindsey has the first one.

Mr. Lindsey: I thank you for that. That's a very good presentation that you put on, and I thank you for sticking with us.

So, really, in your opinion, the best thing to do would be to scrap this bill all together. But, if the government won't do that, at the very least they should pay you compensation for the loss that you surely going to encounter.

Mr. Sran: Sure. At least they can amend it if they don't want to withdraw it. It's security fee—let's about—talk about security. Where are we taking our future about the security?

If we are bringing in technology, ride-sharing and all that kind of stuff, tomorrow my kids, your kids will be taking those ride-sharing services too, right? So where is the safety?

You are driving down the street, there's no decals, no shields, no camera. You don't know if it's a private vehicle or if it's a for-hire. In a taxi, there is a particular signs, taxi signs, strobe lights and the other kinds of features. So, of course, if government's washing their hands, at least what they can do is either amend or compensate.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you for that. That really sums it up very nicely that it should be about the safety of the taxi driver, the safety of the passenger. But, if the government won't listen to that, at the very least they should be able to do is compensate the taxi drivers for what they are going to lose.

But, just on that safety issue, it costs money to have cameras and strobe lights and all the things that are incorporated in your cabs.

* (23:50)

So, if the point of things like Uber is to undercut you and come in and just anybody with a car can be an Uber driver, does that not eventually lead to the existing cab company saying, well, why would I have all this stuff if nobody else has, to which, really, then, is going to—in the interest of saving money—put everybody's safety at risk?

Mr. Sran: That's not going to be fair. Even if Uber doesn't have the camera, I would recommend to have

the camera, shield and all, because it's important for my own safety, for the customers' safety.

So it's not—everything's not about the money, right. So I wouldn't—even if you have to spend a couple of hundred dollars to get all those equipment, I will still go for it.

Mr. Isleifson: Mr. Sran, thank you for your presentation.

I've been here for all three nights of this presentation going on, and I've heard a lot of speculation about what is going to happen when Uber comes in and all this—so it is—unless you have—unless people have documentation from the City of what they would do if this bill is passed, it is all speculation.

So my question for you, I want to speculate the other way. What if the City calls us tomorrow, and says, everything is going to stay absolutely the same. Nothing will change. Would that change your view on Bill 30?

Mr. Sran: I will be more than happy to bring the Bill 30 with the way—if it's going to be same as taxi industry as is, if it passes as is, and whatever the security features we have in the industry, and now, if it comes in that way, I'll be more than happy to welcome it.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Allum.

Mr. Allum: Just waving my hand at you, just so—just to get your attention.

The interesting thing is, my friend says, well, you—we don't know what the City is going to do, and that's part of the—biggest part of the problem on this bill is that it doesn't set out what the City needs to do in order to protect your industry and also to generate competition if that's exactly what they're after. You said, on a few occasions here, you feel like the government's washing their hands of your own business, there. Could you just explain that a little bit?

Mr. Sran: Oh yes, definitely. Well, first of all, it says we can't sue the government, or we can't get compensation. So that's—first of all, that's the thing, right.

In Bill 30, there's nothing mentioned that—either it's going to be the way it is right now. If the bill passes, either the City's going to keep it the way it is right now, or they're going to change it. We don't know. So that's washing hand, too, right.

So, if you want to pass the bill, at least make some amendments. Be fair with everybody. That's it.

Mr. Allum: Yes, then, that's it. I mean, I think that from our point of view, having heard the testimony of so many presenters, it's a—the first option is ditch this bill. Its section—second option ought to be, if they're not going to ditch the bill, then there should be a proper compensation, or else all that investment that you put into this business to feed your family, make a life for yourself here in Winnipeg, in Manitoba—and I'm so glad you have, by the way—that'll all be down the drain. Is that kind of what you're telling us tonight?

Mr. Sran: Absolutely right. That's what's going to happen. If the bill's going to pass what it is right now, we don't know what our future is. That is what's going to happen.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Sran. That's—concludes the five minutes of question time and just—thank you very much for your presentation and coming out tonight.

Before we continue, I would—want to read this—I would like to remind all members of the committee that their pursuit of rules—a standing committee meeting to be considered a bill must not sit past midnight to hear public presentations or consider clause by clause the bill except for unanimous consent of the committee.

So where do you guys want to—what does the committee want to do?

Mr. Isleifson: I just wondered if we could seek leave to seek the committee to call it 12 o'clock and have the committee rise.

Mr. Chairperson: Is it agreed that—for the committee to call it 12 o'clock? *[Agreed]*

And so the committee rises. It's 12 o'clock.

COMMITTEE ROSE AT: 11:54 p.m.

The Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Debates and Proceedings
are also available on the Internet at the following address:

<http://www.gov.mb.ca/legislature/hansard/hansard.html>