MÉTIS NATION
BRITISH COLUMBIA

Special Métis Nation Governing Assembly

August 4, 2026

OUTCOMES

1. Rescission of Unauthorized Sanctions Imposed on the Vice-President (Interim President) of MNBC

DEFINITIONS

In this resolution:

1. "**the Sanctions**" means the restrictions and conditions imposed on the Vice-President by the Board's in-camera decision of April 8, 2026, released in part as the Record of Decision to Resolution 20260428-02 IC on April 28, 2026, and continued and extended by Resolution 20260629-03 IC on June 29, 2026.

2. "**the Vice-President**" means Vice-President Melanie Allard who, following the removal of the President, is required by Article 26 of the MNBC Constitution to fulfill the Office of the President until a by-election is held, and who is accordingly referred to at times as the Interim President.

3. "**Sanction**" means a coercive penalty, restriction, or condition limiting what a person may do in their office, which may be imposed only under an authority and through the process the Governing Documents provide; "censure" means a formal expression of disapproval only, which carries no penalty and imposes no restriction.

4. "**the Governing Documents**" means, collectively, the MNBC *Constitution*, the Board Policy Manual, the *MPCBC Bylaws*, the *MNGA Act*, and the *Senate Act*.

5. "**Applicable Law**" means the external legal framework within which MNBC and MPCBC operate, including the Societies *Act* (British Columbia) and the common law, including natural justice.

WHEREAS

1. The Board of Directors derives its authority from the MNBC Constitution, to which every Director swears an Oath of Allegiance prior to taking office (Article 69), and is bound, in exercising that authority, by the Governing Documents, including the *Board Policy Manual*, under which the Board governs as a collective and makes all decisions by motion at a duly convened meeting; and

2. The Métis Nation Governing Assembly is the governing legislative body of the Métis Nation British Columbia (*Constitution*, Articles 28 and 30), and, as the governing legislative body, may review the decisions of the Board of Directors and direct their correction where those decisions exceed the Board's authority or are contrary to the Governing Documents; and

3. On April 8, 2026, the Board imposed the Sanctions on the Vice-President, restricting her authority and duties; the particulars are set out in Appendix A; and

4. The Sanctions were not imposed under Policy B-3, which is the only process by which a Director may be sanctioned for conduct. The Board has stated on the record that it did not treat the matter as a Code of Conduct matter, and has not accounted for the procedural protections required by Policy B-3; and

5. The Board has identified no authority in the Governing Documents for the Sanctions: Policy B-3 is the only Board policy which confers power and process to discipline a director and was not cited in either the April 8 decision, or in Resolution 20260629-03 IC continuing the Sanctions "as a form of progressive discipline".

6. Policies B-2, B-6, B-7, C-1, and H-0, referenced in the June resolution, confer no power or process to discipline a Director the Sanctions are accordingly without authority; and

7. Under Article 26 of the MNBC *Constitution*, the Vice-President fulfills the Office of the President when there is no longer a President; the Sanctions therefore restrict the exercise of that office, and the governance of the Nation; and

8. In *Morin Dal Col v. Métis Nation* British Columbia, 2021 BCSC 964, the Supreme Court of British Columbia confirmed, that the Governing Documents of MNBC are binding, and that a decision of the Board is valid only where:

   - it complies with the Governing Documents;
   - observes the rules of natural justice; and,
   - and is made in good faith; therefore,

the Sanctions, imposed without the required authority and process, and without the impartiality natural justice requires, do not meet that standard.

9. For the reasons described above and set out in Appendix B of this Resolution:

   - the Board acted without authority and outside the required process, such that the Sanctions are of no force or effect; and,
   - the issue is whether the Board had authority to impose the Sanctions, which is a matter the MNGA may determine and not an appeal within the Senate's jurisdiction; and

- none of the authorities that create that jurisdiction for the Board have been invoked.

