

# Election Kit

---

## How to use this kit:

This kit has materials to help you raise election candidates' awareness of the Charities and Democracy Project and convey your concerns about the current restrictions on charities and advocacy.

You have the opportunity to raise this issue in public forums and all-candidates meetings during the election campaign. **All you need to do is ask one simple question.** It's easy, and the components of this kit will help you do it.

In this kit you will find:

- **Overview of election activities:** what charities can and can't do during an election campaign
- **Tips** on addressing all candidates during public meetings/debates
- **Talking points** for questioning candidates on Charities and Democracy
- **Briefing note** to leave behind with each candidate. Be sure to photocopy enough copies of this briefing note before you attend the meeting.
- **Feedback form** that will help us see the big picture better.

Please review this kit and plan to attend an all-candidates meeting in your organization's riding. If you can't attend, encourage other allied organizations and community leaders to do so.

If you have any questions after reading this kit please contact us:

IMPACS  
Suite 910, 207 West Hastings St.  
Vancouver BC V6B 1H7  
Phone 604-682-1953 ext. 107  
Fax 604-682-4353  
Email Cathy Beaumont, [cathyb@impacs.org](mailto:cathyb@impacs.org)

---

# WHAT CHARITIES CAN AND CAN'T DO DURING AN ELECTION

---

The Canada Revenue Agency policy on Political Activities (CPS-022) describes three types of activities: **charitable, political, and prohibited**. The full text of the policy statement is here: <http://www.cra-arc.gc.ca/tax/charities/policy/cps/cps-022-e.html>

In general, activities that are neither prohibited nor political are considered to be charitable. Charities are free to do as much **charitable** activity as they wish.

Section 6.1 of the Policy Statement defines **prohibited** activities:

“A charity may not take part in an illegal activity or a **partisan political activity**. A partisan political activity is one that involves direct or indirect support of, or opposition to, any political party or candidate for public office.

“When a political party or candidate for public office supports a policy that is also supported by a charity, the charity is not prevented from promoting this policy. However, a charity in this situation must not directly or indirectly support the political party or candidate for public office. This means that a charity may make the public aware of its position on an issue provided:

- a. it does not explicitly connect its views to any political party or candidate for public office;
- b. the issue is connected to its purposes;
- c. its views are based on a well-reasoned position;
- d. public awareness campaigns do not become the charity's primary activity.

“In addition, a charity in this situation is also subject to the restrictions this guidance places on non-partisan political activity, public awareness campaigns and communications with an elected representative or public official.”

Section 6.2 of the Policy Statement defines **political** activities:

“A charity may take part in political activities if they are non-partisan and connected and subordinate to the charity's purposes.

“We presume an activity to be political if a charity:

- a. explicitly communicates a call to political action (i.e. encourages the public to contact an elected representative or public official and urges them to retain, oppose, or change the law, policy, or decision of any level of government in Canada or a foreign country);
- b. explicitly communicates to the public that the law, policy, or decision of any level of government in Canada or a foreign country should be retained (if the retention of the law, policy or decision is being reconsidered by a government), opposed, or changed; or
- c. explicitly indicates in its materials (whether internal or external) that the intention of the activity is to incite, or organize to put pressure on, an elected representative or public official to retain,

oppose, or change the law, policy, or decision of any level of government in Canada or a foreign country.”

During an election campaign, the main consideration for charities is to ensure that they are non-partisan in all their activities. Charities should consider not only the activities themselves, but also the impression those activities might give to an outside observer.

Here are some examples of election activities by charities that could be considered partisan, and therefore **prohibited**:

- Recruiting a candidate for a particular party.
- Nominating a candidate.
- Organizing at the constituency level to sign up members for a particular party.
- Getting out the vote for a particular candidate or party.
- Endorsing a candidate or party publicly.
- Letters to the editor, op-ed pieces, media releases calling for support of or opposition to particular candidates or parties.
- Hosting a dinner for the campaign organizers of a party.
- Distributing leaflets highlighting a lack of government support for your organization’s goals or programs.
- Inviting competing candidates to speak at separate events.

