



INQUIRY RESPECTING THE TREATMENT, EXPERIENCES AND OUTCOMES OF INNU IN THE CHILD PROTECTION SYSTEM

English Transcript

Volume 49

*Commissioners: Retired Judge James Igloliorte, Dr. Mike Devine and
Anastasia Qupee*

Wednesday

9 April 2025

COMMISSIONER IGLOLIORTE: Good morning, everyone.

We're going to start the formalities today by asking Elder Penote Antuan to start the day with a prayer.

ELDER ANTUAN: What I want to say first thing in the morning, I'd like to thank you, everybody and have a good day, and I'll start a prayer for you people.

[Sheshatshiu-aimun spoken.]

Thank you and have a good day.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, Penote.

COMMISSIONER IGLOLIORTE: Elder, we're so grateful for your words of comfort and giving us the right way to start off our hearing again today.

My fellow Commissioners will have some small announcements to make.

COMMISSIONER DEVINE: Good morning, everyone, and thank you.

So it'll just be two announcements we wanted to make this morning. The first one is regarding the healing services team and those who have been attending to the Inquiry. We felt it was important to acknowledge the hard work of the healing services workers and interpreters.

Our healing services team is led by Edward Nuna in Sheshatshiu and by Ivy Pijogge-Andrew in Natuashish. These individuals have attended all Inquiry proceedings. They have borne witness and provided emotional support during and after the Inquiry's time in the communities. These folks work with the Innu Round Table, SIFN Social Health and MIFN Health Commission, and they are mostly Innu, but also include non-Innu.

COMMISSIONER QUPEE: [Sheshatshiu-aimun spoken.]

First of all, good morning and pleased to be here. I was watching on Zoom, so it's

different when you're on Zoom than in person. So I'm glad to be here.

[Sheshatshiu-aimun spoken.]

I'm gonna speak in English.

I know it's hard to be here, to hear the family's stories with the new details, with the raw emotion through the person who lived them. It is a heavy task. We wanted to take this time to acknowledge and thank you for all carrying this burden and helping to lighten the load for other community members. Your support has been invaluable.

As a small token of our appreciation, we have certificates and all healing services workers and the people that have come forward with their stories will receive a certificate, for people that have shared their stories with the Inquiry.

They will receive a certificate and they will receive a USB with their story, because a lot of times in our experience has been that we share a lot of stories to people outside. And people give up freely of their time and their stories. And we felt it was important for the Inquiry to give those stories back of what we've heard, and for families, for their own keepsake and what they would like to – who they would like to share it with.

So I'd like to thank Jeannie, Jeannie Nuna, who made this Innu mitt, miniature ones, and we put a USB into it. And so that's a token of our appreciation for the people that came forward and shared their stories, and they will get a certificate of appreciation along with it. So Paula, our clerk, will be – is in charge of that. So I know that she's contacted people as well, but they'll be here at the CYN.

That's it, I think. Yeah, that's it. Thank you.

Tshinashkumitin.

COMMISSIONER IGLOLIORTE:
Tshinashkumitin now also, Commissioner Qupee and Commissioner Devine.

We would also offer our congratulations, and we will write a letter to George Gregoire Jr. His story and his journey of healing was on CBC this morning. So we will offer him our congratulations as a small token of our recognition of people who are working so hard for the communities to make changes in their personal lives, and to influence others as well.

So thank you very much, and I will turn it over to our lead counsel to continue the day.

C. URQUHART: Thank you, Commissioners.

And I just wanna echo the thanks to all those who've shared their stories and the healing services workers who've borne witness to that; such an important part of this Inquiry. So, grateful to all of those folks.

Today, this morning, we're going to hear the pre-recorded testimony of Ms. Jennifer Barnes. Following that, we'll have a brief break, and then we'll have Ms. Barnes, Ms. Lundrigan and Ms. Shallow available for questions from the three governments, so the province, Canada and the Innu Representative Organizations. After that, we will have an opportunity for the counsel for those witnesses to ask any questions, and then Commission counsel and yourselves.

Thank you.

[Video played.]

COMMISSIONER IGLOLIORTE: All right then. That is a good and positive note to end on.

We've – for the last few days, arising from the testimonies of June 24 to March – 2024 – to March 2025, we have seen witnesses talk about the evolution of this developing relationship leading to the Inquiry that we're heading. And we're grateful for each of the individuals who testified. We're grateful to the work of IRT, Canada, the province, to make sure that we act in a manner that continues to emphasize reconciliation.

So we've finished with the testimonies; Caitlin, you can tell us now what happens next this morning.

C. URQUHART: Thank you, Commissioners.

We – excuse me – we'll take a brief break and then we will return for questions from the parties.

COMMISSIONER IGLOLIORTE: Thank you.

Ten minutes please.

Recess

COMMISSIONER IGLOLIORTE: Welcome back, everyone. And welcome especially to the three witnesses who have previously testified, Ms. Barnes, Ms. Lundrigan and Ms. Shallow. We're very grateful, we're very happy that you are joining us today. And this will be an opportunity for the parties withstanding for questions.

So, Ms. Urquhart, you can let us know how we're proceeding.

C. URQUHART: Thank you, Commissioner.

So I've confirmed with my friends for Canada and the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador that they have no questions. So our first questions will be from the counsel for the Innu Representative Organizations, Ben Brookwell.

And as you know, we have Ms. Lundrigan and Ms. Shallow appearing remotely from St. John's, and Ms. Barnes is here in the room.

And, again, we'll have interpretation by Nympha Byrne and Lisa Rich. So just a reminder for everyone to please pause after, you know, after your answer or question to allow for interpretation.

COMMISSIONER IGLOLIORTE: Yes, that's very good advice. Remember that we have

a dialect for Sheshatshiu community and a dialect for Natuashish. So it will be – both of the translators will have to absorb what you're saying and then speak it in their language. It takes a bit of time and you have to be a little bit patient, but we'd really appreciate if you would.

You may begin, Sir. Please introduce yourself.

B. BROOKWELL: Good morning.

My name is Benjamin Brookwell, and I'm counsel for the Innu Representative Organizations. And I just want to flag for folks participating remotely, the camera for you is over here and Jennifer is sitting over here. So if I'm not looking at you, it's because I'm trying to work out which way to point myself. So if you see me looking the wrong way, that's why.

C. URQUHART: So for Ms. Shallow, I think – can you say something? I just wanna make sure our audio is working.

M. SHALLOW: Hi.

C. URQUHART: Okay, thank you.

M. SHALLOW: Good?

C. URQUHART: Yes. Yeah, we can hear you.

B. BROOKWELL: So before I begin, I just want to confirm what you have in front of you. Do you have the copies of exhibits that have been provided for this examination? I see Jennifer's got a book, but I'm just checking to see that you do remotely.

