

APPEAL COMMITTEE OF THE NORWAY HOUSE CREE NATION

CONSTITUTED PURSUANT TO THE *ELECTION PROCEDURES ACT*

IN THE MATTER OF: The Appeal by Season Roulette dated March 31, 2026 respecting the Norway House Cree Nation *Election Procedures Act*

AND

The Appeal by Larson Anderson dated April 9, 2026 respecting the Norway House Cree Nation *Election Procedures Act*

NOTICE OF DECISION AND REASONS OF APPEAL COMMITTEE

Panel of the Appeal Committee:

Keith Olson (Moderator)
Freda Albert
Ronald Robertson
Myra Saunders
Gayle Sinclair

Legal Counsel for This Panel of the Appeal Committee:

Ari Hanson & Avril Brown

Legal Counsel for the Appellant, Season Roulette:

Harold Cochrane & Alyssa Cloutier

Legal Counsel for the Appellant, Larson Anderson:

David Barbour

Legal Counsel for the Respondent, Stephanie Connors (Electoral Officer):

Devon Mazur & Aidan Geary

Hearing Date: April 14, 2026

Introduction

1. The within decision and reasons arise from two separate notices of appeal to the Norway House Cree Nation (“NHCN”) Elections Appeal Committee (the “Committee”) pursuant to the Norway House Cree Nation *Election Procedures Act* (the “EPA”): the appeal filed by Season Roulette (“Ms. Roulette”) on March 31, 2026, and the appeal filed by Larson Anderson (“Mr. Anderson”) on April 9, 2026.

2. Ms. Roulette's notice of appeal is brought under Article 7.1(b) of the *EPA* alleging that the Electoral Officer, Stephanie Connors ("Ms. Connors"), improperly rejected five ballots that were cast for Ms. Roulette. Ms. Roulette submits that these ballots ought to have been counted as part of the election for NHCN's Chief and Council that took place on March 10, 2026.

3. Mr. Anderson's notice of appeal is brought under Articles 7.1(a) and 7.1(b) of the *EPA* alleging that Ms. Connors improperly counted two ballots that were cast for Ms. Roulette. Mr. Anderson submits that these ballots ought to have been rejected. As a remedy, Mr. Anderson seeks a run-off election between him and Ms. Roulette pursuant to Article 5.14 of the *EPA*, which states:

5.14 If there is a tie between two (2) **candidates** for **Chief** [...], there shall be a run-off election between these two (2) **candidates** held in accordance with these procedures thirty (30) days or sooner after the date of the election that gave rise to the tie.

4. In the paragraphs that follow, the Committee provides its decision along with the background facts relevant to the appeals, a summary of the submissions made by the participants in connection with each appeal, and the reasons why the Committee came to its decision in both appeals.

Decision

5. For the reasons set out below, the Committee unanimously:

- (a) dismisses Ms. Roulette's appeal and finds that the five ballots were properly rejected by the Electoral Officer; and
- (b) dismisses Mr. Anderson's appeal and finds that the two ballots were properly counted by the Electoral Officer.

6. As the Committee has dismissed both appeals, and accordingly not found that any further ballots should be counted or rejected, there remains a tie between Ms. Roulette and Mr.

Anderson in the election for Chief. Therefore, it is the Committee's view that a run-off election for Chief between Ms. Roulette and Mr. Anderson needs to take place pursuant to Article 5.14 of the *EPA*.

Background Facts

Election

7. The background information respecting the election is as set out in the Committee's decision issued on April 2, 2026, respecting the previous appeal of Mr. Anderson heard on March 26, 2026 (the "First Anderson Appeal"), but is reproduced here for convenience.
8. According to Article 3.2 of the *EPA*, "[a]n election for Chief and Councillors shall be held every four (4) years, within thirty (30) days of the second Tuesday in March."
9. NHCN's last election was held in 2022. Therefore, an election was scheduled to take place four years later on March 10, 2026 (the "2026 Election").
10. Pursuant to Article 3.3 of the *EPA*, Chief and Council appointed Ms. Connors as the Electoral Officer for the 2026 Election.
11. Eligible voters were permitted to vote in the 2026 Election in three ways: in-person voting at NHCN's multiplex/auditorium building on March 10, 2026, online voting through a platform offered by a third party company called OneFeather on March 10, 2026, and mail-in voting. Although mail-in ballots could be sent to a post office box prior to the election date, these votes were not counted until March 10, 2026.
12. The in-person polling station was open on March 10, 2026, from 9:00 a.m. until 6:00 p.m. Throughout this period, voters were permitted to attend at the polling station to cast their vote for Chief and Council. Voters were directed to complete their ballots by marking an "x" or a "✓" (*i.e.*, a "checkmark") on their ballot immediately to the right of the name of the candidates of their

choice. Voters were required to choose only one candidate for Chief, and permitted to choose up to six candidates for Councillor.

13. On March 10, 2026, at 6:00 p.m., the polling station was closed and no further voting was permitted. Together with a team of assistants and scrutineers, Ms. Connors proceeded to count the ballots from late in the evening on March 10, 2026, until the morning of March 11, 2026. The counting of the ballots was livestreamed on NHCN's YouTube channel, although the video ended after approximately 12 hours while the counting was still underway.

Facts Pertaining to These Appeals

14. In the course of counting the ballots, Ms. Connors decided to reject a number of them on the basis that they did not conform to the instructions issued to all voters; among those rejected ballots are the five that Ms. Roulette submits ought to have been counted (the "Rejected Ballots"). Copies of the Rejected Ballots are attached at **Schedule A**, and each can be described as follows:

- (a) Ballot 1 – This ballot contains markings beside two different candidates for Chief:
 - (i) an X in the box for Ms. Roulette, and
 - (ii) a checkmark (✓) for Samantha Folster which is crossed out, with what appear to be a set of initials marked beside the latter box.

- (b) Ballot 2 – This ballot contains markings beside two different candidates for Chief:
 - (i) an X in the box for Ms. Roulette, and
 - (ii) an X in the box for Ronald G. Evans with horizontal lines over top of it.

- (c) Ballot 3 – There are no markings of any kind on the front of this ballot, but several candidate names written on the back of the ballot, including what appears to be Ms. Roulette's name under the heading "Chief".

- (d) Ballot 4 – This ballot contains markings for two different candidates for Chief: (i) a checkmark (✓) for Ms. Roulette, and (ii) a checkmark (✓) for Deon Clarke with diagonal lines over top of it.
- (e) Ballot 5 – On this ballot, the box beside Ms. Roulette’s name contains illegible scribbling. There is also a second, larger scribbled marking beside other listed candidates for Chief (but outside any of those candidates’ boxes).

