IHF FOCUS: Religious intolerance; hate speech; protection of asylum seekers and immigrants; protection of ethnic minorities (indigenous peoples).

Religious Intolerance

The case of *Waldman v. Canada,* decided by the Human Rights Committee established under the ICCPR, has presented an unusual dilemma for Canada. The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms prohibits religious discrimination. The Charter is part of the Constitution of Canada. However, Article 93 of the Canadian Constitution discriminates in favour of Roman Catholics and against other religious denominations.

Constitutional Guarantee

Article 93 gives provincial legislatures exclusive power over education. The article states that any law enacted under this power shall not "prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law in the province at the union." In Ontario, at the time that the province joined Confederation, Roman Catholic schools had rights and privileges which other denominational schools did not have. In particular, Roman Catholic denominational schools received state funding. The effect of Article 93 was to prevent the legislature of Ontario from prejudicially affecting those rights and privileges, including funding. State funding of Roman Catholic schools in Ontario is, by virtue of Article 93, constitutionally entrenched.

Once the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms was entrenched in the Constitution in 1982, and, especially once the equality guarantee in the charter became effective in 1985, the question arose whether the discrimination flowing from Article 93 of the Constitution could survive the entrenchment of the guarantee of equality in section 15 of the Charter. The Supreme Court of Canada decided that it could.

The Supreme Court of Canada also ruled constitutional the 1987 Bill 30, extending funding for Ontario Roman Catholic schools for secondary education.

Even that proposed funding was, according to the Supreme Court, protected by the Constitution. Madam Justice Wilson found that, at the time of Confederation, Roman Catholic separate schools were entitled to public funding for secondary education, even if they were not getting that funding. Thus, the Constitution requires the Ontario Government to fund fully Roman Catholic separate schools. Seen in this light, according to the Court, Bill 30 simply righted an old wrong, said the Canadian Helsinki Watch Group.

After this case was decided, parents who wanted state funding for denominational schools that were not Roman Catholic went to court to argue that the guarantee of equality in the Charter required funding in Ontario for their schools. Individuals from the Calvinistic or Reformed Christian tradition, and members of the Sikh, Hindu, Muslim, and Jewish faiths argued that the Ontario Education Act, by requiring attendance at school, discriminated against those whose conscience or beliefs prevented them from sending their children to either the publicly funded secular or publicly funded Roman Catholic schools, because of the high costs associated with their children's religious education. A declaration was sought stating that the applicants were entitled to funding equivalent to that of public and Roman Catholic schools.

The Supreme Court of Canada rejected this challenge as an attempt to revisit its earlier decision on Bill 30. The Court ruled that the funding of Roman Catholic separate schools could not give rise to an infringement of the Charter because the province of Ontario was constitutionally obligated to provide such funding.[2]

International Obligations

However, Canada has signed and ratified the ICCPR as well as its Optional

Protocol that allows for an individual right of petition against signatory States.[3]

A petition was filed with the Committee by Arieh Waldman to find Canada in violation of the ICCPR because of Roman Catholic separate school funding in Ontario. The Canadian Government made a feeble attempt to argue that Ontario funding to Roman Catholic schools was non-discriminatory because the obligation to provide that funding was in the Canadian Constitution. The Human Rights Committee expressed the obvious view that the preferential treatment of Roman Catholic schools does not cease to offend the equality guarantee in the ICCPR simply because it is in the Canadian Constitution.[4]

The present Ontario Government does not want to do anything at all to redress the situation. However, according to the Canadian Helsinki Watch Group, the implications of international lawlessness are more severe for Canada as a whole than they are for any one province. Given the isolationism of Ontario politics, the violation of Canadian treaty obligations imposed by Ontario legislation will have to be handled by the Federal Government and Parliament alone and directly, said the Group.

The Federal Parliament cannot amend the provisions of the Constitution dealing with separate school funding in Ontario unilaterally, without the agreement of the Ontario legislature. As long as the Government of Ontario insists on maintaining the present regime, that regime is constitutionally protected.

The Canadian Helsinki Watch Group took the position that the Government should put the State in compliance with Canada's treaty obligation under the ICCPR by fully funding all separate schools in Ontario and deducting the money it spends on Ontario separate schools from transfer payments and tax points to Ontario. The Government of Ontario should then be left to decide how they want to respect the obligation not to discriminate, whether by maintaining funding of all separate schools or by funding no separate schools.