M. SHALLOW: Yes; yes we do.

COMMISSIONER IGLOLIORTE: We'll have that interpreted.

INTERPRETER RICH: [Sheshatshiu-aimun spoken.]

INTERPRETER BYRNE: [Mushuau-aimun spoken.]

B. BROOKWELL: So the first few questions I want to start with are about, sort of, where we are now. And then I'm gonna go backward in time. I just wanted to start with that.

So, Ms. Barnes, I have a few questions to start with what we heard this morning about the 2021 Protocol Agreement. And the first question is just to confirm that it replaces the 2015 Working Relationship Agreement. Is that accurate?

J. BARNES: Just making sure you can hear me.

Yes, the 2021 protocol replaced the 2015 Working Relationship Agreement.

B. BROOKWELL: And that 2015 agreement itself replaced the 2012 MOUs, is that right?

J. BARNES: Yes, that's correct.

B. BROOKWELL: So the protocol, as I understand it, sets out in some detail how the Innu and the province will work together. Is that your understanding as well?

J. BARNES: Yes, that's correct. The protocol sets out how the two parties would work together in fairly significant detail.

B. BROOKWELL: And I'd like to go through a little bit, just some of that detail. And I understand that it's setting out how to support front-line workers. Would you agree with that?

J. BARNES: Sure, yes.

B. BROOKWELL: And it also sets out – this is broadly speaking – developing Innu capacity to provide services?

J. BARNES: Yes, that's correct.

B. BROOKWELL: I'm wondering if you would agree then that this protocol – I think you described as an evolution – but it marks a significant change in how child welfare services will be provided in Innu communities.

J. BARNES: I would say that yes, that's – that was certainly the intention. I was not – I'm no longer with the department, so I haven't been there to see how it has been implemented. But certainly that was the intention, to change how services were delivered in both Innu communities.

B. BROOKWELL: Let's stick with the intention then for the moment. Would you agree that there's an intention, at least from your experience with this, for the Innu to take a greater lead on child welfare services? Is that fair?

INTERPRETER BYRNE: [Mushuau-aimun spoken.]

INTERPRETER RICH: Mr. Ben, can you repeat what you said? Is that –?

B. BROOKWELL: Yeah, so sticking with intention, that there is an intention for the Innu to take a greater role in child welfare services; whether you agree with that.

INTERPRETER RICH: [Sheshatshiu-aimun spoken.]

J. BARNES: Yes, I think that's fair to say, that the intention was that the protocol would lay out all of the ways that the Innu would take more of a role in delivering services, and how the department staff – any new staff would work together to deliver services in the community.

B. BROOKWELL: I want to explore that, kind of, co-operation or co-ordination a little. Does that include greater information sharing between the department and Innu Prevention workers, for example?

J. BARNES: Yes, I think in terms of one of the goals of this protocol, it really was to improve on the way information was shared. We had the provincial legislation and the federal legislation that both clearly outlined opportunities and obligations around information sharing.

And I think it would be fair to say that we consistently would hear from IRT staff that if they had access to information sooner, if they knew that families were struggling or needed some assistance, they would be better able to intervene sooner in an Innu way.

So the protocol very clearly outlines in very specific detail to support operations, how and when information would be shared and what people could do with that information.

The –

COMMISSIONER IGLOLIORTE:
(Inaudible) to stop.

J. BARNES: Oh, sorry.

INTERPRETER BYRNE: Can you not talk too fast?

J. BARNES: Sorry.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sorry!

INTERPRETER BYRNE: You're gone too fast.

J. BARNES: Sorry.

INTERPRETER BYRNE: I have a problem catching her words sometimes. It's too fast.

J. BARNES: Do you want me to –?

INTERPRETER BYRNE: No, that's fine.

J. BARNES: Okay.

INTERPRETER BYRNE: [Mushuau-aimun spoken.]

Lundrigan, right?

J. BARNES: Barnes.

INTERPRETER BYRNE: Barnes.

[Mushuau-aimun spoken.]

INTERPRETER RICH: [Sheshatshiu-aimun spoken.]

J. BARNES: The other piece that I would add to that is that probably the biggest change from an information-sharing perspective here was the move to proactive disclosure. So prior to this, social workers would share information with IRT staff, but only after they had spoken with the family and gotten consent to do that.

Sometimes that was either delaying things or maybe a family wasn't comfortable to provide consent at that time. So the move was to share information right away so that the IRT staff could respond and support families as soon as CSSD had information that they needed assistance or support.

B. BROOKWELL: This question is following up with you, Ms. Barnes, but if Ms. Shallow or Ms. Lundrigan wish to add to it, please feel free to jump in. I know I'm looking this way and that way. But can you tell us, then, how information was being requested or shared before this proactive approach?

J. BARNES: So I didn't work in community. So I can't speak with any certainty about what things looked like day to day. But my understanding is that information was being shared under, you know, the 2012 MOU and the 2015 agreement. There were some provisions around information sharing, but I'm not recalling what those were.

And certainly there would have been opportunities to have some case-level discussions and certainly with parent consent. So if a parent agreed to have their information shared with IRT staff or either of the two community staff, that certainly would

have occurred. But perhaps not in a way that was as structured and consistent as would be the case under the new protocol.

W. LUNDRIGAN: Okay, I'm Wanda. I'd just like to concur with what Jennifer said. I was there in 2012 and part of that initial MOU, and there was an awful lot of informal sharing of information, and any information that was possible to be shared under the legislation of the day was certainly shared.

B. BROOKWELL: I'm going to shift now from the protocol, to ask some questions about recent Innu facilities, particularly group homes.

So I'm going to ask some questions about four facilities that are relatively recent, so I think it may be Ms. Barnes that is able to speak to them. The four are the Sheshatshiu group home that reopened in 2018, the 2019 Natuashish emergency placement home, and the 2020 – two homes – opening here in Sheshatshiu for emergency placement.

B. BROOKWELL: So my first question about those homes are – is whether you're familiar with them.

J. BARNES: Yes, I am.

B. BROOKWELL: And to your knowledge, are these homes approved by the province under provincial rules?

J. BARNES: Yes, when each of those homes opened, they would have been assessed and approved using the provincial standards in place at the time, and also run with additional programming in place that is Innu-specific.

B. BROOKWELL: And are you familiar with how these homes are funded?

J. BARNES: I am familiar with how they were funded when I left the department. I'm not certain if that would be the same, but yes.

B. BROOKWELL: Okay, let's stick with that period of time; I don't want you to speculate about now.

So at that period of time, can you tell us how they were funded, or by whom?

J. BARNES: My recollection would be that the two group home boards, SIM and MIG, as we would have called them, entered into service agreements with the province, and funding would have come from the province to the group home boards to support their operations. But I believe – I'm fairly certain that the federal government would have provided reimbursement funding to the province for the cost of the facilities.

