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MS. DEBBIE BODKIN: Let me turn the equipment on. Okay, we have the equipment on. And it is 9:24 a.m. on Saturday, April 7, 2018. We're in the Hilton Hotel in Richmond, British Columbia. And as I mentioned, my name is Debbie. I've been a statement gatherer with the inquiry since October. I've spent my whole career gathering statements, interviewing people and so on. And I was honoured to be able to join the inquiry to do my part to hopefully take some -- make some positive changes that are long overdue.

So, Janice, I'll get you just to introduce yourself, please.

MS. JANICE BROWN: Janice, health support.

MS. DEBBIE BODKIN: Thank you, Janice.

Wendy, go ahead and introduce yourself and your birth date and address, and then we'll just go through that form briefly.

MS. WENDY LOCKHART-LUNDBERG: Okay. My name is Wendy Lockhart-Lundberg. My address is [address], Richmond, BC. And I'm a member of the Squamish Nation, status member. My birth date is [date], 1956.

MS. DEBBIE BODKIN: Perfect. I'm sorry,
can you repeat which nation?

MS. WENDY LOCKHART-LUNDBERG: Squamish.

MS. DEBBIE BODKIN: Squamish, thank you.

And, Wendy, I gave you the informed consent pages to read, and you've read them over. And did you have any other questions --

MS. WENDY LOCKHART-LUNDBERG: No.

MS. DEBBIE BODKIN: -- in regards to that?

And I'll just kind of reiterate. You've already signed the forms saying that you're comfortable with your statement being public. And I just want to reiterate that that means the parties withstanding includes such organizations as the Native Women's Association of Canada, Police Services Assembly of First Nations, and many others, including some individual First Nations. All of those organizations are required to sign confidentiality agreements, and are legally bound not to share the information or details you provide.

If your statement is considered public, your full name and transcript of everything you've said on audio and videotape will be transcribed into a statement, which is legally required to be provided to the governments and the parties withstanding. It can also be used to write public reports, prepare educational materials, support research, or question witnesses such as police witnesses.
And is that what you've confirmed and understand you're comfortable with?

MS. WENDY LOCKHART-LUNDBERG: Yes, I understand that, yes.

MS. DEBBIE BODKIN: Okay, perfect. Thank you very much. Okay, well, on that note, as I said, this is hopefully a safe space for you, and I want you to feel like you're in charge and comfortable. And you start your story wherever you feel fit.

MS. WENDY LOCKHART-LUNDBERG: Okay. So, as I mentioned, I'm a member of the Squamish Nation. And my mother, Nona Rose Baker, was born on the Squamish reserve in North Vancouver in 1925. Her father was Henry Hawkeye Baker, and her mother, Mona Baker. My grandfather was actually a very well respected and well-known lacrosse goalie. He's in the Canadian Lacrosse Hall of Fame and the BC Sports Hall of Fame with the North Shore Indians team. And he actually also played for Canada in the 1932 Olympics.

MS. DEBBIE BODKIN: Wow.

MS. WENDY LOCKHART-LUNDBERG: Which is not a very well-known fact. So he's a very decorated and well-known lacrosse goalie. I'm very proud of that.
MS. WENDY LOCKHART-LUNDBERG: My grandfather, yeah. So my mother was born on the Mission Indian Reserve in North Vancouver. And when she was growing up she only spoke her native language until she went to school, when she was not allowed to speak it anymore. And then she married a non-native man, and so her status was stripped from her. And it wasn't until 1986 that she was reinstated under Bill C-31.

And I have to say also that -- I should have mentioned this first, but I just want to say that I'm very glad that they're having these hearings. And I didn't feel that I should be a speaker because I felt that that forum was really for the actual women that were directly impacted by murdered and missing women and girls. But having said that, because of what happened to my mother, I feel that in a sense she was missing because she was stripped of her cultural identity and her status, and she was really torn from her community because of the discriminatory provisions of the Indian Act, where she was -- had her status taken away from her. Which as many people know, did not happen to the Aboriginal men. In fact, when Aboriginal men married non-Indian women, no matter which race they were, not only did the men retain their status and band membership, but their spouses and their descendants acquired them. So today you have mixed
families on reserves or off reserve, where the women that
had married non-native men were actually cast out from
their communities.

So in a sense my mother was missing
because she was stripped from her community and her family,
and that had a big impact on her life, her education, her
economic situation, her as a person. But having said that,
I am so proud that she lived a life of pride and dignity,
and she was always proud of her heritage and her family.
And she always worked hard to raise her family and be
respectful and honour her ancestors.

So in 1986 her status was "reinstored" --
restored. And as was mine as her daughter. And after her
status was "reinstored" I started to research some of her
family history and also her father's estate. And that led
me to search the National Archives of Canada. And I
thought that I was going to be just getting my
grandfather's estate file, but it turns out that there was
actually a file on the family. And it was as though any
life event, or any dramatic event, or any event where they
had to interact with the Indian agent, was documented in
that file. So, for example, one of the ones that -- it
changed my life forever, and from that point on I really
focused on my advocacy work, especially for Aboriginal
women.
There were letters in that file that my mother, when she was about 15 years old, had gone to the Indian agent. And the Indian agent, actually to his credit, wrote a very nice letter on behalf of my mother to the Indian agent in Ottawa. And he said,

"I have a very ambitious young woman here who is willing to do housework to continue her education. She wants to further her education and all she needs is some assistance for the books for that."