10. Further contradictions in the Board's own resolutions and recorded decisions concerning the status and sanctioning of the Vice-President are recorded in Appendix C, and reserved for consideration in the appropriate forum should they not be resolved through this process; and

11. The purpose of this resolution is not limited to rescinding the Sanctions. It is also to affirm that a sanction imposed on a Director without following the process required by Policy B-3 is unauthorized and of no force or effect. Accordingly, even if the Board rescinds the Sanctions before this resolution is considered, the resolution should proceed so the MNGA may affirm that principle.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT

A. The Métis Nation Governing Assembly declares that Vice-President Melanie Allard was sanctioned without proper Board authority and that those sanctions are null and void, effective immediately.

B. The Métis Nation Governing Assembly hereby directs the Board of Directors to rescind the Sanctions in their entirety, effective immediately upon adoption of this resolution, and to restore the Vice-President to the full and unconditional exercise of her office, including her responsibilities under Article 26 of the MNBC Constitution, without delay, review, or condition; and

C. The Sanctions, having been imposed without the authority and process required by the Governing Documents, are of no force or effect, and no further restriction, condition, or sanction shall be imposed upon the Vice-President except through the process required by Policy B-3 in full; and

D. Any governance review, or any other process purporting to review, validate, or continue the Sanctions, shall not be relied upon to maintain any restriction upon the Vice-President, and shall cease immediately upon adoption of this resolution; and

E. The Board of Directors shall confirm to the MNGA, in writing, that the Sanctions have been rescinded and that the Vice-President has been restored to the full exercise of her office, within seven (7) days of the adoption of this resolution; and

F. In the event the Board rescinds or has rescinded the Sanctions before this resolution is considered, this resolution shall nonetheless be adopted for the purpose of affirming that a sanction imposed outside Policy B-3 is without authority, and directing that no restriction, condition, or sanction be imposed upon any Director in future except through the process required by Policy B-3 in full.

FURTHER, THE ASSEMBLY RESERVES AS FOLLOWS:

F1. Should the Board of Directors fail to comply with this resolution, the matter may be brought again before the MNGA and pursued through any remedy available under Applicable Law, including the *Societies Act* (British Columbia); and

F2. Nothing in this resolution limits the right of any Citizen, Director, or Chartered Community to seek any remedy otherwise available to them, and the matters recorded in Appendix C are expressly reserved for determination in the appropriate forum should they not be resolved; and

F3. This resolution, together with its appendices, shall form part of the official record of the MNGA.

APPENDICES (attached to this resolution)

- Appendix A — Particulars of the Sanctions (Record of Decision, Resolution 20260428-02 IC).
- Appendix B — Jurisdiction and the Appropriate Forum: why the remedy lies with the MNGA and not the Senate.
- Appendix C — Record of Contradictions in the Status and Sanctioning of the Vice-President (reserved for consideration in the appropriate forum).

APPENDIX A — Particulars of the Sanctions Imposed on the Vice-President

As released by the Board of Directors in the Record of Decision to Resolution 20260428-02 IC

Submitted by: David Allard, President, Salmon Arm Métis Association

Source

The following are the operative terms of the Sanctions, as released by the Board of Directors on April 28, 2026 from its in-camera meeting of April 8, 2026, in the Record of Decision to Resolution 20260428-02 IC. They are reproduced here as released, for the reference of the Assembly.

Operative terms as released

1. The Vice-President shall not participate in, make or execute any decisions or actions on behalf of MNBC unilaterally, including but not limited to assuming any portfolios, positions, or engaging in external representations, without prior and explicit approval from the full Board of Directors. This includes:

   a. any interference in Senate matters without the explicit approval of the MNBC Board as a whole.

   b. any interference or participation in the subsidiaries of MNBC such as The Amelia Douglas Institute, Metis Prosperity Group, MNBC Committees or the Metis Financial Corporation of BC without the explicit approval of the MNBC Board as a whole.

2. All decisions requiring the action of the Vice-President shall be subject to a formal approval process by the Board and documented accordingly, including any travel approval which must now be authorized by the Executive.

