



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

The 28th Legislature
Second Session

Standing Committee
on
Families and Communities

Bill 203, Fair Trading (Motor Vehicle Repair Pricing
Protection for Consumers) Amendment Act, 2016

Wednesday, November 16, 2016
10 a.m.

Transcript No. 29-2-13

**Legislative Assembly of Alberta
The 29th Legislature
Second Session**

Standing Committee on Families and Communities

Goehring, Nicole, Edmonton-Castle Downs (ND), Chair
Smith, Mark W., Drayton Valley-Devon (W), Deputy Chair

Dach, Lorne, Edmonton-McClung (ND)*
Drever, Deborah, Calgary-Bow (ND)
Drysdale, Wayne, Grande Prairie-Wapiti (PC)**
Fitzpatrick, Maria M., Lethbridge-East (ND)***
Gill, Prab, Calgary-Greenway (PC)****
Hinkley, Bruce, Wetaskiwin-Camrose (ND)
Horne, Trevor A.R., Spruce Grove-St. Albert (ND)
Jansen, Sandra, Calgary-North West (PC)
Kazim, Anam, Calgary-Glenmore (ND)*****
Luff, Robyn, Calgary-East (ND)
McKitrick, Annie, Sherwood Park (ND)
McPherson, Karen M., Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill (ND)
Orr, Ronald, Lacombe-Ponoka (W)
Pitt, Angela D., Airdrie (W)
Rodney, Dave, Calgary-Lougheed (PC)
Shepherd, David, Edmonton-Centre (ND)
Swann, Dr. David, Calgary-Mountain View (AL)
Yao, Tany, Fort McMurray-Wood Buffalo (W)

* substitution for Trevor Horne

** substitution for Dave Rodney

*** substitution for Robyn Luff

**** substitution for Sandra Jansen

***** substitution for Karen McPherson

Also in Attendance

Anderson, Wayne, Highwood (W)

Bill 203 Sponsor

Carson, Jonathon, Edmonton-Meadowlark (ND)

Support Staff

Robert H. Reynolds, QC	Clerk
Shannon Dean	Law Clerk and Director of House Services
Trafton Koenig	Parliamentary Counsel
Stephanie LeBlanc	Parliamentary Counsel
Philip Massolin	Manager of Research and Committee Services
Sarah Amato	Research Officer
Nancy Robert	Research Officer
Corinne Dacyshyn	Committee Clerk
Jody Rempel	Committee Clerk
Aaron Roth	Committee Clerk
Karen Sawchuk	Committee Clerk
Rhonda Sorensen	Manager of Corporate Communications and Broadcast Services
Jeanette Dotimas	Communications Consultant
Tracey Sales	Communications Consultant
Janet Schwegel	Managing Editor of <i>Alberta Hansard</i>

10 a.m. Wednesday, November 16, 2016

[Ms Goehring in the chair]

The Chair: Good morning. I'd like to call this meeting to order. Welcome to members and staff in attendance for this meeting of the Standing Committee on Families and Communities. My name is Nicole Goehring, and I'm the MLA for Edmonton-Castle Downs and chair of this committee.

I'd ask that members and those joining the committee at the table introduce themselves for the record, and I will then call on members joining the meeting via teleconference. I'll start to my right.

Mr. Smith: Mark Smith, vice-chair, Drayton Valley-Devon.

Mr. Orr: Ron Orr, Lacombe-Ponoka.

Mr. Drysdale: Wayne Drysdale, Grande Prairie-Wapiti, substituting for Dave Rodney today.

Ms McKittrick: Annie McKittrick, Sherwood Park.

Ms Fitzpatrick: Maria Fitzpatrick, MLA, Lethbridge-East. I'm hearing impaired, so if you would speak clearly when you speak into the mike, I'd appreciate it.

Thank you.

Mr. Shepherd: David Shepherd, MLA for Edmonton-Centre.

Mr. Dach: Lorne Dach, Edmonton-McClung, substituting for MLA Trevor Horne.

Mr. Hinkley: Good morning. Bruce Hinkley, Wetaskiwin-Camrose.