And this Indian agent asked Ottawa Indian Affairs if they would supply her with money for the books and support to go to school.

And the reply came back from Ottawa, and it said,

"We -- in the past, we have supported Indian boys, but we do not support Indian girls to get an education."

And so that galvanized my advocacy work on behalf of my mother, and my community, and Aboriginal women, because I realized from that point why her life took the steps that it did, and why she ended up where she was, and how things had happened to her, and even questioning -- you know, never disrespecting my mother, but also
questioning,

"Well, why didn't you have an education," right, as a young person not really understanding.

But those letters just made it all clear for me. It was there in black and white. And I'll mention my Senate testimony in a minute, but those documents are actually part of my Senate testimony. I tabled them to the committee. So it's all part of my presentation that I made in 1999.

So from that point on, I started to really advocate for Aboriginal women and my mother of course. And I started to try to get her land back. Her father had land on the Mission Indian Reserve in North Vancouver. And he also had land in Squamish on one of the reserves there. Because in those days they used to migrate for work and resources. So in the summer they would do fishing, and they might be down in the lower mainland, or they would be up on the coast fishing. And then in the other months of the year, they would be more up in the mountains in Squamish area, and they would do logging and forestry. So he migrated between the two pieces of land that he occupied and had homes on.

So when he passed away in 1968, my mother
was not allowed to live in his house, in the house that she was born and raised in. And she actually had his will, and she was his only child, and she -- he bequeathed his land, properties and homes to her. The will interestingly had some issue with a date, and so it actually went through process. And Indian Affairs actually put it through a process, and they called it "Approval of the Will."

So even though the will was approved, because she had been declared non-Indian, she wasn't allowed to inherit the land and the property, and she wasn't allowed to live in the home where she was born and raised.

So, again, it's the fact that she was just torn away from her community, and so I believe in the sense that she was missing. She was missing her family, her community, any supports that she could receive, any support from the government, financial or programs, any community involvement. She was cut off from all that.

So as around the time that I started to do my research into my grandfather's estate -- and on behalf of my mother I was trying to access programs and services for her -- I found out by accident, even though I had been a very diligent band member, and I was going to hearings and meetings -- I was very involved to get information. I
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was speaking at band meetings for the membership on behalf of my mother, or myself, or my son, or my family. And around that time, I found out by accident that even though we had been told about the BC treaty process in which Canada, British Columbia and the Squamish Nation had signed a tripartite agreement, that we were required to mandate and ratify every step of the way in the treaty process; there was a parallel secret process going on with respect to land management legislation. And it was a Bill C-49, the First Nations Land Management Act.

And when I discovered this, I sent a message to my Member of Parliament to ask about it. And he sent me a copy, and I was shocked to find out that the Squamish Nation had signed on to the Framework Agreement, and were listed in the list of First Nations that had signed on to that legislation. But as a band member, I had not been told about the existence of that legislation. And as a band member, I had not been given any information about voting to be involved in that Framework Agreement or that legislation.

And that's a fact that I testified at the Senate about. I was questioning quite extensively on it. And I said that I would swear in a court of law that I was not provided with information about that legislation, and I was not given the opportunity to vote on it, as were band
members. And it would have been easy for them to find that out, because the government, when we questioned it, they could have just asked the Squamish Nation or Indian Affairs for the due diligence about the fact that, you know, if council had put forward the legislation to the actual members to vote on.

So in my Senate testimony, I spoke on the First Nations land management in particular. I was accompanied by my aunt, an elder at the Squamish Nation who sadly passed away seven years ago. Her name was Velma Maisie (ph) Baker. And she was one of my aunts. And we were very closely working on advocacy work.

And in my Senate testimony on the First Nations Land Management Act, I wove the story about my mother and how she was born Squamish, but then torn from her community and not allowed to go back, even when she was reinstated. And I also interwove in my testimony the related factors and issues, for example, with respect to the Human Rights Act of Canada. You know, education, the Governance Act that they had tried to implement as well. You know, the Indian residential schools. All of the related issues that my mother and other Aboriginal women in particular were impacted by.

The other big issue that I wove into my testimony was with respect to the descendants of the
Aboriginal women. For example, myself. So during this process to being reinstated, and starting my advocacy work, and researching, I also applied for status for my son, Maximilian Lundberg (ph). And he has his grandfather's Indian name, which is Hamilk (ph).

And, at that time, when I first applied for him to have status, which was probably in and around the early 90s, they rejected his application because they said under the Indian Act there was a cutoff point. And, again, I relate that to how my mother was treated as an Aboriginal woman when she was missing from her community, and torn from her community, and her, you know, children and grandchildren were not allowed to have the status that the men who married non-Aboriginal women were. So their spouses and their descendants became status Indians.

