

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

Chairperson
Mr. Dennis Smook
Constituency of La Verendrye

Vol. LXX No. 12 - 6 p.m., Tuesday, October 31, 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

Tuesday, October 31, 2017

TIME – 6 p.m.

LOCATION – Winnipeg, Manitoba

CHAIRPERSON – Mr. Dennis Smook
(La Verendrye)

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

ATTENDANCE – 11 QUORUM – 6

Members of the Committee present:

Hon. Messrs. Pedersen, Wharton

Messrs. Bindle, Graydon, Isleifson, Ms. Lamoureux, Messrs. Lindsey, Maloway, Ms. Marcelino, Messrs. Michaleski, Smook.

APPEARING:

Hon. Jon Gerrard, MLA for River Heights
Mr. Mohinder Saran, MLA for The Maples
Mr. James Teitsma, MLA for Radisson
Mrs. Colleen Mayer, MLA for St. Vital

PUBLIC PRESENTERS:

Mr. Bhupinder Mann, private citizen
Mr. Govinder Singh, private citizen
Mr. Carlos Sosa, private citizen
Mr. Alexander Ashton, private citizen
Mr. Ranjit Jauhal, private citizen
Mr. Harjit Sodhi, private citizen
Mr. Tarlochan Gill, on behalf of Mr. Gurinder Singh, private citizen
Mr. Paramjit Bhangoo, private citizen
Mr. Zeweldi Beyene, private citizen
Mr. Jagtar Sidhu, private citizen
Mr. Jaswant Singh Deol, on behalf of Mr. Manjit Singh Sidhu, private citizen
Mr. Sasan Riyazi, private citizen
Mr. Karnail Dhillon, private citizen
Mr. Jaipal Gill, private citizen; Mr. Tarlochan Gill, on behalf of Mr. Jaipal Gill
Mr. Sukhvir Kalaat, private citizen
Mr. Harjinder Dhillon, on behalf of Mr. Balreep Mann, private citizen
Mr. Mandeep Singh Sidhu, on behalf of
Mr. Gurdeep Singh Sidhu, private citizen

MATTERS UNDER CONSIDERATION:

Bill 30–The Local Vehicles for Hire Act

* * *

Clerk Assistant (Ms. Monique Grenier): Good evening. 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. Len Isleifson (Brandon East): I nominate Mr. Smook.

Clerk Assistant: All right, Mr. Smook has been nominated.

Are there any other nominations?

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

Mr. Chairperson: The next item of business is the election of a Vice-Chairperson.

Are there any nominations for this position?

An Honourable Member: I nominate—the member for Brandon East.

Mr. Chairperson: The member for Emerson—or, Mr. Graydon.

Mr. Cliff Graydon (Emerson): I nominate the member for Brandon East.

Mr. Chairperson: Are there any other nominations for this position?

Mr. Isleifson has been nominated.

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

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

In accordance to rule 2-18 this is the final evening for the committee to complete consideration of this bill. Pursuant to rule 2(22), if a committee considering a bill has not yet completed public presentations, it must close them off by 9 p.m. By

unanimous consent, the deadline can be extended to 10 p.m. Furthermore, the Chair of the committee will interrupt the proceedings at midnight and, without further debate or amendment, put every question necessary to complete clause-by-clause consideration of the bill under consideration. Finally, if we are still debating the bill at 11 p.m., any member of the committee who wishes to move an amendment must file 20 copies of the amendment with the clerk of the committee by that time.

We will continue public presentations on this bill in accordance with the list of presenters before you, and I would like to remind those who are in attendance that this is our fifth evening this committee has met to consider the bill and no further registrations are accepted tonight, pursuant to rule 92(6).

Before we proceed with presentations, we do have a number of other items and points of information to consider. For the information of all presenters, while written versions of presentations are not required, if you are going to accompany your presentation with written material, we ask that you provide 20 copies. If you need help with the 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.

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 meetings 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 Hansard—the Hansard recorder to turn the mics on and off.

Thank you for your patience, we will now proceed with public presentations. Oh—just to clarify for the committee, on the list of presenters you'll notice that some presenters have a plus sign or an asterisk beside their names. That means they have been called once before. So we're going to consider the people who have not yet been called so—first. So we will look at starting, I believe, at—No. 58 will be the first presenter, and then we'll be moving

throughout the list until we hear from everybody who does not have any markings beside their name. And then we will proceed on to the marking.

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood): I would like to move that this committee—that for this committee, any presenter be permitted to have a person of their choice translate their presentation into English. And as the members on the committee know, I've brought this motion forward each of the what—four times. So this is my last time to do this.

Mr. Chairperson: It has been moved by Mr. Maloway 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, the floor is now open for questions.

An Honourable Member: Agreed.

Mr. Chairperson: Is the committee ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Chairperson: Shall the motion pass? *[Agreed]*

Mr. Maloway: I would like to suggest that we get permission—leave in the beginning to extend the presentation hours to 10 o'clock. You know, there's 268 people registered for this committee. There's only been—142 have presented. There's 126 people left for tonight, and it's—there's no possibility of getting through to 9 o'clock with more than, you know, 20 people, I would think.

And, you know, I have—looking back, the human rights act in 1987—there was 186 people presented, 179 at MTS privatization. And nobody—my point is, that nobody has ever been denied. You know, the government has always set up enough meetings. And this could have been done very easily had the House leader called meetings for—as he did on Friday, for 14 hours. He could have called another 14 hours for Saturday, another 14 hours for Sunday and for Monday, as well. So it was the government's choice not to do that, and now we're faced with having 126 people here and only a couple of hours. And I realize the longer I speak the more I'm cutting into their time, so.

* (18:10)

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Maloway has brought forward a request to—instead of waiting 'til 9 o'clock to now suggest that we sit 'til 10 o'clock listening to presenters, and should we finish presenters before

that time, then we will move on to the regular business of the committee. But, if there's still presenters available at 9 o'clock, then we'll continue listening to them 'til 10 o'clock.

Is that in agreement with everybody?
[interjection] Ten is the maximum.

Mr. Wharton, you had a comment?

Hon. Jeff Wharton (Minister of Municipal Relations): Yes, so—

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Wharton.

Mr. Wharton: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So to be clear, then, on the member from Elmwood's motion, simply extending the time for participants to go from 9 to 10 p.m. this evening. Failing that, if nobody's here at nine, 9:15 and 9:30 we still would have the option to move forward line by line? [interjection]

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Maloway, could you—

Mr. Maloway: The goal here is to hear the presenters.

I think this will be the first time probably in the history of the province that we had not given every single registered person a chance to present.

Mr. Chairperson: Does the committee agree to sit 'til 10 o'clock to listen to presenters, and if there's no presenters at whatever time in the evening prior to 10 o'clock, we will then move into line by line? [Agreed]

Bill 30—The Local Vehicles for Hire Act

Mr. Chairperson: I will now call our first presenter, presenter No. 58, Sukhwant Pal, Sukhwant Pal. Mr. Pal does not seem to be presented. We will be moving him to the bottom of the list.

The next presenter, presenter No. 59, Bhupinder Mann.

Mr. Mann, do you have any written materials for distribution?

Mr. Bhupinder Mann (Private Citizen): I don't have any written, Sir. I will speak myself.

Mr. Chairperson: Then you may proceed with your presentation.

Mr. Bhupinder Mann: Good evening, everybody. My name is Bhupinder Mann, and I own a taxi—I'm part owner of a taxi in the Unicity Taxi. So that's the way I run my family, support my children. I came from India, Punjab 23 years ago, and I was hired by

our community services as a minister of religion for a gurdwara. I served them for seven years. And there my agreement period was over with them. But that job was not enough to support my children.

My daughter and son decided to go to university, so I quit the job and I did some small jobs. They were not paying well. So there was no choice for me to drive taxi. It was scary for me. Nighttime—I couldn't find day shift. So then I—the taxi driver course helped me how to manage the people. It helped many times with very, very dangerous situations.

So then I bought a half share of a cab and I'm driving that. And my children, they're university. I could not upgrade my degree—I have a master of economics—but at the same time, my children decided to go to university, so I help them. I use my home line of credit to buy that share. It's around \$100,000. Then I—my children did it, but I still have debt to pay. It's more than \$100,000.

So we're talking about the Uber-like company's coming down here why the Bill 30—bill C-30 is lying. Uber-like or other companies come here without any regulations, so it's very scary. I don't understand what—they not allowed to—they not check them for criminal record check or the child abuse or other safety things. They are not checked. I believe the driver who will drive Uber-like companies, they will not come from the heavens. They will come from the same stream of people like us, good and bad. And they need to check. Like, I remember a year—or, more than year ago, a Uber driver, he shot dead three people while his customer was sitting behind, and he's still in jail. And many other incidents happened by Uber drivers, but they are not checked by that.

So I—we believe that that's not fair, that's there should be regulations for them to follow, same regulations we follow that. So, even in Quebec or other, like Ontario, the police are complaining that some drug traffickers or prostitution or other criminal people, they use Uber-like services because there's no camera or there're no criminal check, so this is a haven for them to do their activities, so it's very dangerous. It looks very dangerous, so it should be regulated. That's why we oppose this bill. It did not discuss with our industry.

And then there're other issues, like our investments are in danger because this bill does not allow any compensation or other help, because it's very dangerous because we will—that our industry

will be—we all fear it will damage our industry because they provide cheaper services because they do not follow the same insurance or other criminal checks. So that way, if we are provided—not allowed to those kind of insurances or other cost, we can provide the same cheap service. But that way we will—we feel that it will damage us

And I'm scared that I won't—will not be able to pay my debt if this happens here. So it's very scary because more than 95 per cent Punjabi community people own this business, so it's feel like—it feel like we are—as a minority group, we are under attack. It's feel like racism. It feels—it's a class war, so we are scared. So we—I will request you to remove these things from this bill, or this bill should be stopped. So that's what I want to say.

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

Mr. Tom Lindsey (Flin Flon): Thank you very much for coming and taking time to present to us. It's very important that we hear from people such as yourself.

One of the things you said right at the start, that when you started, you thought that the training you got was very helpful in allowing you to carry on as a taxi driver. Could you tell us a little bit about that training and, really, why you think it's important—*[interjection]*

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Mann, you have to wait 'til I recognize you.

Mr. Bhupinder Mann: Yes, Sir. It's help preventable, and that course was wonderful and—how to deal with people, drunk people, over-drunk people or people with money who need help. So it's happened many times, like, people were angry, over-drunk and—but that course, I learned from that how to deal with people. So it was very helpful to me to deal with people, and it was—I was successful to deal these kind of situations.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Thank you for coming here and telling us about your story.

You have a degree in economics, I understand. I wonder if you could tell us, if you multiply the number of taxis' owners by the losses for each taxi owner, how much does that add up to in terms of all the losses that may be at risk with the falling level of the investment?

Floor Comment: It will damage us, sir. It's very scary.

* (18:20)

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Mann, could you repeat that?

Mr. Bhupinder Mann: I'm sorry, could you just repeat that question, please?

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Gerrard—the Honourable Mr. Gerrard.

Mr. Gerrard: So how many taxi drivers or licences or owners, and how much is each losing, so that we can have an idea of what is the total amount that is at risk?

Mr. Bhupinder Mann: That part—the last part, I could not understand—say last.

Mr. Gerrard: If there were 400 taxi drivers and each one stood to lose in value—some of these were \$500,000 to start with. So five—400 by \$500,000 is \$200 million. That's a lot of money. I don't know if that's even in the ballpark, but maybe you can help me?

Mr. Bhupinder Mann: Yes, sir. We're—they're going to bankrupt it that way. There's—is—we are in a dark—that—in that situation, we were in the dark. No—do not know where to go.

Mr. Mohinder Saran (The Maples): Thanks for come and go here, Mr. Mann.

Okay, it appears that way if Uber comes in, then some people who are already doing full-time jobs, they will be doing also part-time job, so they will be making extra money. But, on the other hand, people who are driving full time taxi and—they won't be able to that much money, so they may not be able to survive.

So in that way, it is possible people might have to sell their house and may have to go to apartments. And it's also possible government have to provide Rent Assist. So nobody is winning in this way. Do you agree? *[interjection]*

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Mann, you may proceed.

Mr. Bhupinder Mann: I'm sorry.

I agree with you, sir. I'm thinking about that. If Uber comes down here I will not be able to pay my debt. I have to sell my house and maybe apartment or go back to India, or—I'm just Canadian citizen. But it's very scary.

Mr. Lindsey: So there's all kinds of issues that a car for hire is being treated somehow differently than a taxi for hire. Do you think that the same rules should

apply regardless of whether we call a taxi an Uber car or a Lyft car or a Unicity car or a Duffy's car. That, really, when you're hiring a vehicle to take you from point A to point B, it's a taxi. And a taxi is a taxi, so why are they looking at having different rules?

Do you think that those—

Mr. Chairperson: The time—Mr. Lindsey, times for—time for questions has expired. Because of the numbers of—number of presenters, we will be going strictly by the rules. It'll be 10 minutes and 5 minutes, so time for questions has expired.

Thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Mann, and we will be moving on to our next presenter.

Presenter No. 60, Rajinderpal Jammu. Rajinderpal Jammu? Mr. Jammu does not appear to be here.

We will move on to the next one. Rajinjudge—Ranjit Judge? Does not appear to be here.

We will move on to presenter No. 62, Mike Kindie. Mike Kindie? Does not appear to be here.

We will now move on to presenter No. 63, Govinder Singh. Govinder Singh.

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

Mr. Govinder Singh (Private Citizen): Good evening, everyone.

My name is Govinder Singh. I came here in 1984. I've been driving a taxi for almost 30 years.

First of all, I want to thank all the committee members, Chairperson and the media. Thank you very much.

I would like to say when I came here in 1984, we had so many jobs available in this city. We had many garment factories, the beer factories and others. But all they're all gone from here. Nobody make an effort to bring them back.

Now, I don't know what's the problem the PC government have with the taxi industry and the medical personnel. In 1991, when Gary Filmon was in power, they brought the bill C-24, and now the PC government back in power and bring the bill for 30 again. So this is totally hurts the taxi industry, that one and this one also. And also we were working with the—under Taxicab Board for almost 60 or

65 years. Why this bill comes on the table because we've been working with the Taxicab Board; under the Taxicab Board, it's very happy. We got along each other pretty good. They always look after the taxi industry; whenever we need anything, they always provide us. Even the government too, they always.

In 2001, when Mr. Pritam Deol was killed, then I really want to thank Steve Ashton. He stepped in, the committee, and bring the shields, roof light and the panic switch; everything, the safety-wise, we need it.

Okay, now the other day, the Mr. Kaur Sidhu was here. He was saying the Taxicab Board losing \$500,000 a year; that's why the provincial Manitoba want to be push that taxi board to the City. If that's the reason, there is a hole somewhere in the taxi board. The Province have to be find out where the hole is; fill up that hole to bring that taxi board back. If any other department is not making a profit for government, so that mean the government push back to the City? I don't understand that.

And plus we have enough taxis to serve the city, but the other day there's a point was from the committee, there's 500 customers have one taxi. That's totally wrong. The Taxicab Board issued a bunch of those licences for executive cars, limousines, accessible cabs, but they all give to the individual owners. Those people, they just work for a couple of hours, then park the car. They don't have a dispatch system. Dr. Mundy when he surveyed, he's openly says if the taxi board want to issue more licences, they should give to the companies, or if they want to give to the individual, those individuals have to be affiliated with any dispatch company which is 24 hours service—provide a service.

* (18:30)

So, now, for the Taxicab Board, when they issue the licence, they issue the licence for \$100, and what those people do, they put that cab or the limousine or standard cab on the road—not standard cab, their accessible cab on the road—and after six months, they sell that cab into the market value, which is \$300,000 or \$400,000, whatever the value was that time. So, why the taxicab not—Taxicab Board not making money out of that? Why they don't sell that licence plate for market value? So, that way, we don't lose that money, our share, and in the meantime, the Taxicab Board make money or the government make money.

Okay. The bill C—sorry—Bill 30, there's a column for the compensation. We cannot apply for the compensation. Why not? If the government compensate with Palliser Furniture, with Motor Coach and others, why not this industry?

First of all, we do not need Uber in this city because we are willing to provide a service. We are willing to put more cars on the road. Talk to us. Talk to the industry, how we can provide the service.

If the government really wants to bring the Uber in, it's up to them, but we are not agree with that at all. I really want to the government to remove that bill from the table and talk with the industry, because we have everything. We have a dispatch system. We have an app system which is very successful. Sixty, 65 per cent people using the app now, which is both Unicity and Duffy's. We both have an app system. So what else the government needs?

And if the government wants to be send us under the City, we've been fighting for taxi stands and other things for years with the taxi—with the City, but they never gave us a response. And now we try to—we make an appointment or make a meeting with the—Mr. Brian Bowman, but he didn't give us a response. And we want to be stay with under the provincial government, under the Taxicab Board. We are really happy, and thank you very much.

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

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood): I want to thank you for a very good presentation. You mentioned compensation in this bill as being a section put in by the Conservatives to ban any kind of compensation for your losses. And I wanted to ask you whether you knew that back in 1971, when Autopac was set up, there were private insurance agencies selling private insurance, and the government of the day led by Mr. Schreyer over there, third premier down—he set up a compensation plan for the private agents who didn't want to sell Autopac, \$2.5 million. And today, that would be around \$15.4 million. So the precedent is there.

Under the Canada-European free trade agreement, all the Quebec dairy farmers are being taken care of—for the next 10 years, they're being compensated.

So here we are in Manitoba, and you have a Conservative government who certainly understands what they're doing to you. And they're not—and they're specifically excluding compensation.

I have—also want to point out to you that, in Australia, every single state has been bringing in a similar type of legislation to this. And in almost all the states—but the State of Victoria—they are offering a \$494 million in assistance. A hundred thousand dollars—which is not enough, but \$100,000 per cab—for the first cab, and \$50,000 per licence for up to three more. Plus, there's a hardship fund in here.

This is what's happening in the State of Victoria in Australia. How can you explain what they're doing to you in this bill?

Mr. Govinder Singh: That's what I'm saying, you know? Like, that's totally wrong.

They should compensate with that because if they want to bring Uber in, what—first of all, we do not need Uber because we are billing to give a service to the city. And if the government wants to put more cars on there, why they don't auction the plates and make money instead of bringing Uber in and robbing the peoples?

Because they're going to be—come in, rob the people, and taking that money to the other countries. And we are all spending our money in the country, inside the city of Winnipeg. I've been here, like, more than 30, 35 years now. And we have other family members we bring from India to here. They sell all their property over there, bring the money from there to here and buy the business. Now, we are all afraid we did something wrong. Why this government wants to be—do like that with us?

Same thing in '91, when the Gary Filmon was in the power. He—the same thing. He bring that bill C-24.

Mr. Gerrard: Thank you for coming in to present, and I want to bring up this issue of compensation because I remember a little over 20 years ago, for many, many years farmers in western Canada had had the benefit of the Crow Rate when they shipped their grain. And that was taken away, and the farmers got a major compensation. And you know, the—my friend from Emerson, the MLA from Emerson, may have been one of them.