B. BROOKWELL: And this is only to the extent that you know – I don't need you to guess, is – do you know when this federal reimbursement would have started, or has it always been in place? I'm thinking particularly: Is this some program that came after 2017, or was the federal government always providing reimbursement for funding for group homes?

J. BARNES: I don't know. The group home in – the first, I guess, reopening – of the group home in Sheshatshiu would have happened in 2018. I do recall that the Innu communities, the provincial government and federal government would have been having discussions about the home and how they would be supported, and certainly – I think it may have been IRT or others – would have sought federal support for training and group home development.

I believe that the funding or reimbursement that was coming as it related to the group homes was really in terms of federal funding for children in care. That would be my recollection and understanding.

B. BROOKWELL: I'm just having a look at the time, and I didn't know what time you wanted to break for lunch today, 12 or earlier.

C. URQUHART: If now's an appropriate time to break, I would recommend we break for an hour now.

COMMISSIONER IGLOLIORTE: Let's ask the witnesses in St. John's how much time do you need, considering that we don't have traffic issues, but you do. You're probably in a part of town where it's not gonna be easy to get around, so let us know if you need one hour or an hour and a half.

W. LUNDRIGAN: An hour is fine.

M. SHALLOW: An hour is fine.

Thank you.

C. URQUHART: We do have – I think we have flexibility in our schedule to return at 1:30 if you prefer.

M. SHALLOW: We're good; one is good for us.

COMMISSIONER IGLOLIORTE: Are you saying one hour is good?

M. SHALLOW: Yes, thank you.

COMMISSIONER IGLOLIORTE: Thank you very much everyone. The progress is good and I think the way that you've established how the interpreters can see some of the questions or at least see where you're going is very good. We'll take a break for an hour and come back then.

Thank you.

M. SHALLOW: Thank you.

Recess

COMMISSIONER IGLOLIORTE: Good afternoon, everyone.

I know we don't have the Mushuau dialect interpreter here at the present time, but I think we'll make a start.

I'm sorry, we don't have the Sheshatshiu Innu dialect interpreter here at the moment. But I think we'll be able to make a start, and I'm sure she'll appear shortly.

Thank you for your patience.

You can turn off the fan for us, Ruth, and we'll be able to start.

B. BROOKWELL: Okay, good afternoon.

Where I'd like to pick up is now in 2019, to talk a bit about the legislative change. And the questions I want to ask you about is the Indigenous representative that came out of that legislation. And the first question, of course, is: Are you familiar with that position identified in the 2019 legislation?

J. BARNES: Yes, I'm familiar with that.

B. BROOKWELL: And to your knowledge, was there any provincial funding for that position?

J. BARNES: No, there was no provincial funding allocated for those positions.

B. BROOKWELL: I want to take another step backward in time to 2015, and to talk a little bit about the Working Relationship Agreement.

And I think this point of time overlaps more than one person. So if you feel like you have something to add to it, please go ahead. But my first question to the panel is whether that agreement was drafted together with the Innu.

M. SHALLOW: (Inaudible) actually (inaudible) the document.

B. BROOKWELL: If you need to find it, it's Exhibit P-050.

M. SHALLOW: We found it.

J. BARNES: While they're looking, I can comment that I was not part of any discussions or negotiations around the 2015 Working Relationship Agreement, so I have nothing helpful to add.

B. BROOKWELL: Okay.

M. SHALLOW: Hi, it's Michelle, and I don't recall being involved with that specifically. I mean, I may have been connected to some conversations about the agreement, but I wasn't part of the process itself.

B. BROOKWELL: Okay.

And that's fine. I don't want anyone to answer if they have no knowledge about it.

What I'd like to turn to, is just having a look at the agreement, and looking at page 2 – and that's page 2 in the top right corner, as well as page 2 of the agreement itself. And if you'll just take a moment to refresh yourself and read the first two bullet points to yourself – I don't need you to read it out – and then I'll ask you a couple of questions.

And so here I'm mostly interested in your experience on how this actually rolled out. That's what the language is. And what I understand it's contemplating is the department consulting with Innu workers about Innu child protection cases. Does that reflect the understanding that you would've had at the time?

M. SHALLOW: I was in the Policy Development Division at the time, and like I said, we may have had some tangential input into it, but I would imagine a lot of this happened at the operational level. So I can't really comment specifically on that, but I just wanted to say that.

J. BARNES: And, again, I wouldn't have been involved in – you know, I agree with Michelle's point that this would have really been operationalized at the regional level between CSSD staff and the Innu staff that would have been in place at the time. And recalling that, that would've been 2015, and the structure that the Innu and IRT would have had was quite different than it is now. So I believe that when we started to have discussions about the 2021 protocol, it was really building on some of the principles that were in the 2015 agreement under the new framework, that we were able to work under.

B. BROOKWELL: I'll move to something else then in this agreement. On page 4, the top of that page, there's a heading about Out of Community Review. And before I get into questions about that, the first one would be if you have any knowledge or familiarity with the Out of Community Review reference there?

INTERPRETER RICH: Where are you?

B. BROOKWELL: Oh, I've turned the page over to page 4. I've skipped ahead a bunch. Sorry. I can repeat it.

INTERPRETER RICH: Okay.

B. BROOKWELL: So I'd like to ask questions about the "Out of Community Review" on page 4 of this exhibit. And my first question is whether you are familiar or have knowledge about the Out of Community Review.

INTERPRETER RICH: Is this the same paper you have?

B. BROOKWELL: I think it's the same, but I haven't asked it exactly how it's written there.

INTERPRETER RICH: Oh, okay.

B. BROOKWELL: I'm sorry. I've deviated from the plan.

INTERPRETER RICH: Okay.

[Dialogue between Interpreter Rich and Interpreter Byrne in Innu-aimun.]

INTERPRETER RICH: [Sheshatshiu-aimun spoken.]

Can I – can we have your paper here? I don't really – can you repeat it again?

B. BROOKWELL: Yeah, yeah, no problem at all. It's me going off course, so I'll just shorten it to say –

INTERPRETER RICH: Yeah.

B. BROOKWELL: – whether you have any knowledge or experience about the Out of Community Review?

J. BARNES: No, it's not something I would have been involved with. Again, I apologize that this is my answer again, but this really would have been something that would have been led by Regional Operations Branch, who would have worked with the communities on any of these sorts of initiatives. I seem to recall being aware of it after the fact, maybe many years later we would have had some discussions around that. But no involvement at the time, that I can recall.

B. BROOKWELL: Okay.

Was that the same for the rest of the panel?

M. SHALLOW: Sorry.

Yeah, I mean, I was certainly familiar that there were children from the Innu communities that were out of their communities, and – but I concur with Jennifer in that that type of work would've definitely happened at the operational level. So we – you know, my division wouldn't have been involved, unless it was a policy issue that was impeding the review, or maybe a policy issue that would help support the review.