Hate Speech

Library Meeting Room Policy

In the past few years, some British Columbia libraries have rented their meeting rooms to the Canadian Free Speech League whose leader, Doug Christie, according to the Law Society of Upper Canada "has made common cause with a small lunatic anti-Semitic fringe element of our society," and the British Columbia Human Rights Commission has promoted hatred in his column for the *North Shore News*.

Both the ICCPR (Article 20.2) and the UN Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination (Article 4c), of which Canada is party, prohibit advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence and public authorities to promote or incite racial discrimination.

According to the Canadian Helsinki Watch Group, the public libraries have a duty to protect against incitement to discrimination and therefore should not rent meeting room space to any person or organization likely to use the space for the purpose of inciting discrimination.

The Library Board had stated that its staff lacked the experience to assess the legal behavior of groups and would have had to rely on outsiders.

The Canadian Helsinki Watch Group was not aware of any library in Canada outside of British Columbia renting a meeting room to an extreme right wing group, a white supremacist group, or a Holocaust denial group. The only time when a refusal to rent a meeting room to such a group was challenged at a library board, in Ottawa, that refusal was upheld and continued.

The Canadian Library Association policy regarding renting premises for meetings is absolutist: free speech is the only human right that matters. However, according to the Canadian Helsinki Watch Group, it is by no means obvious that there should be a linkage between a meeting room policy

and a book acquisition policy, although the Canadian Library Association statement assumes that link. The Group said a library could have a broad policy for acquisition and another narrower policy for use of meeting rooms as granting access to meeting rooms has, in principle, nothing to do with the work of libraries.

The Helsinki Watch Group noted that hate mongers seek out libraries for the same reason that they seek out universities, because of the respectability it gives their cause, because of the aura of credibility it bestows their propaganda: a library location gives hate promoters legitimacy.

The Vancouver Library Board, at a meeting in April 2000, decided to ask renters not to contravene the Criminal Code and British Columbia human rights legislation. If a group refused to sign on to the request, the room could not be rented. If a violation occurred, the group would not be allowed to rent again. Signs would be posted outside meeting rooms stating that the views expressed are not endorsed by and do not necessarily represent views of the library.

According to the Canadian Helsinki Watch Group, this policy, while a step forward, is unsatisfactory because it remains the policy of the library to rent a room to a group even where it can be demonstrated in advance that, in spite of their signing the rental agreement, the group is likely to contravene the Criminal Code and British Columbia human rights legislation. The British Columbia Library should refuse to rent meeting rooms to extreme right wing groups exercising the discretion library managers have to refuse to rent rooms to anyone.

Protection of Asylum Seekers and Immigrants

The Old Refugee Determination Procedure

The old Canadian refugee determination procedure, declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of Canada because of its unfairness, was a very complex system including several deficiencies. One of them was the fact that a person virtually had to violate the Immigration Act to make a refugee claim and the application was on paper only.[5]

Most people went through this system without ever appearing in front of anyone who decided their claim, a feature that attracted the attention of the Supreme Court of Canada. In addition, even if one was rejected at every step (there were 12 in all), there was no remedy from the Federal Court.

The old system suffered from an absence of integration of the overseas and inland refugee determination systems, which used different procedures, standards and criteria. The inland system was so long, drawn out and unfair, that virtually everyone was being rejected, but virtually no one was being removed. The system was completely dysfunctional.

The Present Procedure

The system in the present Act and Regulations is an improvement, but still both needlessly complex and unnecessary unfair. The present Act creates a bifurcated road. The number of steps depends on which of the two roads the claimant is required to take.

Under the present Act, first there is a port of entry interview, where claimants are interviewed on arrival about the substance of their claims without access to counsel, a procedure the Supreme Court of Canada has decided is constitutionally valid. Second, there is eligibility determination, conducted by a senior immigration officer.