Ms Sales: Tracey Sales, communications services with the Legislative Assembly Office.

Mr. Koenig: I'm Trafton Koenig, Parliamentary Counsel office with the Legislative Assembly.

Ms Robert: Good morning. Nancy Robert, research officer.

Dr. Massolin: Good morning. Philip Massolin, manager of research and committee services.

Mrs. Sawchuk: Karen Sawchuk, committee clerk.

Drever: Deborah Drever, MLA for Calgary-Bow.

Ms Kazim: Anam Kazim, MLA for Calgary-Glenmore, substituting for Karen McPherson, the MLA for Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill.

Mr. Yao: Tany Yao, Fort McMurray-Wood Buffalo.

Dr. Swann: Good morning, everyone. David Swann, Calgary-Mountain View.

Mrs. Pitt: Angela Pitt, MLA, Airdrie.

Mr. W. Anderson: Wayne Anderson, MLA, Highwood.

Mr. Gill: Good morning. Prab Gill, MLA, Calgary-Greenway.

The Chair: Thank you.

For the record I'd like to note the following substitutions: Mr. Drysdale for Mr. Rodney, Mr. Gill for Ms Jansen, Ms Kazim for Member McPherson, Mr. Dach for Mr. Horne, and Ms Fitzpatrick for Ms Luff.

A few housekeeping items to address before we turn to the business at hand. The microphone consoles are operated by the *Hansard* staff, so there's no need for members to touch them. Please keep cellphones, iPhones, and BlackBerrys off the table as these may interfere with the audiofeed. Audio for committee proceedings is streamed live on the Internet and recorded by *Hansard*. Audio access and meeting transcripts are obtained via the Legislative Assembly website.

Up next is the approval of the agenda. Would a member move a motion to approve? Moved by Ms Fitzpatrick that the agenda for the November 16, 2016, meeting of the Standing Committee on Families and Communities be adopted as circulated. All in favour of the motion, say aye. On the phones? Any opposed? Thank you. The motion is carried.

Approval of the meeting minutes for September 19, 2016. We have the minutes from our last meeting. Are there any errors or omissions to note? Hearing none, would a member move adoption of the minutes, please? Moved by MLA Dach that the minutes of the September 19, 2016, meeting of the Standing Committee on Families and Communities be adopted as circulated. All in favour of the motion, please say aye. On the phones? Any opposed? Thank you. The motion is carried.

Review of Bill 203, Fair Trading (Motor Vehicle Repair Pricing Protection for Consumers) Amendment Act, 2016. Research services has a summary of written submissions from stakeholders and the public.

I understand that Ms Robert will be addressing the submission summary document. Go ahead, please.

Ms Robert: Thank you, Madam Chair. All right. I will give you a high-level summary of the summary of written submissions, that you would have been provided with last week through the internal committee website.

Just to start off, there were 185 submissions received. Now, just to be really, really clear, on a couple of occasions a member of the public would make two different submissions, maybe one through a web form that we set up and then a separate e-mail or letter, but the thoughts expressed were ostensibly the same, so in those sorts of cases those submissions would be treated as one. We try to catch those and tag them as one submission, but occasionally they slip through the cracks, so they might get tagged as two different submissions.

Also, I would note that six submissions were received after the October 28 deadline, but all submissions were received by November 1. The deadline was at the end of business on a Friday, and submissions trickled in over the weekend. Those submissions have been included in the summary, and of course it will be up to the committee as to whether it wishes to accept the submissions.

Of the 185 submissions 137 came from stakeholders, and specifically 129 came from repairers. When I say repairers, I mean owners, operators, or employees of auto repair and service facilities in Alberta. The remaining 48 were from members of the public. Now, if you look at the list of submissions on the internal committee website, you'll note that a submitter is either attached to an organization, or they're called a private citizen. That's just the way that they're organized on that list. Now, the way that they're summarized is slightly different in that there could be someone who does not say in his or her letter that they represent an organization, but they do say that they're a mechanic or that they're an auto service technician. Those people were categorized in the submission summary as stakeholders, as repairers. Just so you know.

