

**Canadian Human  
Rights Tribunal**

**Tribunal canadien  
des droits de la personne**

**Citation:** 2019 CHRT 39  
**Date:** September 6, 2019  
**File No.:** T1340/7008

**Between:**

**First Nations Child and Family Caring Society of Canada**

**- and**

**-Assembly of First Nations**

**Complainants**

**- and -**

## Table of Contents

I.	Introduction .....	1
II.	Context.....	1
III.		

## **I. Introduction**

We believe that the Creator has entrusted us with the sacred responsibility to raise our families...for we realize healthy families are the foundation of strong and healthy communities. The future of our communities lies with our children, who need to be nurtured within their families and communities. (see 1996 report of the *Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (RCAP)*, *Gathering strength*, vol. 3, p. 10 part of the Tribunal's evidence record).

### **[1] The Special Place of Children in Aboriginal Cultures**

Children hold a special place in Aboriginal cultures (...) They must be protected from harm (...). They bring a purity of vision to the world that can teach their elders. They carry within them the gifts that manifest themselves as they become teachers, mothers, hunters, councillors, artisans and visionaries. They renew the strength of the family, clan and village and make the elders young again with their joyful presence.

Failure to care for these gifts bestowed on the family, and to protect children from the betrayal of others, is perhaps the greatest shame that can befall an Aboriginal family. It is a shame that countless Aboriginal families have experienced, some of them repeatedly over generations. (see



[9] The Panel reiterated its desire to move on to the issue of compensation in a 2018 ruling and wrote as follows:

The Panel reminds Canada that it can end the process at any time with a settlement on compensation, immediate relief and long-term relief that will address the discrimination identified and explained at length in the Decision. Otherwise, the Panel considers this ruling to close the immediate relief phase unless its orders are not implemented. The Panel can now move on to the issue of compensation and long-term relief. (see 2018 CHRT 4 at, para 385). Parties will be able to make submissions on the process, clarification of the relief sought, duration in time, etc. (see 2018 CHRT 4 at, para. 386).

Moreover, the Panel added that it took years for the First Nations children to



needs and substantive equality. Systemic orders such as reform and a broad definition of Jordan's Principle are means to address those flaws.

[14] Individual remedies are meant to deter the reoccurrence of the discriminatory practice or of similar ones, and more importantly to validate the victims/survivors' hurtful experience resulting from the discrimination.

[15] When the discriminatory practice was known or ought to have been known, the damages under the wilful and reckless head send a strong message that tolerating such a practice of breaching protected human rights is unacceptable in Canada. The Panel has made numerous findings since the hearing on the merits contained in 10 rulings. Those findings were made after a thorough review of thousands of pages of evidence including testimony transcripts and reports. Those findings stand and form the basis for this ruling. It is impossible for the Panel to discuss the entirety of the evidence before the Tribunal in a decision. However, compelling evidence exists in the record to permit findings of pain and suffering experienced by a specific vulnerable group namely, First Nations children and their families. While the Panel encourages everyone to read the 10 rulings again to better understand the reasons and context for the present orders, some ruling extracts are

children and families. Canada also ignored evidence-informed solutions that could have redressed the discrimination well before the complaint was filed, and certainly in advance of the hearings. Indeed, the Tribunal's findings are clear that Canada was reckless and was often more concerned with its own interests than the best interests of First Nations children and their families.

[18] The Caring Society submits that this case embodies the "worst case" scenario that subsection 53(3) was designed for, and is meant to deter. Multiple experts and sources, including departdi







issued its May 26, 2017 Order, the number of approvals significantly increased (indeed, over 84,000 products/services were approved in fiscal year 2018-2019), and Canada's witness regarding Jordan's Principle has acknowledged that these requests reflected unmet needs.

[28] Regarding the Panel's question of "who should decide for the victims", the Caring Society respectfully advances that the Tribunal, assisted by all of the parties, is in the best position to decide the financial remedy at this stage of the proceeding. The Tribunal has experience in awarding financial compensation to victims of discrimination and has a sense, through a common-sense approach, of what is and what is not reasonable. Indeed, this Panel is expertly immersed in this case. It understands the FNCFS Progr(s)10(w)6e4(pen)

928]

[31] The AFN submits that the Panel stated in the main decision: “Rooted in racist and neocolonialist attitudes, the individual and collective trauma imposed on Aboriginal people by the Residential Schools system is one of the darkest aspects of Canadian history....the effects of Residential Schools continue to impact First Nations children, families and communities to this day”(see 2016 CHRT 2 at, para 412).

[32] The AFN submits the pain and suffering of the victimized children and families is significant according to the Affidavit of Dr. Mary Ellen Turpel-Lafond affirmed Ap16 Tc Turpel





[45] The AFN advances that it

victims. The complainants are public interest organizations and not victims of the discrimination; they do not satisfy the statutory requirements for compensation under the Act. A class action claim seeking damages for the same matters raised in this complaint, on behalf of a broader class of complainants and covering a broader period of time, has already been filed in Federal Court (see T-402-19).

[51] The AGC submits this is a Complaint of Systemic Discrimination. In its 2014 written submissions, the Caring Society acknowledged that this is a claim of systemic discrimination, with no individual victims as complainants and little evidence about the nature and extent of injuries suffered by individual complainants. The Caring Society stated that it would be an “impossible task” to obtain such evidence. The absence of complainant victims and the assertion that it would be “impossible” to obtain victims’ evidence strongly indicate that this is not an appropriate claim in which to award compensation to individuals. The AFN appears to also acknowledge that this is a claim of systemic discrimination: it alleges that the discriminatory practice is a perpetuation of systemic discrimination and historic disadvantage.

[52] Also, the AGC argues, that complaints of systemic discrimination are distinct from complaints alleging discrimination against an individual and they require different remedies. Complaints of systemic discrimination are not a form of class action permitting the aggregation of a large number of individual complaints. They are a distinct form of claim aimed at remedying structural social harms. This complaint is advanced by two organizations, the AFN and the Caring Society who sought systemic changes to remedy discriminatory practices. It is not a complaint by individuals seeking compensation for the harm they suffered as a result of a discriminatory practice. The complainant organizations were not victims of the discrimination and they do not legally represent the victims.

[53] Additionally, the AGC contends the Canadian Human Rights Commission considers this to be a complaint of systemic discrimination. Then Acting-Commissioner, David Langtry, referred to it as such in his December 11, 2014 appearance before the Senate Committee on Human Rights. In discussing how the Commission allocates its resources, he specifically named this complaint as an example of a complaint of systemic



[54] Furthermore, the AGC submits the evidence of the systemic nature of the complaint is found in the identity of the complainants, the language of the complaint, the Statement of Particulars, and the nature of the evidence provided to the Tribunal. The Tribunal's previous orders in this matter, clearly indicate that the Tribunal also regards this claim as a complaint of systemic discrimination.



statutory mandate. A class action claim addressing the subject matter of this complaint has been filed in the Federal Court.