B. BROOKWELL: I think before I get too far down this road, I'll ask a different question than what's on the plan.

You've mentioned Regional Operations Branch. So if were in this period of time, do you know who that might be, or who may be able to speak to these kinds of questions?

M. SHALLOW: Hi, it's Michelle again.

The document – the signatories on the document are the minister of the day, and the assistant deputy minister of Regional Operations. It wasn't Wanda, 'cause she was retired at that point, but I'm not sure who it was after Wanda. I can't remember. And also, there would have been a director –

W. LUNDRIGAN: A regional director.

M. SHALLOW: – a regional director at the time. And I don't know who that was. I don't know.

B. BROOKWELL: Thank you for that. That's helpful to have a sense of where to look next.

Just to close off this topic, I'd like to know if you know what the – kind of – results were of the review, if that ever came to your attention.

J. BARNES: I'm not aware of any of the specific outcomes of the review, but if we think about the timeline, it would have been 2015 into 2016. And around that time, we would've, I think, been having more discussions around Innu concerns about children being out of community and out of province. And it would have been, I believe, in 2016 when the first proposals were identified to develop placement resources, group homes and emergency placement homes in community, with a desire to bring children home. So while I can't speak to the review in particular, I suspect there may have been some relationship there.

B. BROOKWELL: Okay.

I'm gonna move to a different review, but at the same time, 2015 – I understand that's when a legislative review was starting. And just to begin, were you involved at all with that review?

J. BARNES: Can I – I believe you're referring to the review that began in 2016, the legislative review?

B. BROOKWELL: Yes, that's right. My apologies, the date's off.

J. BARNES: Okay, just confirming. Yes, familiar with that.

M. SHALLOW: Hi, it's Michelle, and I am also familiar with the review.

B. BROOKWELL: So just to situate us, I understand that review was about the

province's protection legislation and to consider updates to the legislation. Is that right?

W. LUNDRIGAN: (Inaudible.)

J. BARNES: Yes, it would've been to review the act and consider any areas for improvement.

B. BROOKWELL: And I think I understand from your evidence that this was the first time where the province was asking the Innu for input about this change to legislation. Do I have that right?

M. SHALLOW: Michelle.

I mean, I can't say if you're right or not. I can only speak to the period of time that we – you know, the review that I was involved with. And we did – as Jennifer had, you know, spoken to already – engage the Innu in that review. Whether or not people before us did it on other reviews, I don't know.

W. LUNDRIGAN: (Inaudible) were involved in that review, but (inaudible) around the legislative.

M. SHALLOW: Yeah, the – in the *Children and Youth Care and Protection Act*.

W. LUNDRIGAN: Yeah.

M. SHALLOW: So were the Innu engaged then?

W. LUNDRIGAN: Well, we had pretty broad consultation. We would definitely –

M. SHALLOW: Yeah, (inaudible.)

W. LUNDRIGAN: I'm sorry.

Sorry, I interrupted.

B. BROOKWELL: That's okay.

What we'll do is translate for a moment and then you can continue.

INTERPRETER RICH: [Sheshatshiu-aimun spoken.]

INTERPRETER BYRNE: [Mushuau-aimun spoken.]

B. BROOKWELL: Okay, maybe we can –

INTERPRETER RICH: Can she repeat what she said?

B. BROOKWELL: Yeah, I was going to say could you repeat your answer, because I think the translation side, we only got to the question. If you could maybe repeat your answer to, you know, what knowledge you have about engagement with Innu for this legislative review.

M. SHALLOW: Are you talking to me?

INTERPRETER RICH: Yes.

B. BROOKWELL: Yeah.

M. SHALLOW: Yes, we – you know, the Innu were involved. We did do consultations with them. They did provide submissions. We had many, many conversations with the Innu about how we could strengthen the act, to support them and their children and their families in their communities. So, yes, is my answer.

B. BROOKWELL: And I think I heard your answer to this already, but I'll ask just so I'm clear. Do you know if this kind of engagement happened in the past between the province and Innu about child welfare legislation? So going before 2016.

M. SHALLOW: I mean, I don't – I was involved in the review of the act prior to that, but not at that intimate level. Like, you – I know that there was another lawyer and Wanda were involved specifically. And so I don't know if you could speak to that.

W. LUNDRIGAN: Okay, so the first review – if I may – so when the department transferred to Child, Youth and Family Services as an independent department, we did a review of the child welfare legislation at that time. Michelle would have been involved, obviously, because she was in the policy shop. We – when we did that

legislative review, there was a requirement for a statutory review within five years.

The focus – it was old legislation. There were a huge amount of changes. The focus – we would have done consultations and there would have been regional involvement and input; not to the extent that there was in 2016, when there was specific and very focused recognition that the legislation –

INTERPRETER RICH: Sorry, can I cut you off here a little bit, because you're talking –

COMMISSIONER IGLOLIORTE: Yeah, so we'll do that much and then we'll continue on, so that they can absorb what's been said and translate.

W. LUNDRIGAN: Sorry.

INTERPRETER RICH: Yeah.

INTERPRETER BYRNE: Okay.

INTERPRETER RICH: [Sheshatshiu-aimun spoken.]

INTERPRETER BYRNE: [Mushuau-aimun spoken.]

B. BROOKWELL: So I think you can continue from where you left off. You were talking about the change from regional input from that first round of reviews to now the more detailed input, and then I think you (inaudible) you wanted to –

W. LUNDRIGAN: Right, so I wasn't there, obviously, to do the review in 2016. But I am certainly well aware that when we did the original review, there was some consultation not focused on Indigenous people, with recognition, obviously that there had to be some changes at some point.

But we were not in a position at that time to work either with the Innu people or the services that were available on the ground, to be able to incorporate what we foresaw as being needed in the future, if that makes any sense at all.

So, yes, of course there was some consultation, but not a focused consultation, when in 2015, '16, they – we recognized or they recognized, people who were on the ground, that there had to be some focus, there had to be special provisions. Hence the much greater involvement of those discussions.

M. SHALLOW: Could I make another comment on that question?

B. BROOKWELL: Yes, of course.

M. SHALLOW: I just wanted to say that, you know, the structure of child welfare within government and within health boards, changed many – I mean, I worked for 30 years, and I think it changed maybe eight or nine times in the course of that.

When the new CYFS department was created in '09, we had been 10 years in – the program had been devolved, I guess, out to the health boards. So just to go off Wanda's comment, you know, in developing the new legislation in '09, you know, everybody involved was also trying to create a new department.

And – let me know when you want me to stop for translation.

INTERPRETER RICH: Yeah. [Sheshatshiu-aimun spoken.]

INTERPRETER BYRNE: [Mushuau-aimun spoken.]

