

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

Chairpersons
Mr. Dennis Smook
Constituency of La Verendrye;
Mrs. Sarah Guillemard
Constituency of Fort Richmond

Vol. LXX No. 11 - 10 a.m., Friday, October 27, 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

Friday, October 27, 2017

TIME – 10 a.m.

LOCATION – Winnipeg, Manitoba

CHAIRPERSON – Mr. Dennis Smook (La Verendrye); Mrs. Sarah Guillemard (Fort Richmond) at 5:15 p.m.

VICE-CHAIRPERSON – Mr. Reg Helwer (Brandon West); Mr. Wayne Ewasko (Lac du Bonnet) at 5:14 p.m.

ATTENDANCE – 11 QUORUM – 6

Members of the Committee present:

Hon. Mrs. Cox, Hon. Mr. Wharton

Mr. Helwer, Ms. Lamoureux, Mr. Maloway, Ms. Marcelino, Mrs. Mayer, Messrs. Micklefield, Smith, Smook, Wiebe

Substitutions:

*Mr. Swan for Mr. Wiebe at 1:34 p.m.
 Mr. Johnson for Mr. Smith at 1:34 p.m.
 Mr. Bindle for Mr. Johnson at 2:22 p.m.
 Mr. Allum for Ms. Marcelino at 2:22 p.m.
 Mr. Smith for Mr. Bindle at 4:43 p.m.
 Mr. Ewasko for Mr. Helwer at 5:12 p.m.
 Mr. Johnston for Mr. Micklefield at 5:12 p.m.
 Mr. Lagimodiere for Mr. Smith at 5:12 p.m.
 Mr. Lagassé for Mrs. Mayer at 5:12 p.m.
 Mrs. Guillemard for Mr. Smook at 5:14 p.m.
 Hon. Mr. Cullen for Hon. Mrs. Cox at 5:14 p.m.
 Mr. Lindsey for Mr. Swan at 5:33 p.m.
 Mr. Selinger for Mr. Allum at 6:20 p.m.*

APPEARING:

*Mr. Nic Curry, MLA for Kildonan
 Mr. Wayne Ewasko, MLA for Lac du Bonnet
 Ms. Nahanni Fontaine, MLA for St. Johns
 Mr. Mohinder Saran, MLA for The Maples
 Mr. Andrew Swan, MLA for Minto
 Hon. Heather Stefanson, MLA for Tuxedo
 Mr. Blair Yakimoski, MLA for Transcona*

PUBLIC PRESENTERS:

*Mr. Rupinder Brar, private citizen
 Mr. Kulgit Brar, private citizen
 Mr. Daljinder Chahal, private citizen
 Mr. Yadwinder Sabioura, private citizen*

*Mr. Manjit Panesar, private citizen
 Mr. Lachhman Dhaliwal, private citizen
 Mr. Hardeep Mangat, private citizen
 Mr. Rupinder Mann, private citizen
 Mr. Sukwinder Dhaliwal, private citizen
 Mr. Beant Kindra, private citizen
 Mr. Kewal Brar, private citizen
 Mr. Gurmail Mangat, private citizen
 Mr. Pamjeet Grewal, private citizen
 Mr. Ram Valeluru, private citizen
 Mr. Jaspal Singh, private citizen
 Mr. Scott McFadyen, Winnipeg Community Taxi Coalition
 Mr. Harprit Jammu, private citizen
 Ms. Ruby Bains, on behalf of Mr. Harpreet Bains, private citizen
 Ms. Ruby Bains, on behalf of Mr. Upkar Bains, private citizen
 Mr. Sukhjiwan Sidhu, private citizen
 Ms. Ruby Bains, on behalf of Mr. Salwinder Phind, private citizen
 Mr. Jaspal Bedi, on behalf of Mr. Satwinder Singh, private citizen
 Mr. Richhpal Singh, private citizen
 Mr. Satvir Brar, private citizen
 Mr. Herman Sodhi, private citizen
 Mr. Jaswant Gill, private citizen
 Mr. Gurminder Hunjan, private citizen
 Mr. Yegzaw Berhane, private citizen
 Mr. Karamoit Kensray, private citizen
 Mr. Diwinder Randhawa, private citizen
 Mr. Rajwant Randhawa, private citizen
 Mr. Balwinder Mann, private citizen
 Mr. Pardeep Chopra, private citizen
 Mr. Prabhdeep Singh, private citizen
 Mr. Harpreet Dhillon, private citizen
 Ms. Varinder Ghuman, private citizen
 Mr. Solomon Derzie, private citizen
 Ms. Sonam Khosa, on behalf of Mr. Gatar Khosa, private citizen
 Mr. Harinder Maan, private citizen
 Mr. Gurmail Gill, private citizen
 Mr. Kaur Sidhu, on behalf of Mr. Baljinder Chahal, private citizen
 Ms. Komalpreet Sangha, private citizen
 Mr. Harbans Brar, private citizen
 Mr. Harvinder Singh, private citizen*

Mr. Gemil Petros, private citizen
Mr. Gurmeet Brar, on behalf of Mr. Jadtar Brar, private citizen
Mr. Vhegwamp Dhaliwal, private citizen
Mr. Amitoj Gill, private citizen
Mr. Tsegai Golom, private citizen
Mr. Jagjit Deol, private citizen
Mr. Joban Brar, on behalf of Mr. Harvinder Brar, private citizen
Mr. Rajesh Amilal, private citizen
Mr. Gurpreet Singh, private citizen
Mr. Gurshvinder Singh Dhillon, on behalf of Mr. Guriqbal Dhillon, private citizen
Mr. Buta Sandhu, private citizen
Mr. Narinder Chahal, private citizen

WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS:

Subhdeep Singh Sidhu, private citizen

MATTERS UNDER CONSIDERATION:

Bill 30—The Local Vehicles for Hire Act

* * *

Clerk Assistant (Ms. Monique Grenier): Good morning. Will the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development please come to order.

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

Mr. Reg Helwer (Brandon West): Madam Chair, I nominate Mr. Smook.

Clerk Assistant: Mr. Smook has been nominated. Are there any other nominations?

Hearing no other nominations, Mr. Smook, will you please take the Chair.

Mr. Chairperson: Good morning. The next item of business is the election of a Vice-Chairperson. Are there any nominations for this position?

Mrs. Colleen Mayer (St. Vital): I nominate Reg Helwer.

Mr. Chairperson: Are there any other nominations? Hearing no other—oh, Mr. Helwer has been nominated. Are there any other nominations?

Hearing no other nominations, Mr. Helwer is elected Vice-Chairperson.

Mr. Maloway—[interjection]—oh.

This meeting has been called to continue consideration of Bill 30, The Local Vehicles for Hire Act.

I would like to remind all of you in attendance today that the Standing Committee on Social and Economic Development will meet again to consider Bill 30, if necessary, on Tuesday, October 31st, at 6 p.m.

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

Public presentation guidelines: before we proceed with presentations, we do have a number of other items and points of information to consider.

* (10:10)

First of all, if there is anyone else in the audience who would like to make a presentation today, please register with the—[interjection]

In according—in accordance with our rules, we are no longer taking registrations for this bill as it was, I guess, yesterday was the last day for that.

Also, for your information, of all presenters, while written versions of presentations are not required, if you are going to accompany your presentation with written materials, we ask that you provide 20 copies. If you need help with photocopying, please speak with our staff.

As well, in accordance with our rules, a time limit of 10 minutes has been allotted for presentations, with another five minutes allowed for questions from committee members.

If a presenter is not in attendance when 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.

Speaking in committee: prior to proceeding with public presentations, I would like to advise members of the public regarding the process for speaking in committee. The proceedings of our meeting are recorded in order to provide a verbatim transcript. Each time someone wishes to speak, whether it be an MLA or a presenter, I first have to say the person's name. This is the signal for the Hansard recorder to turn the mics on and off.

Thank you for your patience.

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood): I have a motion.

I move that this committee—for this committee, any presenter be permitted to have a person of their choice translate their presentation into English. This is the practice that we've adopted for each of the previous three meetings.

Mr. Chairperson: It has been moved by Mr. Maloway that this committee—that for this committee, any presenter be permitted to have a person of their choice translate their presentation into English.

The motion is in order.

Any questions?

Does the committee agree to this? *[Agreed]*

And the motion has been passed.

Bill 30—The Local Vehicles for Hire Act

Mr. Chairperson: We will now proceed with presentations.

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood): I wonder if we could have agreement from the committee to allow No. 10 on our list, Mr. Rupinder Brar. He has to go back to work on some emergency basis, so he would like to present first, then leave, if possible. *Agreed?*

Mr. Chairperson: It has been asked for presenter No. 10 to present first.

Is that in agreement with the committee? *[Agreed]*

The—No. 10, Rupinder *[phonetic]* Brar.

I will now call on Rupinder *[phonetic]* Brar.

Do you have any written materials for distribution to the committee?

Mr. Rupinder Brar (Private Citizen): No, I don't have any written ones.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed with your presentation.

Mr. Rupinder Brar: Sure, thank you. Thanks for all the committee.

So I don't have enough speech to talk about that. I have some issues, whatever, I want to just raise in this committee.

So, firstly, I want to talk about myself. So I came here in 2006, in this city, as a PR immigrant from India. So, when I came here, I got two masters degrees from India and which is I'm just trying to

find a job over here, according to me, but I didn't because there's no work around here. So then I decided to get a licence to drive something or earn, you know, something. So then I got a class 5, 4, whatever the requirements that time we had to for, like, taxi, and then I bought a taxi licence. And I drove three years as a taxi driver. And I earn money, and I get some money, like, you know, for buying a house. So I bought a house that time. I don't remember, that it was 2009, around there. And that time, I was still a driver. So when I'm driving someone, so I'm not, you know, satisfied for that, and still I'm finding a job such as according to my degrees. So there is a—no job over here.

So then I decided to buy a cab. But I don't have money, what I going to do? So then I decide to—sold my house and get a job over here. And I sold the house, and that time, prices gone high and I get money from there. And secondly, then I, like, find another financial for the taxi, because that time taxi prices around \$5 million—or not \$5 million, sorry, half a million, I'm sorry say. So then I find a guy who going to sign me and give me a full loan that's, like, hundred—like, you know, \$100,000. And anyway, I get a cab. So that time, I drove and still I got a loan on that. I have papers on for that. And still I'm owing \$83,000 from the bank. Still I'm paying, from that time to until today. I didn't paid that. And still I don't have a house. I don't have a house because, if I have money, then I going to buy a house. But I don't have a house.

And I'm just thinking, now I'm planning, just free my cab, and then I going to plan to buy a house. But now, suddenly, this going to be, like, you know, happen, and the bill going to be, like, you know, on the committee, Bill 30, and our price is going to down. It's now on zero almost. Because if I want to sell my cab, that's nothing. Nobody want to buy that. Why? Because the reason, Bill 30. Nobody knows what's going to happen next. I don't know either what's going to happen next. Somehow, like, they are talking about Uber or Lyft, right? So we don't mind if anybody want to come over here, I don't mind to do.

But the reason is, why the City want that? The first question. And, second, if anybody want to serve in the city, so why they have a different guideline providing for them, not for us? Why they are not following the same taxi guidelines? Why we need to demolish the Taxicab Board, which is more than 75 years in Manitoba? Why we need to demolish that? Why now? Because the reason, they want Uber.

Because the Taxicab Board require if anybody want to come over here they have to follow the taxi guidelines, which is everybody following. In this city, everything, like Spring, Unicity, handi-cabs, whatever. I think—I don't have exact numbers, but I think it's around 700. Seven hundred. If the 700 cabs or handi-cabs or whatever, anyone's, are following that same guideline, why not for Ubers? That's our requirement.

If anybody want to come over here, they can come any time. They can do a business, whatever, because this is a city, right? We can't stop to anybody. We can't stop to anybody to do a business. But—but—they have to follow us, like, guideline, same guideline. Why we are changing the all guidelines now? Why? Why not for us? Like, suppose, in these days, I paid \$10,300 insurance for my cab for \$5-million coverage for passengers. Why I'm paying that? If anybody come, Uber and Lyft want to come over here and they are doing the same thing what we are doing on the, like, the same amount and same, like that—sorry—\$1,800 or whatever the regular insurance is that, if they are doing the same thing on \$1,800 and we are doing on \$10,300, what's the difference? Why we are paying? Because we are cabbies, that's why? We spend our half-million dollars, that's why? We are living over here more than 18, like you—like, 10 or 18 years, whatever the—our, like, you know, members are over here, so more than 18 years, 30 years. I heard, like, last year—last night, like, some guy said we are over here 30 years in this cab business. And what they get? Nothing? Zero?

* (10:20)

Some have a, like, loan, on a house. Why they got—like, firstly they got a house, then they got a loan, like, loan from them, and then they free, like, you know, buy a cab. The last cab was 550—something like that.

Last night somebody asked a question, why that cab is over here 500 or, like, 400. You don't need to ask us. You have to ask from the taxi board or from the last government, why they authorized that. If they know that cab is \$10 or \$100 or whatever, \$30, like, you know—so when we are buying—okay, so I have some papers—I don't have copies of that. Okay, so this is my bill of sale, if anybody want to see, and I show you.

Mr. Chairperson: No. It has personal information on it. We cannot accept that. Like, you just continue on with your presentation.

Mr. Rupinder Brar: Okay, sorry, yes. So, I just, like, show you, I bought a cab in half share, 227, half share, which is I still paying. So, same as me, lots of people still owning our own.

And, when Uber or Lyft are coming over here, right, so suppose if we are earning \$5,000, so we are not earning that much. We're not earning that much. How are we going to pay our loans? Then what? What are we going to do next?

We are in depression. Our families are in a depression. That's the point going to next. I saw lots of people who have two or three cabs. They are still depression because, in these days, we are put more than 100 cabs as a [inaudible] and we are not find, like, driver, for whole cabs because the reason is everybody afraid.

Driver, either. Either driver is also afraid because they don't want to drive. They said if we are, like, in a, like, you know, if we get a cab, so if Uber want to come, how are we going get money? How we earn the money? Everybody. Me either.

So, still, one guy driving 18 hours, 12 hours, for what? For serve the people. You're going to see my cab is standing over there. People still waiting, and we try to do our best, but we can't do. But, like, lots of people have complaints in rush hours, moreover complaints in the rush hours. We are not serving. How are we going to serve?

If I complete my one trip—my one trip in 10 minutes, from downtown to airport, in rush hours I can't because the reason everybody, like, everywhere is backed up.

The stupid, like, the plan, whatever—I don't know who did it—sorry to say that's stupid, but who did it, the planning of the city. I'm living here, I told you, more than 10 years, same satellite, same setting, nobody want to change, but that time is—

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Brar, your 10 minutes for your presentation has expired, so we will now move into questions.

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

Last night, and I think you said you were here, I do recall, for the first time in our three days of presentations now, 120 people, a total of three people, the first gentleman said that he was at a Conservative fundraiser in 2016 before the election and he was told specifically, by the Premier (Mr. Pallister) himself, that there would be no—

nothing to fear from Uber and that if it were to happen, there would be a level playing field. To me that's a promise made, and this would be a promise broken.

Then two of the other presenters last night spoke about another Conservative—I don't know if it was a fundraiser, but dinner somewhere, and named a bunch of MLAs who were there, and the Premier (Mr. Pallister), and he said—both of the people said—that the Premier there, too, made a solemn before the election that if elected he was not going to do bad things to the cab industry. He was—if he did anything, it was going to be a level playing field.

And—have you heard these stories as well—

Floor Comment: Yes.

Mr. Maloway: —or were you at any of these meetings? *[interjection]*

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Brar, you can't speak until I recognize you so that it'll get into Hansard. Like, you have to wait 'til I recognize you before you start.

Mr. Rupinder Brar: Yes. Sorry.

So there's like—my friend, his name is Kaur Sidhu, who's—like, run for PC in The Maples area this time. And, unfortunately, he, like, you know, didn't win. But he also promised with our community we are playing a level field game, right.

And I also, that time—whatever, the royal—I think, royal buffet, whatever, on Pembina, and the Premier and lots of the MLAs who's in, like, you know, PC 'parby'—party, whatever, and I was there too. That time, they also promised with us the level played game.

That's what we want now. That's what I explained to you already. If we are paying \$10,000, why they are working on \$1,800? They should do same as what we are paying. This is a level playing game. Yes, and—

Mr. Nic Curry (Kildonan): Thank you so much, Mr. Brar, for coming here, sharing your stories. I know you've mentioned it twice—I am really interested though—your background. You said you had some advanced education. I wonder if you would mind telling us what your degrees are in and where you received those degrees.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Brar.

Mr. Rupinder Brar: I am sorry. Yes.

So I have one master degree in my language, which is Punjabi, and one, I have a master degree in information technology. That's MS-CIT from India, university of—like, you know—from there, so I got two master degrees. And when I came over here and I given a, like, IELTS test, which is I have seven bands, each of them speaking, listening, writing, reading, whatever, on the requirements of the PNP. And after that, I told you already my story, and then get a job over here.

Mr. Wayne Ewasko (Lac du Bonnet): I'm interested in some of your—and thank you for coming to present to us today. I know you're busy, as many people are.

So you talked about a level playing field, and I'm trying to understand what you would see as a level playing field.

Mr. Rupinder Brar: Yes, so, I already explained. Level playing field is my—I mean to say they have to follow the same guidelines what we are following, whatever, Uber, Lyft, whatever, who want to come. We don't mind to that. But they have to do whatever we are paying. This is what I mean. That's what I mean of level playing—yes.

Mr. Reg Helwer (Brandon West): So, thank you for that. Now, would it not be a level playing field for you to follow what they are doing?

Mr. Rupinder Brar: I mean to say level playing means, like, we are paying \$10,300, I told you, right? We have a camera; we have a shield; we have a, like, office over here. Like, we have a complaint—like, you know, system if somebody have a complaint regarding us or somebody else, so they going to go there and get a written, and we are taking action as soon as we can. Our manager, our ever able staff's over here.

So, I won't—like, if anybody want to come with—like, the Unicity have office over here. Spring have office over here, Blueline. So, all companies working over here, they have the same guidelines, same, like, you know, offices over here, whatever. Like, you know, they want to—like, any area, whatever. So, that's what I mean. Like, if the Uber want to come over here—so, they have to put strobe lights; they have to put whatever, like, you know—like, if—firstly, I've tried to, like, remove this bill, because the reason is I already explained you. I know you guys decided—you know, it's easy to decide over here, right?

* (10:30)

So, I don't know, like, if you decided Uber is come, so I can't stop, right, because you guys, like, you know, have a—

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Brar, our time for questions has expired, but I will allow Mr. Wiebe to ask his question and a short response from you.

Mr. Matt Wiebe (Concordia): Actually, Mr. Chair, I'll defer to my colleague from Elmwood, because I think he—a question has come up since the conversation based on something that Mr. Brar said. So if that's okay with the committee just a quick question from Mr. Maloway.

Mr. Maloway: Mr. Brar, back to this meeting with the—where the Premier (Mr. Pallister) was at the dinner and other meetings with the Premier and Conservative MLAs. I gather at no time were you told that they would introduce a bill in the Legislature which bans any compensation, which by the way you know is—in Australia there is compensation. You were never told they were going to have no compensation, they were going to confiscate your business, and they were going to throw you to the City and let you compete against Uber, who has all sorts of advantage. Were you ever told that that was going to happen to you?

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Brar we're way over time. I will allow you a short response to that.

Mr. Rupinder Brar: Can you give me two—like two minutes just for answer this one.

Okay. So, yes, like, if we get compensation, like, so we don't mind to that. Like, you know, get that one, right? So we paid our whatever I showed you I have, like, you know, loan, whatever. But what about after that? What about after that? If we don't have a business how are we going to survive that? So—

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for your—does the committee agree to let Mr. Brar finish his—
[Agreed]

Mr. Rupinder Brar: Like, according to sir he said, like, you know, in Australia or somewhere, right, they give us some money, right. But after I getting the money what going to happen everybody knows. So according to Bill 30, sir showed us, right, but there's nothing mentioned over there how many cabs or how many Ubers or how many they going to put over here. Nothing. They open it. So it means anybody can come over here and do a business? How we going to earn if, like, we have 750 cabs over here

and 1,000 people working there. If the 1,000 cabs is going to be come over here—

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Brar, this is already not responding to the question. We thank you very much for the presentation.

And, before we move on to the next presenter, I'd just like to inform everybody in the audience that, if you look at your list of presenters, there's a number coming up in front of us with marks in front of them like a plus sign. That means that these presenters have been called once, so they have been moved to the bottom of the list and we will not go to those ones with the plus signs in front of them 'til we have heard all the other presenters. So, basically—who haven't been heard yet. So, after presenter No. 2 then we will be moving up to presenter No. 25.

Thank you very much, and I will now call on Daljinder Chahal. Darjinder [phonetic] Chahal?

Oh, sorry, sorry. Kulgit Brar. Kulgit Brar.
[interjection]

Just—I have to recognize you.

Also, I'd like to remind the audience that anybody who has a phone, please put it to silent, because when it rings it disturbs the—whoever, it doesn't matter who it is. Thank you.

Mr. Brar, do you have a written presentation for us?

Mr. Kulgit Brar (Private Citizen): No. I just speaking.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed with your verbal presentation when you are ready. Thank you.

Mr. Kulgit Brar: So, good morning, so, both MLAs both parties. So, thank you for giving me the time.

So my name is Kulgit Brar. So I live in Canada in the 15 years with my dad and my family. So I, 10 years working in this cab industry.

So I have just a couple of points: Bill 30 and my job and MPI.

So, like, I buy in the cab 10 years ago. I working, me and my dad. So last year I meet a couple of MLAs, like, Bill 30. I—we questioned the Premier in The Forks. So Premier promised me, I don't give the hard time for the—this industry. But like, when I now, I see Bill 30 hit very hard for the—me and my job and my family. You know, Bill 30, section 10, you say you are good, will you—hero. So this very hard for our families. So I have still a loan

and credit line, this my house. So, what do you do in life in the future, you bring in the other companies? So, what do you do with my job? So I working every day, 10, 12 hours, and my dad working too, and I have that to apply in the weekend, so, one cab, like, whole family working. So if in the—you guys bringing the couple more cabs like a share-a-ride other one, so how in the—this one cab working for families? And second one—this—my cab now, this MPI charging like an association, like, \$10,300, plus in the dispatch we use, plus in the safety, plus in the repairs.

So this very hard for give the, like, a share riding. I'm not against doing the share riding, but, like, having the same fee, same rules, they're welcome to the share rider. Like last year, some MLA told me, don't worry, you level playing the field. But this not level playing the field.

Other one, like city—when in the rush hour, don't provide in the diamond lane and no give the parking downtown area. I remember one time, I picked up the customer in the Portage, like, around in the rush hour, 3 o'clock, and city inspector gave me that—issued the ticket. So what do you do? Then people said, no cabs in the rush hour. So other one, Unicity, Duffy, not have the loss of business. Unicity, Duffy buy the business, like airport. I pick up one customer, I pay the \$2. If I pick up the customer in the downtown hotel, I pay the parking. Every hotel, Unicity have to pay. Other one, nobody give the free pickup. So you guys bring the free some ride here, you pick up the customer.

And some—like, you have Bill 30. You had your licence cancelled. I don't know which licence cancelled, like business licence cancelled, drivers licence cancelled. So this very hard for the—this industry this time. So I requesting the—please stop, like, Bill 30. Like, other one, city have the—like, seasonal car. Wintertime, like summertime, taxi industry, you see the parking lot waiting too, too hours, no traffic coming, nobody calling. Like wintertime, little busy, but seasonal car, all are report in and now in the 150 car already road.

*(10:40)

So, like, sometimes, like, I play in the North End area. Like 9 or 10 o'clock, like somebody, nobody running over there, but I pick up a customer over there. So you think in the—if in the share ride coming, he pick up—give the service over there? No. I cover time. I see some kids throwing the eggs, some throwing the stones. I call the police. The police give

them nothing. The police say, no, I am busy. You report. When are you report. No reaction. Nothing.

Like, summertime, 11 o'clock, I pick up a customer in the Northern Hotel. Like, he had no money, but I give the ride, like \$5, \$10. He come to the cab, haven't getting out. Making the trouble. He broke the cab, nothing damaged. So very big issue. Like, sometime over there people, like wintertime standing in the street, I'll give a hand and pick up. Other one, like these people, sometime too drunk, he have \$5, \$10, but ride is \$20, so this have very hard time, those people, like a cab industry now not have the last winter in the city.

I one year went here working my company. I know how the problems in the company. Couple times I hear customer in the rear, he don't give the time. And couple time I talk to the taxi board, like a safety region but like a—nothing. Now, in the safety we have the shield, the camera and panic button. But like you think in the taxi industry go through the city, city use the more—hard times for me.

Like one time, I remember, I pick up one guy. He too drunk. He went to Sherbrook. He's sleeping in my car. I call in the police in the Friday night, 911, he give answer. Police not coming for half an hour. So I stand waiting over there half an hour. Then one cop car over there, I give a hand. I told, please help for me that this guy out. He said, no. I am busy. I have other calls. You call 911.

So last problem in the cab industry. So if you bring in other companies, no problem, like same rule, same law. Same insurance. Like sometime this cab insurance in the commercial pool. Like, if in the share ride coming, see same commercial rule, the same ride. Share a ride like a—now you see in the—already couple of cars, give the ride.

Other one, like my—

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Brar, thank you very much for your presentation, but your time for your presentation has expired, the 10 minutes. We will now move to questions.

Mr. Helwer: Thank you, Mr. Brar, for coming to discuss your situation with us today. You know, I seem to hear some of the conversation going on here. If I listen to the opposition, they're promising you compensation if you move to Australia, but we're dealing with Manitoba here, as you well know.

You said you owned your cab for about 10 years, I believe, and presumably you bought your

cab from an individual that had seen some growth in the value of that licence. Would you expect compensation from the individual that you bought that licence from?

Mr. Kulgit Brar: Yes, like, so, what do you do after that? Like, you can—I agree, but, like, I have the still in the loan, so what do you do after?

Mr. Maloway: I want to thank you for a very good presentation.

I don't know why the member is, you know, casting aspersions on the—Australia is a country just like us, and each state in Australia is dealing with this same situation we are. Okay? And we're just using them as an example to show how different the treatment is to the industry.

Over there, every state over the last year has come up with a compensation scheme. The best one is Victoria, where they're offering \$100,000 on the first cab, \$50,000 on the next. And they've even got a \$494-million assistance fund and a hardship fund. They have all of these—they've considered all these things. And they're a government just like these guys. And so what if—what has this government done? Not only have they not dealt with the compensation issue, they come up with a bill and they put in the bill saying, no compensation payable. Clearly, they saw that they were going to lose if they didn't put this in the bill.

And here we have evidence of the Premier (Mr. Pallister) before the election telling people, don't worry, be happy. But I don't think the Premier ever told you he was going to dump you off to the city and come up with a draconian bill like this.

Mr. Kulgit Brar: Yes, same thing. Like, I know, like, Bill 30 I see, you are got—value nothing.

So this my opinion, like, government pushing the dump in the *[inaudible]*

Hon. Cathy Cox (Minister of Sport, Culture and Heritage): Thank you so much, Mr. Brar, for taking the time out of your very busy day to be here today with all of us.

I just wanted to reflect on a comment that you made that, quite often, you will—you know, take a fare, and then you don't get paid for it because that individual doesn't have the funds with them. Just wanted to ask if, in fact, you have an app or there's any process for collecting in advance so that you don't get, you know, perhaps stuck with non-payment from a fare?

Mr. Kulgit Brar: Yes, that's—have the GoDaddy app, like North End people over there, he don't have any credit card. He never give the information the credit card. Like, some time—other people, if you ask in the—wants money, nobody give them money.

Mr. Maloway: The fact of the matter is, sir, that we have—in our very own province, have had compensation back. Premier Schreyer, third picture down, was the premier when we set up Autopac in 1971. He offered a compensation plan of, I think, a million and a half, \$2 million. Today, that would be \$15 million to all the agents—insurance agents in Manitoba who did not want an Autopac contract. And I don't know how many people took him up on the offer, but certainly it was seen as the proper and responsible thing to do.

The question is: If the Manitoba government could do this in 1971 for Autopac agents, why can't they do it now for the cab industry?

Mr. Kulgit Brar: Yes, same, like, yes, Autopac, like, I have already last year a couple of meeting. He don't like listen, too. Like, every year in the—insurance grow up, grow up. Like now, he's telling that \$10,300. And maybe in the next year, I was eleven hundred—thousand dollar.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Brar, your time for questions has expired. We will now move on to the next presenter.

Our next presenter is Daljinder Chahal. Daljinder *[phonetic]* Chahal.

Mr. Chahal, do you have any written material for the committee?

Mr. Daljinder Chahal (Private Citizen): No, sorry. I don't.

Mr. Chairperson: Then you may proceed with your presentation when you are ready.

* (10:50)

Mr. Daljinder Chahal: Good morning.

So my name is Daljinder Singh Chahal. I came in Canada in '92; then I took licence in '93. I started part time in '93, then I switched to full time in '94. Since '94, until today, I'm still driving. My cab is sitting outside, front of the Legislative Building. I have 23 years experience.

So I bought a taxi in 2006. I paid \$180,000. I still have a loan, so my—our family, my—our children, my wife, she doesn't work. My—I have three children,

so I'm the only one person working in my family, and I have—my father passed away three months ago because when—on 5th of July. When he heard, like, about this bill, he was so upset, he was saying, my son invested all the money in the taxi, what we will do now? My mother, she's in now in Victoria Hospital. I'm coming straight from there. I was here until midnight yesterday. I left midnight here. I went to this morning to Victoria Hospital; then I'm coming from there. My mom is admitted in there. She was crying, she asking me today, this morning, again, so what they are going to do? I said I'm there. I hope everything will be okay.

So, about safety. Like, a month or two months ago, I—just my camera wasn't working. The taxi board said, you have to buy a new one. I spent \$1,500 on the camera. The installer guy, he installed in my cab. I have a bill, if you want to see. And because I said this had to because the safety issue, I have in the last two months, two big incidents happened with my driver. One driver, midnight, he stabbed in the North End. Like, his right arm, his blood was bleeding and the ambulance took to the hospital, and he had a lot of stitches. The police, they took my car to the safety building. They took all the pictures, everything from the camera. They arrested the same day because it's a silent witness. They can see who did, why he did, who was. Without a camera, it's very hard to find the person who did because 95 per cent of people, when they come to your car, when they see you have a camera, if they want to do, they won't do. They thinking, oh, everything will be recorded. That's why.

I have a shield, strobe light, panic button. If we come into trouble, we press the panic button. The—the message goes to the taxi board—sorry, to the Unicity office. Right away the dispatcher, they track the car from the GPS. Where is this car? They flash, they call the police. They help us out. Sometimes we—they don't give you a chance to—I can't phone to someone. Somebody sitting with you with a gun or with a knife, they won't allow you to take the phone or call to someone because—then after that, like, from the last 23 years, before—every June, on the 9th of June, I'm renewing my licence. When I go to the taxi board to renew my licence, they always ask, where is your criminal record check? Where is your child abuse certificate? Where is your training certificate? If—I still remember two years ago, I applied child abuse. They took a little longer to give to me certification. They took four, six to seven weeks, something like that. My licence expired before; I

didn't get my child abuse certificate. I went to the taxi board. I showed them my receipt. They didn't accept. They are not accepting today. You can even ask them.

I said, look that I paid them. This is my receipt. They going to send me—maybe it will take another a week or 10 days. Said, no, this is a safety issue. You can't drive.

I stayed home 10 days. After that, the Child Abuse Registry came, then I took with me, then I showed them. Then they renewed my licence. Every year we are paying them \$30 to renew my licence. I have to, like, hang in front of the mirror somewhere. The customer can see my licence is valid or not, because everything on there, when it is expiring, who I am, my photo; everything is there, the customer can see.

We have a number on the front, right side on the dashboard. My cab number, 003 there. Also, that car number, everything. Who call to the office, they know which car they sent, who's going to pick up. So they can find right away.

I have 23 years experience. I'm talking about the Uber. The Uber drivers—I heard—I'm not sure. Maybe I'm wrong; I don't know. I heard, who has 5 class driving licence, they can drive Uber. But we have 4 class licence. If I have 5 class licence, I can't drive a taxi, no. Someone taking a licence, he actually—5 class—tomorrow, he can start Uber. He has no experience. He doesn't know which way he go.

You know, like, I have 23 years experience. When we switch from 5 class to 4 class licence, we've got 4 class comes in the commercial. I'm going to save, like, people life, you know. I should have more experience, like—but 5, they know from work they go home from go—from home to go to work, they know only one route, straight.

If someone call saying—customer—we don't know where they're going. If saying I'm going to East Kildonan going to Pembina, they don't know which way we go. Some—they will pay—they won't pay attention. In the stress, they can hit to someone; they can—you know, they don't have experience.

So, my—the second option, like—the second happen was, like, three months ago. The night driver—customer steal my taxi from the driver. And after that—from Transcona. Right away, he called the office. That—when the office called, right away, they called the police. The police call to the office, they said track where—which way your car going. Then

they track from there; they said it's now from Dugald turning left to Lag. and it was four cars came front of the—catch those people on Lagimodiere. They—after that, they arrested right away. They took my car to the police there at 75 Lowson, like, special police command—compound. They took there, and after that, they phoned me the second day, evening time. Their leader said, we took everything out, whatever we need from the camera, so now, they arrested people right away. It's helped us a lot.

So my request is—because the only—like, Indian people, they are not driving taxi. Indian people, Pakistani people, Irani people, Iraqi people, even white people, black people, all communities, they are driving the taxi. Everyone invested in the taxi. Everybody worried now, because you are a respected guy, came to—went to every community before election, please support us, support us. Every community support you. That's why you're elected and you are sitting here.

We helped you. We didn't elect you to destroy us. You should protect us. You should help us, because otherwise, if you won't take serious, the people won't forgive you, never. This is a serious matter, because whatever I'm saying, I'm saying from my heart, because I spent my—all money on the taxis. I'm with a taxi since '94, full-time, 23 years. Now, there's no single buyer in the taxi. Nobody buying my car.

If I know this government will do like this, I'm thinking now I should sell my cab before they elected. I can get my money back. I can move to other city. I can do whatever I want.

Yes, that's all.

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

Mr. Wiebe: Thank you, Mr. Chahal. Sat sri akal, and thank you for coming here. Our hearts go out to you with your mother in Victoria hospital, and I know that that's an extra, added burden to be coming here and spending your time talking about this issue when I know you'd rather be spending all your time with family, so that's certainly something that we appreciate, and appreciate you giving your time.

You know, it sounds like an amazing story that you have, you know, coming here in 1992 and, you know, investing in a small business, you know, working here in Canada and giving everything to this province to build a great province for yourself, for your family, but for all of us as a society.

And what really struck me about your story was that, you know, you focused on the safety aspect and on the—you know, the security and safety of your passengers and making sure that everybody has a secure ride, and you talked about helping out, you know, when the police are involved or when somebody's in trouble, and I think that's a really key point.

* (11:00)

You may know that we have a—an amendment to this bill that talks specifically about health and safety and asking that if anyone else were to get into the market, Uber or Lyft, any company that wants to come in and compete that they do so on a level playing field, that they follow the health and safety rules that you yourself are so passionate about.

Do you think that if that amendment were to be included in this legislation, that amendment and as well as compensation or some sort of recognition for the value that you've put in, you've invested, as a small-business owner, do you think that this is a piece of legislation that you might actually even support?

Mr. Chahal: Yes, same thing. Like, I'm paying \$1,000 per month insure, for example. The other Uber came, they are paying maybe \$80 or \$90 per month or maybe \$100, right, on regular insurance. I'm doing same business, paying \$1,000 per month, those people they're doing with \$80 per month.

Somebody calling—a person called, he was calling us before Uber. We are going to give a ride to him with \$1,000 insurance, covering everything. After that, he started to call Uber. The other guy is giving a same ride to this guy with \$80 insurance. It's not fair. So we need—whatever we paying, whatever we have, it's good both for both driver and passenger. So we need same, like shield, camera, same insure. Everything is same, whatever we paying. Yes.

Mr. Helwer: Thank you, Mr. Chahal, for coming today. We feel for your family's situation. It's difficult to focus on your business when you have personal issues and we've all been there and it is indeed a challenge so I hope things turn out well for you.

So, as a small-business owner, you took a risk in 2006, invested in the taxicab at a substantial amount, and there's lots of talk around about compensation and who it should come from, but I'm wondering—your—the person that you bought the licence from had it for a while, I assume, and he took advantage of

the growth in the value of that licence. Should you expect compensation from that individual, perhaps, that you were overcharged on the licence?

Mr. Chahal: Yes. The—because I still have a lot of loans, if we have a compensation, I can pay off my loan. Without compensation, how I will pay my loan? Because if the Uber coming, they're not bringing any business from the outset. Same business, whatever we're doing, they will take money from our power. Whatever we making, \$100, they will—if they will start to take \$50 from my part; I have expense, 80 to 90 to 100 dollar every day, everyday taxi expense. If I'm driving, not driving, my car sitting outside, I'm still paying insurance, dispatch fees, I'm paying GST, EIE, worker compensation, CPP.

So if I—last year when we filed taxes I paid \$5,500 GST to government. I paid \$4,500 tax to the government. I'm the only one person—paid \$10,000 to the government plus I'm feeding my family, all my parents, my kid, my everybody. Now if the other companies came, what do you think I will pay \$10,000 to government? No, I'm not going to pay any penny from—I won't make money, how I will pay to the government?

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Chahal, time for questions has expired. We will now move on to next presenter. We thank you very much for your presentation.

We will be now moving on to presenter No. 25, Yadwinder Sabioura. If I've pronounced it correctly, if not please—Mr. Sabioura, if—do you have any written material for the committee?

Mr. Yadwinder Sabioura (Private Citizen): No.

Mr. Chairperson: Then you may proceed with your presentation when you are ready.

Mr. Sabioura: Okay. Good morning, everybody. Thank you giving me the time to speak in front of the committee.

I came here about 1985. I had a postgraduate degree, postgraduate diploma. I tried to apply a few places for the job. The answer I get the same: we found a suitable candidate, we wish you good luck.

So then I end up having few jobs. Then I came to taxi, have the family saving. And then I bought the taxi for \$480,000. And had all the savings put it into this one. And now, with this law that you bring—is going to be bring in—will eliminate all the protection and will allow anybody to do everything. Right? Without any cost involved.

So that's—all this will be changed with the wishful thinking of the government. The price we pay was not for the taxi. What the price was—I paid to get the job guarantee, to buy—kind of buying job. The price and the compensation if the law changed to the—anybody can come without any protection, the—all that will be with the assistant of the government. If we look at the other provinces, house prices changes from one price to the other prices, then the government interfere. They protect the price of the—anything, right? So if the law changes, I will be expecting the government to compensate for the—all the prices. Even all the prices. If I buy a shirt from any store, the—if I go there at that last two line, they add GST, PST is also related to the government. One is federal, one is provincial.

In the last election, we were saying in the TV every five minute—8 per cent, 7 per cent, did this, did that. All that. We will come into power, we will do this, we will change to this one. After about a year—no, not year, and didn't—never heard anything about the 7 per cent or 8 per cent. If something changes, I will expect the government, whoever changed the—first, we will like to have the request. So don't change anything. Just—even if the—if we are, first thing will be please against—vote against the bill so not to change anything in the taxi industry. Second, try to accommodate the compensation. You can find all the bills, what the price was paid. The government should take responsibility. We elect those people and—thinking they are very responsible people, like to have a stable place to live, don't want to let the people move around. Should take some responsibility.

Even though the party split in the election process, we help to get some people in power because we have some interests, plus some you have—when you were in the—living in the societies you want, please to look little better for everybody.

So now coming back to the taxi industry, our industry has been very clear and we are about safety, fairness and community. I want to suggest one thing: you should—you don't need this bill if your intention is to bring in any ride-share company. That may be Uber, Lyft, Ola and the other—'frew' other things, right?

In Manitoba, the taxi act and regulations would not prevent any ride-share itself from operating as a dispatch service. The act would require any Uber drivers in Winnipeg to have a taxicab driver's licence and taxicab business licence. I also want to suggest

something else about ride-share—does not provide service to many people, particularly the disabled. Accessibility is a big issue. The accessibility for Manitoba act was enacted in 2013 and the accessibility standard for customer service regulation became law in 2015. Private sector and non-profit organizations with at least one employee have until 2018 to comply with this regulation. The standard defines accessible customer service as when all persons have the same opportunity to obtain, use or benefit from a service. What will ride share do about providing service to the disabled?

* (11:10)

I want to tell you about safety. Winnipeg is the best. Even the MNP says that. Safety equipment for taxicabs such as in-car cameras, panic buttons, rooftop probe lights and driver shields are mandated by the Taxicab Board. Winnipeg appears to have the most vigorous safety equipment requirement of all compared cities. Taxicab owners and drivers genuinely support in-car safety equipment. Driving a taxicab in a risky occupation, not fully made secure with the current safety provisions. Stakeholders indicate that drivers face significant safety risks associated with the violent or intoxicated passenger and discrimination and fare disputes. To protect the safety of passengers, the taxicab requires drivers to undergo criminal record checks, mandatory training for driving safety and safe equipment handling for passengers as well as regular vehicle inspections. Safety driving in a cab, dangerous.

The taxi can-board has identified driving a taxicab as an important public transportation service and one of the most dangerous occupations in North America. As a taxicab driver, I 60 times more likely to—murder, or in the job of the average worker. In Canada, there have been 150 cab drivers killed since 1970; in Manitoba have—there have been 12 taxicab drivers killed while on duty in 1945.

Taxicab drivers are at risk in times of robbery, hijacking of a taxi, abusive and threatening behaviour, physical assault, traffic disputes and incident—fare disputes and combination of the—of all. Shields and cameras dramatic improvement in safety. After the murder of Pritam Deol, the taxicab safety issue report was released in October 2001. It made 18 recommendations. One of the key recommendations was the development of a taxicab driver safety program to enhance drivers' skills, to recognize and assess risk and how to defuse potential hostile situations.

The effectiveness of cameras and shields is clear. The Winnipeg Police Service indicated that for the calendar year 2012–2002, there was 20 fewer reported taxicab robberies than in the previous year. This represented a reduction of 71 per cent in serious taxicab crimes since the in-cab cameras and shields were introduced. When 2003 is compared to 2001, the year before cameras—the shields were introduced, taxicab robberies and other violent in-taxicab cameras—crimes have been reduced by 79 per cent. There was an increase of 10.5 in crime rate overall in the city of the Winnipeg. Over the same period, the arrest rate for crimes against taxi drivers was 35 per cent prior to the introduction of the cameras, and the rate increased to 50 per cent, 2002, and 66 per cent in 2003.

In Winnipeg, a requirement for all standard and accessible taxicabs has been in effect since July 1, 2002, to have a operational in-cab camera and a requirement to have a safety shield installed has been in effect since January 8, 2003. The safety initiative taken to the Winnipeg include other measures, such as mandatory first-aid kits, effective July 1st, 2002, improved taxicab driver training and a requirement that any taxi with GPS must have the system working at all times.

Winnipeg Police Service data indicate that since the introduction of taxi safety measures in 2002, robberies of—

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Sabioura, your 10 minutes for your presentation has expired. We will now move into questions.

Thank you very much for your presentation.

Floor Comment: Can I have a few seconds, please?

Mr. Chairperson: Is it the will of the committee to allow it? *[Agreed]*

Floor Comment: Okay, so our industry is—

Mr. Chairperson: Yes, Mr. Sabioura, continue on. You have a few seconds.

Mr. Sabioura: Thank you. So our industry is about service and about safety. Please keep it that way, the taxi service is. Please vote against this bill and please accommodate if there is any for compensation provided by the—whoever—provided by the government.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation.

Ms. Nahanni Fontaine (St. Johns): So hello and thank you very much for your presentation. I know that we appreciate you coming down and taking time to come and present to us.

So, you know, I really agree with you in respect of the responsibility that we have as elected members of the Manitoba Legislature, and how—and, you know, we have a responsibility to Manitoba citizens, right, including yourself and your family and everybody that's in—here with us today.

So, as you know, like, the members opposite here, this is their legislation. This is their bill, right? So everybody sitting here, this is their bill. So I don't know if you want to kind of comment a little bit on what the members opposite, like, what their responsibility is to all Manitobans. And also, if you wanted to comment a little bit on what compensation would look like. Like, what kind of amounts are we talking about?

Mr. Sabioura: First, for the responsibility, I think we elect the government to give every person in the society—to give the proper representation, to listen to the people. And I guess they should.

Like, if you look at the news media, I don't want to talk bad. The—how the big corporations act. The Province is saying we are not talking about any ride share, we are just giving the responsibility to the City. You know the City, they made the one police station. The deal was made somewhere away from the place we live in. Right? One dollar—few million dollar house. Right? We are talking about the—with the—for the company who live far away and have billions dollar, so they can negotiate anywhere. If you look at the news, in the early February, the Free Press reported that Uber's CEO was seen in the city place, somewhere else. In the City Hall, somewhere else, right?

I believe, because I read the book confession of economic murderer—is written by SKGV person. Somebody give it to me. He said how they destabilize the other nations, not even the city. So if we are—if you have something ideal like this, and you see the—in early February someone walking in the City Hall, the CEO of the company who have interest, right? So, then, in the end of February, you see this bill. There is way more than things going on. Maybe honourable members know about this, right? And somebody maybe didn't disclose this, or somebody didn't bother to investigate what is going on in the other side of the world. Right? Should—I think we act more responsibly instead just saying

okay, we are unloading this to the city. Is way more than this one, other than the livelihood of a few people.

For the compensation, I guess taxi board have the bill of sale, plus somebody—if somebody's just—if I'm giving the taxi to the—my wife, to the—that will be \$1, but the price is still there. The money is not changing the family for some reason. That way we different. The compensation is in the bill—bill of sale. That will be the compensation, quite. But, in case somebody don't have—bought few years earlier, right, but the price is—the investment that time was the same, Province should control the even price. If they can control the price in other provinces, the house price, as my friend was asking, did you go after the person who sell you the company? If I buy shirt from anywhere, I don't go to the store that I—that somebody stole my shirt. Right? So I will go—whatever try to steal or deregulate the person, whoever is it. Right?

* (11:20)

We recommend—request, so keep the law the way it is, or whoever you giving, give the 'setivic' condition. Province is the one who will dictate what will happen. The City—we do trust what somehow—you know how the trust is. You—I guess you have more time to read the news. You can find out better how they react to how responsibility—how responsibly some of the people react, even though in the politics. I know little bit more because I had my political science—

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Sabioura, time for questions has expired. We want to thank you for your presentation and we will now move on to the next presenter.

Our next presenter, presenter No. 26, Manjit Panesar.

Manjit, do you have written material for the committee?

Mr. Manjit Panesar (Private Citizen): No.

Mr. Chairperson: Then you may proceed with your presentation as soon as you are ready.

Mr. Panesar: Thank you, everyone. Good morning.

My name is Manjit Panesar. I have been living in Winnipeg since 1993, and driving with Unicity Taxi last 20 years, so I'm talk about the Bill 30.

The Bill 30 is an attack on a middle class. It takes the livelihood to working-class Manitoba, like

myself, away—all in the name of the digital economy. Uber is not a hometown-grown solution to Manitoba public transportation problem. They are multi-billion-dollar company and they are company based in California, and they make executive rich in bill-killing small businesses like mine. I have invested money into my taxi, and Bill 30 is—will result my investment to become a worthless. So—while a rich CEO becomes richer by exploiting cheap labour, Uber has proven over and over again they cannot be trusted to follow the rules. Bill 30 opens the door for Manitoba to face the same problems cities like London, New Delhi, Quebec.

I understand you want to change but it's—but that change without the considerations of consequences is reckless. Bill 30 is reckless. Imagine that tomorrow someone tells you you don't—no longer have a job as an MLA and because if another person can come say he can do half of the salary your job. You work hard, you follow the rules and got elected. So wouldn't it be unfair to you guys?

So I urge you guys—so taxi industry to make a public transportation better. Don't kill our industry with Bill 30 and don't attack middle-class people, taxi owners and drivers.

Thank you very much.

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

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

And you talked about Uber and the reality is that we're talking about a \$65-billion company, I'm told. It's a huge company. I think it was started in 2009. It has \$3.5-billion recent cash infusion from Saudi Arabian investors. They've got partners like Goldman Sachs, Google Ventures, other private equity groups, and one of their biggest backers is TPG Capital, who's co-founded by David Bonderman, one of the wealthiest people on the planet. He's on the board of directors.

And, you know, the—I can't understand a provincial government who's not looking out for our industries right here in Manitoba. To think that they would somehow bring or invite this huge company to come into the province and essentially, not owning any cabs themselves, taking, what, 30 per cent—so 30 per cent of every cab fare is now going to end up with these guys, wherever they are—certainly not in Manitoba. And they're going to essentially destroy a system that we've had since the war that is, you

know, has companies like Unicity and Duffy's who have employees here, you know, that work for the cabs. They do all their business—they spend their money in Manitoba. They don't send 30 per cent off the top outside.

And it reminds me of, like, the insurance business, too, where—which I've been in for 40 years and I can tell you that insurance companies like Wawanesa have the employees here. They have the building in Manitoba, they have the employees in Manitoba and they take everybody at a good rate. They take the high-risk people with the claim-free people.

What Uber is, and we do see it in the insurance industry every once in a while, is a company that comes in from Toronto, no office here, no employees here, and they go after the claim-free business. They offer, you know, big 50 per cent reductions, and you have to be a pretty dumb insurance agent to go and fall for this because you're just hurting yourself.

If you take all your—your low-risk, your claim-free business and put it off with this other company, then what you've done is you've given your main company like Wawanesa, all the people with the claims. That is just not smart business, and people in the insurance business understand it very well.

The question is: Why can't the government see this? *[interjection]*

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Panesar, I have to recognize you before you answer the question. So, now, Mr. Panesar, you may answer the question.

Mr. Panesar: Okay. You are a hundred per cent right. We are living in Manitoba, working here and we pay tax in Canada, in Manitoba. Those people coming from different provinces, different countries, so taking our money away. You are a hundred per cent right, so they should have to look after that.

The present government talking about the middle-class people, how we can make them better, but now they are killing—they're going to destroy our families, so they should look after that.

Mr. Helwer: Thank you, Mr. Panesar, for coming to speak with us today. I, being in business myself, I admire people that invest in Manitoba and in business. It's always a risk and we know that risk when we enter into that business, and you try to figure out how that's going to work for you.

I'm interested in some of the statements from the member across from me. He's trying to be the

defender of Manitobans, but we saw in 2011 that his government promised Manitobans they would not raise taxes on Manitobans and we saw them raised time and time again. They raised the PST on you, and I'm wondering if, at any time, did that previous NDP government talk to you about compensating you for that tax increase?

Mr. Panesar: Yes. We, at least, like they should have accomplished something at least because we work here in Manitoba. We live in Manitoba. We—the present government today should read that Bill 30 more times and take time to pass that because that will decide lots of families here in Manitoba.

Mr. Chairperson: Time for questions has expired.

I would like to remind all committee members before we move to the next presenter that there's a number of committee members here that they'd all like to ask questions, so I would like everybody to try to keep their questions down to 45 seconds or less than a minute, because when one person asks a question for three minutes, it doesn't leave a lot of time for anybody else to ask questions.

Thank you very much, and we will now move on to the next presenter, presenter No. 27, Abdulbari Mahmoud. Abdulbari Mahmoud—*[interjection]*—he's on the way?

Is Mr. Mahmoud in the building here right now? Okay. Mr. Mahmoud is not here. We will now move him to the bottom of the list.

The next presenter, No. 28, Lachhman Dhaliwal. Lachhman Dhaliwal?

Mr. Dhaliwal, do you have any written material for the committee?

Mr. Lachhman Dhaliwal (Private Citizen): No, nothing.

Mr. Chairperson: Then you may proceed with your presentation when you are ready.

* (11:30)

Mr. Lachhman Dhaliwal: I'm not saying too much because I driving cab last 25 years. So far my experience is when we start there was no shield, no camera, no flashlight. Then couple of murders happened; then they put the shield. Then, after that, they put—they—lots of customers complaining because the driver, there being harassment or sexual harassment or everything. Then they put the camera for the safety for the public. After that they put the

flashlight because if any, any problem for the driver, you going to put the flash on, yes.

But now see 30 bill is nothing add in these safeties or insurance for the same thing. We be paying \$10,000, I heard that another company's coming. I don't know Uber are coming or not. Now they're coming because they said they not want to coming in this rule and regulations. I don't know why they said do you have experience, previous government has experience because we need this—these things. But I don't know this government, why not follow the rules. That's up to them. That's only in my purposes.

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

We will now move on to questions from the committee. Mr. Dhaliwal, there are some questions for you.

Mr. Maloway: Well, presenters yesterday told us that they were—attended Conservative Party functions before the election and they were told by the Premier that nothing really was going to change with the taxi industry, that there was going to be a level playing field. So you can imagine these people's surprise when now they see this bill, No. 30, being brought forward and it specifically says no compensation is payable; these people spend \$300,000, \$400,000 for a taxi licence, which is now worth nothing. And they are responsible for this.

Uber, you know—the competition didn't do this to you, they did. So they should be held responsible for compensation for the industry.

I'd just like to ask you to give us a bit of your history in what it cost you to get into the business and what you feel your licence is going to be worth now.

Mr. Lachhman Dhaliwal: My licence is—I didn't—it's worth maybe—I don't know but when the other company knows—comes in, then the competition buy and sell us. Maybe \$50,000, maybe \$20,000, we don't know. We lose the money but I don't know they can compensate that much because some people buy the car \$500,000.

Mr. Helwer: Thank you, Mr. Dhaliwal, for coming to meet with us today. You've been in business from the sounds of it for many years and, as I've said earlier, I have an admiration for people that have been in business not only for the length of time that you have been but that you continue to invest in your

business, even though some of those regulations were put upon you, but they are for safety, as you stated. So it's to keep you safe and your drivers safe.

So, I'm wondering, Mr. Dhaliwal, if you think back to 2011 and the previous premier, Mr. Selinger, promised everyone that he would not raise taxes in Manitoba, and he raised taxes on your insurance without any notice. He raised taxes on PST without any notice when he promised people that he would not.

So did you receive any compensation from the previous government over those tax increases?

Mr. Lachhman Dhaliwal: We didn't get the compensation from anyone. We just only—they increasing the every year for our insurance is starting from \$2,000 then starting up—now is up to \$10,000. But we have no choice; we have to pay if we want taxi on the road.

Mr. Maloway: The Premier (Mr. Pallister), through this legislation, is using a wrecking ball to ruin the value of your business. It's not like your business has dropped because of the free market, because you're competing with your competitors out there. That's not why your business is worth nothing now. It's because this government brought in this bill. You take this bill away and your taxi licences are going to be worth exactly what they were a year ago. If they were worth \$400,000 a year ago, they're probably going to be back to \$400,000 without this bill.

When this bill passes on the 9th of November, which it will, unless you get it stopped, unless you convince these people to talk to the Premier and get him to withdraw the bill—if that doesn't happen and this bill passes, your investment is pretty much worthless.

And so what would be your comments about that? I mean, comments about a PST hike three years ago or whatever have no relevance to what we're talking about today with this bill.

Mr. Lachhman Dhaliwal: Talk about this bill, you're going to stop it, but government has—in power, they have a majority. They don't stop it. They don't listen us. We have just only—giving—saying something, but we have no power to say. Just only we can request them maybe it should stop, but I don't think so they're going to stop it.

Mrs. Colleen Mayer (St. Vital): Thank you very much, sir, for your presentation, and I appreciate you taking the time to come here today.

Can you tell me if the former government consulted—you commented in regards to, you know, your costs were rising, you know, when my colleague asked about 2011. Did the former government consult with you at all when they raised those costs for you? *[interjection]*

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Dhaliwal, sorry. Time has expired on the question period. *We—[interjection]*

Would you like to—yes, we'll give you some time to answer the question, if you could briefly answer the question.

Mr. Lachhman Dhaliwal: Yes, because the previous government, if the raise \$200, \$300, they're not hurting us. Because now, if this bill passed, then they will be going to ruin whole company. We lose thousand—\$100,000 or \$200,000, everybody. Because if they raise the tax a little bit, it's not hurting. At \$10,000—if this company stay like this, we can afford \$10,000 for the bill, but when the competition comes, they have nothing. They have no under the same rules and regulations; then they're going to hurt us. They're going to kick us out.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation.

Also, I would like to remind the committee that on previous committees I have asked people about using props. I've been told by—in other committees not to be allowing people to use props. By waving papers in the air, I believe that is a bit of a prop, and I would just like to have people—like, we're—I want to keep this committee under control where it doesn't get out of control, so if they would please abide by me.

Mr. Maloway: Just on that point, I mean, I've been around for 31 years as an MLA, and I do know what a prop is. I have used one or two on occasion, and a prop is, you know bringing—

Mr. Chairperson: Are you challenging the Chair, Mr. Maloway?

Mr. Maloway: Not at all, sir. Not at all. I just feel that the only thing I have in front of me is a copy of the bill.

Mr. Chairperson: I'm just giving a caution. I'm not singling you out. I'm telling the committee about a situation that could get out of hand, and if you're challenging the Chair, then do so. If not—

Point of Order

Mr. Wiebe: On a point of order, this is a very concerning development here in the committee this morning, and I did want to start by just saying that I can appreciate the work of the Chair, and it can be difficult when there are a number of presenters who are incredibly passionate, who have taken the time to come down to this Legislature to express their grave concerns with this particular piece of legislation. And I do believe that the Chair is doing the best possible work that he can do to keep the committee moving forward.

My concern here this morning is that—and the reason I call this a point of order is that my understanding of the rules in the House—and I look to the Clerk, as I'm saying this, of course, because they are always our guides on this—on these matters. But it's my understanding that the—that when it is a public document, in this case, the bill that we are actually debating in this committee and that people have come to this committee to present on, that that's not, in fact, considered a prop; it's, in fact, a public document that, in fact, is the sole basis of the reason that we are here this morning.

* (11:40)

So I guess I don't want to go as far as to say that I'm challenging the Chair. I would like to ask the question in the House: When I hold up a document, oftentimes, I'll hear the—or, sorry, the government say, well, will you table that document to make sure that everybody has a chance to see that. And then that becomes a document that we can then talk about.

In this case, because it is a bill, it wouldn't be a prop; it would be the actual document that I think everyone in the committee—certainly, the members of the committee but also presenters would have an opportunity to peruse and to be able to talk about. So I would just like to maybe just get some feedback from the Clerk, through the Chair.

Mr. Chairperson: In response to your concern there, Mr. Wiebe, it's still an exhibit. And when it's being used to—as an inflammatory, like, if it's being used, waving it around to get people excited about it, I would consider that to be a prop.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: So—otherwise, we will now move on to our next presenter.

An Honourable Member: Point of order.

Point of Order

Mr. Chairperson: Point of order, Mr. Maloway?

Mr. Maloway: I'd like to speak to the point of order that the member for Concordia just brought up.

An Honourable Member: No—[interjection]

An Honourable Member: Well, a new point of order.

Mr. Chairperson: On a different subject, Mr. Maloway? I have ruled on this, and I—[interjection]

An Honourable Member: Are you challenging the Chair again?

Mr. Chairperson: Could we please have some order here, please. I think we've got a long committee in front of us. I will do my best to try to keep things in order, but I would ask all members of the committee to also have respect for the presenters and for everybody sitting at this table.

Thank you very much.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: We will now move on to presenter No. 29, Hardeep Mangat. Mr. Mangat? Presenter No. 29.

Do you have any written material for the committee?

Mr. Hardeep Mangat (Private Citizen): No.

Mr. Chairperson: No? Then you may proceed with your presentation when you are ready. Thank you.

Mr. Hardeep Mangat: Good morning, everybody, in this committee. First of all I would like to pay my respect to all the minds and hands who contributed to set up this system where I have the privilege to explain my concerns regarding Bill 30.

So I am a businessman investor and, at the same time, running my business in person, not like Uber, like, sitting somewhere else, but I have two stories which I would like to share while driving cab, and I would like to convey all those stories before the committee.

So day before yesterday there was my customer, a lady, gentle lady, her name was Fazulcus [phonetic] Then he sat in my cab, then he asked a first question, hey, are you owner of this cab? Yes, I said. Then he said: What are you doing to stop the Uber? Hey, we don't want Uber. We want a safe ride. What are you doing?

I had no answer. What can we do? Governments are doing all the things. We can show our concern. Then he said again, we don't want Uber; we want safe ride. She said you should have the poster, get it signed from me, and go to City Hall that we don't want Uber.

So bill is already on the table drafted. I don't think if it is on the table just to improve the taxi service to the people. If it was so, like, I would like to tell, like, the, if Tim Horton want to establish new location, then they ask this thing, businessman, can do another one near to your location. If they said no, then they ask the other one. You go ahead.

So I think if there was—really there was a problem in the taxi business then because we are in the business, there is taxi board. We were never involved with them this—all the system, to find out where is the problem. There are so many things.

Last year, in the winter, early in the morning, around 4 a.m., that was my first trip, I picked up a customer. Sitting in the backseat, he asked me a question; hey, do you know what is the prices of taxis are so high in the Winnipeg? At the same time, he told me that, you know, the fare in the Winnipeg is very high. That's why the prices are so high. I ask of this gentleman, do you have any base saying this, that there is the fare too much high?