[62] Also, the AGC submits that in *Moore v. British Columbia (Education)*, 2012 SCC 61, [Moore]), the B.C. Human Rights Tribunal permitted the complainant to lead evidence regarding systemic issues in a complaint of discrimination against an individual, in that case an individual with dyslexia who claimed discrimination on the basis he was denied access to education. The B.C. Tribunal relied on that evidence to award systemic remedies. However, the Supreme Court of Canada concluded that the systemic remedies are too far removed from the "complaint as framed by the Complainant" [emphasis in original]. The Supreme Court upheld the individual remedies but set aside all of the systemic orders because the remedy must flow from the claim. According to the AGC, while the situation is reversed in this case, the same principle applies. The complainants

see (o9.9(2(n699(4)9.691o)1 a 14e)-1o7.1(b)10) T\* e]







[73]

[77]





within the \$20,000 cap set out in s. 53(2)(e) of the *CHRA*. At the same time, as the Ontario Court of Appeal has cautioned in the context of equivalent head of compensation under the Ontario Human Rights Code, "... Human Rights Tribunals must ensure that the quantum of general damages is not set too low, since doing so would trivialize the social importance of the [Code] by effectively setting a 'licence fee' to discriminate".

[86] The Commission adds that the Court of Appeal noted in *Lemire v. Canadian Human Rights Commission*, 2014 FCA 18, (*Lemire*), the wording of s. 53(3) of the *CHRA* does not require proof of loss by a victim. In the context of the former hate speech prohibition under the *CHRA*, awards of special compensation for wilful or reckless conduct were said to compensate individuals identified in the hate speech for the damage "presumptively caused" to their sense of human dignity and belonging to the community at large.

[87] Additionally, the Commission argues that Sections 53(2)(e) and 53(3) of the *CHRA* each allow the Tribunal to order that a respondent pay financial compensation to the "victim of the discriminatory practice."

[88] Also, the Commission advances the argument that in most human rights proceedings, there is one complainant who is also the alleged victim of the discriminatory practice. However, this is not always the case. The *CHRA* clearly contemplates that a complaint may be filed by someone who does not claim to have been a victim of the discriminatory practice alleged in the complaint. In such circumstances, s. 40(2) expressly gives the Commission a discretion to refuse to deal with the complaint, unless the alleged victim consents. The existence of this discretion shows Parliament's understanding that "victims" and "complainants" may be different persons.

[89] In light of this potential under the *CHRA*, the Commission submits that it is within the discretion of the Tribunal to award financial remedies to victims of discriminatory practices, and to determine who those victims are – always having regard to the evidence before it. For example, if the specific identities of victims are known to the Tribunal, it might order payments directly to those victims. If the Tribunal does not have evidence of

would be capable of identifying them, it might make orders that (i) describe the class of victims, (ii) give the parties time to collaborate to identify the victims, and (iii) retain the Tribunal's jurisdiction to oversee the process.

[90] The Commission further submits that in *Walden et al. v. Attorney General of Canada* (2010), the Federal Court (i) took note of this broad discretion with respect to the admissibility of evidence, and (ii) held that the Tribunal does not necessarily need to hear testimony from all alleged victims of discrimination in order to compensate them for pain and suffering. Instead, the Court noted that it could be open to the Tribunal in an appropriate case to rely on hearsay evidence from some individuals to determine the pain and suffering of a group.

[91] The Commission notes that in questions posed to the parties regarding compensation, the Panel Chair appears to have raised concerns about having the Tribunal order the creation of a panel that would effectively be making decisions about appropriate remedies under the *CHRA*. With the greatest of respect to the AFN, the Commission shares those concerns. Parliament has assigned the responsibility of deciding compensation to the specialized Tribunal, created under the *CHRA*. Nothing in the statute authorizes the Tribunal to sub-delegate that responsibility to another body. Without statutory authority, any sub-delegation of this kind would likely be contrary to principles of administrative law.

[92] The Commission further notes that in her questions, the Panel Chair asked if it might instead be preferable to have an expert panel do the preliminary work of identifying victims, and present their circumstances to the Tribunal for determination. If the Tribunal is inclined to go in this direction, the Commission simply observes that the Tribunal's remedial powers only allow it to make orders against the person who infringed the *CHRA*

participation, but does not require it, would allow the Commission to consider the resource implications of any process that may be put in place, and advise at that time of its ability to participate.

#### **V. The Tribunal's authority under the Act and the nature of the claim**

[94] The Tribunal's authority to award remedies such as compensation for pain and suffering and special damages for wilful and reckless conduct is found in the *CHRA* characterized by the Supreme Court of Canada on numerous occasions, to be quasi-constitutional legislation (see for *example Robichaud v. Canada (Treasury Board)*, 1987 CanLII 73 (SCC), [1987] 2 SCR 84 at pp. 89-90 [*Robichaud*]; *Canada (House of Commons) v. Vaid*, 2005 SCC 30 (CanLII) at para. 81; and *Canada (Canadian Human Rights Commission) v. Canada (Attorney General)*, 2011 SCC 53 (CanLII) at para. 62 [Mowat]).

[95] The principle that the *CHRA* is paramount was first enunciated in the *Insurance Corporation of British Columbia v. Heerspink* 1982 CanLII 27 (SCC), [1982] 2 S.C.R. 145, 158, and further articulated by the *Supreme Court of Canada in Winnipeg School Division No. 1 v. Craton* 1985 CanLII 48 (SCC), [1985] 2 S.C.R. 150, at p. 156 where the court stated:

[96] Human rights legislation is of a special nature and declares public policy regarding

purposive approach, remedies under the *CHRA* should be effective in promoting the right being protected and meaningful in vindicating the rights and freedoms of the victim of discrimination (see *CN v. Canada (Canadian Human Rights Commission)*, 1987 CanLII 109 (SCC), [1987] 1 SCR 1114 at p. 1134; and, in *Doucet-Boudreau v. Nova Scotia (Minister of Education)*,

(a) the material facts that the party seeks to prove in support of its case; (b) its position on the legal issues raised by the case (...) (see *Kanagasabapathy v. Air Canada* 2013 CHRT 7, at para.3).

[102] It is important to remember that the original complaint does not serve the purposes of a pleading (*Casler v. Canadian National Railway*, 2017 CHRT 6 at para. 9 [*Casler*]; see also *Gaucher v. Canadian Armed Forces*, 2005 CHRT 1 at para. 10 [*Gaucher*]). Moreover, as explained in *Casler*:

. . . [I]t must be kept in mind that filing a complaint is the first step in the complaint resolution process under the *Act*. As the Tribunal stated in *Gaucher*, at paragraph 11, “[i]t is inevitable that new facts and circumstances will often come to light in the course of the investigation. It follows that complaints are open to refinement”. As explained in *Gaucher* and *Casler*, cited above, the complaint filed with the Commission only provides a synopsis; it will essentially become clearer during the course of the process. The conditions for the hearing are defined in the Statement of Particulars. (see also *Polhill v. Keeseekoowenin*, see also, *First Nation* 2017 CHRT 34 at, paras. 34 and 36).