But do you think that taxi drivers should be treated at least as well as farmers?

Mr. Govinder Singh: For sure, sir.

Mr. Kelly Bindle (Thompson): Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Singh.

I'm the MLA for Thompson, which is a rural community, and our taxi company up there is managed by the municipality. So it's—in the North, in particularly rural areas where Mr. Lindsey is also from and the member for Dauphin (Mr. Michaleski), people pay their taxes, and they pay a municipal tax, they pay a provincial tax, and they pay a federal tax. And in our ridings, we have a thing called 'perimeteritis', where we think everything happens in Winnipeg—Winnipeg central. And it's an ongoing thing, it has been for years. But the—my constituents pay tax municipally to have their taxis run in that community. And to have them—their provincial tax money go to running taxis—go to pay for taxi board in Winnipeg, it's—doesn't sit well with them—

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

Thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Singh.

Our next presenter, presenter No. 64, Amandep Mangat. Amandep Mangat. Mr. Mangat does not appear to be here.

We will now go by a number the presenters up to presenter No. 76, Jatar Gill [*phonetic*]. Jatar Gill [*phonetic*]? Mr. Gill is not here.

We will move up to presenter No. 77, Mandeep Dhillon. Mandeep Dhillon? Mr. Dhillon does not appear to be here.

We will move on to presenter No. 78, Carlos Sosa.

Carlos Sosa? Mr. Sosa, you may proceed with your presentation when you are ready.

* (18:40)

Mr. Carlos Sosa (Private Citizen): Members of the Legislative Assembly, tonight I appear here as a person with a disability in front of you in opposition to Bill 30, the local cars for hire act.

Bill 30 is designed to do two things: hand over powers to regulate the taxicab industries to municipalities and to dissolve the Taxicab Board, which is extremely problematic for our community. The purpose of this act is concerning for persons with disabilities, especially when it mentions the following: hired by way of an online application, a digital network or platform, a website or any other similar matter. This is very concerning because it will allow for third-party providers to come into the

market, and in some cases, in other localities, have tried to skirt bylaws and also pay their workers poverty-level wages.

Accessibility is also a major concern. In the current taxicab industry, they have to follow rules and regulations to ensure that a number of their cabs are accessible for persons with disabilities. And when we talk about this notion of Uber, it is a vehicle-for-hire service which hires individuals as contractors to provide services, and there can be accessibility loopholes with that. And the question is: does—do provincial laws, do international treaties, apply to a service that is deregulated? And that's a very good question.

Under the current system, there are complaint mechanisms in place so that if a person with a disability has a concern, he or she is able to file that concern with the Taxicab Board. And so, therefore, if it is dissolved, how is that person going to file that complaint, and where's that mechanism to keep the providers accountable? And that's good for the whole industry to have a body that keeps every one accountable, that meets accessibility needs.

As persons with disabilities, we utilize transit and taxicabs—some do. Tax has—work, visit their family doctor, access recreation and social outings. We do so utilizing a service that is regulated where drivers have to go through seven hours of disability-awareness training. So again, if third-party providers come in, are they going to be subject to this training?

With the implementation of the customer service standard under The Accessibility for Manitobans Act, businesses are required to provide their employees training on accessibility for persons with disabilities. As Uber claims to be a technology platform, how can such laws apply to this particular service?

In 2010, the Government of Canada ratified the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, and the provincial government at the time fully supported the convention. Article 9 addresses the issue of accessibility: to enable persons with disabilities to live independently and participate fully in all aspects of life. State parties shall take appropriate measures to ensure that persons with disabilities access on an equal basis with others to the physical environment, to transportation, to information and communications, including information and communication technologies and systems and to other facilities and services open or provided to the public both in urban and rural areas.

Upon quick review of Bill 30, there was no mention of accessibility for persons with disabilities. So therefore, the law would not be compliant with the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

In other cities where there are regulated taxicab services—and I'll say this: in Ottawa, even before the introduction of Uber there, there was an increase in accessible cabs, and that was under a regulated industry, and I remember traveling with someone and calling a cab and within five minutes an accessible cab showed up at the hotel door. Again, that's a regulated environment. An example of where regulations do work is Ottawa for accessible cabs.

Obviously, issues of safety are a concern. I mean I don't see any provision enhancing the safety for persons with disabilities under Bill 30, and another thing that I would also mention is that what is being proposed here is concerning for our community, and the right thing to do is to vote against this bill. As a person who's been involved within the disability community, it is quite concerning that there has been no consultation with the community regarding the introduction of third-party providers, and as an affected group—as we are an affected group, we must be consulted before any bill gets introduced into the Legislature.

And, if a third-party provider comes in, then they must be placed on the same level playing field as taxicabs. They must comply with the same level of training and with the same level of safety regulations, and I would also say that we also need to be very mindful of the impacts that it will have on our communities, on issues of handi-transit, again, these companies, especially taxicabs, also are contractors for Handi-Transit, so again, they do have to follow regulations, and so I do welcome your questions.

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

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you for your presentation as well, Mr. Sosa. You've certainly added yet another dimension to the conversation we've—as we've gone through the process and listening to presenters, many of them have added another piece to the puzzle that's missing and you've brought in some interesting pieces with the disability aspect that, in fact, if the current system is dissolved and an unregulated system such as Uber takes its place, there's nothing that guarantees that there'd be any accessibility in that ride-sharing cab. Is that correct? *[interjection]*

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Sosa, you have to wait 'til I recognize you.

Mr. Sosa: Sorry. Sorry about that. That would be my understanding, I mean I looked at Bill 30 and there's nothing in that bill that talks about accessibility here. Again, I can only comment about Manitoba. I can say that, I mean, generally, there are concerns within the disability community about Uber, about the lack of accessibility, whether there are guarantees or not. I mean we don't see any guarantees here and there needs to be guarantees that we will have accessible cabs because, I will say this to you, especially in the winter when many persons with disabilities, who may utilize the regular transit service, will need accessible transportation because of the inadequate snow clearing on our streets.

Mr. Gerrard: Thank you for coming in and talking about the needs of people with disabilities. Help us understand some of the things that would need to be in place. You mentioned that a certain proportion of the vehicles which are used should be accessible vehicles, which would accommodate wheelchairs or whatever. What other components—what other safety components would be critical?

* (18:50)

Mr. Sosa: You also need a complaint body. So you need an accountability body to ensure that, No. 1, if issues of accessibility are not met, that there are consequences for that. You also need disability awareness training, and that happens within the current system. As I said, taxicab drivers have to take seven hours of training, and so it's quite important that a car, whatever we want to call it, is a taxi. I don't care if it's a third-party provider, it is a taxi; it is providing a service that needs to be regulated and needs to ensure that there are accountability mechanisms in place to protect the safety of the riders, of the users that use it, but also to ensure that also the prices are set in a proper things because I've heard in other places, such as in Edmonton, where surge pricing will take effect after a given night. I've heard of these cases in the past. And, quite openly, our community lives in poverty, and if we were to call a cab, at a certain amount of time, at a certain time, are we to be expected to cough up enough money to cover the extra costs? We simply do not have the money to afford that.

Mr. Bindle: Well, thank you for your presentation. I'd just like to address a couple of issues that—given this—if this bill passes, basically, it hands over control of the taxi industry to the municipality away

from the provincial government, and seeing as many of you have been convinced by the NDP that that means bringing Uber in and competing, but if Uber has—I'll just entertain the thought of Uber, since you brought it up—since Uber has no safety provisions for persons with disabilities and they have—they're unregulated, there's no criminal record background checks, no child sex offence registry, no screening or vetting, there's drug trafficking, sex crimes, no cameras and, you know, actual taxi drivers actually need seven days of training, would that not give the existing taxis a competitive advantage to have people phone them, having all that?

Mr. Sosa: What I would say to you is that if we are going to allow a third-party provider to come in, then they need to be on the same playing field, because if we don't do that, then you undercut the service, and when you undercut the service, then what you're doing is, is you're basically putting drivers that provide good-quality, accessible services out of business. And I don't think we want to do that. I don't think—I don't want—

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Sosa, but we're well over the allotted time, so we will now move on to the next presenter.

Alexander Ashton. Alexander Ashton?

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

Mr. Alexander Ashton (Private Citizen): Thank you. Can you hear me?

My name is Alexander Ashton. I completed civil engineering here in the city, and I also recently completed my master's in urban planning, specializing in transportation.

For the sake of transparency, I am working with the Winnipeg Community Taxi Coalition as a researcher. I am, however, here to try and show some new topics that have not been mentioned publicly by politicians, officials, the press or other members in this committee and that I believe are crucial in this discussion about transportation, Uber and the taxi industry.

So we'll start off with data. Data is critical to planning, controlling traffic congestion in detail, establishing regulations, investing in public transportation for people, no matter what their needs, and ultimately investing millions in infrastructure efficiently. Companies like Uber have routinely

defied sharing data with municipalities on transportation, which is a huge issue for municipalities throughout the world. Uber has for years—have 'gissen' no data, which other—any other taxi industries or transit industries are required to give. This goes against several regulations in other jurisdictions and also against the MNP report.

It can—so data can be crucial because it gives the smallest detail of where pickups and drop-offs are happening, if that needs to be accommodated, if it's causing congestion, or it can be about broader issues such as levels of service in areas, response times, and new developments with Uber's market penetration, which is resulting in increased congestion and a slow-down of traffic speeds in general, and this is beginning to be very well documented in areas of large penetration.

So why is this important to the Province? I know the planning is not your responsibility. This is important because it's the biggest single change to the taxi and transportation industry in Winnipeg since possibly the '30s when the taxi board was established in the province.

You may not be interested in the planning aspects and as that's the City's responsibility, but the Province does provide millions of dollars to the City and transportation and it is important that it is done efficiently and with, of course, data to not be planning blind.

Se we talk about the lack of data and, again, I'm even going to involve discussions about data, about safety or assaults, and we'll move to similar issues of communication.

The coalition has spoken about community and throughout these days you've heard from hundreds of drivers and their families explaining and debating points in detail about the report, what they go through on a daily basis, and, unfortunately, very intense and emotional experiences of danger on the job.

Truly, you won't ever have an opportunity to hear such a level of insight and transparency in the industry possibly anywhere else, and I have not, as somebody who is routinely obsessed with topics of transportation.

Hundreds of people have come to not only talk about their impact on their families but benefit you with transparency and insight of the complexity of the industry.

Compare that with Uber and similar companies who do not negotiate and don't share data. It's taken them years to share anything, and now that they have for specific cities, it's been substandard according to planners and city officials in North America.

You can have a conversation with anybody in this room and they will give you the utmost detail and they will try and answer your question in the next five minutes.

So, I do not believe you have this ability with Uber. I can't even imagine who you would have to contact and how long it would take to get somebody who can make a decision.

So, to me this seems like the risk of losing control and ability to regulate or communicate for any form of government in Manitoba.

Just to give a story about date involving Denmark and Sweden, on the issue of paying taxes, 'uberly' deliberately obstructed the government by not providing data which would have been the only way to get its drivers to declare taxes. It was found that a huge per cent of drivers weren't declaring taxes and Uber did not provide the data on purpose.

This is also reminiscent of what happened in Ontario this year where Uber complained that it did not want to pay HST as it would hinder their innovation.

Now, you know, I'd like to be very innovative, too, and not have to pay provincial or federal taxes, but that's not the case.

So then we'll move on to the economics of Uber. It's no secret Uber is a for-profit company. This is blatantly obvious. They will operate for a profit but with minimum risk and minimum effort. As a result, they don't serve everybody, nor would they, according to their model.

This model is nothing new. There's nothing innovative about it. The issues that Uber is not interested in transportation to the suburbs, poor areas, or servicing the disabled at is—is far less or not profitable.

I am pretty sure that nobody in this room would recommend that the taxi industry or Winnipeg Transit stop serving the suburbs or the disabled. However, it seems that we're paving the route for Uber to do exactly that.

So, to give some concrete and existing examples of this, of Uber and similar companies, New York is

at 0.1 per cent of its Uber fleet or similar companies providing access to the disabled. Ottawa is at zero per cent. Winnipeg is around 10 per cent, just a rough number, but it's around 10 per cent, and going back to Ottawa, they've been discussing about a way to provide finance or assistance for accessibility but nothing has happened in over a year.

* (19:00)

So I was wondering about the suburban points, and I was thinking, man, I sounded way too theoretical. But just this last couple of days Uber has announced it is now charging substantially more for anyone who is further than eight minutes away from the driver, basically to suburban riders and possibly to drivers requiring accessible routes as their network is far less dense.

If I was a politician representing a suburban riding, I would be very concerned about this and its implications, and the immediate and median future.

It's plain and simple, Uber likes to skin the profitable routes, such as the airport and downtown without cross-subsidizing access to other areas of the city or accessibility.

So in the sake of time I would—I'll skip safety issues, but I will conclude that this is the most significant change to transportation in the city since the taxi board creation in the '30s. It is a change in safety, a change in service to areas, a very likely increase in traffic congestion in the city and a change in service to the disabled.

There is so much uncertainty and many clear impacts to people in the community I don't believe this process is ready. I think the experiences of other Canadian cities and international ones need to be investigated, and consultations need to be started on several of the key issues.

What I've identified so far is some of the more obvious examples that can have huge logistical and financial implications on the taxi industry, but also the City and yourselves the Province.

My recommendation is for consultations for the key issues to begin so that the Province is not blindsided by negative and unforeseen consequences that are clearly documented in other cities and in Canada and outside.

So, with that, I'll answer any questions.

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

Mr. Len Isleifson (Brandon East): Mr. Ashton, I want to go back to when you first started off, you said you were really interested on working in the planning areas. And I'm not sure if you're aware or not, but Winnipeg is one of, if not the only large city in Canada, that does not regulate their own taxi industry. It is definitely the only municipality in Manitoba that does not regulate the taxi industry.

Do you not feel that a municipality is in the best position to align the taxi industry with the rest of the transportation industry within their own communities?

Mr. Ashton: Well, I mean, that's a very good point, and I believe the MNP may have alluded to that maybe in some more initial, original steps. However, yes, I believe that should happen absolutely. Data should be taken. Efficiency should be maximized, therefore saving taxpayers possibly millions of dollars.

However, I do believe, with the route that is being taken, the issue of communication, lack of planning since lack of data and lack of, well, a whole bunch of other things I've thought are going to be basically cancelled and won't be possible in the future, including regulations on accessibility.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you for your presentation tonight.

And, as we've said with some other presenters that we keep learning more as we scratch away at this, and you brought in some interesting points. The point about data is very interesting once you start to understand why that data is important for city planners and for a bunch of other issues, some of which we've heard of previously about the potential use of Uber or other similar type car hire services for criminal purposes when there's no data collected as to pickups, drop-offs, all that kind of stuff that the regulated taxi industry quite clearly has that information and is able to provide it to law enforcement as required.

The other thing you talked about was the loss, or potential loss of taxes to the Province, to the City, to the municipality, as it may be, that again there's no way to track how much money a Uber or similar type service driver is actually making because there's no set fare, there's no device in the car that keeps track of how much. You're depending really on the individual self reporting that they made 10 trips today and made \$100 as opposed to, maybe, saying

they only made four trips today when, in fact, they did make 10 trips.

So the potential then is that the taxpayer is going to lose out because there's going to be less income coming in than there would be. And, as they undercut the regulated taxi services, then there's going to be less income for those people and less tax dollars coming in from them, as well.

Is that a fair assessment, and would you like to comment on that a little more? *[interjection]*

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Ashton, you must wait 'til I recognize you.

Mr. Ashton: I think that's a very fair assessment. I mean, we're talking about the same company that basically got in trouble in Scandinavia, but also in Canada. I mean, they tried to resist paying HST in Ontario this year. This happened just a couple of months ago. There—it's no secret they're an offshore account. You read the Uber terms of service, the first paragraph says we are a company in Amsterdam.

I think there's a lot of—I think just the general situation with taxes is worrisome as, you know, the taxi industry does not—I believe doesn't have an offshore account. But also, the actions that happened in Scandinavia are very troubling. And, actually, I called them up because I said why are you trying to force Uber to put taxi meters in? I mean, you know, sounds kind of archaic, right? However, it was as a result because there was simply no other way to establish how many hours they were driving, how many—how much money they were making. It's Uber's decision that led to that regulation and their actions.

Mr. Chairperson: We thank you for your presentation, Mr. Ashton, but time for questions has expired. We will continue on to the next presenter.

The next presenter is No. 80, Kaur S. Sidhu. Kaur S. Sidhu. Is Mr. Sidhu here? He does not seem to be. We will—Mr. Sidhu will be moved to the bottom of the list.

Presenter No. 81, Ranjit S. Jauhal. Jauhal. Ranjit Jauhal. Mr. Jauhal, do you—you may proceed with your presentation when you are ready.

Mr. Ranjit Jauhal (Private Citizen): Good evening, everybody. My—I'm Ranjit Jauhal and I'm the—came in Canada 1972.

I'm on the taxi since 1974 and I start my first job in Thompson Inco mine. They laid off from there.

Worked there about four, five years then come back to the city here. Start with CP Rail. So work 12 years in the CP Rail, get laid off by—they buy us out. Then I go back to the taxi—driving taxi for a while. Then go back to the—again, Grey Goose bus. Driving a bus. Then they sold the company. Come back to the taxi again.

So this is my last permanent job, so, you know, as soon as I get out of the job, laid off from the job—nice jobs—always I ask [*inaudible*] brought me here. And I—one time he was the manager in Duffy's Taxi. I said what—now that Grey Goose sold to Greyhound, we have no jobs. Again, he said, oh, you have your mother. I said you are my mother, but is a taxi. So taxi is mother, give you everything. So that's what it is.

We—I think is better, you know, stay on the taxi. And my old age now I'm going to survive with the—on the taxi things. And now I heard—I've been—I bought the Unicity-Grosvenor-Morris. In 1972, I came that time they get together. One company starting the Unicity. So the girl from German, she want to go back to Germany. She sold me the taxi, \$4,000 because they giving the \$10,000 loan that time. So we pay—like, those days, you know, payments for that \$10,000 plus the expenses. So I pay her \$4,000, because she paid two years \$2,000, \$2,000. So I paid her \$4,000 to get the cab that time.

* (19:10)

So I think now it's—you know, I'm staying in here, in Manitoba, especially the mostly families surviving on the taxis. I know the East Indians mostly are the people sitting. Manitoban, they survive with the taxicab companies. So now they're saying the—going in the taxi—going in the—when no price on it, nothing. And I think if the other company's coming, they should bring same like equal way, the same insurance, same safety and everything.

We don't care about that competition, but our competition have to be—the other company same thing, same coming with the insurance, and the safety, and every rules. And same thing with—since we started, these companies coming day by day, more proving, more safety, more education, more educated the driver, everything coming more and more and more.

Perfect company—is running perfect now. So I heard the government, this—they going, something spends too much money on the taxi board,

something—or the taxi company like—you know, share with that, I guess.

Should we share everything? That's what I said.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation.