The present system is fairer than the old one - for at least some people – but complex. For those found to be "public dangers", the present system is as unfair as the old system. For those who are found to be eligible, there is a fair hearing before an independent expert tribunal. The system is not completely fair because of the denial of access to counsel at the initial port of

entry interview; the absence of an appeal; and the impossibility of reopening to consider change of circumstances, new evidence, or old evidence not previously available. As well, the present system is still needlessly complex, with "public danger" determination procedures that make applications to the Federal Court necessary, and the unfair treatment of refugee claim in the overseas system. There is no right to counsel at refugee interviews, and most visa posts, as a matter of policy, prevent counsel from attending. For example, the visa posts impose criteria that are not part of the inland determination. It is much harder to be recognized as a refugee overseas than inland.

Canada has visa requirements on every country producing significant numbers of refugee claimants; denies visas systematically to everyone who wants to come to Canada to make a refugee claim; and penalizes commercial carriers who bring to Canada persons who need visas but do not have them.

The Canadian policy concerns about immigration numbers from refugee recognition inland are inappropriate. To a large extent, the present design of the inland refugee determination system manages to avoid an unwarranted intrusion of immigration considerations into refugee determinations because, at least for those eligible to make a claim, risk determination is done by an independent tribunal, the Immigration and Refugee Board, and not the Immigration Department.

Immigration concerns intrude more readily into refugee determination overseas because those refugee determinations are done by visa officers who otherwise decide on immigration matters.

The other policy concern that intrudes into Canadian refugee protection unduly is a concern about criminality. International law says that no one, no matter what their crime, should be returned to torture, disappearance or arbitrary execution. Refugees who are also criminals can be returned to danger, but only if the danger they face on return is less than the danger they pose to the community where they seek protection. For Canadian policy makers, this protection of criminals goes too far. Canadian law intrudes into refugee protection to prevent it from happening.

Bill C-31

The Canadian Helsinki Watch Group expressed it opinion that the refugee determination system should be approached with the following objectives in mind: the system should be fair, simple, comply with international law standards and it should be consistent and integrated, not working at cross purposes.

The system proposed in the Government's Bill C-31, introduced in the last Parliament, though in some respects an improvement over the present law, is still needlessly complex, unnecessarily unfair, suffers from a lack of integration and does not fully comply with international law standards.

The proposed system, like the old one, creates a bifurcated road. Some claimants will be found eligible and go through one form of risk determination at the level of the Protection Division of the Immigration and Refugee Board. Other claimants will be found ineligible and go through another form of risk determination, an administrative pre-removal risk assessment. A third group of claimants go down a dead end road with removal without any form of risk assessment whatsoever.

The criterion of "public danger" disappears. Bill C-31, though removing the "public danger" label, makes matters worse. Rather than a double hurdle for ineligibility, as there is in the present system, of a crime with a high maximum sentence plus a "public danger" determination, there will be only a single hurdle of a conviction of a crime with a high maximum sentence.

Under the Bill once a person is declared ineligible, the person goes into a different risk determination stream. Risk de-

termination is made by pre-removal risk assessment by the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, but also allows the Minister to delegate that power to decide. Under the Bill, the definition of risk that both the Protection Division of the Immigration and Refugee Board and pre-removal risk assessment officials would consider is the same.

So, the Bill contemplates two streams of claimants, going into two different determination systems where the risk definition applied would be the same, and where the procedure for application of the definition could potentially be the same. Furthermore, eligible but rejected refugee claimants would be able to go into pre-removal risk assessment, in effect, getting two refugee determinations.

Moreover, those rejected as refugees or found ineligible to make a claim, as well as those who have abandoned or withdrawn their claims cannot apply for refugee determination, if they have left Canada and then returned. They cannot apply for pre-removal risk assessment either, where the return is within a year of the departure.

Another gap in protection, both under the present law and the Bill, is protection from danger for a person recognized as a Convention refugee by another country who can be returned to that country. The gap should be addressed. To do that, there is a need for an amendment to the definition of "a person in need of protection" in the Bill.

In addition to the unnecessary steps of ineligibility and pre-removal risk assessment, the Bill adds the need to apply for a judicial stay of execution of a removal order to keep the person in Canada pending an application for leave and judicial review of a negative refugee determination by the Refugee Appeal Division of the Immigration and Refugee Board.

The Bill, like all its predecessors, does little to address the connection between the refugee determination overseas and refugee determination in Canada.