[103] It is useful to look at the claim in this case which in this case includes the complaint, the Statement of Particulars and the specific facts of the case to respond to the AGC’s argument that this is a systemic claim and not suited for awards of individual remedies.

[104] The complaint form in this case alleges that: “the formula drastically underfunds primary, secondary and tertiary child maltreatment intervention services, including least disruptive measures”. These services are vital to ensuring the First Nations children have the same chance to stay safely at home with support services as other children in Canada (see Complaint form at, pages 2-3).

[105] The Panel already found in past rulings that it is the First Nations children who suffer and are adversely impacted by the underfunding of prevention services within the

[106] Furthermore, the Statement of Particulars of the Caring Society and the AFN of January 29, 2013: “request pain and suffering and special compensation remedies under section 53(2) (e) of the *CHRA* and f...” (see page 7 at para.21 reproduced below):

Relief requested:

Pursuant to sections 53(2)(d), (e) and (f), requiring compensation and special compensation in the form of payment of one hundred and twelve million dollars into a trust fund to be administered by FNCFCS and to be used to: (a) As compensation, subject to the limits provided in sections 53(3)(e) and (f) for each First Nation person who was removed from his or her home since 1989 and thereby experienced pain and suffering;

[107] In this case, the fact that there is no section 53 (2) (f) in the *CHRA* but rather a paragraph 3 is a small error that does not change the nature of the requested remedies. Moreover, this error was later corrected in the Caring Society’s final submissions.

[108] It is clear from reviewing the Complainants’ Statement of Particulars that they were seeking compensation from the beginning and also before the start of the hearing on the merits. The Tribunal requests parties to prepare statements of particulars in order to detail the claim given that the complaint form is short and cannot possibly contain all the elements of the claim. It also is a fairness and natural justice instrument permitting parties to know their opponents’ theory of the cause in advance in order to prepare their case. Sometimes, parties also present motions seeking to have allegations contained in the Statement of Particulars quashed in order to prevent the other party fr cont.

of particulars, the requested relief is beyond the jurisdiction of the Tribunal



engaging or has engaged in a discriminatory practice may file with the Commission a complaint in a form acceptable to the Commission.

#### Consent of victim

(2) If a complaint is made by someone other than the individual who is alleged to be the victim of the discriminatory practice to which the complaint relates, the Commission may refuse to deal with the complaint unless the alleged victim consents thereto.

[113] This wording suggests that complaints on behalf of victims made by representatives can occur and the Commission has the discretion to refuse to deal with the complaint if the victim does not consent.

[114] In this case, the Commission referred the complaint to the Tribunal and does not oppose the remedy sought on behalf of victims.

[115] Consequently, the Panel agrees with the Commission that the *CHRA* clearly contemplates that a complaint may be filed by someone who does not claim to have been a victim of the discriminatory practice alleged in the complaint. In such circumstances, s. 40(2) expressly gives the Commission a discretion to refuse to deal with the complaint, unless the alleged victim consents. The existence of this discretion shows Parliament's understanding that "victims" and "complainants" may be different persons.

[116] Additionally, the Federal Court of Appeal's decision in *Singh (Re)*, [1989] 1 F.C. 430 at 442, discussed the meaning of the term victim where the Court stated:

The question as to who is the "victim" of an alleged discriminatory practice is almost wholly one of fact. Human rights legislation does not look so much to the intent of discriminatory practices as to their effect. That effect is by no means limited to the alleged "target" of the discrimination and it is entirely conceivable that a discriminatory practice may have consequences that are sufficiently direct and immediate to justify qualifying as a "victim" thereof persons who were never within the contemplation or intent of its author.

[117] The Tribunal has already distinguished complainants from victims who are not complainants within the *CHRA* framework:

On the third ground, I am satisfied that the proceeding will have an impact on the interests of PIPSC's members. PIPSC is the bargaining agent for the Complainants and non-complainant Medical Adjudicators who may be



[123] This case was always about children as exemplified by the claim written in the complaint and in the Statement of Particulars and the Tribunal's decisions. Moreover, the AGC is aware that the Tribunal views this case is about children. What is more, the Panel agrees that AFN and the Caring Society filed the complaint on behalf of a representative group who are identifiable by specific characteristics if not by name. Furthermore, the Panel believes it is important to consider the nature of this case where the victims/survivors are part of a group composed of vulnerable First Nations children.

[124] While there are other forums available for filing representative actions, the AFN stated that Tribunal was carefully chosen in this case due to the nature of the claim, but, also due to the means of redress available under the *CHRA* for members of a vulnerable group on whose behalf the AFN has advanced a case of discrimination contrary to the *Act*.

## **VII. Pain and suffering analysis**

[125] Once it is established that discrimination or a loss has been suffered, the Tribunal must consider whether an order is appropriate (see s. 53(2) of the *CHRA*. In this rFB26t Tw 83(ecc /T

[127] The Federal Court of Appeal has confirmed that where the Tribunal finds evidence that a discriminatory practice caused pain and suffering, compensation should follow under s. 53(2)(e) of the *CHRA* (see *Jane Doe v. Canada (Attorney General)*, 2018 FCA 183 (*Jane Doe*), at para. 29, citing (among others): *Grant v. Manitoba Telecom Services Inc.*, 2012 CHRT 10 at para. 115); and *Alizadeh-Ebadi v. Manitoba Telecom Services Inc* [127]

tM(m)7(p)-10(r)-

(ii) making an application for approval and implementing a plan under section 17;

(b) that the person make available to the victim of the discriminatory practice, on the first reasonable occasion, the rights, opportunities or privileges that are being or were denied the victim as a result of the practice;

(c) that the person compensate the victim for any or all of the wages that the victim was deprived of and for any expenses incurred by the victim as a result of the discriminatory practice;

(d) that the person compensate the victim for any or all additional costs of obtaining alternative goods, services, facilities or accommodation and for any expenses incurred by the victim as a result of the discriminatory practice; and

(Re), 1998 CanLII 837 (SCC), [1998] 1 SCR 27, at para. 21, see also *First Nations Child & Family Caring Society of Canada et al. v. Attorney General*

[136]





(i) took note of this broad discretion with respect to the admissibility of evidence, and (ii) held that the Tribunal does not necessarily need to hear testimony from all alleged victims of discrimination in order to compensate them for pain and suffering. Instead, the Court noted that it could be open to the Tribunal in an appropriate case to rely on hearsay

[150] The Panel believes that in those situations only the children should be compensated and not the abusers. The Panel understands that some of the abusers have themselves been abused in residential or boarding schools or otherwise and that these unacceptable crimes of abuse are condemnable. The suffering of First Nations Peoples was recognized by the Panel in the *Decision*. However, not all abused children became abusers even without the benefit of therapy or other services. The Panel believes it is important for the children victims/survivors of abuse to feel vindicated and not witness financial compensation paid to their abusers regardless of the abusers' intent and history.