I can say that more than seven years there is no fare raise. Already in Thompson, meter starts at \$5.50. In Winnipeg it was \$3.50. How you can say it? Then, I think that was a learned man, he has the knowledge of the system. So then I asked him: How much do you think it is expensive, the fare? He said 20 per cent. So I asked him, I am taking you to the airport, you will pay me \$30. If I cut 20 per cent then you will pay me \$24. A man who can't pay \$30, he will not pay \$24. Anyone who can do transit, he would not like cab. So then he said, no, when there are conferences people ask us, hey, still there is no Uber? And I said, people ask many questions. They said there are broken roads. Hey, Winnipeg is too cold. What are answers?

So then said we have to look after the public. Then I said taxi drivers are not the part of public? Who have to look out for the taxicab drivers? We are human beings. We are in business. Who will look after, like, we people? Then I asked him, that Greyhound was going out of—that let, I think, two, three years back they said we can't run this business.

Then the government supported millions of dollars, I think, if I am not wrong. Then he said, oh, no, we are also thinking about you guys. I said how? He said if need be there for the more cabs, then we are thinking that if we need 100 cabs or 200 cabs then we are thinking to give the extra cabs to the existent owners, then we can solve the problem of the short taxis and at the same time we can compensate the existing owners.

So now if this bill—the bill has already introduced, it becomes a law, then we will in big problem. There will be no business.

So what will happen if this bill comes law tomorrow? This bill will shift the ownerships to the Uber. Then, the drivers will be driving the cabs but there will be no owners. Now, we have the passion. Any driver who enters this industry, if he works hard, then he can become owner after four or five years, but once the ownership transfers to the Uber, there will be no one owner. A driver starts today, will drive, will die as driver, not as owner.

* (11:50)

So I have seen many people talking about the value of the taxi, why it is half-million. There are so many reasons. The people driving the taxis, they are not the simply drivers. They are lawyers, they are engineers, they are accountants, they are teachers. They have long experience. Anyone who invested, I think, 100 or 200K, five or seven years back, if it is two to five hundred K, I think, not a big issue. That is why the—because they worked very hard. So now, the situation is like I invested three, four years back. Because at that time—personally, I could not believe that it may happen. We was always hopeful that we—the values and our future will be considered if anything happens. But now I can't believe it is going to happen.

So, I think to consider the problems of the people, if we liken the shape at this time the taxi board is working, we have the safe cabs. My customer is safe. I am also safe. How it happen? Because a owner, or the driver, was murdered. Then we have to think, what should we do? So, we have paid the price for the same system. We have laid our lives. We have spent money. Now, because the scene had changed, like, 50, 60 years ago, only the single person were coming as immigrants. Now, we are coming with families. Like, I came here in 2010 with my family.

Back at home, I was working as an accountant with the government. I work there for 25 years. When I came here, my daughter was going to university and son in ninth.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Mangat, your 10 minutes for your presentation has expired.

We will now move into questions.

Mr. Wiebe: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair, Mr. Mangat, sat sri akal, and thank you for coming in today to present to us.

I appreciate the fact that you started with personal stories because I do feel that sometimes it's those personal stories that have the most impact with committee members. And so I appreciate that you've done that. I also appreciate the fact that you've talked about not only your own family—the fact that you're supporting your family with this investment as a small business owner, but how many people are impacted by this industry and how many people are supported by the work that you do and the investment that you make.

And it really does strike me when you say, you know, you couldn't believe that it would happen—*[interjection]*

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Mandat *[phonetic]*, you can't speak until I've recognized you.

Mr. Wiebe, you can continue with your—oh, you're done? Okay. Mr. Mandat *[phonetic]*, now you can have the floor.

Mr. Hardeep Mangat: So, can I add—so, just today, my friend called from Alberta. He's in Calgary, in the same business. He was talking about the Uber because Uber is already there. Now, Uber—what about insurance? We were talking just about insurance.

There is the—cheaper insurance for Uber. How it is possible? Because they get only 20 hours insurance. There was an accident when their driver was driving on their 22nd hour. He had expensive car, worth \$50,000. Car was broken. He approaching for insurance. Then they calculated and said oh, no, you have already driven more than 20 hours. No insurance. No insurance for that.

So one thing, like—I would like to talk about equality, right? We don't run away from the competition. But I think, like, now, the things that are happening—government under pressure. Or, City is under pressure. So quickly, like, we are going to

change the system when there is no problem. In the winter, there are already extra cabs. Nothing is wrong with the business.

Mr. Curry: Excuse me, Mr. Mangat. Thank you so much for coming here. I know how much work that you do and how much this is taking time out of your day.

I wanted to ask about pricing. You'd brought up concerns about prices, and you might be aware—I don't know if any of my colleagues are aware, but sometimes, and this bill is not about ride sharing, but I've heard rumours that sometimes with ride sharing, prices can surge to, say, over \$1,000 for a trip. And, when I've heard something like that, I look, well, why would I want to use something like that if I know a stable price in taxis? Is that not something where you feel confident that people have two options: a \$1,000 ride and, say, I know to get from my house it's about \$20 from, say, downtown; well, I'm going to choose \$20?

How is that not something where you'd feel confident about competing, or is that something that you've heard of yourself?

Mr. Hardeep Mangat: I already, like, tried to explain that—it was three, four years back, when people were very much excited about the Uber. Like, it will be cheaper, all the things like that. But now four years have passed. We all know all the things; all is in the media. What is happening, like, so many rape cases in a very short time. If someone is talking about India. Also, I think there, I think Uber is working. He said the fare only five or six dollars. I said, no, it is not possible. How come that? He said, no, company's paying.

How the company can pay? It is just a tactic. If today they are charging less, tomorrow they will be charging double, and we can't regulate. Is there any system if there tomorrow, say, they will charge two times or three times? They can charge it, and I think last time on the news, they charge \$2,000, \$3,000 after flashing a message on the screens that now after this time it will be start raining, people are sitting in the bars, who will read that message? They need a cab at midnight, and in the morning, they saw the credit card, three hundred—\$3,000 gone.

Mr. Chairperson: Ms. Mayer, you have a short time for your question.

Mrs. Mayer: Thank you very much. *[interjection]*

Mr. Chairperson: Ms. Mayer, you had a question?

Mrs. Mayer: You know, I just wanted to—you said there were reasons why the cost of ownership had gone up so much, and I'm sorry, I've lost a little bit of hearing in my ear, and I couldn't hear quite. Could you explain why, what your reasons are? *[interjection]*

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Mangat, I must recognize him. So you may go ahead.

Mr. Mangat.

Mr. Hardeep Mangat: Okay, thank you.

So remember, the thing is, like for, like, 50 years back, people were thinking about we will go to Canada and come back home with millions of dollars and do all the good things which they wanted to do. Now the scenario has changed. Now we come to settle here permanently. So we have property there. We have land there. We have money there. So what will happen to that? We dispose of our land. I brought many—but I had my savings or I got after my pension or the other thing. So we are bringing that money here so you know and believe that there are no good jobs. Most of the jobs people are doing in the McDonald's, Tim Hortons, no industry here, no farming here. So we are coming here. Where we have to go? I need money. So, by investing the money, we just got one job. So by the passage of time, if someone invested like \$150 in 10 years back, now he won't sell it less than \$500 or \$400.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Mangat, we want to thank you for your presentation, but the time is way over time, so we want to thank you.

Mr. Hardeep Mangat: Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairperson: We will now move on to presenter No. 30, Rupinder Mann.

* (12:00)

Mr. Mann, do you have a written presentation for the committee?

Mr. Rupinder Mann (Private Citizen): No, I just say it.

Mr. Chairperson: Just verbal, then you may proceed with your presentation when you are ready.

Mr. Mann.

Mr. Rupinder Mann: Thank you so much, Mr. Chair, and the members, to giving me a chance.

So, I'm just talking about the Bill 30. We totally oppose this bill, not only the reason I am the owner

of the cab. The reason is because it's nothing safer in it, I think. And it's because when I come here in 2003, at first day, I saw, in this business or anywhere, like, they are talk about the safety, safety, safety, so all the time, we just saw this thing in it, right, in every job, not only the taxi.

But we are talking about the taxi right now because we discuss about this. So, they need shields; they need the strobe lights because people don't see if so much crime happens like that way, right? So—but now it's pretty sad the government ignore the safety things and they try to give a chance to the Uber, so it's pretty sad. Where is the safety things now? I don't understand.

So, first of all, we are not talking about our safety only; we're talking about the people who live in the city also, right? So, at first day, when we are in Canada, we think it's a bright future we have here. But right now, we see the dark everywhere because we pay so much money to buy the taxis, and we pay the market price. We—nobody wants to pay more than that, right? Even anybody, like franchises, you can say McDonald's, Tim Hortons, and all are franchises. They have one controlled price, so you have to pay that much, then you get the business.

So it's not in my hands. Even the houses are also same thing. The—this house is, they said, \$500,000, but what do you think the price of the house is the \$500,000 it cost them? No. That's the market price, \$500,000, right? But it cost them maybe one hundred, maybe fifty thousand dollars, and they sell it in the market, \$500,000, right? So, that way it works in the market, and we—doesn't matter, we—if we want the business, we buy the business. We need the business. We want the work, so we—you have to pay the price. You have to pay the market prices.

And the safety is the main issue in the taxi, so I don't know why they are not allowing to the cameras and shields and everything. I understand, like, in every field how, like, lots of people's involved in it, not only the one guy or the two guys, but they—all are, like, working together with the prices comparison to here and there we're—from where we get cheaper, people go there, right?

So, in that price is also—we pay that—lots of money in it. We brought the money from the back home; some are, like, sell the lands, and some are sell the houses from the back home, and they brought the money here to buy the businesses—doesn't matter what kind of business is this.

So I am totally opposed this bill, and you are all respected people who's sitting here. I hope you are giving us the best decision. And because in the Uber, like, not much insurance, and we pay too much high insurance in it, and we co-operate the City; we co-operate the Taxicab Board, like, on the safety issues, on everything. They don't want the bad cars, like, right away they said no service. So now it's time to—your time to like co-operate us, please, in these difficult situations, I think, and we pay the lots of taxes here. We work hard for 12 hours, 13 hours, and we pay the bills and kids go to the school. We pay the everything, and we all depend on this business, I mean.

So it's pretty hard for us to—it's pretty sad if the value of our job like this, who we are right now, and we—and another thing. In the Uber, if it comes—so we want a fair thing, the safety and insurance or anything who we pay, so they pay the same thing. So we want that one. We don't want they don't pay that much, and a gentleman said it's a billionaire or millionaire company. We don't care. So—but if means because they pressurize on the government, on the pressurize on us, that's why. If they are billionaire, we don't care. They don't give us any money. We work hard for our money, right, and we spend money here also. That's why we work hard and we get the money and run our business and run our homes and pay the bills.

So, in any job, if someone like comes very money-minder or money people come in that business, so it means not they pressurize to the people and the kill to another people. I don't think so it's fair. It's pretty unfair. So we want a fair deal at last. Thank you.

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

Mr. Wiebe: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Mann, for your very thoughtful presentation. I can tell you're an intelligent man, and your presentation certainly reflects that.

You know, again, I appreciate that you started by talking about safety, not only of drivers but also of passengers and how that's a priority of the taxi industry and it's been a priority of yours. I think that's an incredibly important part of this conversation that we need to remember, that the taxi industry has worked hand in hand with the government to ensure that there is a safe option for passengers, so I appreciate that.

What I wanted to ask about, though, is, you know, you talked about the bright future that you saw here in Manitoba when you came, and I can imagine you came to this country, you know, to make a better life for yourself, for your family, and I also know that in the place that you come from, in India, that oftentimes there are decisions that are made by a government official that don't seem fair, they don't seem like they follow the rules. And I'm wondering if you had any expectation when you came to this country, knowing that this is a place where we follow the rules, where we respect small business, where we respect small-business owners, where we understand that somebody who comes and wants to work hard and earn a living for themselves and for their family that they should be given that opportunity.

Did you have any expectation that when you came here and you invested your hard-earned money in this province in a taxi licence that had a value that that would someday be taken away arbitrarily by a government without any kind of discussion about compensation or—I mean, and let's be clear, not even a discussion about compensation but specific wording in the bill that denies any kind of discussion about compensation. Did you have any expectation, coming to Canada, that the government would do that to you as a small-business owner, as somebody who wants to work and invest in this province?

*(12:10)

Mr. Rupinder Mann: Very nice question. Like, I understand what you say, sir, but that's why I said it's a—we are expected a bright future here, because we believe more than from there in this government, because everybody's give the example it's a good people there, a good country, good atmosphere. So that's why we are expecting more than that.

So, but, in the future, what happen in the future, we'll never know, but, at least, if I get the chance here—to come here, but at least I try to request you and who we expected, please give us—to us, and we want the compensate also who we paid. It's a really hard work money, so we invest in it. So I know when I buy the cab, I don't have 10 dollars left in my pocket. I pick up the groceries on the Visa. I tell you the truth.

Mrs. Mayer: Thank you, Mr. Mann. I really appreciate your words today and that you've taken the time to come here and speak with us.

Many of the presenters that I've heard from over the week that we've been doing this have talked about their background, where they're from, what brought them here, their families, and I'm wondering if today, if you could give me a little insight, because I do appreciate listening to what you have to say, and it helps me to understand you, as a presenter.

Can you tell us a little bit about your family and about yourself a little more, about the work, things like that? A little more specific for me.

Mr. Rupinder Mann: About my family?

Mrs. Mayer: Yes.

Mr. Rupinder Mann: Yes. Like, I came here in 2003 and my wife is a teacher there and I'm—we have a business, gas stations, and I'm a farmer also, farming. But in this, like, province, no farming and if we, like, according to the—mostly according to the place we have, too, are just over there; doesn't matter because I came here in Manitoba so I try to adjust here, so according to the situation, I choose my job.

So, in this job I choose it because it's free, because I pick up my kids from school any time, if I want, take a game, or go to the doctor's appointment. That's why I choose it.

So, and I'm not that kind of person who sit in the chair and work in one place. I'm not that kind. I like to move.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Mann, time has expired, so if you could quickly finish.

Mr. Rupinder Mann: Yes. So, that's the thing; I choose it, that's why. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Mann.

Before we move on to the next presenter, a written submission from Surdeep [*phonetic*] Singh Sidhu has been just received and is being distributed to committee members.

Does the committee agree to have this document appear in the Hansard transcript of this meeting?
[*Agreed*]

Mr. Maloway: Mr. Chair, we have No. 14, Sukwinder Dhaliwal here. He was here on Tuesday 'til midnight, Thursday 'til midnight, and he has to leave. He's here right now, so he's wondering whether he could be, by agreement of the committee, that he could make his presentation next.

Mr. Chairperson: We have a request for presenter No. 14, Sukwinder Dhaliwal, to make his

presentation now. He was here at previous meetings but did not get a chance to—so he was moved to the bottom of the list. What is the will of the committee?
[*Agreed*]

Mr. Dhaliwal, could you please present your presentation?

Mr. Sukwinder Dhaliwal (Private Citizen): Good morning to everybody. My name is Sukwinder Dhaliwal, and I move here from India in 1994 and start driving taxi in '95. Then—I drove a little bit, then I bought my own. And I borrow money from my line of credit, and I bought some property in India. And right now, with the Bill 30, my investment, I think, is going to be a nil. So I work hard to pay that line of credit, and I work hard to pay my mortgage. And I have three girls, and two of them—excuse me. Sorry.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson in the Chair

Two of them are going into the university right now. And I'm paying their tuition fees. After this Bill 30, I don't think I'm going to be afford that. So, please, consider that and think about passing this Bill 30.

I think that's all I can say. Sorry.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Dhaliwal.

There questions of the presenter?

Mr. Wiebe: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Dhaliwal. It's very evident in your passion how important this issue is to you. And the fact that you've now come to committee three times to finally have your say, I think, is incredibly important.

I also want to thank you because, as I said previously, I think those personal stories—the impact that this bill will have on your family, which you speak so passionately about, I think is—it makes a difference. It makes a difference to the members here of the government who are bringing this bill forward. I think it makes a difference and hopefully changes some minds.

What I wanted to ask about was, again, about compensation, which I know the member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway) has mentioned a number of times. You may have heard me talk a little bit about it in the sense of an amendment that's been proposed, or will be proposed—I'm not sure at what stage during the bill—this bill process. But the amendment would specifically allow for compensation. It would allow the government to sit down with the cab industry, to start listening to them, to

hear from owners such as yourself about the investment that they've put into the business, the value that had been built up over time because of the system that was in place and how they could be helpful to make sure that the cab owners are compensated properly.

If an amendment like that was to come forward, if there was some sort of ability for you to begin negotiations about compensation—and, I guess, I would also add that there was also a fairness for drivers to compete on a fair, even, level playing field with companies like Uber—is this a piece of legislation that you could actually end up supporting?

Mr. Sukwinder Dhaliwal: No, I'm not.

The thing is, what's the difference between ride sharing and a taxi? We are both charging money and driving people from point A to B. And we are under rule and regulations. And Uber just comes in and break all the rule and regulations and doing the same job. I spent money to buy that licence, that—issued by the government of Manitoba. I should be compensated because I spent that money in faith of the government.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Dhaliwal.

* (12:20)

Mrs. Cox: I would just like to thank you so much for presenting today, and I know that it's taken a lot of time out of your busy schedule and with your family, as you've indicated, and the fact that you took the opportunity to be here two nights as well, to midnight, and I really appreciate your presentation.

And I just wanted to confirm what you said. The member opposite indicated that they would look at preparing an amendment to the bill which would give owners compensation, and you indicated that you were not in favour of that. Is that correct?
[interjection]

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Mr. Dhaliwal. Sorry. Mr. Dhaliwal.

Mr. Sukwinder Dhaliwal: Sorry. Yes, I'm in favour of the compensation. We need a compensation if this bill will go ahead, or you can amend that clause into the bill, please.

Mr. Wiebe: I think this is a key point, so I want to make sure that we're very clear about this, and I heard very clearly that you talked about compensation. But what I heard you having the most

issue with was the level playing field that Uber or Lyft or another—I mean, let's call a spade a spade—another cab company, whether it's, you know, hailed on your smart phone or hailed over the phone, over the telephone makes no difference—that they would have to follow the same rules, the same regulations, have to pay the same insurance that the cab industry has to pay. And I feel like that's your biggest concern, and to be honest with you, I don't blame you one bit for being skeptical about a bill that so far has had no recognition of the needs of the cab industry whatsoever—

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Eight seconds, Mr. Wiebe.

Mr. Wiebe: Pardon me?

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Eight seconds.

Mr. Wiebe: Okay—has no recognition so far and—

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Two seconds.

Mr. Wiebe: —simply by having an amendment maybe isn't good enough for the cab industry. I think that's a fair point.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Wiebe.

Mr. Dhaliwal, we are now done our question time, but I will allow you to—time to answer the question if you have an answer to Mr. Wiebe's question.

Mr. Sukwinder Dhaliwal: That's okay. Thank you very much.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: All right. Thank you for your presentation, sir.

I now call Talib Khokaher. Talib Khokaher? All right, we will now drop Mr. Khokaher to the bottom of the list.

I now call Beant Kindra. Mr. Kindra?

Do you have any materials for presentation, Mr. Kindra?

Mr. Beant Kindra (Private Citizen): No.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Then please proceed.

Mr. Kindra: Good afternoon, everybody. My name is Beant Kindra. I am driving a cab almost 27 years in Winnipeg city in Manitoba. And, when I buy the cab, that's, like, a half share just I bought at that time, right? I was *[inaudible]* with my life. That's lots going on with my life. I have to sell other half and—just to keep 25 per cent. After that, I buy other

25 per cent to just keep it on the business. Like, that's in-stay in the taxicab business, right?

Mr. Chairperson in the Chair

But I have two kids, seven years old and nine years old, and my wife, I feed him at home for this business I lost about four years ago. I buy other half, \$250,000 from the business. I don't want to give away. I don't want to sell my other half to give to somebody else. That's the way I just keep this whole share around this business, feed my family to get my wife. If I sell this business to other but—one, my half share to other half, right, I don't think so I could do anything else. I can find another job. That's why I spent \$250,000 about four years ago. I just buy my own job to stay with this business, and one other driver works for me at night shift. That's the way we are running with this taxi business. Plus, when I buy this half share about four years ago, whatever I get mortgage, \$250,000. I just bought it from the bank. I am paying right now for that much money, pay to the bank every month, about—almost \$2,500 every month payment that's going out right now, right.

If this Bill 30's—pass away—Uber is coming. We can lose business. How can—we can—I can pay my \$2,600 payment give to the bank, plus my other expensive household, plus—whatever I making every year for right now, I pay to the government GST plus whatever tax on top.

What else I have to say that—on this? If Bill 30's pass away, think about that. Where the money come from? For me, that one is for a 26, 27 hundred dollar payment—whatever I got a loan from the bank, when I buy the half share. And a rule and regulation for the other company, that's, like, whatever I'm paying right now. That's a rule and regulation for the city of Winnipeg. Like, we can get the permit, like, every, every, every years, plus safety. Safety—we have camera, shield plus the panic button in the cab. That's anything that going on in the cab.

Other thing is, what it—the business. Like, rush hour. We ask what them about the diamond lane in downtown, for people waiting for the cab so long. We don't have diamond lane. Rush hour, this very bad in Winnipeg. That's hard to pick up a customer. We applied for the diamond lane about a couple of years—I don't remember when we apply, but board of director in Unicity taxicab and Duffy's, they apply for the diamond lane in downtown. We don't get it. We waiting for the last about five or six years already. But we—that—enemy is coming here. We don't get any answer for that. Plus, pick up rush hour

time in downtown. That's no parking any time, any buildings. Where should we pick up the customers?

And that's all I have to say. Thank you very much.

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

Mr. Maloway: Over the last, I guess, three—there's—we're on our fourth day, now, of presenters. And several presenters yesterday—and one today, I think, spoke about before the election, attending a function, one of the Conservative Party and another restaurant in—on Pembina Highway, I believe. So at least two separate events, with some MLAs present, where they asked either individually or in a group, asked the Premier (Mr. Pallister) directly about a level playing field for the taxi industry. And everyone so far insists that the Premier said, on each occasion, that you will be treated—that there will be a level playing field and you'll be treated fairly.

Now, only a year and a half later, he has written up a bill that basically denies any compensation when most states in Australia are providing compensation of—like, Victoria state up to \$100,000 for the first taxi and \$50,000 for the second. In light of that, he has put in this bill that no compensation is to be paid to you, and he's shovelling responsibility—offloading responsibility for the entire taxicab industry off to the city, where you've got no guarantees that you're going to have a level playing field there with Uber, as you're—as a competitor.

Do you think that this is fair treatment by a Premier who's now broken a promise—broken a pre-election promise to treat you fairly? Do you think this is fair what he's doing here in Bill 30?

Mr. Kindra: That's not fair for us, for whatever they're doing bill—this—there no compensation. For their bill, that's not fair for that.

* (12:30)

Mr. Helwer: Thank you, Mr. Kindra, for coming to present today. As I've always said, I do very much appreciate people invest in business in Manitoba.

I'm interested in a couple of things, but, you know, the member across keeps talking about a promise made prior to the last election by the premier. So the premier at that time was Premier Selinger, and we don't follow the previous government's promises. So if that's what he's alluding to, I'm not sure.

But I'm interested, though, in your—you said you bought a share of the cab. And is this common for owners to own a share? And is it a large amount of the cab drivers that buy a share and then buy more and then eventually own the whole cab, or is it more common to buy outright, or there's a combination of both?

Mr. Kindra: Okay, I just bought the share, but I—that time if I want to sell that share or sell to somebody else that's, like, I don't have a job by myself after that. That's why I bought that share.

Mr. Andrew Micklefield (Rossmere): Thank you for coming and thank you for your words and comments. It's very helpful to hear what you have to say.

Every other jurisdiction in North America has embraced the kind of system that is proposed by this bill, and every other jurisdiction in North America still has taxicabs.

So my question is, why is there such a certainty that the industry would disappear when that has not happened in any other city? In fact, taxicabs retain a niche market and seem to carry along just fine. Surely other taxicab industries in the country and in North America have said these kinds of things. Other Canadian cities where it's municipally governed still have a thriving taxicab industry.

I'm just wondering if you could comment to that.

Mr. Kindra: But I don't know any other country that's what's going on down there, but I'm just talking about Winnipeg, Manitoba, that's all I'm talking about that one. That's whatever we've got industry running Duffy and Unicity, whatever that share is right now, that's at least that's transport ever, that's like one to other that one is.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Saran, we have a few seconds left, so if you could make it brief, please.

Mr. Mohinder Saran (The Maples): Well, I think either I'm mistaken or maybe we are not have enough information. I don't think the taxis outside the Winnipeg, they are under Manitoba Transportation. So it's just a matter of moving all those taxis from all the cities under the Manitoba taxi board, and that should help. Why they are making that much fuss and why they want to change it if, for the last 60, 70 years, it has been working that way?

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Kindra, you have a few seconds to answer that.

Mr. Kindra: Okay, I—this bill—when this bill is passed, I don't know what's going on after that. Nobody knows what's going on. That's why everybody worrying right now.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Kindra. The time on questions has expired, so we will now move on to the next presenter.

Our next presenter, presenter No. 33, Kewal Brar. Kewal Brar?

Mr. Brar, do you have any written presentations for the committee?

Mr. Kewal Brar (Private Citizen): No, unfortunately, I don't. I just came from hospital—

Mr. Chairperson: Then you may proceed with your verbal presentation when you are ready. Thank you.

Mr. Kewal Brar: Okay, I'm ready. Hello, everybody.

I, when I came this country I was—sorry, might I raise my voice? That's my normal tune. Don't think, like, I'm yelling or screaming; that's my normal, okay? I warn you first.

When I came here I was only 21 years old, a very young man. This is the best country in the world. We all know that. And I'm still today proud as a Canadian, as a Manitoban. This country gave me lots—lots.

I started my life by looking for a job, didn't find a job, started pursue my career as a cab driver, as a cabbie, young man. Since then, I'm still driving a taxi 'til today. Life was beautiful: beautiful wife, beautiful three children, born here, raised here, got educated here, got a job here. Everything going so smooth, 'til the Bill 30 came up on the floor—on the table, I should say. Uh-huh. Why? I thought this country's so beautiful. Everything was going smooth. We live in the best country in the world. Is this happening in this Canada which I know, Canadian which I know, Manitoban?

I'm tell you a little about myself. I have four kidneys. I'm kind of a special person in this room, I guess; no one else have four kidneys. Why I have four kidneys? Because I am Canadian, I am Manitoban, this only happen in this country. If I was in any other country in the world, it's not going to happen. I am standing in front of you guys here today because I was in this country.

I had two kidney transplants and maybe this is really, really weird. Rare, really, chance in the whole world—two transplants. And I'm still standing here, I'm getting back to work. So that was a little bit I tell you about how beautiful this country is.

I take you a little back, because I telling you, maybe I've been driving for a long time, when we have a Filmon government, a Mr. Filmon government, probably maybe you have some colleagues sitting here with? He had the same idea to improve the cab service. And—but that was totally different time, the way he dealt with it very, very smoothly. He did not ignore us like previous industries. He always will come us himself, transport minister and the Taxicab Board. Always bring us, sit on the table, want, hey guys, you doing good, but we need little bit more improvement here. How can we do that?

We have our views, they have their views, one meeting, five meetings, six meetings, everything goes well. And finally they decide, okay, we want to do this under the same category and the same system what the previous cabs that are running in this province. We adding more taxis, in fact. The same system. Fine. We not scared; we not running away from competition. They tried, but everybody know that. They did not successful, because those cabs, maybe open another company and did not survive.

Right now, it's totally different. We not, 'til today, we not running away from any competition. Fine, we need to change it. Yes, this is the life. You know, that's pretty common for us. But why, if there any established business we are running here in this province, why we want to destroy that previous business, or running business, to all over start new business? If we need any improvement, if we need anything changes, we are most welcome. 'Til today, what we hearing, our setup 'til today, the provincial government keeps saying our doors are open. Well, which doors? Is any room behind the doors? Is any hall behind the room? Is any government office behind the doors? The door's open, fine, but nobody there.

Okay, so many times, the doors—the same language, same thing. Our—Mr. Mayor, he's saying the same thing: we're open. We're open. Fine.

Few weeks ago, we were in City Hall. One councillor, he asked Mr. Mayor: you keep saying to them the doors are open. Any time frame. One day, he said no. Seven days, he said no. Fourteen days—any days. He said no. But the same time, Mr. Mayor

admit he had a meeting with Uber in his office. Why is that two-tier system? I spend my whole life here, everything, I told you. But why is that? Now I feel, is this same Manitoba? Is this same Canada? Why is that?

Fine it's just—always I heard, like, from the Uber from some place here in the government, of—few well-known families in Manitoba. They want. Well, anybody knows those well-known families, how many times they take a cab in last 15, 20 years? I don't remember even once. And they are the same family when Mr. Filmon we have here as premier. Those are the same family want to know. These cars are dirty taxis. We want little classy taxis. They tried. No.

* (12:40)

Why we have a two-tier system? If the government is elected right now, the present government is elected from only those well-known families? They elected from the whole Manitobans voters. Why we ignoring one end of the city? They huge, huge community. Medical service, they have to go by taxis. Any can—us—their children go to school, they're going to go by taxis. End of month, when the groceries, they have—there are no other transportation whatsoever. Why we—why we're—we don't talk to—about them. Why we ignoring them?

Finally, last—in a piece survey, have whatever might not saying the wrong number—name. They survey by phones. Did they survey? Did they go in that end of the town? Did they go to seniors?

Second question: How many seniors do we have in this province, sir? They are taking cabs. Their children not living here with them. They are—stairs. They are—maybe other part of the world. How they do that?

We have two major companies. They have accounts with us, children paying for their parents' cab fare. So their parents taking cab anytime, any day, any month want. End of the month, we send them an invoice to their children. So they pay us. So the seniors do not have to worry anything. They don't have the cash any—carry any cash. They don't have to need any credit card. They are safe. We know them, for they taking years and years and years. Why don't we talk about them?

Now I'm not talking only myself, my cab, my cab, my cab, because my colleagues or my partner they keep crying last four days—same thing. I'm not going to do the same again. But I now becoming a

senior pretty soon myself too. The way I said, my life was so beautiful, I was flying—everything. I was thinking my retirement. Oh, since that Bill 70 here, where's my retirement? I think that's destroying my—our retirement right now.

Finally, this government want to change; we are most welcome to want a change. But there's a proper way, the way that Gary Filmon did it. Try that; we're open. Why we are rush? Why we have to do in only, like, in two weeks? If the industry lasts long, like, last 70 years, why we can't wait another six months?

Why is the rush? Why is hurry? Right? Such change—do change whatever you guys wanted, but do not ignore us; that's my main point. You know, think about myself. Like, I spent all my life and now I'm getting, like, when I go into retirement and, okay, guys, you are completely decided. And, when the wages there maybe, I heard, I was listening the—sitting there. We can't compare other cities with us, sir, other provinces with us. This is a totally different province—different. Our major population is those people; they're totally depend on—how can we compare with our provinces? We can't, all right. We cannot.

And I think I said enough, because I'm now getting a little tired and—but, please, at the last: Think about that. Don't ignore us completely. Do not do rush. Don't rush, please. It's the wintertime. When the summertime comes, it's slow business; we have buy more time. Discuss altogether. We can solve any problem in this world by dialogue, but, if you want to keep ignore one party, then we going to be nowhere, right? Just wait. Buy time. Another six months, four months, two months—not do, like, have to do it today.

Our government not owe anything to Uber. Why we want to do that rush for them? Why don't our government's high priority should be think about our citizens, our Manitobans? If they were okay, go ahead, because I'm not going to be a cab driver all my life. The rest of life I can be citizen. I need those taxis.

When I start driving cabs, there was nothing safety in this cab. There was all—maybe some my age people know that. Why we have improved every years and years the last 35 years? Because we learn.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Brar, the time for your presentation has expired. So we will now move on to questions.

Mr. Wiebe: Mr. Brar, thank you so much for coming in, taking your valuable time to share with the committee.

And I do have a number of things that I wanted to point out that I think you raised that were important for the committee to acknowledge. The first thing is is the future that you saw for yourself here in this province. I think you said you came as a young man, 21 years old? [*interjection*] Came to this province, and I think that should be applauded, that you took a risk, you came to this province, you came to build a better future for yourself, for your family, and that's an important thing to remember, the sacrifice that you made to come here.

And I also, as I mentioned with previous presenters, I know a little bit about the place you came from, and I also know that a lot of people come to this country because they believe it's a place of fairness, a place where all are equal, and that we reward those who work hard, who contribute to our society and make this place a better place to live, and I think your work that you've done over the years in the cab industry is a testament to that, so I just wanted to acknowledge that.

But what I wanted to pick up on, most importantly, is your discussion about consultation, and it's very stark for me to hear from you that you remember a time where there was consultation, where there were changes in the cab industry, government came to the industry, asked for their input, worked with them. And here we have a bill that, in fact, we have two amendments to this bill that have been proposed in consultation with the cab industry, that are very reasonable, and that is to allow the discussion to happen around compensation, of course, and for rules to be equitable between any competitors around issues of health and safety.

And, I mean, I guess I just wanted to get your thoughts as somebody who's come to this committee in a very reasonable—you know, I know you were concerned about your tone, but it was—it was exactly right, I think. You had the right tone here; you're asking very, you know, straightforward—for consultation, for the government to sit down.

If the government was to listen to the cab industry, to sit at the table with you, to consider these amendments, would this be a bill that maybe you could support, you could work with the government to make sure that the cab industry is on equal footing and that compensation is there if appropriate?

Mr. Kewal Brar: Of course, I said it earlier. We are willing to do that, but at least that up to today we feel we're completely ignored.

I heard another thing, maybe, a little add if you want to allow me, just 30 seconds. There's a few people sitting at this table, they met us, there's was no make arrangements, like, through government or anything. They met us so many occasions like, socials, temples, gurdwaras, everything. Everything say, no, we can't ignore you; no, no, we are with you.

In a couple of weeks ago, when we have something wrong in this building, fire regulation, whatever, right? So we all out. The building was empty. Mr. Premier was standing on the lawn. He talked to us about 10 people. He said, well I talked today, I talk every day to the mayor, I talked today. He say give an example. He said, well I talk to mayor today about what happened in London, in UK with the Uber. So we not ignoring you. But now, at the last minute, say, well, now talk to City. Talk to City. The City keeps saying, the City said no, we, our doors are open. But which doors? Please give us address so we can knock the door.

Thank you.

Mr. Helwer: Thank you, Mr. Brar, for coming to meet with us today. You are, as you said, a miracle standing in front of us. Like you, our daughter is a two-time kidney recipient and I'm sure you thank your donors as we do every day.

Floor Comment: Was my wife first time. But second time unknown, God bless them.

Mr. Helwer: Thank you, Mr. Brar.

So, yes, it's an opportunity we have in Manitoba, some of the best nephrologists as I'm sure you experience during your regular meetings with them.

I'm encouraged by your optimism, sir, you are confident that you can compete at any level, and I'm wondering if you can tell us a bit about what might the path be in your mind to enable ride-sharing in Manitoba?

Mr. Kewal Brar: Is, this is right way to do it from my *[inaudible]* No. This is not right time to write verbally. What I want—again why do you need to rush? Why we can't buy time out like other month, other four weeks? Do we have any deadline we have

to do it? I don't think so we do, sir. I don't think so government have to do this thing, sir.

It should be panel, like from the government, from the old industry. Don't carry us like 20 people, maybe four people, maximum. We can sit. Same bill put on the table, we can tell you where, we are, hundred per cent we want to talk with you guys. We want, if you want to change, any change we are most welcome. But our main concern is up to now do not ignore us, that's what we feeling 'til now last second.

*(12:50)

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Brar.

Mr. Kewal Brar: Is me? Sorry. Oh.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Brar—*[interjection]*

Okay, we want to thank you for your presentation, Mr. Brar. We have gone well over the five minutes for the presentation and question period, so we want to thank you for your presentation, and we will now move on to the next presenter.

Our next presenter, Gurmail Mangat. Gurmail Mangat?

You may proceed with your presentation when you are ready, Mr. Mangat.

Mr. Gurmail Mangat (Private Citizen): Good evening, sir. The two oldest professions in this world, taxi is one of them. Winnipeg industry have taken their turns. They improved all the way. Small companies get together, make bigger, so we can afford investments, so we can build a business.

Unicity, the first company in western Canada have a computer, 1982. And how—because of that, we're able to build business and goodwill. We have here, people invested money in the industry, invested from overseas because they knew there's a return for investment. What happening here, we people are new immigrants. Some came 10 years before, some five years, some 20, 40 years. They have—your banks didn't lend us money. We borrowed money from private financiers. High rate of interest, we have paid. We put blood in this industry. That why we're here today.

In my life, I got bumped two times. First I came, I was working somewhere 23 years. The company sold. All my work, my pension, is gone. Second time, I'm here today. This is not a bomb—hydrogen bomb thrown us by this government.

But excuse we are here, the City of Winnipeg. I'm active member of this industry so many years. A year before we go to mayor, mayor, we'd like to talk to you, like to meet you. He had no time for us. He has a—there was one magazine, Winnipeg racist city in the—in Canada. He has his own drama, and I go to him. I had a very clear vision to talk to him, tell him we are in the same boat. Address us. We have a problem, the City of Winnipeg. We don't have the ambulance. We have no parking space. Police respond bad. This city have 25-year plan. We weren't there.

When we came to—we approached the City, please add us. Listen our concerns. Never, ever, they addressed any concern. That's why we are fully, fully confident in the hands of the government of Manitoba. In the—whenever we have problems, government—doesn't matter which party have government, they came to help us.

We have been through [*inaudible*] report, Dr. Mundy report. We have MNP. But lately, no they have suggestions how we can work whether. They never recommended us anywhere that we should be dumped to City of Winnipeg. We were doing good here. And what happen hundred years before? People from Europe came to this country. They got free lands. They had the farms. They build the farms. Now, when they're—because farm—family farm not very affordable now, they're selling their farms. Where the money go? Go to families. Same—I can compare this industry. We bought cabs here. Nobody give us free. We bought—we invested money, we build goodwill here. I'm not a retired person. When I [*inaudible*] on me, because all my savings gone. No goodwill after once this bill become law. What will happen to me? My saving? How I live? And my future done. This is my RRSP, keep in mind what done happen.

We have—the job we are doing here, very stressful, very dangerous. Playing with [*inaudible*] customers. We don't know what they have in their—in the pockets. We are—situation here, the Winnipeg kind of city, 40 per cent business we have here from First Nation people. They don't have accounts. They have welfare money. Government assistance. We're helping them.

Now, double-standard here is if other car—ride-sharing company come to Winnipeg, the Premier (Mr. Pallister)—I had meeting with him. We have words from him. We have to believe his words. He has given us words that level playing field.

Once this bill become law, where is level playing? Nothing for us. He did not—he promise us a lot, deliver nothing. What will happen, government without promises? We've—still have confident in this government. Government of the people, elected by the people. Think about us, our families, our future. People invested money from overseas sold the businesses here. Where they will go? People borrow money, they have hundred, \$200,000, \$300,000 loan on them. Where they will go?

If car sharing like Uber come here, you want to close doors of local company who create jobs here. Money stays here, pay tax here. To company have no place in Canada, you would—we are not running from competition if there's a level playing field. What kind of level playing? That should be given to us before this law should be passed.

We have experiences in this city. We have kind of training we have here. Kind of money, we have—we paying insurance on cars. Kind of things that happen here, we need government assistance, help to this industry. Don't close our doors. There are countries like Australia, some other countries, they're paying compensation. Even here in a—lately, we have—Government of Canada have agreement with the European common market. Definitely, Quebec because especially lose money in the dairy farming. Government of Canada playing, is have commitment to compensate them. Why not we?

We—there's no shortage of cabs in Winnipeg. We don't—we request the City of Winnipeg so many time help us. We can provide better service. Nothing. That's why we are very, very happy with the staying with the Government of Manitoba, with the Manitoba taxi board. Whenever we have any problem, they have always helped us. What will happen to—last 10 years, we have no meter raise. How much money we're paying, getting business from hotels, from airport. You know much money paid to airport every month? Forty-five thousand dollar. Where one—where the money is out of meter. We didn't get any raise. We requested to—one time to taxi board, please let me collect money. That people will probably pay for that. Denied.

The situation we are here, if I use—I—my feeling is this: is the feeling is when I feel myself, I feel depressed. I don't want to use other word, you understand what I mean. Is this not fairness for us? Government should come of—help this industry. We have invested money, we have put new cabs, latest model cars here. Nobody give us fair compensation

for that. Nobody help us. We are here asking and all these poor people coming from overseas with hopes and dreams, how they can fulfill dreams when they have—get bombs like this. Never thought about the Premier (Mr. Pallister) had this in mind. He would dump us to City of Winnipeg; never, ever thought about that. Never, ever.

*(13:00)

We request you on behalf of my industry and my families; we need your co-operation, open heart. We need to listen how—we are not running from competition; doesn't matter what. But they should have the same kind of level we are here.

Our costs are very high in this business, 12 hours, seven days, is not an easy job. Come on, have drive one of the cabs. Sit in the car; we'd show you what kind of business we are doing. Very difficult. Very difficult.

Don't dump us like this to the City of Winnipeg. No—we are not comfortable with that. We like to stay with Manitoba, government of Manitoba. They have done a lot for us. Whenever we have any concern, they—always they help us. Not City of Winnipeg, we are not feeling good with that.

And this stressful job we are doing. You have listened so many stories from drivers how customers treating them, how day's job they're doing, how long hours they're working; every time you have seen the stories. I have so many stories; I don't want to go back.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Mangat, but your 10 minutes has expired, so we will now move on to questions.

Mr. Wiebe: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Mangat. Thank you so much for coming, for sharing, as you said, a personal take on this, but I also know that you're an important leader in your community and on the taxi issues in the past. So I want to thank you for coming here and giving your expertise to this committee and sharing your experiences; you've learned it through others and as a representative of others.

I note that you mentioned your experience with the mayor and the lack of an open door, even though it was expressed that there should be an open door. I appreciate that; you know, you're looking for a seat at the table to be heard, for your concerns to be listened to.

I also note that you mentioned that you did talk to the Premier, and the Premier talked about a level playing field and assured members of the community and the industry that that would be the case. I think the member from Elmwood talked earlier about members who've been to this committee so far who've talked numerous times about encounters they've had with this Premier—

An Honourable Member: Conservative fundraisers.

Mr. Wiebe: —Conservative fundraisers even, as the member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway) rightly states, as presented by members of the community have talked about that level playing field that had been assured by this government.

Now, we have two amendments that we've talked about a number of times that I think go a part of the way in ensuring that there is a level playing field. Compensation for drivers, obviously, is an important part for those who own a taxi licence and see their value in that slipping away, but, as you rightfully point out, the protections for health and safety, which we've heard over and over again from members of your industry, are tantamount to providing a good service here in Winnipeg, and they've certainly met those standards in the past.

I just wanted to know, do you feel that the government is listening to you, that they are, in fact, providing this level playing field? And I guess maybe I'll go a step further. If these amendments were to be brought in, is this a piece of legislation that you think you might be able to support, you might say that that meets at least part of the concerns of the community?

Mr. Gurmail Mangat: As industry, we need some more time, discussions. All amendment, you asking about, I'm not the only person. We had just discussion, our fellow drivers. We need more time, number one. Number two, we need—looking for compensation, for sure. We believe the Premier's word will be honoured somewhere on the road.

Mr. Maloway: I want to thank you, Mr. Mangat, for an excellent presentation, and, you know, Mr. Kewal Brar, just before you, had talked about how things were so different back in Gary Filmon—actually, he's looking at us right now up on the wall—in his 11 years where he was—had a co-operative approach to the taxi industry.

I give you another example, up in northeast Winnipeg back in 1996 he too was going to do an overnight closure of the Concordia Hospital. Well, you know, there was a revolution up there with Bonnie Mitchelson and other people, MLAs just revolted on him, and he backed off in, like, two months. He said, look, I recognize that the public don't like the closure of Concordia Hospital, and he backed off. There was a man who was approachable, and by Mr. Brar's account, met with the taxi people on a regular basis to listen to their concerns.

Now juxtapose that to where we are right now. We have presenters here. Starting last night for the first time I heard two or three talk about going to a Conservative fundraiser with MLAs there and the Premier (Mr. Pallister) saying he was going to treat the taxi industry fairly with a level playing field. Another two presenters talked about another Conservative function they were at where they—the Premier made the same promise.

You know, you've got Conservative MLAs on the other side of the table here. They can go to the Premier tomorrow morning at caucus or the next caucus meeting they have and they can say, withdraw the bill. We would be doing that if our premier was doing something like this. We'd be going to caucus and saying—and the Premier can ignore one or two of them, but he can't ignore all of them.

So I would like your response to that.

Mr. Chairperson: Question period—time for question period has expired, but I will give you a few seconds to respond.

Mr. Gurmail Mangat: I recognize very good faces, and we had meetings with them, and I understand they'll help us. As a team together, we have no opposition ruling here. We are here in the hands of the government of Manitoba. With all opposition or government right now. Very familiar faces I see them here, they'll have promises with us. I guess to them we will listen. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Mangat.

And we will now move on to our next presenter, presenter No. 35, Pamjeet Grewal. Pamjeet Grewal.

Do you have any written presentation for the committee?

Mr. Pamjeet Grewal (Private Citizen): Yes, I do.

Mr. Chairperson: Just your verbal one.

Mr. Grewal: Yes.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed with your presentation when you are ready. Thank you.

Mr. Grewal: Good evening, Sir. I'm Pamjeet Grewal. I'm living here in Winnipeg, Manitoba, since 1980, and I'm a cab driver since 1982. And I—like my—I grew up my kids here. I stayed here in Winnipeg, Manitoba for almost 38, 39 years. And my kids, they went to the university.

And we're having a problem, like, the way the Uber is coming, right. Our industry has been very clear, we are about the safety and fairness community. I want to stress one thing, we don't need this bill if you is to bring to Uber. In Manitoba the Taxicab Board and the rule and regulation would be prevent Uber itself my operating as a dispatch service. The act would we require as any Uber driver in Winnipeg who have a taxi driver licence and a taxicab business licence.

Well, we're having a lot of problems, like, when we are driving, we've got a 12-hour shift. I work myself six days a week, and yes, we have—we've got a lot of problems with the customers too, like when we pick up a customer, sometimes they're in the good mood, sometimes they harass you too much. And yes, I went to—one time I had a customer from the old bus depot, and this passenger, he wanted to go somewhere on Portage Avenue, and he took the knife out and he tried to kill me. But the thing is that still I'm a care—taxi driver.

* (13:10)

And since we had the first murder, that's Gurnam Dhaliwal, after that we have the shield. But that wasn't mandatory on that time. We—because we're having a lot of problems with the customers when they sit in the car, they said, we are abusing them because we have a shield inside, because it wasn't mandatory. But after Pritam Deol they brought mandatory the shield, which was good. And now we are trying our best to give better service, and if you want to bring Uber, there's no problem with this, but yet there should be rules and regulations, and everything should be under the same status.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Grewal.

Mr. Wiebe: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Grewal, for your presentation. You know, when we

hear stories like this about the danger that cab drivers put themselves in and some of the experiences that they've had, I think it's a chilling experience to hear about, and I think it does strike a chord with the committee, and I think it makes a difference having you here, sharing that experience, and what I took most importantly from you is that you, as a provider of a service, saw that safety of yourself, but also of your passengers, was the most important thing that you could provide.

And, you know, to be honest with you, we've heard that exact same story from, well, I don't know how many now, but I would venture to say there are hundreds that have or will present to this committee and this story, this same exact story, comes up over and over and over again.

You talk about the taxi industry being interested in safety, making sure that passengers are safe, as I said, drivers are safe, and when we hear about companies like Uber and Lyft and other taxi-hailing apps that are coming to Manitoba, do you feel that they would be on the same playing field if they came without additional protections put in this legislation? If this legislation was passed as is, do you really think that that's a level playing field for those companies? *[interjection]*

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Grewal, before you start answering the question, I must recognize you because otherwise your answer does not get picked up in Hansard, so once the question is asked, then I will recognize you so you can answer, so you may start your answer all over again. Thank you.

Mr. Grewal: Oh, I'm sorry.

Mr. Chairperson: You have to repeat what you said because Hansard didn't pick it up because I didn't mention—I didn't say your name. The mics don't come on until I mention your name.

Mr. Grewal: Okay. My name is Pamjeet Grewal—

Mr. Chairperson: No, no. Like, I have to mention your name before you can speak.

Mr. Grewal: Okay, sir. I'm living here in Manitoba since—you want me to start it again?

Mr. Chairperson: No, no. Just answer the question.

Mr. Grewal: Answer the question. Okay. What I was going to say, well, if they want to come on the same level, like, if the Uber they're going to come and they're going to drive for 14, \$1,500, and I spent

almost 300, 400 grand because that was my retirement.

Right now I've got to buy—kids, they're going to the University of Manitoba from—for another, I believe, six, seven years, and whatever I paid, after the Uber come, my property is going to be a zero, right, because they're going to be—if they're going to drive on \$1,500 Autopac.

Because I remember I once—that's a long time ago, where I had Premier Gary Doer in my car, that's a long time ago, when they won, and at that time, also, we were talking about Autopac. He sat in my car for a few hours. I told him, sir, see, with the Handi-Transit, we are making almost \$400, and we, as the taxi industry, we are making that much money. But where is the fairness? Because I'm paying almost—right now I'm paying \$10,500 Autopac, and they're going to drive on \$1,500. It's not worth it.

Mr. Andrew Swan (Minto): Mr. Grewal, thank you for coming down, and I want to pick up on a safety issue as well. I am an MLA who represents the West End of Winnipeg, so the area I represent starts at Valour Road and goes all the way into Langside Street. So most of the people in my area are good people. Unfortunately, sometimes there have been incidents that have happened.

One of the fears that people in my area have said is that, without an equal playing field and safety standards, a ride-sharing company like Uber might simply refuse to serve people that live in the area that I represent. And more and more people are going to need cabs as urgent-care centres get closed, as—*[interjection]* Yes, let me please just finish the question.

So can you talk about that, about what you believe would be—are taxi companies' duty to serve people, whatever part of the city, whatever part of the province they may live in?

Mr. Chairperson: Time for the question period has expired, but I will allow Mr. Grewal to answer the question briefly. Like, I'll give you, like, 20 seconds to answer the question, so like I won't, you can't go on for like two or three minutes. So please answer the question, like briefly.

Mr. Grewal: Yes, well, because if they going to be, safety is always, we want it first. There's no doubt of that. We have the camera. We have the shield. Right? And that the thing that Uber they going to pick up four, five or six people, and we are, according to the Taxicab Board, we are only to pick

up the four because that's the way the Autopac is cover.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Grewal. We appreciate you coming out tonight.

We will now move on to the next presenter. We will now move on to presenter No. 36, Ram Valeluru. And if I'm mispronouncing your name if you could—

Floor Comment: I have so many names. That will be fine.

This is little bit of drivers' stuff, my presentation—

Mr. Chairperson: Yes, once your presentation has been distributed to the committee, you may start your presentation.

You may proceed with your presentation.

Mr. Ram Valeluru (Private Citizen): So, good afternoon, everyone. Like, my name is Ram Valeluru. So, first of all, thank you for this opportunity to share my views and a little bit of opinion on Bill 30.

So my 'perspect' is a little bit different from majority of the previous presenters actually. They were, majority of them are drivers or owners, something like that. I'm little bit neither driver, I'm neither one of any taxi lessons actually. However, I'm a little bit related to this industry, and everybody knows that, like, for every industry creates two types of employment. One is direct employment; second one is indirect employment. Direct employment in this particular industry comes for, like, drivers and owner-operators. So they are creating themselves their own employment, and they are creating for some other drivers.

There are—indirect employment is there the people who depend on this industry, I'm one of them. I belong to, like, that kind of category. So those are, like, for example, in this industry if we take it like a, the people who work in meters, meter shops, or garages, or like printing press, or like dispatch companies, so I work to one of the dispatch company, so I'm the close observer of this industry actually. From my 'perspect' to what I see here is like a, when this bill passes, Bill 30 passes and becomes an act, so it will be kind of a devastation experience, like a, expectation, experience will be on these shareholders actually.

To many of the employees who works any of these industries actually currently, they are full-time employees. Many insist they're expressing their opinions, say that, like, this is not a full-time employment. These, who are working for the TNCs, they will be becoming part-time employees. That means these TNC companies are creating our—indirectly this Bill 30 is creating the part-time employment at the expense of full-time employment.

* (13:20)

So any person, like take myself, I'm a family person. I feel like I should know that by the end of the month this much amount of money I will make, so I plan according to that my future. When you have uncertainty in your life, how much money you are making to—you are making by the end of the day, it's uncertainty will start to build up. It's chaos in the society.

As lawmakers, we have to think a little bit far a head of that what will happen when the gig economy comes into the—comes in place. Gig economy means—probably everybody knows that nowadays—people serves other people. That's true, absolutely, but it's an uncontrolled way. That's called, like, a gig economy's having now.

So, those things like, actually, when full employment is gone and everything is part-time employment created, it's really hard to survey in that uncertainty with uncertainty of economy. So here comes, like, full-time employment. Many of our employees, they are feeling that they are losing their full time, and they are, like, in kind of a fear of they're losing their jobs here. So I'm talking on behalf of them, actually.

There was a couple of drivers, like, a—well, I heard, like, they were in a misunderstanding of these—they are making these employers to pay EA and CPP. Well, in fact, all these, like, small business owners, they know that many of these drivers, they are not full—like, small business owners. As a response, we tell the full-time—like, these job—like—the small business owners, they have to pay CPP and EA. Even the employer has to contribute, and the employee both have to contribute on that one.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson in the Chair

So some of the drivers there in a misunderstanding or misconception that they don't have to pay their portion of EA and CPP. Well, in fact, they have to pay, whereas an owner, a business licence holder for in this particular case—the owner

has a responsibility of collecting this EA and CPP. Their, like, drivers share, and they have to remit to the CRA. This—I want to make that clear. Like, some people were expressing that owners want to start making them pay. No, in fact, they have to pay their share too.

As I close, as I mentioned, like, as a part of my job, I really closely observe this industry. Safety is one of the major factors we have to discuss here, actually. I have so many—some questions here in this, particularly if we don't have that particular equipment in this particular vehicle, what will happen at the time of investigation? Take, for example, camera. The camera, like, is very—is excellent witness for many of the incidents happens. There was a word out, say—like, actually, some people were saying that when [*inaudible*] started operating in any jurisdiction, there's no necessity of cameras because the driver and the passenger, they know their identities, like, before getting—ride starts. Absolutely, I agree with that.

However, once the ride started, so what will happen? Let's say, if anything, an unexpected event or unforeseen situation was happen, who will be the witness for that? So, who is the—who will—like, how do we know the investigator should know that, what happened, what went wrong there. So, that's where, like, a camera plays a vital role in that.

Let's say something happen when—inappropriate behaviour. Like, I'd want some—one person, one individual advances towards another person inside the closed compartment of this vehicle. So that, like, a he-said-she-said. Who said? We don't know. There, a camera plays a very important role, actually. There, as a, like—as an investigator, we should know that, like, oh, this is what happening inside. Okay. This incident took place before this incident happened. So there, like, the camera is very important.

So we should not ignore that kind of—well, it's up to—I know this is not the perfect venue to discuss what exactly kind of equipment is required, whereas—let's take—I want—why I'm expressing this open in here is, let's say, as a person, like, we—most other people, they will execute their will. When we execute a will, actually, we see that our property, in our absence—like, everybody, like our property, like our children, should get the equal opportunities for—like, from my property. Like, they should get equal—even those we are giving to our significant partner, our spouses, she's equally responsible. Still, we'll say one single word that—okay, when you're distributing

this one, make sure that everybody should get an equal opportunity. Everybody should get the same kind of property.

That particular word was missing in this Bill 30. That was one of my concerns here. When we are passing that—our responsibility, our job, to some other person, we expect that, okay, make sure everybody should get the same opportunity. That particular point was missing in Bill 31. I'm going through that one. Please correct me if I'm wrong.

So, one of the—and if you go to—like, another one is the shield, actually. It's up to the lawmakers. We—they—like, bylaw preparers so they can make their own additions, but my perspective is that with a shield, like a camera—a shield is like—it's a very important part. So many people, they were discussing why they need shield, and I said, I don't want to go too much on that one. But, whereas, like, if you see any—their public transit—if you see, and I think in the month of July, CBC.ca website, they have an article in that that's saying that transit—Winnipeg Transit is considering about the shields—installing shields. And as recently as in October 19th, the newspaper—I'd gone through an article saying that Winnipeg Transit is starting six months pilot project to install in six transit buses. That means they are coming to know the importance of shield and what kind of benefits they have with the shield. So this is also exactly same thing like when we are passing this delegation—delegating the 30 or like a transition of jurisdiction, at least we have to mention that make sure these kind of important things they should have in that one. So we are expecting that kind of amendment might be helpful for all these people actually.

And the third one is insurance is one of the major point. I would like to explain like a kind of a—might be like a real environment, like a situation. I can explain one of that when we are dealing recently. Let's say, once we pass this one to delegation all to the different municipalities. Of course, they can come up with their own bylaws. I can understand that. Of course, Winnipeg kind of urban area. They have their resources and they have capable of coming up with their own bylaws. Where are smaller municipalities? We don't know. So who is going to call the guidelines to them? Because that's the very first thing they have to do. And we—who is going to do that one. So they will come up with their own bylaw. Might be their insurance requirement will be different than Winnipeg. Let's say, take one—it's called inter-municipality levy trips, actually? It

comes under highway transportation. Well, like once this transfer, like a Taxicab Board is completely like a—sorry?

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: You have one minute left, thank you.

Mr. Valeluru: Oh, sorry. Okay, so I'll try to wrap up as much, as quickly as I can.

So because the real-time environment so I wouldn't express this one. So what happened was, like, let's say travelling from one jurisdiction to, like—one municipality to the other municipality is very common in this business, actually, in the transportation of, like, CNCB crew or like public-sector people, are so many private passengers. We transport them.

Let's say hypothetically like one municipality has a higher insurance requirement, another municipality has a lower insurance requirement. This particular driver is travelling from the lower, like, insurance requirement, to the higher insurance requirement municipality. He met with an accident in that jurisdiction and his insurance is not sufficient to cover the passenger or himself, a driver and his vehicle. And inside, the passenger suffered. So who will be the responsible for that kind of issue? Is the poor driver?

Well, it's this kind of problem we can—like, let me—one more minute if you allow me to finish this one. This particular topic. So you, for the provincial government, make sure that like at least minimum standard of safety and insurance is required throughout the Manitoba. Then that will solve it. Less up to the next municipality. They can make sure that—okay, they can expand if they want to, they will settle with that minimum standard of requirement. Or else they can go for higher requirements. So at least we have to make sure that, like, everywhere where are these going and they should have same kind of insurance, safety standards throughout Manitoba. That can be done with this amendment of this bill—only possibility?

I think I'm open for questions.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Valeluru.

Are there any questions from the committee?

Mr. Swan: Yes, well, thank you very much for presenting this afternoon. And I wonder if you can just expand a little bit more on the very last point that

you raised, which is the prospect of rides actually taking place between municipalities. I mean, if somebody in the RM of Headingley takes a cab to the airport, they're going from one jurisdiction to another. If somebody down at—down at the lake wants to take a cab from Winnipeg Beach to Gimli, they're crossing jurisdictional boundaries, and you could have councils that have very different rules—or, frankly, no rules at all.

Can you talk just a little bit more about that and the problems that you see with simply passing what was a provincial responsibility off to the many, many municipalities in the province of Manitoba?

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Mr. Baleleru [*phonetic*].

Mr. Valeluru: Thanks for the question, actually. It's a very excellent question.

So, well, actually this is what exactly that my question too, actually. It's not just only the matter of insurance. The kind of rules and regulations—let's say, like, here there's like a per kilometre, \$2 is there. That's in Headingley, \$3 is there. So once they cross the—to, like, jurisdiction, or we can say city limits and entering the Headingley, like what kind of rate do they have to do?

* (13:30)

Right now highway transportation act, again, like, with that kind of rules we are following. Once this taxicab would dissolve completely, who will create this inter-highways, it's kind of different municipalities, say, between the municipalities. That's a grey area as for myself, actually, could be like address a letter, maybe. But as of [*inaudible*] it's a grey area for myself.

Ms. Flor Marcelino (Logan): Thank you for your presentation. You made a very good point in your paper, item No. 1, about the—how the taxi industry employs directly and indirectly and all these many people are part of the indirect employment. Are you familiar with the business plan of Uber? Will—correct me if I'm wrong—from my limited encounter with Uber drivers, they have told me they're part-timers because they cannot rely on driving for—it's not enough to live on if they were to drive 12 hours a day with Uber and that they're only part-time, and the car that they are using, they don't have the safety features that a taxi driver's car has. Can you visualize, if part-timer drivers like Uber in the industry itself, Uber, will all these people indirectly employed be also employed with an Uber business plan?