15. The ballots that Ms. Connors decided to count included the two accepted ballots that Mr. Anderson now takes issue with in his appeal (the “Accepted Ballots”). Copies of the Accepted Ballots are attached at **Schedule B**, and each can be described as follows:

- (a) Ballot A – This ballot is marked using star-shaped symbols instead of an X or checkmark (✓). There is only one marking for Chief, and six markings for Councillor.
- (b) Ballot B – This ballot’s section respecting the Chief election appears to be marked with a squiggle-shaped mark instead of an X or checkmark (✓). There is only one marking for Chief on it.

16. The results of the 2026 Election were announced on March 11, 2026. Along with six Councillors, Ms. Roulette was declared to be NHCN’s newly-elected Chief.

17. Mr. Anderson filed the First Anderson Appeal to the Committee with respect to the 2026 Election on March 11, 2026, in which he raised two grounds of appeal:

- (a) first, that Ms. Connors improperly rejected a ballot that, if accepted, would have resulted in a tie for the Chief election between Mr. Anderson and Ms. Roulette; and

- (b) second, that several members of NHCN were not permitted to vote due to a purported closure of the polling station before its scheduled closing time, despite being in line to vote before the station closed, and that several other voters were unable to vote using the online platform.

18. The First Anderson Appeal was heard by the Committee on March 26, 2026.

19. Ms. Roulette's notice of appeal was received by Ms. Connors on March 31, 2026. The same day, Ms. Connors forwarded this notice of appeal to the Committee, as required pursuant to Article 7.2 of the *EPA*.

20. The Committee released its decision respecting the First Anderson Appeal on April 2, 2026. The majority of the Committee allowed Mr. Anderson's appeal on the issue of the rejected ballot and found that the ballot should be allowed. The Committee dismissed his appeal respecting voters allegedly turned away and/or having difficulty voting online, based on a lack of evidence presented to support these allegations.

21. As the majority of the Committee accepted Mr. Anderson's first ground of appeal regarding the rejected ballot, this created a tie between Ms. Roulette and Mr. Anderson in the election for Chief, which – absent any intervening events – would appear to the Committee to require a run-off election. However, as the Committee had already received Ms. Roulette's notice of appeal at the time it issued its decision in the First Anderson Appeal, and given that the outcome of Ms. Roulette's appeal could have an impact on the need for a run-off election, the Committee suggested in its decision that Council not proceed with the run-off election until the additional appeal had been heard and decided.

22. Mr. Anderson's second notice of appeal was received by Ms. Connors on April 9, 2026. The same day, Ms. Connors forwarded this notice of appeal to the Committee, as required pursuant to Article 7.2 of the *EPA*.

The Appeal

23. The Committee is a body created by statute (the *EPA*), and its jurisdiction is limited to the issues which Article 7.1 of the *EPA* specifically empowers the Committee to consider:

7.1 Within thirty (30) days after the posting of the written statement by the **Electoral Officer**, pursuant to Article 5.15, any **candidate** or **elector** who has reasonable grounds to believe:

- a) that there was a corrupt practice in connection with the election, or
- b) that these procedures were not complied with, or
- c) a person did not qualify to be a candidate or elector as defined herein, may appeal the election of a **candidate** or **candidates** by filing a written notice of appeal with the **Electoral Officer** setting out the grounds of the appeal.

24. Article 7.3 of the *EPA* requires the Committee to hear an appeal within thirty days after the filing of the notice of appeal.

25. Upon receiving Ms. Roulette's notice of appeal, the Committee proceeded to organize and schedule a hearing for Tuesday, April 14, 2026, and issued a Notice of Hearing dated April 2, 2026, setting out the procedure for the hearing.

26. Upon receiving Mr. Anderson's notice of appeal of April 9, 2026, given that the ground of appeal raised by Mr. Anderson therein is substantially similar to the ground of appeal raised by Ms. Roulette in her appeal, the Committee determined that the most efficient means of proceeding would be to hear the two appeals at the same time. The Committee proposed this to the participants in Ms. Roulette's appeal, invited any participants with concerns about this proposal to raise them, and received no objections. As such, the Committee scheduled both appeals to be heard on April 14, 2026, and provided the participants with a Notice of Hearing indicating same on April 10, 2026.

27. The hearing took place in a hybrid format with many in-person attendees at NHCN's Chief and Council Chambers, several more attendees in person at NHCN's band office in Winnipeg, and additional participants attending from other locations via videoconference.

28. The following persons attended the hearing:

- (a) Ms. Roulette, represented by counsel (Harold Cochrane and Alyssa Cloutier);
- (b) Mr. Anderson, represented by counsel (David Barbour);
- (c) Ms. Connors, represented by counsel (Devon Mazur and Aidan Geary);
- (d) several members of NHCN's current and former Council;
- (e) the five Committee members, represented by counsel (Ari Hanson and Avril Brown); and
- (f) counsel for NHCN (Neil Duboff), who attended on a watching brief and did not participate.

29. During the hearing, which lasted approximately two hours and 45 minutes, evidence and submissions were presented by Ms. Roulette, Mr. Anderson, and Ms. Connors, followed by one former Council member (Anthony Apetagon) and one current Council member (Tyler Duncan). The hearing concluded with reply submissions from Ms. Roulette and Mr. Anderson.

Reasons

30. After considering the evidence and submissions of the participants, the Committee has decided to dismiss both Ms. Roulette's appeal and Mr. Anderson's appeal. The Committee's reasons follow.

Ms. Roulette's Appeal

The Appellant's Position

31. Ms. Roulette submits that the Committee's Reasons for Decision respecting the First Anderson Appeal (the "Prior Reasons") are directly relevant to her appeal. Based on the Committee's findings in the First Anderson Appeal, particularly at paragraphs 45 and 46 of the Prior Reasons, Ms. Roulette submits that each of the Rejected Ballots ought to be accepted.

32. Ms. Roulette relies on *Oppermann v. Brown et al.* for the principle that statutes or laws conferring the right to vote "should be interpreted with an aim of enfranchising as many voters as possible."¹ As such, Ms. Roulette submits that the ballots cast in the 2026 Election (including the Rejected Ballots) should be examined in a broad and liberal manner so as to make every effort to enfranchise the voter, where possible.

33. Ms. Roulette further submits that a ballot should not be rejected simply due to the presence of an unusual marking, including where the unusual marking was used to indicate the voter's candidate of choice. Ms. Roulette relies on *Oppermann* to support her position that if, when viewing a ballot objectively, "there is a probable reason or rational explanation for the mark or writing", this can be taken into consideration when determining whether the ballot ought to be accepted or rejected.² The voter's intention in making the mark is also relevant to this analysis.

¹ 2010 MBQB 280 ("*Oppermann*") at para 16.

² *Oppermann* at para 17.