The Canadian Helsinki Watch Group gave the following recommendation about Bill C-31:

1. Everyone in Canada should be eligible to make a refugee claim. There should be no ineligibility step before refugee determination.
2. There should be no administrative pre-removal risk assessment procedure but instead a re-opening jurisdiction in the Protection Division of the Immigration and Refugee Board paralleling the existing re-opening jurisdiction of the Appeal Division of the Immigration and Refugee Board.
3. It should not be necessary to apply for a discretionary stay to the Federal Court. There should be, as now, a statutory stay pending applications for leave.
4. There should be a right to counsel at port of entry refugee interviews.
5. If there is an administrative pre-removal risk assessment procedure, there should be an oral hearing under this procedure, at the very least, for those who had no oral hearing from the Protection Division of the Immigration and Refugee Board.
6. Even if there is an administrative pre-removal risk assessment procedure that considers change of country conditions, there should be a reopening jurisdiction in the Board to consider new evidence or old evidence not previously available.
7. In order to ensure a refugee determination procedure that brings to its task no bias, or reasonable apprehension of bias, Parliament should legislate a transparent, professional and accountable selection procedure for members of the Immigration and Refugee Board.
8. It should be possible to appeal from abandonment decisions.
9. A person should be allowed to make a refugee claim whether he/she is under a removal order or not.
10. If there is both an eligibility stage and

an administrative pre-removal risk assessment stage, everyone who is ineligible for consideration by the Protection Division of the Immigration and Refugee Board should be eligible for consideration under the pre-removal risk assessment procedure.

11. The Bill should grant both the power to prevent removal to generalized risk and to risk that may not be so general as to put everyone at risk, but enough to be faced "generally by other individuals in or from that country." As well, there should be provision to allow for suspension of removals based on the application of individuals.
12. There needs to be mechanism for dealing with danger in a country which has granted the person refugee status and to which the person could be returned, but for that danger.
13. For generalized risk, in addition to gaps in protection coverage, there are failings in due process in the proposed Bill.
14. The Bill should prohibit the removal of anyone to torture, arbitrary execution, or torture.
15. Refugee determinations overseas should be done by the Protection Division of the Immigration and Refugee Board, using the same procedures as in Canada.
16. At the very least, the Bill should recognize there is a right to counsel at refugee interviews at visa posts abroad.
17. As long as the refugee determination procedure overseas remains the same as it is now, the Bill should provide for eligibility to make an inland claim where the person is rejected overseas.

Protection of Ethnic Minorities

Indigenous Peoples[6]

Self-government remained a contentious issue in 2000 with continuing conflict over aboriginal and treaty rights throughout the country. In its review of Canada's Fourth Periodic Report in April 1999, the UN Human Rights Committee raised questions regarding the right to self-determination (Article 1 of ICCPR) and several members asked how this right relates to aboriginal peoples' claims for self-government.[7]

The 1996 Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples Report urged more federal spending for aboriginal peoples and cautioned that failure to improve the conditions for aboriginal peoples could lead to more violence like that which erupted in Oka, Quebec, in 1990. The Canadian Government initiative entitled *Gathering Strength – Canada's Aboriginal Action Plan* is intended to respond to the need to build a new relationship. However, progress has been slow and in 2000 confrontations between aboriginal peoples seeking to enforce their aboriginal and treaty rights and the federal and provincial authorities flared. The social and economic consequences of failed policy continued to be felt. On a positive note, the Nisga'a Treaty received Royal Assent in early 2000. Phil Fontaine, then Chief of the Assembly of First Nations noted this was "a powerful and historic moment for the Nisg'a people. The passage of the Nisga'a Bill is the final chapter in a 100-year-old story of a Nation and its people who have fought to have their self-government rights recognized by the Canadian Government. For the first time in Canadian history the jurisdiction of First Nations Government has been affirmed and recognized by the Federal and provincial Governments of this land."[8]

Voting Rights - Implementing the Corbiere[9] Decision

In 1999, the Supreme Court of Canada found that Section 77 (1) of the Indian Act violated the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms by denying off-reserve members the right to vote in band elections. The Supreme Court subsequently stated that Canada had 18 months to amend Section 77 (1) of the Indian Act, and if it failed to do so, then off-reserve residents would

have the same voting rights as on-reserve residents.

