
**Christian Legal Fellowship (CLF)/Canadian Council of
Christian Charities (CCCC) Symposium
“THE PLACE OF RELIGION IN SOCIETY”
Toronto – September 29, 2005**

**Advancing Religion as a Head of Charity:
What Are the Boundaries?
(Revised)**

By Terrance S. Carter, B.A., LL.B.
© 2005 Carter & Associates

Powerpoint Presentation

For complete paper see www.charitylaw.ca

CARTERS.ca

CARTER & ASSOCIATES
PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

BARRISTERS, SOLICITORS & TRADE-MARK AGENTS
Affiliated with Fasken Martineau DuMoulin LLP

Offices / Bureaux
Orangeville (519) 942-0001
Ottawa (613) 212-2213
Toll Free / San frais:
1-877-942-0001

www.carters.ca

Locations by Appointment /
Bureaux par rendez-vous
Toronto (416) 675-3766
London (519) 937-2333
Vancouver (877) 942-0001

www.charitylaw.ca

OVERVIEW OF TOPICS

- **Advancing Religion as a Head of Charity: Why Should You Care?**
- **Overview of Advancement of Religion**
- **Can a Single Issue Religious Organization be Charitable?**
- **Advancing Religion and the Charter of Rights and Freedoms**
- **Recent Policies by CRA Affecting Advancement of Religion**
- **Advancement of Religion in Other Jurisdictions**
- **Conclusion**

2

A. Advancing Religion as a Head of Charity: Why Should You Care?

- **For para-church organizations, a restriction on advancement of religion can narrow the ability to obtain charitable status**
- **For churches and other religious organizations, the narrowing of advancement of religion as a head of charity can constrain what is done outside of normal worship and mission work**
- **For many Christians, charitable work is seen as a manifestation of faith in action**

3

- **Religious practice (i.e. charitable works) is as important as religious belief in defining advancement of religion. They are not mutually exclusive**
- **It is the practical manifestations of faith in everyday life that makes religion of value to society**
- **The importance of the practical manifestation of religious belief was recently affirmed by the SCC in *Syndicat Northwest v. Amselem***
- **The SCC also acknowledged that a broad definition should be afforded to the definition of religion**

4

B. Overview of Advancement of Religion

- **The courts and CRA recognize four heads of charity: relief of poverty, advancement of education, advancement of religion, and “other purposes” beneficial to the community**
- **In order to obtain charitable status in Canada, an organization must be able to fit its objects and activities within one or more of these heads**

5

- **Recently, the other three heads of charity have generally been broadened in both scope and application by the courts and CRA**
- **However, with inconsistent court decisions involving advancement of religion, the question remains what are the boundaries of advancing religion as a head of charity?**
- **What is it that makes religion charitable?**
 - **Religion makes us want to become better members of society – Carl Juneau**
 - **Propensity towards volunteering and assisting others is based on ethical mores taught by religions**

6

- **Religion is one of the few catalysts that exist by which private conscience can become part of the public conscience**
- **Society’s understanding of rights and responsibilities and our societal notions of freedom are fundamentally based on the morality and values that emanate from religion**
- **Law would be hollow and ineffectual in the absence of the values and principles that underlie it and support it, all of which are shaped and informed by religion**

7

- **Historical background**
 - In the Middle Ages, the Church was responsible for administering intestate estates and other charitable gifts, and provided most of the “welfare” services for those in need in society
 - *Statute of Elizabeth 1601* - The purpose of the preamble was to illustrate charitable purposes rather than to draw up an exhaustive definition of charity

8

- Sir Francis Moor at that time advocated that advancement of religion should be purposely excluded from the preamble in order to protect it from political influence
- In the 19th Century, the courts began to recognize that it was inappropriate to draw distinctions between one religion over another
- *Special Commissioners of Income Tax v. Pemsel* in 1891 recognized advancement of religion as a head of charity

9

- **What are the fundamentals of advancement of religion as a head of charity?**
 - The court has always had the jurisdiction to decide what is charitable [*Vancouver Society* decision].
 - Must have purposes that are exclusively and legally recognized as charitable
 - Must be established for the benefit of the public or a sufficient segment of the public
 - Must be a religious purpose which permits faith in a God and worship of that God

10

– There is an important distinction between charitable purpose and charitable activities

- It is the purpose in furtherance of which an activity is carried out, not the character of the activity itself that determines whether or not an activity is of a charitable nature. [*Vancouver Society* decision]

– Religious purpose should be given a wide meaning in order to avoid conflicts between the judicial and public views and to reflect the evolving nature of religion [*Ontario Law Reform Commission, 1996*]

11

– Courts should not decide on the truth of religious doctrine [*Hanlon* decision].

