

Court File No.:

**FEDERAL COURT**

BETWEEN:

L'ACTION DES NOUVELLES CONJOINTES DU QUEBEC,

Plaintiff

- and -

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN,

Defendant

**STATEMENT OF CLAIM**

TO THE DEFENDANT:

A LEGAL PROCEEDING HAS BEEN COMMENCED AGAINST YOU by the Plaintiff. The claim made against you involves the Divorce Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. 3 ("Act") and the Child Support Guidelines ("Guidelines") enacted by the Governor General in Council pursuant to section 26.1 of the Act, as set out in the following pages.

IF YOU WISH TO DEFEND THIS PROCEEDING, you or a solicitor acting for you are required to prepare a statement of defence in Form 171B prescribed by the Federal Court Rules, 1998, serve it on the plaintiff's solicitor or, where the plaintiff does not have a solicitor, serve it on the plaintiff, and file it, with proof of service, at a local office of this Court, WITHIN 30 DAYS after this statement of claim is served on you, if you are served within Canada.

If you are served in the United States of America, the period for serving and filing your statement of defence is forty days. If you are served outside of Canada and the United States of America, the period for serving and filing your statement of defence is sixty days.

Copies of the Federal Court Rules, 1998, information concerning the local offices of the Court, and other necessary information may be obtained on request to the Administrator of this Court at Montreal (telephone (514) 283-4820) or at any local office.

IF YOU FAIL TO DEFEND THIS PROCEEDING, judgment may be given against you in your absence and without further notice to you.

August \_\_\_\_\_, 2003

Issued by: \_\_\_\_\_  
(Registry Officer)

Address of local office: The Registrar  
Federal Court of Canada  
30 McGill Street  
Montreal, QC H2Y 3Z7

TO: Attorney General of Canada,  
The Honourable Martin Cauchon  
Justice Building  
284 Wellington Street  
Ottawa, ON K1A 0H8

AND TO: Department of Justice Canada  
André Lespérance  
Guy Favreau Complex  
200 René-Lévesque Blvd West  
East Tower, 9th Floor  
Montréal, QC H2Z 1X4

## **Claim**

### **I. Relief Requested**

1. The Plaintiff claims the following declarations and remedies under section. 24(1) of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms (“Charter”) and section 52 of the Constitution Act, 1982:
  - a. A declaration that all or any of the Guidelines and the Act are inconsistent with section 1(a) or 1(b) of the Canadian Bill of Rights, 1960, c. 44 (“Bill of Rights”) and are to the extent of such inconsistency of no force or effect;

- b. A declaration that all or any of the Guidelines and section 26.1 of the Act are inconsistent with section 7 of the Charter and are to the extent of such inconsistency of no force or effect;
- c. A declaration that all or any of the Guidelines and section 26.1 of the Act are inconsistent with sections 15 and 28 of the Charter and are to the extent of such inconsistency of no force or effect;
- d. A declaration that all or any of the Guidelines and section 26.1 of the Act are *ultra vires* the Parliament of Canada;
- e. A declaration that section 26.1 of the Act constitutes an improper delegation of legislative powers by Parliament and that, therefore, the Guidelines and section 26.1 of the Act are of no force or effect;
- f. A declaration that the Guidelines are *ultra vires* the Act and of no force or effect;
- g. A declaration that the Guidelines are void for vagueness and are of no force or effect;
- h. A declaration that the purpose and effect of any child support system under the Act must be to fairly calculate and share between divorced parents the real demonstrable costs of their children;
- i. A declaration that any child support system under the Act that has the purpose or effect of redistributing wealth between divorced spouses without reference to demonstrable child costs and expenses is unlawful or unconstitutional at law and, therefore, of no force and effect;
- j. A declaration that the common law right to enter into agreements regarding care for one's children is uninhibited by all or any of the Guidelines or section 26.1 of the Act;