So with respect to my son's application, I protested it, first of all, and then I appealed it. And eventually it wasn't until 2012, when there was an amendment, another amendment to the Indian Act, which allowed the grandchildren of the original women that were ripped of their status, the grandchildren were finally allowed to apply for status and get their status. So my son now is also a status band member of Squamish. Yeah, his name is Maximililan and his ancestral name is Hamilk.

So during that time with respect to
testifying at the Senate committee, I was working with a lot of community members as well. And we ran into a lot of opposition from some of the community members and some of the band leaders. Despite that, there was a group of us that got a petition of Squamish Nation band members signed. And I believe in the end there was maybe about over 300 signatures on it. So we tabled that in the House of Commons and in the Senate as part of our testimony. And it stated that the band members were not aware of the First Nations Land Management Act, and they had not voted on it and ratified it, as they were told they would do with respect to the treaty process. So, again, there was these two parallel processes: one that we were told publicly about, that we'd have to mandate and ratify; and then the other one which was secret, which we didn't even know existed.

So during the Senate testimony, when we were in Ottawa, there were a lot of our own band council leaders there, and there were also leaders of the other First Nations that were on the schedule of the First Nations Land Management Act. We sensed a lot of, you know, anger towards us. They didn't really openly display it there. But in some of the meetings leading up to us going to Ottawa, when there was discussion about the Land Management Act, because we raised it, or other issues with
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1 respect to governance within the Squamish Nation
2 themselves; I was physically approached by a brother of a
3 band councillor who was like very physically aggressive to
4 me, and trying to more or less force me out of the hall.
5 And unfortunately it was at the end of the meeting and not
6 a lot of people were around, so I felt very isolated, and
7 vulnerable, and threatened.
8
9 So we went to Ottawa and we testified. I
10 believe that our testimony was well received. And the
11 combination of my aunt, who grew up on reserve and knew the
12 community, and the history, and the people very well, with
13 my ability to do the research, and write, and make a
14 presentation in a format that was historical and also
15 relevant to all of the issues, I think it was a well
16 received presentation. And we stayed in Ottawa as long as
17 we could that week to witness other related hearings with
18 respect to that legislation.
19
20 And we left Ottawa. And we also had some
21 private meetings beforehand with some of the members of
22 Parliament, and some of the Senators, including the Senate
23 of the committee, Charlie Watt. And we returned to
24 Vancouver. And the next morning I received a phone call.
25 At the time I didn't have call display, and I just picked
26 up the call. And it was a threatening call from this
27 person that had approached me in the hall. And I won't go
into the details about what was said, but it was a call of a threatening nature, and it was specifically related to me and my aunt testifying at the Senate hearing in Ottawa. Because basically we went and exposed the truth, that they had gone ahead with this legislation without informing the people and obtaining the proper mandate and ratification.

And it was very upsetting, it was very threatening. I felt very scared at first, but of course I was determined not to let it stop me to speak out, and to further raise these issues on behalf of my mother, and other community members, and other women who had suffered same or worse treatment over their attempts to make conditions better for themselves, or have the government, you know, implement policies and programs that will help them.

So I was so upset though that I reported it to the members of Parliament that I had met, and that had supported me to go to Ottawa. One of those was the Senator Charlie Watt. And he strongly encouraged me to go to the RCMP. And I went to the RCMP that evening, supported by my husband, and my son came along. This was the RCMP in Richmond because I live in Richmond, BC. And I was really disappointed because when I got there and told them the story, and told them what had happened, I didn't feel that there was a lot of support. I didn't feel that
someone just said, you know,

"Come in and tell us what happened."

I felt that I was overly question, and

that what I was saying was doubted. And that was another

trauma and violence, as far as I'm concerned, because I

felt that something traumatic had happened. It was very

well documented. I was invited to go to the Senate. I had

a right to be there. I spoke respectfully, but strongly.

And then as a result of that, this is what happened to me.

And so it was very disappointing and

upsetting that I wasn't just asked to come into a room

privately and give a statement.

MS. DEBBIE BODKIN: You did not even get
to do that?

MS. WENDY LOCKHART-LUNDBERG: I did.

MS. DEBBIE BODKIN: You did.

MS. WENDY LOCKHART-LUNDBERG: So because I

had spoken with the members of Parliament who knew that I

had been in Ottawa, who actually witnessed my testimony,

and then the Senate committee chair, along with other

Senators, and because I had their support and they said to

me,

"You need to go to the police and

report this,"

so even though I was not encouraged at
the police station, I felt I had to do that. I strongly had to say to this officer,

"I want to speak to your superior or somebody else in charge. I want someone to take this statement. I have been told to come here and make this report."

And I gave the name of the Senator.

So finally they went away and someone else came back, and they finally took a statement from me. And then they gave me a police case number. And I have that number. And it was subsequently referred to in other testimonies and statements by other Senators, for example, in related issues over the years. Senator Carney, Senator Pat Carney, was one of the big supporters of Aboriginal women. And she referenced that incident in some of her testimony when she was speaking on First Nations issues.