M. SHALLOW: And so for 10 years, from 1998, about then, until 2009, all of the child welfare services were offered and supported and structured within four or five Health and Community Services boards, or the integrated health board. And part of the work of the new department was to kind of bring everything closer to what we would call a line department, which was the Child, Youth and Family Services Department.

And in part of doing that was to be closer to the people who were actually delivering the services. And, hence, I think then that led the way for us in 2015, 2016, to even have

more of a relationship with the people who were on the ground and the leadership in those communities – in the Innu communities – and the Inuit.

B. BROOKWELL: I'm gonna pivot to when – a different subject, but around this period of time, before sort of closing this subject. And it's about the Aboriginal policy consultant that, I believe Ms. Barnes, you mentioned in your testimony.

M. SHALLOW: Actually, if I could just make a comment, because I – if memory serves me correct, I believe that that position was in my division, initially.

W. LUNDRIGAN: Just wait for the translations.

M. SHALLOW: Oh, sorry. I forgot about the translations.

INTERPRETER RICH: [Sheshatshiu-aimun spoken.]

INTERPRETER BYRNE: [Mushuau-aimun spoken.]

B. BROOKWELL: And Michelle or Ms. Barnes, open to either of you who wants to answer first, but my question about it is just to understand the role, and I think I understood it as an internal resource, someone you spoke to internally about policy questions that may affect Indigenous people. Do I have that summarized accurately?

J. BARNES: I'm going to let Michelle respond first, because certainly that position would have reported to her when I was on her team as policy specialist.

INTERPRETER BYRNE: (Inaudible) I gotta translate.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

INTERPRETER BYRNE: [Mushuau-aimun spoken.]

INTERPRETER RICH: [Sheshatshiu-aimun spoken.]

[Dialogue between Interpreter Byrne and Interpreter Rich in Innu-aimun.]

INTERPRETER RICH: [Sheshatshiu-aimun spoken.]

M. SHALLOW: The Aboriginal consultant position was part of the structure that was developed within the Department of CYFS. The position did report to me – Jennifer is accurate – you know, and I’m just going off memory from a long time ago. I did have that position filled.

I remember it being challenging, but it was filled at one point. And at some point, it was transferred to the Labrador Region, and it reported directly to the regional director in Labrador. But the whole purpose of it, when it was in my division, was to help put an Aboriginal, Indigenous lens on any policy that we developed, to be briefed by it.

B. BROOKWELL: Now I know it’s a long time ago, but to your recollection, was this consultant an Innu person?

M. SHALLOW: The original person who was in the position, I believe, was Inuit. But that person wasn’t there very long, and I honestly don’t remember who was in it after that, whether they were Innu or not.

B. BROOKWELL: And I’ll just have one more question on this subject. Is – do I understand it correctly that this person’s role was an internal one? They weren’t going out and doing external engagement with Indigenous groups. Is that a sort of, fair summary?

M. SHALLOW: (Inaudible.)

B. BROOKWELL: Yes, go ahead.

M. SHALLOW: Okay, sorry.

The position would have been internal to the department. It was located in Labrador and would engage whoever was identified as being needed to be engaged, whether that was an internal resource or somebody in the community. Yeah. Does that answer your question?

B. BROOKWELL: I’ll wait for the translations.

INTERPRETER BYRNE: [Mushuau-aimun spoken.]

INTERPRETER RICH: [Sheshatshiu-aimun spoken.]

B. BROOKWELL: I guess my follow-up to that would be, to your recollection then, was this person ever directed to engage with the Innu?

M. SHALLOW: The person would have been directed to engage with the staff that we had working in the Innu community, for sure. I don’t really remember if we directly engaged with the leadership. I’m gonna say no, because that wasn’t my role and it wasn’t my decision. But we did have counterparts at the regional level that we absolutely would engage with and they would probably engage with the Innu leadership at that time. I mean, I know that has changed, but

B. BROOKWELL: I’m about to step into another topic, and I think this may be a logical time for a break, if that’s suitable for Commissioners.

COMMISSIONER IGLOLIORTE: Thank you very much.

We’ll take a break of 10 minutes.

Recess

COMMISSIONER IGLOLIORTE: Thank you, once again, ladies and gentlemen, thank you for your patience. We took a few minutes to try and get some of the sound a bit clearer for the audience here. It looks like we’ve made some progress.

Sir?

B. BROOKWELL: So the new subject that I want to talk about is prevention and funding for prevention. And so I’ll start by asking you, Ms. Barnes, because I believe you

were there most recently at the department. To your knowledge, did the department provide funding for prevention services for the Innu?

J. BARNES: I think Michelle perhaps would have more historical information on this subject. But to my knowledge, the department did not provide funding to the Innu organizations to deliver prevention services, no.

B. BROOKWELL: So maybe if we're looking further back in time, before Jennifer's time, Ms. Shallow, do you have any knowledge about – that there was funding provided to the Innu from the province for prevention services?

M. SHALLOW: I guess prevention is – it's an interesting word, and I don't know how far down that rabbit hole I want to take this group. But I will say that, you know, to my knowledge there would have been no specific funding targeted at prevention per se, but it depends on what kind of prevention you're talking about. Because prevention of further maltreatment is the focus of what we do in child protection, and we developed services – you know, in the later years of my tenure – we developed some services to support parents and families, to prevent further maltreatment.

There are other types of prevention, secondary prevention, primary prevention; I would consider what we do in child welfare tertiary prevention, and I believe that we outlined –

COMMISSIONER IGLOLIORTE: Let's just stop there to make sure that the translators get it.

M. SHALLOW: Oh. Sure.

COMMISSIONER IGLOLIORTE: That's fine.

INTERPRETER RICH: [Sheshatshiu-aimun spoken.]

INTERPRETER BYRNE: [Mushuau-aimun spoken.]

M. SHALLOW: Will I continue?

B. BROOKWELL: Would you like to continue; you were at tertiary prevention, and then –

M. SHALLOW: Yes.

B. BROOKWELL: – I think you may have had more to say.

M. SHALLOW: Well, if you think about what the mandate of the Protective Intervention Program – well, and really, the mandate under the legislation of 2019, you know, the – and really even the one from 2010, the primary focus is the prevention of maltreatment, or further maltreatment, of children and youth. And so part of my job was to research and identify, well, what kinds of programs and services would help families if they were identified, you know, as their children having – needing to be involved with the protection program.

And so we would have provided staff and funding for the supports that we identify, to our staff in the Innu communities. Like we supported – we developed a parenting program called Triple P Parenting, which we helped adapt to the Innu community, if I'm recalling correctly. We identified counselling as an important prevention of further maltreatment service. We identified other financial services, which are all – we outlined in policy to help support families and prevent further maltreatment.

So when I'm talking about things that we provided in the Innu communities around prevention, that's what I'm specifically referring to. Whether or not anybody else provided prevention, I guess it depends on what their definition of prevention is and what they're trying to prevent.