[151] Additionally, the Panel also recognizes that the suffering can continue for life for First Nations children and their families even when families are reunited given the gravity of the adverse impacts of breaking families and communities.

[152] Besides, there is sufficient evidence before the Tribunal to make findings of pain and suffering experienced by victims/survivors who are the First Nations children and their families.

[153] Throughout all the *Decision* and rulings, references were made to First Nations children and their families. The Panel did not focus on the complainants when analyzing the adverse impacts. The Panel analyzed the effects/impacts of the discriminatory practices on First Nations children and clearly expressed this. The findings focused on the agencies' abilities to deliver services and most importantly, the First Nations children, their families and their communities who are the victims/survivors of the discriminatory practices. First Nations children and families are referenced continuously throughout the *Decision*. The *Decision* starts with: "**This decision concerns children.** More precisely, it is about how the past and current child welfare practices in First Nations communities on reserves, across Canada, have impacted and continue to impact First Nations children, their families and their communities".

[154] Furthermore, an analysis of the Tribunal's findings makes it clear that the Tribunal's orders are aimed at improving the lives of First Nations children and that the First Nations children and Families are the ones who suffer from the discrimination. The Tribunal made findings of systemic racial discrimination and agrees this case is a case of systemic racial

discrimination. The Panel also made numerous findings of adverse impacts toward First Nation children and families, adverse impacts that cause serious harm and suffering to children the two are interconnected. While a finding of discrimination and of adverse impacts may not always lead to findings of pain and suffering, in these proceedings it clearly is the case. A review of the 2016 CHRT 2 and subsequent rulings demonstrates this. There is no reason not to accept that both coexist in this case. The individual rights that were infringed upon by systemic racial discrimination warrant remedies alongside systemic reform already ordered by the Tribunal (see 2016 CHRT 2, 10, 16 and 2017 CHRT 7, 14, 35 and 2018 CHRT 4).

[155] Also, the Tribunal has already made numerous findings relating to First Nations children and their families' adverse impacts and suffering in past rulings. Some of these findings can be found in the compilation of citations below:

The FNCFS Program, corresponding funding formulas and other related provincial/territorial agreements only apply to First Nations people living on-reserve and in the Yukon. It is only because of their race and/or national or ethnic origin that they suffer the adverse impacts outlined above in the provision of child and family services. Furthermore, these adverse impacts **perpetuate the historical disadvantage and trauma suffered by Aboriginal people**, in particular as a result of the Residential Schools system (see 2016 CHRT 2 at, para.459). (...)

**The Panel acknowledges the suffering of those First Nations children and families who are or have been denied an equitable opportunity to remain together or to be reunited in a timely manner. We also recognize those First Nations children and families who are or have been adversely impacted by the Government of Canada's past and current child welfare practices on reserves** (see 2016 CHRT 2 at, para.467).

Overall, AANDC's method of providing funding to ensure the safety and well-

Program, funding formulas and other related provincial/territorial agreements (see 2016 CHRT 2 at, para. 393).

As will be seen in the next section, **the adverse effects generated by the FNCFS Program, corresponding funding formulas and other related provincial/territorial agreements perpetuate disadvantages historically suffered by First Nations people.** (see 2016 CHRT 2 at, para.394).

The evidence in this case not only indicates various adverse effects on First

**Similar to the Residential Schools era, today, the fate and future of many First Nations children is still being determined by the government, whether it is through the application of restrictive and inadequate funding formulas or through bilateral agreements with the provinces.** The purpose of having a First Nation community deliver child and family services, and to be involved through a Band Representative, is to ensure services are culturally appropriate and reflect the needs of the community. This in turn may help legitimize the child and family services in the eyes of the community, increasing their effectiveness, and ultimately help rebuild individuals, families and communities that have been heavily affected by the Residential Schools system and other historical trauma. (see 2016 CHRT 2 at, para. 426).

(...) On that point, the Panel would like **to stress how important it is to address the issue of mass removal of children today.** While Indigenous communities may have different views on child welfare, there is no evidence that they oppose actions to stop removing the children from their Nations. Indeed, it would be somewhat surprising if they did as it would amount to a colonial mindset. In any event, assertions from Canada on this point do not constitute evidence and do not assist us in our findings. Moreover, Indigenous communities have obligations to their children such as keeping them safe in their homes whenever possible. While there may be different views from one Nation to another, surely the need to keep the children in their communities as much as possible is the same (see 2018 CHRT 4 at, para.62).

This being said, the Panel fully supports Parliament's intent to establish a Nation-to-Nation relationship and that reconciliation is Parliament's goal (see *Daniels v. Canada (Indian Affairs and Northern Development*, [2016] 1 SCR 99), and commends it for adopting this approach. The Panel ordered that the specific needs of communities be addressed and this involves consulting the communities. However, the Panel did not intend this order to delay addressing urgent needs. It foresaw that while agencies would have more resources to stop the mass removal of children, best practices and needs would be identified to improve the services while the program is reformed, and ultimately child welfare would reflect what communities need and want, and the best interest of children principle would be upheld. It is not one or the other; it is one plus the other. (see 2018 CHRT 4 at, para.66).

**This is a striking example of a system built on colonial views perpetuating historical harm against Indigenous peoples, and all justified under policy.** While the necessity to account for public funds is certainly legitimate it becomes troubling when used as an argument to justify the mass removal of children rather than preventing it.

There is a need to shift this right now to cease discrimination. The Panel finds the seriousness and emergency of the issue is not grasped with some

of Canada's actions and responses. This is a clear example of a policy that was found discriminatory and that is still perpetuating discrimination. Consequently, the Panel finds it has to intervene by way of additional orders. In further support of the Panel's finding, compelling evidence was brought in the context of the motions' proceedings (see 2018 CHRT 4 at, para. 121).

Ms. Lang's evidence, over a year after the *Decision*, establishes the fact that aside from discussions, no data or short-term plan was presented to address this matter. **The focus is on financial considerations and not the best in**

Mr. Dufresne: Why did you file the complaint?