Mr. Valeluru: Thanks for asking that question.

Well, actually, this is a very good point too. Like, as I said, like it's a part-time business. Once city or respective municipalities comes up with their own bylaws, they may not all part-time, as I said, like, if I'm an Uber driver, I don't want to put a shield in my Mercedes, guaranteed, because it's for four hours of driving. So same thing like that, that means the person who is making those are the part-timers and if we remove the camera, the people who are working in the garages, all these secondary people, they will definitely lose their income, obviously. I'm not saying that it is going to be zero, but, however, their income reduces. As a part-time driver sees these people also like a—who are full-time employees right now, their income goes down. When there is no, like, a certainty is there how much you are going to make that money, so nobody going to be in this business. Obviously, they will spread out and eventually, they will be—don't find any drivers or taxi service providers in the city because they don't make enough money. Let's say hypothetically, if they are making \$200, \$100 per day, if they are making enough that if \$50 because of so many people in the business, with rules, without rules, so many things happen with the different rules, it could be. We don't know. So in that situation, they will not—if they don't have enough money to serve in the business. Obviously, if you don't make that much money in that job, obviously, you will go some other place. So by the end of, like, after six months, down the line, after one year, if we turn back and if you see there will be no cab on the road. If you want to go midnight in December in the blizzard condition, there is no personal drivers will be on the road because all these TNC drivers—I don't want to mention any particular company—so many TNCs are there to do Uber, Lyft or like, so many are there actually in this one. It could be any. Or some other person who can make their—myself, I'm a technical person; I can make my own app, and I can come up in the business. So I don't show that much of responsibility as a professional driver. So professional driver means that he's a professional, that he will be in the business, even is a blizzard conditions, water, maybe the situation, maybe 12 o'clock or 2 o'clock, he will be on the road. He will doze in the car and as soon as he receives a call from the dispatch company, he will go and he will provide the service. So if—

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Valeluru, we've run out of time. Thank you for your presentation and for your questions.

Committee Substitutions

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: I'd like to inform the committee that under our rule 85(2), the following membership substitution has been made for this committee effective immediately: Mr. Swan for Mr. Wiebe; and Mr. Johnson for Mr. Smith. Thank you.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: I now will call on Jaspal Singh, No. 37.

Mr. Singh, do you have any materials to present to the committee?

Mr. Jaspal Singh (Private Citizen): No.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: All right. You can proceed with your presentation, thank you.

Mr. Jaspal Singh: Good afternoon, the committee Chairman and the members of the committee. Regarding this bill, our industry is very clear. We don't need this bill because if Uber wants to operate here in the city, they could go under the Taxicab Board act and regulations.

What Uber wants to do is just skirt the regulations. They don't want to go through the drivers being vetted properly, so they save money on that; and they don't want to have their vehicles also inspected twice a year. So, in that case, what they are doing is, like any public utility, they should be governed by the rules and regulations of the Taxicab Board.

What basically they're doing is transporting person from point A to B, so no matter what they say, ride sharing and all that, they are basically a taxi service, so they should be governed by the current Taxicab Board regulations and also they won't be able to transport the disabled people.

Our taxi service provides service to all the people and they have access—anybody has access wherever they want to go to, and also they are safe and secure in the sense that all the taxi drivers are properly qualified. They are trained. They take Taxicab Board driving licence and also Taxicab Board business licence for the owners, so, as such, they are well governed. Now, also the safety features [*inaudible*] So we've got in-camera to provide safety for the passengers as well as for the driver.

So what I'm saying is that they should fall under the Manitoba Taxicab Board act and regulations, so it becomes an equal playing field. There should be the same insurance. No matter what they say, they

are a transportation service like any public utility. All these municipalities, they made these Taxicab Board bylaws all over the world, so they're governed for the public safety in the same way.

Also, I'm in this industry for the last 25 years, and over the years I've seen a lot of new immigrants coming here and they investing in the taxi industry, so they have mortgages to pay, they've got loans to pay, so they went into this industry, thinking that, over a period of time, when they retire, they will have some money there, so that's good for their retirement.

So, since this committee is about economic well-being of the people, so I don't think it's in the economic well-being of the people who are already here in the city operating over so many years and serving the public, at the same time contributing to the economy and also as a taxicab person.

So what I want to say is that for Uber or any other ride-sharing company to operate here, they should be governed by the same rules and regulations, so that's what I have to say.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Singh.

Are there questions of the presenter?

Mr. Swan: Mr. Singh, thank you for coming down to the Legislature this afternoon to present as a small-business person, and we're hearing from so many small-business people this afternoon, and what we've heard from so many people is the idea there should be an equal playing field. We've even had people say that the Premier (Mr. Pallister) has told them there should be an equal playing field.

Just as an example, can you tell us, roughly, how much has it cost taxi drivers to install cameras and install safety shields into their cabs?

* (13:40)

Mr. Jaspal Singh: A few thousand dollars, you know.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: We have—Mr. Curry.

Mr. Curry: Thank you, Mr. Singh.

I think a very important discussion about safety.

Now, you drove a cab before, say, there were cameras as part of it. Would there be a situation where you would ever want yourself or anyone else who operates any kind of taxi to not use a camera or do you think that's an invaluable part of it, the

service that you have, especially compared to when you've operated one without a camera. *[interjection]*

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Mr. Singh. Just wait—Mr. Singh, I have to recognize you for Hansard first. Please proceed, Mr. Singh.

Mr. Jaspal Singh: Yes, that's a regular part of safety for both the passenger as well as the driver. So I think that must be there.

Mr. Swan: Mr. Singh, you talked a little bit in your presentation about you having been involved in the industry for a long time and having had—made an investment. You've also talked about other newcomers who have come and they've invested in the taxi industry. To your knowledge, how much have those individuals paid for a licence to be able to own and operate a cab? And what do you think will happen to the value of that investment if Bill 30 passes as the government has proposed?

Mr. Jaspal Singh: Quite a bit of money, \$300,000 or more. And if this act comes to witness so they lose all their money. So they won't have anything to fall back upon for their retirement or for their well-being of their economic well-being of their family and children.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Any further questions?

Mr. Maloway: I want to thank you for your presentation, and you have—you probably heard before that we have referenced that the state of Victoria in Australia, and that's just one state, pretty well all of the states in Australia are dealing with the same issue. Over the last two years now they are providing compensation to the taxi industry. The state of Victoria is offering \$100,000 for the first cab, 50 for the second. There's a \$494-million assistance fund, and there's also a hardship fund in there.

This is what they're doing in a state like Australia. And juxtapose that to here where you have a Premier who's already broken his promise to the industry saying he was going to treat the industry properly and with a level playing field just a year and a half ago.

Now he's changed his mind completely and he's forcing a bill down his—actually his MLAs' throats too, to disallow any form of compensation, to causing damage that he's caused by this bill. Your values and your cabs are gone from \$400,000 in some cases down to next to nothing, and all of this as a result of the Premier's bill when he promised not to

do it a year and a half ago, now he is bringing in the bill that's wiping out your investment.

What do you say about that?

Mr. Jaspal Singh: Yes, and so there should be compensation if they are the one they don't want to do that. And also there should be level playing field. I think the governing party members—committee members here can go to their caucus and bring all of our concerns what we are presenting here to your leader, and accordingly proceed from there.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Singh, for your presentation.

Mr. Jaspal Singh: Thank you.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: So we now move to presenter No. 38, Scott McFadyen.

Mr. McFadyen do you have any material for the committee?

Mr. Scott McFadyen (Winnipeg Community Taxi Coalition): I do not, Sir.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Please proceed, sir.

Mr. McFadyen: My name is Scott McFadyen, I'm a spokesperson for the Winnipeg Community Taxi Coalition. This is a newly-formed coalition that recently came together to co-ordinate a response from the taxi industry in support of organizations to Bill 30, The Local Vehicles for Hire Act, as well as the City's deliberations on the bylaws impacting the taxi industry.

You've heard from dozens upon dozens upon dozens of presenters. You've heard from the drivers, their sons, their daughters, their spouses, their friends. You've heard from community rights activists. You've heard from accessibility activists. You've heard from academics. And, you know these drivers, they're your neighbours, they're your friends, and they're taking advantage of their democratic opportunity to voice their opinion. Waiting patiently for hours on end is a common trait for all taxicab drivers. So these hearings are nothing new for them.

Bill 30 will have a dramatic impact on the hundreds of families that work in the industry, and the tens of thousands of Winnipeggers that rely on this service daily. Taxicab drivers are business owners who work hard. You'll notice that a lot are new Canadians making better lives for themselves in Winnipeg. They're working six days a week, 12 hours a day and more, and they take pride in their work. And I've heard many cab drivers refer to their

passengers as extensions of their family, members of their family. They do take their work very seriously.

While 99 per cent of passengers are peaceful and law-abiding citizens, here in Winnipeg taxi drivers daily face racism, robbery, and assaults. We've heard story about cab drivers being hit across the head with beer bottles, pipes, stabbings, and other critical injuries. Again, their jobs are not easy. And they're not getting wealthy; instead, they're putting their children through university so that their children can have better lives. And let's look at who their children are: their children are doctors, lawyers, engineers, economists; their children are hockey players, they play the piano, they're artists, and, in some cases, they're future politicians. And many of the drivers are well educated themselves.

So, you know, what do we want? I mean, we've heard from a lot of us. Well, we're focussed on three primary principles, and I'll come to specifically what we're looking for in this legislation at the end, but those three principles which you've heard from a lot of people on are safety, fairness and community. And I'll just delve a little bit more into those in the next little while here.

So safety, so, if one principle rises above all of the others, it's safety, and for obvious reasons. As you've heard, taxi drivers are 60 times more likely to be murdered on the job. In Winnipeg the last murder of a driver was that of Pritam Deol, who was murdered in 2001. And in 2002, the Province mandated in-car cameras, shields, and training. And this was supported by the PCs, the Liberals, and the NDP at the time. The introduction of these measures resulted in a 79 per cent reduction in assaults, and a 100 per cent reduction in murders. The City of Winnipeg is currently considering a shield for bus drivers. These are for the drivers.

There are also stringent measures in place to keep passengers safe. This includes screening drivers for criminal records, looking at their driving records, Child Abuse Registry checks, and screening interviews. For these companies, there's a zero tolerance policy for any impropriety where drivers are suspended, even if they have been charged but not yet convicted.

If the taxis' competitors are not subject to the same regulatory requirements, this will result in a less safe Winnipeg. As we are witnessing, our competitors threatening to not operate in other jurisdictions, such as London, England, and Quebec where it faces even the most basic regulatory

requirements in terms of safety. BC has also given pause to this and has initiated a year-long study. So I keep hearing about all the other jurisdictions are on board with this, that's not the case.

We believe that all vehicles for hire should have the highest level of safety. We're not talking about a level playing field. Actually, I want to correct the record on that, we want the highest level of safety. We don't want a race to the bottom—a highest level of safety.

Fairness, the second principle. So what degree of regulation will apply to our competitor versus the taxi industry? Will it be fair? Will there be similar requirements? These regulations have developed over decades and serve a greater good for the committee. The local vehicle-for-hire act is aptly named. Vehicle for hire, not ride share, not me getting a ride to the curling club with my friend, or not me getting to a hockey game with my friend, vehicle for hire. If there is an exchange of money through a dispatch electronically or through a person, it is a taxi. If it walks like a taxi, if it talks like a taxi, it is a taxi.

* (13:50)

Fairness includes consultation. Mr. Minister, the coalition's concerned that major changes are being made to their industry without meaningful consultation, and we would appreciate an opportunity to meet with you as soon as possible, knowing that this law is likely to go through on November the 9th. However, we would, you know, like to meet with you. We did meet with the former minister previously, before my time, but we still face Bill 30 as it's written today. So, clearly, that meeting didn't go anywhere.

Fairness is important. Any transfer of licensing authority to the city, if it should occur, should maintain the basic licensing system that allows the transference of categories of licence.

The third principle—community. The industry creates hundreds of jobs in Winnipeg; 1,600 jobs to be precise. Again, these are your friends and neighbours, your children's friends. You'll notice that there's been a few hundred presentations made. Our competitor made one presentation. They flew someone in from Toronto. They haven't even actually had the decency to hear all of the presentations. They're gone.

Not all members of our community have access to smart phones and credit cards. Not all citizens will

be able to afford surge pricing or predatory pricing, I've heard, on New Year's Eve or Christmas Eve. Some citizens require a van with a lift, not a black Lexus. All of this is at risk if the province moves forward without considering the ramifications of a multi-billion-dollar corporation taking profits out of our community.

I'm going to just make a quick point on innovation because, really, our coalition does believe in the modernization of the industry. We have apps. We encourage you to download your app today, and we want our customers to have access to all of the latest technologies.

But we're in the Wild West, in terms of regulations, and the laws we write now will set a precedence and will have an impact far into the future. I don't know if any of you remember Napster. Do any of you remember Napster? Yes, litigated to the point of not existing anymore, but killed the music industry, the Wild West of regulations.

So, in conclusion, this is about safety, not eroding safety. This is about fairness and remembering the importance of consistent regulations developed over decades. This is about supporting our community, our friends, our neighbours, people that have taken time away from earning money to be here so that their voices can be heard.

So we have ideas; we have suggestions. The act, as it is now written, is a threat to the taxi industries and the thousands of Winnipeggers who rely on it. It needs refinement, amendments and our group would like to see it withdrawn if the amendments do not go through.

Sorry, and I realize I'm very close to the end here in terms of the specific amendments. How much time do I have? Sorry.

An Honourable Member: Keep going, keep going.

Mr. McFadyen: Just in terms of the specific amendments, don't cancel the licences. Transfer them to the city. This needs to be prescribed in the legislation. No reduction in safety—put that into the act. Establish a compensation commission. Look, we don't want compensation. We don't want to get to that point, but if you're going to strip that out of the act, that's problematic.

The City of Winnipeg taxi act specifies insurance requirements. I haven't even talked about insurance. Bill 30 does not. It needs to, and Bill 30

sets a February 28th, 2018, deadline to bring the act in. Take that deadline out. Why is that deadline in there?

Interesting that this act is set to pass on November the 9th and the mayor of Winnipeg agreed to meet with us on November the 10th, and we've been accused of saying that there's a backroom deal at play here. Well, this legislation is passing on November the 9th. The mayor is meeting with this group for the first time in three years on November the 10th.

Thank you for your time. I hope that you hear the voices of the many small-business owners who are very politically active and vote. Thank you.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. McFadyen.

Mr. Swan: Well, thank you, Mr. McFadyen, for coming down and presenting and I know you've spent a fair amount of time watching as members of Winnipeg's taxi industry present.

We've known each other a long time. We haven't always agreed on every issue, but our NDP caucus certainly accepts what you're saying, not on its own, but in conjunction with what we've heard from so many people who've been prepared to come down to this Legislature and talk about their industry, their livelihood and what it means to them and their families.

I asked the question of a taxi operator not that long ago. I represent the West End of the city and I've people in my area very concerned that ride-sharing services like Uber have, in some cases, just refused to serve areas of a community. And I'm very worried that that would be a lot of people that I represent that count on being able to hire a vehicle to get to medical appointments, for medical emergencies because they can't afford an ambulance, and other reasons. Is that something that you're familiar with as a risk of ride-sharing services coming in, and can you comment on that?

Mr. McFadyen: The principle of community, yes. Not everyone has access to smartphones. Not everyone has access to credit cards. Certainly, we heard during the testimonies, we heard from a disability rights advocate speaking about, you know, some of the potential downfalls, you know, for that community. So, yes, let's not lose sight of, you know, those that may not be so privileged as to, you know, hop in an Uber, to pay the surge pricing. I mean, we've heard \$1,600 for, you know, a short ride on New Year's Eve. And, certainly, you know, the—why

the ride-share, and I'm hesitant to use the ride-share word, but why the ride-share model is potentially problematic for a lot of Winnipeggers is that, you know, once the unfair competition comes in, it'll put a lot of these guys potentially out of business, as has occurred in other jurisdictions when Uber has come in, and meaning that those people that don't have smartphones, don't have credit cards, don't have service.

Hon. Jeff Wharton (Minister of Municipal Relations): Thank you, Mr. McFadyen, for taking the time today to come out and further enlighten the committee here today, and we appreciate your advocacy for the industry.

A couple of questions popped up in respect to your presentation. First of all, you had made a comment that sounds like the industry, of course, is becoming more and more diversified. Can you hear me okay?

Floor Comment: Yes.

Mr. Wharton: It's more and more diversified, and I can say that from the presentations that we've heard over the last three days, going on day 4 now, that the talent from—in the room from the owner-operators and the drivers—and by the way, I was an owner-operator for 25 years too as well, and I can appreciate the challenges when regulations change throughout the course of history as we continue to progress as a society. So—and I know that the folks here that have spoke over the last four days are very talented and can adapt and they've admittedly said that they could adapt to change.

I guess my question is, with the City changing and the Capital Region growing at numbers that haven't been seen in 10 or 15 years, excess of 116,000 people living outside the city within the capital region, currently in 18 municipalities, I guess my question to you is, how do you see the industry with a talent that we already have in the industry, with the cab owner-operators evolving to essentially look at more market share, potentially grow the industry to where it's been the last 65 years. I guess I see opportunity as an entrepreneur myself, and I believe if I polled the fellows in the back, they would probably agree with me that this could be an opportunity to grow. So I guess my question is, how do you see that evolving as we go forward and as the city and the province change?

Mr. McFadyen: Minister, I don't profess to be an expert on transportation, you know, policy or

economics, but, certainly, I think, you know, there—competition is healthy from the standpoint that it, you know, rises all boats. You know, this, you know, the industry, you know, very, you know, recently, has rushed to modernize. And, you know, certainly, technology is a wonderful thing, innovation is a wonderful thing, you know, but where we are concerned is that, you know, if the City, you know, doesn't put in place the framework in terms of the safety as well considering, you know—Barry Prentice, Professor Prentice yesterday, you know, spoke about the inherent unfairness of cancelling the licences. Didn't lay blame, actually, at anyone's feet except for the government that brought in the act in the 1940s. But, just in terms of how the industry will respond to innovation technology, they are there; there's certainly more work to do in order to improve services, and I think they're the first ones to admit that, but, you know, they are creative and hard working.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. McFadyen. Time for questions is expired here.

We will now move on to No. 39. I call Harprit Jammu.

Mr. Jammu, do you have any material for the committee?

Mr. Harprit Jammu (Private Citizen): No, I don't.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Then please proceed with your presentation.

* (14:00)

Mr. Jammu: Okay. My name's Harprit Jammu.

So I've been in Canada for about 30 years and I've been in the taxi industry about 15 now. So I was—I've been working in Winnipeg for about 15—since I was 15 years old, what I was delivering flyers, pumping gas, working at factories, and I saved up every penny I had to buy a business and be a owner-operator of a cab, and with the swipe of a pen, that's all going to be taken away from me. Not only are you guys taking away our property rights, but our rights to even take any legal action, all right, and with this Bill 30 you guys are locking—handcuffing us and throwing away the keys. We can't do anything about it with this bill. If this bill goes through as is, and there's no regards of any safety concerns in the bill, whether it goes to the City, no amendments, no nothing to help us out, and we just want a fair deal.

I think you guys are all decent people. I think you guys have a heart. You guys know this is an unfair bill. From the bottom of your heart, you guys know this is not the right thing, and I've never begged anybody in my life before, but I'm begging you, please do the right thing. Rethink and revoke this bill. Thank you.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Jammu.

Questions from the committee?

Mr. Swan: Thank you very much for coming down this afternoon to speak from the heart about what Bill 30 is going to do to you and your family. If you wish to, would you tell the committee how much money did you have to raise to be able to buy a licence and to be able to operate a taxi here in Winnipeg, and did you have to finance that as well? And what do you fear happening to that investment if Bill 30 passes as it's now written?

Mr. Jammu: Yes, so, I bought the business—I saved up every penny working all those jobs for like 15 years and I bought it 10 years ago, right. It was for \$90,000 for half the cab, half share, and if this bill—with—like I said, with the swipe of a pen, that can all be taken away from me, because there's no insurance for us in the bill, no assurance. Nothing. And it—was there another question in there somewhere?

Mr. Curry: Thank you so much for coming. Your own description of raising those funds reminds me of kind of my grandfather's story as he drove trucks and many other kinds of jobs to bill Curry Industries in the 1970s and we're still around, but it's been—being a child of a third-generation small-business owner, my dad helps run the company now, there are the ups and downs, and—but your story reminds me a lot of that hard work that my uncles tell me wasn't always good times when everything was getting started.

But I wanted to touch more on the concern, of course. As you know, the bill is transferring responsibility of the Taxicab Board from the Province to the City, and there's a lot of concern. Is there any possibility, any even slim possibility, that when that transfer happens there will be essentially the same or a similar state of affairs as currently exists? Is there any slight possibility that the catastrophe that some of the people at this table are describing doesn't happen? Is there a possibility that things can transition smoothly as the work is ongoing currently?

Mr. Jammu: Yes, it's a possibility, as long as it's—the safety standards are kept up to par. Not lowering the safety standards and making it an even playing field, it could be a possibility, and a lot of our coworkers and colleagues have spent hundreds and thousands of dollars, and, you know, that can all be taken away with a swipe of a pen. Just think about that. Put yourself in our shoes. Is that fair?

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Mr. Jammu, I have a question for you: Have you presented before this committee already, sir, under another name?

Mr. Jammu: I came here once and it was all confused with a different name, so—

Mr. Chairperson: So you did present before this committee?

Mr. Jammu: I—yes.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Thank you, sir. We are only allowed to present once before the committee.

Mr. Jammu: I apologize.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation.

So, thank you. For the purposes of the further presenters I want to emphasize that at committee you are only allowed to present once at committee. You cannot use an alternate name, so please if anyone has presented already to this committee, please do not come forward to present again. Thank you.

I now call for Rishpal Khangura. Rishpal Khangura will now drop to the bottom of the list.

Harpreet Bains. I call Harpreet Bains, No. 41.

Thank you, Mr. Bains. Do you have any material to present to the committee?

Mr. Harpreet Bains (Private Citizen): Yes.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Just your presentation?

Mr. Harpreet Bains: Yes.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Please proceed, sir.

Mr. Harpreet Bains: Is any possibility somebody can explain you as a translator for me, please.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: I'm sorry, sir. A translator?

Thank you. Can you give us your name please, ma'am?

Ms. Ruby Bains, on behalf of Mr. Harpreet Bains (Private Citizen): My name is Ruby Bains.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Ruby Bains, okay. Please proceed.

Ms. Bains, on behalf of Mr. Harpreet Bains: Thank you for the chance to present tonight—this afternoon.

Our industry has been very clear, we're about safety, fairness and committee. I want to stress one thing: You don't need this bill if your intent is to bring Uber.

In Manitoba, the taxicab regulations would not prevent Uber itself from operating as a dispatch service. The act would require any Uber drivers in Winnipeg to have a taxi driver's licence and a taxicab business licence.

I want to stress one other thing. Particular, Uber does not provide service for the disabled. Accessibility for Manitobans Act was enacted in 2013 and the accessibility standard for the customer service regulation became a law in 2015. Private sector and non-profit organizations with at least one employee from until November 2018—to comply with this regulation. The standard defines accessibility, customer service when all persons have the same opportunity to obtain use of benefit from a service. What will Uber do about this issue?

Winnipeg is the best, even the PM-MPN says that. Safety you commit for taxicabs, such as in-car cameras, panic buttons, rooftop strobe lights and driver shields are mandated by the Taxicab Board.

Winnipeg appears to have the most vigorous safety equipment requirements of all compared to all cities. Taxicab owners and drivers generally support in-car safety equipment. Drivers in taxicabs is a risky occupation not fully made secure with current safety provisions. Stakeholders indicate that drivers face significant safety risks associated with violent or intoxicated passengers, discrimination and fare disputes.

To protect the safety of passengers, the Taxicab Board requires to undergo criminal record checks, mandatory training for driver safety, safety equipment handling for passengers as well as regular vehicle inspections. The taxicab can-cab board can identify that driving a taxicab is an important public transportation service, and one of the most dangerous occupations in North America. A taxicab driver is 60 times more likely to be murdered on the job than an average worker.

* (14:10)

In Canada, there has been 150 taxicab drivers killed since 1970. Now, that's a large number. In Manitoba, there have been 12 taxicab drivers killed while on duty since 1945.

Taxicab drivers are at risk in terms of robbery, hijacking of the taxi, abusive and threatening behaviours, physical assaults, traffic disputes, accidents, fare disputes and combinations of all of the above. Recently, we had a stabbing in Winnipeg as well, which—the driver was safe but was seriously injured, so that's something to think about when it comes to these facts.

Shields and cameras dramatic improvements in the safety. After the murder of Pritam Deol, the taxicab safety issue report was released in October 2001. It made 18 recommendations. One of the key recommendations was the development of taxicab drivers safety program to enhance driver skills, to recognize and access risks, and how to defuse potentially—how to defuse potential hostile situations.

The effectiveness of cameras and shields is clear. The Winnipeg police indicated that for the calendar year of 2002, there were 20 fewer—20 few reported accidents and robberies that took place in the previous years. This represented a reduction of 71 per cent in serious taxicab crime since the cab cameras and shields were introduced. When 2003 is compared to 2001, the year before cameras and shields were introduced, taxicab robberies and other violent taxicab crimes have been reduced by 79 per cent.

There was an increase of 10.5 per cent in crime rate over all city of Winnipeg over the same period. The arrest rate for crimes against taxi drivers was 35 per cent prior to the introduction of cameras, and the rate increased to 50 per cent in 2002 and 66 per cent in 2003. So, as you can see, with the rate increasing, cameras have been beneficial to the industry.

In Winnipeg, our recruitment for all standard and accessibility taxis have been effective since July 1st, 2002. To have an operation in cab cars and the requirement to have safety shields installed has been in effect since January 8th, 2013—or—sorry—2003. The safety initiatives taken in Winnipeg include other measures such as mandatory first-aid kits, which were effect since July 1st, 2002, improved

taxicab driver training and recruitment that any taxicab should have a GPS system working at all times.

Winnipeg Police Service data indicates that since the introduction of taxicab safety measures in 2002, robberies of taxicabs were reduced by 71 per cent. The Winnipeg taxicab industry indicated that it is very pleased with the decreased crimes that are—have been happening in the city.

Drivers find that customers while in the cab will settle down, knowing that a camera is taking their picture. There are very few instances of hostile instances in a taxicab. Crimes that do not happen in taxicabs are solved quickly by the police using the digital image to identify and find the suspect. In many cases, the predator will admit to the crime, thus enabling a shift—sift resolution to an incident, so our industry is about our service and about safety.

Just want you to consider that they're not against Uber; it's just making it so they're all at the same level, and if any improvements were needed, that cameras should be installed, because not saying that Winnipeg is completely dangerous, but you never know the situation. With cameras, you are able to identify and make it easier to find the issue. It may not be the full solution, but at least you are implementing something that can result to a solution, opposed to having nothing at all.

And same with GPS—yes, I understand that Uber has an app, and they have GPS tracking systems in their app, but there's also flaws that come in the, like, cellphone systems. We can't resolve the situation a hundred per cent. Having a GPS installed within the system that they use may be more beneficial, opposed to just having your cellphone. What if you're working and you're picking up your last passenger, you have your app, and all of a sudden, your phone crashes? Most of you guys may have iPhones or Samsungs; they're not completely always functioning. They do freeze, sometimes they crash and what if that were to happen while you pick someone that wasn't so safe, and your phone crashed, or kind of had a lag and the GPS couldn't pick up to speed? That way, having it fully installed in your vehicle under some other mechanism may prevent that from happening. Not saying that that's one solution, but I'm just saying those are preventative measures that may prevent that from happening.

Thank you for your time.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Bains. Thank you, Ms. Bains, for interpreting.

Questions of the witness?

Mr. Swan: Mr. Bains, thank you for coming down to committee and, Ms. Bains, thank you for making the presentation on Mr. Bains's behalf.

You've raised a number of the points that I think are very important for the government caucus to listen to. One of the things that our NDP caucus is just learning more about the impact of what Bill 30 would do to Mr. Bains and his business and his family, and I'm wondering if you're able to comment on what you fear would happen to your family's investment and your family if Bill 30 simply passes as it's been presented by the government.

Ms. Bains, on behalf of Mr. Harpreet Bains: Personally, we would like to say that my education solely relies on the income that he provides and I'm currently 21. I have lots of high aspirations. I want to succeed in life and maybe, some point in my life career, like, I'd want to be where you guys are.

But, as a science student, I want to go to med, so if this bill takes place, a lot of the people that are actually in the taxi industry will be discouraged that their voice didn't really matter to what they had to say and whatever they didn't want actually happened.

So then here my father is out of a job and then the whole issue with the health-care aide system, then my mother is at loss because the WRHA had a bunch of job cuts. So then those two income sources for my education have been completely shot. So—and I want to go into med, so that's about \$10,000 per semester, so that's a lot of money, and I can only get a loan up to, like, a certain amount. So, if I were to get a loan, I'd be paying off the loan for, like, essentially the rest of my life, and if I were to do that, then my studies would also be affected, because do I really want to be paying off or should I just go get a minimum wage job, save up and then the next thing you know I'm 30 and it might be too late for me.

So, taking away this opportunity for my father would not only impact people like me, but it also impacts you, because if people like me have the ability to succeed and become fellow doctors, then we have the ability to take care of the community. But, if we don't get the chance to actually get there just because of money problems, then people like you will also be impacted because you won't have people like us taking care of you.

So that's one issue to think about.

Mr. Swan: Mr. Bains, just to follow up, I have a daughter who's in science herself who writes her dental aptitude test next week. She told me not to tell anybody and I've just—I've put it on the permanent record.

Thank you, though, for giving the government members a little bit more understanding of the impact of Bill 30 as it's now drafted.

One of the greatest concerns that so many people are telling us is that Bill 30, as it now stands, would not provide any compensation for any taxi operator, for any taxi driver, any owner of a licence who might be negatively impacted by Bill 30. We think that's unfair.

Can you tell us a little bit about how much of an investment your family has made in the industry and whether you think it's fair that this bill could simply pass without any compensation for families that are being hurt by it?

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Mr. Bains, and feel free to ask between the two of you.

Ms. Bains, on behalf of Mr. Harpreet Bains: First, I'd just, like, off by stating that I don't know if we are all on the same page. I don't think compensation is actually one of the major issues. I don't even think that all of the people that are in this industry are looking for compensation. Essentially, they just want to be able to do the job that they've been doing for all this time. So compensation isn't a concern. Eventually they'll make up that money that they lost, so that's not even—it's just the matter of respect, right. They've been doing it forever, and now another high technology releases an app and everyone's just—I don't know—just all over it. It's just kind of like the influence of other cities is blinding the image of what we already had. I mean, not saying that it could be bad, not saying it could be good. We won't know.

* (14:20)

But about—to answer that question, \$400,000, around there. But, then, give or take, you have safety inspections, you have accidents because Winnipeg weather isn't great. You guys all know that we just had random snow in October, so, as you can see, very unpredictable. So \$400,000 is just the initial investment they probably put in. But every year, they probably get winter tires for the safety of their passengers. Like, accidents happen. A little scratch on the bumper when they go get safety issues is a

concern for everybody, and they have to get that replaced. So that—what, you're looking at another \$200.

All those little things probably add up. I mean, him alone, opposed to everybody, that's a lot of money. And, even with your compensation, it won't really do much, because if that is something that's taken away from them—most of them came in—here at a very young age, because they wanted to leave that—the city that they were at, or the country that they were at because of the conditions that they lived in.

So most of them stopped education in grade 12. So, then, they would have to put another investment into getting educated again, which would also be more money. So what—the compensation isn't going to last them a lifetime. It might even—not even help them get started, because education prizes are on—prices are on the rise. University tuition went up. So, if they decide to go to university, they'll first have to invest the money in upgrading all of their education—their grade 12 that they did in their other country and then university tuition prices are on the hike.

So, then, the compensation isn't really the issue here. It's just—they want to make it so the City of Winnipeg can bring in Uber, but just make it so it's right and fair for everyone.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Thank you for your time, Mr. Bains, and Ms. Bains. You must be very proud, Mr. Bains. And good luck in your studies. Thank you.

Committee Substitutions

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: We now have—I would like to inform the committee that, under our rule 85(2), the following membership substitutions have been made for this committee effective immediately: Mr. Bindle for Mr. Johnson, Interlake; and Mr. Allum for Ms. Marcelino, Logan. Thank you.

* * *

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: I will now call—excuse me, No. 42, Jaswant Mangat. Jaswant Mangat not present? He will move to the bottom of the list.

Number 43, Upkar Bains.

Welcome, Mr. Bains. Do you have any material to present to the committee?

Mr. Upkar Bains (Private Citizen): Yes, good evening. My name is—

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Okay, please proceed with your presentation.

Do you need a—Ms. Bains will translate as well, if required. Thank you, Ms. Bains.

Please proceed.

Ms. Ruby Bains, on behalf of Mr. Upkar Bains (Private Citizen): Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I'd like to speak on behalf of Upkar Bains.

First, I'd like to start off by stating the definition of ride sharing. Ride sharing is defined as an arrangement in which a passenger travels in a private vehicle driven by its owner for a fee, especially as arranged by a website or an app. So—which both Uber and taxi industries have created the app, so—which makes it, essentially equal, in my opinion.

In terms of this definition, what's the difference between the taxi industry drivers and the Uber drivers? Because both should be considered under the ride-sharing act—abiding by the same rules as regulations according to the definition of ride sharing.

Mr. Chairperson in the Chair

In terms of safety, the rules and regulations should also be in the same terms defined under ride sharing. Uber states that a vehicle has to be above a 2000-year model. Currently, we're sitting in 2017, going towards 2018. So this is considered—if that's their minimum requirement, is 20–2000, we're looking at about 17- to 18-year-old car. Should that be considered safe? In my opinion, I'd say no. If I had a child who was taking a ride-sharing service home from the bar at 2 a.m., in -40° weather, I personally wouldn't think that it's safe for my kid to get into a car when there is no safety boundaries that they have to pass in order for them to drive that vehicle. Next thing you know, that car could be—I don't know—not working in -40° weather, and here my daughter is in a dress in -40° temperatures.

I say this because when it comes to ride-sharing you're liable for more than just yourself. So if your vehicle has not completed a safety check and is in 2000-year model, that's not safe for the passenger or for yourself, just because Manitoba weather conditions are pretty unpredictable.

Another point of discussion arises from different safety guidelines. Taxis contain shields, cameras that are responsible for the safety of passengers and drivers. Taxi drivers are required to have extensive training that includes a minimum of two weeks for a regular taxi driver and an additional for accessible training. On the other hand, Uber requires none,

which was considered an issue in Quebec, and Jean-Nicolas—I'm going to say this last name wrong—Guillemette, the general manager of Uber Quebec said that Quebec was once the province that required such a gesture, and that ended up being a giant issue just recently and they revoked their services.

If a giant province like Quebec required Uber driving—Uber drivers to obtain training for the safety of their province, why isn't Winnipeg enforcing the new act of ride-sharing that they wanted to implement? And I'm not saying that Quebec and Winnipeg are the same. I know that a lot of regulations in Quebec are different than Winnipeg, but I'm just basing it off the size of the population. Quebec population is a lot larger, and if that province is concerned for the safety of their citizens, then why isn't Winnipeg paying attention to the community? Not saying that we aren't but, like, just because the level of crime that's arising, just having that safety measure should also be a concern in a city like ours.

According to the definition of ride-sharing, we—why aren't both companies under the same act? Why are we implementing a bill just to single out taxi drivers? Uber is coming to Winnipeg, where a service of taxis already was pre-existing. It only makes sense that if they want to come here that they should abide by the rules that were already implemented. If something was implemented in the beginning, it should still kind of stay the same because we haven't had any issues arise.

So if we bring in a company—I know one of you guys said you were an entrepreneur and that you're only—you're looking it at—looking at it in a business perspective. You're saying that when you bring in a company like this you're going to increase the business market and there may be a profit that you make because other people that didn't use taxis are going to start using Uber.

But you also have to look at it in the point of view that with other city—other states and cities like London—very big, also had Uber, had a lot of issues that occurred, then was revoked. Quebec had Uber, very big province, just wanted it to implement safety regulations. If they had nothing to—I don't know—nothing to hide or no problems, then why is it that they said that they wanted safety regulations and then they pulled the entire service? So you have to look at it in that standpoint.

And, yes, you're going to make money by bringing something new, and you want to implement change. I'm also part of the newer generation, and I

think that technology and having apps and services to reduce the waiting time when it comes to New Year's Eve, Christmas—it sucks to wait two hours for a cab. But that money that you're investing in a new business like Uber or ride-sharing, you could invest that by creating more taxis, which would also reduce the wait time, because the same people that drive the taxi, essentially, if they were to lose their job in that industry, will be the same people that drive the Uber. So what is the difference? Just the company name, the amount of time and decisions that you have to put in to implement the new issue, it's essentially going to be the same, but right now to our standpoint of view, we think that this is some amazing new thing and it's just going to change the city and the structure of how everything works.

So—and you can also look at other stake—I know that this is going into the States, but people—it's a world community. It's made up of humans, and whether it's in America, whether it's in Canada, something is about to happen and it can happen anywhere, no matter where you are. So you can look at it in LA. There have been a lot of cases in the last few years where people have been raped—not saying that that couldn't happen in a taxi, but there's cameras that you can find the rape victims, kind of help them compensate what happened, know who it was, why it happened, see both points of view. That happened in LA, rape incidents.

* (14:30)

There's been money issues where, yes, it's in an app, you have cashless transactions which we're presuming that is safer than carrying cash on site to avoid robbery, but a lot of hackings can take place. How do you know that your credit card's not going to hack—going to get hacked? I know credit card companies have fraud-proof plans implemented to avoid those situations, but stuff like that can still occur, and then the person has to go through the credit card company, have multiple hours of waiting time just to resolve an issue that happened to them out of taking a ride-sharing service.

They also have been cases where Uber has not, the Uber company itself has not been giving out full information. If someone were to prevent an issue, they will go and kind of say that they didn't know, they don't know how it occurred, kind of take the—take away from their service and, like, not put their service to that name. So they're saying that, well, we had nothing to do with this. It—those cases actually happened in LA as well. There was some cases that

happened in Florida. I know a lot of people have presented statistics from the States, but that's where it's been for the most part, so that's what they're using to not have it here. And there's been issues in Toronto, as well; that's Canada.

There has been sexual assault cases that have occurred, never have they heard of solution, it kind of just got blown out of proportion and then everyone started questioning the company and then all of a sudden you never heard about it again. So what exactly has that company done about the sexual assault; you never heard about it again.

With it being under the same rules and regulations, we can prevent situations like this. So then being an entrepreneur and bringing in the business, you also have to look at the standpoint of, what, you're going to have lawsuits coming your way, or you're going to have compensations that you're going to have to give to families if sexual assault or stuff like this does come to play because, you know, everyone deserves to be answered to and everyone has the right to voice their opinion is—and just have everything, you know, everyone taken care of.

To conclude, cab industries have no problem in sharing their business with ride-sharing services, as long as the rules for training, safety regulations and other services are at the same level, or if not above. If you want to implement something that is better and the taxicab boards don't already have the safety regulation, you can. This is a win-win situation for both cities and the drivers, for both Uber and cab industries, and no one's rights should be revoked and they all should have the opinion and reason to stay.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. and Ms. Bains.

Mr. Swan: Mr. Bains, thank you for coming down this afternoon. Thank you again, Ms. Bains, for presenting Mr. Bains's words.

You've raised two points that maybe haven't been addressed all that much. I mean, the first is the response that Uber has taken in other jurisdictions when there has been an incident involving one of their drivers to say, well, they're an independent contractor, it's not our responsibility. I want you to know we don't agree with that, that we believe there has to be responsibility, as there is currently, with taxi companies who have their licences.

The other issue that you raise, and I'm very glad you did, was with respect to the province of Quebec

and the dispute that Uber has had with the Province of Quebec's regulations. We think it's really important to note that it is the Province of Quebec that believes that it's necessary to have the kind of safety regulations in place that you talk about. I don't know if they have cameras or safety shields, but they do training. They have a number of other obligations for anyone who wants to operate a ride-sharing service.

Bill 30 would entirely take the Province of Manitoba out of that discussion and then would download that responsibility on 137 different municipalities in Manitoba, all of which might have different views, some of which may not have any experience at all.

Do you think it's—it would be better to continue to do as the Province of Quebec does and have one set of safety standards for the entire province, or do you think that Bill 30, downloading this to 137 different municipalities, is a better way to go?

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Bains. Or, Ms. Bains, you may proceed now again.

Ms. Bains, on behalf of Mr. Upkar Bains: Personally, we believe that under the Province is actually better. The way that they feel is that if it's under the whole Province, everyone's kind of on the same page; it stays consistent throughout the province—like you said, 137 municipalities. That way, one place has it like something else; another place has it—and then you're going to always have this battle, because everyone is going to be like, well, they're doing it better; let's do it that way. Oh, well, they're not doing it right; let's just drop down to their standards—so.

Mrs. Cox: I would like to thank both of you for making the presentation and sincerely wish you well on your dreams and aspirations to become a physician here in the province of Manitoba. Thank you so much for that.

Just would like to ask a question with regard to the level playing field and whether or not compensation is an issue.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Bains—oh, I'm sorry. I'll wait 'til you—Mr. Bains or Ms. Bains.

Ms. Bains, on behalf of Mr. Upkar Bains: Yes, compensation for him also isn't the major issue on hand. The playing field is actually the most—like, that's the issue that's always going to occur. Just—money isn't the answer to all the problems. Just having that level of fairness is—it'll also feel like

they're—we're respected. Whatever they've done for the past 20 years, actually stood out. Right now, they're fighting for basically their career. And having that same level of playing field is more than money for them right now.

Mr. James Allum (Fort Garry-Riverview): I'm just arriving, as you saw me walk in, but I was here last night, and I've been struck by the quality of the presentations that we've had, and many from your generation. I'm sure you're very proud of Ms. Bains there.

You mentioned about the—how old cars have to be. I said—Uber any time after 2000, I think, and, then—so, are there rules around how old a cab needs to be and that kind of thing? Can you explain, sort of, that circumstance?

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Bains or Ms. Bains.

Ms. Bains, on behalf of Mr. Upkar Bains: So there isn't a rule implemented for the make or model of a car, but there is on hand a yearly an safety inspections. So, if your car isn't safe to be driven, then it will not be allowed to be on the road until you get it fixed and then have it re-evaluated.

But, then, with the make and model on hand, yes. So, if—realistically, if you think about it, a 2017 model, opposed to a 2000 model is going to be a lot better just because every year, they tweak it up to make the price higher. Then we all fall for it and we buy it. So, having that said, if it's 2000—and most of the taxis that you see that are in Winnipeg are all fairly new, and every couple of years, they are replaced, whether it's because they got into an accident or whether they just can't seem to pass a safety.

But Uber doesn't have that yearly or monthly visit where you go and get your car fixed or car checked. For all we know, that this person probably hasn't had an oil change in about—I don't know—a year. And would that be safe?

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Bains and Ms. Bains. We appreciate you coming up here today, but time for questions has expired. So we will be moving on to the next presenter. Thank you.

Our next presenter, presenter No. 44, Sukhjiwan Sidhu. Sukhjiwan Sidhu? Do you have a written presentation for the committee or just an oral one?

Mr. Sukhjiwan Sidhu (Private Citizen): No, Sir, just verbal.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, verbal. You may proceed when you're ready.

Mr. Sukhjiwan Sidhu: I would like to thank all the committee members and having me here to giving me time to speak about the industry and Bill 30. I would say hurricane 30. It's came from south. You know all the hurricanes are happening in south? What's happening in the south, it's happening to our industry in Winnipeg, which is man-made. That is nature; this is man-made.

* (14:40)

Having said that, I will tell you about myself. I came to Canada, 1990, as a 15-year-old boy with no mother and two sisters, did a bit of schooling, did part of—part-time job in factory, drove cab. As earlier my fellow friend mentioned, Honourable Mr. Gary Filmon, that time the cab industry was, you guys remember, Tuxedo cabs. That thing came up. The thing was resolved with his help, with industry help, and those executive cars, luxury cars came, like those Cadillac cars. I drove those cars. I've been through everything. The thing was to just resolve, maybe there was a demand. We don't know it will be successful or not. Even himself, he doesn't know.

While I was driving those cars, yes, okay, people like it, but expense and to run those cars, it's not that cheap either. And, after a while, what happened was all the discussions, all the dramas, all—everything was been through so many meetings and everything, what happened was all those cars become as regular taxis. Luxury cars become as a regular taxis. What happened then? Okay, the company could not make through and they are merging to a regular cab industry, like, as at—seeing as the regular cab industry is bigger companies. They're merged to them. And there's no—there's not—only two companies in Winnipeg. There's more than six companies as taxis. We're saying we want competition. There's enough competition in the city, as well as limousines, as well as accessible taxis. I have a handicab—Handi-Transit licence. I drove Handi-Transit for almost seven years. I have all the experience with Uber at any level playing field, level playing field meaning—I will make it simple for my fellow friends—level playing means equal to everybody. The way I'm sitting, he has to sit. The way I'm doing it, he has to do it the way is. The rules and regulations, they have to follow, okay.

And our industry is doing, I would say, the best. We have the Taxicab Board. They provide everything: the training, three weeks; they're not,

like, normal people just go and get the licence, and you're driving a cab—no. What are you doing is—and it's—you're serving the community with your ability, and look at—the things are, why we have to bring a headache in 30? Don't take me wrong. It is, when a hurricane comes, look, how many people are scared? How far they're going? It's the same thing to my fellow friends and myself.

In 1997, I bought a cab while I was quit driving the luxury car, went to driving the bigger companies, and bought a car for \$80,000, paid off within four or five years, okay, drove another, about 18 years. Went back to Transit. Drove Transit for four years. Why I did that, because of my kids. I have two children, a daughter and my son. The thing is, as earlier I said, when I did the schooling, I did pass; I wanted to become a cop. In '94, the circumstances didn't allow me. I did—first I passed the first exam, which usually happened in the St. James area, okay. The circumstances didn't allow me to do that, but I had to work. I was working seven days; that's fine. But the main goal was, let's get married, children, give them the best at—well education. Let's see how they go. That is my field. They're going to be my field. How the farmer going to be happy? If the field's no good, the farmer won't be happy. The gardener won't be happy if there are no flowers blooming.

And, then, what I did to pay it off, went to transit, came back again, quit transit. People say benefits, this, this, this. Why I quit? Because of hours. I was spending almost 14 hours a day to get paid for seven and a half hours, and split work. Here, I can work seven days a week—seven days a week—and I can see my field to grow, to get a better education, to achieve their goals, to become a proud father of two children. The boy is playing; I am very happy. The way the system is going on—I have no words. The taxi board is doing good.

Safety issues are—safety issue is safety for myself, safety for my passengers, safety for others. Others means while I'm driving, I have to go first, second, third, fourth. Who is—the surrounding area. While you driving a normal car, you just, boom. You gone. No, you have to think about all of—all the things what's happening around you, okay. This—cameras, strobe light in the taxis, shield, panic button, okay. What else? There's some other gadgets in our computer system, which is you can punch—nobody knows in this room. Only the company Duffy's and Unicity has—only those drivers know—because of when the person comes here, even myself, I'm bit nervous, too, but they come here, they

forget everything. They want—they have so many things in their heart to say, but everything mumbles up, because the thing—the hurricane 30, it's just wiping them off. They're worried. They're worried, and some of my honourable ministers said: What would make it different? It make big different.

One guy's getting something for free, and one, as myself, paid \$30,000. If somebody's getting a house for free and you paid almost \$200,000, how would you feel? Same thing. When next time it comes, we'll say it's food sharing stall will come. Will that mean it's—they're serving free food? No. Somebody on Broadway, somebody at a five-star hotel, their restaurant—what will they—is there any difference? They will net everything. They have to get food and a new licence as well. It's nothing—I'm sorry if I'm a little loud, but there's so many things on my mind, but the time is not allowing—if, in case—I'm just requesting it to the speaker—in case something, please just tell me that.

Why it's a two-tier system? Why it's two tier? One guy's just going free; one is this, this, this, this. It's—we're all adults. If one adult giving another adult example, this is, I think, be not good way to do it. But there's some way to do it. There's some way to do it, but, as Uber, they're using app. Our app is made to main system, main computer. Nobody in Manitoba, in Canada or any all over the world—

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Sidhu, yes, time for your presentation has expired.

We will now move to questions.

Mr. Helwer: Thank you, Mr. Sidhu, for your presentation, very impressive. I love hearing business stories, and for someone that bought and paid off a—had a return that enabled you to pay it off in four years, that's very impressive. Most businesses deal in a five-year payback and they're thrilled to get that and they're often longer, so I'm very intrigued by your business ability.

* (14:50)

I assume you may have more than one cab licence, if—or in other businesses as well. Can you tell us about your other things that you're involved in?

Mr. Sukhjiwan Sidhu: No, sir. I just have one cab. I'm just rely on that for now on, but I don't know what I'm going to do. And another thing is, as other people mentioned, they're mostly—all the stories are related. All the—whatever we are doing, we are—

background—majority of the cab drivers are farmers and in our nature and our blood is in transportation. That's why they're doing it. It's not an easy job to do it, okay.

When I took a course in transit, I was walking like this: straight. Look at those drivers. They're like this, okay. They're just—we're just doing it for eight hours. In cab, you're sitting 12 hours—12 hours—a day. It's not an easy job. Only one—I just have one cab, but I would request to our PC government: Please, please think about it. Think about how many children came here, how many widows came here. They rely on the cab industry, and they're just working people; they're hard-working people, as myself. And I said, how many things I tried. We chose—because I was not getting enough hours, enough hours. Enough hours means five days; other jobs—this I can do seven days.

How many years I'm going to do it? With this situation I don't know. Thank you.

Mr. Allum: Mr. Sidhu, I thank you for your presentation. It's very passionate and very compelling, and I think all members of the committee are—feel the passion coming from you.

I'm guessing this has caused you and your family a lot of stress and anxiety. Has it?

Mr. Sukhjiwan Sidhu: Yes, sir. This is our fourth day here. I will tell you another thing. Other day, we had a session when there's evacuation happened in our Legislative Building, and I was driving at that time, and I had a passenger, she said, how come I did not get a cab for 20 minutes. She needed to go to the airport. I have all the information from her, but I cannot disclose; sorry.

And she said, what happened? I said this is what happened. Most of the cab drivers are in—taxis are at the Legislative Building. She said: Because of Uber? I said: Well, okay. Everybody has a phone, and they can google around what's going on. I said: Yes.

She said—what she said, her wording was—she said: I won't—I used to take Uber, but never, ever. I'd rather wait for a taxi. I'd rather wait for a taxi, because—I said: Ma'am, why? Because when you talk, you have to go back and forth. She said: I'm riding in your taxi, yes. I'm sitting behind you, yes. People know this is a taxi, yes. People know this is a Unicity cab, yes. It's visual to everybody, yes. Okay. Once Uber person comes, you don't know it's my family member—is it my—somebody driving my kids. Something happens, who will be responsible?

Okay. Other day another gentleman came here. She said, on your app, it will show the picture. Once it's -40°, you're just watching from the window; it's—cab's there; okay, run. And, with Uber, you're going to go and see—who's this? You're rushing to the Parliament or Legislative Building. You need to go to work.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Sidhu, but time for question period has expired.

And we will now move on to the next presenter. Thank you very much, Mr. Sidhu.

Mr. Sukhjiwan Sidhu: I would like to thank everybody. Please consider. Thank you so much. If I—it was hard; I'm sorry for that.

Mr. Chairperson: We will now call on presenter No. 45, Salwinder Phind. Salwinder Phind?

Is there agreement to hear from No. 46 since and wait—[interjection] He's here? Okay. Mr. Salwinder Phind?

Mr. Salwinder Phind (Private Citizen): Yes, Sir.

Mr. Chairperson: You have a presentation for the committee?

Mr. Phind: Yes.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed when you are ready.

Mr. Phind: So I explain to—any help to my niece.

Mr. Chairperson: You need a translator?

Mr. Phind: Yes, from family.

Mr. Chairperson: Yes, come on up, Ms. Bains.

You may proceed with the presentation when you are ready.

Ms. Ruby Bains, on behalf of Mr. Salwinder Phind (Private Citizen): Hello, again.

So, essentially, everyone's covering—

Mr. Chairperson: Ms. Bains, just in case they didn't catch it, but, Ms. Bains, you may go ahead now.

Ms. Bains, on behalf of Mr. Phind: Essentially, all of them that have come today have the same issue—community, fairness, rights—having everything that they have been applied to Uber. Essentially, they are not against the company or the act of ride sharing, they just want all the rules and regulations to be the same. Essentially, when they've implemented taxis,

you don't see a lot of problems because the City itself has these rules and regulations that they implement to avoid these problems.

The Taxicab Board itself has its own rules that it has structured, and they all probably sat down in a committee like this and sat down and made all these rules. They probably sat and created the rule of the camera. There's probably incidents that occurred prior and that's why that issue is now implemented. The safety shield, they probably all sat down and reviewed all of the previous incidents that happened without the shield, and that's why it's there. The strobe light, that's all reasons—those are all three to four reasons why these things are there. And, if another ride-sharing service does come to play, they should also have these, because, eventually, down the road, all these reasons are probably going to be implemented again, because they did right now. *[interjection]*

Another thing he just brought up is that he had an initial investment of almost two, three hundred thousand dollars, and he works independently. He doesn't get a city pension. He doesn't have any Blue Cross coverage. He may with his wife, but what if he was single and he didn't have any coverage and he was on his own? His initial investment of \$200,000 has now dramatically dropped. The value of his car is initially nothing, not enough to live off of.

So he's not saying that that's the solely reason why this bill shouldn't be implemented, but that's one thing to consider. Even if you compensate all these employees, even if they were to sell off their vehicle, get the money back, that's essentially what they're going to use towards their retirement. But that money was—*[interjection]*

He also said that initially when he came, in order to make that investment, he picked up a loan. He used all of his savings from back home to get here. He needed that loan to invest into his vehicle. And now that his vehicle value is no longer the same—it didn't go up, it dramatically dropped—he has no money to pay off the loan and he has no savings left at home to put towards his loan. And now he's almost about to lose a job, because he may not want to be a part of ride sharing, because they're losing something that they worked for 40 years on, and now that job and that car and all those investments have no value. You can only compensate a person so much, but all that hard work has just completely fallen apart.

* (15:00)

And he also has two kids that—one of them is going into business, and the other is going into science. All that money that he gave to his kids to invest in their schooling is also going to be short, because they're not fully done their degree. They also are going to get married at some point. And, in his culture, the parents do initial investments towards their wedding life, because those weddings are huge. And most of the parents save up their entire life to put their—through school—put their kid through school, get them settled and married and kind of see them on their own.

And now he won't have the money to support his wife, who also works for WRHA, actually. So that income source that—all those jobs were cut. And she also works at the Vic, so her—she completely lost her job. So now, with him losing the initial investment of his taxi, his wife losing his job, him having two kids who also haven't finished their education—where is he going to get this money from? And, yes, you're going to compensate him, but can you compensate him the amount for those three people? And, if the compensation value for all these employees is probably going to add up to more than what they're asking for—all their asking for is having the same safety concerns, the same rules and regulations. All they're asking for is specific 'policies' that—all you have to do is implement. And—oh, they're already implemented. So you're, essentially, taking from another company that has already created strategies that are working for the city of Winnipeg.

And other cities also have these exact same things that are implemented. So, obviously, you guys have all the same rules and regulations. Why is a foreign company coming into the city and telling you, hey, I don't want to do this? And, if I'm going not—if I'm going to be here, I don't want to be under the same rules and regulations. So you're essentially telling an outsider—you're letting an outsider tell you what to do. And it's your city, so you should be the ones making the rules and regulations, not an outsider company to create money and investments for the city. What are you going to do with the money and investments if no one's going to want to work, and you're going to have all these people that are upset?

Just like the previous speaker mentioned, he had a customer who said: I will not be taking Uber. I don't know who it is exactly. That's one main concern. If I was older and I had a kid who was

coming home from the bar—or coming home from a friend's house and took Uber and didn't know who it was and never made it home, how would you feel? And, then, nowadays, 16-year-olds don't have licences, but they want to go out to the movies, they want to go to the mall. And most of the parents are working weird hours that they don't have the ability to take their kid. And what if that kid downloads the app on their smartphone, because a lot of people that turn the age of 14, their parents are giving them access to smartphones—and they download the app and, what, they get a credit card—what if they just go into their mom's wallet and get a credit card, put in every number—because not like you need a password to put in a credit card number to pay, and they take an Uber. Is the Uber driver going to be, like, oh, I'm taking a 14-year-old from their house, are their parents aware? They are not going to be that humane to think; they want to make money, they want to finish their shift, they want to go home. But, if that was your kid that got into a car and you don't know who it is, but you let your 14-year-old get into a car and now they're missing. What are you going to do?

A lot of people, as you can see in the news stories, have gone missing. If incidents like this are happening without this ride-sharing service coming into effect, what is going to happen when this ride sharing does come into effect?

An Honourable Member: Point of order.

Point of Order

Mrs. Mayer: I say this with the utmost respect, so please don't be offended by my comment. But I don't find that the person talking is actually translating.

She is giving her opinion on her friends and taking credit cards. She is not translating for the gentleman, so I would ask her to continue to translate and give his opinion, because I want to hear his opinion.

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

Mr. Maloway: Yes, on the same point of order. A similar situation has happened in the—on the first two or three days, as well, and absolutely—I mean, the person should check with the gentleman to see what his ideas are.

And we'll give you lots of time to do that. Yes.

An Honourable Member: There's lenience, but I'm just asking for her to translate.

Mr. Chairperson: It's—this is not really a point of order, but I do understand and—when you are interpreting, it is to be interpreting what the presenter is saying, not your opinion of what's happening. And we did discuss this on the first night where I offered the interpreter, you know, that they were going too far with what they were—I've been giving a little bit of leeway, but it's time to rein it in a little bit.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: So you may continue with the presentation.

Ms. Bains, on behalf of Mr. Phind: He just stated—I understand that you said that interpreting is what I'm doing. Essentially, I do, I am; this is what he has said prior to me being here, so I'm just not making this up on my own. I don't know much about this industry, so, like, I'm just—I just want to state that, as well.

And he just recently said that ride sharing takes payment prior to picking them up, while as when they drive they take payment after. So he's just wondering, what is the proper procedure and protocol? What if they don't show up but they have your money? *[interjection]*

No further statements.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for your statement, Mr. Phinder *[phonetic]*, and we will now proceed with questions. Phinder *[phonetic]*. *[interjection]* Oh, Phind. Phind. Okay, Mr. Phind.

Questions?

We have Mr. Allum, to start with.

Mr. Allum: Well, thanks very much to both of you, really, and notwithstanding the point that was just made, you've done a wonderful job doing your very best to convey the feelings of Mr. Phind.

I wanted to ask him, just first of all, when did he come to Winnipeg and Manitoba, and how long has he been in the business, and just tell us a little bit about how much, how long he's been in the business, how much he's invested, that kind of thing.

Ms. Bains, on behalf of Mr. Phind: He says he's been here for 15 years and he's been in the taxi business for 12, and he has invested 200 to 300 thousand dollars.

Mr. Micklefield: Thank you for your extensive remarks this afternoon. I do appreciate you taking the

time. I know it's not always convenient, and so thank you for doing that.

You highlighted some of the concerns surrounding ride-sharing companies, and I think that there is broad recognition of those concerns. One only has to read in the news to acknowledge that the ride-sharing industry still is ironing out the wrinkles.

The previous—I just want to pick up on a comment we heard from the previous presenter, and you alluded to something which touches it as well, and that is that given the choice, growing numbers of people will actually choose a taxicab, given the option. It is not as if ride-sharing services are sinking the taxicab industry. We find more and more people in more and more places choosing a taxi.

So I'm curious as to why the concern. It seems to me that people are saying their investment has disappeared or has vanished or the taxicab industry is doomed, and yet it doesn't seem that is the case in other cities, and I think even in our city we're hearing that people are saying, no, I'm choosing a taxi, I'm sticking with the taxi industry. So the taxi industry seems to have a very firm niche market and a very dedicated following.

I'm wondering if you could respond to that, please.

* (15:10)

Ms. Bains, on behalf of Mr. Phind: He said that he's not saying that his initial investment is going into the water, he's just saying that his insurance is \$10,000—over \$10,000 and Uber drivers just basically get a car from home and just pay regular insurance, so that's one thing he brought up.

He—and then they made investments on getting all those safety features, which also count—like, had a lot of money value. So, and Uber, then again, doesn't have that, so they don't have to make that initial investment to drive that vehicle, so then all of those dollars add up to the value of the business.

Mr. Chairperson: Ms. Mayer. Did—you had a question? You had your hand up.

Mrs. Mayer: Sorry, just—yes, sorry, I was just—when we were talking, I just wanted to apologize if you felt I was offending you. That was not my intent. *[interjection]* Yes, we were just clarifying. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Well, next question will go to Mr. Allum.

Mr. Allum: So, just to follow up on the question I asked earlier about the amount of investment and—that had gone into building this business. I just wanted to ask him whether if he doesn't feel like the government is kind of abandoning him and pulling the rug out from under him with this bill, that could very well—despite what my friend across the way just said—could very well wipe his whole—

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Allum, time has expired for questions. If there is an answer that's available, we will allow some time for the—Mr. Phind to reply.