Mr. Saran: Thanks, Mr. Jauhal, for coming here.

I think member from Thompson raised one question like why they subsidize taxi board from their money, and also there's a question some people don't have children, why they subsidize some other people's education. That's separate issue, but I think main issue is that is a company—both companies ready to share those expenses? Whatever the government is losing, maybe \$500,000, perhaps they can help pay little bit extra fee so that \$500,000 could be compensated—[*interjection*]

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Jauhal, before you can answer I must recognize you. So you now may answer the question.

Mr. Jauhal: Should be the competition chasing the companies. And drivers, and everything, is in that.

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

We have an amendment to introduce, one of eight. This particular one on safety, we will be issue—introducing it at report stage, which is we'll file it tomorrow and the government will vote on it as late as next Tuesday. So I would like to invite you all down for witnessing the vote on this safety amendment, but I—what I'm interested in knowing—because we do have still one more day—is to find out if I'm missing anything on the safety amendment.

We're going to issue—introduce an amendment to their bill, to Bill 30, that vehicle-for-hire law must provide mandatory safety standards that include (1) a shield, (2) a camera, (3) a strobe light, (4) a panic button, (5) a requirement for mechanical inspection by an automotive service technician certified under the apprentice and certification act at least twice a year, okay? And a requirement that before being offered to drive a vehicle for hire, a person must (1) pass a criminal record check and Child Abuse Registry; undergo at least 35 hours of training in the form approved by the applicable municipality that includes components on driver and passenger safety, conflict de-escalation, geographic knowledge about the area in which the driver is operating and English-language skills; also a requirement that after completing the requirements, a driver must pass a criminal record check and child abuse every two

years, okay, and a requirement while operating a vehicle for hire, the driver at all times has to hold a valid driver's licence in the prescribed class, display photo identification on the dashboard of the vehicle that allows the passenger to determine the name of the driver, okay, a regulatory mechanism for passengers to make complaints and for those complaints to be investigated, and any other requirement an applicable—city council, that is—considers necessary to protect the drivers and passengers of vehicles for hire. Also, we put in a definition of the criminal—the Child Abuse Registry check and the criminal record checks, indicating that is has to be done through the police force.

So, if there's any other thing that I've missed, if I've missed anything, I'd like you to be able to feel free to tell me about it sometime tonight so we could include it in the resolution for tomorrow, so.

Mr. Bindle: Thank you for your presentation. Just to clarify, the taxpayers in the North pay already for taxi regulation. They don't want to pay again. It's not a one-time thing, but they do. Now they pay twice for the Province to look after Winnipeg.

But, in regards to the amendments that are suggested, many people know that—they may or may not know that the responsibility—the purpose of this bill is to hand over the responsibility to the City, so then any amendments that they're suggesting would become the requirement of the City. I mean, there's always the question of why weren't they already in there when the NDP was in power, but I just want—do you understand that that would become part of the—it's missing amendments—

Mr. Chairperson: —Sorry, I didn't have the mic on. Thank you, Mr. Jauhal

We will now move on to the next presenter, presenter No. 82, Kamal Solaimani. Kamal? If—and if I'm not pronouncing people's names properly, when they come up to the mic, if they could please correct me. Does not appear that Mr. Solaimani is here. He will be moved to the bottom of the list.

We will now move back to presenter No. 1. When we call the next presenters, if they are not present, they will be dropped from the list completely. As per agreement and what is part of the process, we are not allowed to register new presenters at this time, so if we call somebody's name and they're not present, they will be dropped from the list. Thank you.

Our next presenter is No. 1, Harjit Sodhi. Harjit? You may proceed with your presentation when you are ready.

Mr. Harjit Sodhi (Private Citizen): Good evening, everybody. My name is Harjit Sodhi—

Mr. Chairperson: If you could speak a little louder, Mr. Sodhi.

Mr. Sodhi: Yes. Good evening, everybody. My name is—last name is Sodhi, and I came to Canada about 10 years ago, and I've been driving a cab from the last eight years. Me and my dad bought a cab, about \$400,000, and we took a loan on it, and we're trying to pay it off now. And as the Uber come, it makes us really hard to pay our loans and everything. And, like, I started going to school now, and my dad is helping out with my school fees. And my sister go to school as well, so it's really hard for my dad to pay off the loans and help us out with the school. No other family member is working right now except my dad.

* (19:20)

And Uber and the taxi industry should play on the same rules. Like, they should have same insurance, same safety features and everything. Like, I used to drive—when I was—one time, I was driving a cab and I almost got stabbed. But due to the shield, I got—I—saved my life. And, if there's no shield in Uber car or any other car, it'll be really hard for drivers. Our city is not very safe for driving cab or—driving cab. That's all, I guess.

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

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you for your presentation. Sorry that I popped out for a minute there, but you—when I came in, you were talking about some of the safety features that taxis have to have that really protect yourself and some of the features also protect the customers. And what you're saying, really, is is you're not opposed to there being competition, but you need to make sure the same protections are built in for other ride-sharing things, as they call them, which really are taxis by a different name, but operating under different rules; you'd really like to see the rules the same for everybody so that you can compete fairly and provide a safe experience for the driver and the passengers—is. Would you like to just expand on that a little, please?

Mr. Sodhi: Yes, there should be, like, there should be shield, cameras, panic button and everything

should be in Uber, too, because you don't know who you're picking up, who the other person is. He might be a criminal or something. He might got a weapon on him, try to rob you, get stuff away from you. So I think every—they should have the safety features too. It's safe for the driver, and, yes, the life is the most important thing, very—it's not about the business.

Mr. Cliff Graydon (Emerson): I'd like to thank you for your presentation tonight. And I believe the member opposite has had an issue with the rules. The rules will be established by the municipality. Right now, it isn't there, but they will be established, and I believe you'll have a fair and level playing field. And at the same time, you brought up a good point, as well, about the safety of the drivers. And we know in the past that some of the drivers have suffered from people and the camera wouldn't've made a difference at the time. So we, certainly, have a concern about the safety of the drivers as well. I don't think you have—*[interjection]*

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Sodhi.

Mr. Sodhi: But the—still the thing is when—if we have a camera, we still have a picture of a criminal. We can—like, the police can still take the pictures out—*[interjection]*

Mr. Chairperson: Order.

Sorry, Mr. Sodhi, I'll let you continue. But it's getting a little loud at the table, so we would like to hear the presenters and not the banter back and forth. So, if you wish to do that, you may go to outside—the chairs so that the rest of us can hear what's going on.

Go ahead, Mr. Sodhi.

Mr. Sodhi: See, if we get a criminal in the cab and something happens with the driver, the police can still have—the police still have a chance to catch him because they got a camera and everything, right. If the same thing happened in Uber and there is no camera, there are no chances. So it's better to have something than nothing. That's all.

Hon. Jeff Wharton (Minister of Municipal Relations): Thank you, Mr. Sodhi, for your presentation. Really appreciate you sharing—you and your dad, of course, working together on your cab for the last eight years.

Question for you, sir: Just wondering, first of all, you're studying in school right now. Congratulations. Are you—what are you studying for?

Floor Comment: Electrician.

Mr. Wharton: Oh, super.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Sodhi, you must wait 'til I recognize you before you answer or else it won't get in Hansard.

So you may answer.

Mr. Sodhi: Yes, electrician.

Ms. Cindy Lamoureux (Burrows): First of all, thank you for coming out and sharing your story, and both you and father have invested into a single cab, if I got that correctly. And I just kind of want to know how you feel—I know one of the other members across the table here, he talked about, well, you know, it will be up to the municipalities to really distribute the roles and the rules. Do you feel that this government is sort of washing their hands of this and just passing the buck off? *[interjection]*

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Sodhi.

Mr. Sodhi: Yes, I do feel like that, yes. It's the same thing.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you again for your presentation, and thank you for your answers.

One of the members opposite has suggested, well, just put faith in the fact that the City will implement the same kind of safety rules and stuff as what are in place now, but we already know from other jurisdictions that have allowed Uber-type services to come into place, that those things haven't been put in place to protect drivers or passengers, so your comment on that.

Mr. Chairperson: Time for questions has expired.

We thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Sodhi, and we will move on to the next presenter. Thank you.

The next presenter is Megan Linton. Megan Linton? No. 2, Megan Linton, does not appear to be here. Linton will be—No. 2 will be dropped from the list and they will, like—they will not be allowed to present if they should show up.

Presenter No. 3, Harpal Bedi. Harpal Bedi? Mr. Bedi does not seem to be present. Mr. Bedi will be dropped from the list of presenters.

No. 4, Rajinder Bansal. Rajinder Bansal? Mr. Bansal does not appear to be here. Mr. Bansal will be dropped from the list of presenters.

Presenter No. 5, Gurinder Singh. Gurinder Singh? Mr. Singh?

Floor Comment: Good evening to all the committee. He has a presentation over here. If you allow me, I will read for him.

Mr. Chairperson: Yes. Could you just state your name for the record?

Mr. Tarlochan Gill, on behalf of Mr. Gurinder Singh (Private Citizen): My name is Tarlochan Gill.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, Mr. Gill. You may present on behalf of Mr. Singh.

Mr. Tarlochan Gill, on behalf of Mr. Gurinder Singh: Thank you for the chance to present tonight. Our industry has been very clear. We are about safety, fairness and community. We want to stress one thing: You do not need this bill if your intention is to bring in Uber.

In Manitoba, the taxi board act and regulation 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 licence and a taxicab business licence.

I also want to stress something else. Uber does not provide service to many people, particular as disabled. Accessibility is a big issue. Accessibility for Manitoba act was enacted in 2013 and accessibility standards for customer service regulation became law in 2015. Private sectors and non-profit organizations with at least one employee have until November 18th to comply with the 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 Uber do about providing service to a disabled?

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 strobe lights and driver shields are mandated by the taxi board. Winnipeg appears to have the most rigorous safety equipment requirement of all compared cities. Taxicab owners and drivers generally support in-car safety equipment.

* (19:30)

Driving a taxicab is a risk occupation not made secure with current safety provisions. Stakeholders indicate that they would face significant safety risks as was seen with violent or intoxicated passengers, discrimination and fare disputes.

To protect the safety of passengers, the taxi board requires drivers to undergo criminal record check, mandatory training for safety—mandatory training for driver safety and safe equipment handling for passengers, as well as regular vehicle inspection.

Safety driving a cab is a dangerous. The Taxicab Board has identified 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 the average worker. In Canada, there have been 150 taxicab drivers killed since 1970. In Manitoba, there have been 12 taxicab drivers killed while on duty since 1945. In this, I just want to add, into—Pritam Deol, since he was killed in one of our cab, after that there was a camera, strobe light, shields, all those things came for driver safety and even for passengers. After that, cameras—80 per cent crimes are less.

Taxi drivers are at risk in terms of robbery, hijacking of their taxi, abusive and threatening behaviour, physical assault, traffic disputes and accidents. Fare disputes, in combination of the above. Shields and cameras; dramatic improvement in safety. After the murder of Pritam Deol, the taxi driver issues report was released in October 2001. It made 18 recommendations. One of the key recommendations was the development of taxi driver's safety program to enhance driver skills to recognize and access risk, and how to diffuse potentially hostile situations. The effectiveness of camera and shield is clear. The Winnipeg Police Service indicates that for the—for calendar year 2002, there were 20 fewer post—taxicab robberies than in the previous year. This represented a reduction of 71 per cent in serious taxicab crime since the—in the cab, camera and shield was introduced.

When 2013–2003 is compared to 2001—the year before camera and shield was introduced—taxicab robberies and other violent taxicab cameras have been reduced to 79 per cent. There was an increase of 10.5 per cent in crime rate overall in the city of Winnipeg over the same period. The arrests made for crime against taxi drivers was 35 per cent per year 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 the standard and accessible taxicab has been in effect since July 1st, 2002, to have an operational in-cab camera, and the requirement to have safety shield installed and—has been put in effect since January 8, 2003.

The safety initiative taken in Winnipeg includes other measures, such as mandatory first-aid kits, effective July 2002. Improved taxicab driver training and a requirement that any taxi with GPS must have the system working all the time. Winnipeg Police Service data indicates that since the introduction of taxicab safety measure in 2002, robberies of taxicabs were reduced to 71 per cent.

The Winnipeg taxicab industry indicates that it's very pleased with the decrease in all crimes, fare jumpers, assaults, robberies involving taxicabs since the introduction of the safety measures. Drivers found—find that customers, while in the cab, were settled down, knowing that a camera is taking their picture. There are very few instances of—hostile instances—incidents in taxicab crimes that do happen in taxicab are solved quickly by the police using the digital image to identify and find the suspect. In many cases, the perpetrator will admit to the crime, thus enable a swift resolution to an incident.

So our industry is about service and about safety. Please keep it that way. Please vote against the bill. Support safety, fairness, and community. Thank you.

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

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you very much for the presentation that you put on on the other gentleman's behalf. I appreciate the fact that both of you are here to share your views on really what's wrong with this bill, and it's interesting that you've introduced quite a few statistics into the conversation that we hadn't really heard before about really how important some of the safety features are that are installed in cabs today.

And those safety features only came about because bad things happened to cab drivers, and really, introducing another service that may not have the same features—in fact we know from other jurisdictions that they don't and have no confidence that they will be forced to put those in in this jurisdiction.

So introducing those kinds of vehicles and people into situations will really just make things less safe for drivers and passengers, won't they?

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Singh—but, Mr. Gill, you're translating on behalf of Mr. Singh, could you please spell out your name for Hansard, because we don't have the spelling of your name—your first name.

Mr. Tarlochan Gill, on behalf of Mr. Gurinder Singh: My first name is Tarlochan. T-a-r-l-o-c-h-a-n; and last name Gill, G-i-l-l.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you. You may proceed with the answer now.

Mr. Tarlochan Gill, on behalf of Mr. Gurinder Singh: It's a really good question about safety. Whatever the government makes or taxi board makes as the rules, we follow all the time those rules. Even I'm driving a cab from 28 years, there is making a requirement for all the drivers to take another safety course even for disabled person and things. I did Handi-Transit for almost 10, 12 years. I have taken those courses at that time, but still the taxi board or the government want us to do those trainings again, we will not refuse it.

But, on the other side, the first day we had an option to come over here, the Uber guy was here. I think we are ready to answer all those questions. Nobody asked him a question about why there is so much criticism—is happening in Canada, when he's saying—Uber guy told the taxis Uber is all over in Alberta, in Ontario, everywhere, it's there, it's working fine.

But nobody asked him the question about why there is criticism, why it's not following the rules. He—like, there is a 35-hour course, was made by the Quebec government. He refused and he is threatening to enter without it. So instead of bringing those kinds of companies, openly, without any—we can say without any consulting with things, instead of facing those consequences, Uber comes here. If you are the government, you make some laws, and they stop following and start threatening. Before facing those consequences, everyone should think about hundred times this thing, please.

Mr. Wharton: Thank you, Mr. Singh, and thank you, Mr. Gill, for coming out this evening. I really appreciate your comments. Again it's—we've been listening to comments for about 34 hours now and have taken in a lot of information and we really appreciate your time you took tonight to help Mr. Gill out.

I do have a little comment though, regarding the comments from the member from Flin Flon, and this is not the first time he's mentioned that other jurisdictions don't have the same safety regulations as Manitoba or Winnipeg has currently. And in the 170-page report from Meyers Norris Penny, there are comparisons with other jurisdictions in Canada. And

I can tell you that Calgary, Hamilton, Ottawa, and Vancouver have in—they do have cameras, they have criminal record checks, they have driver record checks, they also have vehicle checks every six months, and they have general road inspections as well every six months, and the average age of a vehicle is eight years old. So there has been substantial consultation done in this 170-page MNP report that was commissioned by the NDP, and Mr. Singh and Mr. Gill. So I just wanted to make sure I had that on the record for your information as well. Thank you.

* (19:40)

Mr. Tarlochan Gill, on behalf of Mr. Gurinder Singh: Compared to the population, we are talking about Calgary, we are talking about Vancouver, Toronto. Our population is really less than that, and the crime is more in Winnipeg than those provinces.

Mr. Wharton: And that's perhaps maybe why we need to ensure that, as we go forward with this process, Mr. Singh and Mr. Gill and all your colleagues, that we enhance safety. And that's why we're so happy to have you share those concerns with us, because, obviously, there is a problem and we need to make sure we move forward to protect you, your colleagues and the public, Sir.

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

Time for the questions have expired. We will now move on to the next presenter. Thank you very much.

Our next presenter Andy Dhaliwal. Andy Dhaliwal does not seem to be present. We will—he will be taken off the list.

The next presenter, No. 7, Manpreet Paul. Manpreet Paul? Mr. Paul does not seem to be here. He will be taken off the list.

Number 8, Harpreet Singh Sidhu. Harpreet Singh Sidhu does not seem to be here. Mr. Sidhu will be taken off the list.

Paramjit Bhangoo, and, if I'm mispronouncing your name, could you please correct me.

Mr. Paramjit Bhangoo (Private Citizen): It's very nice, actually. It's very right. Thank you.

Thank you, honourable Chairperson and the committee members—

Mr. Chairperson: Oh—Mr. Bhangoo, you may proceed with your presentation when you are ready.

Mr. Bhangoo: Thank you, honourable Chairperson and the committee members.

My name is Paramjit Bhangoo. I come to Canada in May 1983. I am graduated from India—Punjabi University, Chandigarh. When I came here I try to continue my education, I upgrade—besides I was working part time. In 1985, I was studying power engineer at the Red River community College when I started driving taxi as a part time. In 1987, I graduated in P.Eng.—class third. After few months, I got job with school division No. 1. I worked a class 5 job instead of class 3. My job was shift work, which was not suitable for my children. Myself and my wife were working different shifts, so that we would take care of our two young boys.

Main goal was—main goal all my life was to raise our children, give them a good education so that they can go to city, in Canada and contribute their parts in Canadian economy. Therefore, the adjustment of our shift work—I started driving taxi full time. In '92, I brought some money from India and bought a Unicity share No. 234. The sale was approved by the Manitoba Taxicab Board. Taxicab Board knows the price of the share I have paid. In fact, I bought my job and the same time, I created one full-time job and one part-time job.

During these years I worked hard: nights and long hours to raise my children. Also, I have seen all types of racism, threats, violence. During these years, my four colleagues got murdered on the job—stabbing, beating was common.

I am very, very thankful to the Manitoba government who made mandatory safety shield and camera in 2002. This reduced the daily violence about 50 to 60 per cent. Now, I will share some points how the Bill 30 would affect the existing industry. I would request the members: Please take this seriously.

Number 1, that value—the taxi value was a retirement asset for me and other owners of my age. This bill made our assets zero. Now we cannot retire happily. We have to work many more years. Fifty per cent elderly owners are in depression. You will see in a few years, many elderly will—many elderly taxi owners will be an extra burden on our health-care system.

There are about 1,300 full-time jobs in this industry. Beside full-time drivers, about

200 employees are working in our dispatch offices. Bill 30 will change full-time jobs into part-time jobs. I would not expect this from our specific government.