34. Ms. Roulette submits that, on an examination of Ballots 1, 2, 4, and 5, a rational explanation exists for the markings the Electoral Officer viewed as invalidating the ballots. From an objective review of Ballots 1, 2, and 4, Ms. Roulette submits that the voters mismarked their ballots at first instance and then attempted to correct the error by crossing out the first marking and making a clear marking next to Ms. Roulette's name to cast their vote. Further, for these three ballots, the voters attempted to adhere to the *EPA's* procedures by marking their ballots with either an X or checkmark (✓). Based on the Committee's finding in the First Anderson Appeal that an unusual marking should not invalidate a ballot where the voter's intention is clear, along with the Committee's finding that the *EPA* needs to be interpreted in a purposive manner, Ms. Roulette submits that these three ballots should be counted.

35. With respect to Ballot 5, Ms. Roulette submits that the fact that the voter used a squiggle-type marking instead of an X or a checkmark (✓) should not invalidate the ballot where the voter's intention can be clearly determined. In support of this contention, Ms. Roulette references *Bartlett v. McIntosh*,³ where the Manitoba Court of Appeal accepted a ballot marked with a squiggle-type mark on the grounds that the voter's intention could still clearly be determined.

36. With respect to Ballot 3, Ms. Roulette submits that the voter's intention can be clearly determined through an objective examination of the ballot. While the voter did not indicate their choice of candidates in the boxes on the form, they legibly wrote out the names of the candidates for whom they intended to vote elsewhere on the form and made no extraneous or identifying markings on the ballot. As many NHCN community members have limited ability to read and write in English, Ms. Roulette submits that this voter may not have understood the voting instructions clearly and therefore wrote out the names of the candidates for whom he or she wished to vote.

³ 1999 MBCA 475.

37. In general, Ms. Roulette submits that none of the unusual markings on the Rejected Ballots can be considered potentially identifying markings warranting rejection of the ballots. In her reply, Ms. Roulette noted in particular that it could not be determined with certainty whose initials were marked on Ballot 1, given that the voter list contains 52 to 72 people with the initials marked on that ballot (depending on whether the initials are read as “LM” or “SM”, respectively). In light of the Committee’s finding at paragraph 47 of the Prior Reasons with respect to “generic” markings that do not reach the threshold of being potentially identifying, Ms. Roulette submits that none of the markings on the Rejected Ballots can be said to be potentially identifying in this case.

The Respondents’ Positions

38. Mr. Anderson and Ms. Connors each submit that the Rejected Ballots were properly rejected, as the markings contained on the Rejected Ballots were not in compliance with the requirements set out in the *EPA* or the instructions to voters. Further, they submit that Ballots 1, 3, and 5 contain markings that have the potential to identify the voter.

39. With respect to their positions on statutory compliance, Mr. Anderson and Ms. Connors refer specifically to the following provisions of the *EPA*:

5.10 Each ballot must be marked with an “x” being placed beside the name of the **candidate** or **candidates** for whom the **elector** intends to vote and such instruction shall be clearly posted at the place of voting by the **Electoral Officer**.

...

5.12 The **Candidate** shall have the right to be present when the **Electoral Officer** opens the ballot box. If the **candidate** so chooses, one (1) **scrutineer** on behalf of the **candidate**, (in place of the **candidate**), may be present when the **Electoral Officer** opens the ballot box. The **candidate** shall appoint such scrutineer by filing a notice in writing with the **Electoral Officer**. Immediately following the close of the poll, the **Electoral Officer** shall open the ballot box and:

a) Examine the ballots and reject any that are not:

i) initialed by the **Electoral Officer** or his/her assistant, or

ii) properly marked in accordance with these procedures,

...

SCHEDULE “C”

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETION OF BALLOT PAPERS

1. Upon receiving your ballot paper, fill out same accordingly marking with either an “X” or “√” one choice for Chief and a maximum of six choices for Councillor.

40. Mr. Anderson and Ms. Connors also rely on the “Instructions for Voting” document that was posted at the polling station, a copy of which is attached as **Schedule C**. These instructions directed voters to mark their ballots with either an X or a checkmark (√), and to obtain a new ballot from the Electoral Officer if they made a mistake on their ballot. The instructions specifically indicated that any ballots that were scribbled out would not count.

41. Mr. Anderson noted that, in the First Anderson Appeal, Ms. Roulette submitted that these instructions provided clear and explicit direction to voters that an X or a checkmark (√) were the only markings to be placed on the ballot. Ms. Roulette also submitted that markings which may identify the voter, including through subtle means such as drawings, ought to cause the ballot to be rejected.

42. In support of her position, Ms. Connors relies on the same paragraphs of *Opitz v. Wrzesnewskyj*,⁴ *Oppermann*, and *Anderson v. Tait-Reaume*,⁵ as she did in the First Anderson Appeal. The relevant sections from those cases are discussed at paragraphs 32 to 41 of the Prior Reasons, and have not been reproduced here.

43. With respect to the ballots that Ms. Roulette alleges contain identifiable markings, Ms. Connors refers to *Judicial Recount arising out of the 45th General Election in the Electoral District*

⁴ 2012 SCC 55 (“*Opitz*”)

⁵ 2022 FC 1382 (“*Anderson*”)

of *Windsor-Tecumseh-Lakeshore (Re)*,⁶ a recent decision of the Ontario Superior Court of Justice. In that decision, the Court rejected ballots on which the voters wrote their initials, on the basis that the initials could reasonably identify the voter.⁷ In addition, Ms. Connors refers to:

- (a) *Bartlett v. McIntosh*, where the Manitoba Court of Appeal similarly rejected ballots that had names or partial names written on them;⁸ and
- (b) *Rodriguez v. Canada*, where the Federal Court recognized that voters may choose to reject a ballot, or to express their rejection of all candidates on a ballot, by marking a ballot or leaving it blank.⁹

44. Mr. Anderson submits that the use of multiple markings on Ballots 1, 2, and 4 are clear, irremediable errors, that provided ample cause for the Electoral Officer to reject them. For example, the presence of two markings in the Chief candidate list on Ballot 1 did not allow Ms. Connors to properly discern that voter's intention. Further, Mr. Anderson submits that the initials placed beside the Chief candidate list on Ballot 1 provides a means by which to identify the voter, through a comparison of those initials with the voter list.

45. Ms. Connors similarly submits that Ballot 1 was properly rejected as the written letters "SM" to the right of the Chief candidate list could potentially identify the voter. In addition, Ms. Connors asserts that the two markings for Chief candidates, with one struck through, render the voter's intention unclear, and are contrary to the *EPA* and the Instructions for Voting.

46. Ms. Connors acknowledges that some of the authorities have previously accepted ballots that include an "obliterated" mark for a candidate, in circumstances where the reviewing body found that the voter's intentions were nevertheless clear. For example, the Court did so in

⁶ 2026 ONSC 338 ("*Windsor-Tecumseh-Lakeshore*").

⁷ *Windsor-Tecumseh-Lakeshore*, at para. 34.

⁸ 1999 CanLII 4773 (MB CA) ("*Bartlett*"), at para. 34.

⁹ 2018 FC 1125 ("*Rodriguez*"), at para. 38.

Hewlett.¹⁰ However, she submits that these authorities are distinguishable from the particular facts of the 2026 Election, where voters were provided with clear and specific instructions indicating that ballots so marked would not be counted.

47. Ms. Connors further submits that, as the voter marked Ballot 1 in a manner expressly prohibited by the Instructions for Voting, it was not open to the Electoral Officer to apply a different standard after the fact. In light of the clear notice to voters that ballots containing markings scribbled out would be rejected, Ms. Connors submits that this marking was reasonably interpreted as an intentional choice by the voter to mark the ballot in a way that would cause their vote not to be counted.

48. With respect to Ballots 2 and 4, Mr. Anderson and Ms. Connors contend that the two markings in the Chief candidate list on each ballot rendered each voter's intention unclear, and are contrary to both the *EPA* and the Instructions for Voting.

49. With respect to Ballot 3, Mr. Anderson submits that, as the ballot only contains writing on its reverse side, it was not completed in the manner prescribed by the Electoral Officer. In addition, Mr. Anderson argues that the handwriting is merely a list, is not clear, and is ambiguous as to which candidate(s) the voter was referring. As such, according to Mr. Anderson, this ballot does not demonstrate that the voter intended to vote for anyone.

50. Ms. Connors submits that the lack of markings on the face of Ballot 3 goes beyond technical non-compliance or the use of an unorthodox marking, and instead amounts to not submitting a vote, as there is nothing at all on the face of the ballot allowing the Electoral Officer to discern the voter's intent. The Electoral Officer had no way of knowing whether the voter was intentionally rejecting their ballot, or was unable to make up their mind about a candidate. Further, Ms. Connors submits that the list of handwritten names on the reverse side of the ballot are

¹⁰ *Hewlett*, Re, 1996 CanLII 11659 (NL SC) ("*Hewlett*"), at para. 15.

unique, distinctive phrases that create a clear and realistic possibility that the voter who cast that ballot may be identified.

51. With respect to Ballot 5, Mr. Anderson notes that the ballot is not marked with any X or checkmark (✓) as prescribed by the Electoral Officer. Mr. Anderson submits that this ballot is marked with clear and distinct markings, such that anyone could clearly identify it as their ballot. Mr. Anderson suggests that the markings on this ballot contain visible initials, including the letter “W”. In his view, the voter intentionally left these initials visible and not scribbled over. Further, Mr. Anderson submits that the distinct mark beside the candidates for Chief section is an identifiable marking that permits the voter to identify their ballot.

52. Ms. Connors similarly submits that Ballot 5 was properly rejected as the marking on the right-hand side (which she believes is an apparent signature) could identify the voter, which rendering the voter’s intention unclear and is contrary to the *EPA*. Ms. Connors submits that this was not a minor or inadvertent mark or symbol, but a distinctive statement that could realistically be subsequently linked to the voter who made it.

Reasons of Committee

53. The Committee unanimously finds that Ms. Roulette’s appeal should be dismissed.

54. Consistent with its findings in the First Anderson Appeal, the Committee adopts the finding of the Federal Court in *Burnstick* that First Nations’ election legislation must be interpreted purposively, in a manner consistent with the object of allowing eligible voters to exercise their right to vote.¹¹ To achieve that goal, technical compliance with the *EPA* will not always be required so long as the intention of the voter is clearly discernible from their markings on the ballot.

¹¹ Prior Reasons, para. 46, citing *Alexander First Nation v. Burnstick*, 2021 FC 618 (“*Burnstick*”).

55. Although the Committee maintains its view that enfranchising voters by respecting voter intention (and counting non-compliant ballots where the voter's intention can be clearly discerned) is paramount, it finds that none of the markings on the Rejected Ballots demonstrate a sufficiently clear intention on the part of the voters in question to warrant disturbing the Electoral Officer's decision to reject these ballots. In the case of Ballots 1, 2, 4 and 5, the Committee finds that all of them contain multiple markings in the section of the ballot listing candidates for Chief, such that the Committee cannot clearly discern the intention of these voters.

56. With respect to Ballot 3, the Committee finds that the list of names handwritten on the reverse side of the ballot is ambiguous, in that handwritten names on the reverse side of the ballot suggests that the voter was able to read and write in the English language proficiently. It follows that the voter was likely also aware of the requirement in the *EPA* and the Instructions for Voting to mark the front side of the ballot with an X or a checkmark (✓). To that end, the Committee is unable to discern the voter's intent with sufficient clarity to warrant overturning the Electoral Officer's decision to reject this ballot.

57. In light of the Committee's finding that the intention of the voters who submitted the Rejected Ballots is not sufficiently clear to warrant disturbing the Electoral Officer's decision to reject them, it is not necessary for the Committee to make specific findings respecting the Respondents' position that certain of the Rejected Ballots contain identifying marks. However, in the interest of completeness, the Committee notes that if it had found the voter's intention on any of the Rejected Ballots to be sufficiently clear, the Committee would not have upheld the Electoral Officer's decision to reject them on the basis of these allegedly identifying marks. For the same grounds set out at paragraph 47 of the Prior Reasons, the Committee considers the markings on the Rejected Ballots to be generic in nature, and does not find that they constitute identifying marks.

Mr. Anderson's Appeal

The Appellant's Position

58. As discussed above, Mr. Anderson asks that the two Accepted Ballots be rejected.
59. With respect to Ballot A, Mr. Anderson submits that it should not have been counted as each vote on this ballot was marked with a star, rather than an X or a checkmark (✓). He says that the *EPA* and the ballot instructions clearly and unambiguously indicated that only a ballot marked with an X or checkmark (✓) would be considered.
60. Mr. Anderson also submits that the star markings on Ballot A create the potential for voter identification, as this ballot is unique and easily attributable to the person who cast it. He notes that Ms. Roulette's own arguments before this Committee support a finding that this ballot should not be counted, as she previously stated that a drawing, such as a star, has a significant potential to identify the voter.
61. With respect to Ballot B, Mr. Anderson submits that the squiggle-mark beside one of the candidates for Chief does not disclose a clear intent to vote for one candidate. Mr. Anderson submits that it is not known whether this marking was made intentionally, as it is indiscriminate and could have resulted from an accidental pen swipe, a marking made by the Electoral Officer, or a smudge. Mr. Anderson compares the marking for one candidate for Chief on Ballot B with those for several Councillor candidates on Ballot B, which he asserts were each clearly marked with an X. Mr. Anderson submits that the voter's intention on this ballot is clearer with respect to the Councillor markings than the Chief marking, and that any ballot containing additional markings or markings that appear to be accidental must be disqualified.
62. Mr. Anderson presented two additional ballots as examples of ballots that were rejected, notwithstanding that they do not display any information to identify the voter and show a clear intention on the part of the voter. These ballots are attached as **Schedule D**. The first exemplar

rejected ballot contains a marking beside every candidate, with an X beside some candidates and a checkmark (✓) beside others. The second exemplar ballot was rejected as it contained more than one marking in the section listing the candidates for Chief.

63. While Mr. Anderson accepted in his submissions that the Electoral Officer had valid reason to reject the exemplar ballots he provided, his view is that a uniform standard must apply. He submits that Ms. Connors did not apply a uniform test to determine whether or not a ballot was acceptable, which led to some ballots being accepted, and some rejected, for the same reasons. As a result, Mr. Anderson now submits that all ballots with additional or improper markings aside from an X or checkmark (✓) ought to be rejected.

64. As a remedy, Mr. Anderson has requested that the Committee order that a run-off election be held for Chief, even if the Committee grants his appeal and finds that more votes were cast in his favour than for Ms. Roulette (or any of the other candidates for Chief).

The Respondents' Positions

65. Ms. Connors and Ms. Roulette each submit that the Accepted Ballots were properly counted.

66. In support of her position, Ms. Connors relies on the provisions of the *EPA* referred to in her submission regarding Ms. Roulette's appeal discussed above. Ms. Connors also relies on the same paragraphs of *Opitz*, *Oppermann*, and *Anderson* that she referred to in the First Anderson Appeal,¹² as well as in Ms. Roulette's appeal discussed above.

67. With respect to Ballots A and B, Ms. Connors submits that the markings are akin to an asterisk or single-line stroke, and are distinguishable from examples of distinctive written phrases, identifying signatures or initials. Ms. Connors cites *Lukaszuk v. Kibermanis*, where the

¹² The paragraphs from these authorities referenced by Ms. Connors are not reproduced here, but are referred to at paragraphs 32 to 41 of the Prior Reasons.

Alberta Court of Appeal found that a ballot marked with an asterisk or a single-line stroke, among other markings, gives rise to a presumption of validity when the mark is made opposite to one of the candidate's name.¹³

68. Ms. Connors rejects Mr. Anderson's assertion that she applied an inconsistent standard when accepting and rejecting ballots. Ms. Connors submits that the standard she applied was both clear and consistent: where the voter's intention could be discerned and the markings did not have the potential to identify the voter, the ballot was accepted.

69. Ms. Connors further submits that the exemplar rejected ballots provided by Mr. Anderson were properly rejected. With respect to the ballot that contained a mark beside each candidate's name, this ballot was rejected as the markings exceeded the maximum number of candidates voted for, contrary to the *EPA's* provisions. With respect to the second example, this ballot was rejected as it contained markings beside two different candidates for Chief, such that the markings were not in accordance with the *EPA* and the intention of the voter was not clear.

70. Ms. Roulette also submits that Ballot A was properly counted based on the Committee's decision in the First Anderson Appeal. Ms. Roulette refers to paragraphs 45 and 46 of the Prior Reasons, in which the majority of this Committee found that, even if a marking on a ballot is not in technical compliance with the *EPA*, the ballot should be counted where the voter's intention is clear.

71. Ms. Roulette further submits that a star is a generic marking far from the threshold of what could be considered a potentially identifying marking. Ms. Roulette compares the star to other symbols often used by voters, such as a shaded in X and squiggle-type marks, which have been

¹³ 2005 ABCA 26 ("*Lukaszuk*"), at para. 26.

found to be valid markings and not potentially identifying by the Manitoba Court of Appeal in *Bartlett*.¹⁴

72. With respect to Ballot B, Ms. Roulette submits that the copy of the ballot put forward by Mr. Anderson in support of his appeal is hardly legible and distorts the markings, making them difficult to interpret. While Mr. Anderson argues that the markings for Councillor are clear X's, Ms. Roulette submits that they are no clearer than the marking for Chief.

73. Ms. Roulette further submits that Ballot B was properly accepted as it contains one clear marking for Chief that appears in the box next to Ms. Roulette's name. Even if this marking were found to be a "squiggly mark", which Ms. Roulette opposes, she submits that the voter's intention is still clear, and that no potentially identifying marking exists on the ballot.

74. Ms. Roulette concluded her submissions by indicating that Mr. Anderson's reliance on her submission in response to the First Anderson Appeal as a basis on which the Committee ought to reject the ballots in his second appeal is improper. Ms. Roulette submits that she was entitled to advance her position in response to the First Anderson Appeal based on the law and information available at the time, and that she expressly reserved the right to advance any position in any future proceeding. Ms. Roulette submits that the position she advances in her appeal aligns with the Committee's interpretation of the *EPA* in the First Anderson Appeal and that Mr. Anderson's attempts to distract from that should be disregarded.

Reasons of the Committee

75. The Committee finds that Mr. Anderson's appeal should be dismissed.

76. As with Ms. Roulette's appeal, the Committee relies on its decision in the First Anderson Appeal. At paragraphs 45 and 46 of the Prior Reasons, the majority of the Committee adopted the finding of the Federal Court that First Nations election legislation must be interpreted

¹⁴ *Bartlett*, paras. 9 to 11.

purposively, in a manner consistent with the object of allowing eligible voters to exercise their right to vote. As such, technical compliance with the *EPA* may not be required so long as the intention of the voter is clear from the markings on the ballots.

77. With respect to Ballots A and B, the Committee finds that the intention of each voter to vote for Ms. Roulette as Chief and for the various Councillor candidates shown on the ballots was clear, as these ballots contain no other markings. As such, there are no grounds to overturn the Electoral Officer's decision to accept these ballots.

78. As the Committee has decided to dismiss Mr. Anderson's appeal, it is not necessary for the Committee to make specific findings respecting related to remedies. However, in the interest of completeness, the Committee notes that if it had allowed Mr. Anderson's appeal and, in so doing, the election for Chief had no longer been tied, the jurisdiction afforded to the Committee pursuant to the *EPA* would not have permitted the Committee to order a run-off election as Mr. Anderson requested.

79. Finally, the Committee returns momentarily to Mr. Anderson's submission that Ms. Roulette's legal position on whether or not technically non-compliant but clearly marked ballots ought to be counted in an effort to enfranchise voters has changed since the First Anderson Appeal. While there may be some merit to this submission, every appeal before the Committee must be considered and decided on its own facts and through an application of the governing law to those facts. Moreover, it might equally be said that Mr. Anderson's position on the same question has also changed since the First Anderson Appeal. As a result, in coming to its decision, the Committee has not attributed any weight to Mr. Anderson's submissions in this regard.

Conclusion

80. For the reasons set out above, the Committee dismisses both Ms. Roulette's appeal and Mr. Anderson's appeal.

81. It follows from this decision that no further ballots should be counted or rejected. Thus, the election for Chief remains tied as between Mr. Anderson and Ms. Roulette, and a run-off election between Mr. Anderson and Ms. Roulette needs to be held pursuant to Article 5.14 of the *EPA*.

82. The Committee notes that, pending the outcome of several appeals filed and being heard before it, a run-off election was scheduled to take place on May 1, 2026. At the time of this decision's release, the Committee has yet to release its decision with respect to four other appeals that were filed in relation to the 2026 Election. The Committee will be releasing its decision on these appeals prior to date of the run-off election. Consistent with the Postscript to the Prior Reasons, it remains the Committee's recommendation to Council that the run-off election only be held if any of the 2026 Election results remain tied after the Committee's decisions respecting all of the appeals have been released.

Dated: April 24, 2026

The Norway House Cree Nation Election Appeal Committee
C/O Ari Hanson and Avril Brown, Counsel to the Committee
Fillmore Riley LLP
1700 – 360 Main Street
Winnipeg, MB R3C 3Z3

A



BALLOT
NORWAY HOUSE CREE NATION ELECTION
MARCH 10TH, 2026



BALLOT #1

CHIEF

Vote for One (1) person only. Mark an "X" or "√" opposite the name of the person for whom you vote.

ANDERSON, LARSON	
CLARKE, DEON	
EVANS, RONALD G.	
FOLSTER, SAMANTHA	✓
FREDETTE, GILBERT	
ROSS, ALAN (JEFF)	
ROULETTE, SEASON	X
THROOP, ROBERT	

COUNCILLOR

Vote for Six (6) people only. Mark an "X" or "√" opposite the name of the person for whom you vote

ALBERT, EDDIE	X
ANDERSON, ADAM	
APETAGON, ANTHONY	
APETAGON, ORVILLE	
BAYER, LORETTA L.	
CLARKE, ELIZA	
CLARKE, LISA (BUGOOSE)	
CLARKE, SANDRA	
DIXON, DONALD	
DUNCAN, TYLER	
ETTAWACAPPO, KATHLEEN	
ETTAWACAPPO, WARREN	
EVANS, RONALD G.	
FOLSTER, SAMANTHA	X
FOLSTER, TIM	
FREDETTE, GILBERT	
HART, TRUDY	
HENRY, JOHN L.	
LAUGHER, ALFRED	
MITCHELL, CHRISTINA (POKER)	
MOORE, HENRY	

MUSKEGO, FRED	X
MUSKEGO, P. OLIVER	
MUSWAGON, JOAN	
MUSWAGON, LISA (LOUIS GRANDAUGHTER)	
MUSWAGON, LUCY	
MUSWAGON, MIKE	
OSBORNE, DARLENE	
QUESKEKAPOW, JAMES	
QUESKEKAPOW, JOHN	
ROBERTSON, DEAN	X
ROBINSON,(YORK) GEM	X
ROWDEN, DENICE	
SAUNDERS, ALLISON	X
SAUNDERS, LANGFORD	
SIMPSON, ANDREW	
SWANSON, DAVID	
SWANSON, DENNIS	
TAIT-REAUME, PAMELA	
WILSON, ALLAN	
WILSON, DIANE	

57

82



BALLOT
NORWAY HOUSE CREE NATION ELECTION
MARCH 10TH, 2026



BALLOT #2

CHIEF

Vote for One (1) person only. Mark an "X" or "√"
 opposite the name of the person for whom you vote.

ANDERSON, LARSON	
CLARKE, DEON	
EVANS, RONALD G.	XXXXXXXXXX
FOLSTER, SAMANTHA	
FREDETTE, GILBERT	
ROSS, ALAN (JEFF)	
ROULETTE, SEASON	X
THROOP, ROBERT	

COUNCILLOR

Vote for Six (6) people only. Mark an "X" or "√"
 opposite the name of the person for whom you vote

ALBERT, EDDIE	
ANDERSON, ADAM	
APETAGON, ANTHONY	
APETAGON, ORVILLE	
BAYER, LORETTA L.	
CLARKE, ELIZA	
CLARKE, LISA (BUGOOSE)	
CLARKE, SANDRA	
DIXON, DONALD	
DUNCAN, TYLER	
ETTAWACAPPO, KATHLEEN	X
ETTAWACAPPO, WARREN	
EVANS, RONALD G.	X
FOLSTER, SAMANTHA	
FOLSTER, TIM	
FREDETTE, GILBERT	
HART, TRUDY	
HENRY, JOHN L.	
LAUGHER, ALFRED	
MITCHELL, CHRISTINA (POKER)	X
MOORE, HENRY	

MUSKEGO, FRED	
MUSKEGO, P. OLIVER	
MUSWAGON, JOAN	
MUSWAGON, LISA (LOUIS GRANDAUGHTER)	
MUSWAGON, LUCY	
MUSWAGON, MIKE	
OSBORNE, DARLENE	
QUESKEKAPOW, JAMES	
QUESKEKAPOW, JOHN	
ROBERTSON, DEAN	
ROBINSON,(YORK) GEM	X
ROWDEN, DENICE	
SAUNDERS, ALLISON	X
SAUNDERS, LANGFORD	
SIMPSON, ANDREW	
SWANSON, DAVID	
SWANSON, DENNIS	
TAIT-REAUME, PAMELA	X
WILSON, ALLAN	
WILSON, DIANE	

48

[Handwritten signature]



BALLOT
NORWAY HOUSE CREE NATION ELECTION
MARCH 10TH, 2026



BALLOT #3

CHIEF

Vote for One (1) person only. Mark an "X" or "√"
 opposite the name of the person for whom you vote.

ANDERSON, LARSON	
CLARKE, DEON	
EVANS, RONALD G.	
FOLSTER, SAMANTHA	
FREDETTE, GILBERT	
ROSS, ALAN (JEFF)	
ROULETTE, SEASON	
THROOP, ROBERT	

COUNCILLOR

Vote for Six (6) people only. Mark an "X" or "√"
 opposite the name of the person for whom you vote

ALBERT, EDDIE	
ANDERSON, ADAM	
APETAGON, ANTHONY	
APETAGON, ORVILLE	
BAYER, LORETTA L.	
CLARKE, ELIZA	
CLARKE, LISA (BUGOOSE)	
CLARKE, SANDRA	
DIXON, DONALD	
DUNCAN, TYLER	
ETTAWACAPPO, KATHLEEN	
ETTAWACAPPO, WARREN	
EVANS, RONALD G.	
FOLSTER, SAMANTHA	
FOLSTER, TIM	
FREDETTE, GILBERT	
HART, TRUDY	
HENRY, JOHN L.	
LAUGHER, ALFRED	
MITCHELL, CHRISTINA (POKER)	
MOORE, HENRY	

MUSKEGO, FRED	
MUSKEGO, P. OLIVER	
MUSWAGON, JOAN	
MUSWAGON, LISA (LOUIS GRANDAUGHTER)	
MUSWAGON, LUCY	
MUSWAGON, MIKE	
OSBORNE, DARLENE	
QUESKEKAPOW, JAMES	
QUESKEKAPOW, JOHN	
ROBERTSON, DEAN	
ROBINSON,(YORK) GEM	
ROWDEN, DENICE	
SAUNDERS, ALLISON	
SAUNDERS, LANGFORD	
SIMPSON, ANDREW	
SWANSON, DAVID	
SWANSON, DENNIS	
TAIT-REAUME, PAMELA	
WILSON, ALLAN	
WILSON, DIANE	

Councillors

Chiry

Fred Murray

Orville Appagan

Season

Louise Bayne

Rallie

Les Clarke

4

Andrew Simpson

Allan Wilson

4

[Signature]



BALLOT
NORWAY HOUSE CREE NATION ELECTION
MARCH 10TH, 2026



BALLOT #4

CHIEF

Vote for One (1) person only. Mark an "X" or "√"
 opposite the name of the person for whom you vote.

ANDERSON, LARSON	
CLARKE, DEON	✓
EVANS, RONALD G.	
FOLSTER, SAMANTHA	Ⓚ
FREDETTE, GILBERT	
ROSS, ALAN (JEFF)	
ROULETTE, SEASON	✓
THROOP, ROBERT	

COUNCILLOR

Vote for Six (6) people only. Mark an "X" or "√"
 opposite the name of the person for whom you vote

ALBERT, EDDIE	
ANDERSON, ADAM	
APETAGON, ANTHONY	
APETAGON, ORVILLE	
BAYER, LORETTA L.	
CLARKE, ELIZA	✓
CLARKE, LISA (BUGOOSE)	✓
CLARKE, SANDRA	
DIXON, DONALD	
DUNCAN, TYLER	
ETTAWACAPPO, KATHLEEN	
ETTAWACAPPO, WARREN	
EVANS, RONALD G.	
FOLSTER, SAMANTHA	
FOLSTER, TIM	
FREDETTE, GILBERT	
HART, TRUDY	
HENRY, JOHN L.	✓
LAUGHER, ALFRED	
MITCHELL, CHRISTINA (POKER)	✓
MOORE, HENRY	

MUSKEGO, FRED	✓
MUSKEGO, P. OLIVER	
MUSWAGON, JOAN	
MUSWAGON, LISA (LOUIS GRANDAUGHTER)	
MUSWAGON, LUCY	✓
MUSWAGON, MIKE	
OSBORNE, DARLENE	
QUESKEKAPOW, JAMES	
QUESKEKAPOW, JOHN	✓
ROBERTSON, DEAN	✓
ROBINSON,(YORK) GEM	
ROWDEN, DENICE	
SAUNDERS, ALLISON	
SAUNDERS, LANGFORD	
SIMPSON, ANDREW	
SWANSON, DAVID	
SWANSON, DENNIS	
TAIT-REAUME, PAMELA	
WILSON, ALLAN	
WILSON, DIANE	

②

②

Sh



BALLOT
NORWAY HOUSE CREE NATION ELECTION
MARCH 10TH, 2026



BALLOT #5

CHIEF

Vote for One (1) person only. Mark an "X" or "✓"
 opposite the name of the person for whom you vote.

ANDERSON, LARSON	
CLARKE, DEON	
EVANS, RONALD G.	
FOLSTER, SAMANTHA	
FREDETTE, GILBERT	
ROSS, ALAN (JEFF)	
ROULETTE, SEASON	
THROOP, ROBERT	

COUNCILLOR

Vote for Six (6) people only. Mark an "X" or "✓"
 opposite the name of the person for whom you vote

ALBERT, EDDIE	
ANDERSON, ADAM	
APETAGON, ANTHONY	
APETAGON, ORVILLE	
BAYER, LORETTA L.	
CLARKE, ELIZA	
CLARKE, LISA (BUGOOSE)	
CLARKE, SANDRA	
DIXON, DONALD	
DUNCAN, TYLER	
ETTAWACAPPO, KATHLEEN	
ETTAWACAPPO, WARREN	
EVANS, RONALD G.	
FOLSTER, SAMANTHA	
FOLSTER, TIM	
FREDETTE, GILBERT	
HART, TRUDY	
HENRY, JOHN L.	
LAUGHER, ALFRED	
MITCHELL, CHRISTINA (POKER)	
MOORE, HENRY	

MUSKEGO, FRED	
MUSKEGO, P. OLIVER	
MUSWAGON, JOAN	
MUSWAGON, LISA (LOUIS GRANDAUGHTER)	
MUSWAGON, LUCY	
MUSWAGON, MIKE	
OSBORNE, DARLENE	
QUESKEKAPOW, JAMES	
QUESKEKAPOW, JOHN	
ROBERTSON, DEAN	
ROBINSON,(YORK) GEM	
ROWDEN, DENICE	
SAUNDERS, ALLISON	
SAUNDERS, LANGFORD	
SIMPSON, ANDREW	
SWANSON, DAVID	
SWANSON, DENNIS	
TAIT-REAUME, PAMELA	
WILSON, ALLAN	
WILSON, DIANE	



[Handwritten signature]

B

GALLEYS
ANNUAL HOUSES CROSS COUNTRY MEETING
MARCH 10TH, 2000

CROSS
 Please see page 111 for more info. There will be a
 separate list for each house for which you will race.

- ANDERSON LARSON
- CLARKE, DEON
- EVANS, RONALD G.
- FOLSTER, SAMANTHA
- FREDETTE, GILBERT
- ROSS, ALAN (JEFF)
- ROULETTE, SEASON
- THROOP, ROBERT

COACHES
 Please see the list on page 111. There will be a
 separate list for each house for which you will race.

- ALBERT, EDDIE
- ANDERSON, ADAM
- APETASON, ANTHONY
- APETASON, CRYLLE
- BAYER, LORETTA L.
- CLARKE, ELIZA
- CLARKE, LISA (BUGGOSH)
- CLARKE, SANDRA
- DEON, DONALD
- CUNGAN, TYLER
- ETTANACAPPO, KATHLEEN
- ETTANACAPPO, WARREN
- EVANS, RONALD G.
- FOLSTER, SAMANTHA
- FOLSTER, TIM
- FREDETTE, GILBERT
- HART, TRUDY
- HENRY, JOHN L.
- LAUGHER, ALFRED
- MITCHELL, CHRISTINA
- MOORE, HENRY

- BUSKZGO, FRED
- BUSKZGO, F. OLIVER
- BUSWAGON, JOAN
- BUSWAGON, LISA
- BUSWAGON, LUCY
- BUSWAGON, MIMI
- OSBORNE, DARLENE
- QUESKERAPON, JAMES
- QUESKERAPON, JOHN
- ROBERTSON, DEAN
- ROBINSON (YORK), GEM
- HOWDEN, DENICE
- SAUNDERS, ALLISON
- SAUNDERS, LANGFORD
- SIMPSON, ANDREW
- SWANSON, DAVID
- SWANSON, DENNIS
- TAIT, REALME, PAMELA
- WILSON, ALLAN
- WILSON, CRANE

Write the name of the person only. Mark an "X" in the
 square to the right of the person's name.