So I'm really glad I did it. I'm glad that I have a police case number. I'm glad that I had the strength to more or less demand that they take the statement. But like that should not have to happen. And I really feel for, you know, women who don't have the strength, and they may not have the education or the awareness. They may not think that they have the right and the ability. They may not have the support, and they are
so vulnerable, and I feel like that's one of the reasons why I want to come to do this and make this statement, because, you know, I feel I'm a strong person, and I can articulate, and I can give the historical information, and I have a certain level of education, and I can do the research, and I know what the facts are, and I know what my rights are. But I feel that these women are so vulnerable, and they don't -- may not have that ability. And I absolutely don't hold that against them. It's just that circumstances, and the discrimination, and the violence they've been subjected to.

So, anyway, I'm glad that I was strong and I made them take that statement. And it's on the record. And it has been referred to in the Senate several times since, so I'm glad for that.

So over the years since then I continue to do advocacy work. And with respect to the First Nations Land Management Act, what was supposed to happen there was that the Framework Agreement was supposed to be mandated and ratified by the Squamish Nation people. As I said, it wasn't. But after our testimony -- and I'm not sure directly related to my testimony, but it wasn't until the year 2011 that the Squamish Nation finally held a vote of its members on that legislation, on whether or not the Squamish Nation people would opt in. And finally in 2011,
which was, you know, well after -- the Framework Agreement, I believe it was signed in 1996. So it took that long for it to be brought to the people. And the Squamish Nation people overwhelmingly rejected the First Nations Land Management Act.

So as of this date, I believe that we are still a nation under the Indian Act, and possibly still on the -- still involved in the treaty process for First Nations in British Columbia. Although there hasn't been a lot of discussion about that, and there's not a lot of publicity about it, I don't know where Squamish Nation or even First Nations in BC stands on the treaty process. It seems to me that the treaty process is almost, you know, dead or dying. And over the years the federal government has tried to bring in a suite of legislation, which seems to me is overriding the treaty process. And I believe -- and, again, it's absolutely with no disrespect to any Aboriginal people, but I believe that the First Nations people have not been given the information to understood the difference between federally imposed and federally delegated legislation that's going to rule their lives, and it's only going to be in place of the Indian Act, and the distinction as opposed to a treaty process in which First Nations can possibly be sovereign First Nations.

So, again, I don't criticize the people,
that they may not understand it. They probably just don't have the information to make that distinction. But that's what I believe has happened. There's a federal suite of legislation which will replace the Indian Act, versus the treaty process which may allow First Nations to have sovereignty. And as an example of that, it might be with Nisga’a Treaty and possibly other treaties like Tsawwassen First Nation. I don't know the details of their treaties, but I just believe that the First Nations people don't understand the distinction between them.

And if the government continues to just federally impose legislation and delegates legislation, to me it's not making things better, it's just creating more issues, and more complex issues, and issues that people -- again, with respect to those people, just may not understand what it means to them. And I know that there are big groups of First Nations chiefs across Canada who vehemently spoke and opposed in Senate hearings and other policy forums, that they're against that suite of legislation, because they're trying to get sovereignty, and they're trying to have a treaty process in place.

So I feel that because I spoke out, I was basically a whistleblower, and that's why I was threatened. And I didn't appreciate the fact that I didn't have the support of the police, I felt. And if I ever had to
approach like the police again, or any other agency, I would make sure that I have the backing of some person, like in authority, which I feel nobody should have to do, but it's probably better if you do it, and also to have witnesses with you.

Another reason that they may have felt that I was such a threat, and then tried to threaten me for speaking out, was there was another Squamish Nation woman that I told about with respect to the issues that were going to be impacted by the First Nations Land Management Act. And that was a Squamish Nation woman who has a parcel of land in the Squamish Valley on one of the reserves there. And she actually tried many years ago to get an order under the Canadian Human Rights Act. And that's when I realized and did more research about that, that up until the year 2006 Indians -- and I'm sorry I use that term, but that's what we are in the Indian Act, and that's what it was in the Canadian Human Rights Act. Up until 2006, any Indian person who wanted to bring a human rights action or complaint could not do that because there was a Section 67 in there. It wasn't repealed until the year 2006.

So as a First Nations member with all the issues I was trying to raise on behalf of my mother or other community people, before 2006 if I wanted to go and file a Canadian human rights complaint because of what was
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happening to me, or my mother, or other women, or other people, there was no ability for me to do that. It wasn't repealed. Section 67 was not repealed until the year 2006. And even though it has been repealed now, I think there's a process and a timeline now about when and how it's opted in.

So, again, it's just this constant obstacles that are put in our place that are -- we're constantly being blocked, and challenged, and stopped. And we don't automatically have the same rights and freedoms as all other Canadians, we just don't.

And so I told that woman's story as part of my testimony in the Senate as well. And I actually had the court order that she received, that she was denied to bring the human rights complaint. And that document was also a part of my Senate testimony.

