

From: [Glynn Jones](#)
To: [FamiliesCommunities Committee](#)
Cc: [Edmonton Castledowns](#); [Drayton ValleyDevon](#); [Calgary Bow](#); [Wetaskiwin Camrose](#); [Spruce Grove StAlbert](#); [Calgary NorthWest](#); [Calgary East](#); [Sherwood Park](#); [Calgary Mackay NoseHill](#); [Lacombe Ponoka](#); [Airdrie](#); [Calgary Lougheed](#); [Edmonton Centre](#); [Calgary MountainView](#); [FortMcMurray WoodBuffalo](#); [Livingstone Macleod](#)
Subject: response to Bill C203
Date: Thursday, October 27, 2016 5:12:37 PM
Attachments: [Bill C203.docx](#)

I have been in the Automotive Aftermarket for over thirty years. I started as a parts driver and worked my way through various positions in the industry, Parts Man, Purchaser, Customer Service Supervisor, etc. I am very concerned about Bill C203, I firmly believe, that this bill is flawed and needs to be re-done with industry input. I have attached some of these concerns to this email, for your consideration.

Thank you.

Glynn Jones
Area sales Manager
Continental ContiTech
P.O. Box 1
Longview, AB.



October 27, 2016

Standing Committee - Families and Communities
3rd Floor
9820 – 107 Street NW
Edmonton, AB
T5K 1E7

Re: Response to Bill 203 - Fair Trading (Motor Vehicle Repair Pricing Protection for Consumers) Amendment Act

Dear Committee Members,

I must commend, the Alberta Government, on their desire to protect the rights of consumers and I truly do respect, the person, or persons who drafted Bill 203, but Bill 203 is seriously flawed.

*In today's electronic age, there are many ways in which to give consent for repairs. This should be Included.

*What is unreasonable, when it comes to returning the vehicle to the original shop, or taking it to a A different shop? Who decides this? The upset customer? A shop should have the right to address Warranty issues.

*if it does go to a different shop, can the shop charge a higher door rate, than the original shop?

* Most Service Providers and Manufacturers offer or exceed a 90 day warranty. This is redundant.

*Section 57.11 Sub Sections 5/6. This makes little sense. A service provider, does not have to reimburse The consumer, if there is misuse to the vehicle, but then in section 6, the service provider cannot refuse reimbursement. Who decides, whether there has been abuse or not, how are discrepancies handled?

*It is un-reasonable to reimburse a Consumer, for an alleged warranty and not get the parts in question back for inspection. Manufacturers have the right to inspect all warranty parts and if found to be not defective, deny any claim.

With all due respect, this bill was put together, in ignorance of the Industry, with little thought or concern, as to how it might affect everyone involved. It needs to be taken apart and re-constructed, you need input from the Industry, you need to meet with Industry associations, such as A.I.A, C.I.A., involve Independent Service Providers and Industry consultants, like Kelly Bennet and Bob Greenwood. Build a piece of legislation, that benefits and protects everyone, not just the consumer, but the people in the Aftermarket as well.

Glynn Jones
Area sales Manager
Continental ContiTech
P.O. Box 1
Longview, AB.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]