- k. A declaration that the common law, the Bill of Rights, and the Charter, or any of them, require the Recipient Parent (as defined herein) to account on a regular basis to the Paying Parent (as defined herein) for all expenditures made from child support funds paid under the Act;
- l. A declaration that the common law, the Bill of Rights, and the Charter, or any of them, require Generally Accepted Accounting Principles to be employed throughout the child support payment calculation process under the Act;
- m. A declaration that the common law, the Bill of Rights, and the Charter, or any of them, require that all relevant factors, and not just the income of the Paying Parent (as defined herein), be included in the child support payment calculation process under the Act, including the true costs and expenses of raising the children, and other financial information about both parents, such as the costs and benefits of subsequent families;
- n. A declaration that the common law, the Bill of Rights, and the Charter, or any of them, require that the Paying Parent's (as defined herein) costs of supporting the children, as well as the amount of spousal support payments, be taken into account in the child support payment calculation process under the Act;
- o. A declaration that the common law, the Bill of Rights, and the Charter, or any of them, require joint spousal decision-making regarding all expenditures of child support funds awarded under the Act;
- p. A declaration that the common law, the Bill of Rights, and the Charter, or any of them, preclude a parent from bringing an action under the Act for child support on behalf of a legally competent child who is of the age of majority;

- q. A declaration that the Guidelines may not be applied to order divorced parents to bear the cost of child support to an extent that is greater than the cost of child support that could have been imposed upon them while they were married;
- r. Such further and other relief as may be just; and,
- s. Costs on a full indemnity basis.

## **II. The Party**

- 2. The Plaintiff, L'Action des Nouvelles Conjointes du Quebec, is a corporation registered under the laws of Quebec. The organization's objective is to rally and give assistance to couples formed by previously married spouses where in the formation of their new union they suffer iniquities within the judicial system.

### *Federal Role*

- 3. The Federal Government's Guidelines were integral in determining the child support payments currently paid by Paying Parents, as defined herein.

### *The Government*

- 4. The Attorney General of Canada is responsible for the conduct of litigation for and against Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada and, as Minister of Justice, has the superintendence of all matters connected with the administration of justice in Canada within the jurisdiction of the Government of Canada, including the provision of legal advice to the Government.

### **III. The Case**

5. The Plaintiff hereby challenges the constitutional validity of section 26.1 of the Act and the Guidelines. The Act and the Guidelines infringe the guarantee of equality in the Bill of Rights and Charter. The Act and the Guidelines are also beyond the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada under the Constitution Act, 1867. Furthermore, the Guidelines are arbitrary and not consistent with the Act or the common law of Canada.

### **IV. Introduction**

*Statistically, custody and child support awards favour the mother*

6. In the *Survey of Child Support Awards: Interim Analysis of Phase 2 Data* presented to, and published by, the Department of Justice (by the Canadian Research Institute for Law and the Family), Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada (2001), a total of 14,067 custody cases in Canada were analyzed and it was determined that custody was allocated on the following basis:

- a. the mother (sole custody): 80.4 %;
- b. the father (sole custody): 8.6 %;
- c. shared custody: 5.3 %;
- d. split custody: 5.0 %.

The father was the paying parent (“Paying Parent”) in 93.6% of cases with a valid child support award, while the mother was the Paying Parent in 5.7 % of cases. Information was not available or was inapplicable in 0.6% of cases with child support awards.

*Guidelines are unlawful*

7. Current child support laws and regulations are deliberately or negligently skewed to maximize child support payments. This is in contrast to a genuine calculation and sharing of the costs of raising children. The Guidelines have resulted in a massive transfer of wealth; a transfer unrelated to the purpose of child support. Child support payments have become a new tax - a tax on being a father and divorced. This claim lays out the legal and constitutional reasons why the current child support system is unlawful.