Another really big issue in there that I raised was the fact that I as an Aboriginal woman having been reinstated under my mother's status with respect to Bill C-31 in 1986, could not confer status to my son. And I specifically named and pointed out a Squamish Nation councillor, who himself had married a non-native women, and whose children had become status band members. And the reason I directly named him and pointed that out was because he himself, with his son, had gone to the Senate to
testify in favour and on behalf of the First Nations Land Management Act in December 1998. He was specifically asked by Senator Chalifoux, Thelma Chalifoux. She said,

"We have heard that Aboriginal women are not being welcomed back into their community even though they've been reinstated. And can you speak to that? And is this true? Is this true?"

And this band councillor actually said,

"If you have one ounce of Squamish blood and you are Squamish, you are wanted and you are welcomed."

And I read his testimony back in my testimony, and I disputed that statement, because my mother had been reinstated in 1986. And when I testified in the Senate it was 1999. And although she had been given her status number back and her band membership back, she was blocked from actually returning to live on the Squamish Nation Reserve.

So I disputed his words because it wasn't true. The women were not welcomed back. And to this day I find that there is inherent discrimination in the women who were, as I say, missing and torn from their communities, and literally thrown off the edge of the reserve and told...
to leave.

And with respect to my aunt's land claim -
- sorry, my mother's land claim to her father's property -- which was well documented. There was -- as I said, there was -- in a will of my grandfather in which he named my mother as his only beneficiary, and a document called, "The Approval of the Will."

I continued to advocate on her behalf to get her father's land restored to her. And she also -- and I also as well -- applied for housing on reserve.

Unfortunately my mother passed away in 2009. One of the last hearings I went to at the Squamish Nation was about three weeks before she died. I probably went to about 20 presentations at the Squamish Nation. And whenever I made a presentation to the BC legislature, the Senate committees, the House of Common's committees, some of the Vancouver forums or policy committees, I always told my mother's story and wove it all into the issues.

So she made a formal application for housing. And she also made a formal land claim to have her father's land returned to her. And it was not returned to her. So for this band councillor to say that the Aboriginal women were welcomed back, and if they had one ounce of blood they were Squamish or whatever First Nation, that is actually untrue because she was not welcomed back.
And as I said, her father was a very renowned and very famous athlete in all of Canada in the Aboriginal community. He has all sorts of awards and he's in the Canadian Lacrosse Hall of Fame. I mean they couldn't deny that she didn't exist or that his will didn't exist. So she never got her father's land back.

And how the Squamish Nation blocked her from doing this was that the Squamish Nation council issued a band council resolution, and they said,

"When Nona Lockhart is allocated a home in the future, she will be given first consideration of the lot with the lot description."

So she was on the housing list for a house, and she was on the list for elders. And elders are supposed to have priority for housing. But the housing list kept changing. And she was actually on the list as maybe number five or number four. She was even on the list as number two for getting an allocated house in any given year. But they kept bypassing her. So if it didn't meet that band councillor resolution that they made, to say when she's allocated a home in the future she will be given first consideration of her father's lot, that's how they blocked her from returning to the community.

So she was never allocated a home despite
the fact that she was number two on the elders housing list. And then she never got her father's land back in a formal land claim that she made. With respect to the housing list, one of the other things that me and my aunt did in our advocacy work within the band itself was we finally got a motion through our band council and membership to force them to publish the housing list. And we actually got that passed. And for about the first year they would send out a list whenever it was updated. So we could see where we were on the list. And I could see where my mother was on the list, which was how I knew she was being moved. But she was never given a house, and she was like number two on the list. And out of the allocations of homes, which were about 15 homes per year at that time, they were supposed to allocate so many homes to elders. And I believe it was like five per year. So if she was number five, or four, or three, or two on the list, she should have been given a home whenever she reached the spot, but she wasn't.

So, again, she was missing from her community because she was blocked from her community by her own band. And in the course of all of that advocacy work, and with respect to my hearings with any legislative committees that I could speak at, or any policy forums that I could participate in, I also specifically asked and went
to meetings with Indian Affairs land officials. And, again, one of the last ones I went to was in 2009 in January, probably just about six weeks before she died. And I kept being told that basically there was nothing that Indian Affairs could do. They said basically that it was a matter between my family, or me and Indian Affairs, or my mother and Indian Affairs -- or, sorry, me and the nation. So Indian Affairs was basically washing their hands of any involvement and any action.

So we were completely left on our own. And this may happen to a lot of other people, as you know, and women. I mean like how could we get a lawyer? How could we have a lawyer to fight for us? You know, we couldn't afford that. These Aboriginal women wouldn't have the financial means or ability, possibly even if they're up in rural areas, to get a lawyer to fight on their behalf. So I continually verbalized the fact that Indian Affairs had and has a fiduciary obligation to Aboriginal people. And they should have exercised that fiduciary obligation, and they should have stepped in and they should have forced the Squamish Nation to restore my mother to her community where she was born and raised. And the only reason that she was removed from that reserve was because of discriminatory policies in the Indian Act which stated that she was no longer an Indian person because she
married a non-native man. So that was -- another part of
my work was trying to have her actually moved into housing
on reserve. But it didn't happen, and unfortunately she
passed away, and she never saw that.