Taxi was considered—No. 3, taxi was considered small business. There are some owners, they invest four hundred, five hundred thousand dollars in the small business and got Canadian immigration. The government of Manitoba knows about it. They bought their jobs and create for other drivers. Bill 30 made their investment zero. This did not happen with a natural cause; it happened because of our government's action.

Regulated industry is always better for drivers and the public for safe operation. Taxi fare is determined by our government. Any increase or decrease is done by the government. Taxi—regulated taxis have no surge time, and our metre is sealed; we cannot change at all. It remains the same in all weathers, times or rush hours. It remains the same.

Number 5, the government knows Bill 30 is destructible to the existent industry. They know it is not in the favour of small businessmen. They know it wouldn't create full-time jobs. They know this will wipe out our taxi value. That's why they added a no-compensation clause in it.

I, myself, believe in customer service. The public must be served well. If government thinks there are not enough cars to serve the public, please issue more plates. Rather than free, government can sell the plates and government can make money. This way, it will generate revenue for government, and our investment can be saved.

Number 7, as our government prepare with the Bill 30, it seems they think about big corporations only, such as Uber, Lyft, e-t-c. They never thought about the existing industry. I want to inform you that the taxi industry did not get any raise for the last eight years. Our MPI insurance went up; minimum wage has gone up; our maintenance cost has gone up; employees in our office, they got a raise. And maybe your salaries has gone up in the last eight years. Taxi board knows this fact. And nobody told to taxi board they should increase our fares.

At last, if the government still want to go—proceed with this bill, please consider the following things: delay the bill to consult the existing industry. Number B, there must be a level playing field for everyone who perform the same job. Number C, amend the bill to ensure the highest level of safety

for drivers and passengers in all types of ride-share vehicle. Amend the bill section for compensation and legal action, because government allowed it in the past to insurance companies, fishermen and farmers.

All citizens should be equal under any legislation; otherwise, it will be a discrimination with one group, one community. This is my humble request. Please take this seriously. I—a democratic government would never target one group. We are also part of the Canadian community and a healthy economy.

Thank you.

* (19:50)

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

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you very much for your presentation. Very well thought out and very well presented. I commend you for that, and I commend you for, really, not just saying what was wrong, but also suggesting some things that should be done to amend or change this bill to make it fair for everybody.

And, really, that's the crux of the matter, is ensuring that any ride business—call it ride-sharing, call it a car for hire, call it whatever, it's the same as a taxi at the end of the day—ensuring that that's a level playing field. Your taxi industry is not afraid of competition, but they want to compete fairly and evenly with anybody else that wants to enter the field. It somehow seems patently unfair that a ride-sharing company would come in and not have to have all the things in place that you presently have to have in place.

So, really, if you could just kind of summarize why you think perhaps, maybe, a government would suggest bringing in something different.

Mr. Bhangoo: First of all, if they allow different safety measures or systems to operate for the same type of work, this is not fair with the one group.

Secondly, it's—if they're allowing without any safety measures—it's safety is not only for drivers. I consider the public should be safe also.

Mr. Isleifson: Thank you very much for your presentation. We certainly appreciate hearing from different folks.

I know, myself, along with Mr. Maloway here, we've been here almost every day listening to all of these presentations. And you talk about fairness and

how the system might be unfair, but I do want to put on record that it is unfair that the members opposite of this table have convinced you and all those great folks behind you that there was no consultation when, in fact, there were over 10,000 people who participated in this consultation. And it even says here that the taxi board held regular meetings with the industry and over 675 drivers and owners provided information.

So my question to you is: When they say there is no consultation, evidence shows there was, when you say there was no consultation, do you—are you just meaning that you personally were not consulted?

Mr. Bhangoo: Not myself. I don't consider that, that I was not consulted. And they're not supposed to even, to consult one person.

But I was in the board last year and we haven't got any letter from Taxicab Board for any ride share or taking the Manitoba Taxicab Board, to give in to the City or to anything.

Mr. Bindle: Thank you for your presentation. I want you to know, regardless of, you know, what the NDP have been telling you, they know as well as we do that for Uber to come to Winnipeg or not is outside the scope of this bill. The NDP are suggesting that this bill will present, you know, hypothetical future and imagined hardships on taxi drivers and their owners, but we know—as do you—that the taxi business is difficult and competitive industry and, you know, you're giving your vehicle costs, your upkeep, your maintenance, your oil and your gas, including NDP gas tax increases.

Speaking to the hardship in the taxi industry, in 2011, the NDP government unilaterally expanded the 7 per cent PST tax increase on goods and services not previously taxed, such as insurance. And then they illegally increased it to 8 per cent right after the election, when they promised not to, effectively creating a greater hardship for drivers to pay their bills.

Can you please comment on how the industry adjusted to that very real hardship unexpectedly presented by the NDP?

Mr. Bhangoo: Thank you for that question.

I would never go—

Mr. Chairperson: Order. Mr. Bhangoo.

Could you just—it's, getting, again, a little bit loud here. The speaker—like, the person asking the

question and the person answering the question have the floor. If you wish to comment, please either go outside the room or allow people to speak because it's getting hard to hear them. Thank you.

Mr. Bhangoo, please proceed.

Mr. Bhangoo: Thank you very much for this question, actually.

I—what I think, if somebody makes mistake, the government has changed. It takes some—they must made a mistake. Now the ruling party should not do the same thing. They could—like they are in power for last two years. They should think about this, too.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Bhangoo. We are now over the allotted time limit for questions. We will now move on to the next presenter. Thank you very much.

The next presenter is presenter No. 10, Andrez Singh Brar. Andrez Singh Brar? Mr. Brar does not seem to be here. Mr. Brar will be taken off the list.

Presenter No. 11, Zeweldi Beyene. Mr. Beyene? Presenter No. 11?

If you could please state your name so that the—because I don't know if I'm pronouncing it properly, please.

Mr. Zeweldi Beyene (Private Citizen): Hi, my name is Zeweldi Beyene.

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

Mr. Beyene: Okay, thank you, committee. Good evening. I want to talk to you about who we are, the people that drive your taxis and the owners of the drivers and our stories. Many of us are immigrants to Canada. We came here for better future for ourselves and our families. You will be probably—hear tonight—hear from the—I mean from the—my colleagues here tonight, from people, about just how much we have invested in this taxi industry. All shareholders, you know—very well.

Some of us brought the money from our home country to invest here. Some people even came as a business immigrant to invest in the taxi industry. Others have invested by mortgaging their houses, by taking out loans. That's how you build a small business like a taxi.

But there is another thing you may not realize. Just ask our drivers, there are people in the taxi industry—are driving taxi, who back home are

doctors, lawyers, engineers, and other professionals. Why are they driving taxi? Because in many cases, they are unable to get their professional qualifications recognized. Some are eventually successful. We have doctors in the city who started out in the—Canada as a taxi driver.

There is something else as well. The taxi industry has been a step stone for many people who are newly immigrated to Canada. It helped many of us bring family members over, people from our community back home. Here in Manitoba, we are proud now that we have a growing population. Much of that comes from—that's immigration. The taxi industry is a classic example of why we are having that kind of growth.

What's going happen now?

What type of message does it send about taxis to the other potential investors—in anything in this province?

If you can take away our rights as taxi owners, if you can prevent us from having any opportunity to go to the court to ask that we have recognized as having an exportation, a move that will destroy our investments, what message does that send?

What message does this send to other potential future immigrants to Canada? Canada has reputation as a country where there is the rule of law, a country in which government cannot just do what they please. So what are you going to do in—these taxis?

Where is the rule of law? You wouldn't even allow us to go to the court to argue our case. That is shameful. If you are not concerned about the impact on immigrants, what about on other Canadians? If you can do this to taxi today, what is the next? Business owners like farmers, individuals that own land or other property?

* (20:00)

What I find very surprising is that is a Conservative government that is doing this. I have been told too that when you were in opposition, you talked a lot about the property rights of farmers having their land exported by Manitoba Hydro. They, of course, had compensation, but you felt that the process was unfair. Perhaps there was enough compensation. So, what are you doing now you are in government? You are a Conservative government that talked about property and legal rights before and is now taking away our rights, our property rights, our legal rights. Does anyone believe that if you

were a group of farmers with a dairy quota or fishers with a licence that we wouldn't be in this situation?

I personally not want to seek compensation. I want a taxi system is fair to me and other people who are invested in this interest.

Sorry. Excuse me. My frustration—because me and our family, we know how much we invest seven years ago. We invested 475, all our family money. Twenty-five per cent is paid; the other is not paid. Still, we are in loan. So very sorry too. My frustration here—brought me—is my frustration and my stress.

But the bill is not just a bad bill. It is a very—it is a betrayal for all of us who believe that there is a sense of fairness in this country. I ask you to think about this before you vote on this bill. Please vote no to this bill. Take the time to get it right. If you are going to push it through, amend it to ensure safety, fairness and community: the things our industry is talking about.

Finally, I want to say that, if I am frustrated, I will promise you one thing. I wouldn't just be this committee. If you support us, I will be there to support you. I will never forget. Our industry will never forget. Our community will not forget. Please do not forget us.

Thank you so much.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Beyene.

Mr. Bindle: Thank you for your presentation. I want you to know, like, regardless of what the NDP have been telling you, they know as well as we do that, you know, for Uber to come to Winnipeg or not is outside the scope of this bill.

But my question is, do you or do you not trust the competence of the elected officials in the municipal government to do the right thing should control of taxi licensing become the responsibility of Winnipeg City Council?

Mr. Beyene: Yes. Yes, I didn't trust them.

Mr. Maloway: The reality is that this government has brought in this very unfair Bill 30. They have banned any possibility of compensation because they know that you're going to go after them for compensation. In Australia, all through Australia, each state has brought in forms of compensation. State of Victoria—I had the figures here earlier—\$494 million, \$100,000 for each cab licence, \$50,000 for second and third licences. I know that's not

enough to compensate, but this government represented by these people sitting opposite over here, they crafted a bill and they put a clause 10 that said you will get not one cent.

And they're dumping you off to the City, and there's nothing whatsoever in the bill to deal with safety issues, so that's why myself and my colleague here have drafted eight amendments. Five of them, we'll be presenting tonight, and the other three, we'll be doing at report stage next Monday. Next Tuesday is the deadline.

And I just want to go through a list of the safety provisions we have here just in case we miss something. We've said that the City has to require all the drivers, the Uber drivers, all the drivers, to provide a shield. They will never put that amendment in that Bill 30.

Number 2, we've said that the City has to require cameras, has to require the strobe lights, has to require the panic button, has to require mechanical inspections at least twice a year, must check criminal record—have criminal record checks, Child Abuse Registry checks and at least 35 hours of training. Now, we know that when we introduce this amendment, they're going to vote against it. They're going to send this bill to the City, and they're going to—got the City come up with safety rules. That is how badly they're dealing with you in this issue.

Now, there's more. We're also putting in requirements that the drivers are going to have to hold valid driver's licences; they're going to have to display photo identification on the dashboard; they're going to have to allow for complaints to be made and being investigated—in case somebody has a complaint against an Uber driver, there should be provisions for investigation. They're not going to put—they didn't put it in the bill, and they're not going to support our amendment and any other requirements.

So I'm asking the presenter, who's done a very good job with his presentation, whether he can think of any more safety features that we should add in the bill because we have to finish this amendment off tomorrow and file it. So, if there's any other ideas you have of something I've missed, I'd like you to tell me what they could be. *[interjection]*

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Beyene.

Mr. Beyene: Sorry.

About the accessibility training, yes.

Mr. Bindle: I just want to ask you how you—how would you respond to those rural taxpayers that are paying taxes already on their own municipal tax regulators, then they're also paying provincially for the provincial regulators, and now the NDP's suggesting they pay a third time to pay compensation to Winnipeg again—how would you respond to those taxpayers?

Mr. Beyene: I don't know. I don't have an answer for this one, sorry.

Mr. Lindsey: Just on that point, I guess the most logical answer to that is if the government just withdraws Bill 30, then we don't need to worry about compensation. We don't need to worry about introducing the safety amendments because they're already there, right?

Mr. Chairperson: Time for questions has expired. I'd also like to remind the committee that the pointing of fingers, the waving of stuff in the air, questions should be put through the Chair in order—not to individual committee members. I would appreciate, you know, the decorum so that we would have a pleasant—I would like to have a nice committee. I don't want to have to start yelling at some of the members here.

Thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Beyene.

We will now move on to presenter No. 12, Jagtar Sidhu. Jagtar Sidhu.

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

Mr. Jagtar Sidhu (Private Citizen): My name is Jagtar Sidhu. I have been driving cab from 1991. I came to this country with a little money in my pocket, and a couple of years later my wife arrived. Working as a cab driver, I was able to send her to the university. Even we both have the degrees from back home, but only one can—we can afford go.

So I want to be clear here: Unicity, Duffy's does not own a single cab. All cabs are owned by the individuals sitting back there. Some of us paid \$50,000; some paid \$500,000 for the cab. I myself paid \$244,000 in 2008, and I still owe \$180,000 on that.

The system that made us pay it, that kind of prices, was even created by the government before we enter in this country. That system made us pay those prices. When the people were buying the cabs, like \$500,000, the government know it because they

have to be approved by the Manitoba Taxicab Board, whose chairman, and most of them, board members, are appointed politically.

* (20:10)

So I was here a couple days ago, there was a guy saying, like, we're paying the taxi fares higher because of cab prices. No. You paid \$50,000, you paid half a million, cab fare going to be the same. He can collect only the same fare. The guy who paid 50 or 500,000—does not matter.

So we all paid like half a million or less for just to have the paper just saying it, have the government step on it—stamp on it, so if we didn't have to pay these prices, maybe we would not be standing here and asking for help or think twice when you're introducing bill C-30.

Two weeks ago I was in the same building; I was in the public gallery. I heard our Premier (Mr. Pallister) speaking about small businesses, families, how they're going to get affected, the federal government making some changes in income—at federally.

So, I—we are—those families do owe, as the Premier was saying, like how small businesses put their money out of capital at a risk, and they don't get any pension, they don't have vacation pay or anything like that.

We fall in the same category because we have same business number, same GST number; we pay all those taxes.

If this bill passed as it is right now, it's saying you can't compensate—no compensation. You can't sue the government. Why government is afraid? Because the judiciary is fourth pillar of democracy too. Government should not fear from it, so they should leave—take it out. If someone sues the government later on, you can fight in the court.

If this bill is passed it will wipe out value of the \$200 million from the taxi industry of taxi owners, and a lot of us have no pension or nothing. That was the only investment we have. If this bill passed, I work for 26 years—last 26 years for it. It's gone. I've been driving cab from '91 and I own one. It's not worth nothing after that.

That's all.

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

Mr. Brad Michaleski (Dauphin): And thank you for your presentation.

You talked a bit about the value of the licences. What caused the price of the cabs to double in 10 years? Is it because it's regulated by the owners and not wanting competition?

Mr. Jagtar Sidhu: The price has gone up because this was controlled by government; you have no choice. You have to buy through the open market. So some people, just to have job, sold their land and properties back home and come here to buy that so you can have a job. It's only gone up because the government had the control. The taxi industry has no control over it.

Mr. Saran: Thank you, Mr. Sidhu, for coming over here.

My question is that if government did not want to have that price go up, they should have to start with the non-transferrable licences, but they did not do that. So it happened—previously I said it happened under a PC. Price went up, but it happened under an NDP. Price went up, and you guys got in the way, and now, not giving you that opportunity to go to court, and they are doing unjust—as you said, you came with a little money. Now they want you to go away with no money.

So, you wasted your life over here. So many people over here, they wasted their life, and—because this government want them to waste their life. That's what you think?

Mr. Jagtar Sidhu: Yes, this system, it's not going to last 15 years. It's there maybe more than 50 years. I can't blame last government or this government. But when they were transferring those licences, they know people paying for it. Government know for that. They should at least warn them that we not—the money you spend today it could be worsen tomorrow, nothing work. But they not told anyone nothing.

The people weren't confident in the government. Like, they never going to do that now they entered this bill C-30 that those licence are worth nothing.

Mr. Isleifson: That's it, Mr. Chair, and I was going to touch on the same topic, because the previous government was in power for 17 years and it seems that it doubled in the last 10, so it was definitely under their watch and they did nothing about it.

However, tonight, they keep talking about compensation. So, just a very simple question

for you. If I opened up a grocery store tomorrow, and 10 years later, Mr. Maloway opened one across the street, does he owe me compensation?

Mr. Jagtar Sidhu: I heard from one of your MLAs, he said he owned IGA store or something, and he was pushed out by Sobeys. And here was a doctor Andy or something two days ago, he was talking about Sears; the government going to the-compensating Sears. Taxi drivers is like a small corner store run by the family and you can't compare it with the Sears or the other franchise or groceries. I will not sell groceries.

Mr. Lindsey: Turn it over to Mr. Maloway.

Mr. Maloway: You know, sir, the state of Victoria in Australia—it's a state government. It's one of many states in Australia. Every one of them offering compensation, and not one of these states has come up with a little Bill 30 and put a clause in, saying, you can't sue the government for any reason, not a one of them. They've come forward and they've said you're losing, you're taking a big loss in the value of your business and they're putting up \$494 million and they're offering a \$100,000 per cab. This is a state of Australia.

In Manitoba in 1971, Ed Schreyer, a premier of Manitoba, this Legislature allowed for compensation to insurance agents who chose not to sell Autopac, and that was a—\$2.5 million then, which is like \$15 million now. So don't let them try to fool you that they cannot provide compensation, because they can and it's the right thing to do.

Mr. Jagtar Sidhu: Yes, they can, because people spend money because that was government-run board, Taxicab Board, they regulated it. So now, they are taking that board away without any discussion with the industry or they do just those who are going to lose the money like me.

Mr. Chairperson: Time for questions has expired.

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

And once again I will remind the members who are asking questions to please put them through the Chair and not to be waving papers up in the air.

Our next presenter is Manjit Sidhu. Manjit Sidhu?

Mr. Sidhu, you are asking for a translator. Could the translator please provide us and spell out their name so that we can have it on Hansard.

Mr. Jaswant Singh Deol, on behalf of Mr. Manjit Singh Sidhu (Private Citizen): I am speaking behalf of Manjit Singh Sidhu. My name is Jaswant Singh Deol. J-a-s-w-a-n-t; last name, D-e-o-l.

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

Mr. Deol, on behalf of Mr. Manjit Sidhu: Mr. Sidhu, he's living here, like, 31 years. He driving cab, like, 28 years. He own a Unicity taxi since 1995.

* (20:20)

So last two days, his brother-in-law—he's in taxi business—he passed away. So this bill is a lot of stress our members, our people. This bill is a lack of study, lack of knowledge, lack of consulting because I know this bill, not even passed, it's already damaged \$150 million to the cab industry. If it goes past, this can hurt more. All governments, Manitoba, all over Canada, their duty, they always in favour to bring more economy to their people and their province. I don't know why this government bring this kind of bill that hurting the communities and their small-business people.