– Presumption of Public Benefit

- Well established legal principle that advancement of religion is *prima facie* charitable and is assumed to be for the public benefit
- A religious charity can only be shown not to be for the public benefit if its doctrines are adverse to the foundations of all religion and subversive of all morality [*Thornton* decision]

12

– Public v. private religious observance

- A debate has arisen whether a distinction should be drawn between public worship and private worship when determining whether a public benefit exists
- In *Gilmour v. Coates*, a gift to a contemplative order was held not to be charitable, as it did not provide a discernable public benefit
- However, in *Neville Estates Ltd. V. Madden*, the fact that a synagogue was theoretically open to the public and that the members lived their lives in the world was found to be worshipping in a sufficiently public way

13

- In the recent case of *Jensen v. Brisbane City Council*, the court determined that a room was being used for public worship, despite the fact that some of the events held in the meeting room were not open to the public
- Drawing a distinction between public and private worship could be interpreted as having a discriminatory effect, since the courts would then be expressing “a preference for religions which do not go in for private observance” Prof. J. Phillips

14

- Advancing religion can involve speaking out on social, moral and ethical issues
 - “the promotion of religion means the promotion of spiritual teaching in a wide sense, and the maintenance of the doctrines on which it rests, and the observances which serve to promote and manifest it – not merely a foundation or cause to which it can be related.” *Keren Kayemeth Le Jisroel Ltd. V. IRC* as followed in *Re Anderson*

15

- Where political and economic beliefs are fundamental to a religious organization’s religious beliefs, such political and economic beliefs will be considered to be part of its religious beliefs. *Holy Spirit Association v Tax Commission of N.Y.*
- Common law examples:
 - *Re Scowcroft*, a gift of a reading room “to be maintained for the furtherance of Conservative principles and religious and mental improvement” was found to be charitable

16

- *Re Hood*, where the court determined that a gift that was made to spread Christianity by encouraging others to take active steps to stop the drinking of alcohol was found to be a charitable gift
- *Ontario (Public Trustee) v. Toronto Humane Society*, the Ontario High Court of Justice held that a charity was permitted to engage in political activities as long as these activities were ancillary and incidental to charitable purposes

17

C. Can a Single Issue Religious Organization Be Charitable?

- The question remains whether it is possible for a religious organization to be considered charitable where its main activity consists of something that in itself may not be intrinsically religious, but is done for a religious purpose
- CRA suggests single issue religious organizations cannot be charitable – the pursuit of one object which is not intrinsically religious and that may be pursued equally for religious and secular purposes is not charitable as advancing religion

18

- CRA looks at the character of the activities engaged in, not the motivation behind the formation of the group, when assessing charitable status
- In order to be charitable for CRA, a religious organization must involve a ‘significant element of religion’ and be able to pass the ‘religious substance’ test:
 - Is the activity accepted in the writings or by a majority of the followers of that faith as central to the pursuit of that particular religion?

19

– Does it fit directly or by analogy into one of the categories of activities historically considered to advance religion, such as:

- The maintenance and promotion of public worship, including the building and repair of churches
- The orderly administration of divine services – support of clergy
- Spreading religion

• As a result of this policy, a single issue religious charity would have to show it meets the criteria for one of the other three heads of charity in order to qualify for charitable status

20

• Example of a religious humanitarian organization

- World Vision Canada is an example of a single issue religious charity
- World Vision Canada describes itself on its website as “a Christian humanitarian organization reaching out to a hurting world”
- CRA lists World Vision Canada under the category of “Missionary Organizations and Propagation of Gospel”, even though World Vision Canada does not present itself as a missionary organization or otherwise pursues other forms of evangelization