So I do say, again, that I feel that she
was missing in the fact that because of the discriminatory
provisions of the Indian Act, and all of the historical
wrongs that happened to her and other women like her, she
was missing from her community and her family where she was
born and raised because of those discriminatory policies.
And I felt really it was important for me to come and state
that. I did want to make a public statement, and I hope
that the hearings will continue, and that in the future I
will be able to do that. But I felt strongly that the
hearings that are taking place, where people are making
public statements, I really felt that that should be
respected for the women whose family, mothers, sisters,
daughters, aunts, where they had the murdered and missing
women who were subjected to such violence. I do feel
though that what happened to my mother and me, because of
trying to speak up for her, was a form of violence, and
threat, and intimidation. And nobody should have to do
that. And it's all because of -- it was a legal and
technical genocide of what happened to the people, the
Aboriginal people, and the women in particular.
No, I just felt that it was important to be here today. And I do, again, hope that the hearings will continue, because I know of so many Aboriginal women who have had stories like mine. And they need to be shared as well, because it's evidence and it shows of all of the other related issues that women are impacted by. You know, it's all related. You can't isolate any one of these issues. And when I started to be really involved in the advocacy work, and I was fortunate to be supported by Senators like Senator Pat Carney, who really encouraged and had me go forward to, you know, also speak on my behalf, and have my own voice, and be involved in any policy hearings that were taking place -- which I did participate in some others. For example, I participated in the hearings on matrimonial real property on reserve, which is another huge issue. And I participated in those as well. And that's another big issue, that some Aboriginal women alone can speak to just that issue.

When I got to those hearings, which were attended by Aboriginal women from across Canada, and we all took turns and got up and spoke and gave evidence or relayed our stories, I realized how pervasive and expansive the discrimination that we all suffered was. The women at these hearings were telling the same stories. And it was like, you know, our sister, our aunt, our grandmother on
the same reserve telling the same stories. And these were people from all over Canada, from north to south, and northern parts. And they were all saying the same things. And that just galvanized me even more, that, you know, this wasn't an isolated incident or issue, this was pervasive, and it was systemic, and it was all across the country. And these women had incredible stories. And the stories about the matrimonial real property on reserve as well.

I mean, you know, people would say to me after, if they read about any of my testimony, or sometime I was in the media, and I would get calls from people all over Canada, and they would say,

"I didn't know that. I didn't know that was the situation in the case."

And I would also get calls from young women who were studying these issues or women's issues in universities, and somehow they would find me. And this is like before social media. And they would phone me too with all sorts of questions. And they would be writing and researching, which was awesome. And they would say to me too, you know,

"I didn't realize this."

And for them to actually have like an actual case and examples was really important to them. But, anyway, those hearings just made me
realize, you know, how big of an issue and a problem that it was. And that's where a lot of the stories came, where -- with respect to matrimonial property on reserve as well -- where women would say -- if there was a dispute with a matrimonial home, they were often the ones who were thrown out of that home and literally taken to the edge of the reserve and told to go. They may or may not have had their children with them. Their children may or may not have been taken away from them. But they were literally like cast out of their community.

And so when people would say to me, you know, "I didn't realize that this is what happened, and I didn't know that this happened to the women." I still get those comments today. And I say to them like, "That's why there are women, especially in places like the Downtown Eastside." I mean it's not an accident that they live there, you know? They were forced into untold horrible circumstances where they had to -- they had to survive somehow, and that's where they ended up. It wasn't by choice for them to be there.
And people still say that to me today. And at work -- I’ve been coming to the hearings at lunchtime. I work just down the street. And I told some of my colleagues, and I would mention some of the things about the hearings. I mentioned terms like Sixties Scoop, or residential school, or matrimonial property, and they would say like,

"What's that?"

And I'd tell them, and they don't know. And they also find it absolutely astounding and hard to believe. And they don't disbelieve me or disbelieve it, but they're so shocked that it could actually happen.

And a lot of these people too, they may have come to Canada from other countries, and they probably don't know the real history of what happened. So they're very, very shocked. So I still get comments like that today, that people really don't know what happened, and they can't believe what happened. And I say,

"Yeah, that's why there are women that ended up in places like that."

They were thrown out, they had no rights, no support. They were, you know, subjected to violence. And if they were like my mother, and they were suddenly ripped of their status, then they had no right to any public funding for any programs. They didn't have
healthcare, they didn't have education. You know? And I go back to that letter from the Indian agent to -- on behalf of my mother who actually said, "I have a very ambitious young woman here."

And that's what just broke me down and suddenly everything in her life and my life became clear. And, you know, it showed that women like my mother, they weren't lazy, and they weren't alcoholics, and they weren't drug addicts. They were human beings, and they were women, they were daughters, and they were aunts, and sisters, and granddaughters, and wives, and mothers. And they were respectful, and they could work hard, and they could build lives for their families. But they weren't allowed to because of all of these horrible discriminatory provisions and horrible things as a result that happened to them. They weren't given the chance. And fortunately my mother had the strength to survive and live her life with pride, dignity, and raise her family, and live a life where she could hold her head high. I look back and I think like how hurtful it must have been for her to be subjected to that when you think about it. She was born an Indian, and then she was told she was not an Indian. And then she was an Indian again, but then they
still didn't welcome her back. And the government still
neglected her and just left her vulnerable, and didn't
support her in any way to make sure that she got back to
her community.