Mr. Phind, I will allow 20 seconds for the rebuttal.

Ms. Bains, on behalf of Mr. Phind: He said that, yes, it does feel like they're taking the rug underneath because, yes, he has all these investments that he put in and, with the ride-sharing service coming, anyone can, like, have that because if they have a car—and he says that it's cheaper. So then people are probably going result to it, so his investments are just going to go—and how is he going to pay his bills?

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Phind, and thank you, Ms. Bains, for your translating efforts. Thank you very much.

We will now move on to presenter No. 46, Navkiran Gidon *[phonetic]*? Ghinnon. It appears that Mr. Ghinnon is not here. They will—he will be moved to the bottom of the list.

No. 47 is Gaim Yohannes, and I believe that Mr. Yohannes is not here, so we will go to the bottom of the list.

No. 48, Alem Hailemariam. Mr. Hailemariam is not here. They will go to the bottom of the list.

No. 49, Inder Preet Dhillon. Inder Preet Dhillon does not seem to be here, so we will move on to the next one.

No. 50, Manpreet Gill. Manpreet Gill is not here. We will move him to the bottom of the list.

No. 51, Asmerom Woldeslassie. I believe most of these names that I've just mentioned I—were on the presenters list for the other day.

Anyways, we'll move to No. 52, Satwinder Singh.

Mr. Singh, do you have any written material for the committee?

Mr. Satwinder Singh (Private Citizen): I have the translator.

Floor Comment: He needs a translator, if it's okay if I can represent on his behalf.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay.

Floor Comment: He does not have any written materials.

Mr. Chairperson: Could—what is—could you tell us your name?

Mr. Satwinder Singh: My name is Satwinder Singh.

Mr. Chairperson: And you need a translator, so you may go ahead when you are ready, Mr. Singh—and the translator's name as well.

Mr. Jaspal Bedi, on behalf of Mr. Satwinder Singh (Private Citizen): Good afternoon, my name is Jaspal Bedi, and I'll be translating for Mr. Singh.

Mr. Chairperson: If you could just spell your name for Hansard, so we could have it in there.

Mr. Bedi, on behalf of Mr. Satwinder Singh: Jaspal, J-a-s-p-a-l. Last name, Bedi, B-e-d-i.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you. You may proceed with the presentation.

Mr. Bedi, on behalf of Mr. Satwinder Singh: Mr. Singh, he had purchased his taxi last year in December. He paid \$348,000 for his licence. He pays insurance of \$10,327 in a year. There are three members in his family, his wife and a young daughter. He's the only one working in the family. When he bought his licence last year, he was assured that, you know, his savings, that the business that he had bought, it's going to be secure. There was no need of—nobody was talking about this, that Bill 30 is going to come and it's going to destroy his savings, which he sold his land from back home, brought money here and took a personal loan that he's still making payments of \$3,136 every month on a personal loan that he took.

He can't sleep at night ever since this bill has come through. He's up awake at night, wondering, looking at his daughter, how he's going to provide from them, how he's going to make all these payments when other competition comes on, pretty much on a free base, there is no regulations, they're not paying the same insurance. This government is paving the road to bring them in and this industry is heavily regulated. They pay so much into insurance, they pay so much into safety features; there's cameras, there are shields to protect drivers,

and as well as the public. You guys are bringing in so-called ride sharing and there's none of that in this bill that says, you know, that they're going to be putting that into legislation for any ride sharing or anything.

He's wondering what is—what's he going to do? How's he going to pay off this loan when you guys are saying when the licences are, as of February 28th, if Taxicab Board is no longer with—under government of Manitoba, our licences are being cancelled. It says clearly in Bill 30, your licence will be cancelled as of February 28th when this Taxicab Board goes and you forward it to the City of Winnipeg. He wants to know, what is really the need of transferring jurisdiction to the City, if anybody can answer my question, anyone on the right-hand side here, government that's in control right now.

Can this be a part of the presentation, can I ask questions within this?

Mr. Chairperson: No, you cannot ask ques—you can make a presentation and then the committee will ask questions.

Mr. Bedi, on behalf of Mr. Satwinder Singh: The honourable minister, you were saying that there has been a lot of consultation with the taxi industry. I don't know, maybe you can explain to me little bit better, when—what consultation means is when one party sits with the other party, they hear their concerns and their inputs, if any of those inputs are taken into consideration, that's what we call 'consentation.' In this Bill 30, I don't see any of our inputs that are put into this Bill 30, not one. Every time we were met with the people that you say that were consulted—I can speak for myself and the guys behind me and everybody that was here for the last three nights, because I was here every night that this was happening—none of us were consulted. So I don't know where you get the 10,000 people, the numbers that you're saying that it was, we were all consulted, but our input is not in this Bill 30. None of us told you guys that, take our rights away, strip us from our rights for compensation. Any business that does go in here in this great province and this great country, you take any small business out, you're supposed to compensate—

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Bedi, Mr. Bedi, what I've been hearing, like, it is, we allowed you to be a translator, but you are bringing up everything on your behalf right now. So if you'd please revert to translating for the presenter, because I hear me, we, and we're confused, the committee is, so please—

Mr. Bedi, on behalf of Mr. Satwinder Singh: I'm sorry. I had spent time with this gentleman outside and outlined what he had told me and everything. So, when I'm saying me, I'm representing him. You had asked me to come here and I can translate and represent on his behalf. So, I'm sorry, emotions do come. If I'm saying me, that's coming from him, and as well as our industry that's all presenting.

* (15:20)

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, you may continue on for Mr. Singh.

Mr. Bedi, on behalf of Mr. Satwinder Singh: Okay.

He wants to know how's he going to make up and pay the \$300,000 loan that's still outstanding. Where's he going to come up with the money when he knows his business is worth zero? He can't sell it, because right now nobody wants to buy the taxi. Everyone knows Bill 30 is coming and is saying licences are worth zero. If they even wanted to sell it for 50 grand, there's nobody buying. People are saying they're worth zero.

Safety issues. There—you know, it took us decades to come to this point right now, to get all these safety features together and make the taxi industry very safe where it is right now. We're taking million step back—backward if you're going to bring something—I—you know, with Uber, and not put anything in amendments for safety. We can't compromise with safety at all. It should be No. 1 priority.

Why can't the people that are coming in and ride-sharing—they can invest in a business, get cameras, shields, because it's protecting them as well as it's protecting our public and accessible training, that every driver goes through and the 40-hour training that would teach all the drivers how to be safe out there, how they can protect themselves and give customer service. Other drivers are coming without any training. They're not trained.

All the seniors we talk to in our taxi industry, they're all opposed to this. They don't want to get into vehicles with untrained drivers, without any safety features, and they're saying nobody consulted them. Like, it blows their mind.

Why is the government trying to fix something that's not broken? It's working fine right now, the way it is. I don't know why—like, what is the big rush? Why are we in such a rush to do this? You

guys need to do more homework on this. Why a deadline of February 28th? And that's pushed this—like, our industry feels like we're just being pushed into a corner. A lot of us feels like it's, like, insult to an injury.

He—when—he came to Canada 10 years ago with a dream and a hope for a better future for his family, that he can provide by working hard. He bought—he paid for his job. He secured his job. He's not asking for a handout; he's asking for a hand up, and this government that was elected by the people, for the people, you have a duty to protect our people.

There are 1,600 full-time jobs that are being affected by this. That's not just 1,600 jobs; there's 1,600 families that depend on this. Each taxi—he has—his family, he has a night driver, he—that taxi feeds his family. The guy on the weekend who's a student, it pays for his bills, his tuition and his groceries and whatnot. There's three families that are being fed by one taxi. A lot of families are being affected by this, and as we speak here we're pouring our hearts to you guys. You are the government in control. Please, help us. You can't ignore all of our feelings. You guys are human beings. You do have a heart. You have families; you have kids just like we do.

Right now, I personally can't sleep at night after going from here. We're done at midnight, I can't go to sleep. I'm staring at the ceiling, wondering what is going on. Where—you know, we had—I thought it was a promised future. Now, everybody's life savings is at risk. We don't know. I looked at my kids; I don't know if I can provide anything for them. All the extra-curriculum activities—my kids go to dancing, you know, they—swimming classes, tae kwon do, I can't pay for any of that. I used to, and I work hard to pay for that. Now, I will still have to work twice as hard but I'm not going to get that income and at the same time there's—you know, my life savings is worth nothing. That's not fair.

You guys are in control. Please, think twice. Think hundred times if you have to. Our families, our kids depend on this. Our kids' future depend on this. There's going to be a lot of guys are already thinking about being suicidal. They have no way of knowing how they're going to pay this two, three hundred thousand dollars, that loan that's left.

He wants to know: tomorrow, if he can't make up, pay for his payments and anything, what's the government going to do? Are they going to find a job for him to pay for his bills, the payments that are left on his loans?

Mr. Chairperson: I would like to thank Mr. Singh for his presentation. The 10 minutes for presentation is up.

We will now move into questions.

First question, Mrs. Mayer.

Mrs. Mayer: Thank you very much. I just—I appreciated your comments that you've said. What I'm looking for is clarification so that I can understand how this—your thoughts and your feelings on this.

Two things: you had talked about someone told you that your investment was secure last year when you bought into your job. So, I'd like to know who, specifically, told you that, because that was your words. And, secondly, when you took the loan, so you—I assume you went to a financial institute or something along those lines—who did you pay that money to, if you can clarify for me so I understand.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Singh.

Mr. Bedi, on behalf of Mr. Satwinder Singh: He has taken a loan, a personal loan, from somebody, third party, which he's paying 9 per cent interest on it—personal lender, because the banks weren't giving out enough. He sold his land, whatever he can—money he can bring from India, back home. He brought that and he put that in there and whatever he could, he was—more he needed to do, he took it from a personal lender.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Swan—oh, are you—

An Honourable Member: He didn't answer my question.

Mr. Chairperson: Oh, he—okay.

An Honourable Member: There was two questions.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, then you can continue with the question.

Mr. Bedi, on behalf of Mr. Satwinder Singh: You're saying, who told us?

An Honourable Member: Who told him.

Mr. Bedi, on behalf of Mr. Satwinder Singh: Okay, who told him. It was the whole taxi industry that keep—were buying taxis at a growing rate. Taxi prices have been going up since—for the past 20, 30 years, okay. Every year a business licence that gets sold, the next business licence goes, obviously, a little bit higher than what it is.

All these years, you know, as the prices are going up, every business licence gets a stamp from the Manitoba government. Without that, it's not approved. So the government is allowing these prices to go up and letting us know that, you know, what we're investing in is secure.

Nobody was talking about, in the future that this is going to happen, or give us any kind of warnings that this might happen. So we're thinking our investments are secure, because everybody else is doing it.

Mr. Swan: Mr. Singh, I want to thank you for coming down this afternoon. You need to know that the process in Manitoba is unlike most places, and anybody is entitled to come down and tell people about an impact that a proposed law will have on their lives, and I think it's really important that you've come down here to give us some real numbers of the impact that this bill is going to have.

You've told us that you paid \$348,000 for a taxicab licence. You've had to take out a loan at 9 per cent to pay for that and you're now paying \$3,136 per month on that loan. And you've told us that you're very fearful that you're not going to have anything to show for it when this bill passes.

Our NDP caucus has said from the start that Bill 30 should be withdrawn. That's one of the things we've said.

The purpose of this committee is twofold. One is to hopefully get the government members to convince the Premier (Mr. Pallister) to withdraw Bill 30. But, if not, if we can't do that, to make changes to this legislation, to hopefully at least make it better if they insist on following through.

Many people have talked about two major issues. One is to make sure there's a level playing field for safety so that anybody who comes in to offer rides has to have the same safety standards as current taxis. And, secondly, that there be compensation for people like yourself who bought in at a certain level and who are now fearful that that value is going to disappear.

Are those the sorts of changes that you think should be made to Bill 30, that you're hoping that these government members will listen and say to the Premier?

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Singh.

Mr. Bedi, on behalf of Mr. Satwinder Singh: Most definitely, yes; totally agree with you, they should. They should have some amendments in this bill to secure our livelihoods.

* (15:30)

Everything that people have made or brought from overseas, all their life savings, put into this industry, it should be protected, just like you have protected other small businesses in the past and compensated them when you made changes to their business. That's what's fair. That's what Canada does.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Wharton, we have about 30 seconds left, so you may ask your question.

Mr. Wharton: Thank you, Mr. Singh, for coming down today. And Mr. Bedi, again, I've seen you throughout the week and thank you for taking the time to assist Mr. Singh in translating for him.

A couple of things you had asked about Bill 30. And you asked—essentially, you're asking what Bill 30 was. Well, again, it's pretty clear what Bill 30 is. It transfers the taxicab regime to the City of Winnipeg to develop a new regime in consultation with the industry and ride-share industry. That's No. 1.

Number 2, back in 2013, the current—or, the government of the day put out a survey because they were obviously hearing some concerns about, perhaps, the industry, and maybe the fact that there wasn't enough cabs or whatever on the streets. It was determined at that time—and this was one of your colleagues that was sharing this with us on Monday night, that—

Mr. Chairperson: The honourable Mr. Wharton, if you could wrap up, because we are 'plast'.

Mr. Wharton: I will.

So my point is, in 2015, fast forward, the NDP commissioned a report by Meyers Norris Penny to look at the industry as a whole to determine whether there was a need to expand on the industry and the ride-share industry. Simply, what we're going today is saying Bill 30 is acting on the Meyers Norris Penny report that the NDP commissioned.

So my question is this: They have—bottom line is you have everything to show for your investment. Mr. Singh has spent 25, 30 years in the industry, he's owned his cab, he's generated an income, he's raised a beautiful family, he's continued to live in Winnipeg and in Manitoba—

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Wharton. Mr. Wharton, I'm sorry. The Honourable Mr. Wharton.

Mr. Singh, could you please give us a brief answer?

Mr. Bedi, on behalf of Mr. Satwinder Singh: You're saying that you're simply transferring jurisdictions. So why do you need to put that clause that we cannot seek for any compensation?

You're not simply transferring that. You're cancelling our licence. You're not simply transferring jurisdiction; you're putting all those clauses in there. What is the need to do that? Can you please explain?

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for your question, Mr. Singh. Our time has well expired, so we will now move on to the next presenter.

Our next presenter is Herman Sodhi. Herman Sodhi?

Mr. Sodhi will be moved to the bottom of the list. We've also called a number of presenters—these three here—we are removing No. 46, No. 49—*[interjection]* Oh, sorry, No. 47, 48 and 51 from the list because they presented on earlier days, so they will be taken completely off the list. They will not be called back again.

We will now move to No. 54, Richhpal Singh. Number 54. *[interjection]*

Mr. Singh, could you wait 'til I recognize you. I was just writing some stuff down here.

You may proceed with your verbal presentation.

Mr. Richhpal Singh (Private Citizen): Good afternoon, everybody. So myself, Richhpal Singh, and I've been living in the city for last six years. I'm not the cab driver right now, and I'm not the taxi owner. So I'm here today as a civilian, as a citizen of Winnipeg, to present my thoughts and some of the ideas and some of the experience that I have in last few years regarding the taxi industry.

So the first thing when I was looking at the Bill 30—see—so what is the purpose of that bill? So the purpose is written there to give the powers to the City of Winnipeg to make the bylaws to, like, to regulate—'regularize' the taxi industry, and also introduce some other things.

So what is the need of this? If I look at—through the bill, I can't find any right answer about what is the right need of this bill. Is there any need to do that? Or, as a government of Manitoba, are we

unable to do that if there is any concern about that—the existing taxi industry?

So this is the first concern that I have. And the second thing, when I—when we talk about giving the powers to the City of Winnipeg, so I was, like, following the mayor of the city of Winnipeg. So he's openly paving the Uber ride sharing into the city of Winnipeg.

So, first of all, let's understand, what is a ride share? So if we talk about ride share, so ride share means sharing your car. For example, if somebody is going to work, as two people going to the work at the same spot, so they share the ride. So one week, I drive, and one week, the other driver, they drive. So we never pay each other. We just share our cars.

If we talk about Uber or any other ride-share companies, so what they do? So what, first thing, we need to have an app. Then we need to pay up front. And when we pay up front, so what's next? They're going to charge. So what is—this is not a ride share, this is all the—whatever already existing taxi industry they're doing. So if we talk about, in Winnipeg, so every taxi company, they have their own apps. So once they—somebody booked a cab, so they can, like, they can pay up front, or even they can pay it later. So this is the first thing.

And second thing, I have some experience with Uber. I've been to Ottawa this year in March. So I was tracking one of the Uber drivers there, and I asked, how many Uber drivers here? And his answer was 15,000. So 15,000 Uber drivers just in Ottawa only. So we talk about city of Winnipeg, so we have approximately 800,000 people living in the city of Winnipeg, so is there—if Uber is coming—so we cannot control the number of cars or number of drivers. So is everybody making a living? I don't think so. Is—even Uber drivers, they cannot make a living. So this is the thing that we clearly need to understand, that before deciding into this bill, before passing this bill or we need to understand that there—we cannot control Uber, even their fares. Their fares are fluctuating.

We—I've been to Las Vegas this year, in August. So I was talking to the taxi driver there. So their income drops down from \$5,000 to just \$1,500, a cab driver. So in the city of Winnipeg, all the cab drivers and the cab owners, they have their families, they have their houses. So who's going to pay for their mortgages if this thing happens? If everybody driving Uber or everybody driving, like, or any other ride-share company, so who's going to make money?

There is no money in the market. And also is—this is not good for even the person like me who use cab on a regular basis; this is not good for me, as well.

So think about if you call Uber in the morning, and you're going to the airport, right, and somebody come to your place, and there's no safety features in the car. That's what I'm feeling—I was feeling in Ottawa and I was feeling in the States. We cannot—there's no camera. There's no other safety feature. And the drivers, they are not professional. They're just, like, doing part time before going to—before they go to work, they're going to have one trip in the morning. So they want to make some extra living, and they—most of the cab—most of the Uber drivers, they are doing it part time.

So, before going to any solution or any decision, we need to look around or we need to, like, think about all the aspects that those ride-share companies, they going to bring to our city. Is there any value on that or not?

And the one other thing that I want to, like, share with all of you, that this taxi industry, if there is any concern or any changes that we would like to make, we need to talk to the taxi industry first. We need to talk them. If we can do that, why we go to the City of Winnipeg and they going to make the bylaws and all this stuff.

And at the end I would like to say, we need to think twice on this before we make a final decision on this bill. So there are so many things that we need to correct or we need to take into attention. So this is all from me for—

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

The floor is now open for questions.

* (15:40)

Mr. Helwer: Thank you, Mr. Chair; Mr. Singh, for your presentation.

You've tried services elsewhere and used them, found them wanting sometimes, got you there. I likewise had a similar experience in Ottawa. I arrived late one evening, walked out and took the first cab in line. No other vehicles were on the road. It was obviously quite late, started up the Uber app just to see curiously where they might be—and, as I said, we were the only vehicle on the road—and you could see the cab driver's name on his cab, who it was that was driving me. And surprisingly enough we had a Uber right on top of us, and when I looked up that Uber, it

just happened to be the same person driving the cab that I was in. So he's playing both sides of the road, and obviously found an opportunity to work the industry to his benefit.

Do you feel that is anything that we could see in Winnipeg here? *[interjection]*

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Singh, you must wait 'til I recognize you. Go ahead, Mr. Singh.

Mr. Richhpal Singh: Okay. So I don't think so in this way. For example, in the Uber cars, if I—if we talk about the safety features, so there's no safety features, so we get the information of the driver but there won't be any camera installed.

So let me ask you one thing: So why we install cameras on our houses, our front door and the back yard? So what is the purpose of installing the cameras? To protect ourselves, right. So protection, or safety, is the first feature that must be in the city of Winnipeg because I know the city is very high on the crime ratio side, so—I'm not offending anybody. So this is the stats, right. So we—the fact is the fact. If we can say it's sunrise in the east, that's the fact. So this is the fact. So I don't think without the safety—it's not about the safety of the customer, it's also about the safety of your driver.

It's not about the availability and it's not about the price, but the one thing, the price—you cannot say that your life is, like, has this value. The life is priceless. So if something happens in unprotected cars without proper insurance and if somebody dies, so we don't have any second chances. What's the answer then? What we going to say to their families? So these Uber cars, no protection, no cameras. What's going to happen?

Mr. Saran: Thanks, Mr. Singh, for coming over here, and what I am listening for the last three days—but we cannot get that answer—that they don't want to consult the taxi industry, and I wrote a letter and I ask minister to have a meeting and she said, no, anyway it's going through.

So they have made up their minds.

And I don't know how much—how many presentations we can bring over here, how we can change their minds, because they don't want to listen people, because they have some kind of an understanding with mayor and some kind of understanding with Uber. Other day I ask to extend the time to ask the Uber person more questions and previous minister, she said, no, you cannot do that.

So I think they have made up their minds. It looks like we are hitting our head against the wall. I would ask you: If they do this, pass this bill, what's the industry going to do? What kind of action they want to take?

Mr. Richhpal Singh: So, first of all, if they already decided so there is no meaning of this meeting. So the first thing is why we are sitting here? If they already decided, so, there's no meaning of this meeting.

And second thing is if—I was in the city of Winnipeg, I was in the one of the sessions, and when somebody asked the mayor about the Uber, he clearly like a hundred per cent sure that he will bring the Uber in the city. And we all—like, when this come to the representing the City or representing the, like, Province, so it's up to you who representing the—all the population of the Manitoba to make right decision. If it goes to the city of Winnipeg, so, we won't have anything left here to discuss, so it's gone. So now it's our hands here that we can do something better. We can look at the—all the taxi drivers, all the taxicab owners, families, and we can give something, because they are here for last three days and they are all talking, they're presenting, their family members are here. So why they are here? Because they are scared, and I'm in insurance industry right now. Let me explain—let me tell you one thing. I got a call from one of the—

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Singh, your time for questions has ran out. So we thank you very much for coming out and presenting today, and we will now move on to the next presenter. Thank you very much for presenting.

Mr. Maloway: I've been informed that, you know, it is a Friday, there's—we're in rush hour very soon and that Duffy's has 120 fares backlogged, Unicity has 150. There's, like, three conventions going on in the city. There's rides going to the airport. It's a—Friday's a cheque-cashing day, evidently.

So what I'm going to suggest, is ask for a two-hour recess 'til 6 o'clock. That's the—that would clear off the—otherwise, the cabs are going to have to come off the roads and people are going to be inconvenienced if that were to happen. So, you know, we're sitting here for 14 hours today, right? So surely we can take a recess for two hours, let the—let these 150 rides for Unicity and 120 for Duffy's happen, and then the business slows down after that.

Mr. Chairperson: It has been proposed that we take a two-hour recess until 6 p.m.

Is there any comments from the committee, or agreement? Does the committee agree to this?

Some Honourable Members: Agree.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Chairperson: One at a time, here. Mr. 'Helwel,' we'll recognize you first.

Mr. Helwer: We have, obviously, people in the audience. I assume some of them are on the list to present. Can we proceed with the list and find people that are in the audience that may be able to present to us? We have at least, I would say, 15 people that are available, so perhaps some of them are on the list that have not already presented.

Mr. Swan: I think we're actually very close, then, to an accommodation. What Mr. Maloway is saying is the advice that he's been receiving from the taxi operators that are down here and have been down here, who are small-business people who are serving the people of Winnipeg, and what the information we've been given is that right now is an extremely busy time on a Friday, and the choice is either to pull cabs off the road or to have people miss their opportunity to present.

So I don't think there's—I think that we can continue to move ahead, if we would have leave not to drop to the bottom those individuals who are on the road. I think it's very reasonable to modify the member for Elmwood's (Mr. Maloway) request with what the member for Brandon West (Mr. Helwer) is saying. Let's let anybody who is here present, let's hear from them. We can hear what they have to say. If somebody's not here, I propose—

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Swan, I must say that this isn't a debatable—you're proposing to do this, okay, so you may continue, but I just want to remind everybody this isn't something debatable that we can go back and forth here. It is a vote. *[interjection]*

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Swan.

Mr. Swan: Sorry, I'll have to repeat what I said.

I was just trying to articulate what I think was a friendly amendment or a friendly idea put forward by the member for Brandon West. We know that—two things. We know there's a lot of taxi operators that still want to come down here and let this committee know their views on a bill that will have, as we're hearing, grave impact on their livelihood. We also

know that these small-business people, the very small-business people that the government claims that they're on the side of, are very, very busy right now. And we either have cabs being taken off the road at a very busy time, which is going to inconvenience Winnipeggers, or we're going to have people not be allowed to—

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, Mr. Swan, like, we need to stop here for a second here. We have some thoughts of what's happening. We need to come to an agreement, because, basically, if we call somebody, they will go to the bottom of the list. They won't get dropped. And, eventually, we will be calling them sometime tonight.

* (15:50)

So, like, we will continue until there's nobody left to call. So, really, by—*[interjection]* If there's nothing to change here, we will just continue on the way we're going, and we'll continue calling people. If somebody is not here, they will be dropped to the bottom of the list. We have several people from all the days before that are at the bottom of the list that we'll continue calling until there's nobody left to call.

So do you have additional comments or—*[interjection]* Mr. Swan, you must—yes, I must recognize you.

Mr. Swan: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Look, we've already made some accommodations at the start of this committee several days ago to acknowledge the fact that a number of the people who want to present, English is not their first language. And so I think it was the right thing by this committee to allow an interpreter to come up.

We were saying, in this particular situation, these are individual business people who are on the road right now, and I don't think, in this particular situation, it's good enough to simply say, well, we'll drop people down to the bottom of the list. Right now, there is an order. We're understanding that there's some difficulty in getting people off the road, they may be at the airport, they may be on their way out to Transcona, they may be out to Sage Creek. All we're asking—

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Swan, we've done this before. When somebody arrives we don't—like, they will go to the bottom of the list. But, when they come and they arrive, you can bring it up and we ask the committee if they're interested in hearing, at that point, which we have done previously. So we will continue on the way we were proceeding. People, if

they're not here, will get dropped to the bottom of the list. If somebody shows up that's ready to present and he is someplace else on the list, we can always—you can make—ask a request that we listen to him at the time he arrives. Would that not be the best way to answer this?

Mr. Swan: Well, again, I thank the Chair for that intervention. I think the best thing that we can do—*[interjection]*

Mr. Chairperson: Order. Order. Order. Mr. Allum, order.

I'm trying to come to a resolve here. I don't need people arguing across the table. Right now I'm in discussion with Mr. Swan.

Mr. Swan.

Mr. Swan: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson, for clarifying that. All I am saying is that there's a point of order, which I expect is going to become a formal motion by the member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway), to ask that we recess until 6 o'clock. I was actually trying to build off something that I believe the member for Brandon West (Mr. Helwer) was saying, and what I'm suggesting is that—

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Swan, I'm sorry. I've been—got information. There is no point of order; it was a request. If we ask for agreement, if somebody says no, the answer will be no. I think we've got a decent—the way we're working here, we'll just continue working through the system, as it is, and we will just continue—*[interjection]* And we could've heard from a presenter already while we're arguing.

So we will continue on with the next presenter.

And there's no agreement to recess.

Presenter No. 97, Satvir Brar. Mr. Brar, do you have any written presentation for the committee?

Mr. Satvir Brar (Private Citizen): I've got no written material.

Mr. Chairperson: Then you may proceed with your presentation when you are ready. Thank you.

Mr. Satvir Brar: Good afternoon, to all of you guys. My name is Satvir Brar. I've been here for 17 years, and 16 years in the industry. I was a part-time driver; then I went through university and drove a cab through part time. Now I work in the industry, in the office.

This ride sharing, a basic question comes down to it. I think the basic issue is ride sharing for everyone—

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Brar, if you could move the microphone up a little closer so we can hear you.

Mr. Satvir Brar: Sure.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much.

Mr. Satvir Brar: —that's the question everyone is going through. I mean, obviously, the one question I had was if you call a doctor from other country, do you go to his credentials or does he come to—up to your credentials?

I mean, if Uber is coming, they should be following the rules what we have here, not we should be going down to their level. I mean, that's—that should be the question. I mean, obviously, if we don't—industry's been here—I mean, taxi industry has come so far in 40 years. They got the cameras, everything else, all the equipment right now. We would be going back to that 40 years when there was no shields, no cameras. I think you should be having voice recorder in there, as well, for the driver safety. And that's not in there yet, but it should be in there, as well.

I mean, that's very hard for the drivers to protect themselves if there's no shield and there's no cameras. And how would you prove if you're innocent or you're guilty? I mean, people will blame them all the time. And that would be hard for them.

The other part is the service. I think for most people—they said they don't get service, but from 9 to 3, they only get a few calls. There's nothing there. They're always sitting around. And 3 to 6 is really busy. That's when they need the service and the traffic builds up. There's nothing there. I mean, if they had diamond lanes, maybe they will move a little faster. Even for one trip, it'll take them an hour which is normally half an hour. So, if you have 440 cabs that's working at that time, you only have—you know, 220 cabs are doing the service for an hour. And the—that's why the—it builds up. And we need to allow them a diamond lane. Something like that would be a better option than having another company that comes in and they will affect them, as well.

You know, you will lose jobs. I work in the office, I know there is 42 people and half of them will be gone if there is—if it comes in. Obviously, it is a competition, but it—having a competition is a good

thing, but on a right level, not having a competition where one gets the advantage over the other. And that's what Uber would be, or any tab or any of the other companies. And that would be, you know, your money would—here, the 42 are paying taxes and you collect the taxes and they all have jobs. Other way, half of them will be on social assistance. I mean, obviously, they have no other skill than taking phone calls. It would be very hard for them. And some of the people been there for 40 years. I'm—obviously, he's not able to find any other job at this point. So it would be very hard for them.

And one other thing I would like to add is that, you know, these guys who spend a lot of money and when they sell them a cab, I mean, they have to pay a capital gain on the cab. It's not like they're, you know, making profit only. If they're paying a capital gain, it goes to the government and that is—that's money earned by the government, as well. You know, everyone is benefiting. That money goes to hospitals, everyone is using that.

So it's not—if Uber comes in here, 30 per cent is always out. You know, it's not—you're always giving out. And the other disadvantage of having Uber is that, you know, every time you call a cab, if you don't show up it's \$5. It's not free.

And especially for the older generation who don't have apps, they don't use apps. I mean, it would be very hard for them to use Uber, because at—when it's rush hour, there is no Uber available. And how—they have to call the taxis, and taxi drivers are not making enough money, they'll be sitting at home. So who would be driving them?

And that's all I have to say.

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

Mr. Swan: Thank you very much for coming down and presenting this afternoon.

I think you've actually framed it in a way that is really, really helpful. You've talked about how, if someone who's trained in another country as a medical professional or another professional or in a regulated profession, comes to Manitoba, they can't actually practice in their field until there's been satisfaction given that they have met the Manitoba standard. And the ironic part is that many of those are people who I've had drive me in cabs, who are waiting to be able to practise medicine or dentistry or engineering. I think that's a really good way to frame it.

Your point is that there should be a level playing field. Keep in mind, that playing field should be the level we're at now and not a race to the bottom.

I wonder if you can just talk a little bit more about how that level playing field would play out in the area of safety when somebody gets into a cab.

* (16:00)

Mr. Satvir Brar: If they have—let's say if there is a camera in there and something happens in the cab and driver or taxi board can download the pictures and he can improve himself. If there is no safety, if someone gets killed, who's liable for it? Is the government, or who is it? Is it the city? Who's going to take the blame for it?

Now, they brought in the shields because someone got killed. Now, if we're going back to that time and taking the shields off, then we're, actually, we're not progressing, we're, you know, we're going backwards in time. Technology here to move forward. I mean, Uber is a technology, right, and if that's the case, why are we going backwards, why we're taking the shields off, why would we taking the cameras off? Then we're going backwards. Why not going with the technology? That's what I think.

Mr. Helwer: Thank you, Mr. Brar, for coming to present. You obviously have a very good view of the industry, working in it.

I'm curious, from a perspective, if—when someone buys a cab licence and they put it on with one of the cab companies—I don't know which one you work for and I don't need to know—what if that cab driver took a call from another company and took a fare from the other—the competitor, as it were. What would happen to that cab driver?

Mr. Satvir Brar: That's why there is technology. That's why there is computers in there. He wouldn't get a call from the other company. I mean, obviously, it's individualized.

An Honourable Member: So it's a monopoly then.

Mr. Satvir Brar: It's not a monopoly. Monopoly is when one company controls everything. There is 10 different companies. Government would be a monopoly, right, because one person's running the show.

Mr. Swan: I believe you told us that you don't actually drive but you work in an office. Do you want to tell us about the work that you do and how you think that will be affected by Bill 30?

Mr. Satvir Brar: Well, I would, obviously, I would lose my job, because if they don't—if, let's say, Uber comes in and the business moves down, obviously, I would be one of the guys—person would lose my job because they need to downsize it. Obviously, they can't afford that much staff having there. They have to pick up the pensions; they have to do everything else. I mean, it would be really expensive for them. And obviously wages are going up and it's very hard for them to survive.

Mr. Micklefield: Thank you for coming out this afternoon, for your presentation and for your thoughtful remarks. I just wanted to pick up on something you just said in response to Mr. Swan's question, and also I think I heard it during your presentation.

You—I believe you said, and please do correct me if I'm not getting it right, that obviously you would not have a job, and I think you said half of the office would no longer exist. And I'm just wondering, what makes it obvious, where do you get the—you know, half: is that what has happened in other jurisdictions? Have other cities seen a decrease of 50 per cent of their taxicab administration? Is there—and I'm not wanting to hold you to some kind of academic standard—I'm not, I'm really not—but I'm seriously wanting to know, is there evidence that this will happen for certain, Because in other cities I've been to I noticed that the taxicab industry has actually ridden out the storm quite well and continues to operate, you know, quite effectively in other cities?

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Brar. We—our time has expired, but we will let you 20 seconds to conclude.

Mr. Satvir Brar: Well, I think logically it makes sense. If you're not making money in the business, you, obviously, you have to downsize, and that is the business sense. I mean, I've—it'll take them a few months longer to go down in the business; eventually, they have to cut jobs off. I mean, that's—how else they would survive? Otherwise, they could use on a loan for a little while and that's about it. They have to cut the jobs down.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Brar. We will—we appreciate you coming down.

Mr. Maloway: Number 53, Herman Sodhi, is here now, so would it be okay for—to hear from him, then?

Mr. Chairperson: Is there agreement from the committee to hear from Mr. Sodhi now? *[Agreed]*

We will now call No. 53, Herman Sodhi. Mr. Herman Sodhi, you may proceed with your presentation.

Mr. Herman Sodhi (Private Citizen): Yes, my name is Herman Sodhi. Hello, everybody. And the reason why I'm here—my family, they came here in 2006. They came from Germany and I came from India in 2010 here. And I start driving cab in 2012.

Me and my dad, we both—okay. We both driving cab since 2012 and we bought cab in 2015. And my dad still has loan on it to pay off. And I'm still young; I had a dream to go to university, but my dad has a loan to pay off, so I'm helping my dad, driving cab and helping him to pay off the loan. And, yes, this is the main reason I'm driving cab.

And I heard about Bill 30 and, if Uber comes here, so—it's going to be really hard for my family to survive, to be very honest, because we're working hard from last four years. And I still want to go to university. If I work hard, in three, four years and I still save lot of money, and then I can go to university. I'm young—I'm just 26 right now, right?

And when it's come to safety in a taxi, we've got cameras, shields, everything installed by taxi board cab, right? And our cab's inspected by taxi board twice a year, which is a good thing.

And, yes, so, I don't know what to say, what not to say, but it's going to be really hard for us to survive.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Sodhi.

Mr. Allum: Thank you for coming and for saying quite plainly and quite honestly to us that this is going to have a big impact on your family.

Can you just tell us a little bit of the history? Your dad, I'm assuming, bought a licence. You drive with him. Just tell us about the operation of your cab and your small business.

Mr. Sodhi: Yes, my dad—we sold our house in 2015 back home in India, then we bought the cab. But we still have lot of money to pay off. Lot of money. Yes.

And the reason why we bought the cab, because we want to live a good life. I want to go to university. So yes, that's the main reason we bought the cab a year ago.

Mr. Curry: Thanks so much, Mr. Sodhi, for coming in. I think you and I maybe share more things than we expect.

I didn't go to university right outside out of high school. I worked many jobs between high school and university. I was very happy to be able to be a member of the military where I was able to get bursary through that and other things. And my father's also a small-business owner.

And I want to, of course, you know, thank you so much for coming to present. The contents of Bill 30 certainly is what we're debating—we're discussing here at this committee. And it transfers the Taxicab Board from the province to the City of Winnipeg regimes.

So I just want to know, in terms of the concern, is there any possibility, is there any future you can see where the transfer is a smooth transition, where the current system essentially just gets copied over to—from the Province to the City, and that's a smooth transition.

Is there any possibility that could happen, considering that both jurisdictions are working through that process between now and when that can happen?

Mr. Sodhi: I'm not sure what they're going to do when it's going to be under the city. So right now, we are under the taxi board, under our province, right? So I'm not sure what going to happen when it's going to be under the City. So, yes.

*(16:10)

Mr. Allum: Well, thank you, and just to clarify, I mean, there is one way for there to be a smooth transition, and that's for the government to amend the bill to provide the very protections about a level playing field on safety, and if they're not willing to do that, even to offer compensation, and my friend across the way knows that full well, but he doesn't—or none of the members on his side really want to contemplate either withdrawing the bill or changing it.

And one of the great ironies about your being here today, at the very time the government's pulling the rug out from under your dad's and your business, they're also increasing tuition to universities, going to make it more expensive, make life much, much harder for you.

When it comes to the purchase of the licence last year, I'm guessing that this is hundreds of thousands of dollars that your family finds itself owing. What would you—what do you think you would do with that amount of debt in the absence of having that

very important cab and that very important business to your family?

Mr. Sodhi: If Uber comes it's going to be really hard for us to pay off the bill, pay off the amount we owe—*[interjection]* Yes, on the taxi, right. So, when it's come to safety, when a customer is in a cab, he knows who's driving, right. If anything happens, they can go to taxi board or they can go to any department.

Mr. Allum: You know, one of the most important things that we need to do as legislators, and this is all of us, is come out and talk to people when we're contemplating making big changes to people's lives like this.

Do you think anybody ever came to talk to your dad or was there any consultation with you or anybody you know to talk about what they were going to do to—was that—do you know of anybody ever coming to talk about these huge changes to your life?

Mr. Sodhi: No, nobody talked to us when we were buying that cab.

Mr. Swan: If I can just ask, with the time we have left, thank you for coming down to the Legislature, and I know it's not comfortable and it's not easy to come down and speak in front of a bunch of people you've—that you've never met before.

Can you just tell us a little bit—I mean, you're—you've been in Manitoba now for many years, but you want to go to school. Can you just tell the committee, what would you like to study at university, and if you can manage to earn the income to be able to go, what would you like to achieve?

Mr. Sodhi: My dad used to run a restaurant in Germany. When he was in Germany, he run the restaurant for almost six years, so I was—in India, I just—I was in business. So I was about to go to university in Asper for a business—accounting business. So, yes. So I just want to run my own restaurant, a few years ago, but my dad bought a cab, so the thing turns on to that side. So, yes.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Sodhi, but we are out of time for questions.

We will now call—Mr. Maloway.

Mr. Maloway: I wonder if we could hear from No. 71, Jaswant Gill. Evidently, he has a doctor's

appointment and would like to speak now if possible—71.

Mr. Chairperson: There's a request from a committee member to bring forward Mr. Jasmin [*phonetic*] Gill who is—Jaswant Gill.

What is the will of the committee?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Helwer: I think, you know, we have a person that needs to get an appointment, that's certainly acceptable, but I think if we have people coming in that are on the list further down we should probably stay with the list to see if the individual is here has been in—and has been waiting for several hours, perhaps, in future, but this particular gentleman that has an appointment we can accommodate.

Mr. Chairperson: Agreement has been made. We will—Jaswant Gill. Mr. Jaswant Gill.

When you're ready for your presentation, you may proceed.

Mr. Jaswant Gill (Private Citizen): My name's Jaswant. I came here in Winnipeg, 1984. I did different departments, different work: Superstore, Sears store, Walmart after that. I've driven taxi '92, now. Still I driving. I went here to 2002 in Calgary. I see the system over there. Money, money, money, money, nobody care each other.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson in the Chair

I went three—lived over there 30 month, but I feel not good. Every second week, somebody killing each other. Drug dealing. My wife, we decided why not go back. Two thousand six we came back in Winnipeg. If we saying friendly Manitoba, we feeling when we going out. Not here, even. When you going out, you living different place, different behave, different people. You are stuck one side the road. Hundred people going, nobody asking for help. But in Winnipeg, if some reason you are stuck, people stopping, asking what reason, need help. Still Manitoba. Friendly Manitoba.

This my request: we save our friendly Manitoba. When you making any decision, any law, first think of—for friendly Manitoba. After that, whole world.

Last time when we met, before election, to Mr. Brian in Pembina, we are both companies—Unicity and Duffy. Face to face we are talking. Mr. Brian said, we are first thinking for Manitoba.

Yes. He is good person. Look like tall me when we meeting each other, look like—very friendly. Yes.

But I listened so many different concern, safety, business, Winnipeg, Uber, any other thing, any other thing. First of all, always think our safe, friendly Manitoba. Last time I told to one in airport area, one woman came from Thompson to just newborn, double-crib. One around three-something, one around five-something. Nobody picking. When my turn came over there, over there, dispatcher and officer came outside. Why you not picking? I said, there are four, five. If I picking, I getting ticket from police. If some reason an accident, who paying for fifth person? Our insurance for four only. They said okay, we are standing with you because she is woman, she has a family. Wheelchair. She cannot hire second cab. If she can hire the—how can you divide four child?

I give ride. I got risk. I dropped emergency. Children are emergency. Right away, I went to taxi board. I did talk chairman and chief secretary. Oh, they can't, they can't, they can't, they can't. I said not. Give me written. If I would left that single woman, single mom. If I were anything like this need the people, we should add something.

Doesn't matter you can put some van. Doesn't matter you change this law. You can say, mom can't take and left. You can add here without reason, Duffy driver got accident on McPhillips. He got paralyzed. Woman died over there. Over passenger. Some other companies—Vital got accident on Moray and Ness. Fall down. Woman died with wheelchair. That's why any kind of service, any 'koney', you making law, first think about friendly Manitoba. Because we are all working together, all living in Manitoba. Yes. A feeling you can feel how Manitoba people living.

*(16:20)

Forty per cent welfare, some old, some sick, some student, some student came from overseas. We need a broad future. Why we came here? Just for future. People overexcited, they've spent more, more money for future. Now they're being upset, feeling we sold everything over there, came here. After this bill, what we can do?

One my close friends died this 10th October—gone, 89; 215 driver, gone; 206, gone; 343 driver, gone. When you making this bill, how many people losing life? This is not bill, this is life, prison; you making decision.

Please, please, please, this is my service. When I given service someone, depend, Bible promises John Paul, highest priest in Vatican, I've given service in Winnipeg. They sent it by mail to Unicity office, one tie, one Bible.

Honestly, I saying, we are all workers working for a nice future, building a nice Manitoba, because we're not having any big business, not any big tourism. If need, I say truly, put—doesn't matter, 100 more—put inside the companies somewhere, because already last time had a problem like this, at that time Mr. Gary Doer, I came over there. Mr. Filmon that time, I always came over there. I have all pictures with me. When I have gone mission, Mr. Harper told me, I came over there too. We made some 'crue.'

This time, a little bit hard, make a little bit time and reasonable for everyone, for government, for people, for hard workers. Yes. If it is true, this is true, but other thing, if we making a little bit hard, the people are remembering German Hitler theory. How many people gone if have a dictatorship anywhere we can lose so many things.

This is the friendly Manitoba. We should say. We should say, by God, we can say that's it.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Gill. We now proceed to questions.

Mr. Swan: Mr. Gill, thank you very much for being here to present to this committee this afternoon. As we've said a couple of times, it's not easy to get up in front of a bunch of—[interjection]

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Mr. Gill, can you allow Mr. Swan to complete his question, please. Thank you.

Mr. Swan: Mr. Gill, you—I think you said, early in your presentation, you said that, effectively, that you believe that you were promised that your investment in your job would be protected by this government.

Do you want to—can you talk a little bit more about that? Who said that and what did they say?

Mr. Jaswant Gill: Job look like my mom. Same, I respected my mom, same my job. If nobody care for mom, he cannot care for job. If careless, never success. Same my mom, same my job. I did nicely. I want to protect this job, too; for everyone, not for me.

Mr. Swan: Thank you.

Course, we're—the bill before the Legislature, Bill 30, of course, will end the provincial regulation of taxis and cancel taxi licences.

What will Bill 30 do to your investment and to your job?

Mr. Jaswant Gill: I bought taxi \$520,000. But if you making now lost someone sold 154—different \$400,000. That's why people crying, crying, crying and crying. After that, what we can do? If you make a little bit sense, make more solution than people going to settle, business going to settle. You are all qualified guys, all family men, you understanding.

If your competition saying, this look like I feeling, somebody grabbing my mom, killing my mom, I'm getting a lollipop. Killing my mom, my job is my mom. I'm getting a lollipop. You like a green one? You like a red one? You like a blue one? What do you think? One side, my mom; one side, lollipop. Which one would like? Compensation or anything just look like a lollipop.

You share feeling each other. Make nice decision for everyone, and keep in mind our friendly Manitoba can stay here. We not need a hate crime. If open back door, you cannot sleep at home. Nighttime, you can open your back door. What you feeling? Anybody can come. Back door never open. Front door open. If needing more service, bylaw. Everyone satisfied. If opening back door, hate crime, drug dealing—same thing in Surrey—people dying and gang rape. Doesn't matter my daughter; doesn't matter your. We need a safe Manitoba.

If I'm right, okay. But if you want to just remember again, again—to [inaudible] people—still big, big, big, big hurt from that happen. Still people remembering. This bill—same thing for us, when I thinking like that. That that decision—you giving punishment like that. This one, you want to die with the hang up? You want to die with needle? You want to die with chamber? Which kind you want to die? Just asking this meeting—I feeling.

I came yesterday; I came today. I couldn't came 23, 24, because my nice friend got heart attack. A couple drivers already gone—family upset. Be careful. We not need a losing friendship; we need friendship.

Doesn't matter this party coming in power, doesn't matter this one coming in power. I—always, I came between. Always, I came between. I still between. Same thing you; same thing, he. We are all together working together. We need a safe Manitoba.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Gill.

Mr. Allum, we have about 20 seconds.

Mr. Allum: Okay. Mr. Gill, I guess I'll just end by saying, then, Mr. Chair, on behalf of all of us here, thank you for coming, for coming for the last few nights. We're—I think we're all sorry to hear about your friend. We're going to do our best to make sure that there is a protection for your job so that we can all maintain Manitoba as a friendly place for every single one of us.

Thanks, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Gill.

Floor Comment: Thanks for everyone. Please, please, please, please, by God, please.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Gill.

I now call—yes, Mr. Maloway, we have a list here that we can follow.

Mr. Maloway: I understand that, Mr. Chair. However, one—No. 136, Harinder Mann, is here currently, so—

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: I understand that, Mr. Maloway. We will call our list as we normally do, and, if those people are not here, they will drop to the bottom, and we will get to that individual as per our usual rules.

I now call No. 98, Komalpreet Sangha—*[interjection]*—Komalpreet Sangha—Mr. Maloway, I have ruled on this. Are you challenging me, sir?

Mr. Maloway: Different matter.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Different matter.

Mr. Maloway: I move that this committee be recessed until 6 p.m.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Do you have a written motion, sir?

Mr. Maloway: I do.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: It has been moved by Mr. Maloway that this committee recess until 6 p.m. The motion is in order. The floor is open for questions.

Mr. Maloway: I just want to reiterate that this is a marathon meeting of 14 hours. It's not—I don't think I've ever run into one this long—

An Honourable Member: Bill 17.

* (16:30)

Mr. Maloway: Well, okay, but for—not—it's not very often that it happens.

We have a back order with Unicity of 150 rides. We have a back order of Duffy's at 120 rides. It's right in the middle of rush hour on Friday. There is conventions in town; there's people that got to go to the airport. And the issue here is whether you wish to have the cabs, you know, called in for the presenters to be here right now and leave the rides—you know, leave the people without rides. That is a choice, I guess, we will have to make.

The easiest solution here is to simply recess—do a recess until 6 o'clock when I'm told that the—you know, and—a greater number of the presenters will be here.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Maloway.

Mr. Micklefield, do you wish to speak to the motion?

Mr. Micklefield: Yes, Mr. Chair.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak to the motion. You know, I appreciate Mr. Maloway's remark that it may seem simplest to recess until 6, but I would like to propose that we—

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: No, I'm sorry, we are only speaking to the motion.

Mr. Micklefield: Okay. I would like to suggest that we continue down the list in order to—

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: So, wait. Mr. Micklefield, you're speaking in opposition to the motion? Is that what you're saying?

Mr. Micklefield: Okay. Yes, I am opposed to the motion. I think it would be simpler to go as previously planned as per the rules. As per normal practice, I do believe we can make good use of the time between—the time identified in the motion by not entertaining the motion.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Micklefield.

Mr. Swan: Yes, what Mr. Maloway is proposing does require the agreement of this committee, and it doesn't follow the rule, but Mr. Maloway does this with good reason.

The people that have been coming down here day after day, night after night are small-business people. We've heard a lot of evidence over the past

couple of days of how people have invested 300, 400—the last presenter over \$500,000 to be involved in their industry, and their ability to earn is implicit with having a cab out on the road. And the evidence that Mr. Maloway has presented is that there's a great number of cabs out on the road right now because it's Friday rush hour. The last information we had is that there's a backlog of 120 fares with Duffy's and 150 with Unicity Taxi. And we've just simply got the request from the exact industry which is being affected by Bill 30 to have us put a pause on this session just until 6 o'clock to allow rush hour to come to an end and get more people here.

Now, it is true that the rule provides—it's very clear how this is to work. I would point out to this committee that we've had a number of other committees that have been sitting this week. It's been a very busy week for everybody. I know every member of this Legislature has been spending extra time here. Today we are scheduled to sit until midnight.

I would point out that the Clerk's office, with other committees, did actually go and schedule people. They actually broke it down into groups of, what I saw 28, 30, 32 individuals who were then given the guarantee of presenting on a given night. That hasn't happened with Bill 30. And all that happened was that every single person who registered and who subsequently registered was simply put on one list. And that has actually been differential for the people who come down here who've been on the list, many of whom have been unable to attend who didn't have the guarantee of presenting on an evening like everybody else who came down. And I'm thinking of Bill 31, dealing with the tuition raise, Bill 24, dealing with taking away regulations. It seems it was only Bill 30 that had presenters treated in a different way, and I don't actually know why that's the case.

It's not a rule, Mr. Chair, that people be scheduled, but it is a practice which I think everybody agreed made for a more civilized process of hearing. We now have a situation where we have over 100 people who still wish to present to this committee who have only the promise of a list of 100 people. We have certain people very involved in the taxi industry worried about their community, worried about their livelihood, worried about their investment who've been doing a very good job, actually, this afternoon of making sure that people are taking their cabs off the road for the least possible time.

What they are telling us is that we've now come to a point this afternoon, 4:30, the height of rush hour, where there is a real problem, and now there are individuals who want to exercise their democratic right to present to this committee, to have members of the Legislature listen to their concerns and they're telling us that it is a problem accomplishing that. And they have a very simple solution which would be the only other accommodation that's being sought this afternoon, and that is to put the committee on pause, let the members of the committee have dinner, I suppose, let the taxi drivers be able to make some accommodation, get their cabs off the road at a better time for them, and go ahead.

If the government had called these bills earlier, we would have had these committee hearings happening from 6 o'clock until midnight, but the government, in its control, chose not to do that. They knew there were 150-plus people who wanted to present to this committee. We know others have been added. We've had an unusual, not unprecedented, I will say, but an unusual committee hearing from 10 a.m. until midnight, and I would ask the government members to show some compassion, to show—to put their beliefs, to put their stated beliefs in small—to put their stated belief in the value of people working hard, and small business, to listen to a very mild accommodation that's been requested by the taxi industry and those who are so affected by Bill 30.

All that Mr. Maloway's motion seeks to do is to put a pause on, and if this evening there are individuals who cannot or won't make it here, then, of course, everybody knows what the rules are. If they've already been on the list once, their name will be taken off, and because we're now in the third day of hearing, they will have no further offer to present, and if there are individuals who aren't here at that time, their name will be dropped to the bottom of the list, which is the normal rule. All we're asking for on behalf—not on our behalf, but on behalf of so many individuals who've been able to present with such passion and such clarity to give them the best possible opportunity to use a democratic process that I think all of us in this province are very proud of.

Democracy isn't always smooth, it's not always easy but it's very important, so I look to the government members to make this accommodation, to make sure that we have the best possible hearings so that everybody feels that they've truly been given the opportunity to contribute and to let us hear what they have to say.

So that's why I support Mr. Maloway's motion, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Allum: Just on the motion, I also support it. I can understand the government's side if there was sort of saying, well, let's wait 'til Tuesday of next week or Thursday of next week or something of that order, but that's not exactly the motion that's on the table here.

Based on what Mr. Maloway has indicated, it's that time of day on a particularly busy time of day for this particular industry, an hour and a half, actually less than that. An 80-minute pause, recess, Mr. Chair, seems to me to be a really a—all of us, as legislators, just a show of goodwill to an industry that, I think from the testimony, and I don't think anyone would deny that, rightly or wrongly—I think it's right—but rightly or wrongly, feels under attack.

A small, short pause from a committee that's been going all week that started on a Friday morning at 10 o'clock and runs—will be running all the way to midnight tonight, this is a small accommodation, as my friend Mr. Swan just indicated, to an industry and to a—that has a particular timetable to it.

I personally feel it's a small, small show of goodwill that, as legislators, we pick up at 6 o'clock and keep going. The rules back—kick back in. I personally don't think it's a big deal and I think it's up to us as legislators to show goodwill whenever we can.

So that's why I support the motion, Mr. Chair.

* (16:40)

Mr. Saran: I think if we're a member of Unicity and Duffy there are two their representatives that came over here. They requested it because Friday is a busy day and perhaps that meeting should have started at 6 o'clock, and also this is the busiest day for the taxi industry, and that's the time when people kind of make some money.

And for but all the money, it's not only that, at that time the Chair said, well, we cannot decide. It's only the House Leader can decide.

So I talked to the House leader. I put this request to the House leader, government-side House leader, and ask if Friday they can start at 6 o'clock or it can be postponed because Friday is the busiest day, and perhaps we can put extra time on Tuesday or some other day, and he said, okay, I will see what we can do. But I have not heard anything after that.

Unfortunately, number one, these people were never consulted. They got hurt in that way. Now they simply ask a smaller adjustment, and we are not doing that. And this really, I think, it shows we don't care. But one hour and one hour and 20 minutes won't make a huge difference. If we can take this time off, everybody can go have—eat something, and let them little bit—we have adjustment and those people can come, and if they don't show up, then you can put their names out, whatever the process is.

But I—in the past, I seen there is precedent. We were allowing sometimes to people take time; sometime even the Chair will be sitting a long time; they may not have time; they will ask, okay, may I go to the washroom; maybe we can have a five-minute break. So this is—that the way we have been doing in the past. I think about another one hour, 19 minutes won't make that huge difference, and those people should be given at least this opportunity to present—be present over here to have their say, whatever they want to, although, in my opinion, I know this could be waste of time and mind already has been made, but at least listen to them. At least they will feel that they have been listened.

And I urge you, to the Chair and to the committee, let them have one and another 18 minutes off, and we can start at 6 o'clock. They already ask a request about we should start 6 o'clock, but anyway we start 10 a.m., and this is a long day, and many people are already waiting over here maybe five, six hours; they did not get their turn; they went home; then they are waiting again the next day. So if they can wait that long, we cannot wait about one and another 17 minutes? And that's what we should do, and I request this committee, let us—we make a concession in this way, and those people are able to come over here and have their say. Thank you.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Saran.

Is there anyone else that wishes to speak to the motion?

Committee Substitution

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: All right, I would like to make the following membership—where are we here?—like to inform the committee that under our rule 85(2), the following membership substitution has been made for this committee effective immediately: Mr. Smith for Mr. Bindle.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Is the committee ready for the question?

An Honourable Member: Question.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Question. The question for the committee is as follows: Mr. Maloway has moved that this committee do recess until 6 p.m.

Shall the motion pass?

Some Honourable Members: Pass.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: I hear a no.

Voice Vote

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: The motion—okay, all those in favour of the motion, please say aye.

Some Honourable Members: Aye.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: In my opinion, the Nays have it.

The motion is—*[interjection]*

Recorded Vote

An Honourable Member: A recorded vote, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: A recorded vote has been requested.

A COUNT-OUT VOTE was taken, the result being as follows: Yeas 3, Nays 5.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: The 'mortion'—motion is accordingly defeated.

* * *

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: I now resume to the committee, and I call Komalpreet Sangha, No. 98. Number 98, Komalpreet Sangha shall be moved to the bottom of the list.

Number 99, Kulwinder Singh? No. 99, Kulwinder Singh, shall be moved to the bottom of the list.

Number 100, Kulbir Singh? Kulbir Singh shall be moved to the bottom of the list.

Simran Dhaliwal, No. 101. Simran Dhaliwal shall be moved to the bottom of the list.

Number 102, Karamoit Kensray. Karamoit Kensray shall be moved to the bottom of the list.

Number 103, Gurminder Hunjan. There we are.

Welcome, Mr. Hunjan. Do you have any material, written material to present to the committee? No? Then you may proceed with your verbal presentation, Mr. Hunjan. Thank you for joining us today.

Mr. Gurminder Hunjan (Private Citizen): My name is Gurminder Hunjan. I came in 1982 in Canada. And I will be to the—in India, so BA, university of Chandigarh, and Punjab education. I born in Assam.

Mr. Chairperson in the Chair

Assam, I live in just on seven years, then I see the Punjab's education, everything; I like it and love it. Then in 1978, my sister in came—1972, my sister came in here and he apply and we—I come to the 1982 in Canada. Then I got it in job in here city for StandardAero Ltd. for piston cleaning, plus part-time job, that one. And then after, I got a 'furnisture' manufactures, and I make that table, this one, gables and all Woolco, Kmart, in Canada or the US. This is—this company name is 'furnisture' and I'm a supervisor, lean operator—but starting, I'm a general job, starting.

Then, after '90, my job is—factory's gone because time to free trade. So then, I will choose the taxi line, and I will be just—I buy the cab and enter to the cab lines.

And then I will see, time to time, to taxi industries and rules and regulations very good. Not many taxi boards must we need because anything of—we have a—any protection office companies. So then, we do that at taxi board every time to help, and—so, time to time, we talking about to—meeting to of our minister, Mr. Gary Doer, mister—that one is correct—Gary Filmon, premier. And sometimes, some different—our MLAs, Mr. Andrew *[phonetic]* and their side for Bidhu Jha, MLA, so if we talking about to, time to time, to taxi industry.

And right now, we are living starting to—in here, we live in North America. The name is—the earth is five parts: one Asia, one Middle East, one European and one is North America. North America's first president, Abraham Lincoln, his education—what education? He's a cab driver.

* (16:50)

And then I will see that, time to time, I will be to—try to, then after layoff, I say, I try that job to starting the cab line is very good, and I say very good, excellent question, some Ukrainian, some French, some—I love it. Very good, very, sometimes very good questions, some surprise question. I always improvement my life.

So then time to time we asking that question fore in here side to the taxi industries. To company in here side do you like to anyone to ministry or this times? This one if I want to the free no taxi values was supposed to be 5 per cent. Tell me now to which one bank, all loan and no value. Like now, 400, 100, 200, 2,000, 3,000, 5,000, this is a market value. Time two times value for Canada is higher and more excellence level. The question is right now: some new one, one coming and welcome and we want to that be—to strive to in here side job, not to the—anyone to the asking. No, no, he a supporter and we give that chance, because Manitoba we live in and he outside is every time with snow, slippery, icy roads, snow and construction. We have no final bottom line answers.

If this time is solution this way, you can do that final answer. If you want do that, ask him; yes, I do that. No one do *[inaudible]* that nature. Even I am the asking yesterday, starting yesterday the snow three badly accident, three badly.

Support Uber. Okay I'm done with majority government. I'm asking, okay, I'm the minister: Give that chance. This one's right.

Okay, go ahead, I'm experienced and who this one get actually done seriously. Who's responsible? Time to time must we need any kind job need experience, because I am the—actually, I am a cab driver, but I am the carpenter too. Carpentry job and my house—everything in 35 rent group, I live in just one house, In 1982, I buy, and 2013, I sold it. And all repair, everything on myself, inside just myself. And everything, community work, I do it to *[inaudible]* I go to president, not 2001, in Ramguri Association *[phonetic]*.

Ramguri *[phonetic]* means—this is not God; this is Ramguri *[phonetic]* a mini technician guide: carpenter, masonry and different, difference guide welcome to Canada. And we do train, example, Red River College, University of Manitoba, University of Winnipeg. This is education time two times and time two times to develop it.