**the frame of mind that our families need healing and I, as a trained professional, and others out there in Saskatchewan and the other agencies, you know, like there has to be a different way to do child welfare other than breaking families up. We want to heal. We need to heal.** We have to do things differently, which is why when I referenced the SDM it was really appealing to me because it focuses on our strengths, you know, it builds on what we are and what we have. (see Testimony of Derald Richard Dubois, April, 8, 2013, StenoTran transcript a, pp. 60-61 lines 7-24; 1-



Complaint. On the contrary, there

[165] The WEN De report goes on to say that

**effect. - Substandard infrastructure and services have been made worse by federal-provincial disagreements over responsibility.**

The most profound impact of the lack of clarity relating to jurisdiction results in what **many commentators have suggested are gaps in services and funding –resulting in the suffering of First Nations children.** As articulated by McDonald and Ladd in their comprehensive Joint Policy Review (prepared for the Assembly of First Nations and DIAND): First Nations agencies are expected through their delegation of authority from the provinces, the expectation of their communities, and by DIAND, to provide a comparable range of services on reserve with the funding they receive through Directive 20.1. The formula, however, provides the same level of funding to agencies regardless of how broad, intense or costly, the range of services is (see WEN DE at, pp.90-91).

The issues raised by FNCFS providers demonstrate the tangible effects of funding limitations on the ability of agencies to address the needs of children. **Without funding for provision of preventative services many children are not given the service they require or are unnecessarily removed from their homes and families.** In some provinces the option of removal is even more drastic as children are not funded if placed in the care of family members. The limitations placed on agencies quite clearly jeopardize the well-being of their clients, Aboriginal children and families. As a society we have become increasingly aware of the social devastation of First Nations communities and have discussed at length the importance of healing and cultural revitalization. **Despite this knowledge, however, we maintain policies which perpetuate the suffering of First Nations communities and greatly disadvantage the ability of the next generation to effect the necessary change.** (see WEN DE at, p.93).

[166] The Supreme Court of Canada found that the removal of a child from a parent's custody affects the individual dignity of that parent:

In *Godbout v. Longueuil*, La Forest J. held that: ...the autonomy protected by the s. 7 right to liberty encompasses only those matters that can properly be characterized as fundamentally or inherently personal such that, by their very nature, they implicate basic choices going to the core of what it means to **enjoy individual dignity and independence**... choosing where to establish one's home is, likewise, a quintessentially private decision going to the very heart of personal or individual autonomy.

Although the liberty to choose where one resides is clearly not an inalienable right, it may be considered **a strong argument that children should only be forced to leave their family homes in the most extreme circumstances. This is not the case here as Aboriginal children are removed from their homes in far greater numbers than non-Aboriginal children for the purposes of receiving services.**

**Alternatively, it may be argued that placement of children in care, due to lack of services, amounts to an infringement of the parent's right to security of the person, under s.7.** (see WEN DE at, pp.96-97) (emphasis ours).

[167] According to the Supreme Court of Canada, the removal of a child from a parent's custody adversely impacts the psychological integrity of that parent causing distress, in *New Brunswick (Minister of Health and Community Services) v. G. (J.)*, [1999] 3 S.C.R. 46.

The Supreme Court of Canada found the right to security of the person encompasses psychological integrity and may be infringed by state action ZKLFK FDXVHV VLJQL ç FDQW HPRWLRQDO GLVWUHV V  
 Moreover, it was held that the **loss of a child constitutes the kind of psychological harm** which may found a claim for breach of s.7. Lamer J., for the majority, held: **I have little doubt that state removal of a child from parental custody pursuant to the state's parens patriae jurisdiction constitutes a serious interference with the psychological integrity of the parent...**As an individual's status as a parent is often fundamental to

WE BEGIN OUR DISCUSSION of social policy with a focus on the family because it is our conviction that much of the failure of responsibility that contributes to the current imbalance and distress in Aboriginal life centres around the family. Let us clarify at the outset that the failure of responsibility that we seek to understand and correct is not a failure of Aboriginal families. Rather, it is a failure of public policy to recognize and respect Aboriginal culture and family systems and to ensure a just distribution of the wealth and power of this land so that Aboriginal nations, communities and families can provide for themselves and determine how best to pursue a good life. (see RCAP, vol. 3, at, p. 8).

Josephine Sandy Chair, Ojibway Tribal Family Services Kenora, Ontario, 28 October 1992,

(see RCAP, Gathering strength, vol. 3, at, p. 25) (emphasis ours).

[170] Another report filed in evidence supports the existence of pain and suffering of First Nations children and their families. Several experiences of massive loss have disrupted First Nations families and have resulted in identity problems and difficulties in functioning. In 1996, more than 10% of Aboriginal children (age 0-14) were not living with their parents. see p. 7 Joint National policy review (NPR) exhibit filed into evidence. Akin to the WEN DE report, the Tribunal accepted the findings in the NPR as its own findings (See 2016 CHRT at, para.257) Additionally, Canada was part of this study and fully aware of its findings which in fact exacerbates Canada's wilful and reckless conduct in not correcting the discriminatory practice identified in 2000, year of the report. This will also be discussed later.

[171] More Recently, the Panel made findings that support the findings for pain and suffering of First Nations children and their families when the families are torn apart:

Ms. Marie Wilson, one of the three Commissioners for the TRC mandated to facilitate truth-telling about the residential school experience and lead the country in a process of ongoing healing and reconciliation.15 0 TPa.9(d)16(h) Td [(l)6(0e5-10(C.

Ms. Wilson affirms that they, (the TRC), intentionally centered their 5 first calls to Action specifically on child welfare. This was to shed a focused and prominent light on the fact that **the harms of residential schools happened to children, that the greatest perceived damage to them was their removal from their home and family; and that the legacy of residential schools is not only continuing but getting worse, with increasing numbers of child apprehensions through the child welfare system.** (see 2018 CHRT 4 at, para.124).

In addition to the Legacy calls to action pertaining to child welfare, she explains that they also articulated child welfare goals in the subsequent Reconciliation section. Call to Action 55 underscores the importance of creating and tracking honest measurements of the numbers of Indigenous children still apprehended and why, and the support being provided for them, based on comparative spending in prevention and care. (see 2018 CHRT 4 at, para.125).

According to Ms. Wilson, it is imperative that the child welfare system, which is driving Indigenous children into foster care at disproportionate rates, be immediately addressed. **She has learned firsthand that children who are severed from their families will forever carry with them a lasting and detrimental sense of loss, along with other negative issues that may change the course of their lives.** (see 2018 CHRT 4 at, para.126).

The Panel has made findings on this issue in the *Decision* and we echo Ms. Wilson's call to action to immediately address the causes that drive

[173] This was recBody <</8 12 299.4 744.96 Tm (54)Tj 0 Tc 0 Tw 1Td [(Th2r)17(at)1Th23]Th oft.



the interplay of numerous underlying factors (see for example, 2016 CHRT 2 *Decision* at, para. 187) this does not alleviate Canada's responsibility in the suffering of First Nations children and their families who bore the adverse impacts of Canada's control over the provision of child and family services on First Nations reserves and in the Yukon by the application of the funding formulas under the FNCFS Program.