So, in my opinion, she was missing, not
maybe in the same manner as the other women who were really
subjected to the horrible violence, but she lost a part of
her life, her community, her family, her friends, her
culture, her language. She only spoke the Squamish
language until she went to school, and she wasn't allowed
to speak it anymore.

I think back and think she must have been
so strong to survive all that. It's amazing to me. And I
hope that I have -- I hope she really knew how much I was
fighting for her, and how much I loved her and respected
her, and knew, you know, that I really respected her for
everything that she went through, and the fact that she
could survive that. Because I don't think there's a lot of
people that could, being subjected to all that.

MS. DEBBIE BODKIN: I bet you she's here
in this room with you right now.

MS. WENDY LOCKHART-LUNDBERG: Pardon?

MS. DEBBIE BODKIN: I said,
"I bet you she's here with you right
now."
MS. WENDY LOCKHART-LUNDBERG: Yeah.

MS. DEBBIE BODKIN: And supporting you.

And, of course, very proud of you.

MS. WENDY LOCKHART-LUNDBERG: Yeah, so that's why I felt it was important to tell her story again in a different forum. I've done it in the Senate in another -- in other forums. But, you know, like what has changed? You know, even for myself, or my son, or other community members, it's like every time, you know, we want to access a program, or -- you know, there's so many blocks in our way all the time. It's never just straightforward and easy. You can't just phone or go somewhere and say, "I'd like to have this service, whatever."

No, it's like, "Let's put blocks in your way and make it more difficult for you."

So I would just summarize and say, I wanted to be here to make sure her story is on record again. I also want to really encourage the powers that be, the government, the Commissioners, to make sure that every effort is made to have these hearings extended. Because as I have given examples of, there's so many related issues that happened to Aboriginal women, and they need to be told, and they need to be addressed, because it has not
stopped, it hasn't ended.

And also, if there's going to be any legislation from this, or any policy, or any programs, it has to be enforceable, it has to be accessible. You can't just make a law and then have the most vulnerable people unable to access that law or have the protection of that law. And also with respect to any programs like for, you know, housing, education, health, any assistance that they need to overcome all of this; you know, the programs have to be accessible, and there should never be any blocks in the way.

Also with respect to the policing issue.

Right? Like as I gave an example, I'm a strong educated women, and I still had trouble getting the police to believe what I was saying, and getting them to write down what I was saying, even though I had the backing of the Senate of Canada. The only other higher person that I could have had the backing of was the Prime Minister at the time. And still they doubted me and questioned me instead of just taking me into a private room like this and letting me tell my story. I had to like, you know, beg almost, "Please, you need to record this, this is what happened."

MS. DEBBIE BODKIN: And on that note, I was going to ask you: Did anything come of that? Like
were charges --

MS. WENDY LOCKHART-LUNDBERG: No charges were laid, as far as I know. But the police said that they were going to go talk to that person. And I don't know if they did.

MS. DEBBIE BODKIN: You never heard anything back?

MS. WENDY LOCKHART-LUNDBERG: No. I suppose I could have followed up, and I probably still can to this day, but even at the time I was feeling, as you can imagine, like pretty vulnerable, and --

MS. DEBBIE BODKIN: For sure.

MS. WENDY LOCKHART-LUNDBERG: And also just having gone through that testimony, which was pretty — I mean it was empowering to a point, but also it was so traumatic and draining, as you can imagine, just preparing for it, travelling out there, and then making that strong presentation with these band councillors and a whole team of lawyers in the room behind us. I mean I really felt that that was intimidating, you know? It wasn't like this where it was private. Right? It was a whole Senate committee, and then all these people behind or witnesses around, some of whom were hostile.

MS. DEBBIE BODKIN: Just sticking with that, the policing issue that occurred, are there anymore
explicit details that you'd like to share? There's a possibility, if the commission gets a continuation of being there will be a forensic portion of it, where they would review racist incidents such as that.

MS. WENDY LOCKHART-LUNDBERG: Mm-hmm, mm-

hmm.

MS. DEBBIE BODKIN: Are there anymore details that you would like to put on record? You know, officers names, exact dates, anything like that?

MS. WENDY LOCKHART-LUNDBERG: I don't know the officer's name offhand. I do have the police case file number at home. I don't have it with me.

MS. DEBBIE BODKIN: Okay, I can just note that.

MS. WENDY LOCKHART-LUNDBERG: Yeah. I don't remember the officers' names, no. I know that it was the Richmond detachment for sure.

MS. DEBBIE BODKIN: And it was in date wise?

MS. WENDY LOCKHART-LUNDBERG: I would have been May 1999.

MS. DEBBIE BODKIN: Okay.

MS. WENDY LOCKHART-LUNDBERG: And I testified on the 4th. And I think it was around the 5th. So, I don't know, it was maybe like the 5th or the 6th.
MS. DEBBIE BODKIN: Okay.

MS. WENDY LOCKHART-LUNDBERG: But I have that information at home.