I can let you know I drive—started in 1997. That time, Unicity, Duffy have almost 80 Handi-Transit cars on the road. Because the City always want cheaper bid, we can't compete. Then, slowly, slowly, a couple of years, that business goes out of the industry. Now those people goes in private cars because we have high insurance, brand new cabs; we can't compete those people. They pay, like, \$1,200 insurance. We pay over \$10,000. We can't compete with them.

Same like Uber. We don't afraid Uber because it's—myself, I had [*inaudible*] government want bring those companies in because why not they bring the same rules and regulations we following? We not scared for them because we are already invest a lot—millions, millions of dollars, people, their land, their equity because it's not easy; it's mortgage their home. If we pass the bill—this bill through like this, it's not going to hurt these people, like, [*inaudible*] industry; it's going to impact on, like, housing industry too.

Okay, my fellow committee members, they always compare like other provinces. I want let you know, does Manitoba have less economy than others? Ontario, they have auto sector over there. BC have farming, lumber. Alberta have oil industry. We can't compete with them whatever they doing. So we have less to risk place. We have less opportunity. Less people want to live here because of the weather.

This is the centre of Canada. Why we small? We should be grow up like larger than other provinces. There is a reason. Less people want to live over here.

So this is totally—if my fellow committee members just excuse, they just turn over to the City of Winnipeg. If they're really honest with these people, why not put the place, like rules and regulations, in the bill, and say same way as here? The City have to accept the same, all the industries running. They have to do the same thing. All other companies coming, they have to follow same safety measures. Will bill committee members do that? They promise us. I don't think. Next day, you can heard in the news. They will say I don't want this industry.

Because the City don't have money, our rules are broken. We saw too many times. There is a lot of construction. If the City have money, why not they let the construction people to run it 24 hours? People suffering for all the work construction. We have less bridges, less roads, less—because all the time it's construction. People come from other parts of Canada, USA, they talk about, so there's—oh, this is a construction city. Why we all behind with other provinces? Why? There is a reason. That's why. Okay, I have to go India. Why not I can go direct from Winnipeg to India? I always go to Toronto, to Vancouver, to Calgary. I have to take flight from there to go. If my new immigrant people, they want to apply visa for USA, they always have to go Toronto, Vancouver, Edmonton. Why not Winnipeg? Because we are way behind for those provinces. That's the reason.

We're not afraid to—like, Uber, they can come same way. We're running a business—or this can damage a lot of industry, lot of them. Just talking, his brother-in-law, just two days—he's boss—he got heart attack.

So this is a serious matter. Government has to think about it. They're just talking about to save \$500,000. I know it's our rights, our property rights, our Charter rights. I don't like—if people can come five days, they fight until they get the justice. It's not easy job to government do that. Just throw them to the City of Winnipeg.

This is not easy. We will fight into the Supreme Court, because it's damage. Three hundred thousand dollars is not easy; \$400,000 is not one day you can make it. People's lives—40 years, 30 years to make it. It's very hard times. Somebody just don't pay me \$5.

It's—I know how to do it, because we're working hard—16, seven days; 12 hours; bad, bad weather always. People just want to give us hard time when they're stuck in traffic. There is a lot of nice people, but there is some bad people.

Okay, I just want to give you one more thing. If we placed the same regulations, Uber driver will be my brother. He's my brother. He not afraid—he will not afraid to—only in the app. He go to North End. People flag down; take ride. He can get killed. He can get stabbed. Who's responsible? There is already safety measures in place. Why we 'broking'—we want fair everybody. Why we putting those drivers to risk if government really honest with people, pass these regulations, safety measures, everything—same as the industry here, so then send to the City of Winnipeg. I'm sure—I'm guaranteed he's not going to accept it. This is totally dishonest with the people.

Government always earned—governments come and go, but they recognize their hard work do for the people, not destroying the people and the community, because, mostly, it's over 80 per cent East Indian community. So we feel it's getting discriminated because—by the government. This is not right. This is the message—go around to the community, all part, all over the world. This is not right.

I'm requesting all committee members: Be serious. We want work with the government. We don't have problem. Any company, we can compete with them. What if a government allowed those multi-billion companies too easy way? We cannot compete, because we pay a lot of *[inaudible]* expenses, though we invest a lot of million, million dollars, people's hard-working money, people's savings, people's equity—it's on risks.

So this is not good for the government and not even good for the people of the cab industry also. We providing good service to the people. When people go Uber, it's cheaper. So these people will face hard time. They can move somewhere else in the Canada, you know. They can go BC, Alberta—less people be in the cab industry, then it's very poor quality of service for the people of Manitoba—they have in a couple of years.

So this bill is no good. I'm saying again and again, to the committee members: Be serious. Think of too many times to do this kind of act, because this kind of—just saving \$500,000 is not big money the government. Industry also want—they can share some money.

Taxicab Board is running right. The industry is running right. Nobody have any problem, so why are we creating the problem?

This is not good; this is not right. Do the right way, so we—industry want to work with the PC government. Whoever comes, nobody knows. Next couple of years, who will we want working with all—because government of Manitoba been working since almost 60 years. Why are you putting us now to the City of Winnipeg?

Mr. Chairperson: Time for your presentation has expired. I would like to—before we move onto questions, I'd like to just remind that as a translator, the job would be to translate what the presenter was—would be saying and not to present as you've probably presented before. It's not to present your presentation again; it's to present. So, before we move into questions, I'd like to just remind the members that you're a translator, not a presenter.

*(20:30)

Floor Comment: Do you want me to ask him?

Mr. Chairperson: Yes, please.

Hon. Blaine Pedersen (Minister of Growth, Enterprise and Trade): Thank you, Mr. Dhillon [*phonetic*] for presenting on behalf of Mr. Sidhu. Would you please ask Mr. Sidhu what year he bought his taxi?

Mr. Deol, on behalf of Mr. Manjit Sidhu: Yes, he bought cab 1995, \$53,000.

Mr. Pedersen: Thank you, Mr. Dhillon [*phonetic*], for presenting on behalf of Mr. Sidhu, and just pass on to Mr. Sidhu our thanks for him coming to the Legislature tonight and presenting his material. Thank you very much.

Mr. Lindsey: If you could ask Mr. Sidhu for me that we've talked about fairness, to make sure that everybody is playing with the same set of rules, and really what we've heard from other jurisdictions is that's not necessarily the case when a ride-sharing service like Uber comes into a city. So, if you could ask Mr. Sidhu to comment on really—that's what you want. You want fairness so everybody's on the same set of rules.

Mr. Deol, on behalf of Mr. Manjit Sidhu: Yes, he wants everybody to follow same regulations.

Mr. Bindle: Thank you, Mr. Sidhu, for your presentation.

I also want you to know that regardless of what the NDP have been telling you, they know as well as we do that for Uber to come to Winnipeg or not is outside the scope of this bill, but we also all know that the taxi licence values are based on supply and demand, and as we know values of commodity prices, primarily, are driven by speculation and fear as well as optimism.

Is it your belief that the City of Winnipeg will allow an unregulated Uber service into the city of Winnipeg marketplace, and do you speculate that that will eliminate taxis from the streets of Winnipeg?

Mr. Deol, on behalf of Mr. Manjit Sidhu: Yes, he said they can be unregulated. Yes, he's fear for that.

Mr. James Teitsma (Radisson): Hi, I'm new to this table but I just wanted to say thank you, Mr. Sidhu, for coming and I do want to address some of the comments that were made by you through Mr. Dhillon [*phonetic*] around the perception that your community has. I want you to know that we value your community and we want it to be—continue to be a vibrant part of Winnipeg.

And, certainly, I want to make sure that you're spending your time on productive things, and that's one of my concerns that I have is that I think the members opposite me here have—they've done this before and now I think they're doing it again, where they're spending a lot of your time, they're taking a lot of your time—and my time I don't mind so much but your time I do mind—is that—do you feel that your time is being misused or treated poorly, not respected for what it is by being asked to come here?

Mr. Deol, on behalf of Mr. Manjit Sidhu: He not feel that way. He said because it's touching our life it's worth the time, so people both sides they treat us very nicely, we appreciate it, we thankful everybody.

Mr. Lindsey: Thank you for your answers and I thank you for your patience and I thank you both for being here presenting and, again, we just want to make sure that everybody hears what you're saying, that you're not afraid of competition, you just want the competition to be fair. Is that correct? Could you ask your friend, there?

Mr. Deol, on behalf of Mr. Manjit Sidhu: Yes. He wants everything same and same level. Yes.

Mrs. Colleen Mayer (St. Vital): Thank you very much for your presentation.

When we talk about fairness—and I listened—over several nights I've been here, and I listened to the price that you've had to pay going from \$53,000 up to half a mil, is what I've heard sometimes. Those decisions were made, and individuals that were with the former government knew that those prices were going up.

Do you think that that was fair that they allowed that to happen to you?

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Sidhu, you may—

Mr. Deol, on behalf of Mr. Manjit Sidhu: Yes. He said yes. It's government fault they're allowed to—prices go very high, yes.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation. Time for questions has expired.

We will now move on to the next presenter. Thank you very much.

Our next presenter, Khushwant Brar. Khushwant Brar? Mr. Brar is not here. Mr. Brar will be removed from the list.

Our next presenter, No. 15, Sasan Razhi [*phonetic*]. Riyazi. Sasan Riyazi, come forward and you may start your presentation when you are ready, Mr. Riyazi.

Mr. Sasan Riyazi (Private Citizen): Hi, I've been—I came to this country 1988, and I got my driver's licence with taxi in 1990. And I've been—and I've been driving since then.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson in the Chair

In 1993, I bought my taxi for \$46,000 and I paid—I couldn't get a loan from the bank. I paid very high interest in—for my taxi. And I work very hard, day and night, to pay off my taxi, get married and have kids. I promised my kids they can go to school, and I will sell my taxi and pay their school and everything. And now everything is gone and given to—I think Conservative government making the—Uber rich, rich, and richer by tossing us to the City. And already mayor said that he will bring the Uber. I was there in the City Hall. He said he will bring the Uber.

And so we have to go back to the welfare. Lose our house, lose our taxi, our business. And we'll be sitting on the welfare. I don't know what to—what else to do. I been driving 29 years and now everything is gone by this decision, tossing us the City, giving—selling our soul to the City. And he'll bring the Uber and Uber is irregularated, and—we've

been servicing all kind of people in the city. If you don't have a credit card, if you don't have a iPhone, who's going to service them? Who's going to service those people? If you're poor, you won't get even service.

After the taxis are gone, they're—of course, they're cheap today, but they will be like a pharmaceutical company. They're going to charge whatever—after the taxis are gone, they're going to charge whatever. Even the government can't say why you charge this much, why you charge somebody this much or not. And not giving—why you are not giving service to this person. If they don't want to service you, they won't service you. That's how it is going to be. Exactly like pharmaceutical companies. They can charge the drug for—from \$15 to \$800. I watched that guy in the American senate, and nobody can question him why he charged so much.

* (20:40)

Today, I cannot look after—look at my kids, and I say, you study hard. I will send you to university, sell my cab, send you to university or something. No. Everything is gone. I think it's not fair. This is not fair.

Thank you.

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

Will our first question—Ms. Marcelino.

Ms. Flor Marcelino (Logan): Thank you, Mr. Riyazi, for your time and for being here. We truly appreciate the pain these developments have brought to you personally and to many, many people whose livelihoods are in jeopardy or at risk because of this bill.

You made a very good point about surge pricing. That's possible. That could happen. And you also brought up the—well, we know many people have smart phones and credit cards, but there are still some people who don't have that like some seniors, and some, you know, families that just can't afford to have credit cards, or by choice, they don't want credit cards. How do you think Uber can service those kinds of people?

Mr. Riyazi: Uber is—they—they're here to make money, so they—whoever has money, they can have service. Who doesn't have the money, iPhone or credit card, they won't get the service. They will be out of service. That's what I think. So, it will be a

good thing for rich people, but it's not good for, as you said, seniors and poor people.

Even somebody in the taxi, if they didn't pay us, the taxi board regulates us that we should go—always—even they didn't pay us, we did because taxi service is a necessity. We still went and serviced them even if they didn't pay us. If they pay us back, they did. If they didn't, we turn our face all the way, and we still give them service because if somebody's stranded at 2 o'clock in the morning and is sick, wants to go hospital, we still give them the service. But I don't think the Uber will do that. They won't do that.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Okay. Thank you very much.

Mr. Pedersen: Thank you, Mr. Riyazi, for your very heartfelt presentation. Today, during the day, I was reading an Auditor General's report. It's on managing climate change. And in this report—very interesting reading. I would suggest that you read this. In December 2015, when the NDP was in power, when it was in government, they had a plan to reduce emissions down to 10 megatons by—in the future, and in order to do this, it would have required more emission reductions than could be obtained by taking every gasoline- and diesel-powered vehicle in Manitoba off the road. Why would the NDP want to take you off the road in December 2015? *[interjection]*

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Mr. Riyazi. Mr. Riyazi, sorry. We have to wait 'til I announce you so they can turn the microphone on. Thank you, sir. Go ahead.

Mr. Riyazi: Sorry.

I think, as cars, we all know that, is that cars, they're a small part of emission in the—there's big factories that—they create—I talked to so many big people that they told me how much big emissions that—the cars are nothing to those, compared to those, what the big companies, they create emission and gas and everything.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Thank you for that.

Mr. Lindsey: Just to get us back on track here for a while, if we could, to talk about Bill 30 instead of something to do with climate change, with—you know, I understand that you're a taxi driver, not an environmental scientist, so we'll focus on taxis for now.

Really, by the government introducing this bill, it's like going in and stealing your pension. Is that kind of a similar analogy, if you will, that they've reached right in your bank account, yanked out your retirement funds and left you with nothing, simply by introducing this bill?

Mr. Riyazi: Yes, and even if I want to go drive for Uber, that's—Uber is a part-time job. I can't even pay my mortgage, my high mortgage that I won't be able to pay that with a part-time job, and I don't know what else I can do. I've been doing this 29 years, servicing this people of Winnipeg, and now it's gone. It will be gone, my pension and everything. I'll be sitting in welfare, slave to welfare, I guess, that's what I—

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Thank you very much, Mr. Riyazi. The time has expired for the question period, so thank you for participating.

Next we'll call No. 16, is Gurpal Sodhi. Gurpal Sodhi—Sodhi? Hearing none, we'll remove the person from the list.

Next we'll call on No. 17, Karnail Dhillon.

Mr. Dhillon, do you have any material that you'd like to hand out?

Mr. Karnail Dhillon (Private Citizen): Yes I have.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: All right, the podium's yours, go ahead.

Mr. Karnail Dhillon: Hello everyone, my name is Karnail Singh Dhillon. I'm this industry since 2000. Seventeen years. I drive seven-day week, sometimes six-day week, hard work, and I saved some money and bought this cab—

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: One moment please, sir.

Mr. Maloway.

Point of Order

Mr. Maloway: Mr. Chair, on a point of order, could we get copies of the presentation first, before you start, and then start over?

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Okay, just before we continue, there are reports going around. I'm going to ask the indulgence of the committee. We're just checking out the report. There is some financial information on here, so for the purpose of the presentation, please have it, but please hand it back in when we're done with the presentation.

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Mr. Dhillon, please proceed.

Mr. Karnail Dhillon: Okay. So I provided you my lawyer paper when I bought this cab, \$288,000. So I started driving, \$2,000, saved some money, and end the day I bought this cab. I spent my whole money on this cab.

And now we are regarding about Bill 30, and I don't have any other sources to make money. If you guys, like, bring here ride-sharing companies, and how I feed my family? So this is not a—this is a legal paper from my lawyer when I bought this cab. So now it's going to be—it's hard for us. Where I can go now? Because I spent my 17 years on this industry. I have hard to go in some other industry right now because I'm 41 years old now.

So second issue in there, I provided you copy, is that last week that happened. If you bring the ride-sharing company here, how the people reverse the money from the 'yurup'? The 89-year-old lady, I pick her up, and \$7.20 is fare, and when I done my fare, I provide my machine to pay for that. She give me the bank card, she put the bank card in and transaction not completed. Second time I did that, and transaction not completed, because one minute it's going to be have to done. And third time, what she did, she put \$72 tip in there. Did you check it out? So when she done that, transaction approved. When I saw that approved money on my computer, I want to try right away, refund that money to her. But she don't give me the bank card. I said, it's okay, no problem, but she don't understand anything. Next day, I call my office, tell my accountant: reverse this money back to her. And now, today, I double check. You reverse that money already? Not yet, he said [*inaudible*].

* (20:50)

So I have a question to you. In—if this ride-sharing company here, somebody put extra money in the—to ride-sharing company, and they're sitting other side of the bird—in Europe—then how there was the money back to the customer? Because I know, she don't know anything. She's 89 years old. And who can provide the service for her if ride-sharing company here? You have any idea?

So that's why were are want 'labeling' playing field. Everybody is same industry, want to work? Welcome. No problem. They have to pay the same amount what we paying. Today, like, if you going to the MPI, you want insure your truck. They ask you,

you want to go 160 kilometre, or you want go to an—highway, or next province? They have to declare the tool—stuff in there. Have to go to the highway, they different charge you. If you want to work in the city, they different charge you. Is only two, but one you choose—want to choose?

Mr. Chairperson in the Chair

If tomorrow is ride-sharing company here, they starting trucking company there, too. And who's losing the money? Government. MPI. So who's filling that spot? The same is like—is taxi industry.

I'm paying \$1000 a month to the MPI, but don't think I'm going home and sleep. No, I have to sue the MPI next day then the ride-sharing company here. Why? Because I paying last 10 years \$8,000, \$10,000, \$12,000. Why they are creating right now different pool? Why they don't get that before that? Because I'm Manitoban, I'm Winnipegger. I'm live here 17 years.

So why they are creating different pool for them? Not that day when I start? So why I pay \$100,000 to him? But that makes sense, we have to be the same pool. If somebody want to come in, doesn't matter. They have to pay same amount of money.

I'm paying WCB. Where the WCB go? It's Manitoba. They bill—how many people injured every year? And where the money can go? I'm not injured 17 years. I paid lots of money. I didn't get anything back. So if you telling me today you don't pay that, why we don't pay it off? You create that already. I have to pay that. I pay EI, but I didn't get back anything.

So every single part you have to look. Don't think about only for the ride sharing. Ride sharing—the Uber—where the Uber came? All over the world, but now you can see all over. Look a little bit—where [*inaudible*] They shut down that way. The BC, they already passed the motion they don't bring it in.

So we are here last how many days? Maybe six days? We are talking same, everybody. But have to look. Everybody want 'labeling' playing field. So I don't mind. They can come in. They have to pay. If I am paying like \$2,500 month for my cab to run and they are paying about, not even \$1,000, how I can compare with them? It's not competition. If—I bought this cab, \$288,000. If I bought land that day—you know, it's like 2009—if I bought the land that day, it's today's millions of dollars. I don't need to be come here.