[178] Moreover, the Panel found that in this case we are in a unique constitutional context namely, Parliament's exclusive legislative authority over "Indians, and lands reserved for Indians" by virtue of section 91(24) of the *Constitution Act*, 1867. Furthermore, Canada, is in a fiduciary relationship with Aboriginal Peoples. What is more, Canada has undertaken to improve outcomes for First Nations children and families in the provision of child and family services. On this basis, the Panel found that more has to be done by Canada to ensure that the provision of child and family services on First Nations reserves is meeting the best interest of those communities and, in the particular context of this case, the best interest of First Nations children (see 2016 CHRT 2 *Decision* at, para. 427).

[179] This also corresponds to Canada's international commitments recognizing the special status of children and Indigenous peoples. Also, the Panel found that Canada provides a service through the FNCFS Program and other related provincial/territorial agreements and method of funding the FNCFS Program and related provincial/territorial agreements significantly controls

preventative services aren't funded, and all these children are being put into care.” (See 2016 CHRT 2 *Decision* at, para.197).

[182] The pain and suffering caused by the unnecessary removal of First Nations children and their families and Canada’s role is at least reasonably quantifiable to \$20,000. While it is the maximum compensation allowed under section 53 (2) (e) of the *CHRA*, it is not much in comparison to the egregious harm suffered by the First Nations children and their families as a result of the racial discrimination and adverse impacts found in this case. Other pain and suffering caused by other actors could potentially be sought in other forums. The Panel’s role is to quantify as best as possible the appropriate remedy to compensate victims/survivors as part of these proceedings with the evidence available.

[183] Furthermore, the AGC relies also on the *Public Service Alliance of Canada v. Canada Post Corporation* case (see 2005 CHRT 39 at para. 991) to suggest that the Tribunal cannot award remedies for pain and suffering to the non-complainant victims “en masse”. The *Canada Post* case made a finding that there was a lack of evidence before the Tribunal and that there was no systemic case. This is different from this case where there is sufficient evidence to support findings of systemic discrimination and findings of suffering borne by the victims/survivors in this case, the First Nations children and their families.

[184] The evidence is ample and sufficient to make a finding that each First Nation child who was unnecessarily removed from its home, family and community has suffered. Any child who was removed and later reunited with its family has suffered during the time of separation and from the lasting effects of trauma from the time of separation.

[185] The evidence is ample and sufficient to make a finding that each parent or grand-parent who had one or more child under her or his care who was unnecessarily removed from its home, family and community has suffered. Any parent or grand-parent if the parents were not caring for the child who had one or more child removed from them and later reunited with them has suffered during the time of separation. The Panel intends to compensate one or both parents who had their children removed from them and, if the parents were absent and the children were in the care of one or more grand-parents, the

grand-parents caring for the children

novelty and uncharted territory found in a case should not intimidate human rights decision-makers to pioneer a right and just path forward for victims/survivors if supported by the evidence and the Statute. As argued by the Commission, sufficiency of evidence is a material consideration.

[189] Furthermore, the impracticalities and the risk of revictimizing children outweigh the difficulty of establishing a process to compensate all the victims/survivors and the need for the evidence presented of having a child testify on how it felt to be separated from its family and community.

[190] The Panel rejects the AGC's argument that there is no evidence of harm the victims suffered as a result of the discrimination to demonstrate that the victims meet the statutory requirements for compensation.

[191] The evidence is sufficient to establish a connection between the systemic racial discrimination and the First Nations children who did not receive services or did receive services that were inadequate and harmful. This was all explained in the *Decision* and it is now too late to challenge those findings. The children should not be penalized because the Panel had outstanding questions concerning compensation which prompted further submissions from the parties.

[192] Finally, on this point, the Panel rejects the assertion made by the AGC that there is no evidence permitting the Panel to determine the extent and seriousness of the harm in order to assess the appropriate compensation for the individual victims. Furthermore, the AGC's argument that there is no evidence of pain and suffering from children and families as a result of the discrimination is simply not true. This is a similar assertion that Canada has made on the evidence to prove the complaint on its merits. In fact, such a conclusion by Canada is concerning to say the least. It also raises questions from this Panel. The harm done to First Nations children who are vulnerable and to families and communities is precisely why the Panel issued numerous rulings requesting immediate action. This Panel recognizes, as described by the Caring Society, the rights of the child are human rights that recognize childhood as an important period of development with special

circumstances. This is also recognized by all levels of Courts in Canada and was discussed in this Panel's *Decision* on the merits 2016 CHRT at, para.346:

A focus on prevention services and least disruptive measures in the provincial statutes mentioned above is inextricably linked to the concept of the best interest of the child: a legal principle of paramount importance in both Canadian and international law (see Canadian Foundation for Children, Youth and the Law v. Canada (Attorney General), 2004 SCC 4 (CanLII) at para. 9; and, Baker v. Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration), 1999 CanLII 699 (SCC), [1999] 2 SCR 817 at para. 75 [Baker]). As explained by Professor Nicholas Bala:

[L]eading Canadian precedents, federal and provincial statutes and international treaties are all premised on the principle that decisions about children should be based on an assessment of their best interests. This is a central concept for those who are involved making decisions about children, not only for judges and lawyers, but for also assessors and mediators (see 2016 CHRT 2 at, para.346).

Child welfare services, or child and family services, are services designed to protect children and encourage family stability. Hence the best interest of the child is a paramount principle in the provision of these services and is a principle recognized in international and Canadian law. This principle is meant to guide and inform decisions that impact all children, including First Nations children (2016 CHRT 2 at, para.3).

[193] This is where the urgency of remedying systemic racial discrimination comes from. It is clearly expressed in the Panel's rulings. Removing children from their homes, families, communities and Nations destroys the Nations' social fabric leading to immense consequences, it is the opposite of building Nations. That is trauma and harm to the highest degree causing pain and suffering.

[194] The Panel's urging Canada to act on a number of occasions was not expressed without a reason. It was for the reason that this case is about children and there is urgency to act and the Panel understood it.

[195] In *Baker v. Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration)*, [1999] 2 SCR 817 at para. 239 [Baker] an appeal against deportation based on the position of Baker's Canadian born children, the Supreme Court held procedural fairness required the decision-maker to consider international law and conventions, including the United Nations' *Convention on the Rights of the Child*, Can. T.S. 1992 No. 3 (the UNCRC). The





**X. The right to exercise individual rights, class action and victims' identification**

[204] The Panel believes that individuals have the right to exercise their individual rights and for those who chose to do so, they should be able to opt-out from receiving the









“ (...) however, when we are dealing with a document of the nature of the



**families living on reserves.** Non-exhaustively, the **main adverse impacts** found by the Panel are: (...) **The narrow definition and inadequate implementation of Jordan's Principle, resulting in service gaps, delays and denials for First Nations children** (see 2016 CHRT 2 at, para.458).

