

From: webmaster@assembly.ab.ca
To: [FamiliesCommunities Committee](#)
Subject: Fair Trading Amendment Act - RESPONSE October 14, 2016 3:38 PM
Date: Friday, October 14, 2016 3:38:41 PM

PART A: Submitter Contact Information

First Name: Lucas

Last Name: Chui

E-mail: [REDACTED]

Phone: [REDACTED]

City/Town: Calgary

Are you now or have you ever been employed by the automotive service or repair industry? Yes

PART B:

=====
 Feedback
 =====

October 14, 2016

Input on Bill 203

Dear Committee Members:

While I appreciate Bill 203 is trying to protect consumers from unfair motor vehicle repair pricing, I do not understand the premise of tabling the bill. Are consumers today being deceived when they have their vehicles repaired? If so, is there no government tribunal to protect the consumers? If not, why is the bill tabled?

I read the Bill. Good attempt but it is vague, and not at all helping me as consumer. I feel you are putting us consumers in more danger than protection. For example:

57.2 (1) says "first gives the consumer an estimate" but did not explain how the estimates could be given. On phone; Text; email, verbal, facebook, whatsapp, or whatever means of communications that have yet invented? Similarly, how does a consumer prove the offer of estimate is declined or accepted for 57.2(2)?

57.5(1) Why 10 per cent? 10 per cent of what? What if a repairer says I do not know the cost to repair? What should I do? Say no until I can lock someone down to a quote that bound them into the 10% rule? Who is paying for that towing bill?

57.9(1) Who is responsible for disposing the parts returned? I am as a consumer? Would I get charged more if I choose not to take the parts back? Why do I want the parts back?

I just listed a few vague points I feel is putting me at risk as a consumer.

Back to the tabling of the Bill. I fail to understand the reason. I don't know about you, but I choose a trustworthy shop for my vehicles. I do my research, I google, I walk away if I do not like what I hear, I ask questions if I do not understand, I feel I can trust the shop I have my car repaired. How is this Bill helping to strengthen that relationship or weakening it? The Bill implies I cannot trust my repair shop. The Bill shows I will have to pay more now because you propose the Repairer to do more (get people to administer quote; have my car left on without repairing until they are able to contact me for quote; disposing parts for me; etc.). I do not want to pay more.

Yes, I appreciate you trying to protect me from the bad apples. There's got to be a better way than tabling a Bill 203

that would cost me more money and time for repair. How about do not license to those Bad Apples?

I trust that the automotive repair shops will do their best to repair my vehicle. I trust they give me a fair price. I trust that if they don't, I won't go back. I trust they know the consequence of running bad business, i.e. bad reputation on google; lost of license; close out etc. Is there a reason why my "trusts" could not be relied on? I worry this Bill creates a cynical environment within the business where Automotive Repair shops are against Consumers. I don't need your help to put doubt in my repair shop every time I bring my vehicle in. It's similar that I don't need help in putting doubt in my doctor every time I ask him to diagnose me. I want my repair shop and my doctor to focus on my problems quickly and fairly, and get me going.

I frankly do not see this Bill is helping us out. I see the Bill is to create more attention towards administration rather than helping repair shop to repair my car. More administration means I need to pay more money for those administration. I just cannot agree.

As a consumer, I foresee this Bill creates Me Against the Repairer Relationship and destroy the current trusting relationship I have with the Repairer. I foresee my repairer is charging me more because of all the extra steps you need them to do. I foresee more stupid argument on vague procedures, such as how a simple written quote is communicated. I foresee my car not being repaired on time, or worse my car repair is refused because of your 10 per cent rule. I am however seeing that the committee members do not trust the current tribunal AMVIC.

My Conclusion is that I am against this Bill 203.

Sincerely,

Lucas Chui

PART C: HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THIS REVIEW?

- Newspaper
- Radio
- Kijiji
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Other: