



DECISION SUMMARY

FILE EC-045 (Emails and Facebook Posts)

February 12, 2026

Under HEU's [Code of Conduct](#), the Ethics Commissioner is responsible for investigating complaints about the conduct of HEU's Provincial Executive (PE). Members are entitled to see a summary of the decisions that the EC makes after investigating. This is a summary of the EC's decision on file EC-045.

What was the complaint about?

In the complaint, a PE member alleged that between February and October 2025, PE alternate Donovan Adlam repeatedly violated the Code of Conduct by publishing a large number of Facebook posts that were critical of HEU, its leaders, and its institutions. The complainant also alleged Mr. Adlam violated the Code by sending two emails on similar topics, one of which was accessible to HEU staff and the other of which went to a major BC labour organization.

The emails and Facebook posts in question included several themes and the complainant was concerned that in disseminating these themes Mr. Adlam had spread harmful misinformation and damaged their own reputation and that of the union. The themes in the materials included:

- Various claims that PE members acted dishonestly and unethically;
- Various claims that PE members mistreated people associated with HEU;
- Promotion of a Facebook group that is vocally critical of HEU;
- Complaints about HEU processes and institutions; and
- Discussion of confidential HEU business.

What did the EC decide?

Mr. Adlam acknowledged sending the two emails in question and posting Facebook posts on all the above themes, including some under a pseudonym. The EC accepted his

evidence on these points. The EC also based on the documents that he had also posted anonymously at times. The EC found that some of Mr. Adlam's Facebook posts were visible to large groups of Facebook users, while others were visible to anyone.

The EC determined that Mr. Adlam's conduct violated the Code of Conduct in three ways:

- It violated the duty to **act in the best interests of HEU** by publicly denigrating HEU, its leaders, and its institutions (sections 3.2.1 and 4.1.3 of the Code).
- It violated the Code's **confidentiality rules** by discussing confidential HEU business in a public and non-confidential forum (section 6 of the Code).
- It violated the duty to **promote the harmony of the PE and the dignity of its sessions** by publicly criticizing PE members and questioning their integrity (section 4.1.2 of the Code).

The EC found the Respondent's breach of the Code was significant and had a serious impact on HEU and the individuals he publicly denigrated. Given his role as an elected alternate to the PE, his comments carried more weight and had a correspondingly more serious impact.

PE members and alternates are, of course, entitled to think critically about HEU and to air any concerns in an appropriate forum. As elected representatives of the membership, however, they may not publicly air these concerns in a way that damages HEU's reputation, breaches confidentiality, and gets in the way of the harmonious functioning of the PE.

Sanction and remedy

Mr. Adlam voluntarily removed the problematic Facebook content and committed not to publish anything similar in future. He also indicated he did not want to have any further involvement in HEU. Reflecting both Mr. Adlam's intent to disengage from HEU and the severity of the breach, the EC decided on the following sanction:

- He must maintain his commitment to remove all the problematic content, and not to publish similar material in future.
- He is formally removed as a PE alternate, and is disqualified for a period of 5 years from running for or holding any elected role with HEU.