Okay. To the actual document. The way that it is organized: apart from an overview at the beginning of the document of most of the

issues that were raised, it's separated by general opposition to or general support for the bill overall. There were a number of comments, particularly with respect to general opposition to the bill, that the consumer protection already exists, that there's been a lack of consultation, what the negative effects of the bill would be, that there's a need to educate consumers, that sort of thing, and then, as I said, general overall support for the bill from stakeholders and from members of the public.

Then section 3.0 is the big section, and that is issues broken down by particular clauses of the bill. They're regarding specific provisions like comments and recommendations with respect to the definitions or with respect to estimates, with respect to estimate fees, authorizations, et cetera, et cetera. That's how those are broken down.

Then section 4.0. This is a high-level summary of general comments that were made that have to do with the auto industry but not necessarily with the components proposed in Bill 203. For instance, some people suggest that winter tires should be mandatory, that annual inspections of cars should be mandatory, that sort of thing, so not really related to the bill but related to the auto service industry.

Lastly, in section 5.0, which is the list of the stakeholders and members of the public that made submissions, there's also a list of individuals who indicated in their submissions that they're willing or interested in making an oral presentation to the committee. You can find that on page 27 of the document.

Before I finish, the other thing I would just note is that two form letters were received by the committee. A copy of each of those form letters is attached to the appendix to this document. The first form letter was submitted by 34 stakeholders, and the second form letter was submitted by five stakeholders.

Other than that, I don't have a lot to tell you, so I'd be happy to answer any questions you might have. Thank you.

10:10

The Chair: Thank you.

Are there any questions respecting the submissions summary document?

Ms McKittrick: First of all, I really wanted to thank whoever worked on this document, just for its thoroughness and detail and how the comments gathered have been analyzed. I found that it's really, really helpful. I especially appreciate the work that has gone on also to summarize comments that may be out of scope but may be pertinent, so I wanted to really thank you for that.

Arising from that, I'm really interested around one of the key things that has been brought up in some of the remarks in the document, especially around the fact that AMVIC already provides sufficient consumer protection. I was interested in finding out: was this perspective brought forward primarily from the repairers' point of view, or was it more from private citizens' submissions that didn't have any tie to the automobile industry?

The Chair: Go ahead.

Ms Robert: Thank you. I would say that that issue, the issue that AMVIC already provides sufficient coverage and that the Fair Trading Act already provides sufficient coverage, predominantly came from stakeholders, from repairers, but as I recall, there were a couple of individuals, that I believe are members of the public because they didn't identify in any other way, that made the same indication.

Ms McKittrick: Okay. Thank you.

Then one of the other questions I have. On page 6 it was noted that many of the proposals, you know, that are included in the proposed Bill 203 are already consistent with current business practices, but also people noted that if Bill 203 became law, then there would be increased costs for both consumers, users of repairers, and the businesses. Can you explain to us why this was noted?

Ms Robert: Why that is?

Ms McKittrick: Yeah.

The Chair: Go ahead.

Ms Robert: Thank you. From what I could gather, the business practices that are already in place are things like, "We already give estimates," "We already find out if the consumer is okay with us going ahead with the repairs," "We already provide a warranty," that type of thing.

With respect to increased costs that are anticipated, I suspect, based on what I heard, there will be an increased administrative burden, increased red tape. You know, if you have to have the authorization in writing, that's going to slow things down. Well, sorry; that's not really a cost increase. For a cost increase the issues raised would be that if I can't charge a diagnostic fee – okay. The way the bill is written, as I understand it, is that a diagnostic fee is part of an estimate fee, but if the repairer goes ahead and does the work, the estimate fee cannot be charged, and ergo the diagnostic fee cannot be charged. So the concern from repairers was: if it takes me three hours to diagnose this thing and 10 minutes to fix it and I fix it and I can't charge for the three hours to diagnose it, I'm going to end up charging my customers in another way to recoup those costs because I'm not going to be doing it for free. That was one of the main examples of cost increases.

Ms McKittrick: Okay. Thank you. I appreciate your answer.

The Chair: Any other members with questions? Mr. Orr.