So the safety is a major issue. It's not for me only, it's all Manitobans. Early 2000—dollars—somebody rob me. There was no camera around that time in the cab. I go to the court every three month one year. End of the year, the guy go to the jail. You can get that from the court under my name. So when the Mr. Deol by killed, early 2000, I was—same night—I'm driving. So an hour before he killed, I just meet them in the parking lot of the McPhillips casino. So that's why we want two camera in the cars, the same safety not for only drivers, it all Manitobans. And now we have a camera in the car, somebody rob the 7-Eleven they jump in the cab, next 45 minute the police at our office, they track the car, they said you can come to the police office. We went to the safety building and who's going to pay for that? Government? Police? Nobody else. It's my responsibility because I'm Manitoban.

I went there, they download the pictures, everything, and then they got the guy right away. It's not even one time it 1,000 times that happen. If tomorrow ride-sharing company here there's no camera nothing, and how many people get killed. Who responsible for that? You guys.

I heard that question when my other friend speaking. The *[inaudible]* told a story about talking about like that. They shut down next door. They open a new one. They don't waste any money to them.

So you have a idea how many store they bankrupt before they closed? Do you have any idea? Ninety-nine per cent, most of stores they bankrupt before they shut down. You have any single question any cab driver? When they shut the cab they going out of business, they bankrupt? No, none, because I'm hard worker. I'm the corner store worker, because this is the—this is my corner store, it's not a big franchise.

So I have to look every single corner, Bill 30 is very, very big for all over, is not for only Manitobans, all over the Canada. And tomorrow is like same I heard every single day, maybe you know that they are coming to trucking industry too. Right now, all over in Canada how much money make the MPI or any other insurance company from the trucking? Tons of money.

If they came tomorrow they can bought that insurance from Europe they can run here, because they are in power. That happen soon. So that's why you have to look at the safety concern and the 1,600 Manitoba families. Where they going to go?

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Dhillon. Time for your presentation is over. We will now revert to questions.

Mr. Wharton: Thank you, Mr. Dhillon, for your presentation. I really appreciate the opportunity to, of course, hear more from yourself regarding safety and other concerns, and I really appreciate you sharing this information regarding your bill of sale. This is very helpful as we continue to learn more about your industry and some of the challenges.

So I have a couple of questions, if I may, and I'll ask them both at the same time. Number one, you had purchased your licence for \$288 in a private deal according to this. My first question is before you bought your licence for \$288,000 did you have any information on what your approximate revenue would be on an annual basis before you wrote the cheque for \$288,000?

Mr. Karnail Dhillon: Loan from the bank, I got a second mortgage on my house. So that's why I bought it. Like, I know that I'm a hard worker, I can pay to the bank one day. That's why I bought it.

Mr. Wharton: Just wondering, though, if you had any information from the vendor at the time that was related to the income that you were going to be making on this licence that you purchased for \$288,000.

Mr. Karnail Dhillon: That's the demand in that day because, today, like, same, that time when I bought that there's no job. I have to buy the job. Today lot of people they going to learn of tomorrow what's going on in Manitoba. People they buying job tomorrow because every day government cut lot of facilities, lots of people going to be out of jobs. That's why there's no job I have to buy my job, because I know I'm hard work, I can pay this one day, and same happen today, because tomorrow maybe in Manitoba there too.

* (21:00)

Mr. Isleifson: Mr. Dhillon, thank you for your presentation. I think all of us around the table really appreciate how hard you and your fellow taxi owners work. We certainly don't doubt that. There's been some talk today, and obviously we've said and my friend from Thompson has said numerous times that this bill is not about Uber, that's an after fact, but again, there's been some discussion about insurance fees and we've heard that insurance fees that you would have to pay as a taxi owner are roughly \$10,000.

Floor Comment: Twelve thousand dollars.

Mr. Isleifson: Twelve thousand dollars, thank you for that. I have no idea how much the owners of Uber would pay in insurance. I have no idea, but my question, sir, is—I've heard also there are a number of drivers that work for the taxi industry that are not owners. So I want to compare an Uber driver who doesn't own Uber, they're just a driver, how much they pay insurance—you won't be able to answer that, but you might be able to answer how much would a driver who does not own their taxi pay for insurance.

Mr. Karnail Dhillon: Can you repeat one more time?

Mr. Isleifson: How much would a taxicab driver who does not own their vehicle pay for insurance?

Mr. Karnail Dhillon: Just a private car? *[interjection]* Okay, driver, somebody else, how much they paying for—

An Honourable Member: Insurance.

Mr. Karnail Dhillon: On—for the cab? Nothing. I'm paying from my pocket, and second I want to tell you one more thing. Sorry about that. So, you know how much I pay GST every year, where the GST goes?

Mr. Lindsey: It's unfortunate that sometimes things become less clear as we try to make them clearer. I know in Saskatchewan, for example, the Saskatchewan government is toying with the idea of actually making people that drive Uber cars pay something for insurance, but it's dramatically less than what a taxi would have to pay for insurance. So I just want to put on the record that we do have some experience with different jurisdictions and what kind of rules they're putting into place. And I understand the member opposite's question is about a driver versus a owner, but right now if you want to be just a taxi driver not a owner, you have to have a class 5 licence—

Floor Comment: Class 4.

Mr. Lindsey: Class 4, sorry. If you want to have—just drive for Uber you can have whatever licence. So there are different costs involved just for drivers, not just for owners, is that correct?

Mr. Karnail Dhillon: Yes, like, right now, if you going to the taxi board licence, how long you can spend in there? Like, how much money you spend in there? A couple hundred dollars. At least three weeks they train you; then they take test for—from you. Then you going to the road.

But if you—like, somebody driving Uber, like, where they can get the licence? How they train?

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Dhillon, but time for questions has expired.

We will move on to the next presenter. Jasvir *[phonetic]* Gill. Jasvir *[phonetic]* Gill? *[interjection]* Jaipal. Okay, I'll correct the spelling here, Mr. Gill. I see—do you have a translator with you or—no?

Floor Comment: He's going to read his own presentation. If he needs help, then I'll speak.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you. You may go ahead, Mr. Gill, with your presentation.

Mr. Jaipal Gill (Private Citizen): Good evening. I came Canadian—Canada 1991 with a technical qualification, commercial refrigeration and air condition mechanic. And I worked in the—15 years in the sewing company as a cutting department because my paper does not work in here. And 'husel' industries closed in the Winnipeg, and the sewing company, they were moving the overseas, so I started taxicab—taxi—as a driver. And this is my investment.

If I spend \$100 on my family, so I pay \$25 just on the interest because when I bought it, the taxi, I bought with a too much loan from the bank, and this is my investment. We don't want the Uber or ride-sharing here if the government adds some more taxi, because customers are complaining that taxis mostly are coming late and the shortage. And when we late in the five minute late, and the customer started swearing, yelling or even the ready to look like is fighting with the customer. But in the same customer, when they sit in the emergency, four hour, six hour, eight hour, they not yelling over there. They not say anything over there.

I have personal experience. I waited many time with my pregnant wife, I say in the hospital is eight hours. If taxi only five minute late and they need more taxis, it—this is only had a problem in the rush hour. Not in the regular hour. Even though, in the downtown, he will spend—in downtown to hospital in the regular hour, we spend five to seven minutes. But in the rush hour, we spend 20 minutes. We have enough taxi in here, but we don't have the—enough work here.

Just in this problem only the rush hour. Even though if you wanted to increase the taxi, we don't have the tourism here. How many person come from the outside in here? If any—many person come in

from the outside here, they take a rental car. Very less per cent take a taxi. We don't have enough work. If you want to increase the taxis limit quantity—so should we increase the first the tourism.

We have no—if Uber comes, we don't have enough work, when we bought this taxi, we paid is very high amount. And if the Taxicab Board is dissolved and taxi go under the City, we need same value which when we paid already because we—that want taxi through the—that approved through the Taxicab Board, and Taxicab Board and the City. If you pay that time, it's too much money, so we need the same value in the taxi.

And we don't have enough tourism here. All the internal customer on the weekend or holiday, on the school close, work is—goes down 50 per cent already. We wait for the one customer look like is hour and hour and hour. If Uber is still brought here, so they should have to follow the same rules and regulations for everyone else, such as criminal record check, child abuse certificate and MPI, and the training, also.

But one thing I still I not understand—this a very, very common thing, is fingerprint never change. But every two year, we pay to check the fingerprint when we go to criminal record check. But that things for the Uber and another you say you do, you don't want anything. But if everything you need for that local companies.

If Uber does not have to follow these rules, then that is very unfair to us also. How can we seem as a driver is protection is change and brought down for the entire industry. In the 2001, and the taxi driver was murdered on the job. After this is—was recommended to the have camera, shield and training for the—all the drivers. If you do not continue the safety protection, will be putting driver at risk.

We have these—protection is not only for the keep the drivers safe, but also to keep the passenger is also safe. There is a zero-tolerance policy where, if change have been laid or any crimes, the taxi drivers are suspended. Uber does not follow this procedure for checking his driver, and is consistence record of the putting the passenger at the risk. Bill 30 does nothing to ensure of these current safely standard are maintained.

All I am asking is this: we want fairness for everyone.

Floor Comment: Mr. Chair, can I speak something on behalf of this?

Mr. Chairperson: If you're translating for Mr. Gill.

Mr. Tarlochan Gill, on behalf of Mr. Jaipal Gill: There was a question regarding over here about insurance. We pay around—over \$10,000—\$10,700 we pay insurance. For example, if I have a car, somebody else is driving or you are driving, you are not going to share that insurance with me. But the owners are supposed to pay that insurance. Not—if I have—my car is there on my name. If my wife is driving or somebody else because they can share their insurance. I have to pay that insurance. Not the drivers.

* (21:10)

In the same things, he's asking for the safety issues. All those cameras and most of the shields almost from five days, all hours we spend it over here, we're looking for safety: cameras, shields, criminal record, training and all those things. That's what we looking for over here.

Mr. Chairperson: Are you finished with your presentation?

Mr. Tarlochan Gill, on behalf of Mr. Jaipal Gill: Sure, yes.

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

We'll now move on to questions.

Mr. Wharton: Thank you, Mr. Gill, for your presentation, and thank you for taking the time tonight.

I just wanted to—since you are an owner as well—I just wanted to ask you a question and unfortunately I didn't have time to ask Mr. Dhillon. Regarding his bill of sale, and it included—the bill of sale also included a number of things like the business licence, the Taxicab Board licence, a spike light, the computers, security camera, et cetera. It also says here that it included a share in Duffy's Taxi, all of which is now situated in the city of Winnipeg, Manitoba. So my question would be: What would be the monetary value of that share that you would be buying if you bought into Duffy's Taxi?

Mr. Tarlochan Gill, on behalf of Mr. Jaipal Gill: I think a lot of—on Monday and Tuesday, I spoke to [*inaudible*]. He asked the same questions. For example, there are 410 medallion licences out there. Those are the transfer of licence. There are lots of handi-accessible vans. Those vans are taken by the individual people to work and provide service to the

Handi-Transit. Those individual licences should be transferred as it is the way we are transferring from buying from one to each other. That has a share price. Those individual non-transferred licences should be the same.

If the City thinks there is less cabs or lack of service, we are ready to provide all the time service to the City. We, all the time, we work with the taxi board. In wintertime, we know it's a busy time because there's parties are going on. We put extra 100 cars for five months to provide a better service. The question was raised by inspector [*inaudible*] that if Uber taxi or any other taxi licences should be valued the same what we paid, City will make lots of money. They can spend that money in lots of other projects. So that will be fair for us and even the insurance, we are paying \$10,700. Other private insurance is paying on less. Our insurance pool should be same.

Mr. Chairperson: I would like to remind the—

Mr. Tarlochan Gill, on behalf of Mr. Jaipal Gill: I'm working only to—

Mr. Chairperson: Order. Order for a minute, sir.

I'd like to remind the—like, the presenter's answer is what we're looking for, not necessarily yours, so if you could confer with him and then give us the answer, please.

Does the presenter have an answer for that question?

Did you want the question repeated?

Mr. Jaipal Gill: Yes, please.

Mr. Wharton: Thank you, Mr. Gill.

I just mentioned that in Mr. Dhillon's presentation of his bill of sale, which I assume is pretty standard within the industry, with the exception of the purchase price, there are a number of items that are included in the purchase, and this is pretty standard material when you're getting involved in a small business and you're buying into a business. And it says here that he'd also bought a share in Duffy's Taxi. So I just, for the purpose of understanding, again, more about your business, what would be the value, monetarily, of that share when you purchased into the—into Duffy's Taxi?

Mr. Tarlochan Gill, on behalf of Mr. Jaipal Gill: Right now or before? Asking price right now, the value?

Mr. Wharton: When you purchased your company, your licence, you also purchased—[*interjection*] Sorry?

Mr. Chairperson: Could you wait 'til I recognize you before you answer?

Mr. Gill.

Mr. Jaipal Gill: Yes.

Mr. Chairperson: Could you repeat the answer, please?

Mr. Jaipal Gill: I bought it in 2008, \$120,000.

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

In 45 minutes, the government is going to shut down this committee and start doing what we call clause by clause, and we'll be making some amendments to the bill, and the fact of the matter is that this is the first time in memory that we are going to have 100 people not being able to make presentations. The government could have called this committee on Saturday; they could have called it on Sunday; they could have called it on Monday. They didn't do it. They came in here knowing they had 126 people to hear from and they give you 'til 10 o'clock to finish.

But I want to ask you, my question is this: That on next Tuesday we are going to be doing some committee reports directly to the—

Mr. Chairperson: Time for questions on this matter has expired. Thank you very much for your—[*interjection*]—time is up. We'll move on to the next presenter, please.

Mr. Tarlochan Gill, on behalf of Mr. Jaipal Gill: Answer for this question, Chair?

Mr. Chairperson: You have 10 seconds.

Mr. Tarlochan Gill, on behalf of Mr. Jaipal Gill: Okay. It's hard to do in 10 seconds. Chairperson, we are here from 5 days. We can do—we are only the shareholders and drivers are here. We are working so hard, 12 hours, seven days. We could have bring our kids, families. We could have made a [*inaudible*] We don't want to do this. Before making any decision think about 1,600 families. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: We thank you very much for your presentation and your answers. We will now move on to the next presenter.

The next presenter, No. 19, Sukhvir Kalaat. Sukhvir Kalaat?

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

Mr. Sukhvir Kalaat (Private Citizen): Yes, I'm a driver. I'm new for this country. I'm working with Unicity industry since 2011 for about six years, so I have a concern the Bill 30.

So, when I used to drive it's more safety because I have experience from back home with taxi and then when I start with taxi industry I get more safety, I mean, with the cameras, with other things, everything, and then every three to six months inspection and then more guaranteed for us, I mean, special the cameras and other things.

So, just with the Bill 30, just have a concern—a big concern as my driver, because I live with my family, I mean with one kid and my wife, and then if anything happened here, so for my rent and for my other bills and my wife for—she's studying now with a loan, so I can't—if something is happen, so I am in what you call in bad condition and nobody can pay for my bills or something, so I have concerns about the Bill 30.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Kalaat. We will now go to questions.

Mr. Maloway: And perhaps I can ask the question I was going to ask the previous presenter, that we are going to be introducing some amendments tonight, five of them here tonight, and we'll be introducing another two on Tuesday, so you're welcome to come down and see the vote and they'll be a standing vote. The Conservatives will have to stand up and show where their support is going on this.

* (21:20)

But one of our amendments is to deal with the safety issues, and I was wanting you to listen to the list that we have, and just in case you have something that we have forgot, because we have to submit this tomorrow, so we have some time, but we are requiring in our amendment to Bill 30 that the cars would have to be equipped with a shield, with a camera, strobe lights, panic button—all the things they have now, but because they're throwing this off to the City, you're going to be starting from scratch unless we can get this amendment in—the requirement for a vehicle-for-hire to undergo mechanical inspections twice a year, the requirement that they must have a criminal record check, Child

Abuse Registry check every two years; a requirement that the drivers undergo 35 hours of training dealing with driver and passenger safety; conflict de-escalation; geographic knowledge of the area; English language skills; and the requirement that they hold a valid driver's licence and they display photo identification on the dashboard of the vehicle that allows the passenger in the vehicle to determine the name of the driver; and also a mechanism for complaints that people want to make against, you know, any complaints people have and other requirements that the council seems—deems necessary. And also that the criminal record check be done through the police.

Now these are sort of a summary of the rules that we are suggesting. I would certainly ask you if you have any suggestions, to give them to me. And, also, I want to mention that, you know, the government members keep insisting that this bill is not about Uber. The question is, then, what was that Uber guy doing here on day one? Did he kind of get lost somewhere and wander into the Legislative Building, if this bill is nothing about Uber?

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Kalaat. [*interjection*] Could we have some silence here so Mr. Kalaat can answer the question?

Mr. Kalaat, please. You can answer the question now.

Mr. Kalaat: So can you repeat what you say. I mean, not the whole, but in summary—I mean?

Mr. Maloway: I'd really like to do that.

We have put together a list of safety features that we think should be included in the bill, which they presumably don't want to do, and they will have to vote on Tuesday. Do we accept them or do we not?

And I invite you down here to see how they vote on Tuesday. And, if you have other safety things that you want to put in, then let us know and we will add them in, because we may not have a totally exhaustive list at this point. But, so far, it looks pretty good.

Mr. Kalaat: Okay—so, if there is another thing, I mean, some courses or something to be for the drivers—I mean, more about in public safety or something. This one we can take. I mean, especially in a year or something, even one day or today, it's good to have one day or something workshop about—to be more safety about our public or other things

issue. And then I'm happy to see in any of this one—I mean, any courses or short course in addition.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Bindle, but you only have about 20 seconds; you'll have to make it fast.

Mr. Bindle: Whether Uber comes to Winnipeg or not is outside the scope of this bill, and we did listen to Uber, because we listen to everyone that decides to come and present.

My question to you is: If the City does take over, they have the option of leaving it unregulated, they have the option of regulating or in between. Which do you think creates the best option for the City to get the most revenue?

Mr. Kalaat: The most thing, you mean? Yes, the taxi industry, because you see, as a driver, I don't want to work or something with other thing. I mean, because this industry, I feel good thing for my life as my experience—I mean.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Kalaat. Time for questions has expired. We will now move on to the next presenter. Thank you.

The next presenter is presenter No. 20, Simranjeer Sandu. Simranjeer Sandu? Mr. Sandu will be removed from the list. The next presenter, presenter No. 21, Balreep Mann.

Mr. Mann, do you have a translator with you?

Mr. Balreep Mann (Private Citizen): Yes.

Floor comment: Yes, I am his translator.

Mr. Chairperson: Could you please state your name and spell it for the Hansard?

Mr. Harjinder Dhillon, on behalf of Mr. Balreep Mann (Private Citizen): My name is Harjinder Dhillon, H-a-r-j-i-n-d-e-r, and last name is D-h-i-l-l-o-n.

Mr. Chairperson: You may 'proceed'—with the—Mr. Mann's presentation.