**In January 2017, two twelve-year-old children tragically took their own lives in Wapekeka First Nation ("Wapekeka"), a NAN community. Before the loss of these children, Wapekeka had alerted the federal**









dollars to the victim as the member or panel may determine if the member or panel finds that the person is engaging or has engaged in the discriminatory practice wilfully or recklessly.

[228] The language of the *Act* reproduced above refers to the term victim rather than complainant. As mentioned previously, the wording of the *CHRA* allows for the distinction

[231] The Panel finds that Canada's conduct was devoid of caution with little to no regard to the consequences of its behavior towards First Nations children and their families both in regard to the child welfare program and Jordan's Principle. Canada was aware of the discrimination and of some of its serious consequences on the First Nations children and their families. Canada was made aware by the NPR in 2000 and even more so in 2005 from its participation and knowledge of the WEN DE report. Canada did not take sufficient steps to remedy the discrimination until after the Tribunal's orders. As the Panel already found in previous rulings, Canada focused on financial considerations rather than on the best interest of First Nations children and respecting their human rights.

[232] When looking at the issue of wilful and reckless discriminatory practice, the context of the claim is important. In this case we are in a context of repeated violations of human rights of vulnerable First Nations children over a very long period of time by Canada who has international, constitutional and human rights obligations towards First Nations children and families. Moreover, the Crown must act honourably in all its dealings with Aboriginal Peoples:

First Nations children and families on reserves are in a fiduciary relationship with AANDC. In the provision of the FNCFS Program, its corresponding funding formulas and the other related provincial/territorial agreements, "the degree of economic, social and proprietary control and discretion asserted by the Crown" leaves First Nations children and families "...vulnerable to the risks of government misconduct or ineptitude" (Wewaykum at para. 80). This fiduciary relationship must form part of the context of the Panel's analysis, along with the corollary principle that in all its dealings with Aboriginal peoples, the honour of the Crown is always at stake. As affirmed by the Supreme Court in Haida Nation, at paragraph 17:

Nothing less is required if we are to achieve "the reconciliation of the pre-existence of aboriginal societies with the sovereignty of the Crown": Delgamuukw, supra, at para. 186, quoting Van der Peet, supra, at para. 31, (see *Decision* 2016 CHRT 2 at, para. 95).

[233] In light of Canada's obligations above mentioned, the fact that the systemic racial discrimination adversely impacts children and causes them harm, pain and suffering is an aggravating factor than cannot be overlooked.

[234] The Panel finds it has sufficient evidence to find that Canada's conduct was wilful and reckless



(Annex, ex. 35 at pp. 2-3 [Putting Children and Families First in Alberta presentation]) (see 2016 CHRT 2 at, para.270).

Putting Children and Families First in Alberta presentation touts prevention as the ideal option to address these problems at page 4:

**Early prevention and child-centered outcomes are the missing pieces of the puzzle for FN children and families living on reserve**

**Early prevention supports the agenda for improving quality of life for children and families thereby leading to improved outcomes in the areas of early childhood development, education, and health** (see 2016 CHRT 2 at, para.271).

Finally, the Putting Children and Families First in Alberta presentation states at page 5:

The facts are clear:

**Wen:De Report - Early intervention/prevention is KEY**

[...]

[238] The above citations were presentations prepared by staff in the Federal Government supporting the fact that they were well aware of what needed to be done to

2076-589 00hm2(i)7(6)2(a) edve cerd7(6) 00ai(t)2aopes2(at)2( t)1.9(h)10( o)10(pe.9( t)1.92(h)1 ( e )10

Canada to obtain each First Nation agency and First Nation's specific needs. Finally, allowing those agencies that confirm they lack capacity to keep the budget funds from year to year instead of returning them could potentially assist in addressing the issue. As far as other agencies that do have capacity are concerned, **Canada is unilaterally deciding for them and delaying prevention services and least disruptive measures under a false premise. Proceeding in this fashion is harming children** (see 2018 CHRT 4 at para.143). [161] The Panel has always recognized that there may be some children in need of protection who need to be removed from their homes. However, in the *Decision*, the findings highlighted the fact that too many children were removed unnecessarily, when they could have had the opportunity to remain at home with prevention services. (see 2018 CHRT 4 at, para.161).

**The Panel finds it problematic that again, Canada's rationale is based on the funding cycle not the best interests of children, and not on being found liable under the CHRA.**



and funding for the FNCFS Program under Directive 20-1 has on the outcomes for First Nations children (see 2016 CHRT 2 at, para.276).

However, as the 2008 Report of the Auditor General of Canada, the 2009 Report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, the 2011 Status Report of the Auditor General of Canada, and the 2012 Report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts pointed out, while the EPFA is an improvement on Directive 20-1, it still relies on the problematic assumptions regarding children in care, families in need, and population levels to determine f



While Canada provided assistance once the Wapekeka suicides occurred, the flaws in the Jordan's Principle process left any chance of preventing the Wapekeka tragedy unaddressed and the tragic events only triggered a reactive response to then provide services. On a positive note, as mentioned above, Health Canada has since committed to establishing a Choose Life Working Group with the NAN, aimed at establishing a concrete, simplified process for communities to apply for Child-First Initiative (Jordan's Principle) funding. Nevertheless, the tragic events in Wapekeka highlight the need for a shift in process coordination around Jordan's Principle (see 2017 CHRT 14 at, para. 90).

Ms. Buckland acknowledged that the Wapekeka proposal identified a gap in services and that Jordan's Principle funds could have been allocated to address that gap. Despite this, and the fact that it was a life or death situation, Ms. Buckland indicated that because it was a group request, it would be processed like any other group request and go forward for the Assistant Deputy Minister's signature. In the end, she suggested it would have likely taken a period of two weeks to address the Wapekeka proposal (see Transcript of Cross-Examination of Ms. Buckland at p. 174, lines 19-21; p. 175, lines 1-4; p. 180, lines 1-9; and, p. 182, lines 11-16). (see 2017 CHRT.E aTw -o w shet 11



1.0 To ensure that the full range of harms are redressed, we recommend that a lump sum award be granted to any person who attended an Indian Residential School, irrespective of whether they suffered separate harms generated by acts of sexual, physical or severe emotional abuse.