Mr. Orr: Yeah. I don't know if it's possible to do this just off the top, but I just sort of wondered if there was any kind of statistical analysis of those who would be in support of the bill or not in favour of the bill or if it's easy enough to sort of classify the submissions into those categories.

The Chair: Go ahead.

Ms Robert: Thank you. I didn't do a statistical analysis of it, but I can tell you, from having read all of the submissions and working with them, that the vast majority of stakeholders that were repairers were very opposed to the bill. Occasionally there was a repairer that was in support of it and was surprised that it hadn't been enacted already.

With respect to members of the public more of them were for the bill in general, like: I had a bad experience; therefore, yes, these protections are needed. That type of feedback was given. But some members of the public expressed opposition to it, that it wasn't needed, that all it was going to do was drive up costs, so there was no point to it. But I would say that more members of the public were supportive of it than weren't, and the vast majority of repairers were opposed to it, and then a few were not. Does that help?

Mr. Orr: Thanks. Yeah.

The Chair: Any members on the phone with questions?

As noted, there are six written submissions which were received after the closing date of Friday, October 28. All submissions were received by November 1. What are members' thoughts in this respect, and does the committee wish to accept these late submissions?

Mr. Shepherd: I would move that we accept those submissions. I think that's been the general practice of most of the committees I've been involved with in terms of these reviews.

The Chair: Thank you.
Any discussion?

Mr. Orr: Just for clarity, we should probably put in a second cut-off date; I mean, if somebody sends one in tomorrow, November 1?

The Chair: Yes. That would be part of the motion.

Moved by Mr. Shepherd that
the Standing Committee on Families and Communities accept written submissions on the review of Bill 203, Fair Trading (Motor Vehicle Repair Pricing Protection for Consumers) Amendment Act, 2016, received by November 1, 2016.

Any discussion on the motion? On the phones? All in favour of the motion, say aye. On the phones? Any opposed? Thank you. The motion is carried.

Stakeholder and public submissions: decision on posting to the external committee website. Our next item of business is a decision on posting stakeholder and public submissions received in relation to the committee's review of Bill 203 to the external committee website, providing public access to all submissions received. This has been the general practice of committees. Stakeholder letters as well as the advertisement for public input advised that submissions and the identity of the authors may be made public.

Are there any comments or questions respecting the posting of stakeholder and public submissions to the external site?

Mr. Dach: I'd simply like to move that we do so, and I can state the motion if you wish.

The Chair: I can read it.

Mr. Dach: All right.

The Chair: Moved by Mr. Dach that
the stakeholder and public submissions received by the Standing Committee on Families and Communities with respect to its review of Bill 203, Fair Trading (Motor Vehicle Repair Pricing Protection for Consumers) Amendment Act, 2016, be posted on the external committee website with the exception of personal contact information or third-party information.

Any discussion on the motion? On the phones?

Hearing none, all in favour of the motion, please say aye. On the phones? Any opposed? Thank you. The motion is carried.

Communications update. Members should have a copy of the communications measurement summary document, and I would ask that Ms Sales just speak to this item. Go ahead, please.

Ms Sales: Thank you. Yes, all members should have received a copy of the communications measurement summary. It's fairly comprehensive. I don't really have anything to add, but I can answer questions if the members have questions.

The Chair: Thank you.
Any questions? Mr. Orr.

Mr. Orr: Yeah. Thank you for the good work, and obviously we got lots of response. That was really positive. The only thing I didn't see in your report is the final cost. Did we stay within the \$22,000?

Ms Sales: Actually, I believe we came in under the \$22,000.

Mr. Orr: Do you know by how much, roughly?

10:20

Ms Sales: I think it was just under \$2,000. However, we may not have actually received all of the invoices.

Mr. Orr: Okay. But we're within the \$22,000?

Ms Sales: We were definitely within if not under.

Mr. Orr: Fantastic. Thanks. And good response, lots of interaction, so it's good.

Ms Sales: Thank you.

The Chair: Any other questions? Any members on the phone?
Hearing none, Mr. Shepherd.