Mr. Harjinder Dhillon, on behalf of Mr. Balreep Mann: Thank you, everyone. I'm here to help my colleague, or—my friend, Mr. Mann. Mr. Mann, he came in Canada 1992, and starting from all jobs, cleaning, factory, and then he started driving a truck, and, finally, he want to be—he want to buy a—he want have a stable job, so he drove a cab for a while, and then he bought a cab 2011 and the amount was 425.

So since that, he's working hard, and he have two kids, two old parents—they are dependent on

him—and his wife and his kids—they are going to school—and all responsibilities on the single person. His wife is doing part job because the kids are not old enough to take care about themselves.

So the reason why we are here today, everybody's having the same concern, the majority of them. Just a few odds, they have a different concern and—but end of the day, when you see the statement everybody have, majority, 90 per cent, is the same.

So, safety concern, we're going to start from there. So, many of the people who presented to—you know what safety is all about. We deal with unsafe situations all the time; racism and threatening comments, robberies, attempted robberies. We even get assaulted. But it used to be a lot worse. We are very proud of our fact we have one of the safest taxi industries in North America. This is in an industry that is one of the most dangerous to work in.

We are very concerned that there's nothing in this bill to maintain what we have. The best safety protection, yes, for our drivers, but also for our passengers, I want you to know exactly how important this is. I'm going to read from some of the report that outlines what the situation is.

So how safe is Winnipeg for a taxi? I want to read what some of the report says about safety report, like MNP report, like presentations from the taxi board. Winnipeg is the best. Safety equipment for our taxicabs, such as in-car cameras, panic buttons, rooftop strobe lights and driver shields and mandated by the Taxicab Board: Winnipeg appears to have the most vigorous safety equipment requirements of all compared cities. Taxicab owners and drivers, generally support in-car safety equipment. Driving a taxicab is 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 passengers, discrimination and fare disputes. To protect the safety of passengers, the Taxicab Board requires drivers to undergo criminal record checks, mandatory training and driving safety and safe equipment handling for passengers, as well as regular vehicle inspections.

* (21:30)

Driving a cab is very dangerous. Driving a taxicab is an important public transportation, serving one of the most dangerous occupations in North America. A taxicab driver is 60 times more likely to be murdered on the job than the average worker.

In Canada, there have been 150 taxicab drivers killed since 1970. In Manitoba, there has been 10 taxicab drivers killed while the duty since 1945.

Taxicab drivers are at the risk in terms of robberies, hijacking of the taxi, abusive and threatening behaviour. Physical assault, traffic disputes and accident. Fare disputes and combination of the above. With the shield and cameras, there is a dramatic improvement in safety after the murdered Mr. Pritam Singh Deol, the Taxicab Safety Issues Report was released in October 2001. It made 18 recommendations. One of the key recommendations was the development of the taxicab driver safety program to enhance driver skills to recognize and assess risks and how to diffuse potential hostile situations.

The effectiveness of the cameras and shield is clear. The Winnipeg Police Service indicates that for the calendar year 2002, there were 20 fewer reported taxicab or robberies than in previous year. This represented the reductions of 71 in series-serious taxicab crime since the cab cameras and shield were introduced. When 2003 in compared to 2001, that year before cameras and shield were introduced taxicab were 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 overall in the city of the-Winnipeg over the same period. The arrest rate for the crime against taxi driver 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.

So the drivers find that customers, while in the cab, settled down, knowing that the camera is taking their picture. There are very few incidents-or, hostile incidents in taxicabs. Crimes that do happen in taxicabs are solved quickly by the police using digital image and identify and find the suspect. In many cases, the 'prosecutetors' will admit to the crime, thus enabling a swift resolving to an incident.

So, when it comes to driver safety, we can take in an industry where you are 60 times more likely to be murdered on the job than other jobs, turned into the industry where there has not been a single murder since 2001, and a big decrease in assaults. So it shouldn't matter who you drive in the vehicle-for-hire industry, in Winnipeg, you should have the best safety protection.

Please listen to us in terms of safety. Reject this bill. If you are going to proceed with it, protect the

Winnipeg models. This makes us safest taxi industry in North America. Our reason is our industry. Our reason is for Manitobans. Safety, fairness or community. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Mann. We will now proceed with questions.

Ms. Marcelino: Thank you, Mr. Chair; through you, I would like also to thank Mr. Mann and, also, Mr. Dhillon for reading his presentation. Very substantial. So many facts and figures there.

This bill would transfer the responsibility-excuse me-for the taxi industry to the City of Winnipeg. Do you think the City of Winnipeg will enforce the same safety rules that are currently in place now, required by the provincial government when it's transferred to the City?

Mr. Harjinder Dhillon, on behalf of Mr. Balreep Mann: Okay, thank you. He thinks if they're going to pass this bill to the City the way it is, he's not sure City will follow it.

Mr. Saran: Thank you, Mr. Mann and Mr. Dhillon.

My question-I think the sticking point is that government put the clause that you cannot take the government to the court while all the other industries in the past had that kind of opportunity.

If they remove this clause would you think, then, it won't hurt you as much as it will hurt otherwise if they will transfer to the City?

Mr. Harjinder Dhillon, on behalf of Mr. Balreep Mann: The way Mr. Saran, he asked the question, and-first of all he said his input and money investor and he's not sure about that, and if they're really concerned they should put that clause in.

And another thing is he wants to add on is a safety, so both things he wants to add on, his goodwill and a safety.

Mr. Teitsma: Mr. Mann, Mr. Dhillon, I appreciate very much the story and I do recognize the hard work that you put in since 1992 and all the jobs that you did leading you to this is the kind of success story that we want to see happening across our province and certainly I deeply value the work that you do and the way that you do it.

I do want you to be aware, though, that Manitoba is the only province that I'm aware of, at least, that still is regulating its own-or, it's the biggest city's taxi industry, and this may be not that important to you, but for me it's very important for

governments to respect each other, for a federal government to respect a provincial government and provincial government to respect City of Winnipeg government and other city governments.

And this is what this bill reflects for us is that we want to make it clear this is the City's responsibility, but I wonder how we got here, and I reflect on that and I do want to give you time to respond, so, for years and years and years, the taxi rates that you get to charge, pasted on your door, don't change—hardly change at all.

Why? Uber—or, sorry—the licence prices go up and up and up, and yet no new licences are created, which would take those prices back down again to a normal level and not make you pay as much as you did.

Why? Uber's been coming for years. Provincial government did nothing to prepare under the previous government. Why?

Mr. Harjinder Dhillon, on behalf of Mr. Balreep Mann: Okay. The answer he wants to give, I think this is a beautiful Manitoba. If we are having a unique thing comparatively to other provinces, like a Manitoba Taxicab Board, and he said he wants to keep it. If there's anything unique done better than others we should keep it. We don't have to follow others just like a blindly.

And second thing is price. I think there was a price thing, right?

An Honourable Member: Fees—licence price. What number of licences—*[interjection]*

Mr. Harjinder Dhillon, on behalf of Mr. Balreep Mann: Yes. Number of licences. I think, for your notice, there's 89 Handi-vans with a meter there on the road—

* (21:40)

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Mann, time for question period has expired. I've allowed it to go a little longer than it should. We want to thank you very much for your presentation.

Before we move on to the next presenter, I would like to remind the committee—remind all in attendance that at 10 p.m., the committee must close off presentations and immediately proceed to clause-by-clause consideration of the bill. The public will have the ability to provide written submissions for an additional 24 hours.

Our next presenter, Gurdeep Sidhu. Gurdeep Sidhu? You have a presenter, Mr. Sidhu—

Mr. Mandeep Singh Sidhu, on behalf of Mr. Gurdeep Singh Sidhu (Private Citizen): Yes, Mr. Speaker. This is my father, Gurdeep Singh Sidhu. My name is Mandeep, spelled M-a-n-d-e-e-p. Middle name is Singh, spelled S-i-n-g-h, and my last name is Sidhu, same as my father, and I'll be interpreting for him.

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

Mr. Mandeep Singh Sidhu, on behalf of Mr. Gurdeep Singh Sidhu: So, I'm going to be talking about what my father wrote down and informing that to you individuals, okay?

My father came to Canada in 1988. He was 18 years old. He started driving a taxi in 1991. Since then, he's been driving for 26 years. Six years ago, in 2011, we purchased—or, he purchased a taxi, becoming an owner for three hundred and seventy-three thousand, seven hundred—\$370,000. Today, that taxi's worth zero. There is no compensation. There is no pension. He doesn't get anything. He doesn't pay into that. That was his pension, and now it is zero. He doesn't get anything. His main reason for buying a taxi was to provide for his children: me and my sister. He can no longer do this. He can—no longer can sell this taxi and put it towards the mortgage. It's worth zero.

A friend of mine lost his father a few days ago, who's also a taxi owner. He was—I would call him Lucky Uncle—I was very close to him. Now, since that taxi is worth zero—his son doesn't want to be a taxi driver; son wants to be a businessman, but who's going to take over ownership of the taxi? Who's going to drive it? Who's going to provide funds to that family now? It's worth zero. They could have sold it before. Now they can't sell. It's worth zero.

Moving on, my father wanted to talk about a few points about Bill 30. You guys say that there was consultation with industry workers. We didn't get no letter in the mail. I check it every day. Nothing from the Manitoban government was given to talk about consultation of this Uber bill, Bill 30.

I believe, and my father believes, as talked this as a family group, that the government should do more consultation and should study more about the taxi industry. I don't believe anyone here today talked about the racism that my father gets with being a taxi driver. I want to be a police officer one

day. I've—I do security work, and I've seen many individuals, including my friends, be racist to these taxi drivers here today. I've never dealt with racism, but they have, which—I believe that you guys should study about this and find these problems out.

Next big thing is safety. It's a major concern to everyone here, including owners, drivers, and people from the public. For example, in 2001, Pritam Deol was murdered in The Maples. This happened in 2001. Ever since then, the government made every owner pay for a camera and a shield, which did bring the crime statistics to 79 per cent down. However when I was in grade 2, a classmate and I—a classmate of mine named Melissa, her father passed away—was murdered as a driver. So safety's still a concern here. It's—people are still being hurt. That's one thing we wanted to point out here.

Another thing we wanted to point out was, my father told me that when I was born in 1994, he drove a taxi; he was dispatched to Elmwood. When two individuals entered his car, immediately after, someone took a knife, placed it right by his chin and slit it. It was intended to slit his throat. I could have been fatherless today. However, my father was able to convince them to take the taxi and leave. He then went to the city. He saw a constable. Constable was on a call. He told him to go call 911; he could not deal with the call. My father, not knowing English at the time, as he does now, did not understand and was unable to properly call 911 about this problem.

The next issue my father wants to talk about is that the government, meaning the Manitoban government, has full right to put conditions, which can be placed by you guys, onto the next government body, meaning the municipal government. This is something you guys can do to safeguard these taxi owners and drivers, workers in this field. Dad found, in the Bill 30, that nothing has been mentioned about safety measures to this bill.

Another thing my dad liked to point out is that the government here sets prices for the drivers. That way that no one can overcharge, undercharge a customer; it's all fair, everything's okay. However, Uber is able to do—they can charge whatever they want towards you. Two weeks ago, and this was on CTV News, an individual in Minneapolis was charged \$411 for a 11-kilometre taxi ride, which would be \$18 in the city, in Winnipeg. He was charged \$411, and Uber will not be compensating him.

I have a friend in Toronto. He takes Uber and a taxi every day. He goes to the University of Toronto there. He's informed me that when it's busy, when there's—when there's Leaf games, when there's baseball games, Raptor games, the taxi price will go up because it's busy; people want—sorry—Uber prices will go up because it's being demanded. So, instead of paying, say, it'll be \$12, you might be paying \$34 simply going from one end of town to a five-minute street to where you want to go; you can be charged almost triple the price. There's no safeguard here.

Another thing my father would like to mention is that Ucity and Duffy are Canadian Winnipeg companies. But you guys like to bring in a corporation who strictly wants to just make money into Winnipeg. They—there's no love for Winnipeggers here, no love for Manitobans. However, Ucity and Duffy do. Today the City, my dad was telling me, they—if my dad wanted to pick up someone from the Superstore, the City says that you can't park your vehicle in front of a fire lane. However, my father would get out and help out individuals, such as a handicapped person or an individual who was pregnant, put their groceries in the car. That's a reasonable thing to do. However, the City—as—if you stop and get out of your vehicle, they will charge you \$50—[interjection]—\$300, sorry—for stopping and simply helping someone. So the City is already targeting taxi drivers. There's no safeguard here.

Next thing my father's pointed out here is that there's no compensation—or there's no compensation being given to any taxi driver or taxi owner, and there's no legal effect being placed on the government, which means that we can't sue. We can't sue the government if this Uber thing goes across. And I would like to ask: Why is this? Why can we not sue? Why can't these people behind me sue you guys? That's something that I'd like to be answered.

Another thing is that, currently, the Manitoban government, the provincial government, is in charge of the taxi business. If you pass it on to the City, which has many other problems, I don't believe that'll be the proper move. The City can't even budget out their own policing budget. How are they going to compensate towards taxi drivers?

The companies here, taxi companies, have been negotiating with the government. For eight years they've been saying, please give us diamond lane access so they can stop in a diamond lane, they have access in the diamond lane, they can safely drop off

individuals, which is in place in Edmonton. Drivers in Edmonton can do this, but here it hasn't been. It's been eight years. This is something that has not been—is an issue that has not been—this is an issue that has not been taken lightly. This is a very simple thing—sorry.

* (21:50)

The next thing I'd like to talk about is the government here in the city really likes to compare Winnipeg to Vancouver and Toronto. Toronto and Vancouver have a vastly huge population compared to Winnipeg. It makes sense for them to have Uber. Here, there is way too many taxis already. Simply—I now work at the Health Sciences Centre. There's taxis there always waiting. There's always a taxi there for someone. I used to work at St. Vital. There's always a taxi there for someone.

When you drive through downtown, you see taxis right at the hotel waiting to pick someone up. When you drive to the airport, there is tons of taxis there.

When you go to Toronto, there is—it's hard to get an Uber; it's hard to get a taxi. If you get a taxi, they're only going to charge you what their price is. If you get an Uber, which is, like I said before, if it's in demand, you're going to be charged extra.

So, I'll just like to tell you guys that there's enough taxis here, and even now, during the Christmas holiday going towards, I think, March or April, the city has put in—

Mr. Chairperson: We'd like to thank you for your presentation, Mr. Sidhu, but the 10 minutes for the presentation has expired. We will now move into questions.

Mr. Bindle: Thank you for your presentation, and yourself and the previous presenters talked about the risky business and safety in the taxi business, and I hear you. A friend of mine, she's a First Nations driver, she was murdered in Thompson, Melissa Chaboyer, and that was never solved, actually. That's a horrible thing, and also, in the city of Thompson, the taxi business is ruled by the city and safety is regulated by the City of Thompson and prices are regulated to keep the prices down.

This bill, whether Uber comes to Winnipeg or not, is outside the scope of this bill, but my question is, from the City of Winnipeg's perspective, I know that they care as much about safety, as deeply about safety, as all of us, and I mean, of course, it's in their

best interest, but they do have the option, and I'm curious about what you think that the best scenario would be for them, that they could leave it as is; they could totally unregulate it with Uber, or do something in between.

Which do you think would be the best option for the City of Winnipeg to generate the most revenues?

Mr. Mandeep Singh Sidhu, on behalf of Mr. Gurdeep Singh Sidhu: Do I have time to translate that to my father?

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

Mr. Mandeep Singh Sidhu, on behalf of Mr. Gurdeep Singh Sidhu: Could you just repeat your question in a—just a bit more broadened down, please?

Mr. Bindle: The city would have the option of taking over regulating the taxi industry, they would have the option to keep it the same, they would have the option to make it totally unregulated, like with Uber, or a combination of the two.

Which would generate the most revenue—which do you think would generate the most revenue for the City of Winnipeg out of those scenarios?

Mr. Mandeep Singh Sidhu, on behalf of Mr. Gurdeep Singh Sidhu: Sorry, sir. What is your name?

Mr. Bindle: Kelly.

Mr. Mandeep Singh Sidhu, on behalf of Mr. Gurdeep Singh Sidhu: So, Mr. Kelly, my father says that he feels like you are giving him a question that you should be answering yourself. You are the governing body. You should be able to figure out how Winnipeg will be getting revenue. The Manitoba government, they're not getting any money out of this, so how is the city going to get money if, comparing it to the system that's been in place for so long, how is the city going to get money if the Manitoba government is not getting money? Does that make sense to you, Mr. Kelly?

Mr. Teitsma: We'll see if I can get into a question here. But I do want to, first of all, thank you and—for presenting tonight and I think broader members of the taxi industry, as well, if I can be so bold as to bring them into this.

I'm a—newly elected. I've only been an MLA for 16 months, and I very much, now today, I know so much more about what the taxi industry does and is than I did when I was elected. And that is because of

the work of people like yourself and your colleagues, and I'm very grateful for that.

And I specifically want to say that I'm grateful for the work that you—or the service you provide to seniors, and the service you provide to people who have a disability, and the service you provide to low-income Manitobans, right, that perhaps other companies might not be providing. And I think that's also your opportunity and your hope that, as a taxi industry you have opportunity to provide those services on a-going forward for many, many years.

And the last thing I want to say, though, is you talked about racism, the racism that you suffer, and I want to say I've no tolerance for racism. I stand against it. I believe all the members around this table would stand against it, and that you have our support, our oath that we do not stand for—do not tolerate that in this country or in this province.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Sidhu, time for questions has expired, but I'll give you 10 seconds to give it a quick answer.

Mr. Mandeep Singh Sidhu, on behalf of Mr. Gurdeep Singh Sidhu: Sorry, sir. What's your name?

An Honourable Member: Mr. Teitsma.

Mr. Mandeep Singh Sidhu, on behalf of Mr. Gurdeep Singh Sidhu: Sorry?

An Honourable Member: Teitsma. Teitsma.

Mr. Mandeep Singh Sidhu, on behalf of Mr. Gurdeep Singh Sidhu: Oh, the honourable individual here he didn't finish his question. He was still talking. I was just translating. So, if he may be allowed to just keep going, and then we can—

Mr. Chairperson: Time for question period has expired, so we will be moving on to the next presenter.

Mr. Maloway: Given that we've got about three minutes left, and we have about 104 people who are here—who are here—to present and they're going to be cut off in three minutes. I've never heard of this happening ever, probably since the Legislature began in 1870. There has never been a case where presenters have been refused. And so I would ask for leave of the committee to allow all of the presenters who are here tonight to finish their presentations.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Maloway there is—this is not a point of order, and the committee does not have—

this committee does not have the right to waive a rule from—on the deadline. We cannot do that.

I also mentioned earlier that it is 24 hours for written submissions. So people may put in written submissions.

Mr. Lindsey: I'm relatively new at this business, but my understanding is that we can agree by unanimous consent to change rules or change the way things are done.

Mr. Chairperson: That rule cannot be changed. It is something that there are—if the committee agrees for other areas, but this is one on a deadline that the committee cannot change.

Mr. Maloway: I believe that if there's unanimous agreement on, you know, to proceed and hear the rest of the presenters, that can be done by a committee.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Maloway, I have already ruled that there—the committee does not have the authority to change that. And that is my ruling on it.