MS. DEBBIE BODKIN: Perfect.

MS. WENDY LOCKHART-LUNDBERG: Yeah, so I just really encourage a continuation of this process with, you know, concrete measures put in place that women can actually access, and use, and be able to access without fear, and reprisal, and intimidation, and blocks, and legal measures. If you're going to make a law or a policy, we should just be able to access it without problems and confrontations. You know, like I myself have applied for housing on reserve, and that was like over 30 years ago now too, and we're still going through this thing with our own band about like the housing list, even though we made a motion to have it public. Right?

MS. DEBBIE BODKIN: Mm-hmm.

MS. WENDY LOCKHART-LUNDBERG: And we know -- and we tried to get those lists because we know that the Squamish Nation and other First Nations get direct funding from the federal government. So it was always my argument. And to this day I will go down to my death, it's the fiduciary responsibility of the government. We are Indians under the Indian Act. They have a fiduciary obligation. They can't back off when it suits them and say,
"This isn't our concern and our matter."

You know? They have an obligation. We're Indians under the Indian Act. So you can't just -- you know, you can't just fund something, and then if we can't access it, you can't say, "Well, you have to deal with that yourself because it's not our problem, it's not our issue."

Well, yes, it is your issue. And obviously we can't access it, and we're being threatened, and we're being blocked, and so you have to intervene. It has just to be accessible, to the women especially.

MS. DEBBIE BODKIN: Mm-hmm.

MS. WENDY LOCKHART-LUNDBERG: They're the most vulnerable. So I just want to say thank you, and I want to honour my mother who was an incredible mentor and role model, and so strong despite everything that she went through. And I also want to honour my Aunt Maisie, who was also very strong and powerful in her community, and supporting me in our work together. And also my son, who is also very strong. And as you can imagine, like any family member, how confused, and upset, and angry they feel. Like,

"Why does my mother have to go
through this? Why did my grandmother have to go through this? Why was my great-grandfather and great-grandmother treated this way?"

You know, especially for the younger generation coming up, where he wouldn't have grown up with them. I have a lot of experience of being at my grandmother's or grandparents' home on the reserve. Right? And some experience of being in the community. And now as an adult trying to be in the community to be involved with what's going on there. And, you know, trying to learn some of the language and some of the ways that were lost. But for my son, as younger generations too, can you imagine like the confusion and the, you know, lack of understanding. And no disrespect to him, because he just wasn't given the opportunity to be part of his grandmother's, you know, Aboriginal cultural life.

So I honour him too because he is very strong, and he's very supportive, and compassionate. And I was really fortunate to bring him with me to Ottawa on a couple of occasions. So he met a lot of the women from across Canada, and he witnessed some of the hearings, and -- so he has a really good understanding and appreciation. And, you know, given the opportunity, if he was welcomed into the community -- and he could do good things, you
know? So I honour him as well.

MS. DEBBIE BODKIN: I think you've
honoured all your family members beautifully.

MS. WENDY LOCKHART-LUNDBERG: Thank you.
MS. DEBBIE BODKIN: And I'm honoured to be -- to be able to be here and listen to your story.

MS. WENDY LOCKHART-LUNDBERG: Thank you.
MS. DEBBIE BODKIN: You're extremely strong and beautifully well spoken. I'm envious how well spoken you are.

MS. WENDY LOCKHART-LUNDBERG: Thank you.
MS. DEBBIE BODKIN: I learned a lot listening to you.

MS. WENDY LOCKHART-LUNDBERG: Good.
MS. DEBBIE BODKIN: Work wise, you didn't mention what you're working at now. You said you worked close by.

MS. WENDY LOCKHART-LUNDBERG: So is this on camera?
MS. DEBBIE BODKIN: Yeah. Do you want it off camera? That's fine.

MS. WENDY LOCKHART-LUNDBERG: Well, I can say what I do, I just don't want to mention the organization. Right?

MS. DEBBIE BODKIN: Oh, don't even. Yeah.
MS. WENDY LOCKHART-LUNDBERG: Okay, so I work as an administrative support person.

MS. DEBBIE BODKIN: Okay.

MS. WENDY LOCKHART-LUNDBERG: And I also have some legal assistant background.

MS. DEBBIE BODKIN: Okay.

MS. WENDY LOCKHART-LUNDBERG: And experience working in legal. So I -- that's why I'm able to research and write, and also I think, you know, chronologically put together the presentations that I did. So, yeah, I support -- actually, now I support a team of engineers. And it's almost like a -- in some way I do technical editing and I also do -- it's a bit of first responder work, because we send engineers out to certain fatal and serious injuries around the province, so. Anyway, I support a team of about 14 engineers. And my work is quasi-legal in engineering. And that's what I do.

MS. DEBBIE BODKIN: Wonderful. Well, again, thank you very much for sharing your story.

MS. WENDY LOCKHART-LUNDBERG: Okay. I need some more Kleenex.

MS. DEBBIE BODKIN: Yeah, it's 10:32 and I'm going to shut the equipment off here.

--- Whereupon the statement concluded at 10:32 a.m.
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