Here are some examples of election activities by charities that could be considered **political**:

- Letters to the editor, op-ed pieces, newsletter articles or media releases that call for support of or opposition to a particular law, decision or public policy.
- A call to political action (see definition on page 1) in your organization’s newsletter or on its website.

A charity can devote from 10-20% of its resources (human, financial, premises and equipment) to political activities in each fiscal year, depending on the size of its annual budget. For more information on this, please review the complete policy statement at <http://www.cra-arc.gc.ca/tax/charities/policy/cps/cps-022-e.html>

Here are some examples of election activities by charities that could be considered **charitable**:

- Private meetings with candidates (one on one) to discuss your organization's public policy issues. Try to meet with every candidate to avoid giving any impression of partisanship. It's OK in these meetings to ask the candidate to retain, oppose or change legislation or policy if they are elected.
- Candidate education or training for all parties in a given region, as long as it is strictly non-partisan and there is no indication of support or endorsement of any individual or party.
- Public awareness and outreach events designed to help citizens learn about issues that are important to your organization.
- Survey of all candidates in your riding, requesting responses to questions on the issues your organization cares about. Be fair: send the survey to every candidate, and stipulate a maximum number of words for each response.
- Publishing the results of this survey in your organization's newsletter or on its website. Include the names of all candidates, even those who did not complete the survey.
- Hosting an all-candidates meeting for the riding in which your organization is located. Invite all candidates, not just those from the front-running parties. Have an impartial moderator who does not have a formal role in your organization. Give all candidates an equal amount of speaking time. Conclude by encouraging all in attendance consider the issues and opinions of all candidates when they vote.

From CRA's perspective, there is no limit to the amount of charitable activity that a charity can do.

---

# WHAT CHARITIES CAN AND CAN'T DO DURING AN ELECTION

---

The Canada Revenue Agency policy on Political Activities (CPS-022) describes three types of activities: **charitable, political, and prohibited**. The full text of the policy statement is here: <http://www.cra-arc.gc.ca/tax/charities/policy/cps/cps-022-e.html>

In general, activities that are neither prohibited nor political are considered to be charitable. Charities are free to do as much **charitable** activity as they wish.

Section 6.1 of the Policy Statement defines **prohibited** activities:

“A charity may not take part in an illegal activity or a **partisan political activity**. A partisan political activity is one that involves direct or indirect support of, or opposition to, any political party or candidate for public office.

“When a political party or candidate for public office supports a policy that is also supported by a charity, the charity is not prevented from promoting this policy. However, a charity in this situation must not directly or indirectly support the political party or candidate for public office. This means that a charity may make the public aware of its position on an issue provided:

- a. it does not explicitly connect its views to any political party or candidate for public office;
- b. the issue is connected to its purposes;
- c. its views are based on a well-reasoned position;
- d. public awareness campaigns do not become the charity's primary activity.

“In addition, a charity in this situation is also subject to the restrictions this guidance places on non-partisan political activity, public awareness campaigns and communications with an elected representative or public official.”

Section 6.2 of the Policy Statement defines **political** activities:

“A charity may take part in political activities if they are non-partisan and connected and subordinate to the charity's purposes.

“We presume an activity to be political if a charity:

- a. explicitly communicates a call to political action (i.e. encourages the public to contact an elected representative or public official and urges them to retain, oppose, or change the law, policy, or decision of any level of government in Canada or a foreign country);
- b. explicitly communicates to the public that the law, policy, or decision of any level of government in Canada or a foreign country should be retained (if the retention of the law, policy or decision is being reconsidered by a government), opposed, or changed; or
- c. explicitly indicates in its materials (whether internal or external) that the intention of the activity is to incite, or organize to put pressure on, an elected representative or public official to retain,

oppose, or change the law, policy, or decision of any level of government in Canada or a foreign country.”

During an election campaign, the main consideration for charities is to ensure that they are non-partisan in all their activities. Charities should consider not only the activities themselves, but also the impression those activities might give to an outside observer.