We will be proceeding with line-by-line very shortly.

Mr. Maloway: I would challenge your ruling.

* (22:00)

Mr. Chairperson: The ruling of the Chair has been challenged. Shall the ruling be sustained?

Voice Vote

Mr. Chairperson: All those in favour of sustaining the ruling, please say aye.

Some Honourable Members: Aye.

Mr. Chairperson: All those opposed to sustaining the ruling, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Chairperson: In my opinion, the Ayes have it. The ruling of the Chair is sustained.

Mr. Chairperson: The hour being 10 p.m., in accordance with subrule 2(22), the committee will now close off public presentations and will proceed immediately to clause-by-clause consideration of the bill.

Mr. Chairperson: Does the minister responsible for Bill 30 have an opening statement?

Mr. Wharton: Yes, I do.

I would like to thank each and every person that made it out to make a presentation over the last several days and spent some time sharing their concerns and issues with respect to what we're talking about in Bill 30. Many of our presenters, of course, stayed very late as well, as long as the committee members, and I'd like to also extend a thank you to all the committee members that took part in this democratic process, and I'm glad that we've all survived and we're continuing to move forward.

So, over the past few nights, this committee has had the opportunity to hear a range of diverse perspectives on the vehicle-for-hire industry. And yet, despite these diverse perspectives, there were a number of common themes that were shared throughout the presentations, which I would like to touch on.

The Province recognizes that the taxi services are important transportation option and that existing taxicab industry plays a critical role in the local transportation network. The Province also recognizes the need to modernize the industry and the outdated rules regulating it.

Bill 30, The Local Vehicles for Hire Act, modernizes regulation of the vehicles-for-hire industry. Modernization of the industry is needed. The MNP review identified a number of deficiencies in the existing regulatory framework governing taxicabs, a frame that—work that dates back to 1935.

Bill 30 transfers responsibility of the industry to municipalities, the level of government best positioned to oversee this industry. This puts the city of Winnipeg in line with other capital cities across Canada and with a number of municipalities right here in our province such as Brandon, Portage la Prairie, and Selkirk.

Under the proposed legislation, municipalities will have explicit authority to design systems that fit their unique needs. This means municipalities can decide how best to enable a safe, reliable, and competitive vehicle-for-hire industry.

I heard concerns from taxicab owners that driver and passenger safety will be compared—compromised under Bill 30. This is not the case. Municipalities, including the City of Winnipeg, are mature levels of government whose primary purpose is to develop and maintain safe and orderly, viable and sustainable communities. In fact, the responsibility to maintain

the safety of the inhabitants is enshrined in both the City of Winnipeg Charter and The Municipal Act. Also municipal regulation of the local vehicle-for-hire industry has some additional safety benefits including of increased co-ordination and co-operation with municipal police services, parking and bylaw enforcement resources.

Similarly, I've heard concerns about accessibility being compromised under Bill 30. The Province recognizes that accessibility on demand transportation is a critical service for people living with disabilities, and again, the City of Winnipeg is best positioned to assess this need. The City of Winnipeg currently regulates Handi-Transit services, and municipal regulation of the local vehicle-for-hire industry may complement existing accessible services. Vehicle-for-hire business owners and drivers will continue to be subject to customer service standards and forthcoming transportation standards under The Accessibility for Manitobans Act.

I've also heard concerns regarding industry viability and the need for a fair, level playing field. Our government is committed to providing a fair and level playing field for traditional taxis and transportation network companies. This means creating a condition for fair and competitive market for all transportation providers and a range of viable options for consumers.

There will be—continue to be ongoing role and market for existing taxicab industry for trips via phone, dispatch, street hails and taxi stands. Experience in other jurisdictions suggest that cities that have allowed TNCs to operate have managed to maintain a competitive and viable traditional taxi industry. To ensure continuing service, under Bill 30, all valid licences issued by the taxi board for vehicles will be transferred to the City of Winnipeg when the act comes into force. This will ensure that existing taxicab businesses and driver's licences, the holders, can continue to carry on business and that consumers who rely on the taxicab industry will not experience any interruption in service.

In closing, maintaining the status quo is not a viable option. I recognize that change can be hard, particularly in a system that has remained static for over 80 years. The current system is not working and has produced a very high barrier for those wishing to enter the industry, thereby limiting supply to a level far below what market can bear. This has also led to minimal competition and a lack of incentives for

companies to find innovative ways of improving service for passengers.

Bill 30 introduces a new framework that provides greater flexibility for existing operators to remain competitive while opening the door for municipalities to explore TNCs. Bill 30 balances the needs of customers, consumers and industry stakeholders.

The act has a coming-into-force date of February 28th, 2018, which will allow time for the City of Winnipeg and other municipalities to create their own vehicle-for-hire bylaws. In the interim, the Province will continue to work with the City to facilitate a smooth transition for consumers and industry stakeholders.

I look forward, of course, to further discussions on this important legislation from the committee. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: We thank the minister for his statement.

Does the critic from the official opposition have an opening statement?

Mr. Maloway: It's really hard to know where to start. You know, we have a government that's been elected now for a year and a half. They have 40 members; that's the largest number of members, probably in 100 years, and, you know, this government, with 40 members, couldn't even manage the committee process for presenters.

We have had in the 30 years I've been here—we have had a number of big, big issues we've dealt with here. And in each and every case, we've had a government, both Conservative and NDP, that were able and smart enough to make certain that everyone had a chance to present. And this government knew very well that it had close to 300 presenters, and they deliberately chose last Thursday to call the hearings for Thursday night, all day Friday, I guess, thinking the people weren't going to show up, and they were surprised, I guess. But they didn't have the foresight to call the meetings for Saturday and Sunday and Monday so that these 100 people could've had their say. This is a travesty. It's never happened before, and it's happened to these people now.

So now let's get back to the issue itself and the bill. The fact of the matter is it's a very draconian bill, just as section No. 10 alone, banning any form of compensation when compensation has been—being offered by pretty well all the states in Australia. It's

been offered before by governments, and yet, for the taxi industry of Manitoba, it's specifically written into the bill that it doesn't apply.

Now, we've had presenters here, at least three or four, who have mentioned since Thursday night—two of them were on Thursday night, I believe—that the Premier (Mr. Pallister), the Premier himself, and who sits in caucus with the members opposite every day, the Premier himself promised that—at a Conservative fundraiser in one case and two other fundraisers or parties, whatever they were, promised that it would be a level playing field and that they would be treated properly and fairly. And to me, that is an absolute broken promise, and they collectively have the—know the—when the promise was made, who made the promise and who was there. And I see people nodding to me right now.

* (22:10)

The Premier of this province made a promise, and now he's not even here himself. He sent his MLAs in here to do the dirty work, to pass this bill—well, pass the bill without hearing from 100 presenters and then send it over the City, as if they're going to get better treatment over there. They know that's not going to happen.

So, Mr. Chair, you know, I'm prepared to deal with whatever amendments we're going to deal with tonight. The amendment on compensation, the amendment on the safety regulations, we're going to put them off to Tuesday so that we get a recorded vote from all these Conservatives in the Legislature at report stage. So, we're going to leave those two off 'til report stage. We're going to do the other ones tonight.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation.

During the consideration of a bill—[interjection]

Ms. Lamoureux: May I ask for leave to have a one-minute closing statement?

Mr. Chairperson: Does the committee grant leave to Ms. Lamoureux for an opening statement? [Agreed]

Ms. Lamoureux: This government, they should be ashamed right now.

They are hurting thousands of families here in the province of Manitoba, and they are jeopardizing the safety of Manitobans here in our province by refusing to hear people out, people who have been waiting 20-some-plus hours here, over 100 people

who have not had their opportunity to voice their opinions, voice and share their stories, when historically, people have always been allowed to.

This is a new precedent for this government, and they should be ashamed of that. They should be ashamed by their poor, poor, poor demonstration of consultation. They claim over and over again to be consulting, yet again, with the hundreds and hundreds of witnesses we have had, none of them have been consulted with. What are we to believe when that is what we're given?

Mr. Chair, it's an abuse of power. It truly, truly is. And I want to apologize to the taxicab drivers. They do not deserve this. You do not.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your statement, Ms. Lamoureux.

During the consideration of a bill, the preamble, the enacting clause and the title are postponed until all other clauses have been considered in their proper order. Also, if there is agreement from the committee, the Chair will call clauses in blocks that conform to pages, with the understanding that we will stop at any particular clause or clauses where the members may have comments, questions, or amendments to propose. Is that agreed? *[Agreed]*

We will now proceed with Bill 30.

Clauses 1 and 2—pass;

Shall clause 3 pass?

Some Honourable Members: Pass.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Maloway: Mr. Chair, we have an amendment to bring.

Mr. Chairperson: Amendment to clause 3?

Mr. Maloway: I move

THAT Clause 3.2(i)(i) of the Bill be amended by striking out ", meters or any other method" and substituting "or meters".

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Maloway, could you start—oh—(i)(i)—Mr. Maloway.

Mr. Maloway: I move

THAT Clause 3(2)(i)(i) of the Bill be amended by striking out ", meters or any other method" and substituting "or meters".

Mr. Chairperson: It has been moved by Mr. Maloway

THAT Clause 3(2)(i)(i) of the Bill be amended by striking out—

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

Mr. Chairperson: The amendment is in order. The floor is open for questions.

Mr. Maloway: I want to point out that this amendment removes the reference to charges being determined by method other than the zone fare or meters.

Mr. Chairperson: Is the committee ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Chairperson: Shall the amendment pass?

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Mr. Chairperson: All those in favour of the amendment, please say aye.

Some Honourable Members: Aye.

Mr. Chairperson: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Chairperson: In my opinion, the Nays—Mr. Maloway.

Recorded Vote

Mr. Maloway: Mr. Chair, we'd like a recorded vote on this.

Mr. Chairperson: A recorded vote has been requested.

A COUNT-OUT VOTE was taken, the result being as follows: Yeas 4, Nays 6.

Mr. Chairperson: The amendment is accordingly defeated.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: Shall clause 3 pass?

Some Honourable Members: Pass.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Maloway: I have another amendment.

I move

THAT Clause 3(2)(j) of the Bill be amended by adding ", which must provide an aggregate automotive liability limit of at least \$5,000,000".

Mr. Chairperson: You've misread it. You have to—Mr. Maloway, you have to read it completely.

Mr. Maloway: I have a different wording here. Okay, I will reread this, then.

THAT Clause 3(2)(j) of the Bill be amended by adding ", which must provide an aggregate automobile liability policy limit of at least \$5,000,000" at the end.

Mr. Chairperson: It has been moved by Mr. Maloway

THAT Clause 3(2)(j) of the Bill be amended by adding ", which must provide an aggregate automotive—

Some Honourable Members: Dispense.

Mr. Chairperson: The amendment is in order. The floor is open for questions.

Mr. Maloway: This is a fairly obvious amendment. It requires the bylaws to include an obligation to carry \$5 million of motor vehicle liability insurance.

Mr. Chairperson: Is the committee ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Chairperson: Shall the amendment pass?

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Some Honourable Members: No.

* (22:20)

Voice Vote

Mr. Chairperson: All those in favour of the amendment, please say aye.

Some Honourable Members: Aye.

Mr. Chairperson: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Chairperson: In my opinion, the Nays have it.

The amendment is accordingly—Mr. Lindsey.

Recorded Vote

Mr. Lindsey: I'd like to request a recorded vote, please.

Mr. Chairperson: A recorded vote has been requested.

A COUNT-OUT VOTE was taken, the result being as follows: Yeas 4, Nays 6.

Mr. Chairperson: The amendment is accordingly defeated.

Mr. Chairperson: Clause 3—pass; clauses 4 through 7—pass—[interjection] Mr. Maloway, you had a question. [interjection]

Clauses 4 through 7—pass; clause 8—pass.

Shall clauses 9 and 10 pass?

Some Honourable Members: Pass.

An Honourable Member: No.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Maloway.

Mr. Maloway: Mr. Chair, we have another amendment here to clause 10.

Mr. Chairperson: Clause 9—pass.

Mr. Maloway: *THAT Clause 10(2)(b) of the Bill be amended*

(a) by adding "on the same terms and conditions set out in the licence on the day this Act comes into force" after "continues in force"; and

(b) by striking out "or its term expires".

Mr. Chairperson: It has been moved by Mr. Maloway

THAT Clause 10(2)(b)—

An Honourable Member: Oh, sorry. Dispense.

Mr. Chairperson: The amendment is in order. The floor is now open for questions.

Mr. Maloway: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and this particular amendment makes it clear that the existing Taxicab Board licences will continue on the same terms and conditions and removes the reference to the licence expiring.

Mr. Chairperson: Is the committee ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Teitsma: Mr. Chair, I just want to take a moment to reflect on some of the comments made earlier about the over 100 people who had not had a chance to give oral presentations.

It may surprise you to know that I'm not required to be here tonight. Nobody told me that I needed to be here tonight. I'm here because I want to hear, and I think the same actually applies to my neighbour immediately to my right. She's—as you notice, we're not raising our hands or participating as members of the committee, and I think, for myself, I can tell you that whatever written submissions are received in the next 24 hours, I personally will go over them and I'm sure that we can get that commitment from some of the other members of my caucus as well.

I think it's very important, some of the matters that were brought up a little bit maybe overly harshly, but the importance of public consultations I do not dispute. I think it's very vital and it's a treasured part of democracy in Manitoba. And so, as I said, I will commit to reading any written presentations that are submitted.

Thank you.

Mr. Saran: And I am also affected the same way, and I have not given the chance to raise my hand, although I rose—raise my hand, but I am not counted. And I think that's—in a way, there's a different issue, but in that—in that way, there's prejudice there which—I'm not allowed to vote for that.

But I have been here for the last—since it started and every minute I have been here, and similarly, those people have been here. But, I think, it's certain that this community has been singled out and is not given the same chance for compensation as the other industries had.

Therefore, I feel—

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Saran, the comments should be in regards to the clause that we're discussing, and in order to vote, there is a list. Like, you have to be on that list. And I'm just the Chair here, and I'm following the rules of what they are. I don't make the rules, so, unfortunately, if you're not on that list—Ms. Lamoureux is on the list because she is a member of the committee, but you are not on the committee. I mean, there's other members here that aren't on the list but are attending tonight, and you're allowed to speak, but when it comes to voting, only the members on the committee list are allowed to vote. So we will continue on with the line by line.

Mr. Saran: That's what I think. Already a member from the government side allowed to speak, and that was also a different issue, not the issue on the clause—same thing I'm doing. So I think, why I am being barred to do—say whatever I'm supposed to say, but the government side member is allowed to do it. So, I won't prolong this discussion, but I think government, all the members, you must have to think about that there should be fairness. It's not fairness anyway to me not be on the voting member. Similarly, the—many things are happening in the Chamber too.

So I just want to tell our community that's the way we have to fight further to get our rights. We are not getting our rights equal to the other members, so we have to fight as an individual and as a community MLA. And the way I have been treated as a community MLA, it was not an attack on me; it was an attack on everybody on the whole community. I think we have to fight against it.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your comment, Mr. Saran. My warning was to all the committee, the other members here, to make sure they kept their hands down, that they aren't—I was not singling you out alone; I was informing the whole committee that the committee members that are on the list are the ones that the Clerk will be counting. I'd like to thank you for your comments.

Is the committee ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Chairperson: Shall the amendment pass?

The amendment we're voting on right now is the one on clause 10. Shall the amendment pass?

Some Honourable Members: No.

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Voice Vote

Mr. Chairperson: All those in favour of the amendment, please say aye.

Some Honourable Members: Aye.

Mr. Chairperson: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Chairperson: In my opinion, the Nays have it.

Recorded Vote

Mr. Lindsey: Recorded vote, please.

Mr. Chairperson: A recorded vote has been requested.

A COUNT-OUT VOTE was taken, the result being as follows: Yeas 4, Nays 6.

Mr. Chairperson: The amendment is accordingly defeated.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: Clause 10—pass;

Shall clauses 11 through 13 pass?

Some Honourable Members: Pass.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Maloway: Have an amendment in clause 11, so *THAT Clause 11(2) of the Bill be amended by striking out, "or the term of the licence expires".*

Mr. Chairperson: It has been moved by Mr. Maloway

THAT—

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

Mr. Chairperson: The amendment is in order. The floor is open for questions.

* (22:30)

Mr. Maloway: This particular amendment removes the reference to licences expiring for licences in municipalities other than Winnipeg.

Mr. Chairperson: Is the committee ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Chairperson: The question before the committee is as follows: Shall the amendment pass?

Some Honourable Members: Pass.

An Honourable Member: No.

Voice Vote

Mr. Chairperson: All those in favour of the amendment, please say aye.

Some Honourable Members: Aye.

Mr. Chairperson: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Chairperson: In my opinion, the Nays have it.

Recorded Vote

Mr. Lindsey: A recorded vote, please.

Mr. Chairperson: A recorded vote has been requested.

A COUNT-OUT VOTE was taken, the result being as follows: Yeas 4, Nays 6

Mr. Chairperson: The amendment is accordingly defeated.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: Clauses 11 through 13—pass; clause 14—pass; clause 15—pass; clauses 16 and 17—pass; clauses 18 and 19—pass.

Shall clauses 20 and 21 pass?

Some Honourable Members: Pass.

An Honourable Member: No.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Maloway.

Mr. Maloway: I have an amendment.

Mr. Chairperson: Clause 20—pass.

Mr. Maloway: *THAT Clause 21 of the Bill be amended by striking out on—"or on February 28, 2018, whichever occurs first".*

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Maloway, could you please reread the amendment. You have to make sure you get it exactly as printed.

Mr. Maloway: Okay.

THAT Clause 21 of the Bill be amended by striking out "or on February 28, 2018, whichever occurs first".

Mr. Chairperson: The amendment is in order. *[interjection]*

It has been moved by Mr. Maloway

THAT—

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

Mr. Chairperson: The amendment is in order. The floor is open for questions.

Mr. Maloway: This amendment removes the mandatory in-force date.

Mr. Chairperson: Is the committee ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Chairperson: Shall the amendment pass?

Some Honourable Members: Pass.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Mr. Chairperson: All those in favour of the amendment, please say aye.

Some Honourable Members: Aye.

Mr. Chairperson: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Chairperson: In my opinion, the Nays have it.

Recorded Vote

Mr. Lindsey: A recorded vote, please.

Mr. Chairperson: A recorded vote has been requested.

A COUNT-OUT VOTE was taken, the result being as follows: Yeas 4, Nays 6.

Mr. Chairperson: The amendment is accordingly defeated.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: Clause 21—pass; enacting clause—pass; title—pass. Bill be reported.

The hour being 10:35, what is the will of the committee?

Some Honourable Members: Committee rise.

Mr. Chairperson: Committee rise.

COMMITTEE ROSE AT: 10:35 p.m.

The Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Debates and Proceedings
are also available on the Internet at the following address:

<http://www.gov.mb.ca/legislature/hansard/hansard.html>