B. BROOKWELL: So I'd like to unpack a couple things. I think what I just wanna

confirm first is that the department did not provide primary or secondary services, but tertiary services. Is that generally what you're identifying?

M. SHALLOW: I mean, particularly in –

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Wait a minute.

M. SHALLOW: Sorry.

B. BROOKWELL: That's okay. We'll translate the question first.

[Dialogue between Interpreter Rich and Interpreter Byrne in Innu-aimun.]

INTERPRETER RICH: Can you say – repeat that again, Ben?

B. BROOKWELL: Yes, of course.

So I just wanted to confirm what you had said. Do I have it right that it was the department providing tertiary services, so third level, and not providing primary or secondary services.

INTERPRETER RICH: [Sheshatshiu-aimun spoken.]

INTERPRETER BYRNE: [Mushuau-aimun spoken.]

How do you say it in English, tertiary?

B. BROOKWELL: Tertiary, so a third level.

INTERPRETER BYRNE: [Mushuau-aimun spoken.]

B. BROOKWELL: Okay, please go ahead.

M. SHALLOW: Yeah.

What I would say is that – and I don't know what's currently happening, I haven't been there in six years – but the last – you know, I would say the last 10 years for sure – we were focused in the child welfare program on preventing further maltreatment. And so

the department would have been providing services to help prevent further maltreatment.

That's it; that's my answer.

B. BROOKWELL: So I think I just need to help distinguish in my mind what you've said. Prevent further maltreatment, do you see that – is that service different from what's been described elsewhere as early intervention? Sort of, coming in to support families before things get to that stage where there's a risk of maltreatment or a need for removal? Are those different services in your mind?

You can go ahead when you're ready.

M. SHALLOW: Okay, me? Yes.

B. BROOKWELL: Yes, please go ahead.

M. SHALLOW: Yeah, so the mandate under the child – *Children and Youth Care and Protection Act*, and the subsequent *Child Youth and Family Services Act* – or *Children, Youth and Families Act*, sorry, of 2019, the mandate was clearly to provide services to children who are identified as being at risk of maltreatment by omission or commission of the parent.

So, you know, it's – we would provide services to prevent further maltreatment, and it's like – just as an example, there – and I believe you have – the types of prevention are outlined in one of the documents that you folks have. It's a PowerPoint presentation, the Legislative Review of 2017 document. It's number P-162. And it outlines clearly the types of prevention, and it gives very clear examples of what they are.

So, for example, like, a primary prevention service would be, you know, a program that's developed and targeted at the general population. Like, anybody in Newfoundland and Labrador could do the Nobody's Parenting Program [read: Nobody's Perfect

Parenting Program] that used to be offered through Public Health. That's just an example, which would help potentially prevent and be, you know, an early intervention mechanism targeted for all families.

But then if you move to the secondary level of prevention, these are targeted at families who are in need. They've identified the problems themselves and they need programs to help alleviate, maybe, some of the issues going on in their families.

B. BROOKWELL: I'm just gonna pause just for a moment, because I know you're pointing us to a document. So we'll give a second for the translation, but also for the benefit of the Commissioners, page 9, Exhibit P-162, I believe is the PowerPoint that we're looking at.

C. URQUHART: And that will be in the larger book that you have.

In that one, yeah.

COMMISSIONER IGLOLIORTE: Thank you.

B. BROOKWELL: We might – we're just gonna give a moment for the translation to catch up and then we can continue.

Thank you.

M. SHALLOW: Okay, thank you.

INTERPRETER RICH: [Sheshatshiu-aimun spoken.]

INTERPRETER BYRNE: [Mushuau-aimun spoken.]

B. BROOKWELL: Okay, I think we're caught up. Thank you for your patience on that.

Please go ahead and continue, or if you need me to refocus things, just let me know.

M. SHALLOW: (Inaudible.)

B. BROOKWELL: Yes, okay, so I'll try and – having a look at this pyramid, and I think we're trying to distinguish the types of prevention.

M. SHALLOW: Mm-hmm.

B. BROOKWELL: And what I wanted to understand was, out of these three levels, what it was the department was providing funding for.

[Dialogue between Interpreter Byrne and Interpreter Rich in Innu-aimun.]

INTERPRETER BYRNE: She can't see.

INTERPRETER RICH: I can't see.

INTERPRETER BYRNE: Can she have a book?

INTERPRETER RICH: [Sheshatshiu-aimun spoken.]

INTERPRETER BYRNE: [Mushuau-aimun spoken.]

B. BROOKWELL: Okay, thank you again for your patience.

Please go ahead when you're ready.

M. SHALLOW: So in carrying out the mandate of preventing further maltreatment of children and youth, the provincial government would have the responsibility to – under our department – to identify what services would help families in that regard and that was part of my job, to identify those services.

And while the funding did not flow directly to the Innu leadership, you know, the funding would have been provided within the context of the structure of having staff in the community, hiring people to carry out the work that – and the programs – that we identified, like a parenting program or a

counselling program, et cetera. So we would have provided funding for all that to help prevent further maltreatment.

I imagine there were lots of other types of funding that were provided to the Innu for other types of prevention, but I was not involved in that, so I can't speak to it.

B. BROOKWELL: So to close the loop on this for me, to see if I understood, the prevention services you were describing, do they fall into that top of the pyramid, the tertiary part? Is that what we're talking about?

M. SHALLOW: Yes.

B. BROOKWELL: Okay.

I'm gonna shift topics to one that Ms. Lundrigan spoke about, which is the importance of having the experience of a people in the community where social services are provided.

INTERPRETER RICH: Can you say that again, Ben?

B. BROOKWELL: Yeah, sorry. I made that perhaps too complicated. I'll break it up.

INTERPRETER RICH: No, she can say it.

B. BROOKWELL: Okay.

INTERPRETER BYRNE: [Mushuau-aimun spoken.]

[Dialogue between Interpreter Rich and Interpreter Byrne in Innu-aimun.]

INTERPRETER RICH: [Sheshatshiu-aimun spoken.]

[Dialogue between Interpreter Rich and Interpreter Byrne in Innu-aimun.]

Can you say it again for myself? So I can really understand it and translate it more.

B. BROOKWELL: Yes, of course.

So I want to ask Ms. Lundrigan some questions about the importance of having people from the community involved in social services.

So my first question about this is: To your recollection, were there efforts to recruit Innu into the child welfare services provided in Innu communities?

W. LUNDRIGAN: Okay?

B. BROOKWELL: Yes, please go ahead when you're ready.

W. LUNDRIGAN: Okay, so I can only speak from when I was with the department.

So when we were transitioning the department from the regional health authorities to the Department of Child, Youth and Family Services, we were basically taking all their staff, all the social workers who worked on the ground, all the people who were in Sheshatshiu, all the people who were in Natuashish, all the people who worked for Child, Youth and Family Services within those health authorities.