Here are some examples of election activities by charities that could be considered partisan, and therefore **prohibited**:

- Recruiting a candidate for a particular party.
- Nominating a candidate.
- Organizing at the constituency level to sign up members for a particular party.
- Getting out the vote for a particular candidate or party.
- Endorsing a candidate or party publicly.
- Letters to the editor, op-ed pieces, media releases calling for support of or opposition to particular candidates or parties.
- Hosting a dinner for the campaign organizers of a party.
- Distributing leaflets highlighting a lack of government support for your organization’s goals or programs.
- Inviting competing candidates to speak at separate events.

Here are some examples of election activities by charities that could be considered **political**:

- Letters to the editor, op-ed pieces, newsletter articles or media releases that call for support of or opposition to a particular law, decision or public policy.
- A call to political action (see definition on page 1) in your organization’s newsletter or on its website.

A charity can devote from 10-20% of its resources (human, financial, premises and equipment) to political activities in each fiscal year, depending on the size of its annual budget. For more information on this, please review the complete policy statement at <http://www.cra-arc.gc.ca/tax/charities/policy/cps/cps-022-e.html>

Here are some examples of election activities by charities that could be considered **charitable**:

- Private meetings with candidates (one on one) to discuss your organization's public policy issues. Try to meet with every candidate to avoid giving any impression of partisanship. It's OK in these meetings to ask the candidate to retain, oppose or change legislation or policy if they are elected.
- Candidate education or training for all parties in a given region, as long as it is strictly non-partisan and there is no indication of support or endorsement of any individual or party.
- Public awareness and outreach events designed to help citizens learn about issues that are important to your organization.
- Survey of all candidates in your riding, requesting responses to questions on the issues your organization cares about. Be fair: send the survey to every candidate, and stipulate a maximum number of words for each response.
- Publishing the results of this survey in your organization's newsletter or on its website. Include the names of all candidates, even those who did not complete the survey.
- Hosting an all-candidates meeting for the riding in which your organization is located. Invite all candidates, not just those from the front-running parties. Have an impartial moderator who does not have a formal role in your organization. Give all candidates an equal amount of speaking time. Conclude by encouraging all in attendance consider the issues and opinions of all candidates when they vote.

From CRA's perspective, there is no limit to the amount of charitable activity that a charity can do.

---

# TIPS for QUESTIONING YOUR FEDERAL CANDIDATES AT AN ALL-CANDIDATES MEETING

---

Speaking as a constituent to your local candidates is the essence of democracy. It is a simple and effective way to get your concerns heard. In effect, you are encouraging Parliamentarians to do one of their most important jobs - listening and responding to the interests and concerns of the people they represent.

Evidence from other campaigns suggests that this approach is effective, particularly when constituents across the country are delivering the same message during an election campaign.

Putting questions to all MP candidates, eliciting their views, and asking them, if elected, to act in Parliament on your behalf, can create a groundswell towards change.

---

## **GENERAL TIPS:**

- Be absolutely clear about what you are asking and the relevance to the charitable sector. This Election Kit provides questions to ask your MP candidates at all-candidate meetings or forums. Remember, the goal is to get a commitment of support for changing the *Income Tax Act* and removing the 10% rule.
- Response of any kind is useful. By posing the question in a public meeting, you are transmitting a clear signal of your interest and concern on this issue.
- Don't be disappointed if candidates are not immediately supportive. Hearing their views and justification of a position is valuable and a fundamental part of the democratic process.

## **REPRESENTING YOURSELF:**

Be clear about who you are and who you represent. For example, you may choose to represent yourself as part of the IMPACS Charities and Democracy project. Or you may choose to emphasize your individual standing in your community as well as the numbers of constituents you represent.



## **STEPS TO TAKE:**

### **1) Find your MP incumbent and candidates**

Visit the Elections Canada website at [www.elections.ca](http://www.elections.ca). Type in your organization's postal code to find the name of your riding, your MP, and the names and party affiliations of all election candidates.

