

[Home](#) > [FCA Decisions Menu](#) > [Decisions](#) > [Federal Court of Appeal Decisions](#) >

Action by Christians for the abolition of torture v. Canada

Federal Court of Appeal Decisions

Action by Christians for the abolition of torture v. Canada

Court (s) Database: Federal Court of Appeal Decisions

Date: 2002-12-16

Neutral citation: 2002 FCA 499

File numbers: A-805-00

Notes: [Digest](#)

Date: 20021216

Docket: A-805-00

Ottawa, Ontario, December 16, 2002

CORAM: DÉCARY

LÉTOURNEAU

NADON JJ.A.

BETWEEN:

ACTION BY CHRISTIANS FOR THE ABOLITION

OF TORTURE (ACAT)

Appellant

and

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

and

MAUREEN KIDD, in her capacity as

Director General of the Charities Directorate

of the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency

Respondents

JUDGMENT

The appeal is dismissed with costs.

"Robert Décary"

Judge

Certified true translation

Suzanne M. Gauthier, C.Tr., LL.L.

Date: 20021216

Docket: A-805-00

Neutral Citation: 2002 FCA 499

CORAM: DÉCARY

LÉTOURNEAU

NADON JJ.A.

BETWEEN:

ACTION BY CHRISTIANS FOR THE ABOLITION
OF TORTURE (ACAT)

Appellant

and

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

and

MAUREEN KIDD, in her capacity as

Director General of the Charities Directorate

of the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency

Respondents

Hearing held at Montréal, Quebec, on December 4, 2002.

Judgment delivered at Ottawa, Ontario, on December 16, 2002.

REASONS FOR JUDGMENT: DÉCARY J.A.

CONCURRING: LÉTOURNEAU J.A.

NADON J.A.

Date: 20021216

Docket: A-805-00

Neutral Citation: 2002 FCA 499

CORAM: DÉCARY

LÉTOURNEAU

NADON JJ.A.

BETWEEN:

ACTION BY CHRISTIANS FOR THE ABOLITION
OF TORTURE (ACAT)

Appellant

and

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

and

MAUREEN KIDD, in her capacity as

Director General of the Charities Directorate

of the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency

Respondents

REASONS FOR JUDGMENT

DÉCARY J.A.

[1] This appeal has to do with the revocation of the registration of Action by Christians for the Abolition of Torture (ACAT) as a charity within the meaning of subsection 149.1(1) of the *Income Tax Act*.

Facts

[2] The ACAT was incorporated under letters patent issued by the Quebec Inspector of Financial Institutions on January 28, 1985. The ACAT's purpose is described as follows:

[translation]

The ultimate purpose of the corporation is the abolition of torture throughout the world in accordance with the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*:

"No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment."

The corporation believes such abolition is possible. It summons its members to concrete actions in defence of persons who are being tortured. Through the relaying of appeals from around the world it tirelessly broadcasts the message of human rights to the various Christian communities. Accordingly, the members of the Church are solicited from inside, on behalf of the Gospel. This consciousness raising leads to ever-increasing participation of all Christians, personally or in groups, in the parishes, Church associations, movements, in the fight for the defence of a tortured humanity.

The corporation calls for prayer, at the heart of our time and our society. In its view, prayer and action are indissociable. It initiates meetings that come together to cry out to God on behalf of the tortured and the torturers. It prompts thinking by Christians and non-Christians, who are confronted day by day with the phenomena of violence. That is why the ACAT conducts its own research, disseminates research carried out elsewhere, prompts initiatives within agencies and groups that are independent of it. Solidarity with the other associations is, in this area as in that of action, one of its characteristic features.

(A.B., vol. 1, p. 4)

[3] The articles of the ACAT then describe as follows the "objectives" it seeks and the "means of action" it intends to implement:

[translation]

ARTICLE 3 - OBJECTIVES

The purpose and objectives of this Association are:

- (1) to raise awareness among Christians and churches in particular of the scandal of torture and capital punishment without distinction as to political regime or country;
- (2) to encourage Christians to apply spiritual means such as prayer for the abolition of torture and capital punishment;
- (3) to arouse any effective action, individual or collective, for the abolition of torture and capital punishment;
- (4) to work in this campaign with men of good will.

ARTICLE 6 - MEANS OF ACTION

To fulfill its purpose and attain its objectives, the Association resorts to the following methods in particular:

- organizing all or any demonstrations, study circles, lectures and symposiums;
- compiling the greatest possible documentation, both written and audiovisual;
- disseminating these documents by every means, reproducing and publishing articles, pamphlets, bulletins, magazines, etc. and using these publications.