21

– Presumably, if World Vision Canada were to apply for charitable status today, one would assume that World Vision Canada should be able to qualify under both the relief of poverty head and the advancing religion head, as its mission is to relieve poverty as a way of demonstrating God’s love in response to a hurting world

22

- However, given CRA's current policy, World Vision Canada would likely only qualify for charitable status under the head of relieving poverty
- Such a designation would not reflect the true nature of the organization
- It could potentially be misleading to donors
- It could potentially expose directors to breach of trust
- It would also deny the ability of the charity and donor to make religious based restrictive gifts

23

- Example of faith-based food organization
 - Consider a religious organization that prepares food to be used for religious observance and is considered an act of worship (i.e. some Hindu and Jewish adherents)
 - The manner in which the food is prepared involves various religious rituals which can involve only certain ingredients and be prepared by certain individuals as an act of worship

24

- These organizations are funded by adherents whose intent it is to advance their religion
- Take away the religious aspect of food preparation and such an organization would not qualify as a charity
- CRA would have to look at the motive driving the organization and not the activity alone in order for the organization to be considered charitable

25

- **CRA policy at odds with Supreme Court of Canada**
 - **CRA’s position respecting single issue religious organizations runs contrary to the fundamental principle established by the Supreme Court of Canada with respect to determining what is charitable:**
 - **It is the motive or purpose behind the activities that must be scrutinized when determining whether an organization is charitable [Vancouver Society decision]**

26

- **Inconsistent to suggest that motives behind the formation of a group are irrelevant**
- **‘Religious substance’ test is very restrictive and is inconsistent with tests used by courts**
- **CRA’s test appears to only recognize mainstream religious groups engaging in public worship**
- **A more rational approach to the issue would be to look for indicia of a nexus between the activity taking place and the advancement of religion**

27

D. Advancing Religion and the Charter of Rights and Freedoms

- **SCC decision in *Amselem* provides a broad definition of freedom of religion:**
 - **Freedom to undertake practices, and harbour beliefs, having a nexus with religion, in which an individual demonstrates he or she sincerely believes or is sincerely undertaking in order to connect with the divine or as a function of his or her spiritual faith**

28

- Subjective and personal notions of religious belief, obligation, precept, commandment, custom or ritual are encompassed by this freedom
- It is the religious or spiritual essence of the action, not any mandatory or perceived-as-mandatory nature of its observance that attracts protection
- Courts should avoid judicially interpreting and determining the content of a subjective understanding of a religious requirement

29

- Courts must proceed on the basis that the Charter does not create a hierarchy of rights and that the right to religious freedom enshrined in the Charter is expansive [*Same Sex Marriage Reference* decision]
 - Freedom to practice one’s beliefs is at the core of the freedom of religion

30

- Possible charter challenges to advancing religion
 - Argument 1: freedom of religion and conscience is offended by the conferral of positive state benefits on the basis of religious status
 - Rejected in *Re Mackay* decision: Monetary support by the state for the expression of minority views cannot offend the conscience of those opposed to the viewpoint
 - Indirect subsidy achieved through charitable status does not constitute state affirmation that one religious view is superior to another

31

– **Argument 2: a charitable purpose cannot be contrary to public policy [*Canada Trustco* decision]**

- **A charitable purpose will only be found void for public policy reasons in clear cases in which harm to the public is substantially incontestable**
- **Allowing individuals to hold religious beliefs and to practice in accordance to those beliefs is not a violation of the religious freedom of those who do not agree with the beliefs in question**

32

– **Argument 3: by denying charitable status to a religious group, CRA is in effect saying that one religion is less worthy than another, thereby denying equality before the law**

- **Not a violation of the Charter for the government to provide funding to some religious groups while withholding it to others [*Adler* decision]**

33

E. Recent Policies By CRA Affecting Advancement of Religion

- **New CRA policy on Applicants Assisting Ethnocultural Communities**
 - **Sets out guidelines for registering community organizations assisting disadvantaged ethnocultural communities in Canada**
 - **Provides framework within which these organizations can attain charitable status.**
 - **Religious organizations must qualify under one of, or a combination of, the four heads of charitable purposes, including advancement of religion**