Visit the websites of the party candidates in your riding. Here are the links to the major parties; be sure to also visit the website of any other party that has a candidate in your riding:

[www.liberal.ca](http://www.liberal.ca)

[www.conservative.ca](http://www.conservative.ca)

[www.ndp.ca](http://www.ndp.ca)

[www.blocquebecois.org](http://www.blocquebecois.org)

[www.greenparty.ca](http://www.greenparty.ca)

Familiarize yourself with the main “planks” in each party's platform. Look particularly for references to the field in which your organization works, and to the voluntary sector as a whole.

### **2) Prepare for the all-candidates meeting**

- Know your candidates: check out their websites and latest printed materials.
- Find out if they have met with local groups before on related issues. If so, what was the outcome? Have they ever spoken publicly and/or via the media about charities in Canada? About charities and advocacy?
- Designate a speaker from your organization who will pose the question at the all candidates forum. This could be your President, Executive Director, or someone else who is well-known and respected in the community.
- Prepare your question. Decide what follow-up question you will pose if necessary. See the Talking Points section of this kit for some ideas.
- Check the Charities and Democracy Project section of the IMPACS website ([www.impacs.org/charities](http://www.impacs.org/charities)) to see if there's any new information you can use.
- Record each candidate's response to your question. Use the Feedback Form.

### 3) The Meeting or Forum

A typical all-candidates meeting lasts for a pre-determined period of time, usually one to two hours. Prepare to do a lot of listening – the candidates will do most of the talking.

The question period could be open-mike or could require pre-registration on a speaker's list, you will need to research this prior to the meeting to ensure you have the opportunity to address the candidates.

- Get to the microphone quickly, those at the end of the line may not be heard due to time limitations.
- State your question concisely, clearly and in everyday language (see sample questions in Talking Points)
- Keep a positive tone: listen actively, show interest in and understanding of their point of view.
- Thank the candidates for their answers.
- Record who has said what before leaving.

### 4) Follow-up

- Write a letter thanking each candidate for answering your question, reiterating the importance of the changes to the Income Tax Act and the 10% rule.
- If they were supportive, thank them and make it clear that you expect their continued support in the House of Commons.
- Complete the Feedback Form and fax or mail it to IMPACS, so we can get a better sense of what is happening in these meetings across Canada.

IMPACS

Suite 910, 207 West Hastings St.

Vancouver BC V6B 1H7

Phone 604-682-1953 ext. 107

Fax 604-682-4353

Email Cathy Beaumont, [cathyb@impacs.org](mailto:cathyb@impacs.org)

---

# TALKING POINTS

## for Questioning MP Candidates on Charities and Democracy

---

### **KEY IDEAS to convey to MP candidates:**

- **This minor legislative reform will re-energize Canadian democracy and public interest in public policy-making.**
- **These changes will assist you to connect with your constituents.**
- **These are simple changes. They require no major fiscal resources.**

### **HOW TO ASK A QUESTION AT AN ALL-CANDIDATES MEETING**

#### **Choose a Speaker**

When you attend an all-candidates meeting in your organization's riding, don't go alone. Bring with you key staff and/or volunteers in your organization who are responsible for, or interested in, advocacy, social action or service delivery.

Among your group, decide who will stand up and ask the question at the meeting. Generally, the person who is most accustomed to speaking in public will be a good choice. Choose a speaker who will be clear, articulate and respectful of all candidates.

The speaker should begin by:

- Introducing themselves and the organization they represent
- Posing a question to all candidates seeking a commitment to change the Income Tax Act.

#### **Questions to Ask Candidates** *(these are simply suggestions, use wording that you are comfortable with):*

- Charities are on the front-line of every major social and environmental initiative in Canada. We work in the public-interest and we have expertise and solutions to bring to the public policy process. At the same time, charities are the only group in our society that can be penalized if we speak out publicly about keeping or changing a law in Canada or internationally. For example, a group working against torture in Quebec lost its charitable status for writing letters to leaders of other countries asking them to stop torturing their political prisoners. Businesses, on the other hand, can do all the

advocacy they want and can deduct those costs as business expenses. What will you, as a Member of Parliament do to level the playing field for charities to engage in public policy more freely? Will you amend the Income Tax Act to allow greater space for charities' advocacy activities?

