



**In this issue:**

1. [UCCB-related Amendments to Federal Child Support Guidelines](#)
2. [New QB Rule on Mandatory Attendance at Parent Information Program](#)
3. [Costs on Settled Claim: Q.B.](#)
4. [Unilateral Move = Contempt: Q.B.](#)

---

**1. UCCB-related Amendments to Federal Child Support Guidelines**

The UCCB-related amendments to the Federal Child Support Guidelines and the Regulatory Impact Analysis Statement were published in [Part II of the Canada Gazette](#) on April 4, 2007 at p. 328 (or page 18 of 67 in the PDF version.)

---

**2. New QB Rule on Mandatory Attendance at Parent Information Program**

The *Court of Queen's Bench Rules, amendment*, [Man Reg. 67/2007](#), (new Rule 70.24.1) requiring parties to actions for custody, access or private guardianship to attend Family Conciliation's parent information program was made by the Court of Queen's Bench Rules Committee and registered April 4, 2007. New Rule 70.24.1 comes into effect on May 15, 2007 and applies to petitions, applications and motions filed on or after that date in the Court of Queen's Bench and the Provincial Court.

---

**3. Costs on Settled Claim: Q.B.**

In [Bird v. Bird](#), 2007 MBQB 59 (CanLII), the parties came to a settlement agreement in a proceeding to vary child support. The Petitioner sought costs on the basis that he was put to significant expense in obtaining both the financial disclosure and the child support that he was entitled to receive. The court states that:

I am aware of the policy reasons for not routinely awarding costs on settled matters. However, when the responding party "settled" by agreeing to pay what she was already ordered to be pay, policy considerations weigh in favour of an award of costs. The respondent's support obligations were fully defined by the existing order. To fail to award costs would send the message that parties obligated *by order* to provide ongoing financial disclosure and to adjust their child support payments accordingly would have nothing to lose by ignoring the order and requiring the payee to commence another proceeding.

---

**4. Unilateral Move = Contempt: Q.B.**

[Morrison v. Charney](#), 2007 MBQB 47 (CanLII) deals with a contempt motion where the mother unilaterally moved the children within the Province of Manitoba. In this case, the court had made a joint custody order, but the terms of the order had not yet been settled. The court reviews the law of contempt (paras. 29-34) and states that:

Too great a reticence to deal with breaches like this will only serve to diminish respect between parents and for the Orders of the court. It will only breed contempt. When Orders are made in the interests of the children, they should be respected. If they are not in the children's interests when made, they should be appealed. If they were once in the children's interests but are no longer, they should be varied. They should not be ignored.

---

[Go to the eLaw Archive](#)

*The Law Society of Manitoba provides this service solely for the benefit of and to support the competence of its members. Members should exercise their professional judgment in using or adapting any content.*