34

- An ethnocultural group is defined by the shared characteristics that are unique to, and recognized by that group, which include ancestry, language, country of origin, national identity and religion
- Religion is only considered to be a shared characteristic if it is inextricably linked to the group’s racial or cultural identity
- Concerns were raised that previous draft of policy would have narrowed scope of advancing religion i.e. because of its implied reference to opposing abortion and promoting or opposing same sex marriage
- CRA revised policy eliminated this reference in response to the concerns raised

35

- New proposed CRA policy on meeting the Public Benefit Test
 - Proposed policy seeks to clarify the rules relating to public benefit
 - Proposes a two-part public benefit test that requires proof of tangible public benefit being conferred
 - A tangible benefit must be conferred, directly or indirectly
 - Benefit must have a public character, that is, be directed to the public or a sufficient section of the public

36

- presumption of public benefit could be challenged when the “contrary is shown”
- “a religious charity can only be shown not to be for the public benefit if its doctrines are adverse to the foundations of all religion and subversive of all morality” *Re Watson [emphasis added]*
- Example used in previous draft stated that: “where a religious organization is set up that promotes beliefs that tend to undermine accepted foundations of religion or morality, the presumption of public benefit can be challenged” *[emphasis added]*

37

– Example deleted in response to concerns that this would have broadened the circumstances in which the presumption of public benefit under advancement of religion could be challenged

– i.e. from promoting beliefs that are contrary to the foundations of all religion and subversive to all morality to promoting beliefs that are contrary to any accepted foundations of religion or morality

38

F. Advancement of Religion in Other Jurisdictions

- U.K.: A new Charities Bill was reintroduced in the House of Lords in May 2005 following the most recent Parliamentary elections. The Report stage is provisionally scheduled for October 2005
 - Proposes an expansive list of descriptions of heads of charity, including advancement of religion, advancement of human rights, and conflict resolution or reconciliation
 - Introduces a statutory public benefit test which eliminates the common law presumption that a purpose of a particular description is for the public benefit

39

- This may narrow the current common law position for organizations applying under the traditional heads by imposing a new mandatory, but unclear, public benefit threshold requirement
- Australia: In 2003, the government released a draft Charities Bill, however, after a consultation process which exposed several deficiencies in the legislation, the government decided to continue to use the common law definition of charity

40

- Passed new legislation (*Extension of Charitable Purposes Act*) that has the effect of extending the common law definition of charity to include charitable purposes such as the provision of childcare on a non-profit basis and closed or contemplative religious orders that offer prayerful intervention to the public

41

G. Conclusion

- In Canada, it will be left to the courts and to CRA from an administrative context to decide the future of advancement of religion
 - Room for advocacy work on the part of religious organizations to ensure CRA policy respecting single issue religious charities concords with decisions from Supreme Court [*Vancouver Society* decision]

42

- As a result of the *Amselem* decision (concerning the practical manifestations of faith as an aspect of religious freedom under the Charter) and the broad recognition of the nature and extent of religion by the courts in all jurisdictions, a broader definition of awareness of religion is warranted


43

- Religion has a significant role in identifying and promoting values that advocate and encourage personal attitudes towards others and conduct between citizens which, even in a non-legal sense, is charitable
 - It is appropriate for the state to continue to provide broad support for religious organizations by granting and maintaining their charitable status, since this acknowledges the public benefit that comes from advancing religion within a pluralistic society

44

DISCLAIMER

This handout is provided as an information service by Carter & Associates. It is current only as of the date of the handout and does not reflect subsequent changes in law. This handout is distributed with the understanding that it does not constitute legal advice or establish the solicitor/client relationship by way of any information contained herein. The contents are intended for general information purposes only and under no circumstances can be relied upon for legal decision-making. Readers are advised to consult with a qualified lawyer and obtain a written opinion concerning the specifics of their particular situation.
© 2005 Carter & Associates



CARTER & ASSOCIATES
PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
BARRISTERS, SOLICITORS & TRADE-MARK AGENTS
Affiliated with Fisher Worthington Duggan LLP

NATIONAL OFFICES
Ottawa • Orangeville
Locations by Appointment
Toronto • London • Vancouver
Toll Free: 1-877-942-0001
www.carters.ca
www.charitylaw.ca