Mr. Shepherd: Thank you, Chair. Thank you for the update notes there. I appreciate that. Taking a look through what we've got there, I noticed we received about 68 submissions, I think, from private citizens if that's correct. But as I was reading through, I think, as this was mentioned earlier, we did see some that were identified as private citizens, but then they also noted that they worked in a repair shop or they owned or they were sort of involved in the industry in some way. Certainly, that's all valid and useful feedback, but I just wanted to get a sense of the process by which we decide what's considered to be public feedback and what's considered to be stakeholder.

The Chair: Go ahead.

Ms Sales: Okay. For the purposes of the communications summary what we did was that we looked at items that we could measure. For instance, we looked at the online submissions. We looked at the identified private citizens' submissions, which were 68. We asked a question of the submitters as far as: have you worked or do you work in the automotive industry? As well, some of them within the submission, as Nancy had pointed out, indicated that they were involved in the industry in some way, but until you actually read the submission all the way through, you could not actually get that information. That is why my information differs slightly from Nancy's. Does that make sense?

Mr. Shepherd: Absolutely. That's helpful context. Thank you.
I just had one other question if I could, Chair.

The Chair: Go ahead.

Mr. Shepherd: Thank you. I was very happy to see the results we got, I believe over 185 written submissions, so that's wonderful. Great response. I was just wondering: could you give us a sense of what aspect of the communications plan appeared to be most successful? What seems to have had the best impact for, I guess, the dollars spent?

Ms Sales: Okay. I can speak to that. Actually, again going back to what we can measure, we did have a marketing question on the online submission form that asked people how they heard about the review. Keeping it in context, of course, we received 48 online submissions. We can't speak to how everyone who submitted heard

about the review. That being said, 6,700 stakeholders, I believe, were sent out notification through e-mail through the stakeholder letter, so we can assume that a large majority of them heard it through that.

That being said, as far as the online submissions 35 per cent of those who responded said that they heard about the review through social media. Facebook was actually our top performer in that instance.

Mr. Shepherd: Thank you.

Ms Sales: You're welcome.

The Chair: Any other questions regarding the communications? Go ahead, Mr. Yao.

Mr. Yao: Sorry. I didn't see how the questions were posed, so that would be my question. How was the question posed, and was the public made aware of the current practices and processes available?

The Chair: Go ahead.

Ms Sales: I'm sorry. I don't understand the question.

Mr. Yao: They were asked a question about this bill – do they think this consumer protection is valid to turn into a bill? – but were they made aware of the fact that there are routes to take regarding their automotive issues?

Ms Sales: Okay. Are you speaking to the online submission form?

Mr. Yao: Any of the requests for submissions. Are they provided with all the information?

Ms Sales: Generally speaking, at least for the online submission form, basically the submission form left it wide open for people to say whatever it was they would like to say. We also had a link to the bill on the website so the public could read the bill and they could decide for themselves.

Mr. Yao: But the bill doesn't refer to the current practices that are available.

Ms Sales: We also had a link to the Fair Trading Act as it currently stands.

The Chair: Thank you.
Mr. Orr.

Mr. Orr: Yeah. I'm just following up on Mr. Shepherd's question. He asked about the positive side. Were there any of the initiatives that you felt were unproductive?

Ms Sales: That's a good question. Actually, I think that that's a very hard question to answer. I would say that most of what we can measure would suggest that they were all very successful. When we decide on a communications plan, we try to have a comprehensive plan that includes online as well as traditional media, and based on the results in the summary, it's very clear that they all were quite successful. Let me just see here for you: 10 per cent of those who submitted through the online submission form referenced newspaper as the way that they found out about the ad. Yes, we had less of a response through newspaper than through social media, but 10 per cent is not something that you can ignore.

Mr. Orr: And you're probably hitting a separate audience, then, I would assume.

Ms Sales: I would suggest that that could be the case. Absolutely.

Mr. Orr: Okay. Good. Thanks.

The Chair: Any members on the phone with questions? Thank you.

