

- TWU is about a human rights issue that applies to our territory and not about human rights in other provinces or territories.
 - This is different than waiting and seeing what happens in other jurisdictions based on different legislation. Ms. Ahlfors wants to put his name on a list if the resolution passes, to work pro bono on this issue if litigation is necessary on this issue.
- **Questions/comments on Resolution 1**
 - Q: Jack Squire - With all the law schools across the globe, how are you going to let the standards and policies of every law school everywhere before deciding whether to admit a student to Nunavut?
 - A: Thomas Ahlfors - Only Canadian law schools are accepted for admission here, as foreign lawyers have to attend some classes at a Canadian institution. Foreign universities are not at issue.
 - Comment: Barry McLaren - No formal motion to discuss this issue.
 - **Motion** to open discussion:
 - **Moved by Barry McLaren and seconded by Thomas Ahlfors. Motion Carried.**
 - Comment: John MacLean – The resolution was not unanimous at a Canadian Bar Association National Council meeting in February. The biggest barrier currently is money.
 - The profession has come a long way in making sure there is professional representative of population it serves.
 - A law faculty should not infringe on individual right to privacy.
 - Strongly recommended approving motion and following human rights legislation.
 - Comment: Marc Noreau – There are only 15 members of LSN in the room. This is an important subject and resolution, and 15 members should not necessarily be able to pass this resolution without a complete debate.
 - **Motion** to put off this debate until later date:
 - **Moved by Marc Noreau and seconded by Philip Grassie. Motion Carried.**
 - Comment: Phillip Grassie - The issue is currently under litigation and it would be prudent for us to wait for a judicial outcome before making our own decision.
 - Comment: Thomas Ahlfors – We should not wait because proper notice of the motion went out in accordance with rules of the LSN, so anyone who wanted to be here could have come or phoned in.

- Waiting for a judicial decision is not persuasive, as our *Human Rights Act* is different from other jurisdictions and whatever decision is made would not necessarily be applicable here.
- Comment: Mark Mossey – For rule of law purposes, the Charter needs to be considered as well as the *Human Rights Act*.
- Comment: Scott Wheildon – A committee will look at anti-discriminatory provisions when created – we currently do not have the benefit of what the Federation says at present.
 - If the resolution isn't studied further, there is also the possibility of eroding the National Mobility Agreement and Territorial Mobility Agreement. A study needs to be done on a national level to assist in deliberation. We may not be considering all ramifications of the issue.
 - We should adjourn to engage in greater consultation with membership, to hear what judiciary will say, and to study the impact on territorial mobility agreement should we adopt this resolution.
- Comment: Terrence Meyers – There needs to be discussion of whether or not this is a direction we want to move in.
 - Further discussion may be in the form of committee to provide more procedural direction for members and see what principles we support. The committee could then evaluate this on larger scale, and take account of judicial interpretation.
 - Lay individuals, judiciary, and community stakeholders should all be brought in.
- Comment: Mark Mossey – Willingness to commit to this idea.
- Comment: Thomas Ahlfors – Asked if Mark Mossey could amend the motion. Scott Wheildon seconds.
- **Motion** for resolution to be put forward to the next AGM
 - **Motion by Marc Noreau, seconded by Thomas Ahlfors. Motion Carried with one opposed.**
- Comment: Mark Mossey – The Federation process takes a long time to work through. Only admit students through nationally accredited law schools.
- Q: Marie Belleau – It seemed like a debate about TWU was going to happen today but will now be adjourned for another year.
 - A: Mark Mossey – It is prudent to put this off for a year, as there needs to be a significant amount of analysis at many levels.
 - A decision could also jeopardize unanimity of the national level.

- Today, all the membership has done is to say the decision will be postponed, as there is the potential for significant consequences.
- Comment: Scott Wheildon – This is a major issue and will not be put off for a significant period of time. The Executive has seen the motion and understands the need to work towards a conclusion. This will be presented as a motion for next year.