*Guidelines are unfair*

8. This case is primarily about divorced fathers who make child support payments to their former wives. The Plaintiff brings this action because the Guidelines are unfair. Although few divorced mothers pay child support under the Guidelines, the families of those who do may also suffer from this unfairness. It is not just that the amount of money paid under the Guidelines is unfair, there are other inequities inherent within the Guidelines, including an inequitable impact on family relationships.

*Parents must provide Essentials*

9. Married parents have a duty to care for their children, a duty that includes emotional as well as financial support. But this duty only extends to a requirement that the material needs of children be provided for. It is not necessary that the parents actually pay for the support, if that support is in fact provided through funds from other sources. The exact cost of this financial duty can vary based on individual circumstances, but the only legal obligation is to provide the essentials of life (i.e. the minimum acceptable amount of food, shelter, clothing, education and other basic needs, referred to herein as the "Essentials").

*Parents may choose to go beyond Essentials*

10. While society expects parents to provide more (referred to herein as “Discretionary Costs”), the law only requires the Essentials. This is as it should be, because if the law were to force parents to pay Discretionary Costs, the state would be dictating to parents how to raise their children.

*Guidelines blur “Essential” with “Discretionary” payments*

11. The Guidelines do not distinguish between a child’s Essentials and the Discretionary Costs above those needs. By prescribing an amount that is based solely on the Paying Parent’s income - and not on any formula related to the Essentials - the Guidelines do not identify the proportion of the Guidelines amount that is considered Discretionary Costs. This vagueness is particularly inappropriate, given that a parent who has been awarded custody and is receiving child support payments on behalf of a child (“Recipient Parent”) may apply for additional payments for Discretionary Costs over and above the unstated Discretionary Costs that are already implicit in the Guidelines amounts.

*What does it cost to raise a child?*

12. Although the Plaintiff argues that payments based on the cost of the Essentials are an appropriate foundation for the Guidelines amounts, there are different cost levels that could arguably form the basis of the Guidelines amounts, including:
  - a. “Average Costs” - the average cost of providing for a child’s Essentials as well as other Discretionary Costs incurred by an average family; and,
  - b. “Actual Cost” - the actual dollar amount spent by any particular family in providing for a child, including, if applicable, any Discretionary Costs incurred by the child’s parents over and above the Essentials.

Amounts determined under the Guidelines bear no relationship to the Essentials, to the Average Costs incurred by a typical family or to the Actual Costs of raising a specific child. Amounts determined under the Guidelines are almost always higher than the sum of the cost of Essentials and a reasonable amount for Discretionary Costs - and, too often, much higher.

*Guidelines economically punitive*

13. In many cases, Paying Parents and their families suffer harm as a result of orders issued under the Guidelines. To the extent that payments under the Guidelines are higher than the Paying Parent's proper share of the Essential Costs and Discretionary Costs, the payments economically punish the Paying Parents, and their new families. In some cases, the Paying Parent may have more than enough money to make the payments; however, this does not justify payments that are unreasonably high and discriminatory.

*Guidelines deprive Paying Parent of decision-making role*

14. Even where payments made by Paying Parents under the Guidelines are fair, Paying Parents still suffer unfairness under the Guidelines. Paying Parents have no input into how child support payments will be spent. There is no accountability to Paying Parents as to how the child support payments have been spent. Furthermore, only Paying Parents are subject to the onerous requirement to provide detailed financial information.

*Guidelines devalue role of Paying Parents*

15. Eliminating the Paying Parent's decision-making role can devalue that parent in the eyes of the children. The Guidelines unbundle the emotional and familial aspects of a purchase from the financial aspects. The Guidelines cause an involuntary transfer of familial authority from

the Paying Parent to the state (and through the state to the Recipient Parent). This deprives children of the right to have guidance and control from both parents, even if the children do not appreciate the value of that guidance and control at the time.

