























SECRET

Presentation by AANDC DG October 31, 2012

FNCFS Program Reform Options – Summary

Option recommended

	Option 1 (preferred)	Option 2	Option 3
2013-14 to	\$54.2 M	\$31.2 M	\$10.6 M
2017-18	\$99.1 M	\$45.0 M	\$21.8 M
TOTALS	\$420.6M	\$206.0 M	\$96.4 M

OPTION 1: Fully Expanded EPFA / 3% Escalator / Strengthened Accountability

OPTION 2: Implement EPFA in British Columbia and New Brunswick / 3% Escalator / Strengthened Accountability

OPTION 3: Implement EPFA in British Columbia and New Brunswick

Federal and provincial policy differ in terms of the length of time a child
must wait before being able to apply for new mobility equipment and the
number and/or types of mobility devices the government will pay for a
particular child.

Service Example: A child with multiple disabilities and /or complex medical needs requires a wheelchair and stroller and requires that a lift and tracking device be installed in his/her family home. The Non-Insured Health Benefits Program (NIHB) will provide children with only one item, once every five years. If the item is a wheelchair, NIHB supports the provision of manual wheelchairs only, which must be fitted with seating inserts in order to accommodate small children. If the item is a ceiling mounted lift and tracking device, funding is not provided by NIHB to install the device in the family home. If these same children were to reside off reserve, they would be eligible to receive more than one mobility devices (if needed) and any installation costs would be borne by the provincial program providing the mobility device.

AANDC/Health Canada (2009) Internal Report on Jordan's



"While there are currently no outstanding jurisdictional disputes involving Jordan's Principle in Canada, we believe that the best way to ensure First Nation children and families get the support they need is by working with willing partners and continue engaging with provinces, territories and First Nations to collaborate on implementing Jordan's Principle."

Spokesperson for AANDC Minister Bernard Valcourt, as reported on CBC Feb 10, 2015

v. The documentary evidence does not support a prima facie case

- 163. The Complainants rely on an assortment of internal government documents, which they assert are admissible for the truth of their contents, either as "public documents" or admissions against interest by the Respondents. This assertion overshoots the mark.
- 4. The information in these documents are not admissions. At best, they reflect personal views of employees of the department at particular points in time. While these documents have been admitted into evidence, the Tribunal should access their weight contextually with reference to the Respondent's viva voce evidence regarding their proper interpretation.

Final Written Submissions, Attorney General of Canada, 2014
Available at www.fnwitness.ca