3. The Board shall communicate this restriction to the CEO and MNBC Board and Executive immediately to ensure clarity and compliance.

The Record of Decision further stated: “This restriction shall remain in effect for 90 days pending further review by the Board of Directors.”

Subsequent continuation

By Resolution 20260629-03 IC of June 29, 2026, the Board continued the Sanctions, providing that they “remain in place until a governance review … be completed,” and describing them as having been imposed “as a form of progressive discipline.” The stated duration was thereby changed from a fixed period of 90 days to an open-ended one.

APPENDIX B — Jurisdiction and the Appropriate Forum

Why the remedy sought lies with the MNGA, and why the MNBC Senate is not the forum for it

Submitted by: David Allard, President, Salmon Arm Métis Association

The nature of the MNGA's claim

The claim advanced by this resolution is not that the Board decided a matter wrongly. It is that the Board had no authority to impose the Sanctions in the manner it did — outside the only process the Governing Documents provide for the restriction of a Director. On the claim advanced, a measure imposed without authority is of no force or effect from the outset. The question is therefore not whether a valid decision should be reviewed or appealed, but whether a decision that was never validly made can stand. That is a question of authority and process, anterior to any question of the merits, and it is not a question the Senate's appellate jurisdiction reaches.

1. The Senate's appellate jurisdiction over Board measures is real, but it was not engaged

The Constitution provides the Senate with appellate jurisdiction in respect of certain measures against a Director. Article 25 provides that a person suspended from the Board of Directors, by a vote of the majority of its members, may appeal that suspension to the Senate, whose decision is final and binding. Article 23.8 provides a similar appeal where a person is disqualified by criminal conviction. Policy B-3, s. 10 provides a right of appeal to the Senate where a suspension or disqualification is imposed through the Code of Conduct process. Nothing in this resolution questions those provisions; the Supreme Court of British Columbia confirmed in *Morin Dal Col* that a suspension made under Article 25 gives rise to a right of appeal to the Senate.

None of those provisions was engaged here. The Board did not suspend the Vice-President under Article 25, and cited no such authority; it did not proceed under Policy B-3, and has stated on the record that the matter was “not a code of conduct complaint.” The appeal rights the Governing Documents provide attach to a suspension or disqualification made under the authority that creates them; they do not attach to a measure that invokes no such authority, for there is then no decision of the kind the appeal provisions contemplate. This is the very distinction on which *Morin Dal Col* turned: the Senate's jurisdiction arose there because the Board had expressly suspended the President pursuant to Article 25.

Further, each of those appeals is a personal right of the affected Director — a route by which a suspended Director may challenge a suspension — and not a route by which the Assembly's question, whether the Board acted within its authority at all, can be determined. Beyond these appellate provisions, Article 8.0 of the Senate Act sets out the duties the Senate is constituted to carry out: mediation; citizenship and central registry appeals; election appeals; regional and community disputes; natural resources appeals; and ceremonial functions. The review of a Board measure imposed outside any authorizing provision is not among them.

2. Natural justice binds the Senate but does not enlarge its jurisdiction

Article 9.1 requires the Senate, in all appeals, to be bound by the rules of natural justice. This governs how the Senate must conduct a matter properly before it; it does not extend the categories of matter the Senate may hear. A matter outside its appellate jurisdiction does not come within the Senate's authority merely because natural justice was not observed in the decision being questioned.

3. There is no reviewable decision for the Senate to hear

As section 1 sets out, the Senate's appellate jurisdiction attaches to decisions made under the authorities that create it. An appeal presumes a decision validly made within a process, which a party asks the Senate to review. The MNGA's claim is different in kind: that the Sanctions were imposed without the authority and process required, and are for that reason of no effect. Where the very existence of a valid decision is what is in issue, there is nothing properly before the Senate to review. On the claim advanced, the Senate cannot acquire jurisdiction over the validity of a measure that was never a valid exercise of Board authority; as to the Senate, the point is moot. The determination of whether the Board acted within its authority, and the granting of any remedy that follows, lie with the MNGA and, in law, with the Supreme Court of British Columbia.

