

**From:** [Jason Bender](#)  
**To:** [FamiliesCommunities Committee](#)  
**Subject:** Bill 203  
**Date:** Tuesday, October 4, 2016 6:14:01 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)

---

Bill 203 does not protect consumers or repair facilities. All parts manufacturers already provide a minimum 1 year 20,000 km limited warranty with any part installed. The limited part is it must be installed at an authorized warranty repair facility. That means that if the part is purchased from one repair shop it can have the warranty work done at any licenced repair facility authorized by the manufacturer of the part within 1 year or 20,000km. If a consumer tries to go to a repair facility that is not authorized then who ultimately is responsible to pay? The manufacturer of the part or the installer. If it is a failed part then the manufacturer would pay for the new part and labor under warranty if done at a authorized repair facility. In the proposed bill it is the repair facility regardless if it is an install issue or part failure. We cannot legislate a manufacturer to pay a non authorized repair facility to pay for warranty so Bill 203 will put the burden unjustly on the repair facility. This is not logical and is a burden to repair facilities unnecessarily. It will also create a dispute because the warranty could have been done at no charge to the consumer. Almost all parts including used parts come with a warranty. Bill 203 only confuses the warranty provided versus clarifying,

The consumer should to return to the original repair facility for any future warranty work or another authorized repair facility. It is in the best interest of the consumers.

Bill 203 does not do anything to increase consumer protection. It will actually make it more difficult to claim for the warranty the consumer would already be entitled to.

Currently almost all work performed on a vehicle is done with a signed work order. If a technician notes warranty work or other work that requires the consumer to pay they must contact the consumer for authorization. Almost all of these transactions are done with email or text authorization. Electronic authorization in today's world should be sufficient. If a repair facility is required to have a signed estimate on file that could delay the response time to repair. If the consumer is informed of the cause, correction and price that should be sufficient to proceed with repair if consumer agrees. If not a consumer could have a vehicle removed from the shop waiting for the written estimate to be completed. In that time another vehicle will be placed ahead for the repairs. This will result in the original consumers vehicle not being completed in time further frustrating consumers. In addition there a cutoffs for ordering parts with all manufacturers. If the signed estimate is not returned in a timely basis it could again further delay repairs. That is not consumer protection but rather an extreme inconvenience to consumers.

Bill 203 seems to address an issue that affects less than 1% of all repairs and maintenance work orders we complete in the automotive industry on an annual basis. It is not in the best interest of consumers or automotive repair facilities.

Jason Bender  
**General Manager**

Phone (403) 241-1040

Fax (403) 241-4345

[www.royaloaknissan.ca](http://www.royaloaknissan.ca)