ANDERSON, LARSON	
CLARKE, DEON	
EVANS, RONALD G.	
FOLSTER, SAMANTHA	
FREDETTE, GILBERT	
ROSS, ALAN (JEFF)	
ROULETTE, SEASON	
THROOP, ROBERT	

Write the name of the person only. Mark an "X" in the
 square to the right of the person's name.

ALBERT, EDDIE		MUSKEGO, FRED	
ANDERSON, ADAM		MUSKEGO, P. OLIVER	
APETAGON, ANTHONY		MUSWAGON, JOAN	
APETAGON, ORVILLE		MUSWAGON, LISA	
BAYER, LORETTA L.		MUSWAGON, LUCY	
CLARKE, ELIZA		MUSWAGON, MIKE	
CLARKE, LISA (BUGGOOSE)		OSBORNE, DARLENE	
CLARKE, SANDRA		QUESKEKAPOW, JAMES	
DIXON, DONALD		QUESKEKAPOW, JOHN	
DUNCAN, TYLER		ROBERTSON, DEAN	
ETTAWACAPPO, KATHLEEN		ROBINSON (YORK), GEM	
ETTAWACAPPO, WARREN		ROWDEN, GENICE	
EVANS, RONALD G.		SAUNDERS, ALLISON	
FOLSTER, SAMANTHA		SAUNDERS, LANGFORD	
FOLSTER, TIM		SIMPSON, ANDREW	
FREDETTE, GILBERT		SWANSON, DAVID	
HART, TRUDY		SWANSON, DENNIS	
HENRY, JOHN L.		TAIT-REAUME, PAMELA	
LAUGHER, ALFRED		WILSON, ALLAN	
MITCHELL, CHRISTINA (POKER)		WILSON, DIANE	
MOORE, HENRY			

C

PLEASE READ IMPORTANT

Instructions for Voting

- 1. Place an “X” or “✓” in the box to the right of your choice(s)**
- 2. Vote for ONE (1) Chief only**
- 3. Vote for SIX (6) or Less for Councillor, You do not have to choose all SIX (6) and your vote will still count.**
- 3. When you have finished, bring the ballot back to the ballot box for verification by Election Staff to then be deposited in the Ballot Box.**
- 4. If you make a mistake, return your ballot to the Electoral Officer, who will give you another ballot (once only) if you scribble it out your ballot will not count.**

**IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS
OR MAKE A MISTAKE
PLEASE CALL ONE OF THE ELECTION STAFF
FOR ASSISTANCE!**

D

MARCH 10TH, 2026 ELECTION

CHIEF

Vote for One (1) person only. Mark an "X" or "✓" opposite the name of the person for whom you vote.

ANDERSON, LARSON	✓
CLARKE, DEON	X
EVANS, RONALD G	X
FOLSTER, SAMANTHA	X
FREDETTE, GILBERT	X
ROSS, ALAN (JEFF)	X
ROULETTE, SEASON	X
THROOP, ROBERT	X

COUNCILLOR

Vote for Six (6) people only. Mark an "X" or "✓" opposite the name of the person for whom you vote.

ALBERT, EDDIE	✓	MUSKEGO, FRED	✓
ANDERSON, ADAM	X	MUSKEGO, P OLIVER	✓
APETAGON, ANTHONY	X	MUSWAGON, JOAN	✓
APETAGON, ORVILLE	✓	MUSWAGON, LISA (LORIS SWANSON'S WIFE)	✓
BAYER, LORETTA L	X	MUSWAGON, LUCY	✓
CLARKE, ELIZA	X	MUSWAGON, MIKE	✓
CLARKE, LISA (BUGOOSE)	X	OSBORNE, DARLENE	✓
CLARKE, SANDRA	X	QUESKEKAPOW, JAMES	✓
DIXON, DONALD	X	QUESKEKAPOW, JOHN	✓
DUNCAN, TYLER	X	ROBERTSON, DEAN	✓
ETTAWACAPPO, KATHLEEN	X	ROBINSON, (YORK) GEM	✓
ETTAWACAPPO, WARREN	✓	ROWDEN, DENICE	✓
EVANS, RONALD G	X	SAUNDERS, ALLISON	✓
FOLSTER, SAMANTHA	✓	SAUNDERS, LANGFORD	✓
FOLSTER, TIM	✓	SIMPSON, ANDREW	✓
FREDETTE, GILBERT	✓	SWANSON, DAVID	✓
HART, TRUDY	X	SWANSON, DENNIS	✓
HENRY, JOHN L	X	TAIT-REAUME, PAMELA	✓
LAUGHER, ALFRED	✓	WILSON, ALLAN	✓
MITCHELL, CHRISTINA (POKER)	X	WILSON, DIANE	✓
MOORE, HENRY	X		

ANDERSON, LARSON	/
CLARKE, DEON	
EVANS, RONALD G.	
FOLSTER, SAMANTHA	
FREDETTE, GILBERT	
ROSS, ALAN (JEFF)	
ROULETTE, SEASON	
THROOP, ROBERT	X

COUNCILLOR

Vote for Six (6) people only. Mark an "X" or "✓" opposite the name of the person for whom you vote

ALBERT, EDDIE	X
ANDERSON, ADAM	
APETAGON, ANTHONY	
APETAGON, ORVILLE	
BAYER, LORETTA L.	
CLARKE, ELIZA	
CLARKE, LISA (BUGOOSE)	
CLARKE, SANDRA	
DIXON, DONALD	
DUNCAN, TYLER	
ETTAWACAPPO, KATHLEEN	
ETTAWACAPPO, WARREN	
EVANS, RONALD G.	
FOLSTER, SAMANTHA	
FOLSTER, TIM	X
FREDETTE, GILBERT	
HART, TRUDY	
HENRY, JOHN L.	X
LAUGHER, ALFRED	
MITCHELL, CHRISTINA (POKER)	
MOORE, HENRY	

MUSKEGO, FRED	
MUSKEGO, P. OLIVER	
MUSWAGON, JOAN	
MUSWAGON, LISA (LOUISE GRANDDAUGHTER)	
MUSWAGON, LUCY	X
MUSWAGON, MIKE	
OSBORNE, DARLENE	
QUESKEKAPOW, JAMES	
QUESKEKAPOW, JOHN	
ROBERTSON, DEAN	X
ROBINSON, (YORK) GEM	
ROWDEN, DENICE	
SAUNDERS, ALLISON	
SAUNDERS, LANGFORD	
SIMPSON, ANDREW	
SWANSON, DAVID	
SWANSON, DENNIS	
TAIT-REAUME, PAMELA	X
WILSON, ALLAN	
WILSON, DIANE	