4. The Senate cannot grant the operative remedy

Nothing in the Senate Act or the Senate Policy Manual empowers the Senate to rescind a resolution of the Board, to restore an office-holder to the exercise of their office, or to direct the Board to reverse a decision. The Senate's own decisions are forwarded to MNBC for implementation (Senate Act s. 9.4). The Senate is not positioned above the Board in a manner that would allow it to quash the Board's resolutions; the remedy of rescission is not one the Senate is constituted to grant.

5. The remedies otherwise available in law lie with the Supreme Court of British Columbia

Where a member of a society seeks to set aside the conduct or decisions of its directors, the remedies provided by the *Societies Act* (British Columbia) are:

- the oppression remedy under section 102, for conduct that is oppressive or unfairly prejudicial to a member; and
- the remedying of irregularities under section 105, for defects, omissions, and irregularities that render a proceeding or resolution ineffective or place the society in default of its bylaws.

These are Part 8 remedies, reserved to the Supreme Court of British Columbia. The MNBC Senate has no jurisdiction over either of them.

6. The forum that can act now is the MNGA

The remedy the resolution seeks — the rescission of the Sanctions and the restoration of the Vice-President to the exercise of her office — lies within the authority of the Métis Nation Governing Assembly as the governing legislative body of the Nation (Constitution, Articles 28 and 30), exercising its authority to review the decisions of the Board and direct their correction where those decisions exceed the Board's authority or are contrary to the Governing Documents.

Summary

The MNGA's claim is that the Board acted without authority and outside the required process, such that the Sanctions are of no force or effect. That is a question of authority anterior to any appeal. The Senate's appellate jurisdiction under Articles 23.8 and 25 of the Constitution and Policy B-3, s. 10 is acknowledged, but none of those authorities was invoked, and no decision of the kind they contemplate exists to be appealed; the matter is moot as to the Senate. The Senate cannot quash a Board resolution or restore an office-holder, and the remedies otherwise available in law reside with the Supreme Court of British Columbia. The authority that can act on this matter directly is the MNGA.

APPENDIX C — Record of Contradictions in the Status and Sanctioning of the Vice-President

A reference record, for consideration at a later date under the proper authority

Submitted by: David Allard, President, Salmon Arm Métis Association

This appendix records, without argument and without attributing motive, a series of internal contradictions drawn from the Board of Directors' own approved minutes and resolutions, and from statements made by Board members at the Summer 2026 MNGA. It is provided as a point of reference for further review and is not itself the subject of the operative resolution.

1. The Board's own stated principle: restriction requires authority and process

In a formal resolution of December 15, 2025, released from in-camera by unanimous vote, the Board recorded the principle that the restriction of a member of the Board — including a member holding office — requires the authority and the process provided for that purpose, and that a restriction imposed without that authority and process is invalid. The Board expressly relied on that principle, and on the absence of the required authority and process, as its stated basis for setting aside an earlier restriction. The Sanctions imposed on the Vice-President on April 8, 2026 were imposed without the authority and process the Governing Documents provide, and do not satisfy the principle the Board stated for the record.

2. The Board's own standard of unanimity, not met

The Board's approved minutes of December 15, 2025 record: "Any sanctions imposed on the Vice-President by the Board should be unanimous at this point." The Sanctions of April 8, 2026 were imposed by a divided Board, not unanimously.

3. The same discussion recorded a need for caution and legal advice

The December 15, 2025 minutes further record that the decision "should not be rushed," that "a legal perspective … should be obtained," and that decisions of this kind "need to be done thoughtfully, and legal counsel should be consulted."

4. The authority cited confers no power to sanction

The April 8, 2026 decision cited Policy B-7 (Role and Authority of the President) as its substantive authority. Policy B-7 is a role-description of the President's office and contains no power to sanction, restrict, or discipline any office-holder. The only policy providing for the sanction of a Director — Policy B-3 — was not cited and not used.