And my three kids, and the one who is first is Manpreet *[phonetic]* He is well educated and he's in a St. Boniface financial setting. And second is my Harpeet *[phonetic]*. He's ASAP company for a plumbing, heating, cooling company; Kuldi *[phonetic]* is my son—Jaspreet *[phonetic]*, he's a medical. He's a doctor. I like to talk to him, and I will be try—to try to best to invest in Manitoba, because I no like to the Vancouver, Edmonton. Bottom line am I asking, lose the Alberta, win the Manitoba. True line this way.

Last year I go and check it. How could the government give the *[inaudible]* No technician, we play *[inaudible]* With this, I say, wow, you've got the one thing and what can I do play? Garbage, true line garbage. But Manitoba, our Winnipeg, Unicity, we belong to the company and we've got app systems. Time to time change, technicians. You will be called to the Unicity office; all you have a app system in here side. You will call, under five minutes, under two minutes, and you see my cab is coming. Why you stop in here side for Bay, Memorial, maybe because right now rush hour and this and that.

So that meaning we time to time we are a company to day by day each improvement and more developing and more industries and more grew up and more we are helping to Manitobas everywhere. But you see is I know that sometime we are asking this one needs authorize for time to the City Hall, mayor. Mayor is always—discuss already he is—my job is just only improvement just on the road conditions and everything. It is not for law. This is law for a Manitoba government. Taxi board never been too broke. It is mistakes. Hundred per cent. Not for 1 per cent I'm asking.

If you say, no, no, no. We do the taxi board. So who's controller? God?

If you say someone's religion understand you come to the court and tell him who are you? I'm a social worker. Tell him I'm a religion guy. I'm the God helper. No. Lies, always.

So this is my question this one. Time to time I'm asking and time to time I'm industry working and I love it and very good and my excellent and I will be always not for tired job. My job is sometimes helping and sometimes is education and sometime is to the government and sometimes.

The question is right now we're talking about to safety shield. That is our Premier, Mr.—that one is

Mr. Gary Doer. He's asking government to tell me now, what happening, why do you are hated. I'm not prisoner. Generally I'm asking example. I say no. My question this was no. That question is right now is safety meaning we see their side drive their side, one, two, this one is safety, where is purpose?

If Friday evening and Saturday evening, whatever do in here or whatever do anyway, deliver no one to—because everyone is happy because tomorrow is off holiday and sometime is *[inaudible]* and happening.

So time to time I asking so then I will see that two years. He will say, I say one year I need for a time to time, one month I lift the safety shield start—safety shield I put on my cab.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Hunjan, your 10 minutes for your presentation has expired.

Floor Comment: I need one minute more.

Mr. Chairperson: I'm sorry, Mr. Hunjan.

Mr. Allum: Committee grant leave to the presenter to continue on for one more minute and it would cut into his question time so that he can complete his statement?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairperson: You may continue on.

Mr. Hunjan: The public are not, but we are sometime drug gang in Jubilee Avenue. The police go there and police go there, then he shoot to police officer. I said, police is not safe in here. I said public is very safe. I am the cab driver, so I need little bit protection need.

This is my bottom line. That's it, finished.

Mr. Allum: Thank you for your presentation and for the energy and enthusiasm that you've put into it. If I understood you correctly, your primary concern is about safety. Is that correct?

Mr. Hunjan: Yes. Safety. So that is safety must be made because new one coming and he will be just only an initiator, different guy coming, different countries coming to here, and he have no knowledge to Manitoba and must be need—if you the better one he will be living here say 10 year, five year, then after driving the cab, no complain. And I will—tell me now to where I go. I go very nicely. Everyone too friendly. Officer, you come to here; okay, welcome.

But the safety is—if I go to anyone to the choose anywhere outside country so need must be there side

culture, got it. After need for six month, two year, then after to the cab line public provide because it is not simple job.

Mr. Allum: No. I don't think any of us think it's a simple job. I think, well, all of us here around the table would think that it's a quite complicated job and risky at times, and that you work very, very long hours, and I think I can assure you that all of us here, even though we're on different sides of the table—*[interjection]*

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Hunjan, you have to wait until you're recognized to speak. Mr. Hunjan, go ahead.

Mr. Hunjan: That is actually this is the question for everyone is in here side is friendly. No one to criminal in outside. I'm 100 per cent, I'm a solid Christian. No one asking—the question is right now, if you're someone hated, so my heart is all no, no. If you're a little bit safety, everyone could do it who had safety.

* (17:00)

So this is my battle. Actually, I've no need for safety, but I—rule and regulation I follow.

And so second time, my question is right now supposed be if I were to the \$100 I got a plate. No one RBC, chairman. No RBC knows. And even bank. No give the one penny. No give the loan approval.

Okay, the plate is—if your job in Manitoba is \$100,000. Right now, my value start. And market analysis, economics, marginal utilities start. Name each business, capital question. Finish.

And this is my question for—this one is, because some time socialism. This time is all questions start to socialism to India, not for a Canadian. Canadian—Canada is a capital country, capital question. So not sold that communist country is China. Egypt, a capital country. He value this money. Okay, what are you doing? What are the study educations? If you have a bank, we'll—approval. Yes, sir. You sit down. What kind of your loan? Okay, ma'am, I do to that. I will pass you a loan.

Name is business. Economics questions. Time to time is Adam Smith, Marcel and economics. Economics is a science which studies humans' behaviour as relationship and scare means alternative uses. Same—all life running this way. Alternative uses, this is. Okay.

Mr. Chairperson: We'd like to thank you for—oh, for your—no more questions?

We'd like to thank you for your presentation, Mr. Hunjan, and we will now move on to the next presenter. Thank you very much.

We will move on to presenter No. 104, Yegzaw Berhane. Yegzaw Berhane?

Mr. Burhane, do you have any written material for the committee?

Mr. Yegzaw Berhane (Private Citizen): Not right now.

Mr. Chairperson: Then you may proceed with your verbal presentation as soon as you're ready.

Mr. Berhane: My name is Yegzaw Berhane, and I'm a owner and operator in a Unicity taxi.

I've been driving for the last 20 years.

Mr. Chairperson: If you could speak up a little bit, or maybe move the mic a little closer because the committee is having a hard time hearing you.

Mr. Berhane: Yes. I'm nervous. First time—

Mr. Chairperson: You can go ahead, Mr. Berhane.

Mr. Berhane: I've been driving for last 20 years and I had lots of experience. And I have two kids and I have bills to pay for a mortgage and—I have a house. And I'm the only one bring food on the table. And on both—Bill 30—about Bill 30, first of all, before he decide something, you have to think twice. Taxi board, provincial government taxi board, they are well-organized and instead of dissolving the taxi board, he should keep taxi board as it is. Don't even change the address. The building, and the—don't even change the address. And Bill 30, you just drop it—the whole thing.

And if he pass it, it should be safety first of all. Safety has to be first thing we concern. Any Uber drivers has to be safetied, just like a taxi. They have to have a shield, a camera and strobe lights. And they have to go through all trainings and criminal record. I would call it, this one is just plain failed if they do that.

Sorry. I'm done.

Mr. Chairperson: Are you done with your presentation?

Mr. Berhane: Just very much, yes.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay. Thank you very much for your presentation.

Mr. Allum: Well, thank you so much for coming and look at a—it's not easy at that podium, and it's hard to speak with all the noise behind you and everybody here, so don't you worry about it. You did a great job.

You said that you've been driving a cab for 20 years.

Floor Comment: Twenty-some years, yes.

Mr. Allum: Twenty-some years, and so you own a licence, I'm assuming.

Floor Comment: Yes.

Mr. Allum: Yes. And so, what would you really like to see happen? Would you like to see the government just take this Bill 30 that we're talking about today and take it away and start over again? Would that be what you would want? And if you do want that, what else would you like to see?

Mr. Berhane: Yes. My first option is just take it away, everything. Just throw it and leave the taxi board as it is. And we are doing fine. We are very hard workers; and we pay bills, we pay taxes, just like you guys. Like everybody else, we pay taxes. But Uber, they are not paying anything at all. They just provide cars, probably, and Uber owners, they just take a commission out of it. And they are not giving anything for Manitoba. That was my concern.

Mr. Allum: Yes, thank you, and that's—I think that's quite clear to all of us that that's your concern. Now, you seem to say that the taxi board has worked pretty well. Am I right about that, that the taxi board has worked well, and if so, why has it worked well for the industry?

Mr. Berhane: Okay. Taxi board, they have their own bylaw, and, as you know, we are citizens, law-abide citizens, and we abide the law, and we're fine with the taxi board. And we're organized, and, like, our company too. We are updating everything. We have a modern computer, and even we start doing apps. So, even the customers say—like that service. We do very good service almost day by day. Every day, we are improving. And that's why I'm trying to say, instead of dismantling the taxi board, just leave it as it is, and let's do our job, and let's serve the public.

Mr. Micklefield: Thank you, sir, for your very helpful presentation. I'd like to assure you that on all

sides of this table, we certainly value safety. We certainly do not want to jeopardize anybody's life in any way and take those issues quite seriously.

* (17:10)

Possibly, you know, in the excitement of the—and the emotion of Bill 30, we—I just want to reiterate that The Local Vehicles for Hire Act really brings Winnipeg on the same page as every other jurisdiction on the continent, in North America. These kinds of things are looked after at a municipal level. And so, that's really what we're doing here. This bill is about jurisdiction—who is responsible for what. So it is, of course, in response to a survey that was rather considerable.

And I just want to reaffirm the commitment on members of all sides—and I think that's true of the members opposite as well as of ourselves—that safety is something that is taken seriously and is not to be trifled with. So, I think that—I just wanted to send that message.

Thank you so much for your presentation and we certainly do want to wish you a wonderful evening and a wonderful weekend. And thank you for coming down to the Legislature to share your views, as is your right in this province. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Berhane, time for question period has expired. Do you have a rebuttal to that? Or—

Mr. Berhane: Sorry?

Mr. Chairperson: Time for questions has expired. Do you have an answer for the member's question?

Mr. Berhane: Yes, I do want to say something.

Mr. Chairperson: Go ahead, Mr. Berhane. We'll give you 20 seconds to—

Mr. Berhane: Okay. This Bill 30—we are not criminals, just do it for criminals.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Berhane.

Mr. Maloway: We have No. 102, Karanzit Kensray [*phonetic*] evidently just got here seconds after we went with 103–102. He's 102. So in other—he just missed it by one, and he's here to present.

Mr. Chairperson: Is there leave from the committee to accept this presenter—No. 103–102, sorry. [*Agreed*]

Committee Substitutions

Mr. Chairperson: We have a couple housekeeping items that we'll do before we call up the next presenter. I would like to inform the committee that under our rule 85(2), the following membership substitution has been made for this committee effectively immediately: Mr. Ewasko for Mr. Helwer, Mr. Johnston for Mr. Micklefield, Mr. Lagimodiere for Mr. Smith, Mr. Lagassé for Mr. Meyer—so, Ms. Mayer.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, order. Order.

Could we get everybody changed into their positions, please, as we must continue on with our business. Order. Could we have all the substitutes pull up to the table, please? We have more business to do here.

Our next item of business is the election of a Vice-Chairperson. Are there any nominations?

Hon. Cliff Cullen (Minister of Crown Services): I'd like to nominate Mr. Ewasko.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Ewasko has been nominated. Are there any other nominations?

Hearing no other nominations, Mr. Ewasko is elected vice-chairperson.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson in the Chair

Committee Substitutions

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Order, please.

I would like to inform the committee that under our rule 85(2), the following membership substitution has been made for this committee effective immediately: we have Ms. Guillemard for Mr. Smook, and then Mr. Cullen for Ms. Cox.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Our first next item of—our next item of business is the election of a Chairperson.

Are there any nominations for Chairperson?

Mr. Curry: I nominate Ms. Guillemard.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Ms. Guillemard has been nominated.

Are there any other nominations?

Hearing no other nominations, Ms. Guillemard is elected chairperson.

Madam Chairperson in the Chair

Madam Chairperson: I'll now call on Karamoit Kensray, private citizen.

Mr. Kensray, do you have any written materials for distribution to committee?

Mr. Karamoit Kensray (Private Citizen): No.

Madam Chairperson: Please proceed with your presentation.

Mr. Kensray: Okay. Good evening, all the respected committee members. My name is Karamoit Kensray. I've been driving cab since 2001 as a driver. I came to Canada for a better life for my family and for myself. The problem I'm here to talk about regarding Bill 30, this will—bill take—affect our future in many different ways.

I have a family of seven, with five kids. I'm the only working person in my family. Many of us have to pay our children's studies, pay mortgages. We work hard to support our families. Bill 30 will take over our taxi industry, which will make us hard to survive.

In my point of view, the decision of passing this bill will open the door for other international taxi companies such as Uber. If the Uber comes, we want them to follow the same rules, same as taxi: child abuse check, criminal record check for drivers, cameras, safety shields and paying the same amount of insurance we paying, keeping in mind for the safety of Winnipeggers.

If you already made your mind to send us, taxi industry, to the City, you should pay us compensation. At last, we are request to the committee members to think twice before you passing the bill.

Thank you, committee members, for giving me time to speak my expert's views.

Madam Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation.

Do the members of the committee have questions for the presenter?

Mr. Allum: Thank you so much for coming today and to—keeping your presentation nice and short and sweet and concise, and we all greatly appreciate that. I heard you say that you—family of seven and five little ones at home, so bravo on that alone, wow, holy cow. And you've been driving a cab, I think you said, for about 16, 17 years. You must feel like the rug's

being pulled out from under you here in the sense that this bill could potentially put your small business that you put your heart and soul into, it could blow it to pieces. Does it cause a lot of stress and anxiety in your house?

Mr. Kensray: Yes, it is, like, normally like, all of the families who—like, the pain is here, all the people, like, stress, like family's scares. Everybody's stress in there.

Mr. Allum: That—see, that's one of the things we found is that, you know, life seems to be getting harder under the other government and causing people a lot of anxiety and a lot of stress and mostly for no reason. Do you see any reason why the government needs to proceed with Bill 30?

Mr. Kensray: You know [*inaudible*] they just want to open the door for Uber. I guess. That's why they bring the bill. If they don't bring the bill, never, ever any companies come to Winnipeg.

Mr. Ewasko: Thank you, Mr. Kensray, for coming in and just to echo some words of Mr. Allum, thank you for your presentation. It was short, to the point, and you got your message across.

* (17:20)

What I encourage you and many of our other presenters to do is to not necessarily listen to some of the fear mongering that you end up getting from some members opposite. And so I'd like you to take a good look at the bill as far as exactly what its intent is, and its intent is to move the authority from the Province over to the City without, you know, potentially, it would be up to the city and I know that your—that some of your concerns are safety and those are our concerns as well. And so I'm pretty sure that the City of Winnipeg would be taking your concerns for your safety of not only you as a dad, but for your—considering your whole family as well.

So I would just like you to make a quick comment on the safety issue.

Mr. Kensray: Yes. The safety issue's a number one. That's why. But the thing is, like, if you're taking our industry to the city, right, now is like, our, like, taxi value is zero. So people, like, spend \$500,000, some \$400,000, some like \$300,000, so they, like, just not like they pay the taxi. They're still paying the installments for the taxis. So who's going to sponsor you for those payments?

Mr. Allum: In a way, Mr. Ewasko is right. The bill just seems to, you know, transfer it from the

Province and wipe out the Taxi Board and transfer it to the city and then the city will make up new rules. But if the government was really concerned about safety or a level playing field, we'd find that somewhere in the bill, and I—if I look through the bill, I don't see anything about safety in here, and I don't see anything in the bill that says the rules should apply, that are existence now should apply in the future and that everybody should be a part of it.

My understanding, from many of your colleagues, is that you're not afraid of the competition. You just want a level playing field where everybody plays by the same rules. Am I right about that?

Mr. Kensray: Yes. So, you know, like, I was on the board of directors last year at Unicity Taxi, so I met Mr. Brian Pallister like, two times, premium. One is in Victoria and one is in another focus, so when I met them he always says, don't worry; no one's going to come here.

We just keep, like, in our hands—I don't know what happened. Like, suddenly they just changed quickly.

Hon. Heather Stefanson (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Thank you, Mr. Kensray. I just wanted to thank you very much for taking time out of your schedule away from your family tonight and being here. You're very passionate about this issue, spoke very well tonight and just on behalf of our government I want to thank you for being here.

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Allum, 15 seconds.

Mr. Allum: Fifteen seconds. So, we just want to get some clarity. What—who did you say told you that everything would be okay and that it would be a level playing field?

Mr. Kensray: Mr. Premier.

Madam Chairperson: The time for questioning has expired. Thank you very much for your presentation.

Mr. Kensray: Thank you. Everybody have, like, a wonderful weekend and I hope, like, next weekend you will give us a good news. Thank you.

Mr. Maloway: Mr. Diwinder Randhawa [*phonetic*], he's No. 177. He is evidently here, would like to present.

Madam Chairperson: Does the committee grant leave for No. 177, Diwinder Randhawa, private citizen, to present at this time? [*Agreed*]

Okay, I will call upon Mr. Diwinder Randhawa. Do you have any written materials for distribution for the committee?

Mr. Diwinder Randhawa (Private Citizen): No.

Madam Chairperson: No? Please proceed with your presentation.

Mr. Diwinder Randhawa: Thank you very much to giving me opportunity to express myself and my feelings.

I came here about 30 years ago. I bought this—and I'm this business—in business, like, last 25 years, and after driving a few years I borrowed some money from my parents, from my relatives and I bought a cab.

Until now, like, a couple months ago, I was doing pretty good. I bought a house on—with this 'caf'—cab. I gave good education to my children. My daughter, she got a good job. She's working for the city, and my son, he got—just he completed diploma, the fire and paramedic. So he's going to get a good job, too, just because of this job.

I work six, seven days, 12 hours and, like, last few days I was talking to them. I said, you know, I gave you everything, you've got to go to a job, I support you, and you have a bright future. But my future, once—when I retired, my future looked—before, it was bright, but now it looks like dark. I thought I, I'm going to have—I invested some money, and I going to have—once I retired, I'd sell this cab, and me and my wife, we're going to have some money for our remaining years. But with this bill, looks like everything just disappears, you know?

And that's one thing. The other thing, like, I don't mind competition. If Uber comes in, just—we should have the same rules and regulations. They should be insurance we paying, everything we paying.

And that's all my concern, you know? Just treat everybody equally. And it shouldn't be two sets of laws, just for—one for them and one for us. Yes, should have even playing field, you know?

So, I think that's all I want to say. When you make any decision, please keep in mind, you know? Yes.

Madam Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation.

Mrs. Stefanson: Thank you, Mr. Randhawa, for being here tonight and for your presentation. Again,

you are also very passionate about this and taking time out of your schedule for being here tonight, and I just want to thank you for your presentation.

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Allum—Mr. Randhawa, we will be taking questions from our members at this point.

Mr. Allum: Yes, thank you so much for your presentation. And one of the things that I heard you say, that you—really, your investment in your cab, your taxi, was your, kind of, pension plan going forward, and you are concerned that that pension plan you'd put in place is now being kind of blown to smithereens. Have I got that right? Is that what you envisioned when you started, that by investing in the cab when you were a little bit younger, that it would serve you well when you're a little bit older?

Mr. Diwinder Randhawa: When our money I earned—you know, I paying my mortgage and especially, you know, all the university expense. It's not an easy job. So, my kids, they got good educations. They got good jobs, one of them and other one, just because of this. So, that was my, you know, dream, that. You know, I have investment; I have no savings any—that was my savings, and now that savings is gone. Yes.

Mr. Allum: So, one of the things that the bill does that strikes us as being kind of strange is that it rules out any kind of compensation for you or any of your fellow owners—

Floor Comment: Yes, it does.

Mr. Allum: Just hold on. They explicitly rule it out. They didn't write in anything about safety. They didn't write in anything about the same level playing field. They didn't write in anything about rules—everybody having the same rules, but the government made a point of writing in that you wouldn't be compensated.

Now, I—my guess is that you would like to see this bill just tossed out, but do you agree that if that can't happen, that you should at least be compensated?

Mr. Diwinder Randhawa: Yes, yes, yes. When I bought this cab, it wasn't that expensive that time, a long time ago, but now, some people, they spend about \$500,000, \$450,000. They borrowed this—borrowed money from so many people. This—whatever they have back home, this sold it, bring money back here. And they have nothing left—sorry.

I know some people that, too, you know. So I think it should be compensated, yes, yes.

Mr. Ewasko: Thank you, Mr. Randhawa, for giving us your presentation tonight as well. And I'm not sure, and I've got a quick question for you. Are you—were you aware that the former NDP government actually commissioned the Meyers Norris Penny report in 2015, and that there were well over 10,000 respondents to their process? Were you aware that it was the former NDP government that actually commissioned this to be looked upon?

* (17:30)

Mr. Diwinder Randhawa: No.

Mr. Allum: As—it's—my friend is trying to tell you that somehow we're to blame for their bill that's going to wipe out your business. And believe me, we're not to blame. We're here trying to fight with you as best we can to have the government withdraw this bill and start over with a proper conversation with you and every other cab driver about what this actually means to your business.

Would you like the government just to start over?

Mr. Diwinder Randhawa: Yes, I want the government to start over. Yes.

Mr. Ewasko: Thank you, Mr. Randhawa, and as my friend from across the way is sharing with you, it's interesting that I feel like I'm in the court of law and I feel that he's leading the witness a little bit, and sort of—I appreciate your honesty with me that you weren't aware that the former government actually commissioned the report.

Mr. Diwinder Randhawa: —remember that anywhere exactly. I don't know. I can't say that, yes. No.

Mr. Maloway: We're talking about Meyers Norris Penny again—that has nothing whatsoever to do with this Bill 30 that's in front of us.

This Bill 30 takes away any right of compensation so the licences will be worth next to nothing. It doesn't put any safety requirement—shields or strobes or anything else—in the bill that the City will have to follow. It is—it basically—it goes against the Premier's (Mr. Pallister) promise that he made to several of the presenters at a Conservative fundraiser. And other times, he promised that he would give a level playing field. And he was not

going to, you know, basically turn your licences into a worthless exercise—entity. *[interjection]*

Madam Chairperson: Mister—okay, I'm sorry, time for questioning has expired for this presenter. Thank you very much for your presentation. We are going to move on to the next presenter.

And I do want to actually offer some advice to our committee members and our presenters that I would like to keep conversation respectful, including the tone. And we have presenters who have taken time out of their busy schedules to give us important information. So let us respect our presenters with our tone and with our questioning, and let's get as much information as we can from each presenter. Thank you.

I will now call upon—oh.

Committee Substitution

Madam Chairperson: Order, please. I would like to inform the committee that under our rule 85(2), the following membership substitution has been made for this committee effective immediately: Tom Lindsey for Andrew Swan.

* * *

Madam Chairperson: I will now call upon Sudheep Sidhu *[phonetic]*, No. 105, private citizen. Mr. Subhdeep Sidhu? Mr. Sidhu will be moved to the bottom of the list.

We will now move on to No. 106, Sukhinjure *[phonetic]*—oh, sorry, Sukhjinder Sidhu. Sukhjinder Sidhu will be moved to the bottom of the list.

Number 107, Rajwant Radhawe *[phonetic]*. Mr. Radhawe *[phonetic]*, do you have any written material for presentation for the committee?

Mr. Rajwant Randhawa (Private Citizen): No, dear.

Madam Chairperson: Please proceed with your presentation.

Mr. Rajwant Randhawa: Good evening, all respected committee members. Actually, I want to share my life and my job and also the concern with the taxi and the Bill 30.

I, like, born in India and, you know, done my graduation from there. And also—and done my electrician like—as electrician—diploma in there. And tried to find a job, like, in India. We know—you know, it's overpopulated country and it's very hard to

find a job in there. Then I decide to move to Canada and, you know, I was lucky Manitoba gave me the opportunity to come here.

And I came here in 2006, and, you know, I have my wife and two kids. My kids, they born here. My wife came with me. And, when I came here, like, I started to work in a factory, and my wife suddenly, she had many problems, and after that she had a surgery, gall bladder. You know, the doctors said they had her gall bladder take off. She was at home, nobody was with me to and—to help us, and then, you know, it was hard to survive. I had to quit my job, like, and I was at home for about like three, four months. And, you know, the money I brought with me it was almost gone, and I was really worrying about, you know, about my life.

I came here to—for a good life, but, you know, I was in trouble. And then, you know, my friends, they suggest to me to drive a cab. That's why I choose this profession. I try to, you know, and then I started to drive a cab, and because we do long hours, like we do, you know, double as, you know, anybody does. So, you know, there's good money, but for the hard work.

So, you know, then I started to, you know, drive a cab, and we were on the track again, you know. And from that time I'm the only one is working in my family. We had two kids after that. Nobody was with us from our family; that's why my wife she's at, you know, home with the kids from then on.

You know, and I was driving for somebody else, like for 10 years, like almost 10 years, and because, you know, and that too it is pay lease or pay, you know, the commission. We say, anyway you can select the 50 per cent from your day. It was hard, like, for—we were in it that long, like, for me any more. And then I decided to buy a cab.

I bought a cab last year, and I paid about a like \$400,000 for that. And I put all my savings, like, from the 10 years and also, like, I sold my property from back home and invest the money here. I, you know, like, that's not anybody's fault; like, that's my choice—but because I was in this profession from that long and also I talk about this, you know, the people who had in this business, like, from 40 years or more than that.

But, like, you know, suddenly our city decided to move that way, like, you know, bring other multinational companies, the taxi companies, we can see or, you know. We, you know, like, we know we

are not running from the competition or we are not afraid, like, you know, from. But the—Winnipeg is not—still is not that big a city. Like, with that, if we are bringing more taxis or more cars on the road—like, I drove eight years the nighttime. It's okay in busy times. We can say everybody can get the fares and they can make money. But, after midnight, there's still there's, like, you know, in Winnipeg, no work 'til 6 in the morning. We have to wait, like, at least two hours for a fare. If we, you know—so we wait in that hour—like that hours we still work because of the service we are providing to the people, and because our average is depend on the busy hours too.

* (17:40)

So, some people, they say, well, we need more cars on the road, like, just because of two hours. And if we are bringing the more cars, like, you know, nobody can survive. It will affect our income, like, whatever we are doing now and also, like, you know, we—I think nobody can survive if we bring more cabs. And I'm not saying just me. Even the new, you know, people who are coming to—on the road or who are deciding to come on the road, I don't know how they can survive, like, you know, on this job.

So—and another thing's, like, you know, about Bill 30, I'm hearing, like—and there are so many issues—the safety issues too. I am sharing, like, a couple of my, like, personal experiences as a cab driver. I had, you know, attacked with a knife, and within in six years, I also had attacked with the pepper spray. I made a police report, like, for the both, like, incidents. And then I decided to, you know, quit this job because it's—I don't know anybody has that experiences like the pepper spray in your eyes, like, from this close, you know. You know, you are paying I—you know, as I going to die, but I can't survive with this bill.

And after that, I decided, like, you know, I can't do this anymore. And, you know, I stopped driving a cab, and I was stressed out, you know. But without a job, it's very hard to survive. My wife was at home. Even with the minimum wage—like, anybody can calculate. Like, how can you survive with the minimum wage in an apartment, too, if you have two kids, your family? So, you know, and then I again made my mind and, you know, hardly came back on the job, so.

And also, like, if we—the—you know, we really sometimes—like, we deal with the customers from all over Canada. They come here. They are really happy

with our taxi services because—in other cities, and I have experience, like, from Toronto, they have, you know, their taxis under the city. I don't know, like, why nobody cares about their, you know, cleaning or—their cars are way dirty than our because our taxi board is here to see all the taxis, like, how they doing. Even for the customers' safety too, like, the cameras are working; our cars are clean. They're, you know, safetied or—and, you know, updated.

So, like, if we say the other companies or the—especially, you know, the Uber or anything—because, you know, riding in a cab just is not riding in another car. You're with your kids, like, with your whole family, right, and any unexperienced, like, driver is with you on the road, especially our slippery roads. I don't know, like, our—one mistake can take everybody's life. Everybody's—you know, drives. We know how dangerous is it, like, if you're with, you know, unexperienced driver. Like, if we saying, you know, they don't need any. So, that's why I say the levels of the—you know, the, like, safety and also the licence levels also, too, right? We need a, like, at least class 4 licence. That make you a little better in driving. You have some experiences—

Madam Chairperson: The time for presentation has finished. Do members of the committee have questions?

Mrs. Stefanson: Thank you, Mr. Randhawa, for being here tonight and for your presentation and for sharing your personal story. It's—we very much appreciate, as a government, you taking the time and being here tonight.

Mr. Rajwant Randhawa: Thank you very much.

Mr. Allum: Thank you, and like Minister Stefanson, of course, I want to also thank you for taking the time and sharing a very compelling story.

The last election, I think was—I kind of blocked out the date, but I think it was April 2016—in April 2016. I'm not—

The last election, I think, was—I kind of blocked out the date, but I think it was April of 2016—in April 2016. I'm not—*[interjection]* Ah, there we go. Funny, I knew you'd remember that.

And I'm not sure when you bought your licence, but the—during the election, I don't remember any of the parties—NDP, Conservative, Green, Liberals—talking about Uber. Maybe the Liberals, because they're kind of out there sometimes.

But would you have invested so heavily in your licence if you had any idea that something like Bill 30 was going to come along?

Mr. Rajwant Randhawa: No way, sir. Like, you know, like—if anybody knows, like, you know, there's that kind of risk is coming in the, like, industry and the, you know, like, any kind of business, like, you know. I think nobody's, you know, that stupid. Like, you know, you invest like that—that much money in a—just create a job. Like, this is not actually the business, right? This is our job.

So, no, I didn't, you know, invest my money, like, in this profession. At least, like, if I knew that, like—if you're getting anything free, why you would, like, you know, spend at least \$400,000. Some of our, you know, fellow drivers, they spent more than 500, too. So it—in—no way, like, nobody knew about it, so—

Mr. Ewasko: Thank you, Mr. Randhawa, for your presentation and sharing your own journey as well. And you sound like a very, very, very proud man and a hard-working man, as well.

Earlier in your presentation, you made mention in regards to the fact that you feel that there is more than enough—there's more than enough cabs to suit a small city like Winnipeg. I've read some things where Winnipeg has a ratio of one taxicab for every about 1,550 people, whereas a city like Edmonton has one cab for every 611 people.

So I'm just wondering, do you still strongly feel that there's enough cabs to suit the Winnipeg market?

Mr. Rajwant Randhawa: Yes, sir.

Also—I also read in a, you know, that survey too, right. Only like 70 per cent Winnipeggers—they take taxi once a year. And also, you know—and the rest, I don't know how they divided it. Like, the rest population—maybe I'm wrong, like, not even 70, but close to that. But that's another factor too, right?

And that other—they don't use the taxi as much as in other cities. So we can't, you know, hundred per cent say that, like, you know—according to that, like, we really need the taxis, right? You can see our cars, too, right? In the—because I am on—in the seat, right? So I can tell, or anybody can tell who is doing the survey, right?

I'm waiting two hours for the customer, right? So I know that, that wait, right? I don't think so anybody know about that.

Mr. Allum: I guess the thing is is that, going back to our earlier point about whether you would have invested in the—if you had known this was going to come along. But the value of the investment I think you said was over \$400,000. So that would mean to me that you thought that it would be a stable business for many years to come, given the cost.

One of the things the bill excludes is compensation for you. Do you think, if the worst happens and this bill does go through, that at a minimum there should be compensation for you and other cab drivers, as well, for the investment that you've put into this business in good faith to support your family?

Mr. Rajwant Randhawa: Yes, sir. Like—otherwise, the—you know, if we don't get any compensation or, you know—because like, I'm taking as example to me, right? I will be on the road. Like, you know, I took a loan against my car, you know? And I sold my, you know, everything from the back home. Where I will go, then? Who will pay my installments? Like, who will pay my loan?

* (17:50)

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Randhawa, the time for questioning has expired, but we do thank you for your presentation.

Mr. Maloway: Madam Chair, we have No. 24 is listed as Jasvir Gill, but, evidently, that is incorrect. He's here now, but his name is Jaswant Gill, and he is a totally separate, distinct and separate person than the other Jaswant Gill who is somewhere on our lists. There's evidently two people with the same name, like Smith, you know, Frank.

Madam Chairperson: According to our rules, we actually cannot add new names or even corrected names without—at this point, there is no way to verify whether it's a new name or a corrected name, and we, according to the rules, are going to remain with the list that is presented before us, and the committee has already agreed that we are not going to add new names to the list.

So we will go ahead with No.—oh, Mr. Maloway.

Mr. Maloway: On a point of order here.

Point of Order

Madam Chairperson: On a point of order. Mr. Maloway.

Mr. Maloway: Yes. The gentleman claims that—he's No. 24 on the list, for starters, right? And his name is

Jaswant Gill, and he has, I guess, ID to that name, and he said it was taken down wrong when he phoned in. It was taken down as Jasvir. So that is—that would be a clerical error in the office, right, when he phoned in, and he's here—

Madam Chairperson: At the time that presenters phone in and provide their names, it is requested that they spell their names. The person who phoned in spelled their name according to what is on our list. If that was a misspelled name, it is not, at this point, part of the committee rules to add that name to the list.

* * *

Madam Chairperson: This decision has been made and we are going to be moving on to No. 108. We call upon Mr. Sandeep Singh Chawla. Mr. Chawla? Mr. Chawla will be moved to the bottom of the list.

Number 109, Gurleen Grewal, private citizen. Gurleen Grewal will be moved to the bottom—oh. Okay, Gurleen Grewal will be moved to the bottom of the list.

Number 110, Gurjiwan Bhullar. Gurjiwan Bhullar? Okay, Gurjiwan Bhullar will be moved to the bottom of the list.

Number 111, Harish Sood. Harish Sood shall be moved—*[interjection]*—not here? Harish Sood will now be moved to the bottom of the list.

It has come to our attention that No. 112, Iqbal Dhillon, has already presented on Monday and will not be listened to tonight.

We are moving on to—I'm sorry, if your name has not been called to present, then you may not approach the mic. And I have given an explanation for Mr. Iqbal Dhillon. Because Mr. Dhillon has presented already on Monday, we will not be hearing from him again tonight.

So—so I will now call upon Balwinder Mann, private citizen.

Mr. Mann, do you have any written materials to submit for the committee?

Mr. Balwinder Mann (Private Citizen): No.

Madam Chairperson: Please proceed with your presentation.

Mr. Balwinder Mann: Hello, everybody. My name is Balwinder Mann. I drove taxi as a driver from 1995 to 1996, and I became taxi owner-operator in

1996. I have been part of Unicity Taxi 'til the present.

When there was no shield and camera, I was attacked with a knife on my face on night shift. Luckily, I survived the attack. I got seven stitching on my lip at St. Boniface Hospital. I left scared when we got the safety shield and camera. In 2007, I got a back problem and could not drive taxi because it was a problem for me on sitting for long hour. So I had two drivers and made some income to help my family.

I have three kids. Two girls go to university, and my son is in grade 12 now. I do not know how whether we survive for 10 years as I did not have taxi. Government say that there are not enough taxi in Winnipeg. Everybody agrees. I'm agree, too, because city is growing. Government can know how many private cars are selling per day in Manitoba, and how many buses' shuttle service in—service are 'availe' in major hotel and in nursing home and Safeway shuttle service. I'm agree, need more taxi—10, 20, 30, 40, 100-plus. But it is wintertime, is already 125 taxi, already is seasonal car—wintertime needed.

But how many Uber is bringing in Winnipeg, Manitoba? But no limit. Taxicab Board is expensive, around roughly—is 500 K. But revenue is roughly is 200 K. If Uber coming, is Manitoba 20 to 35 per cent in—of the income is going to go out of Manitoba. Nobody know where it will go.

Driver and owner local taxi industry make and spend money in Manitoba. What is the benefit Uber coming in Manitoba? Can you explain me?

And thank you.

*(18:00)

Madam Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation.

Are there any questions from the committee members?

Mr. Allum: Yes. I just wanted to thank you for coming tonight and for your presentation.

Were you ever consulted, did you have any knowledge, did anybody ever ask you, about any of the things contained in Bill 30 here?

Mr. Balwinder Mann: Yes. I don't think so. Is taxi industry moving toward—under Manitoba government to move to on the City of Winnipeg, so now is Manitoba government is big, but City, Winnipeg, is

not a big one. Can they—I don't think so, kind of, hold on the same—industries have on rules and regulations, but is Uber new—Uber is coming. Is not the same on rules and regulations, not on law is same as. So that's why. Yes, sir.

Mr. Allum: So, what—if I understood you correctly there, you—what you'd really like to see is kind of a level playing field where if Uber or Lyft or whatever these other companies are come to Winnipeg, that they're abiding by the same rules, playing by the same rules as you are. Is that right?

Mr. Balwinder Mann: I don't think so as they're not following the same rules. Not anywhere on world on the Ubers is not—you know, it's like a few—not a few months, a few—couple of weeks ago, is same on Quebec. One year ago is give them rules and regulations. They not follow them. Not anything on changing on—under the government. So, same on other state. On BC, they're not allowed on the road, Uber, because of no—is not experienced driver, not—they don't know is—who is driver, right? So that's why.

Mr. Allum: So, in British Columbia, Uber doesn't—isn't allowed to operate there? And could you tell the committee why not?

Mr. Balwinder Mann: Yes. I don't know why. So, because on—is—Manitoba have owner classes, one week, two weeks, some drivers is more. But Uber, they have not any classes or not on any experience because on just as a new driver, put her on the car, paying on Uber member or whatever, right? So—and they driving. So, Manitoba is have a taxi under Taxicab Board.

So, same like on Handi-Transit. They have on—when I starting on that time, on 1995, I two days on classes on Handi-Transit, take the licence. So, a couple years, I driving Handi-Transit. I have on—professional driver have on award under taxi—sorry—Handi-Transit. But after then, it's no Handi-Transit on Unicity Taxi. But a couple of years ago, almost is 10, 15, 20 years ago. So, this year—or, last year is again starting on. Doesn't matter how long you drive or a new driver or maybe 20, 30—how many years a driver, right?

So, still is one day, eight hours on the classes, put on—take the new licence under the Taxicab Board, plus means Handi-Transit. So, what is Uber? They don't know; is it classes, experience or something like that.

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Allum, 15 seconds.

Mr. Allum: Thank you—well, 15 seconds? Then I just—on behalf of all of us, I think it's safe to 'thay' thank you for coming tonight and for your presentation and for sharing your guidance and advice with us. It's much appreciated.

Madam Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation.

I will now call upon No. 114, Pardeep Chopra, private citizen. Mr. Chopra, do you have any written materials for distribution to the committee?

Mr. Pardeep Chopra (Private Citizen): No.

Madam Chairperson: Please proceed with your presentation.

Mr. Chopra: Yes. Honourable Chairperson and respected committee members. I have been in this taxi business more than 30 years. See, like, it's very unfortunate that a lot of people don't know about the taxi business. They think they just drive around, they sit there waiting for a fare, read the paper, have a coffee and, as a matter of fact, this is a very, very difficult job. I think the most difficult job in this world, and most dangerous job. It's more dangerous than being a police officer.

It was the article in the Free Press one time. It was CJOB, there was a program, this police officer really—they were talking about taxi, how bad is, how dangerous taxi business. And this police officer wife was telling on CJOB, oh, my husband is a police officer. His job is very, very dangerous. This press would ask this lady, what threats did he have?

Police officer there are always two. They have equipped with all kind of, you know, weapons, guns, or pepper spray, and taxi driver cannot have pepper spray. We will be charged for that. We cannot protect ourself. Somebody can kill a cab driver, but cab driver cannot do nothing. Right? Even—I give you example, it happened about a month ago, I was just going to use washroom at Salter and Mountain gas station, so I'm going in, meantime this one person coming this way he said, could you take me just to, like, Redwood, because that is on Mountain.

I said to myself, okay, so first I was going to tell him why can't you walk, it's just nice weather, but I didn't say it, you know, we are not supposed to say anything negative, right. We have to keep everything positive. I said, okay, buddy. So I took him there, and then he said, okay, buddy. He give me \$5. So my fare was around \$5. I said, okay, buddy, so you going. I have to go. Remember I told you just—no,

no, no, wait here, my wife is coming. His wife came, she said she gave some money to him, oh, I'm not going. I said, okay, buddy, where are we going now?

No, no, no, no. Wait, wait, wait. My brother is coming. His big brother, maybe 400 lb., he came. Sat in the front. He's so bossy, go here, go there, go there. I said, like, could you please give me a deposit, some money, you know, and you're bossing me around, go here, go there. You know, I've been in this business for 30 years and he must have been maybe, I don't know, 27, 28, whatever. And anyway so they gave me \$20. I said, okay.

So they want to go to the bank, they want to go to North End, they want to go to place again on Sutherland. So my—basically, my \$20, their 20, ran out because he took so long to cash a cheque, you know. And finally, he's telling me the guy at the back, buddy, we have to go all the way to Watt Street. I said, buddy, can you give me more money? No, no, we will give you money. So I drove it all the way to Watt Street, I waited for them—no Keenleyside, sorry, I waited for them and waited, waited, waited, finally this guy came. My fare is over \$35, right. And I said, buddy, could you give me more money please. No, no, buddy, we will give it to you, don't leave.

Anyway, then coming back they want to stop at 7-Eleven. Then finally we—they took so long, finally we came to Redwood where initially this person wanted to go. So my fare comes up 26—\$46.50 so he give me \$20. I said, buddy, you owe me \$26.50. Just wait, wait, coming, coming. They just walk out, because he know the taxi driver cannot do nothing.

First I can call police. Police will never show up for four hour. So I don't want to waste my four hour for \$26.50 fare, right? They just walk out. I waited, waited, you know, Redwood is—I put my flasher in rush hour. You cannot stop there. I can get a ticket. Finally, I just left. I came to know these people not going to come. So I lost \$26.50, right?

My point is this: this taxi business is, like, I work, most of my co-workers, my friends, work 12 hours a day. We have to. We don't want to work 12 hours, nobody wants to in this committee, nobody want to work 12 hours a day or six days a week or seven days a week. No, nobody wants to. And so many—my respected committee members of the city, could you tell me please how many Winnipeggers wake up 2:30 or 1:30 just to go to work? They have to wake up 2:30, they shower, get ready, one hour. Then they have to start the private car, takes

20 minutes, wherever they live in St. Vital to start the shift 4 o'clock. They have to be exact 4 o'clock. Four to four. Twelve hour shift, right? And I don't think so—too many Winnipeggers wake up 2:30 in the morning to go to work.

*(18:10)

And do we want to do this? No, nobody wants to do this. Nobody wants to work on Sunday. Nobody wants—But sometime you have to do. Why? Why? I tell you, sir. See, this is in our—I don't know East Indian blood I don't know, our culture, whatever. We want, no matter what we do, whether drive taxi, whether my wife is accountant or some my co-workers, whatever they do, East Indian parents do their best. I know all the Canadian parents do, too, but East Indian parents, no matter what, drive a taxi, they drive—whatever the mothers do, they don't want their kids to do same thing.

So my daughter is—okay, you will be surprised that being a taxi driver when there was a graduation of my daughter, my daughters went to St. Mary's Academy. I used to sit at the same table where the judges of Manitoba sitting, where anesthesiologists sitting, where cardiologists sitting—same table. Why? How?

But my wife saved the money. You know, we used to get \$30 per kid for family laws that time, long time ago. So, \$60. So my wife saved \$60 plus put \$60 more for our kids' education because we want them to have the best education, we want them to have—become good citizens of Winnipeg, good citizens of Canada.

So my daughter went to University of Manitoba. She's RT, medical professional, she's a respiratory therapist. She went to medical college for five years, but we paid everything. My wife saved money for their education, right.

Then, my youngest daughter, she has MBA, and in order to do MBA I don't know whether anybody knows, in order to do MBA in Manitoba, sir, costs you \$50,000. In order to do MBA in Toronto will cost you \$150,000. In order to do MBA in States cost you \$150,000, right, but my daughter passed her B.Com., and she was a marketing manager. I told her to save money. I even—I took her to Brandon University twice shows—to write exams—LSAT; they got law school entrance exam. So she passed, 90 per cent marks.

But then she changed her mind. Then she told me that, dad, I want to do MBA, like, she work

with the marketing manager for a big company in Winnipeg. I strongly encouraged her, so she saved some money. I helped her, right. I don't want her to know, so she works in Toronto for a very big company and she's like executive-type of job, and I'm very proud of her.

And she went to a bank—she was paying rent, but I—it was bothering me that why is she paying \$1,400. I want her to buy her own condo or house, whatever she wants to do. So, anyway, about one and a half months ago, she went to bank. She was dealing with RBC and when the bank manager put her name, first and last name, and her social—she was surprised. Her eyes was popping up. She said: Oh, Geeta, like, you did B.Com., MBA, and it cost so much money. Most—a lot of MBA, like, kids having MBA degree, they have a \$100,000 loan—150 student—you don't have not a 5-cent loan. Why? How? And, not only that, you don't have any loan, you saved so much money in two years. And how did you do it? Who told you?

Her answer was that my dad told me. That Geeta always save money and you buy your own house and you will be very happy. And right away the bank manager pre-approved for my daughter for one and a half million dollars.

Why? Because she does not have a 5-cent student loan. She does—she has a Visa card. She has a line of credit over \$100,000, which was giving a prime rate, but I told her, my daughter, that the most important thing for everybody in Canada or States or anywhere in the world, to have a good credit with the bank. If you have good credit at the bank you can win this world. You can buy any property. You can buy or sell any property. You can, like, beside my taxi business, of course, I do same thing, but I can do only for due to my good credit, because whenever I take loan and I always make sure I make my payments because bank manager doesn't want to listen any excuses. That's the last thing he wants to hear from anybody.

So, anyway, I'm very proud of my kids that I give them best of both worlds, you know. Of course they were learning—my wife didn't work for 17 years, and we saved every money and a lot of times my friends asked me, how you are able to afford to send your kids to private school? The answer was that I keep hard work and I keep on refinancing my house. I said to myself, I don't care what—how much money I have to borrow against my house, but my education of my kids is the most important, right.

I should have done, when I came to Canada—this is my mistake—I should have gone to university, and—but circumstances were not in my favour at that time. I didn't have any money, anything, but I want—so I give you another example. My nephew, one of my nephews, he's a—he did a special education in anaesthesia. He's an anesthesiologist. Then he did it in cardiac. I guided him. And my brother was—before we were living together, his name Ahmed [*phonetic*]. I say, Ahmed [*phonetic*], I want—

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Chopra, the time for your presentation has now ended, and we are going to move on to questioning. So, if there—are there questions from the members?

Mr. Tom Lindsey (Flin Flon): I thank you very much for your presentation. And, yes, it's very emotional for you, and a lot of people we've talked to—[*interjection*]

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Chopra, the rules of our committee is that I will recognize you, and then you can speak. So Mr. Chopra, go ahead and answer.

Mr. Chopra: Can I speak a little bit more? Yes.

See, my point is that I work very hard to give the best of both world to my—both daughters. Right? I don't know—one time, I read an article in East Indian newspaper. In England—I'm talking—in England, British people start wondering that how come East Indian population ratio is so low, but their kids are becoming doctors, lawyers, judges and chartered accountant, MBA. Why? Why these East Indian kids are going ahead of British kids? Why? What's wrong? What is wrong with the British kids? So they did a survey. They have to spend millions of dollar. What they find out? That in East Indian families, the mother—no matter whether she worked in factory, father, no matter will drive taxi, whatever he does, the father doesn't mind working 16-hour day for the kids so that they can get better education.

They don't want—the parents of east—they don't want—immigrant parents—like, we are immigrant, of course—that their kid should suffer. Right? The—we don't want—like, my nephew, example. My brother came to this country for \$10, but he work hard, right? He work hard to give a good education. He put them at SJR, St. John's Ravenscourt. My other nephew, Ajay Chopra, I don't know whether you know him, he ran for MLA for the Point Douglas, 1999. But he went to SJR, which is very expensive school.

I had my friend, doctor–dentist, he's a gum specialist. He said–he call, Pardeep–he call me Deep, you know, my–the short cut, just like Robert is Bob, he said Pardeep, I could not understand one thing about your brother. And he's a businessman, he run a grocery store, I understand. I am a doctor–he's a gum specialist–I cannot afford my–to kids to SJR, how can your brother can afford? I just simply told him just hard work. And he give first priority to his kids, to–just like my nephew became big doctor. So all of us we know, we need an anesthesiologist, sir. Very, very–I even did not know. I told her, it just like we go to dentist, he freeze our mouth and he does surgery. Sorry, yes. So he does surgery. I thought maybe in a hospital.

Same thing, orthopedic surgeon can do same thing, give anesthesia, or cardiologist can do same thing, or any general surgeon can do same thing, give anesthesia and do the surgery. So my nephew told me, uncle, this does not work in hospital. 'Anesthesia' has to be given by specialist, which I am. But he did BSE, sir, first–four year. Then four year become a doctor. Five year to become a specialist. So four and four: eight, and five–that's thirteen. Then he did in the cardiac, which is a cardiologist. So he's 'anesthesia'–a cardiac anesthesiologist. So in hospital, anesthesiologist is the most important doctor in hospital. Without him, no surgery can be done. So to all of them, I pick up all the lady, they tell me, oh, they told me my knee surgery, they postpone it. You know why, sir? Because they cannot find anesthesiologist. It is anesthesiologist.

Lot of time, like, the doctor say–or, hospital say, Mr. Smith or Mrs. Smith, you have to come two to three hours before your surgery starts. Why? The reason is that, our–my nephew told me, reason is that, my nephew told me, of course, all the work is done by his staff. He doesn't do that–he said we have to weigh the patient, we have to ask all the question whether that patient is allergic to any medication. And he said to me, Uncle, it's not like your business, if you miss the turn you can go to the next and make a U-turn. There's no U-turn in the medical field. He said I have to be 110 per cent accurate that–the medicine because, for example, he said, if I give little bit of extra anesthesia, patient can go into coma. Right? If you give less anesthesia, patient can wake up middle of the surgery. He said I don't want to–that to happen. That's why they give me tough training for five year. Then, of course, a two year in cardiac and become specialist.

So my point is that whether it's my brother or me, we work hard. That's it. Nobody give you \$5 free, sir. You know that, right? You have to work for that, right? So what we did, as I said, when I went for graduation of my nephew, there were 50 kids. Out of 50 kids, 35 kids were East Indian kids. I was so surprised. And then, one time, it was news about there was a east doctor, Dhalla. He's in Brandon. He work in Brandon hospital.

* (18:20)

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Chopra, your time has expired now for questioning. Thank you very much for your presentation, and we will move on–we are going to move on.

Committee Substitution

Madam Chairperson: We are now moving on–order, please. I would like to inform the committee that under our rule 85(2), the following membership substitution has been made for this committee effective immediately: Greg Selinger for James Allum. Thank you.

* * *

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Chopra, you may take a seat in the audience again, please.

I will now call upon No. 115 on the list, Jagjit Mooker. Jagjit Mooker, private citizen–will now be moved to the bottom of the list.

Number 116, Solomon Derzie. Solomon Derzie will now be moved to the bottom of the list.

Number 117, Baljit Johal, private citizen. Baljit Johal will be moved to the bottom of the list.

Number 118, Satwinder Sran, private citizen. Satwinder Sran will now be moved to the bottom of the list.

Biram Sandhu, private citizen. Biram Sandhu will now be moved to the bottom of the list.

Harprett Dhillon. Harprett Dhillon? Harprett Dhillon will now be–oh. Harprett Dhillon will now be moved to the bottom of the list.

Baljunder Bhatti. Baljunder Bhatti will now be moved to the bottom of the list.

Prabdeet [*phonetic*] –sorry–Prabhdeep Singh.

Mr. Singh, do you have any written materials for distribution to the committee?

Mr. Prabhdeep Singh (Private Citizen): No, I'll—whatever I'll say, I'll say—it's not written out.

Madam Chairperson: Okay, please go ahead with your presentation.

Mr. Prabhdeep Singh: Good evening, everyone. My name is Prabhdeep Singh. I just moved to Canada around three months ago. Actually, today, I completed three months. I came here on the 27th of July. I came here with my family. I have two kids.

I was having a wonderful career in India, but still I choose to come to this city and specifically Winnipeg in Canada and chose this to have a bright future for myself and my kids.

And for that—from the last three months, I've been working upon to start a career in taxi—as a taxi driver and later on to become a taxi owner maybe in the future. But at the moment I've been working on this thing. I've cleared most of the exams that were required to qualify as a taxi. I got a licence yesterday only, and for that I did a few knowledge tests, a few road tests and I even attended 20 days of training through the Taxicab Board, and there's a collegiate on Hamilton, through which we learned so many things our teacher taught us and tried to—instead of making a good driver, he tried to make a good—what we say that—as a—to bring about the city's good things to the customer that we are going to attend.

But when I saw this thing that this taxi business is not going to be in a very lucrative stage in the coming future, and whatever I did in the last three months seems to be gone haywire, like in the—I think from March, you guys been planning to bring Uber and other sharing taxis into the business. I feel that whatever I did in the last three months, if I compare myself with the old people, those who have been—have—into this taxi business from the last 20, 30 years and keeping up on their taxis and trying to make an asset out of this business, like, some of my cousins, they're having—they owned taxis, and what I been talking to them and trying to find out that they feel—they're very scared. The thing that—this is the only thing that they made by working for 20, 30 years, and it's going to be zero in the next coming few months. And all the people, those who are not going to qualify or going to go through this thing, are going to be having a level play field with the people, those who have been doing this and working hard for so many years.

And I don't think this is the right way, because, directly or indirectly, more than 1,000 families are

connected to this business in the form of taxi owners, taxi drivers. And suddenly, they all feel that they're not having a safe future, the future they've been working upon for so many years. They've been trying to make an asset for the coming generations and trying to have a good life and trying to make good future of their kids. But I don't think they're in any kind of good position right now, because suddenly they find that the government is coming out with the legislation that's going to kind of finish their future suddenly, an asset that they've been building from so long. It's going to be come zero within next few months or few weeks, I can say.

In such a business where—there should be level play field. If you want to bring this legislation, it should be as if, like, what we have been doing or what my family has been doing from so many years. The new people, those who are going to come into this business, they need to invest money, time, energy, and then they should feel—and they should become equal to the people, those who have been doing this business from so many years.

It's not, kind of, fair that somebody just comes up and has a driver's licence and starts playing a taxi and says that, okay, from today onwards, you and I are equal. We don't have any difference. Either you guys should compensate for what assets are—what losses that we and our community—community means taxi drivers' and taxi owners' community, not any other thing—what losses we are going to face. And you should make the people, those who are going to come into this business, to spend something extra, to spend time to pay.

You can—you guys can have a survey and find out what is the cost of the taxi today, present cost. And since this rumour has come into being, that Uber is coming, the prices have gone down, I think—almost one third the prices are remaining what it was a couple of years ago. So, already a lot of losses has already occurred, and God knows what's going to happen after 28th of February, whether even one third of the present amount people are going to get or not.

I'm not very confident, and the situation seems to be very bleak. Like, you guys have been working very hard to bring those people into this business. I hardly find voices—there are voices, but not very prominent voices, those who are standing with this community. More people are inclined towards bringing the new people into this business rather than

saving the people, those who are already working into it.

The rest, it's all up to you guys to just see and think about the people, so many people, those are already residing here and those who've been working really hard to safeguard their interests and finding themselves to be in such a—what a pity position I can say that they're finding.

This is all I wanted to say, that—give them a fair chance. Give us a fair chance, and it's—money's not everything. Like, you guys—for the government, it's the taxes that they're going to get, but already, this business is giving a lot of revenue to the government, and I feel that you guys should think about us and see what's good for us, those who are already into this business, not think of the people, those who plan to come into it.

* (18:30)

People might come and you might get positive results for the couple of—few months, half a year or a year. Later on, you'll see that you—the existing industry will be ruined, and there won't be a position where we going to come back and have ourselves in such a state where we'll find that, okay, now we have another chance. It's now or it's going to be never.

It's into your hands whether you're going to finish this industry or you're going to save this industry.

Thank you, that's all I want to say.

Madam Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation.

Do members of the committee have questions for the presenter?

Mr. Wharton: Mr. Singh, thank you so much for your presentation this evening. And also, welcome to Manitoba and welcome to Canada. And your two daughters and your wife, as well. Glad to have you here and, again, I really appreciate the time you took.

We've been listening to—all—well, now pushing probably close to a couple hundred stakeholders, and we're—really appreciate the input that you're providing for us. And with that, I thank you very much again.

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Singh—or, Mr. Lindsey.

Mr. Lindsey: No, no, no, no, come on back. I want to be able to ask you some questions, and other people might want to ask you some—*[interjection]*

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Singh—Mr. Singh, you'll have to wait until I acknowledge you before speaking into the mic.

We are going to have Mr. Lindsey ask a question at this point.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you very much for your presentation, and certainly you're very passionate about it.

It's interesting that—you're right, the government talks about welcoming new Canadians and talks about how hard people work. And now, it seems, with this bill that maybe that hard work isn't going to be appreciated. If Uber or some other ride-sharing comes in and undercuts your ability to earn a living, then that's not going to be good for you, your family, the business. But at the end of the day, it's also not going to be good for the government, is it?

Mr. Prabhdeep Singh: Yes, but I actually, I couldn't get your question. Like, what really you were—asked me.

Mr. Lindsey: I'll shorten it up a little.

If the ride-sharing company Uber comes in and puts traditional cabbies—yourselves—out of business, the government is actually going to get less money from taxes and everything else. Is that right?

Mr. Prabhdeep Singh: Right now, I hope that you guys—the taxi community's giving out consistent taxes in the form of revenue to the government.

You can presume that, in the coming months, the ride-sharing company might give you revenue in the beginning, but I don't think they'll be able to consistently give revenues to the government in the form of taxes because this city is not that big. It's quite a small city, and the—presently, whatever the cabs are working, they are having—we can say that not a very large sum of business. But still they are surviving. And I don't think that if another 500 or 1,000 cabs will come into the streets, I think it'll be a profitable business for all—I don't think so, because the size of the city really matters.

It might have happened in a big city, but not a city like Winnipeg. It's already saturated, and oversaturating it won't help.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you for that.

It's interesting, something you talked about earlier on in your presentation, that you had to take tests and pass the tests in order to become a taxi driver. One of the things that we've just recently

heard is Quebec has demanded that Uber drivers have to take tests, but they said they're not going to.

So do you think that would be very fair, or—for yourself, that you've had to take training, but somebody else doesn't? And is that going to be good for customers?

Mr. Prabhdeep Singh: The person who is not trained into customer dealing won't be able to give that—satisfactory results. I don't—I think most of the people you will be—with the same view that, unless and until the person is trained and goes through this rigorous training and examination, he won't be able to perform.

And not even 50 per cent of what the services are right now being given. In no circumstances.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you for that.

Really, from your presentation, I guess what I get is that the best thing for you would be if the government just took this Bill 30 off the table and scrapped it altogether. Is that right?

Mr. Prabhdeep Singh: That's what I've been trying to tell you guys from the last few minutes, that already the taxi industry isn't—whatever the situation is, we are already surviving. It's not that we are very 'prosperousing' and we are earning a lot of money out of it. We are already at the level where we are surviving, and if you go below that, it will be hard for us to survive.

Madam Chairperson: The time for questioning has expired. Thank you very much for your presentation. You may go back to the audience now. Thank you.

Mr. Maloway: Number 120, which is just two earlier, Harprett Dhillon, was just a few minutes late here, and he would like to speak if he could. He's here right now. He's—we're on 122, and he's 120, so he was—*[interjection]*—yes, he was 120, and when you called 120, he was—

Madam Chairperson: Is it the will of the committee to hear from Mr. Harprett Dhillon, No. 120, who earlier had been moved to the bottom of the list? *[Agreed]*

Mr. Dhillon, do you have any written—oh, sorry. I will now call on Mr. Harprett Dhillon. Do you have any written—

Mr. Harprett Dhillon (Private Citizen): No, I don't.

Madam Chairperson: —materials for distribution? Please go ahead with your presentation.

Mr. Harprett Dhillon: Good evening, everyone. Myself, Harprett Dhillon, and I'm working this industry as a cab driver for the last nine years. And recently—sorry—

Mr. Ewasko: Point of order.

Point of Order

Madam Chairperson: On a point of order, Mr. Ewasko.

Mr. Ewasko: Mr. Dhillon—and I'm not sure how I ask this question, but I was here on Monday night for presentations. Were you not here on Monday night?

Floor Comment: No, I'm here first time, sir. First time here.

Mr. Ewasko: Well, I'm sure that Mr. Maloway also thought that he saw you.

Floor Comment: No. No, I wasn't here.

Mr. Ewasko: You weren't here Monday?

Floor Comment: No.

Mr. Ewasko: Okay.

Floor Comment: And this is very similar name in East Indian community, or similar face, as you can see, but I wasn't here.

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Harprett Dhillon, please go ahead with your presentation.

Mr. Harprett Dhillon: Okay. Thank you.

As I said, I'm working as a cab driver in this industry for the last nine years, and recently, I bought a cab, half share. I saved some money, I borrowed some money, and I didn't take over yet. And it—I'm going to take over 6th November of next month. So, it's very shock for me. I heard, like, you are bringing Uber here.