When we were – when we recruited for positions, for example, say a social work position, we would certainly have welcomed interest from Innu or Inuit people. But one of the restrictions that we had was that social work was a regulated profession, as are most professions, so in order to practice social work, you had to be a registered social worker, which meant you had to meet specific educational requirements and you had to be – you know, it was a regulated profession like most professions in Newfoundland are.

So we –

B. BROOKWELL: I'm just gonna ask you to pause for a moment for the translation to catch up.

W. LUNDRIGAN: Okay, sorry.

INTERPRETER BYRNE: [Mushuau-aimun spoken.]

INTERPRETER RICH: [Sheshatshiu-aimun spoken.]

B. BROOKWELL: Okay, please continue.

W. LUNDRIGAN: Well, so – and we had extremely difficult recruitment problems attracting any social workers to the Labrador region. We had some people who were Inuit and Innu culture who worked in some other quasi- or semi-professional positions or – I mean, we had Lyla, thank God, who was probably our closest thing to understanding Innu culture because of her lived experience in that field, for so long in that community.

But, no, we did not – we didn't know where to recruit. We would have had to try and recruit out-of-province. So the short answer is no.

COMMISSIONER IGLOLIORTE: Mr. Brookwell, I'm mindful of how long the interpreters have been going. So if you can continue to a natural break, or give them a break now, one or the other.

B. BROOKWELL: Now is a perfect time. I'm moving to a new subject, so it would be great to have – a break now is perfect.

COMMISSIONER IGLOLIORTE: Thank you.

Ten minutes, please.

Recess

COMMISSIONER IGLOLIORTE: Give us a moment here, please. We're going to allow Commissioner Qupee to assist all of us in determining – explaining how difficult it is to translate some of the terms we use so loosely. It's not that easy to make it

appreciated by Innu listeners. So I'll just give it a second.

COMMISSIONER QUPEE: Hello. Hello? Is it on?

Okay.

I just wanna take a few minutes just to explain the word prevention. I know that interpreting is a very tough job, and it's so many words that you have to try and figure out and how you can use it so that people can understand it.

[Sheshatshiu-aimun spoken.]

And we all understand, like, what prevention is. It's the action of stopping something from happening or arising. And in Innu, like –

[Sheshatshiu-aimun spoken.]

On that side? Okay

[Sheshatshiu-aimun spoken.]

So that's – I'm just explaining to people, like, what's happening in the formal hearing, what that means and how we're inviting people to give their testimonies. And so this is what we're doing, and the role that we're all playing. And especially for the interpreters to understand in the broader context of what we're doing. And it helps as well, like, with the flow of the interpretation if you understand how we're using this word: prevention.

So I just wanted to take that time. Thank you.

Tshinashkumitin.

[Sheshatshiu-aimun spoken.]

COMMISSIONER IGLOLIORTE: Yes, thank you, Commissioner Qupee.

People should understand that we're taking two members of the community off the

street and bringing them in here to do interpretation. And it's fine if you're having a conversation between two people who speak English and Innu-aimun, but what we are doing is asking them to phrase legislative language, legal language – they probably know how to do the medical side of it.

So we have to try and ensure, as Commissioner Qupee has done, that people appreciate the kind of words that are being used in English and how they can be best converted to Innu-aimun.

You may continue, Sir.

B. BROOKWELL: Thank you.

I want to speak a bit this afternoon to the panel about placement facilities and foster homes. But I'm going – this morning we talked about what's there now. I'm going back to talk about 2017, 2016 and earlier.

So starting with this time, 2016, this was before federal funding coming in. To your knowledge, was there a shortage of placement facilities in the communities at that time?

Maybe what I'll do to make this make sense is I'll just start with Ms. Barnes, if she has anything to comment on, and then we can go over to Ms. Shallow and then Ms. Lundrigan. We'll just kinda go around.

J. BARNES: I don't have any statistics in front of me, so I won't try to quote any numbers. And it would have been around that time period that – I think – it would have been around that time period that some of the director positions in the department switched. So over that time period, the responsibility for the in-care program would have transitioned from Michelle to me. I moved into that position in 2017, so I don't remember exactly when the change happened.

But my recollection would be that at that period of time, there were certainly challenges with basic resources, so foster homes or other placements throughout the entire province. And I certainly would be able to recall that there would have been children leaving the Innu communities for placements, which I believe would only have happened if there were no placements in the community or if it was determined in the region that the needs of the child couldn't be met by the services that were available in the community.

B. BROOKWELL: Michelle, if you have anything to add, please go ahead

M. SHALLOW: Well, you know, I agree with Jennifer's comments, for sure. And I just would say to the Commissioners that there's been a long history of challenges in finding placement resources for children in care in Labrador and in – basically in – on the Island portion of the province as well. And, I mean, you know – and that goes back to, in my memory, even the early '90s.

And even though we got better at recruiting and reimbursing and supporting foster families, even now to this day, I still see and hear on radio commercials, you know, looking for foster families and on television I've seen, you know, commercials as well. So I think it's an ongoing challenge. And I'll just add one other thing: I think that's a challenge across the country. We're not alone in that regard.

B. BROOKWELL: And, Ms. Lundrigan, is there anything you want to add on before I go to the next question?

W. LUNDRIGAN: Well, I concur with both my colleagues. Finding foster placements and kinship agreements, relatives, appropriate group homes has been a huge struggle for Child, Youth and Family Services for a very long time. I started my career as a social worker in Child Protection on Bell Island, and we had the same problem then, in 1980.

When I went to the – back to the department in 2009, I was horrified by the number of Innu children that we had placed on the Northern Peninsula. It was startling to me. I hadn't been in that system for many, many years. But identifying a problem and finding the appropriate solution were pretty far apart. It was very difficult.

B. BROOKWELL: So I'd like to break the challenges down a little bit, and propose a similar approach to start in the room and go virtual around for your comments.

I was pausing just for a moment. I don't want to get it too complicated.

INTERPRETER BYRNE: Sorry about that.

INTERPRETER RICH: [Sheshatshiu-aimun spoken.]

Can you say that again, Ben? I was writing.

B. BROOKWELL: Okay. No, that's all right. I want to explore some of these challenges, and I'm gonna propose the same approach, that we'd start with Ms. Barnes and then go around to Ms. Shallow and Ms. Lundrigan for you to comment as a panel on this because I think you have information from different periods of time.

So the first question is about capital infrastructure, money for buildings. And what I'd like to know is looking at this period of time, 2015-2016, if you can explain what, if any, challenges there were about capital infrastructure for the department.

INTERPRETER RICH: [Sheshatshiu-aimun spoken.]

[Dialogue between Interpreter Rich and Interpreter Byrne in Innu-aimun.]

INTERPRETER BYRNE: Can you explain that some more?

