

consent, no evidence before us.

This, this is a matter that is brought about to embarrass the family, which it has done, to simply make the family look ridiculous in front of the community, which it has done, and to simply annoy the clients.

All these clients are serious, these, these respondent -- applicant/respondents, as you would. Mr. Andre Bouchard, Claire Demery and Linda Staub have hired lawyers to get this dismissed, to have this removed, they don't want this blot on their record, as it were, and Ms. LeGare has nothing but, but delay, delay, delay. And unfortunately, our clients haven't had any contact with their father for over two years because he's been in BC.

Now, he does want to come back to Manitoba, according to his affidavit, but obviously he has doctors, he has a life set up out there, he's thinking of having surgery out there. So you get a protection order just because you think you want to come back sometime? I don't believe that the, the Act allows, I think I want to come back and, therefore, I want a protection order in Manitoba and I think I might be threatened if I get there and, therefore, I want a protection order and I think I might have my property damaged but there was no evidence of any of those things in the transcripts or anywhere in his application.

We would like these matters dismissed and, of course, costs.

THE COURT: Okay, Mr. Bouchard?

MR. L. BOUCHARD: Yes.

THE COURT: Well, do you --

MR. L. BOUCHARD: Hello.

THE COURT: -- do you have any response?

MS. LEGARE: May I speak on his behalf? Mr. Bouchard has -- my dad has a life estate and these parties have signed documents stating their father could go back in June --

THE COURT: That has nothing to do with this

the money. He told you in June he didn't have the money to pay the costs, so you were very explicit that you could award costs if, if he, you know, wished, wished to proceed.

As Mr. Land said, this was -- this entire amount -- procedure was meant to embarrass, to -- it was vexatious, it was unnecessary and it was to get even with her siblings for what she perceives is being left out of the proceedings. Ms. LeGare was never aware that her father had signed over the property many years earlier and she thought it was going to be hers. It's very simple. She's convinced her father it's going to be hers and that he's going to get it back. He wants his property back. It is not a matter of, of protection. It is not a matter of danger. It is simply that matter.

My client would love to see the public trustee involved, would love to see somebody taking over him, because the influence that she has on him is not normal, it's not right and it's not fair. But he is aware. He's there, he hears, he said he understood, and we have to assume he does. Mild cognitive difficulties do not make people unaware of how to reason necessarily, but the reasoning in this matter just is not very clear.

So I would argue that, that own lawyer costs are advisable.

THE COURT: So what specifically are you requesting, Ms. Dixon?

MS. DIXON: I would request my fees, my hourly fees. I would request my full disbursements. I have already given Ms. Staub a reduction in fees for the first part. I would be able to provide the court with an invoice for that and my second invoice for my subsequent fees.

THE COURT: But can you tell me the dollar amount approximately of what those costs are?

MS. DIXON: My previous invoice was -- just one moment. I have it here, My Lady. My previous invoice, My Lady, was for \$6,300 in fees, which I reduced to 3,500 plus