We move on to section (d), decision on oral presentations. Members may recall that during our review of the Mental Health Amendment Act, 2007, the committee invited a number of stakeholders to attend and make an oral presentation following the completion of the written submission process. The committee received a substantial number of written submissions respecting Bill 203, so the question is: does the committee also wish to schedule oral presentations? I will open the floor to discussion. Is it the wish of the committee to invite specific parties to make an oral presentation? Any members? Mr. Orr.

Mr. Orr: Sure. I think, yes, we should hear from some. I mean, I'm open to discussion on it, but my thought initially was that maybe we should begin with that list of individuals who actually said that they're willing to make a presentation rather than asking people who maybe don't want to be willing. The only comment that I would have there is that AMVIC itself, which is the government-appointed agency to overlook this, didn't make a submission. I think we should for sure ask them if we're going to add anybody to that list. My instincts would be to go with the list of individuals who want to make a presentation and leave it at that.

Ms Robert: Sorry. I just noticed an omission on the list of individuals willing to make an oral presentation. The Motor Dealers' Association of Alberta has requested that if oral presentations are held, they would like to participate in that. I apologize for that omission.

The Chair: Thank you.

Any discussion on Mr. Orr's suggestion to reach out to all – how many are there? Twenty?

Mr. Orr: Maybe you're right. I didn't count.

The Chair: I would suggest that at this point perhaps we start a list.
Mr. Orr, you're suggesting AMVIC?

Mr. Orr: Well, yeah. I mean, they are the government-appointed agency. They didn't make a written submission. I think we should hear their point of view on it if anybody's.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Drysdale.

Mr. Drysdale: Yes. My colleague Mr. Rodney has provided me with a few names to add to the list if that's all right: the Canadian Independent Automotive Association, Alberta chapter, and the Recreation Vehicle Dealers Association of Alberta. Of course, he had AMVIC, but we've already got that. He also suggested Jon Carson, MLA for Edmonton-Meadowlark, to make an oral presentation as well.

The Chair: We've already received an oral presentation from Mr. Carson at the beginning of this process.

Mr. Drysdale: I think he was thinking that once we heard from everybody else, then if Jon comes in, they could ask him questions about what they heard from the public. That was his suggestion.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you.

10:30

Ms McKittrick: I really appreciate that list. I think it was already mentioned that many of them are out of town, and they may say the same thing. I have two names that I would like to kind of propose for the list. I was very pleased to see a submission from the Alberta Motor Association. I think they're an Alberta-wide group that deals a lot with both consumers and repairers as part of their mandate, so I would like to add them to the list. Then I was also pleased to see a submission from the Co-operators because they're an insurance company who, again, has wide experience in this business. I think that as an insurance company or co-operative they would have something to say to us.

So I would like to suggest that we add to the list the Alberta Motor Association given their Alberta range and the Co-operators given that they represent a different side of the business on the list.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Dach: One other invitee that I think should be named, if they're not already within the list of 20, I think, that Mr. Orr suggested, would be the Better Business Bureau. I'm wondering if Mr. Orr's 20 could be identified so we have a better idea as to who they are.

The Chair: We have them on the list, on page 27 of the summary document.

Mr. Dach: All right. I've got it now. Thank you.

The Chair: Any members on the phone wishing to contribute to the list?

Hearing none, Mr. Shepherd.

Mr. Shepherd: I just wanted to clarify one thing, Chair. I do note on the list here that we have a Mr. Wayne Paulsen from the Canadian Independent Automotive Association. I wanted to clarify, then, if Mr. Paulsen was just a member of that association making a submission or whether he was in fact representing the CIAA. Certainly, I think it would be valuable to have them as an organization as part of the list, but I just wanted to clarify since he's listed as an individual and not the organization itself.

The Chair: Thank you.

Go ahead, Ms Robert.

Ms Robert: Thank you. If I recall correctly, Mr. Paulsen is the executive director of the Alberta chapter of the CIAA.

Mr. Shepherd: Thank you.

The Chair: Okay. Can I have a member move a motion to create the list? Moved by Mr. Dach that

the Standing Committee on Families and Communities invite AMVIC, the Recreation Vehicle Dealers Association of Alberta, MLA Jon Carson, the Alberta Motor Association, the Co-operators, the Better Business Bureau, the Motor Dealers' Association of Alberta, and the 19 identified stakeholders on page 27, excluding any redundancies in the list.