The Indian Residential School Policy was based on racial identity. It forced students to attend designated schools and removed them from their families and communities. The Policy has been criticized extensively. The consequences of this policy were devastating to individuals and communities alike, and they have been well documented. The distinctive and unique forms of harm that were a direct consequence of this government policy include reduced self-esteem, isolation from family, loss of language, loss of culture, spiritual harm, loss of a reasonable quality of

**Compensation for First Nations children and their parents or grand-parents in cases of unnecessary removal of a child in the child welfare system**

[245] The Panel finds there is sufficient evidence and other information (see section 50 (3) (c) of the *CHRA*), in this case to establish, on a balance of probabilities, that Canada's systemic racial discr



communities. Those children experienced pain and suffering of the worst kind warranting the maximum award of remedy of \$20,000 under section 53 (2)(e) of the *CHRA*. Canada is ordered to pay \$20,000 to each First Nation child removed from its home, family and Community from **January 1, 2006** until the earliest of the following options occur: the Panel informed by the parties and the evidence makes a determination that the unnecessary removal of First Nations children from their homes, families and communities as a result of the discrimination found in this case has ceased; the parties agreed on a settlement agreement for effective and meaningful long term relief; the Panel ceases to retain jurisdiction and beforehand amends this order. Also, following the process discussed below.

**Compensation for First Nations children and their parents or grand-parents in cases of unnecessary removal of a child to obtain essential services and/or experienced gaps, delays and denials of services that would have been available under Jordan's Principle**

[250] The Panel finds there is sufficient evidence and other information in this case to establish, on a balance of probabilities, that Canada's systemic racial discrimination found in the Tribunal's *Decision* 2016 CHRT 2 and subsequent rulings: 2017 CHRT 7, 2017 CHRT 14, 2017 CHRT 35 and 2018 CHRT 4, resulted in harming First Nations children living on reserve or off-reserve who, as a result of a gap, delay and/or denial of services were deprived of essential services and placed in care outside of their homes, families and communities in order to receive those services or without being placed in out of home care were denied services and therefore did not benefit from services covered under Jordan's Principle as defined in 2017 CHRT 17 and 35 (for example, mental health and suicide preventions services, special education, dental etc.). Finally, children who received services upon reconsideration ordered by this Tribunal and children who received services with unreasonable delays have also suffered during the time of the delays and denials. All those children above mentioned experienced pain and suffering of the worst kind warranting the maximum award of remedy of \$20,000 under section 53 (2)(e) of the *CHRA*. Canada is ordered to pay \$ 20,000 to each First Nation child removed from its home and placed in care in order to access services and for each First Nations child who

was not removed from the home and was denied services or received services after an unreasonable delay or upon reconsideration ordered by this Tribunal, between **December 12, 2007** (date of the adoption in the House of Commons of the Jordan's Principle) and **November 2, 2017** (date of the Tribunal's 2017 CHRT 35 ruling on Jordan's Principle), following the process discussed below.

[251] The Panel finds there is sufficient evidence and other information in this case to establish, on a balance of probabilities, that Canada's systemic racial discrimination found in the Tribunal's *Decision* 2016 CHRT 2 and subsequent rulings: 2017 CHRT 7, 2017 CHRT 14, 2017 CHRT 35 and 2018 CHRT 4, resulted in harming First Nations parents or grand-parents living on reserve or off reserve who, as a result of a gap, delay and/or denial of services were deprived of essential services for their child and had their child placed in care outside of their homes, families and communities in order to receive those services and therefore, did not benefit from services covered under Jordan's Principle as defined in 2017 CHRT 17 and 35. Those parents or grand-parents experienced pain and suffering of the worst kind warranting the maximum award of remedy of \$20,000 under section 53 (2)(e) of the CHRA. Canada is ordered to pay \$ 20,000 to each First Nation parent or grand-parent who had their child removed and placed in out-of-home care in order to access services and for each First Nations parent or grand-parent who's child was not removed from the home and was denied services or received services after an unreasonable delay or upon reconsideration ordered by this Tribunal, between **December 12, 2007** (date of the adoption in the House of Commons of the Jordan's Principle) and **November 2, 2017** (date of the Tribunal's 2017 CHRT 35 ruling on Jordan's Principle), following the process discussed below.

[252] It should be understood that the pain and suffering compensation for a First Nation child, parent or grand-parent covered under the Jordan's Principle orders cannot be combined with the other orders for compensation for removal of a home, a family and a community rather, the removal of a child from a home is included in the Jordan's Principle orders.

[253] The Panel finds as explained above there is sufficient evidence and other information in this case to establish on a balance of probabilities that Canada was aware





compensated \$20,000 under section 53 (3) of the *CHRA* per child who was unnecessarily apprehended or denied essential services.

#### **XV. Process for compensation**

[258] The Panel in considering access to justice, efficiency and expeditiousness has opted for the above orders to avoid a case-by-case assessment of degrees of pain and suffering for each child, parent or grand-parent referred to in the orders above. As stated by the NAN, there is no perfect solution on this issue, the Panel agrees. The difficulty of the task at hand does not justify denying compensation to victims/survivors. In recognizing that the maximum of \$20,000 is warranted for any of the situations described above, the case-by-case analysis of pain and suffering is avoided and it is attributed to a vulnerable group of victims/survivors who as exemplified by the evidence in this case have suffered as a result of the systemic racial discrimination. Some children and parents or grand-parents may have suffered more than others however, the compensation remedies are capped under the *CHRA* and the Panel cannot award more than the maximum allowed even if it is a small amount in comparison to the degree of harm and of racial discrimination experienced by the First Nations children and their families. The maximum compensation awarded is considered justifiable for any child or adult being part of the groups identified in the orders above.

per se, rather it objects that the compensation be paid in a trust fund to finance services and healing activities in lieu of financial compensation as suggested by the Caring Society. Such meaningful activities should be offered by Canada however, not in replacement of financial compensation to victims/survivors. Financial Compensation belongs to the victims/survivors who are the ones who should be empowered to decide for themselves on how best to use this financial compensation.

[261] However, the Panel also acknowledges the Caring Society's argument that it is not appropriate to pay \$40,000 to a 3-year-old. Therefore, there is a need to establish a process where the children who are under 18 or 21 years old have the compensation paid to them secured in a fund that would be accessible upon reaching majority.

[262] In terms of Jordan's Principle, many children who were denied services and who are still living with their parents could have the compensation funds administered by their parents or grand-parents until the age of majority.

[263] For all the other children who have no parents, grand-parents or responsible adult family members and who are underage, a trust fund could be an option amongst others that should be part of the discussions referred to below.

[264] Special protections for mentally disabled children and parents or grand-parents who abuse substances that may affect their judgment should be considered in the process.

[265] It would be preferable that the Social benefits of victims/survivors not be affected by compensation remedies. This can form part of the process for compensation discussions.

[266] The possibility for individual victims/survivors to opt-out should form part of this compensation process.

[267] Given that the parties and interested parties in this case are all First Nations except the Commission and the AGC and, that they all have different views on the appropriate definition of a First Nation child in this case, it is paramount that this form part of the discussions on the process for compensation. The Panel reiterates that it recognizes the First Nations