B. BROOKWELL: Yes, having said it, I realized it was much more muddy than it was in my head.

The first question that I wanted to know about is whether there was challenges with money being made available to build things like placement homes or other facilities.

INTERPRETER BYRNE: [Mushuau-aimun spoken.]

J. BARNES: I think I understand your question, so please correct me if I'm not answering. It would have been around then, perhaps a little later, and I'm thinking specifically of the Innu proposal around placement resources. And at that time, the – there was an existing group home building in Sheshatshiu that was going to be renovated and opened as the first placement, and that one opened in 2018. But the ultimate goal was to have five placements, three in this community and two in Natuashish.

And I remember one of the challenges to opening the two emergency placement homes here in Sheshatshiu related to the need for physical homes to do that, and no appropriate structure being available. And if my memory is correct, the band, so Sheshatshiu Innu First Nation, actually constructed the two homes that became the emergency placement homes as, to my understanding, there was no access to funding in another way to build those facilities.

B. BROOKWELL: And so over to Ms. Shallow and Ms. Lundrigan, if there's anything further you wanna comment about infrastructure money.

M. SHALLOW: It's Michelle here.

I don't have anything to add, and I really don't remember if I was directly involved in that or not. I may have been, but I honestly cannot remember.

B. BROOKWELL: So I think the closest we got was the specific example. What I had in mind to close off this question is: To your knowledge, was there ever a line item in the department's budget that would go toward building facilities in either of the Innu communities; whether that was something that was budgeted for or not.

W. LUNDRIGAN: This is Wanda. Oh, sorry, I'll wait for the interpreters.

INTERPRETER RICH: [Sheshatshiu-aimun spoken.]

INTERPRETER BYRNE: [Mushuau-aimun spoken.]

W. LUNDRIGAN: So to my knowledge, there has never been a line item or a budget item for allocation of capital works projects or infrastructure in Child, Youth and Family Services.

INTERPRETER BYRNE: We're having a hard time hearing you.

INTERPRETER RICH: Can you say that again, Wanda?

W. LUNDRIGAN: I'm sorry.

INTERPRETER RICH: Can you repeat that again?

W. LUNDRIGAN: Yeah, can you hear me now?

INTERPRETER RICH: Yeah, I can hear you (inaudible) but –

W. LUNDRIGAN: Okay.

M. SHALLOW: We didn't change anything.

W. LUNDRIGAN: We didn't do anything different here.

INTERPRETER RICH: Okay.

W. LUNDRIGAN: Can you hear me?

INTERPRETER RICH: Yes.

W. LUNDRIGAN: Okay. So basically the answer is no. Child, Youth and Family Services have never had a line budget item for infrastructure or capital works, which is building facilities.

B. BROOKWELL: I see I'm running down the day, so I'll try and end with this topic, is – moving from infrastructure to training, training people or families to provide foster care. I want to explore that briefly at the end of the day.

And so my question here is in that period of time, 2015, 2016, or earlier, to your knowledge, were there any programs put in place to help train or support Innu to increase the number of foster homes, to help people provide that role?

J. BARNES: So I – in that time frame, I wouldn't have been responsible for that program, but I have some familiarity. So I can start and perhaps Michelle can pick up. There would have been foster parent training programs available. There was a standardized – it was called PRIDE – that would have been a standardized foster parent or adoptive parent education program.

I do recall there being efforts that would have been led by regional operations, I believe, at the time, to deliver that training in the Innu communities in partnership with staff in those communities and also with – if I'm remembering correctly – with Innu representatives who would support the delivery of training to attempt to make it more culturally relevant in those communities. I don't recall anything other than that or different than that being developed for the Innu.

COMMISSIONER IGLOLIORTE: Interpreter Rich has asked the Inquiry panel to excuse her at 4 o'clock. If you have a question that you must ask, Nympha will handle her side

of the interpreting. So if you want to continue for a minute or more, please do so.

Thank you very much, Lisa. I appreciate your work.

[Dialogue between Interpreter Rich and Interpreter Byrne in Innu-aimun.]

INTERPRETER BYRNE: I said you're always leaving me.

B. BROOKWELL: Okay, maybe I should check before I launch too far. How late are we going today? I thought we were gonna end at 4, but –

COMMISSIONER IGLOLIORTE: Lead counsel?

C. URQUHART: I would suggest that given the question's been asked and Ms. Barnes had an opportunity, that the remaining panel members have an opportunity to answer this question and then we wrap it for the day and start again tomorrow.

COMMISSIONER IGLOLIORTE: Thank you.

M. SHALLOW: So I can – is it okay for me to go now?

B. BROOKWELL: Yes, yes, please go ahead.

M. SHALLOW: I mean, you know, I've only been retired six years, but I feel like my memory is totally shot. It's amazing. So forgive me.

I do – I had responsibility for the in-care program and foster care prior to Jennifer taking it in 2017, and I do recall – and I don't know if I can give much detail, but Jennifer's comments prompted my memory that we did an adapted PRIDE.

So PRIDE is an acronym for – and I don't remember, but it's an acronym for training, the foster parent training. And I do recall

that we did adapt that to the Innu and possibly Inuit communities. One of my staff did lead that particular project and worked in partnership with somebody in Labrador, but I forget – I really can't remember who it was.

I mean, I'm thinking now that we did adapt it particularly for the Inuit, but I can't imagine we wouldn't have adapted it for the Innu as well. But it was pretty – you know, I mean, PRIDE is an international training program for foster parents, and we adapted it within the department very early on to support foster families.

B. BROOKWELL: If there's anything further, I don't know if Ms. Lundrigan has anything she wants to add?

W. LUNDRIGAN: No, thank you.

B. BROOKWELL: Okay.

Well I think that makes sense then to wrap up there and continue tomorrow, if that works for the Commission.

COMMISSIONER IGLOLIORTE: Thank you very much.

Thank you, interpreters, Ms. Byrne and Ms. Rich. And I will ask Caitlin to outline the rest of the day or tomorrow, please.

C. URQUHART: Thank you, Commissioners.

So I think that will be all for today. We'll wrap up, of course, with a prayer from Elder Penote Antuan, and then tomorrow the – Mr. Brookwell will continue his questions. Following that, the counsel for the witnesses will have an opportunity to ask their questions. We may have some follow-up questions, and then, of course, Commissioners, you are welcome to ask any questions to the witnesses. So that's the plan for tomorrow.

COMMISSIONER IGLOLIORTE: So I'll ask Elder Penote, if you could close our day with a prayer, please.

ELDER ANTUAN: I'd like to thank everybody who's been here all day. Today is quite a day, because when you sit down doing nothing, try to learn what you got to, I think it's very difficult. As for me, I enjoyed every bit of it and (inaudible) because I understand how you people try to work with us in this situation.

And now I will say a prayer.

[Sheshatshiu-aimun spoken.]

Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER IGLOLIORTE: Thank you very much.