IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CANADA

(On Appeal from the Court of Appeal for the Province of Ontario)

BETWEEN:

MCKINNEY ET AL.

Appellants

AND:

7-38 218

C.13

33

7.3

55

. 4

ì

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH ET AL. and ATTORNEY GENERAL OF ONTARIO

Respondents

FACTUM OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA INTERVENER

SACK, CHARNEY, GOLDBLATT

i TCHELL

Barristers and Solicitors

20 Dundas Street West

Suite 1130

Toronto, Ontario

JEFFREY SACK, Q.C. (416) 977-6070

Solicitors for the Appellants

SOLOWAY, WRIGHT, HOUSTON, GREENBERG, MORIN Barristers and Solicitors 99 Metcalfe Street Ottawa, Ontario K1P 6L7

ROBERT E. HOUSTON (613) 782-3222

Ottawa Agents for the Appellants

INDEX

			Page No.
PART	I	Statement of Facts	1
PART	II	Points in Issue	2
PART	III	Argument	3
חמאת	TV	Order Sought	5

No. 20747

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CANADA

(On Appeal from the Court of Appeal for the Province of Ontario)

BETWEEN:

MCKINNEY ET AL.

Appellants

AND:

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH ET AL. and ATTORNEY GENERAL OF ONTARIO

Respondents

FACTUM OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA INTERVENER

PART I

STATEMENT OF FACTS

1. That portion of the Statement of Facts relating to Application of the <u>Charter</u> to the Respondent Universities as set out in Part I of the Factum submitted on behalf of the Appellants is adopted by the Attorney General of Canada for purposes of this appeal.

10

PART II POINTS IN ISSUE

- 2. The constitutional questions stated on this appeal are as follows:
 - 1. Does s. 9(a) of the <u>Ontario Human Rights Code</u>, 1981, c. 53 violate the rights guaranteed by S.15(1) of the <u>Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms</u>?
 - 2. Is s. 9(a) of the <u>Ontario Human Rights Code</u>, S.O. 1981, c. 53 demonstrably justified by s. 1 of the <u>Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms</u> as a reasonable limit on the rights guaranteed by s. 15(1) of the <u>Charter</u>?
- 3. Does the <u>Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms</u> apply to the mandatory retirement provisions of the respondent universities?
 - 4. If the <u>Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms</u> does apply to the respondent universities, do the mandatory retirement provisions enacted by each of them infringe s. 15(1) of the <u>Charter</u>?
- 5. if the <u>Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms</u> does apply to the respondent universities, are the mandatory retirement provisions enacted by each of them demonstrably justified by s. 1 of the <u>Charter</u> as a reasonable limit on the rights guaranteed by s. 15(1) of the <u>Charter</u>?

3. The Attorney General of Canada makes submissions as to the tests to be applied in answering Question 3, but takes no position on the other questions.

PART III ARGUMENT

Application of the Charter

4. The Ontario Court of Appeal held in this case,
(1988), 63 O.R. (2d) 1 at pp. 24-5, that the Charter does not
apply to universities or other bodies simply because they may
be "creatures of the legislature". Rather, that Court held
that it is important to consider whether a body is created to
perform a governmental function and whether the action
complained of is a governmental function. In all of the
circumstances, the Court concluded, at p. 28, that the
Charter "has no direction application to the respondent
universities or to their contracts of employment with the
appellants".

A CARANTER DE LA SERVICIO DE LA COMPANSION DE CONTROL DE CONTROL DE CONTROL DE CONTROL DE CONTROL DE CONTROL D

appropriate for the Court of Appeal to apply the tests on which it relied in making its decision, and that the Court may have been right in holding that the Charter does not apply to the respondent universities or their contracts of employment with the Appellants. But, a conclusion in that regard must be reached upon a proper weighing of all relevant circumstances in light of all the tests and factors referred to in paragraphs 3-11 and 13-16 of the Factum of the Attorney General of Canada in The University of British Columbia v. Connell. The Attorney General of Canada makes no submission as to what is the correct conclusion in that regard.

PART IV

ORDER SOUGHT

6. The Attorney General of Canada takes no position on the disposition of the constitutional Questions as stated in this appeal.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

10