5. The authority cited concerns a different office

Policy B-7 governs the role of the President. The Sanctions restrict the Vice-President, whose role is governed by a separate policy (Policy B-8). The stated authority does not correspond to the office restricted.

6. The matter was described as "sanctions" before it was described as "censure"

The December 15, 2025 minutes refer to "possible sanctions" in relation to the Vice-President. The characterization of the measures as "censure" was advanced later, at the Summer 2026 MNGA.

7. A restriction earlier declined, later imposed

On December 15, 2025 the Board defeated a motion to pause the Vice-President's email access (3 opposed, 2 abstained). Comparable restrictions were subsequently imposed as part of the April 8, 2026 Sanctions.

8. One office sanctioned, another enforced

The Sanctions imposed on April 8, 2026 restrict "the Vice-President." By June 29, 2026 (Resolution 20260629-03 IC), the Board refers to the same person as "Interim President Allard" and continues the same Sanctions against her.

9. The Board's own acknowledgement of Article 26 succession

On April 20, 2026 (Resolution 20260420-01), the Board appointed an Acting Vice-President. Backfilling the Vice-President's seat is consistent only with the Vice-President having moved into the Office of the President under Article 26 — the succession the continued Sanctions operate to frustrate.

10. A restriction that forbids a constitutional duty

Article 26 requires the Vice-President to fulfill the Office of the President when there is no President. Operative clause 1 of the April 8 Sanctions bars her from "assuming any portfolios, positions," and from participating in decisions without full-Board approval.

11. Sanctions acknowledged, then labelled censure

At the Summer 2026 MNGA the Board stated: "We imposed sanctions. The sanctions are not a code of conduct. It is a method of censure." Coercive restrictions were acknowledged, while described as censure, which by ordinary meaning carries no restriction.

12. An authority described as absent by the assembly itself

A Chartered Community President observed of the Sanctions: "discipline is not automatically associated with censure … that was kind of just decided and the sanctions were pulled from somewhere."

13. A censure concept sourced to a later resolution

The Board explained the censure concept as arising from a resolution tabled at the Summer 2026 MNGA in June 2026. The Sanctions were imposed on April 8, 2026. The stated basis post-dates the decision it is said to justify.

14. "Not a code of conduct" — confirmed by the Board

The Board stated at the assembly, more than once, "This is not a code of conduct complaint," confirming that Policy B-3 — the only process by which a Director may be sanctioned for conduct — was not used.

15. An apology provided, then declined

The stated trigger for the Sanctions was a failure to provide an apology. At the assembly the Vice-President stated she had provided a written apology; a Board member stated they had "begged" her to write one; and members observed the apology had been given but "not accepted."

16. Aggrieved members among the deciders

Board members described the Vice-President's December 15, 2025 letter as “borderline defamatory of myself and some of my colleagues who voted” and stated “I was defamed on that.” The same members participated in imposing the Sanctions.

17. A duration that shifted from finite to indefinite

The April 8 Sanctions were stated to “remain in effect for 90 days pending further review.” The June 29 resolution changed this to remain in place “until a governance review … be completed.”

18. Process ordered after the penalty

The June 29 resolution directs a governance review of the Interim President's correspondence and decisions to be conducted after the Sanctions were imposed and extended, reversing the sequence in which review precedes any sanction.

19. Further authority cited that contains no disciplinary power

The June 29 resolution describes the Sanctions as “a form of progressive discipline” while citing Policies B-2, B-6, B-7, C-1, and H-0 — none of which confers a power or process to discipline a Director apart from Policy B-3 — and omitting Policy B-3.

Status of this appendix

These contradictions are recorded for completeness of the record and are reserved for consideration at a later date, in the appropriate forum and under the proper authority. They are not advanced as findings and attribute no motive; they are matters requiring resolution. Quoted words are drawn from approved Board minutes and from the Summer 2026 MNGA proceedings; exact source references to be affixed prior to any formal filing.