Consultations between the Canadian Federal Government and First Nations regarding amending the Indian Act proved to be inadequate. The Federal Government's amendments to the Indian Band Election Regulations and the Indian Referendum Regulations[10] failed to address the concerns of First Nations. The Assembly of First Nations noted, "In the end it is First Nations communities that suffer the consequences." [11]

Nisga'a Treaty

The *Nisga'a Final Agreement Act*, negotiated between the Nisga'a people, the Government of Canada and the Government of British Columbia, received royal assent on 13 April 2000. This gave full legal effect to the treaty, which grants the Nisga'a title to 2,000 square kilometres of the lower Nass Valley, limited self-government, extensive fishing and logging rights, other treaty rights and a cash settlement.

Treaty Rights

Conflict between aboriginal peoples and resource companies continued in 2000. The exercise of treaty rights was also a source of conflict between aboriginal peoples and non-aboriginals.

The 1999 unrest over fishing in Miramichi, New Brunswick resulted in conflict between members of the Burnt Church First Nation and non-aboriginal fishermen. The conflict over fishing resources continued in 2000.

◆ In Nova Scotia in 10 September members of the Indian Brook band were charged with illegal fishing and assaulting police officers. They claimed they were exercising their treaty right to fish upheld in the Supreme Court's decision in Marshall.[12] In the Marshall case, the Court reaffirmed that local treaties signed by the Mi'kmaq and Maliseet communities include a communal right to fish and hunt in pursuit of a "moderate livelihood." In addressing fishing rights, the Court was clear that the Treaty right is subject to regulation, however regulations that infringe that right must be justifiable.

◆ In Quebec, seven Algonquin protesters were arrested for blockading two logging roads in a game preserve. The protesters claimed that logging by the forestry company, Domtar, would destroy their livelihood. They claimed that logging permits held by the company were granted illegally because they had never ceded any rights to the land.

Dudley George – Ipperwash

In April 1999, the UN Human Rights Committee urged Canada to hold a public inquiry into the shooting death of Dudley George in 1995.[13] George, an aboriginal activist, was shot dead by Ontario Provincial Police at Ipperwash Provincial Park. The Ontario provincial Government continued to block an inquiry. There were calls in the Ontario legislature for the Ontario Human Rights Commission to be given the power to investigate whether the lack of a public inquiry into Dudley Georges's death violates the Human Rights Code.[14]

Innu

The 1999 report by Survival International, entitled *Canada's Tibet: the Killing of the Innu,* claimed, "The Mushua Innu of Uthshimassits are the most suicide-ridden people in the world." Traditionally a hunting people, many were forcibly relocated by the Canadian Government thirty years ago with a devastating impact on their way of life. The Innu have suffered from high rates of severe alcoholism, domestic violence and teen suicide. The Innu have been engaged in lengthy land claims negotiations with the Federal Government, but in the meantime they have suffered immense social and economic problems.

The Innu's sacred hunting grounds have continued to be plagued by ultra high-speed low-level training flights by Canada's military and its allies. In 2000 the Italian Air

Force started low-level training. A 10- year agreement between the Canadian and Italian Governments signed in 1999 allows the Italian Air Force to train in low-level flying at 5 Wing Goose Bay.[15] The Italian Air Force joined crews from the Royal Air Force, the German Air Force and the Royal Netherlands Air Force. The Innu argued that these training flights had an adverse affect on the land, animals and environment and prevented them from living normally.

Controversy over the development of a huge nickel mining project at Voisey's Bay and massive hydroelectric projects (the Lower Churchill Project) on land claimed by the Innu continued. In 1999, an "agreement in principle" was reached between the Innu Nation, Canada and Newfoundland that aimed to provide the Innu with the tools necessary to address the issues confronting their community. However, this was an interim step that did not fully address Innu land claims or self-government. Lack of progress on the implementation of this agreement led to the June 2000 offer by the Innu. Among other things the Innu demand that they be treated like other First Nations while waiting for land claims to be settled and offered to accept less land in hopes of speeding up the negotiation process.[16]