- Under current law, charities in Canada are restricted to using just 10% of their resources to advocate to advance their charitable purposes. This 'rule' is the Canada Revenue Agency's (CRA's) interpretation of unclear language in the *Income Tax Act* and outdated, poorly developed principles from the common law. Both the *Income Tax Act* and the CRA's administrative policy need to be clarified. Would you support an initiative to change the *Income Tax Act* to allow charities greater freedom to advocate on behalf of their causes?
- Will you support changes to the *Income Tax Act* that would allow charities to further advocate for their causes?
- Charities are currently limited by the *Income Tax Act* to using just 10% of their human and financial resources on advocacy for their causes. Would you support changing this legislation?
- Charities should be able to achieve their mission in the most effective way possible. Charities want to be able to speak out and participate in the public policy debate on the issues they serve without fearing punishment. Currently they cannot. If you are elected, would you support changes to the Income Tax Act that would lift the so-called 10% rule and allow charities more freedom to advocate on behalf of their causes?

## HOW TO HAVE A MEETING WITH A CANDIDATE

It is possible to have private meetings with candidates (one on one) during an election to discuss your organization's public policy issues or to request their support for changes to the Income Tax Act to remove the restrictions of "the 10% rule". You can even request a candidate's support to retain, oppose or change a law, policy or decision if he or she is elected.

Outside an election, the Canada Revenue Agency (CRA) policy statement on political activities that meetings with elected representatives and public officials are charitable activities, even if they include a request to retain, oppose or change a law, policy or decision by any level of government in Canada or another country.

During an election campaign, the key to holding these meetings successfully is to be **strictly non-partisan**. Here are some tips:

- Try to meet with every candidate in your riding (not just the front-runners).
- Follow the same agenda with each candidate.
- Keep all meetings to the same length of time.

- Ask the candidates what they know about the issue, and what thoughts or opinions they have about it.
- It's OK in these meetings to ask the candidate to retain, oppose or change legislation or policy if they are elected.
- Bring one or two key staff or volunteers from your organization with you to each meeting, preferably the same ones each time.
- Take copies of a Briefing Note as a leave-behind for the candidate.
- Lead with education, follow with a call to action. Some candidates will not be familiar with your issues. Help them understand the current situation (in non-technical terms). Personify the issue by telling a story about an individual or family associated with your organization. Then tell the candidate how your organization would like to see the situation improved.

## **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

- The Charities and Democracy Project represents the interests of a broad-based and growing network of not-for-profits and charities across Canada. The project is led by IMPACS, the Institute for Media, Policy and Civil Society, a national charity. We work in partnership with the Voluntary Sector Forum, Imagine Canada, Volunteer Canada and Community Foundations Canada.
- Findings of cross-Canada workshops on charities and advocacy held in 2004 and 2005, which included 996 participants, showed 79 % supported legislative change towards lifting current restrictions on advocacy by charitable organizations
- The requested change to the Income Tax Act will result in:
  - healthier, more robust, open and balanced public debate
  - better policy decisions
  - better use of scarce resources
- Democracy and the quality of public policy debate in Canada are at the core of this issue. Charities want to contribute to public policy debates on their issues without fear of punishment.
- Canada's charities have specialized knowledge to contribute to public policy dialogues. Their vital work in virtually every community in the country gives them experience and skills to suggest innovative, practical, and efficient solutions to complex public issues.
- Charities are on the frontlines in many of the issues Canadians care most about: health care, the environment, employment, social justice. They are well-placed to observe, analyze and understand the impacts of public policies on the people and communities

they serve, and to make informed recommendations on adjustments and improvements.