So, what's government? We elect the government to make the policies to make people life better, easier. So we expect from government, they are making policies to make life better, but this bill, as myself and other like people in this industry, not making easier. It's making our life harder. If this bill passed, Uber is coming, I'll be on the road. I spent my savings; I borrowed money from my friends. If this business done, I'll be on the road. I have no option without bankruptcy.

* (18:40)

So, with a, like, bankrupt guy, it's not easy to stay in the society. So, I'm here to say, like, we expect from government the policies to make the people life better. And as, like, they're bringing Uber, we don't scare from the competition. But competition should be fair.

I came here. I got my licence. Then they said to me you have to go for Taxicab Board licence. I got that. They said, to be professional, get this licence and working as a professional.

With Uber, the guy with the class 5—anyone can drive that, right? For us, like, we got this licence and where is the safety reasons? I want to talk about that.

In cabs there is a camera, and something happened in the past and they checked the cameras. In Uber, there's no cameras. We need criminal search record after every two years.

So, for Uber, who has a class 5 licence, anyone can go and drive it. For Uber, there's a no, like, customer care number. You can email them or text them. It depends on them if they respond to you or not.

Here, something happened. Unicity belongs to Winnipeg. If they are not answering the phone anyone can go to the office. Where, if something happening in the Uber, where are the people going for that complaint?

And this city has, like I said, enough cabs. According to the population, if more cabs coming, this business is going to done. The people who they're coming new in this industry won't survive here because this is—the city's not like metro cities—Toronto—we are comparing to these cities.

Another thing. Lots of cities, they have banned Uber. If you heard about England, London banned Uber for the safety reasons.

Lots of—another city's example—I was checking on the Google. They banned, like for the safety reasons, so why we are playing for the people, like, of the safety, why we are bringing Uber here? What's the reason?

If it's a big safety matter, so why we are bringing Uber here?

And that's all I want to say. Like, if this bill passes and, as the part of the society we all, like, belongs to this industry, we'll be on the road.

So I expect from the government we are also the one small plant of Canadian garden because diversity is the beauty of Canada, so if you want to remove

this plant and throw it away, it's up to you, but you should take care also this plant—taxicab industry people. That's all I want to say. Thank you very much.

Madam Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation.

Do members of the committee have questions for the presenter?

Mr. Wharton: And thank you, Mr. Dhillon, for your presentation tonight and we're glad you made it down. You were probably out working. That's a good thing.

I understand you were a driver for nine years and now you're an owner-operator.

Mr. Harprett Dhillon: Sorry. I just bought a cab. I did not take over yet. It will transfer on 6th of next month.

Mr. Wharton: We have a lot in common. I started as a driver in the moving industry and I ended up buying my own truck about 20 years later as well, so I can appreciate the road that you took to get to where you are today.

You were mentioning you take possession next week. We've had a lot of, I guess, discrepancy on what the value of that license is, what it was 20 years ago, what it was 10 years, and what it is today, and you're a prime example of what, obviously, what's happening in the current day.

Was the value of the licence comparable to what it was 10, 20 years ago?

Mr. Harprett Dhillon: I just moved here nine years ago. I don't know 20 years ago, but right now it's different, I think.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you for your presentation. I think it's quite interesting that Mr. Wharton, with the government, talks about he had a small business and grew it, and you also are trying to have a small business and grow it. The difference, I guess, is the government didn't come in and undercut so that he couldn't survive, and really that's what this bill is about, right? It's about undercutting what you're trying to do as a small businessman.

Mr. Harprett Dhillon: I didn't get you. What was the question?

Mr. Lindsey: That, really, this bill, if it comes into being, is going to undercut your ability to survive, to make money as a small businessman.

Mr. Harprett Dhillon: Yes, it will affect on us a lot. So I'm the only person work. If, like, more cabs being—coming here, so I won't survive, then. It's hard for me.

Mr. Lindsey: And you talked that you're just going to take over in six months—6th of next month. So when you decided to buy, were you aware that the government was introducing this legislation?

Mr. Harprett Dhillon: It wasn't that time.

Mr. Lindsey: That's quite interesting that you've just tried to enter into this.

So, one of the other things you talked about, which we've seen elsewhere—you talked about London shut them down for safety reasons. Are you aware that Quebec was trying to enforce some training requirements on Uber drivers, and Uber said no? Are you aware of that?

Mr. Harprett Dhillon: No, I'm not.

Mr. Lindsey: Well, that ties in with some of the things that you're talking about. This just recently happened, that—it's about training, it's about safety. It's not just about safety for the drivers, but it's about safety for the passengers. And, really, without any of these rules that are in place now, neither the driver or the passenger are going to be as safe.

Is that right?

Mr. Harprett Dhillon: If it's same thing, like the cabs we have and like—another thing is the insurance they are paying should be fair. Similar rule regulation for everyone. We don't scare from the competition, I told you.

Mr. Lindsey: And I think that's an excellent point that you make is you're not afraid of competition, but you want it to be fair and level playing field. *[interjection]*

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Dhillon.

Mr. Harprett Dhillon: —what I meant. This city is not that bigger. We think, like, we bring more cabs here, it's—it will be also a problem. It will trash the industry we have right now. The new people also will face trouble. It's hard for them to survive and they will make trouble for the people right now, they are working.

Mr. Saran: Thanks for coming over here. My question is that, if everything—all the regulations you are obeying now, Uber also obey all those regulations, but they get a permit at zero dollar, you bought taxi for \$400,000, it will be fair competition?

Mr. Harprett Dhillon: It's not. I said if it's coming, I will be on the road. I made that point.

Madam Chairperson: The time for questioning has expired. Thank you very much for your presentation.

I will now call upon No. 123, Wayne MacAuley, private citizen. Wayne MacAuley will now be moved to the bottom of the list.

Number 124, Santksokh Saini, private citizen? Santksokh Saini will now be moved to the bottom of the list.

Number 125, Gurjeet Singh, private citizen? Gurjeet Singh will now be moved to the bottom of the list.

Number 126, Varinder Ghuman, private citizen? Ms. Ghuman, do you have any written materials for distribution to the committee?

Ms. Varinder Ghuman (Private Citizen): No, I do not.

Madam Chairperson: Please proceed with your presentation.

Ms. Ghuman: My name is Varinder Ghuman, and I say hello to everybody that is sitting on their side of the table.

I'm—my husband is a taxi owner, and so is my brother, so I have two people that I relate to very closely being taxi owners. And from the last maybe six to—maybe six months or a year and so, I have been watching 15 people of the family being stressed out by the bill that you guys are trying to bring.

While I was sitting here, then it came to this Chamber before that, I was not fully aware of how insensitive the bill is, to be really honest. I was never—I was not sure and I was really in a bit of a giving benefit of the doubt to the—their side of the table, that maybe it's not that harsh.

* (18:50)

Sitting here from last two hours of—one and a half hour I'm really agonized by it. No sensitivity. No fairness. No assurance of the people that are sitting right here. No assurance of when they will lose their asset. You are going to compensate them? You might have too many people on your side that thinking that this bill should come out of the people that are supporting you. But what about the 1,000 families on the other side that are suffering? You should be responsible for every citizen of this city. That is the responsibility of the state to think about every person in the city.

My brother came when he was only 19 years of age to this city. I only came two years before him. I called him, he was only 19. He came, he had to support his parents. I was only here for two years. My husband was also driving taxi. Being an engineer he was driving taxi, because that's the only way he was going to support himself.

But my brother, who was only 19 years of age, he started driving a cab because that was the only option he had. He didn't had an option to go to the school. He was—he has been an owner and an operator from last 25 years or 23 years I could say. Thinking that okay I am going to do this, even though he was really hurt. He was hurt around '96 or '97 when he was almost shot dead but he ran out of his taxi. But even then the guy kept on doing the same thing being as there is no option.

But the only thing that drive these people right behind me is because they always thought, even though they're driving 12 hours a day, seven days a week, end of the day when they're like 50 or 55 years of age they will have an asset of \$400,000 that they will be supporting their kids for their education, for their marriage or for supporting them to buy their houses.

The only thing that benefited them was that they have a cab that they are paying instalments on and they are working for that, and they're paying the bills of the family. The only thing that kept on going for these guys was that end of the day when they're 55 or 55 or 60 years of age they will have something to back on.

And mind you one thing, these guys do not have any sick leaves. They have to be on the road. They cannot be sick. They do not have the benefits that you guys enjoy. If you're sick you're at home or if you have any of the benefits that you enjoy. They are self-employed people that have created jobs for themselves, and this job doesn't pay them more than 10 hours—\$10 an hour, an average person, but they only survive because they drive 12 hours a day.

Some people talked about the fairness, and I have no words. I really can't think of how you guys can bring a bill, and you're not even talking about that the other party is going to go through the same examination for licences and they are going to pay the same taxi insurances, and they are not going to pay any amount to buy those taxis.

Like, I have no words how you guys can bring that bill—this bill even though it might affect, like,

small little amount of people. But you're responsible for each and every citizen of this city. When I voted for you guys I thought, no, I'm not voting for PC this time, because people that are talking enough, of course, I talked to Mr. Greg when he came to *[inaudible]* of Manitoba, I been there because I was *[inaudible]* that society. I knew he was never going to bring this bill, but then I talked to Mr. Ron Schuler, and on the same time he also assured, no, there will be fairness.

And, of course, I chose you guys, will I choose you any other time? No. Because I never thought that you sitting here and telling people, no, we think about you, we do understand. Where is it written that you are understanding the problems? Have you have any assurance? Is it put anywhere in this bill that these people will be compensated for the losses they are going to face? Have you put in the bill that the other party is going to play with the same rules? They will have to—they will be facing the same—they will be going to the same classes. They will be going to the same education to be a taxi driver. They will be paying the same insurances for the taxis.

Have you every seen a game in the world where there are two players playing and they have two different set of rules?

I am lost of words, because I never thought, in this city, in this educated city, when we talk about a secular city or city that thinks about everybody, you will be bringing a bill with no fairness at all. And don't think and—I know that you think there will be more people supporting you guys, but you have the responsibility of each and every citizen of this city that has voted you, that has paid the taxis, that had paid—their insurance is \$10,000 a year for the taxi insurance to you for the last 25 years, and now you're telling them, no, guys. Your taxi value is zero from the coming months.

I give you a scenario. You have a house. You bought a house for \$200,000. You paid the mortgage for 20 years, and suddenly the government tells you—so you find out from the government that there's a house that is coming right beside you—the owner of that house is not going to pay the same amount. He's not going to pay the same house insurance. He does not have to go through the—all the things that you guys went through. How would you guys feel? You paid the mortgage for two—20 years, and the next person buying a house next to you will not go through the same thing.

Any kind of asset—any kind of asset—when you buy and you do for it, have the other person that is going for the same asset to go through the same rules and regulations. And I don't know how—what in the world you were thinking when you were bringing this bill that, no, we do not need the same set of rules for that party, but you're still bringing them.

These people have been working for the last 30 years, and now when they're 55 or 60 years of age, they do not have anything else to do. They've already spent their prime age driving a taxi for 12 hours a day, and now you just suddenly come and tell them, no, from now on, we're bringing another party that will be earning the same amount of money—mind you, they don't earn that much money. There's no scope for any more taxes, the business that they're having right now. But they will be doing the same kind of thing, but they will have a different set of rules for them. Where in the world do you think this policy can be put on the table? We have two different set of rules for same set of players.

I don't have anything else to say.

Madam Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation.

Do members of the committee have questions for the presenter?

Mr. Greg Selinger (St. Boniface): Thank you, Mrs. Ghuman, for your presentation. Do you want to get rid of the bill entirely? *[interjection]*

Madam Chairperson: Ms. Ghuman?

Ms. Ghuman: Yes?

Madam Chairperson: I first have to identify you before you speak into the mic. Ms. Ghuman, go ahead.

Ms. Ghuman: There's not one thing. One thing, you're not assuring people that they will be compensating. Second, there is no fairness; there's no same set of rules. And the third thing is, where did you made out that there'll be 100, 1,000 or 500 more taxis and they will have the same—like, they will have enough business to survive their families.

There's not one thing in the bill. There is numerous wrongs in the bill that you should be bringing—even thinking to bring it on the table.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you. Very good presentation. I thank you for bringing it.

You said that you had talked to Ron Schuler during the period before the election, and whereabouts was that? Do you—*[interjection]*

Ms. Ghuman: Yes. That was in Sikh Society of Manitoba. And mind you, I am not saying that he did not said he won't bring the bill. The assurance we got was that there will be fair play.

Mr. Lindsey: I want to thank you for clarifying that. And that's a very important piece of it, isn't it, the fairness to make sure that everybody's on the same page, the same rules, and that—this bill doesn't do that, does it?

Ms. Ghuman: No, it does not.

Mr. Lindsey: So, if the government was to decide, okay, we'll compensate the taxi drivers for the loss that's surely to come, would that be acceptable, or, really, should the whole bill just be thrown away?

Ms. Ghuman: I'm totally against the bill, a hundred per cent. They should not be on the table at any cost. There's nothing that will say, okay, no—I don't see anything in it right now. Unless there are some changes, I don't see anything it right now.

* (19:00)

Mr. Lindsey: I thank you for that, and then that's very important. And it's important that we get people like you to give us that perspective—well, not to give us, but to give the government that perspective, because you're right; they are supposed to be representative of everybody and help people get ahead. And really, this bill doesn't do that, does it?

Ms. Ghuman: No, it does not.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you for that, so.

It—if somebody wanted to start a new cab company, if they played by the same rules that the existing cab drivers, cab companies have, that they have to buy a licence, they have to buy insurance, they have to be trained, they have to have all the safety stuff that's mandated now, then that would be them starting on the same level playing field. That'd be fairness, would it not?

Ms. Ghuman: That is the only way if there is a bill, if it goes. That is the only way it should be on the table. That is the only way it should be on the table to have a fair play.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you for that, because, really, there's nothing anywhere in this bill that talks about fairness. All it does is talk about getting rid of what's

in existence now and turning it over to the City, which doesn't have near the same resources to ensure compliance, to do everything that the Province does. So there's no way that it's going to end up being the same, being fair, is that correct?

Ms. Ghuman: I don't see anything in the bill right now that it should be on the table. That's all.

Mr. Lindsey: So, really, this bill is just about the government offloading their responsibility onto the City without offering any kind of protections to cab drivers, to cab companies, that fairness will prevail at the end of the day. They're just going to wash their hands of it and let somebody else worry about it. Is that right?

Ms. Ghuman: You're right, and I just wanted to add one thing. Even if I was not a cab owner's wife or a sister right now, even if I was nobody of that same business related to that, I would—even then I would be saying, how come the government can bring something like that which does not have anything that is called fairness?

Mr. Ewasko: Ms. Ghuman, I would like to just thank you very much for coming in and giving your presentation. It is very passionate, and you're speaking absolutely from the heart, and I hear it very loud and clear.

I've got a question for you, and the question is: Are you aware that Manitoba is the only province in Canada that has the power over regulating the transportation or the ride-share regulations for its capital city? Every other province, the capital cities take care of that unto their own. It is not regulated by the Province in every other province except for Manitoba. Are you aware of that?

Ms. Ghuman: Yes, I am aware of that, and there are—and when you say it's—this is the only province and other cities are—they have Uber and all that, you must also be aware that even in those cities, there have been so much protest against that, against Uber or any other thing, just because of the same reasons. If their voices were not heard, that does not mean that that was okay to go ahead.

Madam Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation. The time for questioning has expired.

Mr. Maloway: I'd like to seek leave of the committee to allow No. 116, Solomon Derzie. He—we are on 126 right now or just finishing 126. He's

116, so he obviously was a few minutes late when his number was called.

Madam Chairperson: Is it the will of the committee to hear from Mr. Solomon Derzie, private citizen at this point?

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Madam Chairperson: Agreed? [*Agreed*]

Mr. Derzie, do you have any written materials to distribute to the committee?

Mr. Solomon Derzie (Private Citizen): No.

Madam Chairperson: Please proceed with your presentation.

Mr. Derzie: Forty—sorry for being late, and we are struggling, you know. I'm a night shift driver, and have so much load, you know, just to pay my bills. It was unfortunate I bought my taxi just so late. It is only seven years since I bought it. I came here in Canada, 1989. I was sponsored by a church. I don't want to be a burden on that church, and the next month I had a job. I was working in a factory for minimum wage. And I work it for 18 years, to—sometimes not getting fair raise, so—and two children—I had two children. My wife is not—was not working that much, so—I bought a house. When you have a child, you know, because they ask you so many questions. So I have a—I bought a house just, you know, to, you know, to make happy my children, just as any.

So anyways, I quit my job and try to just—went to a school to drive a truck. And I got my class 1. I tried it, I couldn't sleep in a car, so I quit. So the next day, the next thing I have to do is just—the—just—I decided to buy taxi. My wife was not agreed, but, you know, the economy was not that much in good shape, so the only choice I had. I have to convince her, and I bought the taxi. And I was doing fine. And when—I remortgaged, by the way, when I buy the taxi. I remortgage my house. My house was almost paid off when I buy taxi, just it is another—just—I owe—around \$180,000, then I have to buy—I have to pay high mortgage, I have to pay the taxi loan. And now, all of the sudden, Uber information came, the price dropped down. The first thing happened to me was my family was broken out—broken down. My wife blamed me.

So she's not working, I have to move out of my house, and I have to rent an apartment. I have to pay all the mortgage for that. And, you know, I can't keep up. I can't keep up on my just income. I work

12 hours, by the way. Some people just, they are surprised. They know taxi owners, you know, live in a decent life, decent—with decent house and they teach—they send their children to school. You know what? We work 12 hours a day, 'skisty'—365 a year. If you multiply it, we work 1,417 more hours than regular citizens. That's why, you know, that's why we try, you know, to level up, you know, our standard of life, you know, the—with other citizens. And it's not—it was not a miracle or it's not just—to have a taxi's not just—it's a luxury, you know? We put too much pressure on us, and we sacrifice our service. You never know who—which you are picking. You never know where they're taking you.

And I was robbed under a gun one time. They were—there were two—all—since I work all the time night shift, which is dangerous shift. You know, I try to choose, you know, to work safe area. I was sitting in the delta—or, at Delta. They came anyways. I can't refuse. I know, I had a feeling, but I can't—I couldn't refuse. They came, yes, 'zoska'—and when he pulled the gun, he told me, I know this camera—he was looking into the camera. I came out from the prison; I don't care, he said. I'll shoot you, he said. I'll shoot you. And I had to give all I have. And I have to co-operate. And he took me to Maryland Hotel and they left. After half an hour, they are just caught because of what—because of the camera. So don't underestimate, you know, is—don't underestimate the use of those—you know, those safety measures.

* (19:10)

Anyways, when he—when we come to my financial burden, I couldn't keep up, you know, paying my bills. Have I told you I pay my apartment, I pay the old house mortgage and everything. So I had to live, you know, on credit cards. My credit cards are full, so I have to withdraw my pension, my RRSP which I saved when I was working at that furniture company. We are struggling.

Now, you guys are telling me that \$210,000, you know, I paid, it is zero? You know, too much stress in my house. And you have to think for your government, too. When you make us stressed, you are making the health-care system also stressed. You know, once in a while, I have to go to the, you know, emergency. I have high blood pressure. I have—I am diabetic because I'm sitting 12 hours, you know.

My family history was just—my dad had zero high blood pressure history. No diabetic. So even my kidneys hurting me because when I'm first out, I have to hold because I don't want to miss a trip. I

have to go to washroom, but I have to hold it. I don't want to miss it. I don't want to miss that trip.

So, so many stories, you know, so many stories on us just to be told, but are we hurt? I have to let you know our mayor told, you know, the taxi drivers, he doesn't care. He cares for his people. Are we his people, too?

Maybe some guy coming, you know, today's Friday, to party, so he calls Uber; maybe he gets the discount, \$5 or something. Does it buy you one—does it buy—does that money buy for him one tequila or something? But if I give—if I give a ride for the cheaper, if I'm, let's say, let's ask your Uber driver, if I give 10 people, I'm losing 10 times five—\$50. Who is enjoying more, who is happy? That guy who saved \$5 for that day or me, who lost it all, who lost \$50 and just almost go empty-handed.

So we have to balance. If, you know, our customers are the citizens who is our mayor is worried about, I'm his citizen, too, who couldn't, you know, bring, you know, milk and bread to our children, you know, large table.

So something has to balance. We are not asking, you know, impossible, you know. Our people, yes, people need cheaper stuff. We want to buy cheap clothes; we want to buy cheap food; we need cheap gas. We need cheap cellphone companies. We need cheap insurances, you know. Some, you know, just [*inaudible*] company came from China, let's assume, you know, hire people, you know, for, you know, cheaper, with less than the minimum wage, and sell for the people just in cheap—with cheap prices.

I heard that, you know, that some rumours going on. In Vietnam, the Nike company was exploiting children for—just like slavery, and that company sells that shoes for cheaper because they exploited the children. Uber is doing the same thing.

You know, friends, economies bad in the world. Uber and credit card companies enjoying, you know, the situation. When the economy is bad, you know, immigrants have no choice. They have to take, you know, they have to drive for Uber.

So what is the difference, you know, the children being exploited in Vietnam and the immigrants, you know, who are driving—forced to drive Uber for cheaper—

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Derzie, your time for presentation has now expired, so we will now ask if there are questions from members of the committee.

Mr. Wharton: Thank you, Mr. Derzie, for your presentation and talking about safety. And that's an area that we've heard over the last week that comes up quite often. And I know that there's been a lot of progress in your industry with respect to the shields, panic buttons, cameras and two-way radios.

In your view, sir—and I know you—every—almost every person that's come up here that's had something happen is—you know, either a potential stabbing or gun or something along that way. Is there any way in your view that safety could be enhanced even further than what it is today, for the case of the committee here, just for more knowledge?

Mr. Derzie: Yes. Every driver, Uber driver, regular taxi, have to have, you know, the safety measures. Yes, of course.

Mr. Wharton: Was there any other additional safety equipment that you would think would assist in maybe avoiding some of these issues that are still going on today?

Mr. Derzie: Yes. If the radio and the camera system just changes into—also to just voice regulator too, yes. Yes, yes.

Mr. Maloway: I want to thank you for an excellent presentation. I wish you had even longer period of time to give it. I have an—we have an amendment to the bill—we have, actually, lots of amendments to the bill, not that they will be guaranteed to pass, but we think it's positive to try to put something into the bill that will make it better, because there's no requirement right now for the bill to—for the City to have any safety features.

But one of the things we want to require of the City is the shield, camera, strobe light, panic button, criminal record check. I believe the—yes, criminal record check, twenty—35 hours of training and also the Child Abuse Registry check every two years.

Do you think there is any other things that you would like to see put into the amendment? For safety?

Mr. Derzie: Yes, these are wonderful, you know. These are wonderful safety measures. Yes.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you very much for your presentation. And really, that's what you're concerned with, right, is that we've got things in place now, there's rules, there's regulations. But with this bill, there's no guarantee that any of those rules and regulations are going to remain in effect because it's looking like, really, the whole point is that people

want cheaper rides. Cheaper doesn't mean better. If Uber and things like that come into being, there's nothing that guarantees they're going to have to have the same requirements as a taxi does now, so that'll make it cheaper, but it won't make it safer. Is that right?

Mr. Derzie: No. No. It doesn't make it safer. Yes.

Mr. Lindsey: And while my colleague here has talked about maybe making some amendments to try and make it better, would you say that the best thing for this government to do would be to withdraw this bill altogether?

Mr. Derzie: Definitely. You know, one thing also, I had, you know, so many customers from other provinces, from United States. I drive long drives, and sometimes they charge—they don't pay attention for the meter. When I—they ask—is me, \$200. Twenty dollars? Yes. One guy from Vancouver, he came. It would have been, you know, \$45 or for just 50 bucks I find, just from so many customers, this is the cheapest. This is the cheapest province in the country. And we don't need Uber. We don't need a what. The business is already dying, anyways. Year after year, the business is dying, you know? I sit—I sat—believe it or not, two hours—waiting for one trip at Delta. Nobody's coming out from the hotel. The trip is not coming from the sky, so.

* (19:20)

Madam Chairperson: The time for questions has expired. Thank you very much for your presentation.

I will now call upon No. 127, Manjot Kaur. Manjot Kaur, private citizen—will now be moved to the bottom of the list.

Number 128, Pankeg Kashyat, private citizen. Pankeg Kashyat will now be moved to the bottom of the list.

Number 129, Kala Sharma, private citizen. Kala Sharma will now be moved to the bottom of the list.

Balvir Aulakh. Balvir Aulakh will now be moved to the bottom of the list.

Gatar Khosa.

Mr. Khosa, do you have any written materials to distribute to the committee?

Mr. Gatar Khosa (Private Citizen): Yes.

Madam Chairperson: Do you have 20 copies?

Mr. Khosa: No, just this.

Madam Chairperson: Do you require 20—do you want to distribute it to the committee?

Mr. Khosa: No, we don't have—we only have one copy.

Madam Chairperson: Okay, please go ahead with your presentation.

Ms. Sonam Khosa, on behalf of Mr. Gatar Khosa (Private Citizen): Good evening, everyone. My name is Sonam Khosa—

Madam Chairperson: Order, please.

Would you please state your name and spell it for our records, please, if you're here to translate.

Ms. Khosa, on behalf of Mr. Khosa: Sure. Sonam, S-o-n-a-m. And last name too? Khosa, K-h-o-s-a.

Madam Chairperson: Please proceed with your presentation.

Ms. Khosa, on behalf of Mr. Khosa: My dad's name is Gatar Khosa. He is in this business from 17 years. He wants Bill 30 to stop, please. If Bill 30 passes, then his business value and income sources are zero. If his business value is zero, then the government will pay compensation, because when he got cab, he paid cost of market price by the taxi board. People work from—paperwork from lawyer approved by the government. Why did the government not get stopped when the cab's prices started going up? If you need more cabs in the city, doing survey in regular hours, not rush hours.

Both company's members should be with the survey guides. If needed more cabs, the government should keep 5 per cent less from market price. You should not provide free of cost so old cab's prices stay stable. If you can't do that, contact with both companies that they will help the government for selling in good price.

If Bill 30 passes, not only bankruptcy but also kill people.

Thank you very much. Please stop this Bill 30.

Madam Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation.

We will now ask committee members if they have questions for the presenter.

Mrs. Mayer: Hi, Sonam, I just want to acknowledge your presence here. I think it's very brave of you to stand before such a large room. I don't know if you've ever been to this type of event, and I think

that it speaks volumes of how proud your dad should be of you to help him and come and take part of the democratic process. So, thank you on behalf of our caucus, for coming and stepping forward because I think family and community is important, and what you did tonight for your father and for your family, you should be very proud of.

Floor Comment: Thank you.

Mrs. Mayer: You're welcome.

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Lindsey—oh. Just remain here until we are finished questioning, you have five minutes.

Mr. Lindsey: I, too, want to thank you for coming, and you must be very proud of your daughter. You should be very proud of her. What you're saying, or what your dad is saying, is if this bill goes ahead, it could very well bankrupt your dad and put him out of business?

Mr. Khosa: Obviously.

Ms. Khosa, on behalf of Mr. Khosa: Obviously, yes.

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Ewasko. *[interjection]*

Mr. Khosa.

Mr. Khosa: So business, *[inaudible]* right. So this why stop Bill 30.

Mr. Ewasko: Sonam, did I pronounce your name correctly?

Ms. Khosa, on behalf of Mr. Khosa: Sonam.

Mr. Ewasko: Sonam. Sonam, I appreciate you coming today and giving the presentation on behalf of your dad. I believe Sukwinder *[phonetic]* is your sister. Was your sister—no. So, on—

Ms. Khosa, on behalf of Mr. Khosa: My sister is Manrose *[phonetic]*.

Mr. Ewasko: Manose?

Floor Comment: Manrose.

Mr. Ewasko: Was she here—is—she was here on Monday presenting.

Ms. Khosa, on behalf of Mr. Khosa: No.

Mr. Khosa: Not Monday, just *[inaudible]*

Mr. Ewasko: I just want to say thank you very much for coming and giving the presentation on behalf of your dad, and your sister was here as well and I appreciate them both sharing and our—so, where do

you—what do you see yourself doing in the future as far as school?

Ms. Khosa, on behalf of Mr. Khosa: I don't really know yet but I think of being a police officer. Yes.

Mr. Lindsey: Okay. Again, thank you very much for that. What do you think will happen to your chances of going on to university or—if your dad can't run his taxi?

Ms. Khosa, on behalf of Mr. Khosa: He will not have that much money, right, so I don't think I'll be going to school then if he doesn't have any money. So, yes.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you for that very much. That's really part of what the heart of the matter is, is that this bill affects people, not just the drivers today but it affects the young people going forward. That it's going to impact their ability to get ahead in Canada and really become productive members of our society. So I really want to thank you for bringing that forward, that that's an important aspect that I don't think maybe some of the government members have really considered yet. So, thank you for sharing that.

Mr. Selinger: Yes, Gatar and Sonam, thank you for coming and presenting. You made a powerful case how these kinds of pieces of legislation can have an impact not only on your business today but your future tomorrow, and I think you should know that everything you said will be a permanent record of the Legislature and will forever inform us about how we should be making decisions as elected officials. So thank you for being here. *[interjection]*

Madam Chairperson: Thank you very much.

Mr. Khosa.

Mr. Khosa: Thank you.

Madam Chairperson: I first have to say your name before you speak into the mic, so if you wanted to repeat what you just said, Mr. Khosa.

Mr. Khosa: Yes, my name's Gatar Khosa. So—were you asking question? My name's Gatar Khosa and I'm in here in this business from 17 years, right, so I want to stop to Bill 30, right, because my income after—the issue this bill and my income's slow, right. My price is totally lost. So this why I'm say stop Bill 30 and put a limit of cab in the city, main point, right. Unlimited—no income—good income, right. So that's the one.

Madam Chairperson: Thank you very much. The time for questions has now ended. Thank you for your presentation, you may join the audience now.

I will now call upon Lakhvir Auklah *[phonetic]*—Aulakh pardon me. Lakhvir Aulakh will be moved to the bottom of the list. Number 133, Umrao Kandhola. Umrao Kandhola will be moved to the bottom of the list. Number 134, Herbans Takhar. Herbans Takhar will now be moved to the bottom of the list.

Number 135, Ishroop Singh. Mr. Singh, do you have written materials to distribute to the committee?

Floor Comment: I don't.

Madam Chairperson: Please proceed with your presentation.

Floor Comment: Good evening everybody, my name is Harinder Maan. I came in Canada in 1992—

Madam Chairperson: I—just a second. Could you please repeat your name and spell it into the record?

Floor Comment: Harinder Maan. Maan is my last name.

* (19:30)

Madam Chairperson: I'm sorry, sir, I haven't yet called your name. We have to deal with the person before you.

So, Ishroop Singh will now be moved to the bottom of the list.

Now, No. 136, Harinder Maan.

Mr. Maan, please proceed with your presentation.

Mr. Harinder Maan (Private Citizen): Hello. Good evening, everybody. My name is Harinder Maan.

I came in 1992 in Canada from India, and when I came here, I start working Willmar Windows here. I work seven years, and I work really hard, saved some money, and I invested. At that time I work part-time in a taxi and then somebody's going it's better, so I quit there and start working in taxi full time. I bought it, almost \$270,000 taxi. I spent all my money in there. I went back to my country, sold my property and spent all that money in taxi too.

And I have a family here, three kids. My two kids going to university already. My daughter is youngest one; she's in school. And, if this Bill 30 came here, it's going to be very hard for me and my

family, because I'm the only one person working in my family. And I request all of you to please think about me and my family and all these my friends' family who depend on this business here.

And, you know, the Uber things, I have used that one in India. It's very hard to, you know, like, if you compare with taxi, it's very useless, because their service is so bad, and if you lost or anything in there you won't get back. I lost my phone in there. I try my best to get there. I couldn't find it. But the taxi service is so good there. Same thing here. We work plus 35° to -35°; it doesn't matter how hard the weather is, how storm, everything, you know.

But we are always available to work. We work six days, seven days, 12 hours, 16 hours. If we don't have even drivers, we still work extra hours so make sure everybody gets a cab to get home, because they are dependent on us and we dependent on them.

So I request to all the committee please think twice before you make any decision, because this is not only the Uber thing; it's lots of families, lots of kids' future in your hand. Please. Thank you very much.

Madam Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation.

Do the members of the committee have questions for the presenter?

Mr. Saran: Thanks for coming over here.

Okay, in this situation, and the way I see it, we are a democratic country, and people look at the numbers—politician look at the numbers, appears that way, and maybe the community majority of them who are involved in a taxi, they don't have that many numbers.

Do you think democracy is failing?

Mr. Maan: If they think there's not enough cab, they can decide to put some more extra cabs. But, you know, Uber, it's not a cab; it's like everybody can go and sign with their condition and all the things there. Even they don't have to get any special licence like we do. We go for training and a criminal record check and all the requirement Taxicab Board said. And, even though we—the inspector pull us on the right of way we can check—we always prepare for that. But I never heard any Uber driver to stop on the road and check their cars or anything. And by the criminal was, you know, you can look there, taxi people feel very safe in the taxi too.

Mr. Lindsey: I'll let Mr. Saran go ahead now.

Mr. Saran: Okay. I think majority time we are talking about supply and demand, so some people, politicians, are worried about that, there's not enough taxis.

What about if we have a ongoing price, even Uber can come in and they also can buy either taxi from the market or perhaps we should—the taxi board should be issuing on ongoing price the licence. Then it doesn't matter how many people afford a taxi and how many other companies come over here. That will be fair play. You think that will be the best solution to do it?

Mr. Maan: Yes, you're right, sir. At least, if they want to come, they should compare with us. Like, all the taxi requirements, everything. And also, all those people spend, like, \$3,000, \$5,000 like I spent \$200,000. So they should at least match that one so we don't get trouble or anything, you know? They should be in the same. Treat it by—like us.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you very much, sir. I appreciate you being here and appreciate your willingness to participate in the democratic process. It's somewhat daunting and confusing and frustrating sometimes the way these processes work. I know I find it that way sometimes, so I'm sure you do, too.

Really, the heart of the matter is, is—what Bill 30 does is it creates an unfair playing field. Everybody isn't going to play by the same rules, is that right?

Mr. Maan: Yes.

Mr. Lindsey: So do you think that Bill 30 should just be withdrawn, or do you think there's some way to make it so that it will work.

Mr. Maan: It should be withdrawn.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you for that. It's very clear from several drivers—owners that we've talked to that, really, the only way to fix this bill is to withdraw it because there's nothing in here that creates a fair playing field for everybody.

So all the things—the strobe light, the shield, the panic button—all of those issues, they all cost money, right?

Mr. Maan: Yes. It cost money and we pay for that one. They should at least pay that one too, also, because when we pick up the customer here, customer feel very safe with camera. That's what I notice in my 15, 16 years experience. Lots of

customers, they are very comfortable if—when they're in the camera.

Also, we're—we as a driver, we are very comfortable too, because it's everything you get recording. So you don't have to worry about anything.

Mr. Scott Johnston (St. James): Thank you very much for your presentation. I've—sit in a number of presentations. They're certainly very interesting, and certainly appreciate the fact that many people have taken the time to present.

Your comments about you—Uber kind of interested me a little bit. You're a service-oriented business—or, industry. And you kind of indicated that the services that this perceived competition may offer will be substandard to the market—if I heard your comments correctly. And every speaker that I've heard—and, certainly, my experiences in a number of other people who have spoke about your industry—you have indicated that your industry is very, very efficient and very well able to serve the needs of the people of Manitoba—Winnipeg, in this case, that use your service.

So being a service-oriented business, and with the—with some of the problems that you indicate exist with this perceived competitor, it would appear that the market would—

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Johnston, if you could please state your question, we are actually past our time for question.

Mr. Johnston: Just—my case is is that it would appear that you're able to compete very effectively against this perceived competition that's coming in. Would you not agree with that?

Mr. Maan: No, sir.

* (19:40)

Madam Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation.

I will now call upon Amandeep Sran, private citizen. Amandeep Sran will be moved to the bottom of the list.

Number 138, Sandeep Sran? Mr. Sandeep Sran will now be moved to the bottom of the list.

Number 139, Gurmail Gill?

Mr. Gill, do you have written materials to—

Mr. Gurmail Gill (Private Citizen): No, I don't.

Madam Chairperson: Okay, please proceed with your presentation.

Mr. Gurmail Gill: Yes, my name is Gurmail Gill and I came here in this country in 1980 and I—before I worked in the different places for three, four years, and I hold taxi licence in 1984, when I started driving taxi for part-time, and then I get some help from my family, of course, my brother just get me—borrow some loan from the bank so I could own my own cab share. Like, I bought the half one.

So that's where I started from, and those days, interest rate is very high, like 14. So it's not easy to pay off my loan. It's took me years and years. So things going on, and those days, same like today, it's not easy to make money. Like, our meter started—what was it—like \$1.35, and we took customers to airport to Fairmont hotel about \$8. So how many fare you can make a day for you make your good-day income?

So that way started working, and those old days, we're driving like big cars, like heavy, heavy big cars. Usually people put in their, like, ex-police cars or whatever others—Jeeps, Aspens or so. So, slowly, we people—we means our community—when we get in this business, we grew the cab services. We started putting nice cabs in there and keep the nice clean cars and—so time goes on and people buying more and more cabs.

Like, who sets the price? The government. Like, once, they said, no you can't buy more than \$100,000, \$200,000. It can't be that much. Then maybe there's a something solution, or if government thinks there's a short of cabs, so then they can time to time deliver some here and there, but it's all trust of the government.

That's where we're spending money. Like, that's where we invest our money. So it's not easy to—like, so many years we build up this—like, I'm saying like I started from '87 and now it's how many years. So now when Bill 30 came, my values keep down. It's no value these days. Nobody buying cabs anyway. Doesn't matter how much. So it's took me about 30 years to build up this, and if I lose everything, of course, I get in depression and anxiety, and I don't know how I survive that, because this is my retirement hope. That's where I could—I thought, like, when I get old—like, I'm already 58, so seven more years, at least—if seven years pass, maybe that's things different, but it's a matter of a few months. February 28th, maybe, and Manitoba government just, the way they say, washed their hands, go to the

City. And City people—like, if you—there's already questions raised. Like what you think, City people not care of you guys? Of course, they are a small lobby there. The government is big. The government is good hand we are. And City, we already ask for so many years that since diamond lane came here, they don't allow us. We ask City people, few taxi stands here and there. They don't allow us. They gave us one here and there. Those useless, anyway. Where we looking for, they not.

So, I don't know how City help us better than government. So, we've been in government for a long, long time—like, maybe since 1940 or something, maybe a little later. But since then, we are safe playing, like, same, like, safety issues you're talking about. Of course, every customer safe in my cab, our cab, all the people we're driving in Winnipeg city, because first: mechanical safety. Every six months, our mechanical safety checkup. Like, car is safe. If there's anything happen in the way, car broke down, customer safe, driver safe.

And other hand, there's a random checkup by the Taxicab Board. They're going to stop your cab anywhere. They're going to check your cab. What's—anything—nothing wrong with there, clean cabs. And they send you right away to the mechanical safety if they feel like there is something going on. So, they're going to check it again.

And other hand, safety, we have a camera here. Camera is saving both ways, driver and the customers. Like, lost and found also came in the safe—if you lost your wallet, you lost your laptop or your phone or something. If you go, like, this driver may be cheating, he got that stuff, so right away you can call the Taxicab Board. They check our camera, inside, outside. They see where the driver are, what they doing after you drop me off. So it's very easy to find out.

I already hearing here some people say Ubers, they don't have any cameras. They don't have any shields. They don't have any mechanical safety. They don't have a criminal record check. They don't have child abuse. They don't have nothing like this. So, how you think those cabs are safe?

And of course, we are the taxi driver. Time to time, we not figuring out who's sitting our back. They're drug dealers, maybe. They have something in there. There are so many things happening when police check. Sometimes they find something; sometimes they don't. But how you find out this is Uber cabs. He drove someone there, and he left

something there or he got something there, because there's no camera, no—nothing to check up.

And who service to those old people, old folks; of course, handicapped people. Of course, people don't have any credit card. And, like, day like today, it was very busy out there, so I don't know how people can afford to calling those advanced paying, like, on your credit card business.

Of course, people flag down on the street. Like, Winnipeg city is 30 below, and when you call Uber, who knows, like, when they going to coming, maybe fast or maybe not, but I mean, you have to prearrange for that, and you have to wait for that. Sometimes you don't have enough time. You just get out of your office; you're busy or you're doing—just get out, you flag the cab down and you're on your way.

So, Bill 30 is like destroy the taxi industry here. That's what I'm seeing because they cancelling the licence, like the holder's licence. And I tell you one more thing: taxi driver or, whatever, Uber drivers, not come just like this. You get a licence and get in there, and here you go. You have to go through this, all the studying, all the record checks, everything, and [*inaudible*] you too. I think so many years that's—I'm—how many, like, 30, more than—something like that. And still, customer ask me, like, you don't know this? You don't know this? I said, every day learning day. Like, everybody's not perfect. I'm not a god, but I've got good experience. I can take you safe to your place. Please calm down and listen to me what I'm saying. Tell whatever your situation is.

* (19:50)

So that's so many other things. When you invest your money, like you selling your property back home, or some other source, like maybe your house on jeopardy, you put your house and you buy a cab, so what's happening then? And—

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Gill, your time for presentation has now expired. We are going to move on to questions from the committee.

Are there any questions from the members of the committee?

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you very much, Mr. Gill, for your presentation, and sometimes 10 minutes doesn't seem really long enough to tell us everything you need to tell us, is it?

Do you believe that the best thing that this government can do is withdraw Bill 30? *[interjection]*

Floor Comment: Of course.

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Gill.

Mr. Gill: Sorry. Of course, they should do this, drop this Bill 30, yes.

Mr. Lindsey: So, really, over the course of the number of years you've been driving taxi, you've seen things improve, particularly on the safety end of things. Once upon a time they didn't have shields, and now they're mandated to have shields if you're driving a taxi. They didn't have cameras once upon a time, but now the law says you have to have a camera.

Your meters are all locked and controlled by the taxi board. You can't just charge whatever you want, right.

So does this bill, or from your knowledge of Uber, do they have any of those same features that you have?

Mr. Gurmail Gill: If they don't have any features, whatever I told you in my cab, they're not supposed to be here, and that's not safe. And when—sorry—that's okay. When I start in '84 as a part-time driver, don't mind me Canadian if I don't like work, and we are the one all dispatcher companies calling us, and there's no cellphone in those days. They call home—home phone line and please come here; we got some airport cars. We are this. So, we get out and serve them.

There is no coffee break in our business, actually. If you're busy you keep going. But even my own son, like he's 28, he don't like work. He had to have coffee break, lunch break. He don't care. So that's the system we went through.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you very much for that.

Really, you're not opposed to fair competition, that if there's another car that's going to be a taxi and really anybody that's getting paid to pick somebody up from point A and drop them off at point B, that's a taxi, but these Uber guys, they'd like to claim they're something different so they don't have to play by the same rules, so that's not fair to you, is it?

Mr. Gurmail Gill: No, it's not fair because, first of all, I don't know what they're talking about a ride share. Ride share, like, I came from India a couple days ago, maybe three days ago. Ride share is there when you're flagging down those three-wheelers

going and to give 10 rupees here, one more block gives you 10 rupees other guy; then other 10 rupees, they all go to same place, like the bus depot. That's the share ride.

If you are a whole three-wheeler there, you have to pay him \$70 or \$100—I mean rupees, whatever. That's your car ride share. I don't know what you're talking about ride share here. Like, you book your own cab, you go point A to B. Same thing we're doing. So if we are not ride sharing, how they are ride sharing?

Ride sharing is other thing like when you pool, like a student go to university or something and putting four people in cab and they share the gas and share the price. That's what you call ride share. Not your own credit card, you book your own cab and go one place to other place. It doesn't matter if it's cheap or expensive. That depends on service, depends on safety and we all know cheap things are not good. Cheap is never good. Maybe feel happy, everybody looking for free and cheap, but it's no good. If you want decent service you have to pay.

Mrs. Mayer: Thank you, sir, for coming today and taking part in the democratic process and speaking to us. I have sat here since 10 o'clock this morning and I've heard stories from individuals just like yourself.

Can you tell me a little bit about your story? There was a gentleman earlier this afternoon that talked about that, you know, in order to buy-in to his business, become an owner, he had to borrow about \$350,000, maybe—everyone has a little bit of a different amount. It's varied. You know, he was paying 9 per cent interest on that to a third party, not to a financial institution and stuff like that. Can you just tell me—because I'm very interested in knowing more about your life—tell me a little bit more about yourself, about the questions I just asked?

Mr. Gurmail Gill: You ask me personally how I handle my loan, where I get the loan?

Mrs. Mayer: Well, how did you get to buy-in to your business?

Mr. Gurmail Gill: How do I get to—in my business? I have to put some—like, of course, my brother was here, and he put his house on this thing and co-signed for me and, of course, I don't have my brother anymore. He passed away. Then I bought his share for get my own, like I pay another—like, close to \$200,000 and it's still take me years and years to pay it off, and today, if it goes down, so where I can

go? Where I can build again like what I built in last 30 years?

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Gill, the time for questioning has now expired. Thank you so much for your presentation, and you may join the public.

I will now call on No. 140, Manjinder Brar, private citizen. Manjinder Brar will now be moved to the bottom of the list. Number 141, Lovellen Sharma. Lovellen Sharma will now be moved to the bottom of the list. Number 142, Sukhwant Paul. Sukhwant Paul will now be moved to the bottom of the list. Number 143, Vikramjit Singh Mooker. Vikramjit Singh Mooker will now be moved to the bottom of the list. Number 144, Seheg Gill. Seheg Gill will now be moved to the bottom of the list. Number 145, Anina Sidhu. Anina Sidhu will now be moved to the bottom of the list.

Number 146, Baljinder Chahal. Mr. Chahal, do you have written materials for distribution to the committee?

Mr. Baljinder Chahal (Private Citizen): No.

Madam Chairperson: Please proceed with your presentation.

Mr. Baljinder Chahal: But I need a translator.

Madam Chairperson: You would like a translator?

Mr. Baljinder Chahal: Yes.

Madam Chairperson: You may invite your—oh, is the will of the—

An Honourable Member: We already passed that.

Madam Chairperson: Okay. Then please introduce your translator.

Mr. Baljinder Chahal: Mr. Kaur Sidhu is my cousin, so—

Madam Chairperson: Could you please have your translator introduce himself and spell his name into the record, please?

Mr. Kaur Sidhu, on behalf of Mr. Baljinder Chahal (Private Citizen): Sorry, I missed the question. My name is Kaur Sidhu.

Madam Chairperson: Can you spell your name into the record, please, sir?

Mr. Kaur Sidhu: First name, Kaur—K-a-u-r. Last name, Sidhu—S-i-d-h-u.

Madam Chairperson: Thank you. Go ahead with your presentation.

Mr. Kaur Sidhu: Okay. One thing I want to ask, because he's my brother. I sponsored my other brother and he sponsored him, and with the help of taxi. This is just preamble, I'm talking about. And he drove cab for the last 20 years and he's cab owner, and if the—if this powerful standing committee feels comfortable, I know his story. Even he picked me up today, after my shift, because he was feeling—he knows his English, but—his English level is not bad—but he's a bit nervous to speak. So if I can only tell part of story because I know and he can go and sit. Is that okay?

* (20:00)

Madam Chairperson: Yes, go ahead.

Mr. Kaur Sidhu: Honourable Chairperson and committee members, thank you very much for giving me an opportunity to talk about this very important issue to specifically East Indian community and thousands of families.

Why I said specifically the East Indian community on basis of data. There's only one white person, who is owner of taxicab in Unicity. That's No. 40. That's what I came to know. And there are about nine or 10 black fellows. The remainder, big chunk is East Indians. So this is how it is—this business is now in front of us. It was different about 30 years ago, but this is what the new data and scenario is.

Because of that, the new bill that's being discussed here, I hope government would have very open mindedness and also will understand and have sympathy with the hard-working cab drivers and owners, especially since now you know their stories. Before this bill came into existence, probably you did not know in that depth. Probably before the understanding was that Winnipeg city is the only city—or, jurisdiction, in Canada where there was no Uber or Lyft or other ride-sharing-called service provider. And that's fine to modernize.

And I talked to almost majority of the people who are sitting behind me, and many of the people who came and have presented here, too. They are not opposing Uber, Lyft, or any other kind of ride-sharing service. They're opposing the conditions under which Uber, Lyft or other service provider will come, because those conditions are so comfortable and easy for the new service provider—so called—and the industry will face the same old conditions. That includes, you heard again and again, includes very expensive insurance, drivers safety, vehicle safety,

a driver's criminal record check and other complications. I don't want to go over them, but I just wanted to say a few things.

One is: I again my duty and state and emphasize industry has no fear to compete. The only fear they have is not level playing field. I want to bring in to attention to the ruling party, which I was a part of, too, tried to become an MLA from Maples. Well, we have different kind of representative. That's fine, that's the democracy, and they have a lot of respect for that. And the issue was about the fairness. We did talk about, during the election time, too, about level playing field. And that's what the industry is looking for, that new service providers would have to have—should have same conditions.

Number 2, some of the people already is thinking if industry or Taxicab Board had been already transferred to the City of Winnipeg, it's not—yet, at least, in my opinion. The decision had been made. My request to this very strong, powerful committee is please reconsider that decision. It should stay with the Province. Province was running this before. Though there are other jurisdictions where taxicabs are being monitored and services are being provided by—similar services are being provided by the Province, but that didn't mean that we have to follow them.

The only reason I read in the Free Press—because that's what I read most of the time—is that this—the government want to transfer Taxicab Board to City of Winnipeg because it's creating half—about a half million dollars of deficit to deliver these services by the Taxicab Board.

I talked to the industry people. They do understand, if they're getting services from the Taxicab Board, and if there's a deficit being created because of the cost of those services, that's about a half million dollars, they're happily willing to pay extra levy on their yearly licences. But that provided them assurance that their—it's in their benefit because their interests will be looked after—many reasons. We all are human beings.

The taxicab industry has very good relationship of provincial politicians of all stripes, NDP, Liberals and PC. And if whenever they have an issue, it's pretty—all parties are pretty accessible to them. To go to City, it's unknown. That's where we have fear. Why do we have fear from dark? Because unknown. So, because of the unknown territory they're going to push it into because of this bill, they have fear. The transition is always fear. It's not modernization; it's,

kind of, dissolving the body and giving to some other authority that will administer. And we don't know about that body, and we don't have good relationship, not that strong, as we have with provincial politics and the politicians and the community.

So, please keep into mind before you will make final decision that if the reason is because of the half million deficit the government has to pay—or, the other taxpayer has to pay, and specifically, services are being received by taxi owners and drivers, and owners and drivers are willing to take that deficit, and they're willing to accept the higher fee if they have to pay for it. And that should not be the reason.

Another thing is, there was an MNP report. Probably, you heard again and again during the last week or so. There was—the report came in 2015, and that report where other recommendations were there. They were one of the recommendations that the city of Winnipeg needs more cabs. The number was in the report, 200. And also, the report specifically mentioned that 50 cabs per year should be added and should be monitored their impact on the existing number of cabs for the next coming four years. The industry doesn't oppose that either. They're very open for that. If the province want to go back to that report and add additional cabs, and that way also, it will produce more revenue for the Taxicab Board and for the government, the deficit will not be half a million dollars.

And secondly, the last comment is, the number of cabs we have, they are directly producing about 500. They're directly producing full-time, 1,000, at least, jobs, even more than that if we include the staff who is helping them in offices when they receive our trips. Okay, so, 1,000 jobs, full-time, Monday to Friday, and again, 2,000 part-time jobs on weekends. So, there are 3,000 jobs. If in each cab—I just calculated myself; it may not be accurate—produces about \$300 revenue every day. So, if you multiply by 500, that's \$1.5 million every day. So it's a half-billion dollar business. But because of this new act would have created uncertainty and so much nervousness—

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Sidhu, your time for presentation has expired. We are moving on to questions from the committee now.

Do members of the committee have questions for the presenter?

* (20:10)

Mr. Maloway: I want to thank you, Mr. Sidhu, for an excellent presentation. We did—we have been meeting now for four nights. This is a 14-hour session today. And last night, we had, I think, three presenters who stated that they had spoken to the Premier (Mr. Pallister) at a party dinner, I think it was, one of them, and the other two was at another social event. And they were assured by the Premier—this was before the election, by the current Premier that there would be—that anything that was done with the taxi industry would be done in a—with a level playing field. And, clearly, the Premier has, you know, is on record now—I mean, enough people have said that he's made this promise; this is clearly a broken promise, and I just wonder why you think he would do something like that. Like, say, that he was going to treat people fairly in advance of the election with lots of witnesses, with other elected MLAs around, and then do something like this just a year and a half after that.

Mr. Kaur Sidhu: I think MNP report, it was initially came into its existence by the NDP government, if I'm not wrong about it. And, for sure, it's a very important issue, and if Premier made, or somebody met him, I don't know; I have no direct knowledge about it. But I strongly believe, personally—and I have some interaction with the Premier too, but did not talk about this issue specifically—that this very good committee would have sympathy and also the Premier would have sympathy and also make a progressive decision and modernize the industry. The industry's willing to change too if it's required.

Mr. Maloway: The fact of the matter is that we know that Australian states, all of them, are dealing with the same issue with Uber, and all of them are—have compensation plans. I think Victoria has a compensation of \$100,000 a taxi and \$50,000—Victoria, state of Victoria, that's right—\$50,000 for the second cab, a total of \$494-million assistance plan. And here we have, in a similar type of situation, a provincial government in Manitoba comes up with a bill in which they put in a clause, 10, which says absolutely no possibility of compensation. And, clearly, we've had presenter after presenter saying that their investments of \$400,000 and up are going to be wiped out. Like, I just can't believe this.

We have Premier Schreyer, the third painting in, when Autopac was set up, offered a compensation plan, a compensation plan to all the insurance agents who did not want to be Autopac agents: a Manitoba government, just like this, offering compensation to

insurance agents who didn't want to sell on Autopac, under an Autopac contract.

Would you like to comment on any of this?

Mr. Kaur Sidhu: I made a comment. I think probably honourable member, Jim Maloway, didn't hear about it. Just want to clarify again that I, personally, wanted this bill to be withdrawn and the Taxicab Board to be modernized and new number, if it's required, maybe added because the taxi industry is ready for it. So that's what my request to you is, very strong and powerful committee, and to the Premier as well.

Mr. Lindsey: So what you're saying is the industry isn't afraid to change, to grow, to adapt to a new world, but, really, what they don't want to see is somebody come in and completely wipe out any monetary value that they have now and play by a completely different set of rules.

Mr. Kaur Sidhu: What I am saying to you is this: this industry has no fear to compete. It's very clear to them, and they're very happy to compete, and they know that they would not only survive, they can beat the expectation when it comes to service [*inaudible*] cost. There is the service, physically, they provide and get up. And during the last NDP government, when Theresa Oswald, honourable ex, Theresa Oswald, was Health minister, I think there was a clause added to the health act that before taxicab drivers were providing service door to door—sorry, curb to curb, the service was added door to door.

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Sidhu, the time for questioning has now expired. Thank you for your presentation.

Mr. Maloway: Madam Chair, we have a No. 98, it's Komalpreet Sangha, she's a student, and she is wishing to be able to make her presentation where she can. I think she's writing her speech in the back there and she's maybe done. Here she is.

Madam Chairperson: Is it the will of the committee to see number 98, Komalpreet Sangha? [*Agreed*]

Ms. Sangha, do you have any written materials for distribution to the committee? No? Please proceed with your presentation.

Ms. Komalpreet Sangha (Private Citizen): Hello everyone, my name is Komalpreet Sangha, and my dad has driven a taxi for the last 16 years. He works seven days a week, because he bought the taxi for \$250,000, and he is the only one working in our

family, because my mom is not allowed to work because of medical reasons.

What my dad earns is spent on our family's needs. After work, he takes us for our games and practices even though that takes his work—his rest time off. He does anything for us for us to have a happy and fulfilled life. We are worried about his safety at work. When he comes home, we are very relieved.

I am also going to university soon. As you know, the fee of university is very high. Will you guys be paying for the university fee if you guys pass Bill 30?

Everyone has the same standards, and the safety issues, you need a criminal record check, child abuse certificate. We have cameras, safety shields and also a fare meter sealed by our Taxicab Board.

If there is two teams playing on the field but they don't have the same rules, please explain how that's fair.

Bill 30, is a government washing their hands and passing all taxicab to the City and there are no rules or regulations are consulted and they, the City, has no safety measure set examples. Examples are shields, cameras, criminal record checks, child abuse certificates.

I am worried for my dad's safety, as I have heard Uber does not follow any rules or regulations. We heard stories about bad accidents, people robbing you, there are people assaulting you. As you know, driving a taxi is very dangerous. Our safety has been improved over years. A taxicab worker is 60 times more likely to be murdered on this job than any other average job. Taxicab drivers, are at risk in terms of robbery, hijacking of the taxi, abusive and threatening behaviour, physical assault and much more. Thank you.

Madam Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation.

Are there questions from the committee members?

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you very much for coming and speaking, and I got to say I admire you. I'm sure I couldn't have stood up in front of a crowd like this when I was your age to speak. I can barely do it now.

So I just want—really you have plans to go on to university, but if your dad's taxi business goes out of business, what happens to those plans?

Ms. Sangha: Well, those plans won't work as much and we will have to work harder and find other jobs for us to make it work, for me to get a better job so that I can do better in the future.

Mr. Lindsey: Clearly, you talked in your presentation about two teams on the field but both of them playing by different rules. That's what this bill is going to allow to happen, isn't it?

Ms. Sangha: Yes, that is exactly what's going to happen. So I don't understand how that's fair if they're playing with two different rules.

Mr. Lindsey: Clearly it isn't fair, and I know we understand that; clearly, you understand that. Hopefully, by more people such as yourself coming, the government will also begin to understand that this isn't fair.

So do you think the best thing that could happen, the really good news for you tonight would be if the government said, we're withdrawing that bill? *[interjection]*

Madam Chairperson: Ms. Sangha.

Ms. Sangha: Oh, sorry. That would be amazing.

* (20:20)

Mr. Lindsey: I would like you to ask the government to withdraw that bill tonight that's—and please do that. *[interjection]*

Madam Chairperson: Ms. Sangha.

Ms. Sangha: Sorry. That would be very great. Can you guys please withdraw the bill?

Mr. Lindsey: Well, unfortunately, I don't see any of them putting their hands up to say that, yes, they would. So it's kind of too bad. Really, what this is about is making sure that we have things in place to keep your dad safe while he's driving a cab, and Uber or other supposed ride-sharing things, to your knowledge anyway, don't have those same kinds of things in place, do they?

Ms. Sangha: No, they don't.

Mrs. Mayer: Thank you very much for your presentation. I think that when young people like yourself come before a big body like this and into a big wonderful building that it's encouraging to see youth like yourself come here and brave enough to stand up to speak to us, because I'm sure it's a little nerve-racking for you.

Can you tell me a little about yourself? How old you are, where you go to school, things like that. What do you want—what would you like to be when you're ready to go to university and finish that path?

Ms. Sangha: I am currently 15 years old, and I go to Garden City Collegiate. I'm in French immersion, and I'm planning to be a lawyer. So, yes.

Mr. Selinger: Thank you, Komalpreet, for being here tonight and being so articulate in your presentation. That's a good school, Garden City Collegiate. I know some of the teachers there, and I've always been impressed by them, plus you've got a very good basketball team as well.

I would want to ask you this: No matter where this legislation or this piece of law goes tonight, would you want to have the same safety standards for whoever drives a cab to protect the drivers and, of course, to protect the customers?

Ms. Sangha: Yes, because if everyone has the same stuff and it's more safe for everyone, that you're not as worried about the people that are driving.

Mr. Lindsey: I'm sure we're just about out of time here and, again, I just want to really thank you for putting your point across from your family's perspective about fairness and equalness, and really this bill doesn't do that. And you would like your dad to be able to continue to earn a living so that you can go to school and be a lawyer. Is that right?

Ms. Sangha: Yes, that is right. Thank you.

Madam Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation.

I will now call upon No. 147, Sukhwant Pal, private citizen. Sukhwant Pal will now be moved to the bottom of the list.

Number 148, Harbans Brar. Mr. Brar, go ahead with your presentation.

Mr. Harbans Brar (Private Citizen): Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to talk to you fellows.

My name's Harbans Singh Brar. I am living in Canada from last 45 years and 35 alone in Winnipeg. I drove taxi for six years in city of Winnipeg. I was a president of one of the largest companies in city of Winnipeg in the taxi industry. I was a board member for Manitoba, Taxicab Board member for a number of years. I had my own business out of service centre, where we fixed taxis, cars, gas stations, and I had experience—very, very, very good experience

with them. And also I was a president of Sikh Society of Manitoba for five times in last 20 years. I know about my community, how my community's making a living. Every one of—I don't think so, first of all, not one of you drove a cab.

No. So you don't have any experience what is the cabbies have problems, how the people treat them, how the government treats them, how the police treat them. Everyone—you know, more likely if I say here to the cab drivers, the City of Winnipeg one time, when I was a president, they were treated like a third-class citizen. They were not treating like a, you know, we are a same Canadian citizen, we are same Manitobans.