Economic and Social Indicators

In 2000, the UN Development Programme ranked Canada first in terms of human development.[17] However the social, economic and health indicators for aboriginal peoples ranked far lower than for the Canadian population as a whole. The same report noted that in 1991 the life expectancy at birth of Inuit males was 58 years and that of registered Indian Males 62 years, 17 and 13 years less, respectively, than for all Canadian males. Suicide rates of Registered Indian youth (ages 15 to 24) were are eight times higher than the national rate for females and five times higher for males.[18]

There has been a rapid increase and prevalence of HIV infection in aboriginal communities. This situation is worsened because those at risk remain socio-economically marginalized and are reluctant to undergo HIV tests. The annual proportion of AIDS cases attributed to aboriginal persons has increased over time, from 1 per cent before 1990 to 15 per cent in 1999.[19] In comparison to non-aboriginal peoples, aboriginal peoples have a 6.6 times greater incidence of tuberculosis, are 3 times as likely to be diabetic and 2 times as likely to report a long-term disability.[20]

Misconduct by Law Enforcement Authorities

◆ Following an RCMP investigation, charges of unlawful confinement and assault were filed against two Saskatoon city police officers on 12 April. Darrell Night alleged that the two officers arrested him in the early hours of 28 January, drove him to an isolated area on the outskirts of Saskatoon, took his jacket and threw him out of the police car while shouting racist remarks at him. The temperature was –26 Celsius that night. Two other aboriginal men, Rodney Naistus and Lawrence Wegner were found frozen to death within the next week in the same area Night alleges he was thrown from the police car. The RCMP was investigating these two deaths and three other deaths in similar circumstances.[21]

◆ On 17 February, the Winnipeg police chief put five members of his force on indefinite leave with pay pending an investigation into the deaths of two Metis women, Doreen LeClair and Corinne McKeowen.[22] It has been alleged they failed to respond to the calls because the women were aboriginal. The women made five 911 emergency calls before the police responded to a domestic incident. It took eight hours for the police to arrive on the scene by which time both women were dead in what appeared to have been a brutal stabbing. A former boyfriend was arrested and charged with second-degree murder for allegedly stabbing the two women.

Endnotes

[1] Based on the Annual Report of the Canadian Helsinki Watch Group (by David Matas).
[2] Adler v. Ontario [1996] 3 S.C.R. 609.
[3] Article 25 of the Constitution. Article 2(2) of the ICCPR provides: "Where not already provided for by existing legislative or other measures, each State Party to the present Covenant undertakes to take the necessary steps, in accordance with its constitutional processes and with the provisions of the present Covenant, to adopt such laws or other measures as may be necessary to give effect to the rights recognized in the present Covenant."
[4] Arieh Hollis Waldman v. Canada, Human Rights Committee, 05/11/99, CCPR/C/67/D/694/1996, paragraph 10.4.
[5] Oral hearings were possible only if the Immigration Appeal Board after a negative decision by the Minister of Immigration believed that there were reasonable grounds to believe that the claimant, at the oral hearing, could succeed in the claim.
[6] This term does not refer to one homogenous group but to four distinct cultural groups: North American (First Nations) Indians registered and not registered under the Indian Act, Metis people and Inuit. The author of this section is Rachel Hammonds.
[7] www.unhchr.ch
[8] www.afn.ca - Nisga'a Bill Receives Royal Assent – Press Release.
[9] Corbiere v. Canada (Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs) [1999] 2 S.C.R. 203.
[10] Published in the *Canada Gazette* on 2 September, 2000.
[11] www.afn.ca
[12] R. v. Marshall [1999] 3 S.C.R.
[13] www.unhchr.ch At its 1747th meeting on 6 April 1999, the Committee adopted a recommendation strongly urging "the State party to establish a public inquiry into all aspect of this matter, including the role and responsibility of public officials."
[14] NDP News Release, "Tories Block Human Rights Probe of Ipperwash," 31 October 2000.
[15] www.capitalnet.com/~pmogb/website/announcements/italy_e.html
[16] www.innu.ca
[17] United Nations Development Programme, *Human Development Report 2000.*
[18] www.ainc-inac.gc.ca/gs/soci_e.html
[19] www.hc-sc.gc.ca
[20] See endnote 17.
[21] *Windspeaker News,* May 2000. www.ammsa.com/windspeaker
[22] www.angelfire.com (18 February, 2001), www.ammsa.com/windspeaker (March 2000).