- The playing field must be levelled. Currently, Canadian businesses can participate in political activity and they can write off the costs of these activities as business expenses.
- Canadians want charities to speak out about important issues. 95% of Canadians say that charities should speak out on issues like the environment, poverty and health care. 78% say that the laws should be changed to permit charities to advocate more freely for their causes. (Talking About Charities, 2004; [www.muttart.org](http://www.muttart.org))
- Concern that this change may have serious fiscal implications is not well-founded. Initial analysis based on data in the 1997 *National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating* shows a liberally estimated total \$7.3 million cost to federal and provincial governments combined if tax credits were issued for donations to civic and advocacy organizations (currently not credited).
- Concern that this change may result in a decline in services by charities (in other words, that they will abandon their service mandate in favour of advocacy) is not well-founded. It is inefficient for charities to continually treat the symptoms of community problems. It would be far more efficient for charities to tackle the root causes of problems. This concern also fails to recognize the capacity and responsibility of the Board of Directors of charities to make informed decisions about how to allocate their scarce resources most efficiently.

## BRIEFING NOTE: Charities, Civic Engagement and Public Policy The Problem and Proposed Remedies

Charities in Canada make significant contributions to the social and economic fabric of our country. The charitable sector represents 8.6% of our GDP and contributes billion of dollars to the Canadian economy.

### **The Problem**

Canada's over 80,000 charities face limitations on their ability to speak out and participate in public policy debate and policy formulation in their fields of endeavour. These limitations - known as the 10% rule - are found in an administrative policy of the Canada Revenue Agency (CRA) which is based on poorly crafted provisions of the federal *Income Tax Act* s. 149.1(6.1) & (6.2)). The rule restricts charities to using no more than 10% of their resources on "political activities," which include speaking out to achieve changes to laws, policies, or government decisions which impact their charitable work and the communities and individuals they serve.

- ◆ This limitation is incompatible with the principles of modern participatory democracy and undermines citizen engagement. We believe that legislative reform is needed.
- ◆ The impediment to Canada's 80,000 charities adding their voices to public policy debate adversely impacts their ability to advance their charitable causes, and weakens public policy debate and public policy development. This in turn ultimately weakens democracy in Canada.

**We should recognize charities for what they have become -- one of Canada's greatest strengths:**

- ◆ Charities work to advance the public interest, not private interests
- ◆ They are sources of problem-solving and innovation
- ◆ They can give voices to marginalized Canadians
- ◆ They foster civic engagement

## **Proposed Change**

- ♦ Is not related to the definition issue of charities
- ♦ Enables charities the freedom to choose which levers to use to pursue their charitable objects
- ♦ Reinforces the absolute prohibition on charities engaging in partisan politics
- ♦ Focuses on the limits placed on charities participating in public policy debate in a non-partisan way.

## **Charities in Canada**

---

- ♦ have the unique role of acting in the public interest and for the public good without being part of government.
- ♦ work in every community in the country on the issues that are neither profitable for private business nor effectively addressed by universal government programs.
- ♦ understand their communities and their fields of work and they are well-placed and well-suited to identify systemic problems and propose innovations to solve them.
- ♦ provide an important vehicle through which Canadians can come together to discuss public and community concerns..

## **Canadians hold charities in high regard**

---

In 2000, the Canadian Centre for Philanthropy and The Muttart Foundation conducted a comprehensive survey on public opinion about charities and issues related to charities..

- ♦ 90% of respondents agree that charities are becoming increasingly important to Canadians.
- ♦ 79% believe that charities understand the needs of the average Canadian better than government.
- ♦ 88% agree with the statement “Charities should speak out on issues like the environment, poverty and health care.”

## **The New CRA Administrative Guidelines**

---

In September 2003 the CRA released new administrative guidelines that provide more coherent direction to charities than was available previously. The new guidelines are an improvement: they reduce confusion on this issue, and provide some additional latitude to charities. However, in our view the new guidelines have not gone far enough to free charities to participate in public policy debate, for ultimately the CRA was bound by the inadequate provisions of the *Income Tax Act*.



CRA's new guidelines categorize too much activity as "political activities". Section 6.2 of the new guidelines says:

"A charity may take part in political activities if they are non-partisan and connected and subordinate to the charity's purposes.