*Guidelines are hidden alimony*

16. The Guidelines lead to child support payments that are too often unreasonably high. Instead of providing for the Essentials for children of divorce, or even providing for the higher Average or Actual costs of raising a child, the Guidelines often represent extra alimony payments to former spouses. And because the vast majority of child support payments are made from divorced fathers to divorced mothers, the Guidelines discriminate against men.

*Unequal treatment*

17. The Guidelines do not treat divorced and married families equally before the law. Divorced parents, especially divorced fathers, are subject to greater child support costs than non-divorced fathers. These higher costs are not just the result of responsibility for two households. They are also the result of artificial and often inflated child support payments ordered under the Guidelines. This is discrimination based on family status. The state should have no more authority to interfere with financial decisions of divorced parents than it does with the financial decisions of married parents.

*Costs not shared fairly*

18. Another proper purpose of child support orders - to fairly allocate the cost of raising children - is not achieved by the Guidelines. The Guidelines usually require the Paying Parent to assume a disproportionate share of the costs. This makes the Guidelines illegal and unconstitutional.

*Problems with the Guidelines*

19. The Guidelines discriminate, and this discrimination is not justifiable in a free and democratic society. The Guidelines do not serve the goal of fairly allocating child care costs, and they cause undue hardship to divorced fathers, divorced mothers, their children and their new families. Among the problems with the Act and the Guidelines are those described in the following subparagraphs:

*Guidelines do not live up to their promise*

- a. Section 26.1(2) of the Act outlines the principle that: “spouses have a joint financial obligation to maintain the children of the marriage in accordance with their relative abilities to contribute to the performance of that obligation.” The current formula, which is usually based only on the Paying Parent’s income, violates this principle.

*Proper purpose not achieved*

- b. The Guidelines arbitrarily use parental income (generally, just the income of one parent) instead of Actual Costs to determine the amount that should be paid to support the children. Furthermore, the Act irrationally requires parents to disclose income and assets where the disclosure of such information would be irrelevant to the determination of the child support which should be paid under the Act;

*Canadian Guidelines more onerous than Quebec’s*

- c. Even though the purpose of the two sets of guidelines is purportedly the same, the Guidelines often provide for child support payments significantly in excess of those payable under Quebec’s guidelines, particularly at higher income levels.

*Guidelines contradict social science*

- d. The Guidelines ignore or contradict relevant research (including that developed by the Government of Canada), conclusions and evidence regarding the cost of raising children in Canada. The Guidelines further lack a bona fide economic foundation, as they provide for a fixed percentage of the Paying Parent's after-tax income to be paid as child support, even though the cost of raising children does not rise proportionally as income increases.

*Guidelines components unclear*

- e. The Guidelines provide a means through which Recipient Parents may seek reimbursement for extra expenses from Paying Parents, yet the Guidelines do not indicate how much of an allowance for such extra expenses is already included in child support payments determined under the formula set forth in the Guidelines.

*No accurate measurement of finances*

- f. Neither the Act nor the Guidelines properly assess the income, expenses, assets and liabilities of both parents for the purposes of determining the parents' relative ability to pay child support, and rarely is there any effort to assess the Essential, Average or Actual Costs of the children.
- g. The Guidelines give wide discretion to impute a larger income to a Paying Parent, but not to a Recipient Parent.
- h. There is no provision in the Guidelines for a Paying Parent to deduct spousal support payments in determining the income on which child support payments are based. To further compound this inequity, spousal support payments are generally not included in the calculation of the income of a Recipient Parent, in

the few instances where Recipient Parent's income is considered to be relevant under the Guidelines.

*Guidelines one-sided*

- i. Except in the case of high income (\$150,000.00-plus) Paying Parents, or where each parent has the children at least 40% of the time, the Guidelines generally ignore the Recipient Parent's income and do not take into account each parents' relative ability to pay.

*Transfer of wealth unrelated to children*

- j. The purpose of the Guidelines should be to share the true costs of raising children as mandated in the Act. However, the Guidelines do not have this effect. Instead, they have the effect of equalizing the income of the Paying Parent and the Recipient Parent after divorce.