Mr. Orr.

Mr. Orr: Thank you. Yeah, quite a few of them, actually, are on the list, which is kind of where I was in the first place.

Maybe we should be asking ourselves, too, as we craft this: how much time do we intend to give each invitee, and what's the total amount of time that we feel is reasonable to contribute to this? It might impact what we decide on as a final list. When I initially suggested that we begin with the list of 19, I mean, I would be open

to paring that down a little bit. I just thought we should sort of limit ourselves to the people that actually said that they wanted to make a submission rather than inviting a bunch of people that don't really care to. As I said before, I'm open to discussion on that. Maybe the questions of how many, how long, and how much time we are planning to give them would impact this.

The Chair: That's a good question. Based on the last round, that we did with the Mental Health Amendment Act, 2007, we provided a panel. Each panel was given five minutes, and the panel was divided into groups of like-minded stakeholders. Each group got five minutes and then questions. We would invite several people, let's say, that were affiliated with a repair shop. That panel, that group of people, would be given five minutes, and then members could ask questions back and forth with that.

Mr. Orr: Sure.

The Chair: Is that an effective summary? With five presenters it would be 25 minutes per panel.

Mr. Orr: Okay.

The Chair: And then followed by the questions. Does that change your request?

Mr. Orr: No, I don't think so as long as we allow ourselves adequate time and feel like we can work the people in in a reasonable amount of time. I mean, I don't know what the committee thinks, but it seems to me that the last time we spent three or four hours at it. I'd be prepared to commit three or four hours listening to what people have to say.

The Chair: Thank you.

Any other discussion before we attempt to read the motion? On the phones? Thank you.

Perhaps we'll take a five-minute break while we complete the list for the motion. We'll return in five minutes. Thank you.

[The committee adjourned from 10:38 a.m. to 10:43 a.m.]

The Chair: Thank you. We'll return to the motion, and I would ask that the clerk read it into the record, please.

Mrs. Sawchuk: Thank you, Madam Chair. The motion by Mr. Dach is that

the Standing Committee on Families and Communities invite the Recreation Vehicle Dealers Association of Alberta; Lethbridge Dodge Chrysler Jeep Ltd.; High Country Chevrolet Buick GMC Ltd.; Prairie Lube Ltd.; Fountain Tire Northland; Harold's Auto Service; South Trail Kia; NAPA Canada; OK Tire, Spruce Grove; the Canadian Independent Automotive Association, Alberta chapter; Signature Tire; Rimbey Parkland Automotive Repair Service Ltd.; Jiffy Lube; Better Business Bureau Serving Southern Alberta and East Kootenay; Canada's Building Trades Unions; Silverhill Acura; Okotoks Nissan; Okotoks Chevrolet Buick GMC; Country Hills Hyundai; Strathmore Ford; Sunridge Nissan; AMVIC; MLA Jon Carson; the Alberta Motor Association; Co-operators insurance to make an oral presentation at the next committee meeting respecting Bill 203, Fair Trading (Motor Vehicle Repair Pricing Protection for Consumers) Amendment Act, 2016.

Oh. Pardon me, Madam Chair. I passed right over this one, the Alberta Motor Dealers' Association, which was included in our original list.

The Chair: Thank you.

Any discussion on the motion? On the phones?

Hearing none, all in favour of the motion, please say aye. On the phones? Any opposed? Thank you. The motion is carried.

I would like to thank on behalf of the entire committee the stakeholders and public members who came this morning to observe this committee meeting. We appreciate that you took time out of your day to come and be present with us.

We'll move on in the agenda to other business. Are there any other issues for discussion before we conclude our meeting? On the phones? Thank you.

The date of the next meeting. Members will be polled to determine their availability once a date has been established.

I would now call for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Orr. Moved by Mr. Orr that the meeting be adjourned. All in favour of the motion, please say aye. On the phones? Any opposed? Thank you. The motion is carried.

Thank you, everyone.

[The committee adjourned at 10:46 a.m.]