We presume an activity to be political if a charity:

- a. explicitly communicates a call to political action (i.e., encourages the public to contact an elected representative or public official and urges them to retain, oppose, or change the law, policy, or decision of any level of government in Canada or a foreign country):
- b. explicitly communications to the public that the law, policy or decision of any level of government in Canada or a foreign country should be retained (if retention of the law, policy or decision is being reconsidered by a government), opposed, or changed; or
- c. explicitly indicates in its materials (whether internal or external) that the intention of the activity is to incite, or organize to put pressure on, an elected representative or public official to retain, oppose, or change the law, policy, or decision of any level of government in Canada or a foreign country."

Section 6.2.b. limits activities by charities that should in fact be encouraged, for they can be very productive and beneficial to public.

## **Arguments for the Limitations**

---

There are four key arguments used to justify these limitations on charities: A) a tax policy argument; B) a fiscal impact argument; and C) a concern that charitable services will decline if the limitations are reduced.

### **A) The Tax Policy Justification**

The primary justification for the current restrictions is a tax policy assertion. It is based on the proposition that there should be limits on the degree to which one person can be required to subsidize the private political activity of another. The reasoning goes this way:

- i. Donations to charities provide an income tax advantage or credit for donors.
- ii. The tax implications are that other taxpayers must pay more income tax (a subsidy) as a result of the credit given to donors to charities.
- iii. Such a subsidy is acceptable when charities deliver services, but must be restricted if charities speak on policy matters in their charitable fields.

## The Shortcomings of the Tax Policy Justification

### a) Public Policy Input is not Private Political Activity

All charities are legally bound (and properly so) to advance the **public interest**, and cannot pursue private interests. To categorize the efforts of a health charity to have government establish higher workplace safety standards, for example, as “private political activities” misses a critical distinction between public and private interest, and misconstrues the nature of charity.

### b) Crude Design and Application

The “tax expenditure” by the federal and provincial governments through charitable donation receipts amounts to just over 2% of the total revenue of Canada’s charities.

- ♦ Canadians claimed donations of approximately \$5 billion in 2002.
- ♦ federal & provincial tax credits are worth 40% or \$2 billion (the “tax expenditure”)
- ♦ charities’ budgets total about \$90 billion annually. \$2 billion is approximately 2.2% of the total budget of charities. Yet The 10% rule limits the use of all charity revenue, not just the small portion that may with some validity be called a “subsidy.”

### c) The Problem Entrenches Inefficiency

The tax policy argument does not take into account the fact that the 10% rule is a quota that entrenches inefficiency by preventing charities from publicly advocating efficient ways to solve problems.

## B) The Fiscal Impact Argument

A second argument used in defense of the 10% rule is that if it is removed or modified, there will be a large increase in donations for charitable advocacy.

### The Failings of the Fiscal Impact Argument

- ♦ It is difficult to predict how much more receiptable donation revenue will come to charities if the 10% rule is changed.
- ♦ An analysis by the Canadian Centre for Philanthropy (CCP) of data from the 1997 *National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating* shows that Canadians gave \$19 million to “civic and advocacy organizations.” If one assumes that none of this amount is now receiptable and that a change in the law would make the full amount receiptable, at an average tax credit of 27%,

the incremental cost would be approximately \$5.1 million per year to the federal government and, at an average of 42% of the federal tax rate, approximately \$2.2 million per year collectively to all provincial governments, for a liberally-estimated total of \$7.3 million per year.

### **C) The Concern that Charitable Services Will Decline if the Limits are Removed**

This concern is based on the premise that if charities devote more of their resources to public policy input, they will have fewer resources to devote to the delivery of charitable services. It is not efficient for charities to continually treat the symptoms of community problems. It would be far more efficient and beneficial to communities for charities to contribute their experience and wisdom to tackling the root causes of problems. For example efforts by a cancer charity to change smoking laws rather than simply treat cancer sufferers.

This concern also fails to recognize the capacity and responsibility of the Board of Directors of charities to make informed decisions about how to allocate their scarce resources most efficiently.