*No accountability - Guidelines do not prohibit misdirection of children's money*

- k. Under the Guidelines, the Recipient Parent is not required to account for child support funds to the Paying Parent or to the child. Such funds may be used by a Recipient Parent for any purpose at all, even purposes unrelated to the children and even where the child support relates to adult children. Neither the Act nor the Guidelines allow the Paying Parent any input into the manner in which the child support is expended.
- l. Further, where the Guidelines require budgets setting forth the costs of the children, there is no requirement that the budgets be supported by evidence. In high income cases, where the court is required to use its discretion in determining the amount of the child support, the Act and the Guidelines do not require a proper

accounting, as would be required by common law trust principles when funds are expended out of a trust held for a child.

*Guidelines do not address Actual Costs or apportion those costs properly*

- m. The Guidelines do not include a maximum ceiling on child support. This ignores the reality that there is a limit on the amount of money that can be reasonably expended on raising children.
- n. The Guidelines do not require an accounting of third party support for a child. This allows duplicate collection of all or a portion of the Guidelines amounts.

*Guidelines ignore tax benefits available to Recipient Parent*

- o. The tax benefits of having children, which reduce the costs of the children to the Recipient Parent, are not accounted for in determining the Guideline amounts.

*Guidelines ignore Paying Parents' costs*

- p. The Guidelines do not take into account the costs Paying Parents who have their children less than 40% of the time incur to raise their children and the Guidelines do not require the Recipient Parents to share in those costs.

*Guidelines stereotype families*

- q. The Guidelines arbitrarily presume the non-custodial parent should be the Paying Parent, when the financial circumstances may indicate just the opposite.

*Guidelines ignore subsequent families*

- r. The Guidelines are biased against Paying Parents' subsequent families by arbitrarily requiring resources be directed to their first families. The Guidelines do not require the needs of both families be accounted for.

*Guidelines improperly apply to adult children*

- s. The Guidelines apply to adult children and permit a Recipient Parent to seek child support for children over the age of 18.

*One-sided burden of disclosure*

- t. The Guidelines require the Paying Parent to produce documents, as often as once a year, demonstrating income and assets. The costs associated with establishing financial status under the Guidelines are excessive and unreasonable. The same onerous costs are not required of the Recipient Parent, if the Paying Parent's annual income does not exceed \$150,000.00.

*Guidelines violate parental rights*

- u. The Guidelines infringe upon the privacy of divorced families and the ability of divorced parents to raise their children in a manner of their own choosing.

*Guidelines encourage discord*

- v. The Guidelines encourage custody battles, as parents strive to achieve or prevent the crossing of the 40% custody threshold.

**V. Bill of Rights**

*Guidelines violate Bill of Rights*

20. The Guidelines and section 26.1 of the Act, in purpose or effect, deny the right to the enjoyment of property and the right to equality before the law and the protection of the law contrary to sections 1(a) and (b) of the Bill of Rights. Sections 1(a) and (b) of the Bill of Rights read as follows:

1. It is hereby recognized and declared that in Canada there have existed and shall continue to exist without discrimination by reason of race, national origin, colour, religion or sex, the following human rights and fundamental freedoms, namely,

(a) the right of the individual to life, liberty, security of the person and enjoyment of property, and the right not to be deprived thereof except by due process of law;

(b) the right of the individual to equality before the law and the protection of the law.

The Guidelines violate due process, freedom of contract, and equality rights by imposing a rigid formula for calculating child support. They do not bear a rational relationship to any real child support cost levels nor to the fair allocation of those costs to parents. The Bill of Rights proscribes discrimination against men and discrimination against divorced parents.

**VI. Charter of Rights - Section 7**

*Guidelines violate liberty*

21. The Guidelines and section 26.1 of the Act, in purpose or effect, deny to fathers and mothers in Canada the right to privacy and liberty, contrary to section 7 of the Charter. Section 7 reads as follows:

7. Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of the person and the right not to be deprived thereof except in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice.