Other than anything else—the price or anything else—in my heart is safety of the Manitoban peoples. I want to—I want them to be more safe. Anything else like the price, the money—that comes and goes in life. You know, that's not a big thing.

Everyone know you what is the Uber going to have. Like, the equipment, and what is the—do I have to repeat that? Like, a camera, shield. You know, the light, the button. You know, everything. And if I ask you—if I ask you the girl on the other side of the table, will you be ride with Uber the guy doesn't—I'm asking you, any one of you: will you send your girl or daughter—I mean, daughter or your mother, your sister, your son, your brother with guy who doesn't have a licence, doesn't know the city about anything? Will you send any? Any one of you will send your daughter, your wife, your sister, your mother?

I walk every day at the Wellness with 200 people. And you know what they are saying? The government getting crazy and bringing the Uber for nothing. For the just—I don't know, they want to kill the industry. If you don't want to send your daughter, your girl, your brother, your sister, your mother, your father with those people, why you want to bring them here? For who?

When I was a president, I took presidency I think '87, '88. Six people were get killed. Six cab driver were get killed. First Dhaliwal—Mohinder knows that, ask him. One of them was the neighbour. And then Purmajeet was on Highway No. 1, then guy named John was in the North End. And there was another three guys that got killed. And we were block—we were—we would block that the legislative for the shield. We were crying here, they did—all the cab driver, was 400 cry cab drivers, 300 cab drivers came here. We—you know, we were asking for the shield. And the same time—that time, it was the same

[inaudible] government-like, the PC government. The government is here, now bringing the Bill 30 and they were. They were not letting us put the shield on. We—it was the same thing that what's going on right now.

So I think—my first think is Manitobans won't be safe if the Uber comes, first of all. The Manitobans—the girls, the boys, or any Canadian—Manitoban citizen won't be safe in the Uber.

How—any one of you drove into the Uber from here to the airport, and you forgot your phone, you forgot your [inaudible], you forgot your laptop there, who you going to call? Who you going to call, like, where—how you going to find where you're—who took you from here to there? At least any Unicity taxi or Duffy or anyone is—at least you phone them, who you call in the first place and, you know, they find out right away which number goes to your house and pick you up and everything. So I'm saying again, you know, my point is clear. My point is clear, you know, the Manitobans won't be safe in Uber.

And the—if we talk about the price, who the taxi drivers are. Who the taxi drivers are when we fellows, all of us sleeping at night after 9 o'clock or we are celebrating Christmas or we are on the dinner or we're on the wedding party or we are the—you know, the—we're enjoying ourselves and they are behind the wheel. For daughter to daughter to daughter to daughter, as many times—many times as the people don't pay them. They call police, they never put a charge. If anyone pick up a candy bundle from the store and they put a charge under \$200 theft, right? Am I right or wrong? But if someone took their fare—even \$50, \$30, \$10, \$5—nobody care. Why? Is that not the example, is that not the proof our government, our police, our citizen are treating them like a third-class citizen?

* (20:30)

I see—I saw that when the price was \$20,000, \$14,000, \$20,000, \$30,000, \$45,000. The first cab I bought, it was \$47,000, second one I bought—50; the third one, I bought for \$37,000. Because six people will get killed. The price came boom, you know, and their investment has never been safe and it's never going to be in safe positions. You know, as goes.

Well, but, you know, they keep their lunch kit in the car. They don't eat like you and me or anybody take a break, half an hour, or—and how the people treat them, you know, very, very shitty language to use them. But they are our brother, they are our

sister, they are our—and they create jobs, you know, for—here. I mean, they are part of the economy.

Then why the price went up? Because the Manitoba nominee program, Greg Selinger. They brought the Manitoba nominee program in 2004 and a lot of—a lot of people came from other countries and Manitoba doesn't have a job, and only way they can survive, take a licence, and I can assure you there's maybe 10 or 15 doctors driving a cab—10 or 15, and you need to drive a cab. You know, well-educated people are driving—you know, they're not a, like, a kind of [inaudible] people. They are, you know, very educated people, if you see their background, you know.

But, because they came to this country and this country teach them like that, so, you know, price didn't go away, say, they didn't bought the lottery ticket. Let's go because they put—they know the cab, the taxi, the car worth—I think they put over \$25,000 to 30,000 and one time was, you know, when you can buy the plate and everything for \$30,000. You know, they keep clean, as I said, you know, and they work 24 hours, 15 hours. They have a family; they have a house, their son, their daughter, you know, go to university. They have to pay fee.

They are like us. They are not different than us. You know, they are the ambassador of the Manitoba. They are the ambassador of Manitoba when someone comes at the airport and ask about our city and, you know, they got hours and hours and hours training, like the classes, and the Uber.

Like, I don't know, I think the bus depot or the airport are the, you know, it's like—it's just like a part time. I have a truck, so I'll be into the Uber driver, okay, so just punch in, but, you know, how are you going to find me after that when you forgot something or when I did something.

You know, that's how the price went up to, you know, whatever, because there was no job in Manitoba and people came from other country; they have to survive, they have to feed their kid, and they, you know, they got a licence because they are well-educated people. They look, you know, look at the map, you know, study the map and everything. They got the licence and everything.

So, at the end, the city, I don't know why we want to bring two-tier system in Winnipeg, why we want to bring two-tier system in Winnipeg. If tomorrow this government pass you know people can drive without licence, would you be agree? Because

they're going to—they can kill your families on the road. It is just like that. It is just like that without licence, without knowledge of driving—

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Brar, the time for your presentation has now expired. I will now go on to questions.

Do members of the committee have questions for the presenter?

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you very much for your presentation. Clearly, you've got a lot of experience and a lot of knowledge around this.

Right now, whether it's Unicity or Duffy or any other local cab company, you take cash when people get in, that they can pay you with real money. They don't have to have credit cards. Is that right?

Mr. Harbans Brar: Both. They can pay, you know, I was one in '87 when we brought the Visa system and the Interac system. You know, they can pay by Visa, Interac and they can pay cash, whatever the way they want to.

Mr. Lindsey: Now, my understanding is Uber doesn't take cash. You can only use a credit card. So, really, that's going to limit, particularly in inner city downtown areas, who's going to be able to call Uber? So it becomes a class thing. As much as unfair in so many other ways, it's now unfair that way, too, is it not?

Mr. Harbans Brar: That's what I said, you know, at the Wellness and the Seven Oaks, the people talking there. I think there are—10 per cent or more people doesn't have a phone—iPhone with them, first of all. How they going to call them? And, you know, what number? I don't—you know, I don't know what numbers. People don't have a Visa card. You know, they're not—they don't qualify for Visas.

You know, the Uber doesn't have the equipment what they're supposed to have. The Uber does not have the equipment what they supposed to have to run for—in the industry.

Mr. Lindsey: Really, that's kind of what I was getting to. It's not just the safety equipment that Uber doesn't have, which is bad enough, but they also don't have any of the other things that your local cab companies have that make it affordable for people in this city to pick up a phone, to use a pay phone, to get a friend to phone and talk to somebody and get a cab to where they are. If Uber comes in, they don't have any of that. They don't have the safety stuff. It's completely unfair. *[interjection]*

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Brar.

Mr. Harbans Brar: Oh, sorry about that.

First of all, they are our brothers and sisters, tomorrow and Christmas, the people have a party, like, '86 is—Dhaliwal get killed at Christmas night or something or day before. And someone stabbed or someone killed someone, the Uber driver doesn't have a shield, doesn't have a panic button, doesn't have a camera in there. You know, is that not pretty critical? Is that not the big chance is a risk of life for Uber drivers? And should we let them in without those—all those equipment? No.

Mr. Ewasko: Thank you, Mr. Brar, for your presentation. And I'd like to echo the fact that you're—seem to be coming here with a lot of experience and wearing various different roles throughout your life.

You've mentioned safety and you've mentioned the response time of police, or the non-response time for police, whatsoever, if you've had some sort of violation committed towards any of your drivers or fares or somebody jumping away from not paying their fares.

Now, if this bill passes and the City of Winnipeg takes over as far as regulating this service to Manitobans or to Winnipeggers, then, technically, they would be able to meet your needs even faster because the city police are under the auspices of the City of Winnipeg. What's your opinion or comments to that?

Mr. Harbans Brar: That we increase any police numbers than before. I mean, you know, like, how do you assure they will response to the taxi driver, because it's underneath them? It's going to be under—yes, no. It's not—you know, it's not going to change. I can tell you right off the bat, it's not going to change, never. Forget about it.

Mr. Ewasko: Thank you, Mr. Brar, for that answer. So then, really, that's sort of a hypothetical question, right, because we won't actually be able to know until it's there, so much like a lot of these rules that either the taxicab drivers or many of the owners or many of the young students who've been here today as well. We don't quite know how it's exactly going to work out, right? *[interjection]*

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Brar.

Mr. Harbans Brar: Sorry about that.

You should have a few people, experienced people, in this board who knows about the industry. I was a board member—I was a Manitoba Taxicab Board member for a few years, and we have tons of complaints—tons of complaints from the public, from the drivers, from everywhere. Like, you know, the people, they lost their suitcase, couldn't find it, and, you know, the—you won't believe it, you know, much of it. And also, the fares, you know, there's so and so. There's—you know, I think the industry cleaned the industry—the owner of the taxi drivers, you know, cleaned the industry very well. Let them drive. Let them make their living, you know, anything you want to, but you don't want to bring it, like, the field shall be playing. Before the voting, the 2016 voting, all three parties were saying, you know, the playing—the field will be playing for everyone, even your—our Premier (Mr. Pallister)—

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Brar, the time for questioning has now expired, so we have to move on to our next presenter. Thank you very much.

I will now call upon No. 149, Jastal Mann. Jastal Mann will now be moved to the bottom of the list.

Number 150, Harvinder Singh. Mr. Singh, please go ahead with your presentation.

* (20:40)

Mr. Harvinder Singh (Private Citizen): Thank you. My name is Harvinder Singh. I left my hometown in 1996. Since then, I have been living in Winnipeg. I choose to live in Winnipeg for all those years because it is nice place to live and everyone is friendly.

I have three kids, where—two of them go to University of Winnipeg and are taking full course loads. And my son is grade 11, who's been planning to go to university as well, get a better future. And my parents, as well, live with me. And my wife, who does not work because of some medical problems. So it is just me who is providing for all seven of my family members.

I have been in the Unicity Taxi industry more than 20 years. First, I started as a driver for two years as night shift, which was 12 hours, seven days a week. No holidays. Then, in 1998, I bought half share of the Unicity taxi. Then I sponsored my parents and my brother, and soon they came here on my support. My brother then got a taxi licence, as well, and me and my brother bought other half share taxi around 2002. Then me and my brother shared the shift day and night, exchange every month.

Last year, I bought full share of the taxi, which is \$330,000. Where I took some loan and some on my house guidelines. Then me and my brother had our own taxi. Now, when the government bring the Bill 30, our job at risk.

Everyone is saying the population of Winnipeg growing, need more taxis. I also agree with this statement. But all over the world, if a city grows, the government's responsibility to build bigger roads, more parking lots, more hospitals and clinics. But Manitoba government is not doing any of this. However, they are going to the opposite way, as they are shutting down emergency rooms but not looking at those who are dying because the room is closed. So in my thinking, this means Manitoba wants the population to stop growing.

In the Unicity Taxi industry, we are proud the service we provide. Many of us have investor our life—invested our life, saving into the industry. We have brought lots of money into Winnipeg and Canada to invest. Some people even came as business immigrants. Many other have mortgage their homes to be able have a licence in the taxi industry.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson in the Chair

With one bill, you are wiping all of this out. You are even taking away our legal rights. And that is wrong. That is not the way I thought things were in Manitoba.

Government just worries about themselves, as they want just Uber taxi to come in. But they are not looking at thousands of people will struggle to provide their family and a healthy lifestyle. If Uber come, thousands of families are going to suffer due to loss. You guys will be responsible for this. You should think twice before putting a family into *[inaudible]*.

I know a lot of people who are depression just thinking about Uber taxi coming and are thinking about how they will provide their families. So you should think twice about Bill 30 and about what these people will go through. We are not safe if we go under the City; we are only safer Manitoba government. We're safer under Manitoba government, and we have no problem with the Manitoba Taxicab Board because the City does not give anything towards the taxi industry: no parking spaces, no diamond lanes, so on. That's why we all request you to withdraw this Bill 30 and think about all those live families that will be at risk.

If you already made up your mind to send our taxi industry the City, you will have to pay us compensation and safety. We request the committee think twice before passing the Bill 30.

Thank you for giving me the time to speak and telling me my views on Bill 30. Thank you.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Singh, and thank you for your presentation.

Do any members of the committee have some questions for the presenter?

Mr. Selinger: Thank you, Harvinder, for your presentation tonight.

In your experience as a driver, which safety measures have made a difference for you and your customers?

Mr. Harvinder Singh: Customer needs everything safety, like shields, cameras, first thing, camera. Customers have—need a camera; shield only protects the drivers, do not protect the customer. Cameras, shields, meter and panic button we have in the car. We have a strobe light on the roof. That's the safety.

Mr. Selinger: And do you believe those safety features should be available, no matter who offers a taxi service, whether it's Uber or Unicity or Duffy's. Do you believe those safety measures need to be in place for whomever offers a taxi?

Mr. Harvinder Singh: Yes, I would agree, same rule and regulation which I have. I was, like, a camera, meters, safety shields, panic button. The big—we pay a lot of insurance, almost more than \$10,000 insurance per year. Does everything these—if Uber come, no problem. We fight Uber with all those safety rules and regulations, if all the same, which one we have?

Mr. Selinger: And is your cab licence, your taxi licence, what you have put aside for your retirement? *[interjection]*

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Mr. Singh, just give it a couple seconds whilst I acknowledge you.

Thank you, Mr. Singh.

* (20:50)

Mr. Harvinder Singh: Yes, that's why I bought—before I even half share. Me and my brother driving a long time. Last year, I bought \$330,000. One keep my brother, and one I have. That's why we bought the taxi; slowly, slowly, maybe 15 or 20 years we pay it off, the loans—330,000 loans not repaid in one day or one year.

Mr. Selinger: And do you believe that if they're going to allow Uber to come into this marketplace, there should be compensation for those of you that already hold taxi licences?

Mr. Harvinder Singh: First thing, I don't want Uber come here. I don't need the competition. If you decide, government decide, we are reminded, you have to have then Uber; then we have to need the compensation, because I have \$330,000 loan. Tomorrow or next month, Uber comes. Who pays my loans? It's government pay loan? Who pay? Now we are no—then what we do? We're—next option goes suicide, because I have no money. How we pay? We can buy house, go to the bank. Who pays my loans?

Mr. Selinger: Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Singh.

Mr. Harvinder Singh: Thank you.

Mr. Lindsey: I want to thank you for your presentation as well. Really, the best option for you is for the government to withdraw this bill because an earlier conversation, one of the members opposite suggested, well, we don't know what rules the City of Winnipeg would put in place, but really we do, because we look at other jurisdictions and they haven't put the same rules in place to keep it a fair and level playing field, have they? So we do have a pretty good idea what's going to happen, and that is going to be two different sets of rules which will basically bankrupt your business, so the best thing for you is to withdraw Bill 30. Is that correct?

Mr. Harvinder Singh: Yes. I understand.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you for coming out tonight, and I know it seems to take a long time to get your turn up there, but it's certainly worthwhile, because the more voices that we hear, the better chance we have of convincing this government that they're wrong and that they should withdraw this bill. So, if they don't, then you believe that they surely must compensate you for the loss that you're going to suffer.

Mr. Harvinder Singh: Yes. I need a compensation for sure.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Time for questions has expired. We'd like to thank you, Mr. Singh, for your presentation.

I'll call the next presenter. Gemil Petros? Gemil Petros. Mr. Petros, do you have any written materials for the distribution to the committee?

Mr. Gemil Petros (Private Citizen): What you say?

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Please proceed.

Mr. Petros: Yes. I—

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Go ahead Mr. Petros, go ahead.

Mr. Petros: Yes, okay. Just—I came in Canada 27 years ago with four kids and start to build new life in Canada. I work hard; I start, like, cleaning for three years. Besides, I take in language. After long, hard working, we start buy house. We get a mortgage. After, we go—yes, I decide to buy a taxi with loan. Then I was working very hard 'til now. Never relax. Wake up morning, 5 o'clock, all day I work, 12 hours, because to cover my bills, and other—my wife the same. She works, both help each other to build new life and to raise kids, and now after we finish everything problems before we finish our mortgage we get tired now. When we have relax, I don't know. So we did our best to come this level of life.

So the things everybody here is the same. You hear it from each other of us. We have the same problem. So I like to say you guys to see our complaints or to see our ideas and to stop Uber not come here, because over here in the Winnipeg I think the population is 650,000, our—the size of our citadel compare with other cities like Victoria or like Montreal or like Toronto. These cities have enough transportation, different kind of transportation, for the medical people or handicapped people, besides the taxis. So we save as we can, and we have experience how to relate—how to do with relationship, public relationship.

If we got any problem, you know, in our work while we work, how we escape from that problem? We don't need any problem, just we want to work. So any bad people comes around, like customers, not all of the customers bad, only very few. Mostly, they are good customers.

So in my conclusion I say I don't—I oppose Uber to come here. So this, my explanation.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Petros, and thank you for your presentation.

Do members of the committee have any questions for this presenter?

Mr. Lindsey: I thank you for coming out tonight and sharing your thoughts with us.

So, really, the introduction of Uber, it's not about fairness, is it? It's just about a cheaper service.

Mr. Petros: Can you explain for me? You mean the service is cheaper, not coming for cheaper service you mean?

Mr. Lindsey: What I mean is it costs the present cab companies a certain amount of money to operate their cabs, to put the shields in, to buy the licences, the insurance. If Uber comes in and doesn't have to do any of that stuff, it allows them to charge less, which isn't fair, then.

Mr. Petros: Yes. Without safety things, the operation of transport is not good. We—you have to have safety, like shields, just like cameras, like that is what we need.

Mr. Lindsey: And, really, that's what you want is you're not afraid of competition, but you want to have everybody playing by the same set of rules so that it is fair. Is that correct?

Mr. Petros: Yes.

* (21:00)

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you for that.

If this government insists on bringing in this badly flawed piece of legislation, at the very least, do you think they should compensate taxi drivers for what they're going to lose with the value of their cabs that they've got now?

Mr. Petros: Yes. I don't know what compensations they give us. We don't know that, and we need our job. So I don't want to be, like, to beat me in competition.

Mr. Lindsey: Well, in fact, when we read the bill, we do know what compensation that this government is prepared to offer you. And the answer is zero. There's a clause very specifically in this bill that says you're not entitled to compensation. So that makes it just that much more unfair, does it not?

Mr. Petros: I don't know how much is the compensation, and I can't say anything about that.

Mr. Lindsey: And I realize that you don't know how much compensation.

Unfortunately, the way the bill is written right now, there won't be any compensation. So we do know that already. So that's one of the things that we've suggested, that if the government won't just withdraw this bill altogether, that at least withdraw that part so that you can get compensation for what you're going to lose.

That's not the ideal situation. Obviously, you want to be able to keep driving cab and making money, so the best solution for you would be for the government to withdraw the bill altogether. Is that right?

Mr. Petros: I don't know what I say about—

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Mr. Lindsey.

Mr. Lindsey: Yes. I know it's hard to understand everything that they've put in this bill.

So, really, the best answer is, if another company is coming in—be it Uber or somebody else—that they have to have everything in place that you have. They have to have the shields; they have to have the cameras; they have to have the strobe light. And, as importantly, they have to have the training.

And so, really, if they have to have everything that you have to have, then there's really no need for this bill, right? So let's just suggest to the government that they scrap the bill and let you get back to business. Would that be the ideal situation?

Mr. Petros: Yes, the ideal situation. I don't know what—

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Petros, for your presentation today, and coming out and being here with us. And thank you for the presentation.

I'd like to call—

Mr. Maloway: I would—looking for leave to allow No. 6, Jadtar Brar, to appear—or, make his presentation. He's here with his son to translate the father's speech, so there's a complication there. Jadtar Brar, No. 6.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: So is that agreed by the committee? *[Agreed]*

Mr. Brar, if I could please get the interpreter to please say their name into the—onto the record, and please spell it, please. First name and then last.

Mr. Gurneet Brar, on behalf of Mr. Jadtar Brar (Private Citizen): Gurneet Brar. G-u-r-n-double-e-t. And then last name Brar, B-r-a-r.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Brar. You may—do you have any documentation for the committee?

Mr. Gurneet Brar, on behalf of Mr. Jadtar Brar: No, I don't.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Then you may proceed with your presentation.

Mr. Gurneet Brar, on behalf of Mr. Jadtar Brar: First, I would like to thank you all for giving us this time and opportunity to raise our concerns—

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Oh, give me one second, Mr. Brar.

Okay, so, for the record, Mr. Brar, you are speaking on behalf of Mr. Jadtar Brar?

Mr. Gurneet Brar, on behalf of Mr. Jadtar Brar: Yes, I am.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Okay. Then please proceed.

Mr. Gurneet Brar, on behalf of Mr. Jadtar Brar: So, again, I would like to thank you all for giving us this time and opportunity to raise our concerns, and we are really grateful for that.

So I'm sure you have heard many times now how this—how these changes that are proposed will have an immense effect on all the families, and that is true for my family as well. I'm a university student, and the tuition fees are immensely high. My father provides all of that for us. And he also provides other amenities like the house, car insurance, bills, everything, and to be honest, I don't know how he does that, but I'm really thankful that he does. And—until I can provide for myself and for my family, I would hope that my father has the ability to continue doing this.

And I would also like to talk about other issues that my dad raised to me when he was talking to me about what was going on. So, in the past, there have been changes such as CNCP and handi. They were all—the taxi board—all the taxi drivers managed all of that, but then that got separated, and private cars started taking care of all of that, and taxi drivers took a hit for that. They lost their earnings. And then further, there's Duffy and Unicity, so that's two teams playing the same team—or, same sport at the end of the day. And that's also separated, so Unicity has to pay fees for certain areas of the city—hotels, the airport—and that is all coming out of their pocket at the end of the day.

And I know that this is—in the past it's been discussed, and that is not what we are here to discuss, but the situation that we're facing is a little bit similar, because they will be taking another hit if Uber were to come in.

So, the first issue that comes to mind is regulations. The taxi board regulates the taxi drivers very well. It's very strict. But Uber does not have these regulations. They do not have any safety

protocols in effect, and I have experienced this and seen this first-hand because just this past summer I went to the States, and I did want to see, like, what all the fuss was about, wanted to see how Uber operated, and I took the Uber. And there were no security effect—in place for the driver and for myself.

So, I mean, the taxi board has shields—or, the taxis have shields; they have cameras, so anything that's—any activity that's going on in the taxi, it can be seen. If the driver's going to do something to the customer, that will be noted. If the customer robs the taxi driver or hurts them in any way, that will be noted, and it's just a security that is needed. And if Uber were to come in—well, in other cities, they do not have that, and I don't know how the City of Winnipeg would implement that.

And to go on further, major cities have Ubers, and they are working pretty well for Ubers and for taxis, but at the end of the day, that's because those cities are so big. Like, some counties in the States have populations in the tens of millions. So, if you divide that population in half for Uber and taxis, that's still a lot of customers that the taxis will have and the Ubers will have. If you divide it into quarters or thirds, that's still a huge number, so they will still have earnings at the end of the day to provide for their families, while city of Winnipeg has, I think, less than a million. And—so, if you divide that into half, that is a huge number and a huge hit.

And then there's cities such—in Canada, Edmonton and Calgary, which have populations just above a million, so it's more than us, but not near as close to how the States are. And we have relatives in Edmonton. When Uber was introduced, they took a huge hit. Their earnings dropped like crazy, and now they're doing part-time jobs. And most taxi drivers, they're very—well, not very old, but they're getting close to retirement age, so working two jobs is very hard for them, and it's something that is near impossible for them to do.

And then comes a situation with the taxi board. So, I—my dad told me that there are plans to dissolve the taxi board and then the taxi system, and all the regulations will be under the City. And from the drivers' perspective, they like the taxi board. They like the regulations. They like how everything is operated. The cars have to be maintained; they have to be clean. If there's any problems with the taxi drivers and the customers, they can go to the taxi board, and it will be taken care of. They have

someone to go to, while in Edmonton, they don't have a taxi board.

* (21:10)

And the relatives I was talking about earlier, they actually lived in Winnipeg before. They drive taxis—years. And then, when they went to Edmonton, they noticed the difference. They noticed that there is no taxi board and most of the cars were not as maintained as they were here. And they had more problems, more issues, more hurdles that they had to go through than they do here. And they complained a lot about that.

And so, with the taxi board, the taxi drivers are happy with it. They're happy with how it operates, with what comes with it. So their question is: Why do we have to dissolve it in the first place? Because they are scared of the regulations, rate—changes in regulation that will come. And they are also scared of the politics that will come with it since they won't be dealing with the taxi board any more; they will be dealing with the government—the City. And that is not something that they would like to do. So, if it is possible, they would like to keep the taxi board.

And my dad was—told me that when this decision was made, it was not discussed with a wide variety of people, it was discussed with few people, and there wasn't a big group consensus as to what changes are going to be implemented, why they were going to be implemented, and they didn't really have a chance to raise their concerns about this until now.

So the taxi drivers understand that times are developing, we're going into a modern age, and things always change. And they're willing to change with it. They just ask that the City is supporting of them, they understand their concerns and they bring changes to the Bill 30 so that it doesn't have as detrimental of an effect on them and it's a more—smoother transition for them.

And, at the end of the day, why do we need Uber if the taxis are able to provide for the city, since in the summers, the business goes very slow, and then in the winters, it gets better. But then you have Christmas taxis that are implemented, and then the business comes down again. So, if customers are being delayed in their pickups, or they're not getting picked up, then I would understand the Uber—there is a need for Uber. But, if that is not the case, then why do we need Uber in the first place?

So it's a big community that is going to be affected by all of this, and we just want the support of the City.

Thank you.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Brar, for your presentation. I'd like to ask now for members of the committee who would like to ask some questions.

Mr. Selinger: First of all, thank you, Gurmeet [*phonetic*], and thank you, Jadtar, for coming down with your son and for an excellent presentation.

The first part of your presentation, Gurmeet [*phonetic*], I think you were suggesting that the market for customers is already shrinking in Winnipeg. Would you like to elaborate on that just briefly? What business has been taken away from the taxi industry right now?

Mr. Gurneet Brar, on behalf of Mr. Jadtar Brar: Like I said before, they used to transport people who were working with the CNCP. They had contracts. They don't have those contracts anymore, so that was a big shrinkage. And then there were handi-taxis that were separated and specialized just for handis. So that is a huge impact on them.

And, in terms of—we're, like, we're getting better city transport like buses, so you have less people taking taxis. Over the years, we have seen a shrinkage in the amount of people taking taxis. And that's, like, seen with the amount of earnings that my dad brings home at the end of the day.

Mr. Selinger: So it's your feeling that—and your analysis that, in a shrinking market, to add a new competitor with a different set of rules will make the ability of people like your father to make a living extremely difficult.

Mr. Gurneet Brar, on behalf of Mr. Jadtar Brar: Yes, I do agree with that.

And—I mean, it's a completely different area, but—kind of a similar thing happened with Target coming into Canada. With Walmart being so big and everyone going to Walmart and Superstore—the States doesn't have Superstore. So, when they brought in Target, they weren't even making that much money. And they had to shut down, because there was something like they were projected to earn—make profit far down into the future.

So that was competition, and that competition halved the market. And they weren't able to profit. And that could happen with the taxis as well.

Mr. Selinger: Did you want to comment on what safety procedures you believe need to be in place, no matter who offers the taxi service in Winnipeg?

Mr. Gurneet Brar, on behalf of Mr. Jadtar Brar: The shield is very important. It protects the driver from so many different attacks that can come on them. From the back, from the side, it—there was a statistic that crime came down with that 'implemate'—implementation, and with cameras.

Since everything is regulated, if the driver is about to do something, they will think twice because they are being watched. If the customer is about to do something, they can see the camera in their face and they will know that, you know, even if they do something and run away, at the end of the day, they—the police will know who did it and they'll be able to find them after an investigation.

Mr. Selinger: It's my impression from listening to other people present tonight that the camera has been a key—a camera that can't be shut off—a video camera that cannot be shut off has been a key feature of safety for both customers and drivers. Would you agree with that?

Mr. Gurneet Brar, on behalf of Mr. Jadtar Brar: Yes, I would totally agree with that.

Mr. Saran: Thanks for coming. For the last 57 years, taxi industry under the province. Why you think the province woke up now and they want to make a change? Don't you think there could be some kind of deal between city, province and the Uber? What do you think about that?

Mr. Gurneet Brar, on behalf of Mr. Jadtar Brar: That is also always a possibility because before Uber, this was never an issue at all. My dad never knew anything about this. He never came home and talked about some—a change like this about to be implemented, and it's only in recent times when Uber's coming in that this is. So it is something that can be connected and it raises the issue as to why now.

Mr. Saran: Also, I think this community is politically wary of them which only taxi industry—majority of that. Is not—there is some other motive to reduce its power—critical power—so when taxi goes to the city and the constituency will be bigger and population will be small portion of that, in province we—this Eastern community in some of the constituencies have really effective population and they can make the difference.

In their subtle way of not only economically to reduce the power of this community, it's also politically to reduce the power of communities. Maybe that could be also subtle way of doing things.

Mr. Gurneet Brar, on behalf of Mr. Jadtar Brar: It for sure can. It's a huge community and it's only growing, so it could be something that needs to be—could be seen as something that needs to be controlled and that's why this change is being implemented, so that is something that should be looked at and it's something that we want to discuss about openly before any changes are made.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Time for questions has expired. Thank you, Mr. Brar, for your presentation.

Mr. Maloway: Mr. Chair, I would like to get permission to hear from Mr. Dhaliwal, No. 65, Vhegwamp Dhaliwal. He has to pick up his kid from the hospital or visit his kid in the hospital, so he's eager to make his presentation. *[interjection]*

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Can I ask if there's agreement of the committee to let No. 65, Mr. Dhaliwal, speak? *[Agreed]*

Mr. Dhaliwal, do you have any written materials for distribution for the committee?

Mr. Vhegwamp Dhaliwal (Private Citizen): No, Sir, thank you.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Okay, then you may proceed with your presentation.

Mr. Vhegwamp Dhaliwal: Thanks, everyone. My name is Vhegwamp Dhaliwal. Thank you for the chance to present tonight.

Madam Chairperson in the Chair

I came here in 2000 and I start working for—as a taxi driver from 2000. I'm married. I have three kids. All three kids goes to school. I'm working taxi industry almost, like, 16, 17 years.

First, when I start driving, I drove nighttime. I drove at least, like, 12 years nighttime. Then I buy taxi and I have a loan on my house and pay for the taxi.

* (21:20)

And taxi drivers have to have many qualifications to drive. We have to get a criminal record check, child abuse record check. We have to take wheelchair accessible courses and get a class 4 licence to drive a taxi for the taxi to be drivable. The taxi has to be inspected every six months. The taxi

has to have safety cameras, safety shields, and the owner has to pay \$11,000 per year on insurance.

We make sure that we take as many safety precautions to make sure that the driver and the passengers are safe. Do big companies like Uber and Lyft also have to follow these regulations? If not, then why not? Everybody have the same rules and regulations. What is the mean by ride sharing? This is a loophole. Ride sharing—nothing is same like taxi. They are picking up customers from one place to other place, same like taxi picking the customer. What—why they call Uber and Lyft, they don't pay the same insurance we do pay.

Taxi is my investment. It is my pension. According to the Bill 30, my investment, pension and property are being dissolved. When other people get their property dissolved by the government, they are given compensations. Why are taxi owners not given compensation when our property is being dissolved? When I think about what ride sharing means, it means that I give people ride for free? What Uber and Lyft are charging people money for this service, they are not giving the ride free, and their ride—they're not same price they charging to the people. Sometimes they charging double; sometimes they charging triple. Where are the rules? Where are the laws for those people? They should be called a taxi service and scheduled to be regulated like a taxi. What is the difference between Uber and taxi?—same thing.

Bill 30 also mention that when it is passed no one can sue the government. If the government believe that this bill is good, then why mention that we cannot sue the government?

The biggest thing that Bill 30 should address is that all vehicles for hire should have the same playing field and get the same opportunity to complete with—compete with each other.

Our industry is about service and about safety. Please keep it that way.

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Dhaliwal, your time for presentation has now expired, and we are going to move on to questions from the committee.

Are there any questions from the committee members?

Mr. Selinger: Thank you, Mr. Dhaliwal, for coming and presenting tonight.

Are you the owner of one taxi licence?

Mr. Vhegwamp Dhaliwal: Yes, sir. I'm owner of the one taxi.

Mr. Selinger: That represents, as you said, your main source of property for retirement?

Mr. Vhegwamp Dhaliwal: Yes, sir. That's my pension in the old days. All my family, my kids going to school, my parents who live with me, all depend on taxi.

Mr. Ewasko: Mr. Dhaliwal, I appreciate you coming and sharing your presentation today.

Mr. Selinger had asked you a question in regards to your licence. If you don't mind me asking, was it—it was another member, another taxi owner that sold you that licence? Or how did that work?

Mr. Vhegwamp Dhaliwal: Yes, I buy from other owner.

Mr. Selinger: With respect to your pension and—which is based on owning a taxicab licence, you made the point, which I thought you made very well, that that is being dissolved by this piece of legislation without compensation.

Mr. Vhegwamp Dhaliwal: Yes. When they put in that Uber in the city, because the—like, licence, like taxi prices drop very fastly, and that price is not anymore.

Mr. Ewasko: Mr. Dhaliwal, if I buy a—if I purchase a house for \$300,000 and the housing market starts to go down, and say that that house then is valued at 150 or 200 thousand dollars, is that necessarily the government's fault?

Mr. Vhegwamp Dhaliwal: It's like—depend on the—but the government is making the rule, because this is the same like property.

Mr. Selinger: Yes, what is distinctive about this legislation is this is a deliberate piece of legislation which explicitly does not allow any compensation for you by introducing outside players to this market, such as Uber, and that means that your property, your taxi licence, has already dropped in value. Can you indicate how much you may have paid for your licence and what you think it is worth now?

Mr. Vhegwamp Dhaliwal: I paid almost \$400,000 and it now is about one hundred something, like, 120 or 125.

Mr. Ewasko: Mr. Dhaliwal, does Bill 30—if it's implemented—does it actually stop you from making a living?

Mr. Vhegwamp Dhaliwal: It's not stopping—stop me to making a living, but it can be like way, way less, because it's more competition. There is no limit on the cars in Uber. Like, I don't know how many thousand people, because they don't have any limit on the cars. We don't have a big city, like how we can survive?

Mr. Ewasko: Mr. Dhaliwal, how do you know that there's no limit to a ride-sharing company coming in if this is then sent over to the City of Winnipeg's jurisdiction?

Mr. Vhegwamp Dhaliwal: That's what—when you say—when you go on Uber's site, there is no limit on the site. There is part-time, there is full-time; you can drove one hour, you can drove two hours, you can drove five hours, you can drove not even—if you want to stop you can stop. No—nothing like that.

Mr. Ewasko: Mr. Dhaliwal, so then, you, as a taxi owner or a taxi driver, you don't have the same rights? You can't drive for one or two hours and stop or three hours and stop or 12 hours and stop?

Mr. Vhegwamp Dhaliwal: I have the same thing, I can do whatever I like to, but there is too many expenses on the taxi. We pay lots of insurance prices. All other taxi pieces, all to the government. We can't drive for two hours or three hours. How we can pay the—all these expensive, and how we can survive our family like that?

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you for your presentation. Just to get back to something Mr. Ewasko said earlier, that we already have a pretty good idea of what kind of rules ride-sharing companies like Uber want to have, because they're in other jurisdictions already, aren't they? So we already know that they don't want to have any of these things that we've talked about, right?

Mr. Vhegwamp Dhaliwal: Yes. I'm agree with that, what you say, sir.

Madam Chairperson: The time for questioning has now expired. Thank you very much for your presentation.

Mr. Maloway: Like to ask for leave to allow No. 80 on your list, Amitoj Gill. The last name's Gill; it's No. 80 on the list. Is that acceptable?

Madam Chairperson: Is it the will of the committee to allow No. 80, Amitoj Gill, to present at this time? Is that agreed?

* (21:30)

An Honourable Member: Yes.

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Madam Chairperson: Agreed? Agreed?

Mr. Wharton: Just for clarity, I understand that this fellow's here, but was—I think there might be a fellow that was probably here earlier that might want to speak that was probably thinking he was going to speak 'abown' this time. So I think maybe we should canvass, maybe, the room to ensure that he's not here as well, so that we're not getting into a one here, one there, so.

Madam Chairperson: We need to deal with this matter first. If we will be allowing Mr. Amitoj Gill to present at this point, and if that is not the will of the committee, then someone needs to indicate so. Otherwise, that is the question before us.

Mr. Maloway: I just want to say that this is our fourth night. This a 14-hour day, and we have asked for a number of requests where people in the hospital and other reasons. Here's my pile from today. I have a similar pile from every other day. Not one person has come up to me and complained that I took somebody else before them, because that's the suggestion being made, that maybe somebody's out there that wants to speak and is not willing to let the other people go before. And I just want to assure it's a small list, and there's good reasons why we're asking for leave.

Mr. Wharton: It's—it seems like the member from Elmwood seems to have a good control over who's coming at certain times, so I think my recommendation would be move forward with this presenter.

Madam Chairperson: Is it the will of the committee to move forward with No. 80, Amitoj Gill? *[Agreed]*

Mr. Gill, you have any written materials for distribution to the committee?

Mr. Amitoj Gill (Private Citizen): I have nothing.

Madam Chairperson: Please proceed with your presentation.

Mr. Amitoj Gill: Okay, thanks, everyone, for giving the time and sorry for that, all that interruption. Sorry for that.

And I'm driving cab for the last eight years, and for—talking about this Bill 30, I can say this: Bill 30's kind of discrimination. This is not discrimination just for the—for my skin; it's discrimination for everyone,

even those sitting—people sitting in this Chamber, like you, you, this discrimination for everyone. Discrimination for the drivers: no one was considered the time when the government tried to pass the bill. They should have to ask the people, the—working in the industry for the 30, 40 years. They should have to ask them, too. Like, we will to go do this, and discrimination for the customers too. Not everyone got have the—those smart cell phones. Not everyone can use their credit cards, and there's lots people in the city, they're disabled; they need the accessible taxis. So what we are talking about: TNC.

In TNC, they don't have the—those accessible taxi options. So that's the discrimination for those people too.

And one more thing I wanted to say, like, one of the committee members says, like, we're going to pass the Bill 30 and this goes to a City of Winnipeg. I agree. If—before that, the Taxicab Board, they were handling all the complaints, compliments, everything. So how the City of Winnipeg can draft the bylaws before it was handled by the City of—provincial government. Now, the City of Winnipeg, they want to draft the bylaws, but they have to adopt the same bylaws. Then after a few months, they can read what they had—the feedback. After that, they can draft the bylaws.

And one more thing, like, in our city council, they're saying they don't have enough fund for the WPS, and what they're spending hundreds of thousand dollars in all those surveys and drafting bylaws. I think that money can be used for the WPS or for the safety of the citizens

And this is—seems like—everyone seems like they're—they want—they're in a rush to bring the TNC, like transport network companies like Uber, Lyft, all those companies. But if they want to come, they should be fulfilled. Everyone should be treated like the same.

Back home, we came here all my—all—some people that's working with me, they have nice jobs, they have nice SUV provided by the company, food is free for them, everything. But I was here, I was happy because in this country, in this beautiful country, everyone is treated fairly. There is no difference, like someone is rich and someone is poor. Everyone is equal. But in this case, it seems like rules are different for the upper and middle class.

And one more thing, it's that the safety is the biggest concern for the person who's going to drive

the Uber and the citizens of this city, too. Few years before, there was the—someone killed like a lady in the St. Vital, and the witness they saw cab, they took the cab from the Elizabeth way and go St. Vital, they killed a lady. How they find? Because the cab dropped them and they called Duffy's, Unicity and they find.

So if someone took the—someone is—want to do those kind of things and they took the Uber how you going to recognize who drop them off there if they're in the Lexus that—thousands of people they have the Lexus cars, how—if I see car, yes, someone dropped by the Lexus 300. So to whom they should call? After that, they checked the camera, everything, and they found those people guilty and I think they're in the jail right now.

And one more thing, we were talking about just before cheaper rides. Later on, someone can ask for the cheaper liquor too and lots stuff they can ask for the cheaper. You can't provide. Or anyone can stand up and say I am above the laws and I not want to follow the rules and I can provide the cheaper liquor for the everyone and, you know, what people can ask the cheap.

And this—moreover that, there's a safety concern, too. There's a shield, camera and the panic button, which we can use if we—there were anyone is in the trouble. If something happens outside of the—this legislation building right now and they came with the Uber or so-called OTNCs, so to whom Winnipeg police can call because they have no dispatch system. That's the main concern, too. That time, they're going to find next day who was there, maybe they were not in the city anymore. They were away from city.

And one more thing. I am driving cab and there's any issue in my licence, the same day they call the Taxicab Board and they call the Duffy's, Unicity. They send emails to them so everybody knows this person is not able to drive the cab. So they suspend my ID and I'm not supposed to be on the road. Same time. And so that means if we want to pass the—if you guys, not me—if you guys want to pass TNCs, so that means MPI should have to share the licence information to the—those companies too. So that's not good for the privacy of those people. Like, maybe good for the politicians, to everybody maybe next day they are on the Internet like this one is the—this is information of that person.

So I'm—that's the little concern too. So how they going to find, like, my licence is suspended and still I'm driving the Uber because they don't know my

licence is suspended if they—the only way they know, MPI should have to mail them. So that means every time they did a suspension, anything happen to the licence, they have to send email to them. So I think that's not good for the privacy for anyone.

And there should be compensation for everyone, like, before the—like, if someone was asking for the question—I'm not good in the numbers and the names. Like, if I buy the house for \$200,000 and the next day it's \$50,000, this is not the same suggestion, I think. You're better than me, but I think this is not the same suggestion. If you are saying I live in the house and you are saying just evacuate the house, and I want to build a new building, there's always compensation there. This draft, this is the same like that. You guys are telling us just leave your cab and we want to bring the TNC, all those networking companies, in the city.

* (21:40)

So everyone is rushing, running behind them and want to approve the bylaws for them, but at least there should be—we should consider not—I'm cab driver, not consider me, but should be consider the safety of the people who going to use them, who going to drive them.

Lots of crime in our city. Anyone can use them. I can steal your credit card. I can punch and call the Uber. I can make fake IDs, and I can use those IDs and use the Uber. I was in Alberta, and I know how it works. I can make three or four IDs, and I can make the three or four accounts, and I can use the Uber, and you can't—you will be—you can't find me. How you going to find? There should be my picture. Maybe I used the wrong picture. It's all in my hands. Maybe I can use your picture on my profile. So they're not going to find you, so—maybe yours too, yes.

Yes, that's all I can say, so.

Madam Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation.

Mr. Wharton: Thank you, Mr. Gill, for your presentation. Again, as we've talked—the committee has mentioned many times, and the members have mentioned, it's been a very informative week, and we've appreciated each and every one of you for the time you've taken away from your families, away from your business and—to come out and present your concerns. And again, we greatly appreciate that.

I just wanted to touch again on a point that has come up several times, and again, you had mentioned it yourself, about consultations, that you said apparently there weren't any consultations at all. Is that correct?

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Gill.

Mr. Amitoj Gill: Sorry.

Yes, there should be some kind of consultation. Like, there's people working in the industry for 10, 30 years, so they spend whole their life there. So if you're drafting something so—that going to affect my job, so it's fair. It's equal. So if someone ask you, we going to do this, I'm not saying, like, you have to do this, but still, there should be something fair for us, too.

Mr. Wharton: Thank you for that.

Are you aware, about five years ago, the former government—the NDP government—did a survey in the industry? Are you aware of that, sir?

Mr. Amitoj Gill: Yes.

Mr. Wharton: Are you aware of the outcomes of that survey?

Mr. Amitoj Gill: No. Maybe I just forget that all. I'm a little nervous, like, standing here. This is first time, so standing in front of so many people, so.

Mr. Wharton: You are doing a great job, and don't be nervous. I know it's very difficult. That's why a lot of us probably took toastmasters before we started getting up in front of a crowd. So I commend you for what you're doing.

Now, I—just again, 2013, they did a survey. And then, fast-forward ahead, the same former government, the NDP government, commissioned the MNP report. Are you aware of that, sir?

Mr. Amitoj Gill: No.

Mr. Wharton: Further to that, the MNP report was commissioned by the former NDP government. And I just have a couple of quotes if I have time. I hope I can get them to you, sir.

I'll just read here: the MNP report: The MNP's comprehensive review of the taxicab industry indicated that the public wants more transportation options. The report also suggested that the current supply of taxicabs in the city of Winnipeg is not sufficient to meet the existing demand—this was an MNP report that the NDP government commissioned

in 2015—experience in other jurisdictions suggest that the traditional taxicab services can still maintain a role in local transportation—the local transportation market after the introduction of TNCs, and the phone dispatch and street hails will remain an important part of your business.

That was commissioned in 2015 by the NDP. That's one of the reasons why we're talking today, and that's why—and the Bill 30 is simply moving the regulatory regime from the provincial government to the municipal government, City of Winnipeg. And currently, every—there's half a dozen municipalities in Manitoba that currently have their own bylaws.

I just wanted to bring that to your attention, sir.

Mr. Amitoj Gill: Yes, if they—I know there's a lost cities, they have the—they draft the bylaws, but this situation is different.

We can't compare our city to Alberta, Toronto. If someone is jumping in the river, I'm not going to jump in the river, too. So that makes the difference too. If there is—if they need the—more service, yes, you can put them out—more cabs too, but not kill the industry like that. So, we welcome TNC. I'm not against them. Okay, bring them. But there should be the fair field. There should be the same rules what we have, and they should have the same rules too.

So, they're—nobody's above the rules. If the next day I'm going to say you, I want to open the restaurant, but I don't want to get the food certificate, and I don't want any inspector to come and check my restaurant. So that's not fair. You know, there should be something. So that's we are asking. We are not here for, like—you are not—we're not asking you, just stop it.

So—and we know you're—I don't know you're going to stop this or no, but still, there should be the fair fields for everyone. So you—if you can change the rules for someone, so I can tell you the 10 or 15 doctors' number in the city and they are in the procedure to getting the licences. If you want to, you can change the rules. Like, they don't have to get the licence and bring them in this service. They have the 10, 15 years' experience back home. Someone is from Philippines, India.

Mr. Wharton: I thank you, and I really appreciate your sense of humour, as well, in a very difficult time. And thank you so much for your presentation, and again, we take—we're taking some good notes back. Thank you very much.

Mr. Lindsey: I thank you very much for your presentation, and really, a lot of what you've said really gets to the heart of the matter. You're not opposed to competition, but you want competition on an equal footing so that the rules are the same for everybody.

Mr. Amitoj Gill: Yes, that's right. There should be the rule for—the rules should be the same for everyone.

Madam Chairperson: Thank you very much. The time for questioning has now ended.

I will now call upon No. 152, Tsegai Golom.

Mr. Golom, do you have any written material for distribution to the committee?

Mr. Tsegai Golom (Private Citizen): No, I do not.

Madam Chairperson: Okay. Please proceed with your presentation.

Mr. Golom: Good evening, respected members of consulates and legislative. Thank you for listening our concerns.

I am going to give you a little what I experience in my driving. I see all the good, the bad and the ugly in driving a taxi. I started 20 years ago. I was, by trade, I was an airplane mechanic back home, but when I came here, when I go to—to go to my trade, they asked me, do you have Canadian experience? Well, I was telling them, how can I have Canadian experience if I was not in Canada?

Then I started as a mechanic in a garage. Then, from there, I go to—I was working with the Canadian Wheat Board for six years. Then I worked as a part time—it was not enough, it was a little above minimum wage—and then I started to work, part time, a taxi for two, three years. Then I started to have a share with another guy, and I buy my share, a taxi.

It doesn't mean a taxi is making more money, but nobody stop you. There is no limit on time riding. The more you drive, the more you make; a little better than seven hours in the office.

Then, I have my own. I guess I couldn't go back to school. I am a little older. Even I passed the retirement age by now, but I don't have to—enough for retirement. I am still working.

Then, I see so many things in driving: sometimes aggression, sometimes they don't pay fare. In fact, yesterday, I got a customer, early morning, going to

work. She was in my cab and she spend almost 20 minutes—\$20. I was ask her, if you are going to pay me, give me ahead. If not, this is too much now. So she said, I will pay you. Okay, do you have the money? No. She do—refuse. Then I told her, because I know this money, she—it is not going to give me. Okay, get out from the taxi; get another one. Then she said no. She didn't want get out from my cab; and I brought her to the police station. At the police station, they—two cops, they were there. They ask her; they ask me, and they give me the incident number. She said I am going to pay to the office. I just wouldn't go. I left and she didn't pay the fare, which is \$30.

* (21:50)

So, on this business, we face so many things, and now—by the way, my—I paid my taxi, but I have still mortgage. And the taxi, I put for sale because, as I told you, I'm retired. I'm over retired now—over retirement age now. I put for sale for two years because when they heard about Uber, nobody asked me to buy. So I still working, I have my neighbour, Mr. Blair. He see me every day I go to work.

But, when Uber comes, it really is affecting us, all our life. I have my children, thanks—some of them go to university, and almost one of them is successfully finished. The one is my daughter, is still going to finish next year, as a nurse. So I am losing my retirement now. I don't have hope unless this bill is withdrawn.

So, when Uber comes, Uber is not going to serve for everybody. Uber is going to serve for those who are able to afford the iPhone, for the businesspeople, well-equipped people. They are not serving same like me, like the other—my cab drivers behind me. We serve to old, disabled, poor, rich, everywhere we go. So this Uber, for the first time, they say their bill is low, because the low is—they have a reason to be low. They don't pay the same like we—us for insurance, for—already heard it about this one. That is no new to say. But I heard one of their speakers on CJOB. They—he said they are going to work for 10 hours a week. Nobody is going to tell them, you get out; you already work 10 hours. They work as long as they want. Nobody is going to say, yes, you make this; that's enough.

So we want you, the government and you, all the members of—like this—to draw this one, to talk to whom is concerned, and to help us to say and—to serve the people as we used to do. Thank you.

Madam Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation.

Do members of the committee have questions?

Mr. Blair Yakimoski (Transcona): Thank you very much for coming out, Tsegai. It's good to hear your story as a representative of taxi drivers here in Winnipeg and as a friend. I would be—you are a very, very good representation of the best there would be in terms of taxi drivers. Your kindness and how you deal with people is wonderful. Thank you very much for taking the time out tonight and coming in, telling us your story.

Mr. Golom: Thank you. Thank you. I appreciate for your compliment. I appreciate. Thank you very much.

Mr. Lindsey: I want to thank you for coming out and sharing your thoughts as well that, really, the problems with this bill far outweigh any benefits, and certainly there's no benefits to you with this bill, so the best outcome possible for taxi drivers right now is to withdraw Bill 30. Is that correct?

Mr. Golom: Yes, indeed. That's what we are coming. All these cab drivers are concerned. We are just voicing our—giving our voice for you, for the government, to consider this.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you for that, and I understand that you've had conversations with Mr. Yakimoski about this in the past. And I hope you continue to have conversations with him about it so that he can come back to his friends here and try and convince them that what they're proposing really isn't good for your friendship, because it's not good for you.

So I just want to clarify that the issue of compensation—if they insist on going ahead with this bill as it stands now, it very specifically says that it doesn't matter if your taxi is now worthless; there will be no compensation. So, at the very least, would you like to see that changed so that you're adequately compensated?

Mr. Golom: Well, for me, as I told you, if I get what I—it was the price of the taxi, I will take it. But for most, they are middle-aged drivers, younger drivers. They want to have their work continue, not compensation.

Mr. Selinger: Thank you, Mr. Golom, for coming tonight.

I thought I heard you say that you've been trying to sell your licence for your cab or your taxi for the

last two years, and you've seen no buyers because they're concerned about this threat of Uber coming to Winnipeg. Is that true?

Mr. Golom: Indeed, it is true. That's true, and nobody's—they panic. Everybody is just—

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Selinger.

Mr. Selinger: So it seems to me that just withdrawing this Bill 30 would not be sufficient to protect the value of your licence unless there was a specific period of time set out that no Uber-type of activities would be allowed into this market. Otherwise, if the threat's there, every legislative session or every year you're still going to have trouble selling your licence. Is that correct?

Mr. Golom: Indeed, it is. Yes, people, they—it is uncertain. People, they don't want to buy. Most of them, you heard them—some of them, as I told you—I about—they were a little less than this time, the last four, five years. But a lot of them, they bought it—300, 400, 500 and—not 500—400, 350,000. They are in trouble for sure.

Mr. Selinger: And we've heard a lot about compensation.

I've been thinking about other industries that are going through dramatic change. For example, the fishing industry. And often, the government will buy out their licences, if they feel that they need less fishermen, for example. Or if, in this case, that they feel that they need a new business model with more competition.

So would it be your view that, if they're going to change the rules, that they ought—the government ought to not just compensate, but actually buy your licence back at the market value before this threat occurred?

Mr. Golom: If they can afford, the government can buy all what they were, the price. On my side, I can't speak for the older people, but for me I am too old to drive to work. I go to retirement for sure.

Madam Chairperson: The time for questions has expired. Thank you very much for your presentation.

Mr. Maloway: I wondered if we could have leave of the committee to have a—No. 167, Jagjit Deol, do his presentation.

Madam Chairperson: Is it the will of the committee to allow No. 167, Jagjit Deol, to present at this time? *[Agreed]*

I will now call Jagjit Deol. Mr. Deol, do you—oh, go ahead with your presentation.

* (22:00)

Mr. Jagjit Deol (Private Citizen): Respectable Chairperson and respected committee members, good evening. My name's Jagjit Deol, right, I just—I want to—I don't want to make a long presentation, but I want to say a few concerns which is with me and my family and, also, about security for the peoples and the drivers.

Okay. In '93, I came to Winnipeg from India and I did few months one job. After that, I got a Taxicab Board licence. I started to drive a cab, right, and almost right now 24 years I'm driving a cab with Unicity and three and a half years ago—I was thinking long time ago, but three and a half years ago I was talking with my family I want to buy the cab licence.

My parents, they are both retired teachers from the high school, and they are get retirement back in India. They are not retired from here. So the—my dad and mom, they are living with me right now, they said that if you want to buy the licence, right, we will help you. I said, Mom, I can't afford it. It's almost close to half million dollars. My mom and dad, they did a service as a teacher back in India over 40 years. They said, don't worry, we will help you. I don't know how much, but we can try it. Finally, my mom and dad, they bring it to close to \$200,000 from back to India to here to help me, which is their hard-earning money from the 40 years service, and rest of—I buy the licence three and a half years ago, \$486,000. Top of that, I buy the brand-new car, Prius V, which is—I spend \$33,000. Over half a million dollars I spent that. Two hundred thousand dollars, my parents give it to me buy the licence. They help me out, and rest of the money I buy the—I get the loan from the RBC bank, which is close to—over \$5 million. And I spend for 24 years in this field.

So now, right, three and a half years ago, there's nothing I heard about Uber, so I spend my parents' hard-earning money, which is—they saved in 40 years, and also I got \$300,000 from the RBC bank. So now I'm thinking how big I'm stupid, right. I spent my parents' hard-earning money, which is—they saved in 40 years and also still I have a loan under my name with the RBC bank.

So I'm thinking—I'm feeling something—really sorry about my parents. I ruined his hard-earning money and I just spent the money because I want to

make a good future of my kids. I had it—I have two kids, right, 16 and 23 years old, and the 16-year-old, my son, he's just in 11 grade, but my other son, he went to University of Winnipeg. He—earlier this year, he did five-year degree in a bachelor's of science in biochemistry, and he passed—just a couple months ago he passed the MCAT test. Now he went to the medical school. So right—I always push my kids, right, your grandfather's well educated. I'm also engineer from back from India, right, but I wanted—I always said to my kids, right, don't worry. I help you out no matter what, right. But now, always my kids they are asking, oh dad, we are the—heard about Uber this and that. I said, don't worry, right.

That time, I never heard of—like, as I say, I never heard about the Uber three and a half years ago. That time, I spent five—close to \$500,000—half million dollars, and the last licence sold a couple months ago it was \$154,000, and I try to sold my cab for \$70,000. I put the note in Unicity there. Anybody come forward, if anybody buy for \$70,000, but nobody contacted me yet. So that means everybody knows if Uber comes, the price going to be zero in the next few months.

So now I don't know about my future. I don't know about my mom, dad, but I want to make my kids' future, but how I can make my kids' future when my—I'm losing my job in a few months, maybe in—by Christmas or in February?

And the second thing I want to talk about the safety, and most of them, probably you know that the last murder on the cab, the cab driver, Pritam Singh Deol. He was my uncle, and he was killed by three kids in The Maples area when—2001. Before 2001, we don't have a camera and mandatory shield. If we have that safety equipment in the car before that, then I think my uncle, he will be alive today. So I'm just asking from—I'm not in the favour of the Bill 30; I just want to request to respect our delegate to drawn the bill at the sake of our family members. Don't think only those cab drivers. We are, like—I have nine people at home, and me and wife is only working in the family. And my parents living with me; they're not working anymore. And Mr. Saran, he know me well, and what else? I had a cousin there who just recently, two months ago, came from India. He's living with me. I'm helping him. He didn't find a job yet.

So if the government want to bring the Uber bill and pass the bill and bring it, Uber here, so anybody can let me know, right, how can I pay my debt, the

loan, which is still under close to \$300,000? And how can I support my son who's already went in the medical, the med school? And I—sometimes I'm getting crazy, right. When I'm spending anybody from you guys, like, you guys spend anything on, like, how many are spending in any business, and next day, the government said, right, oh, your business going to be zero, just going to be out from—*[inaudible]* What's going on you heart?

And a few—earlier, there's a—my sister, Gomen *[phonetic]*, and a little girl talked about rules. How you can set up the rules on two teams when they are playing in the same field, when the same game? This is not a fairness.

And before the Assembly elections, I went to in one dinner party there, which is arranged by cab drivers. Duffy's and Unicity, I think, there's a 50—over 50 cab drivers and owners there. Honourable Premier Brian Pallister, he was there, and he make a promise with us, and I had the video of that—I mean, the dinner party's, which is, I can show you, I can bring it, even on Monday, if you—anybody want to see it. The Premier make a promise with us; it will be a level playing field, fair field, right? So don't worry. We are not, like, putting, like—I'm sorry.

So one thing I want to add more, right: how the government elected anybody put behind the wheel who doesn't have the city knowledge, who doesn't have the criminal record, who doesn't have the child abuse certificate, right? How you can put anybody—put behind the wheel and how anybody can send daughters or your family members with a stranger?

We go through the general knowledge test, go through our Taxicab Board licence, and then we every year we have to get a criminal record, then we have to child abuse certificate, right? Then we have—there is a camera for the, like, earlier, I said my uncle, he will be alive if there's a camera before 2001.

* (22:10)

So I'm asking to the respected committee members: If the Uber come, if the Uber driver doesn't need the city knowledge test, doesn't need a criminal record check, doesn't need a child abuse, doesn't need a camera, doesn't need a safety shield, if anything happened with any girls, right, I—there's girls in my family too—so who will be responsible? Is the government, the committee members? Who is going to be taking responsibility for—

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Deol, your time for presentation has now expired and we are going to move ahead with questions.

Mr. Wharton: Thank you, Mr. Deol, for your presentation. We have a couple of things in common. First of all, we're both small-business owners—I was a small-business owner for 30 years—and we both asked our parents to help us get our start, and I did the same thing in 1982, where mom and dad stepped up and helped me get my start in business, so I certainly can appreciate where you're coming from.

Quick question for you: when you have a mortgage, of course, when you take out a \$300,000 mortgage and we have to pay it back, and typically it takes anywhere—depending on amortization—25, 30 years, maybe even 15 to 20, depending on how you set it up. On a \$500,000 loan, thankfully 200 from mom and dad, but the 300 from the Royal Bank—*[interjection]*—yes, that must take a long time. *[interjection]*

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Deol.

Mr. Deol: —twenty five years amortization—I'm sorry, there. It's set up with 25 years amortization. So, I'm—because I—there's nine people living in my family, so I'm right now—I'm not paying the full payment. I'm—sometimes I just pay the only the interest there. The debt is still under my name, there.

Mr. Wharton: So you took out that loan a couple years ago, you said.

Mr. Deol: I took out from the RBC bank, there.

Mr. Ewasko: Thank you, Mr. Deol, for your presentation.

It—you put a lot of great points on the record and, you know, you mentioned safety and you mentioned all these things about Uber and, according to you, them not having all these various different safety things.

The other night I was on committee, on Monday, and the member from Logan, Ms. Marcelino, had mentioned that she's taken Uber three times. I've never taken Uber. I've always taken cabs here in the city or any other place where I've traveled if I have had to take some sort of form of transportation like that. So, with Uber being so unsafe, as you're making it out to be—and I don't know, but we've got Ms. Marcelino, has taken Uber three times and she is a brilliant lady. She was a minister in the previous government, and so why would somebody like that take Uber if it's so unsafe?