### **In Conclusion**

---

The reasons for legislative reform are far more substantial and compelling than the defences of the status quo. By making the proposed amendments to the *Income Tax Act*, the federal government can tap into the front-line experience, expertise, problem-solving and innovation of charities and encourage their contributions to public policy. The government will also fulfill the commitment made in the September 30, 2002 Throne Speech, when it committed that it will put into action the **Accord** it signed with the voluntary sector, “*to enable the sector to contribute to national priorities and represent the views of those too often excluded.*”

## Appendix: Examples of Public Policy Work by Charities

There are countless illustrations of how work by charities to change a law, policy or decision of government can be constructive. Here are just a few:

- Canadian aid organizations have worked tirelessly and successfully to change laws and policies in developing countries on health care issues, and was instrumental in convincing the Government of Canada to make generic HIV/AIDS medications available in Africa. The CRA guidelines impede this vital work.
- Charities are a vital component of the Canadian health care system, providing a wide range of services to people with physical or mental illnesses or disabilities. Because of their extensive front-line experience, these charities are uniquely suited to assist policymakers at the provincial and federal levels, but the 10% rule limits their contributions.
- Many charities are retraining Canadians who are trying to re-enter the workforce after a disabling accident or injury. These charities work with people who know first-hand how their accident could have been prevented. Yet the charities are muzzled by the 10% rule in their efforts to improve workplace safety regulations that would reduce the incidence of disabling accidents.

## Proposed Amendments to the Federal *Income Tax Act* *Prepared by* IMPACS – Institute for Media, Policy and Civil Society

Section 149.1(6.2) of the federal *Income Tax Act* states:

**Charitable Activities.** For the purposes of the definition “charitable organization” in subsection (1), where an organization devotes substantially all of its resources to charitable activities carried on by it and

- (a) it devotes part of its resources to political activities,
- (b) those political activities are ancillary and incidental to its charitable activities, and
- (c) those political activities do not include the direct or indirect support of, or opposition to, any political party or candidate for public office,

the organization shall be considered to be devoting that part of its resources to charitable activities carried on by it.

### **OPTION A:**

Amend section 149.1(6.2) as follows:

**Charitable activities.** For the purposes of the definition “charitable organization” in subsection (1), where an organization ~~devotes substantially all of its resources to charitable activities carried on by it and~~

- a) ~~it~~ devotes part of its resources to political activities,
- b) those political activities are ancillary and incidental to its charitable activities, and
- c) those political activities do not include the direct or indirect support of, or opposition to, any political party or candidate for public office,

the organization shall be considered to be devoting that part of its resources to charitable activities carried on by it.

### **OPTION B:**

Replace section 149.1(6.2) with the following clearer statement:

#### **A charitable organization**

- a) must not provide direct or indirect support of, or opposition to, any political party or candidate for public office,
- b) may participate in public policy debate and advocacy intended to advance its charitable purposes, if:
  - (i) there is a reasonable expectation that this activity will further the purposes of the charity to an extent justified by the resources devoted to it,
  - (ii) the views expressed by the charity are based on a well-founded and reasoned case, and expressed in a reasonable way, and
  - (iii) this activity does not become the charity’s dominant activity.

# Feedback Form

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this form.  
It will help us tremendously during and after the election campaign.

Your name/your organization name: \_\_\_\_\_

Your contact info: phone: \_\_\_\_\_  
email: \_\_\_\_\_

Your federal riding name: \_\_\_\_\_

Name/party of candidates at the all-candidates meeting: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Date/location of meeting: \_\_\_\_\_

Please read these questions carefully *before* addressing an all-candidate's meeting. Please answer the questions as soon as possible after the meeting and return this form to:

fax: **604-682-4353**

Thank you!

Was this the first the candidates had heard of this issue? Yes  No   
If no, where did they first hear? \_\_\_\_\_

What points did each candidate seem to respond to favourably? Unfavourably? \_\_\_\_\_

What questions/suggestions did they have for you (please be specific)? \_\_\_\_\_

What aspects of this issue seemed most problematic for the candidates? \_\_\_\_\_

Are the candidate's willing to support this initiative by raising it in caucus (if they are elected)?  
In another forum? \_\_\_\_\_

Does any candidate want more information sent? Yes  No

Which candidate? \_\_\_\_\_

What material? \_\_\_\_\_

Is there any information or material you wish you'd had to help this process? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_