The Guidelines' process interferes with parental decision-making. It represents an impermissible violation of a parent's liberty interest in the parent-child relationship. Furthermore, the Guidelines do not allow the Paying Parent the right to participate in spending decisions. Instead, the Guidelines arbitrarily dictate the amount of support to be paid and permit the Recipient Parent full spending discretion.

*Due process violated*

22. The Guidelines also violate the due process elements of section 7 of the Charter. In particular, interim child support orders may be based on misstated or inaccurate financial information regarding the Paying and Recipient Parents, but those interim orders effectively create a precedent for a level of child support that is difficult to rebut in subsequent hearings.

*Void for vagueness*

23. Furthermore, the Act, and section 26.1(2) in particular, establishes a process which is vague and ambiguous, thus violating the principles of fundamental justice and due process of law.

## **VII. Charter of Rights - Sections 15 and 28**

### *Guidelines violate equality*

24. The Guidelines and section 26.1 of the Act, in purpose or effect, deny to fathers and men in Canada equal protection and equal benefit of the law contrary to sections 15 and 28 of the Charter. Sections 15 and 28 read as follows:

15(1) Every individual is equal before and under the law and has the right to the equal protection and equal benefit of the law without discrimination and, in particular, without discrimination based on race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age or mental or physical disability.

28. Notwithstanding anything in this Charter, the rights and freedoms referred to in it are guaranteed equally to male and female persons.

The Guidelines and the Act discriminate against men, because men are far more likely to pay child support than to receive it and Paying Parents are disadvantaged by the Guidelines and the Act. The Guidelines and the Act discriminate against divorced parents and their children by denying to parents the right to care for their children in the manner allowed to married parents under the common law. The Guidelines and the Act interfere with and allow state interference with parental decision making in divorced families in ways that would not be legally permissible in married families.

## **VIII. Charter of Rights - Section 1**

### *Guidelines unjustifiable*

25. The discriminatory impact of the Act and the Guidelines cannot be justified in a free and democratic society.

*Violation of rights not rational*

26. The flaws in the Act and Guidelines, as outlined in paragraphs 7 through 20 above, and the improper calculation and sharing of the costs of child support under the Act, are not rationally connected to the proper objective of fairly determining and apportioning the cost of children after a divorce, and in fact hamper the achievement of that objective.

*Violation of rights not minimal*

27. These flaws are not minimal or trivial, but seriously and significantly impact fathers and families, both economically and in their non-economic family relationships, especially the sacrosanct parent-child relationship.

*No benefit to balance harm of violation*

28. The deleterious effects of these flaws are not in any manner redeemed by balancing salutary effects. Administrative efficiency is no justification for a violation of the principles of fundamental justice.

**IX. Section 26.1 of the Act and the Guidelines are Ultra Vires Parliament**

*Ultra vires Parliament*

29. To the extent the Guidelines and section 26.1 of the Act authorize a child support order in an amount greater than the needs of the child, the Guidelines and section 26.1 of the Act extend beyond the subject matter of “Marriage and Divorce” in section 91(26) of the Constitution Act, 1867 and fall within the subject matter of “Property and Civil Rights in the Province” in section 92(13) of the Constitution Act, 1867.

**X. Constitution Act, 1867, Section 53**

*Illegal tax*

30. The Guidelines and section 26.1 of the Act are *ultra vires* the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada to the extent they authorize a Court to order child support payments unrelated to the needs of a child. Such an order amounts to an order to pay a tax determined by the Courts in a manner inconsistent with section 53 of the Constitution Act, 1867. Parliament may not sub-delegate its authority to impose a tax or impost under section 53 of the Constitution Act, 1867. Section 26.1 constitutes such a delegation of the power to impose a tax or impost.