Mr. Deol: Please let me finish. I just want—something. Probably you know that—see the news, it was in the global news. Back in India, in New Delhi, in the capital of India, one person, he was driving a cab and he raped a girl and he caught by police and this put him in jail for seven years, and he came out back on the road after seven years and he started driving Uber and registered car under Uber. And my question is why Uber doesn't track his criminal record. And after two years—two years ago, right, before now—he did the rape again and tried to kill the girl. Somehow, the girl, she survived and ran away and finally she took the picture of the back of the licence plate, and he caught again within a week and now he's in jail.

So now you can think, right, the—when the driver doesn't have the city knowledge, doesn't have the criminal record, doesn't have the child abuse certificate, how you can put him behind the wheel? It's unsafe—totally unsafe. If you want to bring Uber, let them go for the Taxicab Board general-knowledge test, through—also, get the criminal record check, also for the child abuse certificate. I'm not asking for myself, I'm asking for the people who's taking the cabs or Ubers, right. If anything happened with any girls, who going to be—get a responsibility?

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you for your presentation and thank you for your passion in believing about safety for drivers and safety for passengers, because that's really important.

And we know from experiences elsewhere that they don't—Uber doesn't have all the safety things in place that cabs in this city have. So to suggest, as earlier had been suggested, that, well, we don't know what Winnipeg city's going to do—we do have a pretty good idea what they're going to do, they're going to do the same as what everybody else has done, right. So that is going to make it unfair for current taxi businesses.

Is that correct?

Mr. Deol: I just want to say something about Honourable Mr. Mayor Brian Bowman. The other cities, they—in other cities, the Uber wanted to go there, but especially in our city the mayor wants to bring the Ubers. So if the committee puts any condition on the Uber—you have to keep the camera, safety shield or get a criminal record check or child abuse register—they are not going to come.

So when the mayor wants to bring the Uber, personally, I'm thinking he's never going to be put any condition on Uber.

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Deol, the time for questions has expired. Thank you very much for your presentation.

Mr. Maloway: Madam Chair, I would request permission of the committee to hear from Harvinder Brar, who is No. 5 and he has an interpreter. I think it's his son, I'm not sure who's who here, but—and that's my last request. I mean I had three more but they went home, so, yes. Harvinder Brar, number—

Madam Chairperson: Is there leave for the committee to allow No. 5, Harvinder Brar, to present at this time? *[Agreed]*

Mr. Brar, could you please introduce your interpreter or, maybe your interpreter—tell us your name and spell it into the mic, please.

Mr. Joban Brar, on behalf of Mr. Harvinder Brar (Private Citizen): My name is Joban Brar. J-o-b-a-n and then B-r-a-r for my last name.

Madam Chairperson: Go ahead with your presentation.

Mr. Joban Brar, on behalf of Mr. Harvinder Brar: So I'm going to be speaking on behalf of my father here, Harvinder Brar, and what he—so I am proud to be part of the taxi industry and Manitoba. I'm here tonight to tell you that Bill 30 is a bad bill.

Let me tell you how it works in the industry. You can't become a driver overnight; you have to meet the licensing requirements. You have to go through a criminal record check. You have to go through a Child Abuse Registry check. You have to go through an interview. You have to pass an English language proficiency test. You have to go through a training program, and let me tell you, one of the first things you do is you find out what the rules are, because if you don't follow the rules what happens is you get into trouble.

Over the last few months many of us has been learning about the politics in Manitoba. It's not like we're not involved, but—many of us are active politically, but the lesson we are learning here is just how people making their decisions that are affecting us often don't even know what is really going on. In other words, they haven't done their homework.

I start with what I heard from the Legislature. The minister said that there has not been an increase

in the number of taxi licences in recent years. While that said—while that may be the case with standard taxi licences, it didn't mention the fact that there has been a significant increase in other taxis.

I don't know if the minister read the report, but I'll read what MNP said: while standard taxicab numbers have remained flat at 410 and total annual supply has increased by 9 per cent, reflecting a 52 per cent increase in the number of accessible taxicabs and handicap vans, a significant increase in the number of seasonal taxicabs in 2015 provided an overall fleet increase of 15 per cent from November to March compared to 2008.

So there are a lot more taxis. The report did talk about increasing the number of licences for the next few years to maintain the current ratio, but to suggest that there's been no increase in licences is very misleading.

I also want to point out that there are many—there are more licences to serve the disabled. In our industry we know that that's important, many of our medical and other needs that we need to attend to. I can tell you every day of the week taxis are picking up people to go to the hospitals in many cases, such as emergency situations. Accessible taxis are taking our seniors and others that are disabled on a daily basis.

* (22:20)

Everywhere it is in the world Uber operates, this is the last thing that they are concerned about. If they come to Winnipeg, they may operate from the airport to downtown, let's say. You may see them in certain areas of the city, but Uber is not a solution for anyone with a disability. They are a huge problem. And, if you undercut a taxi system, you undercut our ability to serve the people most in need.

I can tell you another thing about customers. Too many have no other options for transportation. The situation is that Uber and Lyft, both ride-sharing services run with—they run with—through a app and with a credit card, so cash isn't accepted, and that's a huge problem for a lot of customers because a lot of people do—they don't keep credit cards with them, they just work with cash, and if Uber is—and Uber and Lyft ride-sharing services such as those two companies are in Winnipeg, that creates a huge problem for people who only like cash, they don't like credit cards.

And what I wanted to is just elaborate a bit on what I said with the disabilities, is that app is run

through a—I mean, that those services are run through apps, and the problem is that someone with a disability may not even know how to run—use a phone properly or let—use a phone—use a app properly or properly know how to use what the—how the app works.

There is also the fact that we charge the same rate, regardless of how busy we are. There is no such thing as surge pricing. Just to go on the computer and google Uber and surge prices and you will see thousands of stories about people payed amounts for basic taxi services at peak times.

So please look at the current system. Changes have been made to serve Winnipeggers, whether it be the increased number of the disabled taxis, whether it be the computer apps that both major companies use, we are keeping up with the times, but if you think Uber is about modernizing the taxi in—history, I don't necessarily agree with that. Uber would set us back in terms of the kind of service we can provide to the people.

It can not only—it is not only that we have 1,600 jobs, virtually all full-time supporting our families, you will be replacing that with Uber jobs, which are part time, poorly paid and don't even provide the service for the Manitobans that they deserve. And so, in a perspective, to see the difficulties that taxi drivers face, maybe you should do a bit more research on what it is to become a taxi driver and to face the hardships that they do and to see how those regulations actually work and how the drivers—how a full fare would work.

We're proud of the service that we provide. Many of us invested our life savings into this industry. We have brought significant money into Winnipeg and Canada to invest. Some people even came as business immigrants. Many others have mortgaged their homes to able to have a licence. So the financial debt is extraordinary.

With one bill, you're wiping all of this out. That is wrong. That is just plain wrong. That is not the way I see things that were brought in Manitoba. Bill 30 is at this—at what it is right now, Bill 30 is one of the most harmful pieces of legislation that we have ever seen. It will literally put hundreds and hundreds of hard-working Manitobans out of work.

Also, I would like to elaborate. This is just speaking from a personal perspective on—I would like you to give a insight of what the current situation is in our household. I am 18 and I go to the

University of Manitoba. I'm at—I'm first-year right now, and my brother is 19 and he's in his second year. The tuition fees daily skyrocket, and my father is the only provider in our house. So if you think, if tuition fees are skyrocketing and the salary in the house decreases for my father, who is the only worker in the household, you can see how much of a burden that can be on the family.

And now, many of you may think that, oh, why don't you just get student loans. Well, to that I say is, who's to guarantee that I'm getting a job after I finish my post-secondary studies? There—as—in today's generation, there are people with PhDs swiping the floors at McDonald. So debt is never good, and that's why I want to avoid it, and my father knows that debt is never good and he wants us to avoid it, basically.

And speaking from personal perspective, going to a different city this summer with—that had both ride-sharing services such as Uber and Lyft, we've seen from first-hand how safety protocols are taken between those companies. It is ridiculous. We've seen how poorly safety is taken. There's no cameras in the car. There's no safety shield in the car. There's no regulation that the taxicabs in Winnipeg have. Haunted and baffled at how bad these protocols were taken, we resorted to the metro system over there and taxis in that city. That would provide more safety for us.

And we also experienced lots of app crashes with that. And just because Uber is done through an app, we were stranded outside city parameters with no way to get home—and a popular tourist attraction where they promised—well, Uber said that it would regulate in that part of the city in that county. Well, it was at 10 at night, and no way to get home, opening the app and two minutes later, oh, sorry, try again. App crashed, app crashed, app crashed.

Haunted at how were we going to get home, we were—we just had to resort to a taxi, and we were very—we tried to contact the company, the Uber company, too, and they said, oops, we're just having problems right now. You can try again in a half an hour, so keep trying. That's not really our fault. And that's also baffling at—like, this is—like, a company like that should be able to provide proper transportation, and someone like the taxicabs in Winnipeg never had that problem. They've never had a customer saying, oh, we've been waiting for so long, why didn't these taxicabs come pick us up?

The population in Winnipeg isn't that high. For Uber to come, the competition would be immensely high with not enough population and service to go around for everyone. What that does is that—in cities where there's—the population is high, such as Edmonton or Toronto, even they're having difficulties. Like, I can speak from a personal perspective. I've had relatives who were taxi drivers in Edmonton who—when Uber came there in, I think it was 2015, when it came there, their income decreased so much, and they were left to shock and were forced to get part-time, minimum wage jobs—part-time and full-time. And you can see that someone who buys a taxi for over \$200,000 who is barely even earning enough to—

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Brar, the time for your presentation has now expired. We are going to move on to questions.

Mr. Ewasko: Thank you, Mr. Brar, for coming here and presenting on behalf of your dad and speaking so eloquently on the topic.

The—when you spoke earlier in your dad's presentation about the Hand-Transit—or, handicab, sorry—that is regulated by the City, correct? That's part one.

And part two is, what is the value of those handicabs under the City's regime?

Mr. Joban Brar, on behalf of Mr. Harvinder Brar: Can you give me a second so I can just translate?

Can I get permission to repeat that question—to just repeat that question and elaborate a bit more?

Mr. Ewasko: So, I'm going to break it into two. So, the first question is: are the handicabs regulated under the City or the Province?

Mr. Joban Brar, on behalf of Mr. Harvinder Brar: So, he said that he's not fully sure of that question. Yes.

Mr. Ewasko: So then, the second part of my question, if you could ask your dad, what is the value of a handicab? What's the value of a handicab?

Mr. Joban Brar, on behalf of Mr. Harvinder Brar: He said he doesn't know exact numbers just due to him driving a taxicab and not a handi.

Mr. Lindsey: I want to thank you for your presentation and speaking on your dad's behalf. He should be very proud of you. You've done a fine job. Obviously, so is he in bringing you up.

* (22:30)

So you talked about things like there has been an increase in taxis in the last few years, and the other thing you talked about was the ability for people to pay with cash, but both Unicity and Duffy's have apps that you can use if you want to, but you also still have the ability to pay with cash, so that makes it accessible for everybody, whereas the ride-sharing companies you can't pay with cash. So it really carves out a big portion of the population, and in you and your dad's opinion, that's not very fair, is it?

Mr. Joban Brar, on behalf of Mr. Harvinder Brar: Yes, like, elaborating on what you just said right now, I mean, I can speak on my dad's behalf when he says that a huge majority of the customers that they get daily, they pay with cash; they don't pay with a credit card. A lot of people just don't choose to have credit cards for whatever personal reasons that they may have. Cash is the efficient and sufficient way to go.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you for that, and the other part of that is that not everybody carries a smart phone. People still use pay phones, believe it or not, and people use the store phone, and people use a phone from a hotel, so just having an app is not sufficient, is it?

Mr. Joban Brar, on behalf of Mr. Harvinder Brar: Absolutely. What you just said right now, no, it's not at all. In today's era, I do agree. In 2017, a majority of people do have smart phones, but a lot of older generations, they're just used to a pay phone. I mean, when you go—like, I've—I had a part-time job at a grocery store, and I can't even tell you the numerous amount of people who, when they're done bagging their groceries, they say, can you call a cab for me? Can you call the cab for me? If ride-sharing services such as Uber and Lyft are here, if they don't have a cell phone and—then I can't really do anything about that because—and they can't either.

Mr. Saran: Yes, I was thinking about that handicab—those ones. My understanding is that some of them are under the Province, and other ones are under the City. Under the Province, those are non-transferrable. If those are non-transferrable, then they don't have any price. And don't you think, to solve all that problem, they should buy back all the taxis—the Province should buy back all the taxis, pay them whatever they paid and make all the licences non-transferrable? Then anybody can get a licence that they can drive, and they don't have that loan problem.

Mr. Joban Brar, on behalf of Mr. Harvinder Brar: Yes, I do agree with what you just said right now.

Madam Chairperson: Thank you, and that concludes the time we have for questioning. Thank you very much on your presentation, and you may now join the audience.

I will now call Rajesh Amilal, private citizen, No. 153.

Mr. Amilal, please go ahead with your presentation. Oh—do you have written materials for distribution to the committee?

Mr. Rajesh Amilal (Private Citizen): Yes, please.

Madam Chairperson: Okay. Please go ahead with your presentation.

Mr. Amilal: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Rajesh Amilal. I have been a half-share holder and operator with Unicity Taxi, No. 117, for around 15 years. I have a wife and two kids: one son and one daughter. I work long hours, usually from around a 12-hour shift—

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Amilal, my apologies, I'm going to need you to speak a little bit louder and into the microphone so that we can actually hear you on our recording devices. Okay, go ahead with your presentation.

Mr. Amilal: Good evening, everyone. My name is Rajesh Amilal. I have been a half-share holder and operator with Unicity, taxi No. 117, for around 15 years. I have a wife and two kids: one son and one daughter. I work long hours, usually from around a 12-hour shift.

The taxi industry has been what helps me feed my family and put my children through school. The taxi industry is a close group of workers, since it is based here in Manitoba.

I oppose this bill and find that it is unfair that the government wants to make such a big decision in applying this bill without at least consulting the taxi industry. The government should stop or delay this bill so they can talk with the taxi industry and get our parts in this huge decision.

I also feel that driver safety will be put at risk if this bill comes through. Taxi driving can be a dangerous job if the car does not have proper security in place, like shield and camera. Proper training also helps drivers in feeling and becoming safer when they work. There should be some sort of

law in place that holds all vehicles for hire to the highest standard of safety, like our taxi industry has.

There should also be a law in place that also protects our passengers and keeps them safe. Our taxi industry has the highest standard of passenger protection. Drivers should fully criminal background checks and zero tolerance. Rules should be applied in every vehicle for hire.

A ride-sharing app like Uber will put both passenger and drivers at risk because they don't have good safety standards and security that the current taxi industry has. I believe all drivers should be fairly treated. Manitoba needs to make sure that licensing requirement for a taxi and Uber will be same, to be fair. We should also have same insurance and same job to serve the whole city. There should also be a same requirement to charge the fare and same rates to serve all citizens, including the disabled.

We are common people who have put our own money and time into the industry. Bill 30 will threaten our jobs and stop us from feeding our families. All the investment we have put into the—our jobs will be worthless. This bill attacks our rights for fairness and will unfairly give ride-sharing apps like Uber all our customers. The government should go back and take out the parts of Bill 30 that don't allow our taxi industry to seek compensation and stop us from taking fair and just legal action.

And, when we driving the cab, there is lots of stress. And we need, mostly, proper training, camera, strobe light and other safety, which will bring our cab very safe.

So thank you for listening.

Madam Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation. We will now move on to questions.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you very much for your presentation. Can the—it's very useful to listen to people that are actually in the industry and get their thoughts on it.

What do you think the best possible outcome for you and for your industry could be from tonight's presentation? Would it be that the government actually withdraws Bill 30? Would that be the best outcome?

* (22:40)

Mr. Amilal: Yes, but if they don't want it to withdraw their bill, we want what taxi industry is,

like—has taxi licence and trainings and camera, strobe lights and proper training. So we can be working safely and good for other passengers, too.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you for that.

Really, what this should be about is about fairness, right, so that everybody's playing from the same rules. We heard a young girl talk earlier about having two sports teams on the field but they're both playing by different rules, that that's no way to play a game of anything and it's also no way to deal with life, right. So if somebody wants to be in competition, they should follow the same rules, have the same safety standards, have the same insurance requirements, have the same basic everything and compete on a equal footing. Is that right?

Mr. Amilal: Yes. I give you example. Like, if I want to open my own restaurant, I have to follow the rules, whatever industry is telling. So same thing I want it, like Uber should be follow all rules what the taxi industry has. Our—this is good for us and for our passengers and for all our community.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you for that, and you're right, that's a very good example, and it's an example that we should all look at, that it's another industry that has rules that are there to protect everybody, to protect the people that work in the kitchens, to protect the waitresses, but it also has rules that protect the customers, which really is what you're talking about with the taxi industry, that there's rules there to protect the drivers, there's rules there to protect the passengers. So to introduce a new hamburger joint that doesn't have to have a vent fan or doesn't have to follow any of the rules wouldn't be fair. And, really, to introduce a new taxi company, regardless what they call themselves, Uber or Lyft or Joe's taxi, if they don't follow the same rules, that's not fair, is it?

Mr. Amilal: Yes, if Uber doesn't follow the rules, why we need this kind of service here? Our—lots of customers will be—can be in a dangerous—if they're not going—which car they are going and they don't have a camera, they don't have a strobe light and other things like no criminal check, no child abuse. So this will be very harmful for citizens and our drivers.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you for that, and it just occurred to me while you were talking about criminal record checks, I talked the other night, when I was here at committee, about volunteering to drive for Operation Red Nose, which is a service at

Christmastime that allows people to go out and have a few drinks and somebody will drive their car home for them so that they get home safely. And do you know that in order to do that volunteer service you actually have to have a criminal record check? But now here we have somebody that's going to be a car for hire, a taxi, that may not require a criminal record check. That seems patently unfair, doesn't it?

Mr. Amilal: Yes. If they don't have any criminal checks or any other safety equipment, it shouldn't be allowed to drive in the city or in the province, and also, when they drive anywhere in the world, they try to break the laws and don't obey whatever other—whatever which city they want to go, and they don't—they try to skip the—all laws from there.

Madam Chairperson: That concludes our time for questioning of this presenter.

Thank you for your presentation.

The next presenter on our list, Mr. Gurpreet Singh—*[interjection]*—order, order—had phoned to ask—*[interjection]*—okay.

Well, you had phoned to ask to be removed from the list, but if you are here, we will hear your presentation.

Go ahead with your presentation.

Mr. Gurpreet Singh (Private Citizen): Hi, everyone. Thank you to get me here.

I did not prepare for anything, no presentation. I'm just expressing my feelings about what's going on in the industry right now.

I'm—I came eight years ago and I started driving a cab on that time. I did a couple of other jobs, too, but it didn't suit me, so I just driving a cab. So I have different experiences every day I had, in a taxi, driving. And after seven years of driving a cab, I bought my own cab. And I just requested—I requested my parents to send me some money from India. So my father, he owned a shop from the last 30 years. He sold it for me and he sent the money over here. So, I spend my savings on that, and I took a equity loan on my house, too.

So a year ago, there was no awareness about—that Bill 30 is going to be introduced. So I did the—all paperwork, legal way. Even if you buy a coffee cup, there is a—on that, like, is hot, handle with care. When I bought a cab, nobody—I got a city licence, I got a Taxicab Board licence. Nobody told me

nothing. And they said okay, keep on going. Pay the fees and you're good to go.

And after a few months in, they said there is a Bill 30 introduced. I was thinking there's something for me, like, about the safety. There's lots of issues in these days about the safety of the taxi drivers, either. Customers, too. And when I saw that, there's nothing for the taxis, they're driving from last 50, 70 years, and they said it's totally wrong and we're introducing the right thing.

So it's a fight against the right and wrong. I don't know, like, 50, 70 years experience is wrong? Or that was right, or right now they are wrong? So that's all about it. Like, if there's something wrong, why do you—did you run 50, 70 years. Long time.

Under the name of technology, they're trying to bring another competitors here. I don't think so, they are the taxi drivers. The Uber are just like pizza delivery guys. The same way they deliver the customers. They don't need anything, class 5 licence. We have the really difficult situation of driving conditions in the winter time. Last night, there's 97 cars crashed. Accidents. Find out, go. There's no taxis in there. This is the reason we are here. We have something special skills. That's why we are driving on the road.

And, on the other hand, if the students, they have an app, click on it, sit on their private car. Doesn't know, like, it's a safety from last two, three years or not. No criminal records. You're listening from every single body, right? So I have no need to say these things again and again.

So, I have lots of friends in Australia, I have lots of friends in other countries. They are driving Uber. If there's three guys living in one house, one of them, they have a car. So they don't really care. If the Uber-registered guy is sleeping, they take his phone and start making money. In the nighttime, customer, they don't really care, they don't take a look on the picture this is the right driver or the wrong driver. And that's not legal.

* (22:50)

I think you should be—like, you're sitting here. PCs should be there to introduce us. Like, this is a illegal thing. And we are trying to tell them this is the illegal thing. It shouldn't be that way, because we are going through so many safety features in our car. We—I stab—I attacked so many times with the pepper spray, with the knife and everything, but I'm totally satisfied that—with the justice system here because

we have a cab to take pictures out of it and they send somebody jail if they find out they're guilty. But I don't know on which idea you send somebody to pick up someone with no safety features, no driving experience and they just pick up somebody and in that kind of weather conditions you take the customers. That's not legal. I don't think so.

Leave the taxi as a taxi. Don't do that. I'm just requesting you, just think as a taxi driver, one day, how hard we are working, and we are not like making so much money. We are just surviving, hand to mouth, that's all, because there's a big loan and there is so many expenses of insurance. Insurance is really expensive, everybody knows that, it's close to \$11,000 right now a year, and if somebody's paying like \$100 a month and he starts doing the same thing, and people say it's not a taxi, it's ride sharing, tell me what's the difference, doing the same thing.

So, so many things going on in these days. Why is it banned in so many countries? You are the doctors, right. If doctors know this tablet is allergic to the human body, they don't give it to the patient, right, and it's—there's allergy going on, if you see in London, if you see in Montreal, and why are you giving us that tablet? Right? And if you allow that once, they come in and they start doing something wrong. Any crime happens, anything wrong happens, who's going to take responsibility, because you guys are the presenting the Bill 30, right, so you have to take the responsibility if anything wrong goes on after that. And we will be out of the game, for sure, after a few years, because there's lots of students here. They're not from here, they are on a student visa, they will start driving Uber, right, and there's a limited business. It's not that, like, a big, big city. It's limited, really, really limited. Only weekend nights you can make money. On the weekdays, sometimes there's a 50-, 60-, 70-minutes wait for the trip.

In those—in our city—and the other thing I want to tell you, the crime rate already here, like, we are already on the No. 1 in whole Canada, right. It's the highest crime rate in Winnipeg. There's lots of drug dealers, they take cabs, but they don't see us. Like, they don't try to personalize our cabs, but according to the Taxicab Board and according to our companies, we are not allowed to do personalized things, those drug dealers and those criminals—but if Uber comes, they going to give cash money to the Uber drivers and there's not GPS tracking, no nothing. They can—they are free to go anywhere in the city. But if the cop cars pull us over, there is a system in the system where we pick them up, they

track us, and they're do that all the time. They catch the criminals, they catch the drug dealers that way, like which house is taking a cab every day and which places they are going, all the way in the city. But in the private cabs, if they personalize the drivers, they give them some extra money, there's no GPS tracking. They can go free anywhere. You can't catch them at all. And that's my request. Please, think about those kinds of little, little things. Crime rate will go high more.

And, if there is something wrong with the taxi business, if, like, you're not satisfied with our service, sit with us and talk with us. We will figure it out, put more cars, right, and some—one of the gentlemen said like, I bought a house for \$200,000 and the prices go down—[*interjection*]-yes, so, like, City of Winnipeg's responsible for that—it's not possible in the houses, it's not possible; prices are going high every day. It's possible only then when you just bring the China-made houses. That's possible too. Like, if you just bring the labour from China, the cheap stuff from the China, it's possible prices can go down. Everything is possible, but it depends on the politicians. [*interjection*] Yes. So nothing is impossible here.

So that's all I want to say, but think as a human, not as a politician. I know, like, you want to grow up Winnipeg. You want to grow up, but all money's not going—not to Winnipeg. It's going to the US.

Madam Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation.

We will move on to questioning from the committee now.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you very much, and I'm glad that you got to give your presentation, because it was a very good presentation and it added some more into the conversation that we haven't thought about. Certainly, the GPS tracking thing is something new that we hadn't really heard about, so thank you.

Really, ride sharing isn't Uber. Uber is a taxi, correct? Is that—

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Singh.

Mr. Gurpreet Singh: Oh, you're talking to me. I was thinking you were saying Mr. Singh to him. Sorry. He's a Singh too. Okay, so, sorry. Sorry for that.

Yes, there's—I don't know why they put the ride sharing. Doesn't make any sense. It's a taxi. For sure, it's a taxi, and it's a taxi; it's not ride sharing.

And one more thing, if you say it's ride sharing, you put two people, stranger people, in the back of your seat, right? They don't know each other. If they assaulted each other, who's responsible for that? If they're both of them drunk, they get into a fight, you're the driver. What are you going to do? Uber is taking responsibility? They know that, like, they're not drunk? So, ride sharing is not—it doesn't work in Winnipeg. It could work in other cities, but in Winnipeg—I pick up customers every day. It's hard to handle the customers in the nighttime. You can't even think about it, like, share the ride from the bars, two different kinds of people. No, it's not possible here.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you for that, and again, another thought that we all need to consider. Really, by them calling themselves ride sharing, they think they've found a clever way around having to follow the regulations. And really, all it's going to do is put unsafe—potentially unsafe vehicles, potentially unsafe drivers that are going to charge less money, which will undercut your ability to provide a safe ride. Is that correct?

Mr. Gurpreet Singh: No, it's not safe at all. I don't think so. This is just a clever way—you said right. You're totally right with that. It's just under another name they're trying to bring their service. They don't say straight, it's a taxi, because if say straight, taxi, they have to go through all those things. But you are all—like, all of you have more experience of life than me, but do you feel anything different? Is anything different from taxi? I don't think so. I'm an—younger in age. I don't have, then, experience, but I'm driving for almost eight years, and I have friends, they're driving Uber in Toronto, in Australia. There's nothing.

And another thing I want to say, on Uber, people take it as a part time job. It's not. You can't survive on, like—on that. You can't run your house. You can't pay those bills. Like, they charge more than us. On a \$10 trip, they charge three, four dollars to the driver.

Everybody attracts to the new things all the time. When it comes to the market, everybody attracts—oh, what is that? Okay, just try that. But when you get bad experiences, then they don't use it anymore. And there's lots of bad reviews on the—online if you check it out on the computer. On those other cities, you can get lots of reviews from there, so everybody see clearly everything. Why still they are talking on those things again and again?

Mr. Ewasko: Mr. Singh, I'm going to go back to a statement that I made earlier, and I'm not going to talk about the housing thing anymore.

We've got the member from Logan. She was a minister for many, many years in the NDP government. She took Uber three times. She says three times. Maybe it was more; I have no idea.

* (23:00)

Now, what are we saying about the safety? Mr. Singh, you're saying that Uber is absolutely unsafe. You've got friends in Toronto. You've got friends in Australia that drive these things. They're unsafe. Or are they just unsafe for Winnipeg? Because Ms.—Mrs.—Ms. Marcelino has taken Uber. So I'm thinking, because she was a minister for many years in the NDP government, I'm thinking she may be, you know, is a fairly smart lady. So what are we saying about this?

Mr. Gurpreet Singh: Thank you for that question. I want to tell you, everybody—she's a human too, right. Like, she's a minister as a position but she's a human, too, right. So every human attracts to a cheap thing. That's why they—nobody wants to pay extra dollars, not you, right. So that's the thing, but just as example, everybody drinks. Everybody drinks, right, but some people die every year because of the drinking. So what do you say about that? It's the same thing with that. Start drinking—right? So with the same thing, if she's taking—

Madam Chairperson: The time for questioning has expired. Thank you very much for your presentation. Thank you. *[interjection]* I don't—we have to move on.

We are moving on to No. 155, Guriqbal Dhillon. Mr. Dhillon, do you have any written material to hand out to the committee?

Floor Comment: Good evening, everybody. I speak in behalf of my nephew, Guriqbal Dhillon.

Madam Chairperson: Okay. Can you please state your name and spell it into the record?

Mr. Gurshvinder Singh Dhillon, on behalf of Mr. Guriqbal Dhillon (Private Citizen): My name is Gurshvinder Singh Dhillon—G-u-r-s-h-v-i-n-d-e-r Singh—S-i-n-g-h, and last name Dhillon—D-h-i-double-l-o-n.

Madam Chairperson: Okay, go ahead with your presentation.

Mr. Gurshvinder Singh Dhillon, on behalf of Mr. Guriqbal Dhillon: Okay. We are sitting here I think last seven days, so we are talking about taxi industry, and—[*interjection*]-yes, look at there, you start this morning, 10 o'clock, right. And I have a little bit different question. How the Uber—if you pass that bill, you open a door for ride share and Uber, how they going to affect to the taxi industry, to the people they're involved last 40 years?

First of all, it's already affected. Don't think only price. Price-wise, affected, but it's going to affect their daily lives. Whatever we make daily, it's going to affect that too. For example, if we are making \$200—so I don't think so we are able to make a \$200 if you open a door for Uber and ride share. One thing.

Then, what's going to happen? Right now, the people that working night shift, Monday—sorry, Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, you can go. I don't know where they get the survey. Go ask the cab drivers how many hours they're sitting at the airport, hotels, everywhere, and how much they are making. If we bring Uber and the ride shares, the people that working night shift, are they not able to make \$50. Why they going to drive a taxi? They have a more opportunity they can move, because we are stuck, because we are the owners. They are drivers. They can go anywhere. They can go Alberta; they can go Ontario. They can go anywhere, because they not survive here. Who is responsible for that?

Then, the other thing, the people, the night time, they're going to the hospital. The taxi provides service to the every community, doesn't matter who is. When they call any taxi company, they go pick up and take them to the hospital because they not afford a—what they calling—ambulance. Ambulances cost I think around \$500. Even though they have a little heart attack and they take a taxi, and I have a question about you guys. Maybe you're sitting here and I want to ask you about that. Everybody worries about the taxi industry. You living here, I think, more than my life, but you tell me something: Do you have anybody—

An Honourable Member: Point of order.

Point of Order

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Johnston, on a point of order.

Mr. Johnston: I'm under the impression here that we're hearing—this gentleman is interpreting for the other gentleman. What I'm hearing is the speaker's

opinion and the 'peaper'—the speaker's commentary. Am I wrong?

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Maloway, on the same point of order.

Mr. Maloway: On the same point of order, a number of days ago, long time ago, four days ago, when we started this, we—I introduced a resolution each and every day, each session, unanimously approved by this committee, that people be allowed to have translators, okay? And, from day one, we had people presenting very similar to this, and we just had, an hour ago, if you were here then, similar situation where it was explained that the person explained his situation to the translator so the translator knew all the issues and was simply bringing them out. [*interjection*] And that's right, there was a woman here who was being—translating for one of her relatives, and the question was asked, just like you are right now, and the answer was very straightforward, and she said that they had talked about it before, and she was just relating what he had told.

An Honourable Member: Speaking to the same point—

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Johnston, on the same point of order.

Mr. Johnston: I have—I certainly concur with the motion that was passed in regards to allowing translators. What I'm objecting to is that it appears that the translation here is not a translation, it's this gentleman speaking again to the committee, and I'm hearing opinion and I'm hearing thought from an individual; I'm not hearing what I'd consider to be a translation. So, Madam Chairman, I bring this to your attention. I would leave it to your discretion.

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Lindsey, on the same point of order.

Mr. Lindsey: Yes, I sat through a few of these committee hearings now, specific to this, and the definition, or the accepted practice, I guess, of the interpreters, are somewhat different than what we've seen traditionally, if you will. I'm sure these gentlemen have discussed the issues beforehand, and in the interests of expediency, as opposed to communicating back and forth and then communicating to us, I'm sure that that's kind of what their game plan is, is they've talked, they've all come to the same conclusion, and now one gentleman is presenting, really, what they've talked about beforehand.

Madam Chairperson: I believe I have heard enough of the—of this point of order, and the member does not actually have a point of order. We are going to continue with the agreement that the committee had made on translating services. I would, however, remind the presenter to keep his comments based on the perspective of the person he is translating for, not on personal reflections.

* * *

Madam Chairperson: Go ahead, Mr. Dhillon.

Mr. Gurshvinder Singh Dhillon, on behalf of Mr. Guriqbal Dhillon: Thank you very much.

I hope everybody listen to me, please, and I not any attack any person for anybody, and I don't know even because my questions that about the taxi industry: how we get the damage? Now, some people, they want to sell his cab. They are already close to retirement. They not able to sold his cab. You already know that.

*(23:10)

Then other thing is that people, they bought a cab lately. They not able to work now, because they are in depression. They make arrangement—the money, and now they're thinking, what's going on? Where we have to go? They can't quit. They can't run. They can only die, jump in the river or maybe other way, because the government is responsibility when you expose the business, you have to look after the business. Don't forget when we thinking the question was raised, the last guy, the one person, he said, oh, your house price is going down. Yes, the house price is going down. Is it a living? House price is living; taxi is my income. We can't compare taxi and house. We putting money from we—whatever's we making, and we paid my mortgage. When I need emergency, I took some money from my house, I go into the bank, and, okay, this is my house. I need such—that money, and the bank said, no problem, because you have a house. Now, tell me something, sir. What we can do now, then? The people, they don't have a house, they have—whatever they have in money they throw in the taxi last 40 years. How they can collect that, because the taxi price went down and nobody likes to buy it.

Other thing is that when we compare other cities, we compare, yes, Toronto have Ubers, okay. Do you ever think about that? Hundred fifty thousand people, they coming from international. Do we have a single flight international in Winnipeg, sir? Anybody know that? How many people that coming

down? We playing airport. We sitting at airport, sometimes flight delayed some reason. Three hours we sitting, we don't know we getting customers—\$10? I don't know we getting \$20. And then the airport took a dollar seventy—ninety five each fare. Whatever we loading from the airport they took \$1.95 each. At least Unicity paying to the airport almost \$500,000. Do you think, sir, that the money is coming?

If the Uber is coming tomorrow—I know you like competition, yes, that's very easy to make competition because—but think about that, sir. We have a family. We have investments. We trust the government, doesn't matter who is that, because we vote you guys. We have several meetings. I belong to Southdale area, Andrew Smith. There other people there—Ron Schuler—they promised all the time, they said it is a level playing field. I have a question for you guys. Could you give me definition, level playing field? Do you have any answer for that, level playing field, what that means? I couldn't get any answer from—I asked to several people many times, the only words they're saying, level playing field, but what that means, level playing field, I couldn't get that. So I request you guys, please, think a hundred times—think a hundred times. This is your city. You want to grow your city. You don't want to destroy immigrant people's taxi industry. This is your responsibility because you are the present government. You have to think to the hundred times, please.

Other things: when we're talking about we don't have enough cabs, I think you forget how many rental cars we have now. Do you ever know that? Car rental companies, how many we have in Winnipeg? I driving taxi, we have Summer Games, the people they have a—the dealership, they have a big event. They took customers from airport to downtown, downtown to whatever the destination. We not making nothing. Where's the problem? How we saying it is the problem here, we not getting back to service? St. 'bon' hospital, we are sitting there eight to 10 hours. Nobody care about that. Why only taxi industry care about that? Why is that?

I went myself, last year, I got pneumonia. I sent—sitting there eight hours. Nobody care about that. They said, just wait, the doctor's not available, as soon as he's coming he can check you out. Okay, I waiting. But if you wait half an hour for taxi, oh, it is big news. Yes, that's right. It is big news because there's some VIP people, they run the city. They run the city. That's why they make a big issue, the big news. That's right.

So, my friends, I request you, please, I request you all, think about the whole thing. Survey—you asked in survey, Mundy report, Dr. Mundy report, what he right on, he said, no, we need only wintertime extra cars, not for the whole year, but still we agree that because city is growing. We not deny it. We—Unicity and Duffy's, they employ almost more than 100 cabs because we want it, because we agree that we want better service because we don't want people waiting.

We have a better system. We have a computer; we have an app. We have everything. The police, they want to check my cars? Yes, they can phone my office. They can on GP—check on GPS where this car is running, which direction is running. Even though if I took any criminal guy, the police give him warning so they can put him as here on my screen. This guy, be very careful. Maybe is in damage—be careful.

What's you talking about that, like, Uber? What do they have? They have only app. They have only app and we make it, like, Uber's. What will the taxi? Taxi is your company. You promote that company. The government promote that company. We not promote that. We just work for that. This is your responsibility; you save this company. You save people.

That's all. Thank you very much.

Madam Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation. We will now open it up for questions from the committee.

Mr. Saran: Thank you, Mr. Dhillon.

First of all, I think we are in the situation where government wants to construct a highway, somebody house in the way. So they want to demolish that house, and therefore they have to pay more than what actual price is.

And other thing I think about Flor Marcelino, she took Uber just to experience what kind of service they provide and what they do. Don't forget, sometime with the interaction with the taxi people, people become politicians. Even they become leaders. So don't target that.

And so my point is that how—you are talking about Uber. These guys are not admitting it. They say, no, we're not talking about Uber; we simply want to transfer this—transfer responsibility to the City. Why they are doing it?

Mr. Gurshvinder Singh Dhillon, on behalf of Mr. Guriqbal Dhillon: First of all, I'm not feeling safe under City, myself—on behalf of my nephew. The reason that why, because we struggling last 15 years to get a diamond lane. What's wrong is that, if the City provide us just on the rush hours, morning time, afternoon, we can use a diamond lane. Is nothing wrong. And when we compare the other city, we have many examples. My friends, they are showing many examples. Oh, yes, that city's doing that.

So why we are paying two tax—GST and PST? Some province they don't. Why we are paying two tax? And other thing is, why City? Because I not feeling safe. I feeling safe myself, and maybe they, all shareholders, they agree with me. I feeling safe under Taxicab Board, and I wanted anything coming in the city should be under Taxicab Board and he have to follow the same rule, regulation, whatever we follow last 20, 40 years.

That's all.

Mr. Lindsey: You brought up something again that we haven't really talked about very much. You talked about \$500,000 that Unicity pays to the Winnipeg airport for the pleasure of sitting at the airport to pick people up. But, if Uber comes in, people getting off the plane, they just use their app. They're not paying Winnipeg airport any money for the pleasure of coming to pick people up. And there's nothing there to stop them from picking people up, is there?

So, really, it's going to affect your business, and now it's going to affect the business of the Winnipeg airport, too, is it not?

Mr. Gurshvinder Singh Dhillon, on behalf of Mr. Guriqbal Dhillon: First of all, if you compare other cities, how much is our cab ride from airport to downtown? Seventeen dollars, fifty cents, even though rush hours: \$17.50. What do you think? How much the Uber—they going to—maybe they are going to give a ride free, maybe. Maybe people, they have rich people, they belong to Uber, then they can provide free service. How they going to do that, I don't know, but your question that we are paying.

* (23:20)

That's our question, because why we wanting Uber? What is the benefit we have if we bring Uber? And you also have to think about that. If you bring in Uber, what is the damage to the City and to the shareholders and to the, whoever, the taxi industry they going to be hurt.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you for that.

Again, it's—we talked about issues of safety, that Uber doesn't compare anywhere close to having shields and strobe lights and panic buttons and cameras. They don't have to pay for any of those costs so they're not competing on an equal footing for safety, they're not competing on an equal footing for cost, and now we're talking about the money that Unicity pays to the airport so that they supposedly have the only right to pick people up at the airport, but Uber's going to just blow that out of the water, because they're just going to come and pick people up and nobody will know if it's a Uber taxi or my wife's coming to pick me up at the airport. So really it's another way of undermining your whole business and challenging you to stay in business, challenging you to be able to make—

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Lindsey, if you could please place your question because we are actually out of time for questioning. So please place a brief question and I ask for a brief answer.

Mr. Lindsey: My brief question to you, sir, is: this whole business is unfair advantage for Uber, is it not?

Mr. Gurshvinder Singh Dhillon, on behalf of Mr. Guriqbal Dhillon: Yes it is. It is not—it is totally unfair with us and it is—I will tell you something. It's not we paying only to the airport, we also paying to some hotels too. That's why we told you we are paying lots of money, sir. The taxi business is not run easy. Why we are stuck here? Why the people they have a big mortgage? You don't know, sir. Ask them, the people, please, how much they have a mortgage—remortgage on the house. How much they survive? Nobody knows about that. So please I request you to the all people, please think about that—

Madam Chairperson: Okay. So the time for questioning has now expired. Thank you very much for your presentation and we are going to move on to our next presenter. Thank you very much.

Okay, No. 156, Harmel Sidhu. Mr. Harmel Sidhu will be moved to the bottom of the list.

Number 157, Karamjit Singh Mundi. Karamjit Singh Mundi will now be moved to the bottom of the list.

Number 158, Vimal Chaudhary. Okay, Vimal Chaudhary will be moved to the bottom of the list.

Number 159, Buta Sandhu.

Mr. Sandhu, go ahead with your presentation.

Mr. Buta Sandhu (Private Citizen): Thanks, ladies and gentlemen.

I come in 1980 in this city, work here and there, few years, then I start driving the cab in 1990. I put so much effort in the industry. I see so many stories in the taxi when I driving and it's not easy job. It's just—this job is like you step on the snake. So many good people, so many bad people, so many bad experiences I gone through, but still I survive.

Next year, I'm getting 65. I thinking my retirement. I think this one—this bill make me zero. This is not right. My dream's gone in the gutter, and—I have four children. They are born all here, grow up here. They are all well educated. They are settled down, but still there are—I'm not happy with Bill 30. They all take my dreams away from me. What I was thinking when I was retired, I would be—do this and this. Of the ride sharing, I don't understand what the ride share means. Ride share means there's two people who can be driving one—but they are not charging the same—ride sharing when they charging the same kind of fare from single fare to one place to the other point then it's the same, like taxi. Why the name is ride share? I don't know where they got this name, ride share.

This is unfair with the taxi industry, and how come there's two kind of laws in one city? One have this, this thing we got to go through the taxi classes, taxi licence, criminal record, child abuse record, everything we go through, and the other person is not go through anything. How is it fair for everybody? All the taxi industry is not same like Uber. We have standards. We have go through the—so many things.

We have every single person we pick it up, we have record in our office whenever we can get anything that we are follow through the GPS, and it goes through if something happen. I'm driving here on the Osborne. Something happen, accident happen, right where they—somebody call. Oh, this Unicity taxi, this number is involved in accident; right away goes the help, right away police start down there, anything else to happen. But if something Uber drivers happen something, who knows it's private car or it's a taxi.

So this way, this Bill 30 is very unfair. I'm not very happy with this one. I have so many other issues with the Bill 30. Bill 30 is just taking all of our taxis came to the city. We don't have good relations with the City. I don't know why they want—don't want us

to be share with their bus lanes or they are not providing us enough taxis. They're thinking us, we are third-class citizens. Why?

And there's nothing can survive us if you—if there is taxi board last almost 60, 65 years taxi board is here. Why is this question come up now we are not keeping the taxi board and giving to the City? Why we did not before Gary Filmon was here, when Gary Doer was here, Mr. Selinger was here? Why this question happen now?

This is all my questions.

And, when something happen, anybody call the taxi board. Then they can find out what—who's have any problem or any kind of things they are find us. Even the driver can be having a problem with a passenger, then the taxi board call driver and passenger together and take their views, and then they who's fault is, then they can be solved over there. If the passenger wrong, then they tell the passenger this is the right drivers.

* (23:30)

We pick up so many people at night from the clubs and those kind of places. People don't know where they going; come in the cab, oh, cabbie, fucking cabbie, take me home. What's your address? Do you know my address? How can we know their—everybody's address? It's no—it's happened to me. Come in the cab, take me home. Where's your address? Over the bridge. Which bridge? We don't know.

There are so many things happen in the taxi industry, but we still survive. We work hard. I work 30 years, support this Manitoba. All my kids grow up, they are all settled here, supporting the Manitoba; nobody move out. And when it's my time to be retired, take—you guys are taking my dues. How can I be—my dream could be true? That's not fair.

I—we would like to be—taxi board is there, and how come there is no same rules for the other company coming—ride-share company coming? I don't know it's Uber or some other companies, but the ride share is not the same. It's a different name but same taxi service, so why the separate name? When the taxi service, it's a taxi industry have the all same rules. There are so many safety issues.

So we are all not happy with what you guys doing. We elected you, supported you. You make a government. You're supposed to favour your own people or third person you don't know even. Why we

allowing the other third parties we don't know? And we making money and spending money in Manitoba. The third party, we don't know where they taking money. Fifty per cent money they're taking away in the other areas, other countries.

So do—you have to think about this bill. Again and again, I'm not agree with this bill. I'm not agree with it at all. That's all.

Madam Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation.

We will now have questions from committee.

Mr. Johnston: I'm—want to zero in a little bit on the City of Winnipeg now taking responsibility. We haven't really talked a great deal about the potential benefits of the City of Winnipeg being responsible versus the Province, and I'm just wondering what—why you would see the City of Winnipeg with the authority being a disadvantage. I mean, all of the other—as my—some of my colleagues have mentioned, all of the other jurisdictions in Canada have the cities taking care of taxis because, frankly, the connection—or relationship just makes sense.

Why is it such a—so hard to swallow having the City of Winnipeg as that authority?

Mr. Sandhu: That's the—what I saying. Why is it happening now? Why is it not happening last 60 years? The last 60 years, the Manitoba taxi board is here. Why is it happening now? That's my question.

Mr. Saran: Thank you for your coming over here.

Okay, my—we are—for the last three or four days, we are trying to guess why this government want to transfer this authority to the City, and we are simply guessing. And, mostly, we are thinking, maybe there's some plan to bring Uber.

Let me think of another angle. Maybe there's other group whom some politicians want to give the upper hand. Is not there a possibility some other groups also involved in this so that they can take away your earnings from you and give to somebody else?

Mr. Sandhu: Yes, that's true. They are taking our food, taking the food from our mouths, take to the—somebody else's. We—I am agree, a hundred per cent agree with that one. That's the—why I don't understand why these things happening now. If they—if the City need more cabs, they survey it, they can go through the procedure. All the companies, they

are local, they—actually, they can make more money on this. They can auction the licence plate of taxi then they can—'therewise', the companies can buy it and distribute money. Government makes money and stay money in the city.

Mr. Johnston: Just further to my question in regards to the relationship—or, the bill putting the authority under the City of Winnipeg. You are a private businessman and certainly your colleagues are private businessmen, correct?

Mr. Sandhu: I'm a taxi driver owner-operator.

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Johnston, on a follow up.

Mr. Johnston: It's fair to say that you're private businessmen.

Mr. Sandhu: Yes, it is. You can say that. Unicity is a private company. So I'm with Unicity, so they run the business, so all the owners, taxi drivers, most of them is all owner-operators.

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Johnston, on a last follow-up question.

Mr. Johnston: So, with the City of Winnipeg taking responsibility, versus the Province, the threat or possibility of your industry being monopolized really becomes more and more distant. Would that be a fair comment?

Mr. Sandhu: I don't understand the question, please.

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Johnston, to restate it.

Mr. Johnston: Well, my friends from—on the other side of the House make a point of saying how they are concerned about compensation and they're concerned about the freedom of the industry, et cetera, but their history of monopolizing different industries are factual. They monopolized the 'ambiance' industry, they monopolized MPI, insurance companies, private insurance companies, private operators, and I'm not sure—they keep on saying about compensation, I'm not sure how much compensation that that government gave anybody when they did that. So I'm just kind of wondering what—I'm kind of wondering exactly, you know, why there's no concern about the possibility of a long-term relationship with the provincial government and having some of these things happen.

Mr. Sandhu: I still don't understand the question, but I still can answer it. Why the government wants to give this to the City? That's my question. Why is they raise this up now after 60 years when everything was going good? Why it's happening now?

Madam Chairperson: The time for questions on this presenter has expired.

Thank you very much for your presentation.

We will now move on to No. 160, Narinder Chahal. Narinder Chahal?

Okay. Go ahead with your presentation, Mr. Chahal.

Mr. Narinder Chahal (Private Citizen): Yes, my name is Narinder Chahal. So, good evening, everybody.

So, this Bill 30 going to hit me very hard because I'm going to be 65 this January 1st, next—in January 1st, '18. So it's very hard on me. I'm kind very depressed, you know. So this all my retirement money, so now it's going to be—I don't know what's going to happen.

* (23:40)

Yes, I have been with this—the taxi industry since 1993. So, I was, like—was very happy with the working with the taxi board, under the taxi board. So, I like the—keep the same if the taxi board is the same thing, like, a independent taxi board, not under the City. So we had a very good relation. No—like, they check our standards—taxi, car standards, their size and everything; clean, safety. Every six months they check the meter. So, with my thinking, I think the taxi board should be, like, that we want to keep the same. If it's the same, then it's better for the City, better for the taxi industry.

So, the other thing, I drive around, like, everywhere almost every day. So, the City policies, I don't like. The one thing you see, they make sometimes, like, okay, we go in the, like, the school zones, you see school zones, they just—it's my opinion, right—they put their—the cameraman. They have a camera; they pay money to him to sit there. Thirty speed, right? Why not they make—this my idea, maybe I could be wrong, right—so why not they put those bumps there, street bumps? Thirty speed; whoever go there automatically will slow down. They don't need spend money for those cameras.

And the other thing, those stupid things they make in residence areas: why they make those round intersections? And one wintertime—I'm lucky I have a small car. I'm lucky I have a—not very small, my car is a good size. Wintertime, when there is snow, when you want to go straight, then you go there, you hit the curb. *[interjection]* Yes. So they make so many

stupid things. The City government I don't like. I know what kind of people there.

The other thing you see, the Assiniboine, that avenue there, what did they make there? Bike lane. This lane, this lane the people go there, you don't know which way you turn. Then you make a wrong turn, they give you ticket.

So, very strongly, like, I like the independent taxi board; we can work under that. Not under the City; I don't like that.

Okay, the other thing, if the Uber comes, it's very hard to make money for us, very hard to make money for them. So they make—a few times they make service there. So they had the specialist people, you know, from New York, from other cities, right? The people are specialists, right? They tell Winnipeg no need the—like, the taxis in summertime. Summertime we are okay. And wintertime, they tell you, add 80 more. But we are adding almost 150 now every wintertime. So that system is very good for the Winnipeg. Winnipeg is not like New York. I have been to New York, I know how much business is there. Maybe Uber can survive there. And other cities; Vancouver can survive, Toronto, but not Winnipeg.

Okay, when the schools close here, summertime, who comes here? The people go out for holidays. There is—we don't have much attractions here. Summertime, we suffer. And wintertime, need; wintertime, need here. The people can't walk. As soon as the people start walk, we have less business.

So, like me, for my idea, okay, let's see—Winnipeg, like, growing up; more population now, right? And before, I remember—I'm, like, I'm driving since 1993—before in the city, like, Unicity, Duffy's, we have a Handi contract with the City. So then the other company, they bid a little bit less, then they give to them. That time it, like, that business was, like, we were doing that business, right? So those Handi, like, vehicles, they are like taxis too. They're transporting the passenger. We were doing that. So they're—you should add, like, those cars, too.

And then another thing, like, when there are any events, like a game, anything, then they put so many buses, those things. We don't mind; that's okay. That's business there. But the summertime, we have enough cars. Or if they want to add something more, then should be like the taxi board was doing very good—like the last caller said, they were doing a very good job. And those people in the, like—I should say

those—their employees—or those board members, there is at least two, three taxi drivers there. They have experience. So those people know better. Those people work there. Like, the—when they know a driver make something wrong, they know. They write when they know. It's driver fault. They—if the passenger give the wrong—like, a false statement, like a phony complaint, right, then they know.

So, like, for me—like, strongly, I like the taxi board—independent taxi board, not under the City. So, City, I see. I drive around it so many—I know, like, I agree with the City, those—they make those decisions to change the lanes, this and that. The other thing is: What's wrong with that diamond lane? Our board, Unicity board, Duffy's board, we are fighting for a long time for the diamond lane. So what's wrong if the rush hour, we can use the diamond lane? So I'm going to pick up somebody going to airport, I can go fast. I can give them fast service. Coming from airport, I can come fast. For the rush hour—what's wrong? Why they not let us use that one?

Then, they tell, there is no taxi service, because the city policy—City don't listening us. The other thing, in the city, wherever is a fire hydrant, right, the people can't park there. Why not they allow the taxi to sit there? Just sit. If the driver is not inside, then they can put \$500 fine. Nobody will mind. So we are sitting in the car, sitting in the fire hydrant there. If there's something happen, fire truck comes, then we will move. So, this way, we can serve better the city. So there's a complaint only the downtown, downtown area, rush hour.

So you stop—sometimes we stop this commissioner—the city commissioner. They—if we going to drop off the customer, they take your picture, send you the ticket, your home. So, like, with me, my idea—that Uber is coming, is that bill going to hurt, like—not like me, some people like—I'm retired next year, so I had a planning to sell, but I can't sell now. So there is other—my colleagues, too, saying, you know, somebody, they trying—like, they retiring next year or after that, so I'm just totally disagree with the Bill 30. So it's no good for the, like, taxi industry, even no good for the—like, the passenger, the public too, you know.

Madam Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation. We will now take questions from the committee members.

Mr. Ewasko: Thank you, Mr. Chahal, for coming in and giving your presentation. You mentioned a couple things. You said that you've been fighting

over this diamond lane thing for a while in the taxi board, and it's been many years under the previous NDP government, and I don't think that they were able to stand up and fight on your behalf whatsoever.

So I think, you know, if this bill proceeds to pass and it does go over to the City, then I think that that is something—one more item that you would be able to go forward to the City and talk about and maybe have a better chance at getting that diamond-lane service.

My question—you mentioned the handicab, and I had asked this question to a gentlemen earlier, and I figured I'll ask somebody in the business for this answer. So the handicabs—so, two-part question. First part is: Who has the jurisdiction over the handicabs in the city of Winnipeg? And the second part is: What is a handicab service worth? We talked about the taxis from 350 to 500 thousand for licences. What are handicabs worth?

Mr. Narinder Chahal: Yes. No, I was talking about, like, handi—we were doing that business before. They tell—like, now the city grow up, more population, right? So those handi—whatever the handi contract, they are, like, now working, like, taxis. They're already—you should count in there more taxis, that ones.

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Ewasko, on a follow-up?

Floor Comment: Because they are transporting the people too, right?

* (23:50)

Mr. Ewasko: No, but that's what I'm asking you. So what is that—so, if you went and owned a handicab, what is that worth? What is that worth?

Mr. Narinder Chahal: I don't understand. Like, so what you mean, like, on—

Floor Comment: Can I help?

Mr. Narinder Chahal: Yes.

An Honourable Member: I see somebody in the—I'll ask them later. I'll touch base with you later.

Mr. Narinder Chahal: Yes, well, but like—I mean, like, it's about, like, I'm talking about more taxis in the city. I just tell those are taxis, too. Because we don't have people doing that business. So those—they should include the more in the taxis, that one. Everything like a transportation, right?

Same like Uber coming, right? It's the same thing. I mean—

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Lindsey.

Mr. Chahal.

Mr. Narinder Chahal: —like, more taxis in the city. No, there is no need more taxis. Need only the wintertime.

Mr. Lindsey: So, really, to try and capture what you've said here—that it's late, and not everybody's listening, you're not in favour of the provincial government turning the licensing of taxis over to the City. That's a—*[interjection]*

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Chahal.

Mr. Narinder Chahal: —a taxi board like before. Independent, right? They can make their—they are very expert, you know? They're do—some employee there drove taxi before, too. So they know our problem and that customers' problem, everything. So I am favour of that one.

Mr. Lindsey: So, really and truly, the system right now, the way taxis are licensed, isn't broken, but somebody wants to come in with some other taxi service. Only they're not going to call it a taxi service; they're going to call it something else so that somehow that's going to be a benefit. And we're not sure to who—that this Uber is some multinational corporation; it's not a local company and so—*[interjection]*

Madam Chairperson: Mr. Chahal.

Mr. Narinder Chahal: Like, leave the taxi board—let the taxi board decide. Like, that—they made the survey lasted two times, right? So then they decided, like, they need, like, 80 taxis in the winter time. So, like, the taxi board should decide. If there is—like, Winnipeg going to grow up more, right, more population, more and more. Then need more taxis, right? So let the taxi board decide, not the City decide, you know.

Mr. Wharton: Thank you, Mr. Chahal, for your presentation tonight, and we really appreciate you sharing your concerns as well, and I would say that it's definitely been another informative evening tonight, and I would think the committee would agree that certainly the last 14 hours has been very educational. And I think, collectively, we've probably learned a lot more about your industry tonight.

And I would say on behalf of the committee and everybody here, thank you for coming and enjoy your evening. Thank you.

Madam Chairperson: The time has ended for questioning.

Mr. Maloway: Well, given that this committee's going to be meeting again on Tuesday night at 6 o'clock and it's a little late to be starting another presenter, I would ask leave of the committee to call it midnight.

Madam Chairperson: Does—is it the will of the committee to see the clock as midnight? *[Agreed]*

Committee rise.

COMMITTEE ROSE AT: 11:54 p.m.

WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS

Re: Bill 30

Good evening,

My name is Subhdeep Singh Sidhu; I am a born and bred Winnipegger and the proud son of a taxicab owner-operator.

By now you have heard from many stakeholders who have told you about their plight and the predicament your government has put families like mine in.

I understand the nature of politics so I have a general idea of where this committee is eventually going to end up. I think what's lost in this discussion is the human connection to the people who will be most impacted by this bill in a negative way. I would like to share the story of my father; I am hoping this will open up your eyes and maybe even your hearts.

My father married my mother on May 1st, 1991 in Punjab, India. On March 31st, 1992 he was able to immigrate to Canada as my mother had been living here in Winnipeg with her family since 1980. My father at the time was a practicing Gursikh (in English this can be translated to an orthodox follower of the Sikh religion). He had a turban and beard, which made it tough for him to land a job at that time in our country's history. He ultimately made the decision to cut his hair and shave off his beard so that he could provide for his family. He got a janitorial job at Sears working there for 4 months before finding an opportunity in the taxi industry.

He started off as a driver in 1992 during the Christmas season. In March of '93 I was born and by that time my dad was working consistent evening

shifts and my mother was working day shifts on the Bobcat at General Scrap in Transcona. On March 25th, 1994 two very important things happened my cousin Taranjit was born and my father became the owner of Duffy's Taxi 198. My parent's call her our family's good luck charm she takes pride in that! After this happened my mom made the decision to become a full time stay-at-home mom. In 1996 my younger brother Jashandeep was born and our family unit was complete.

Growing up as kids we didn't notice what time our dad left for work but we knew what time range he would be home. Let me take you through the regular day in the life of my dad he begins his day at 3:00am when gets up to shower and brush, followed by his daily reading of one of our Sikh scriptures known as the Sukhmani Sahib (this translates into English as Treasure of Peace). He then has his morning tea and toast; and he's out of the house and into his taxicab by 4:45am-5:00am. A typical shift for my dad last's until 5:00pm, he used to work this shift 7 days a week but has in the past year switched to 6 days a week as he volunteers at one of our local Gurdwara's (this translates into a Sikh place of worship) on Sunday's.

As kids my brother and I growing up did not understand the tremendous amount of time and effort my dad put into providing for us. As many kids at our school would try to tease us about our dad's profession. It wasn't until we got older into our late middle school years we realized how blessed we were. Many in the media and public do not see being a taxicab driver as a noble profession; it is looked down upon by the mainstream. We the family members of taxicab owner-operators see our dad's and mom's who drive their taxicab for a living as people seeking to provide a better future for their children in a job that at times can be thankless. I really don't think you can get nobler than that.

As an individual I can understand the skepticism many people have off all governments of every stripe. Many of the taxicab owner operators who are immigrants, were told by the government of the day, back in the 1990's and 2000's to follow the rules and pay their fair share of taxes so that they could be productive members of our beautiful Canadian society. They did that, and now they're being punished for playing within the rules that the provincial government established for them and their investment that their families rely on.

As a young person who aspires to one day own a small business of my own, I will always be worried about hurtful government policy that targets small businesses. At the end of the day I know the PC MLA's will be bound by party discipline to follow through with this bill; any MLA who suggests the government MLA's on this committee will change the Premier's mind is just looking to gain cheap political points. The taxicab board is a provincial responsibility. When a government takes power they inherit whatever situation the previous government left them with. This current government inherited a taxicab board that has a major influence on the price of a taxicab plate. Their sheer ignorance in trying to

shovel this responsibility onto the city without obtaining any assurances from city hall for taxicab owner-operators is astonishing.

I urge you to not pass this bill without amending it and getting assurances from city hall regarding the price of a taxicab plate. Please remember the families you will hurt in the process of passing this bill as it is currently written and the taxicab owner-operators you will leave effectively at the mercy of Mayor Brian Bowman and his Executive Policy Committee at city hall.

Thank you for your time.

Subhdeep Singh Sidhu

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>