**XI. Guidelines Ultra Vires the Act**

*Guidelines improper*

31. Section 26.1 of the Act authorizes the Governor in Council to establish guidelines within the conditions, limits and mandates of that section. The Guidelines do not reflect these conditions, limits, and mandates. Furthermore, the Guidelines, and in particular sections 3, 4 and 7 thereof, conflict with sections 15.1(1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(7)(8), 15.3(1)(2)(3), 16(1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)(8)(9)(10), 17(1)(4)(5)(6)(6.1)(6.2)(6.3)(6.4)(6.5)(7)(9) and 26.1 of the Act.

**XII. Common Law**

32. Section 26 of the Charter recognizes other rights and freedoms not enumerated in the Charter. Among those freedoms is the common law freedom of parents to make decisions and agreements with each other regarding the rearing of their children, including spending decisions and agreements regarding how much each will contribute to spending.
33. The Act and the Guidelines also interfere with common law property rights, and the freedom of parents to structure their own relationships

with their families, even after a divorce, without unnecessary or undue interference from government.

**XIII. Act is Impermissibly Vague**

34. Section 26.1 of the Act is impermissibly vague and, therefore, of no force or effect.

**XIV. Conclusion**

35. The Guidelines and section 26.1 of the Act should be declared of no force or effect or, in the alternative, should be read down to limit any infringement of:

- a. property and equality rights in section 1(a) and (b) of the Bill of Rights;
- b. life, liberty and privacy rights in section 7 of the Charter;
- c. equality rights in sections 15 and 28 of the Charter;
- d. provincial jurisdiction over property and civil rights in a province set forth in section 92(13) of the Constitution Act, 1867;
- e. the jurisdiction of the House of Commons to impose a tax or impost; and,
- f. the common law right to make arrangements regarding one's children.

36. Under section 52 of the Constitution Act, 1982, the Constitution is the supreme law of Canada and the provisions of the Act that are inconsistent with the Constitution are, to the extent of the inconsistency, of no force or effect.

**XV. Place of Trial**

37. The Plaintiff proposes that this action be tried at the City of Montréal in the Province of Quebec. The trial is expected to require fewer than 30 days.

DATED at Montréal, in the Province of Québec, on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of August, 2003.

---

Ruth Veilleux  
Barrister Solicitor

Marchand, Mignan, Melançon, Forget  
Société en Nom Collectif / General  
Partnership  
Advocats / Barristers Solicitors  
1 Place Ville-Marie  
Bureau / Suite 1900  
Montreal, QC H3B 2C3  
Telephone: (514) 393-1155  
Facsimile: (514) 861-0727

Acting on behalf of:

Gerald D. Chipeur  
Barrister Solicitor

Chipeur Advocates  
Barristers Solicitors  
2380 Ernst & Young Tower  
440 - 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue SW  
Calgary, AB T2P 5E9  
Telephone: (403) 537-6536  
Facsimile: (403) 537-6538

Court File No.:

2003.

---

**FEDERAL COURT**

---

BETWEEN:

L'ACTION DES NOUVELLES CONJOINTES DU  
QUEBEC,

Plaintiff

- and -

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN,

Defendant

---

**STATEMENT OF CLAIM**

---

Ruth Veilleux  
Barrister Solicitor  
Marchand, Magnan, Melançon, Forget  
SOCIÉTÉ EN NOM COLLECTIF / GENERAL PARTNERSHIP  
Advocats / Barristers & Solicitors  
1 Place Ville-Marie  
Bureau / Suite 1900  
Montréal, Québec H3B 2C3  
Téléphone: (514) 393-1155  
Télécopieur: (514) 861-0727

On behalf of:

Gerald D. Chipeur  
Barrister Solicitor

Chipeur Advocates  
2380 Ernst & Young Tower  
440 - 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue SW  
Calgary, AB T2P 5E9  
Telephone: (403) 537-6536  
Facsimile: (403) 537-6538

File No. 1066-001