(A.B., vol. 1, pp. 5-6)

[4] The nature of the "[translation] ACAT activities for reaching its objectives" is described as follows:

[translation]

- Organizing all or any demonstrations, study circles, lectures and symposiums.
- Compiling the greatest possible documentation, both written and audiovisual.
- Disseminating this documentation; reproducing and publishing articles, pamphlets, bulletins, magazines, and using these publications.
- Organizing public awareness campaigns.
- Maintaining a network of active members participating in the Association's action.
- Promoting through the Association a dialogue between Christians of the various Churches.
- Collaborating with agencies having the same objectives as the Association.

(A.B., vol. 1, p. 12)

[5] This statement of activities is supplemented by a document describing as follows the initiatives taken by the ACAT:

[translation]

The ACAT (Action by Christians for the Abolition of Torture), an ecumenical association created in June 1974, seeks to be a "watchman" in the Church (Ezekiel, 33). It fights alongside all those who defend human rights.

The ACAT proposes:

1st step, to become informed in order to inform

- the "Courrier de l'ACAT"
- some "Dossiers supplémentaires au Courrier"
- various publications
- items of documentation
- posters and pamphlets
- audiovisual montages

2nd step, to participate in the International Campaign against torture

Sending letters and petitions on behalf of prisoners who are victims of torture, whose names are reported through Emergency Appeals of the ACAT

(A.B., vol. 1, p. 13)

[6] On February 6, 1985, the ACAT submitted to the Minister of National Revenue of Canada (the Minister) an application for registration as a charity.

[7] On April 23, 1985, a representative of the Minister refused the application for registration, essentially for the following reason:

[translation]

It is our belief that the purpose of the activities of Action by Christians is not only to educate people on human rights but also to convince the countries and groups that are suspected of practising torture to put an end to it.

We do not doubt the beneficial effects that your organization is attempting to contribute to humanity, but these activities, such as information through "contacts with the media, symposiums" and contacts with officials in countries or groups, lead us to believe that the organization is seeking to influence the persons involved in the acts of torture and humanity in general, which is not considered as being charitable. This kind of activities, in our opinion, is not charitable given that such activities entail and may give rise to controversies of a social or political nature.

A.B., vol. 1, p. 17)

[8] The ACAT did not give up, however. On May 30, 1985, its president answered in part as follows:

[translation]

But how can we pursue such an "objective of a charitable nature that is beneficial to the community as a whole" other than by attempting to convince those who can act on the matter of the need to respect fundamental human rights and the requirements of international law, which, moreover, have often been adopted at the level of national law?

Not only do we believe that our activities are exclusively charitable, within the meaning of the legal definition of the word charity, but we also believe that it is absurd to acknowledge the charitable character of an activity and prohibit it from being carried out by depriving it of its "status as a charitable organization". How, indeed, can one "not doubt the beneficial effects that [our] organization is attempting to contribute to humanity" and at the same time deny us registration as a charity because we are attempting "to convince the countries and groups that are suspected of practising torture to put an end to it"? Asking us to "relieve the [radical] poverty" that is the consequence of torture without asking those who practice torture to put an end to it is tantamount to asking us to square the circle!

A.B., vol. 1, p. 23)

[9] On July 10, 1985, a representative of the Minister restated his refusal and suggested to the ACAT that it "[translation] maintain Action by Christians in order to attend to the political activities and create an organization distinct from it which would be devoted entirely to charitable activities and have its own financial resources" (A.B., vol. 1, p. 26).

[10] On December 10, 1985, resisting certain pressures, the Minister himself reminded the ACAT that [translation] because of its intention to pursue activities of a political nature, however, the ACAT does not meet the criteria of the *Income Tax Act* for registration as a charitable organization. The courts have on many occasions ruled that political activities directed to influencing, embarrassing or pressuring a government, in Canada or elsewhere, must not be financed with funds intended for charity.

and invited it to "substantially alter its orientations and reformulate its objectives so as to limit the actions of the ACAT to activities that are exclusively charitable" (A.B., vol. 1, pp. 151-52).

[11] To remedy the deficiencies identified by the Minister, supplementary letters patent amending the objectives of the ACAT were issued on August 25, 1986. These new objectives were:

~~Subjected to the same treatment as the victims of torture, 1986. These new subjects were:~~

[translation]

- (1) As an objective of evangelical commitment, to encourage the different Christian communities in Canada to bear together, through prayer, the sufferings of the victims of torture;
- (2) As an educational objective, to increase awareness, particularly among these Christians, of the scandal of torture (through information and training in human rights);
- (3) With the objective of relieving their misery, to provide material assistance to the victims of torture (sending letters of encouragement, food and clothing, and rehabilitation assistance).

(A.B., vol.1, p. 29)

[12] The Minister then expressed his satisfaction and, on September 16, 1986, he recognized the ACAT as a registered charity.

[13] On September 27, 1986, the ACAT adopted some General Bylaws which describe its "means of action" as follows:

[translation]

- ecumenical prayer meetings
- sending letters of encouragement to victims of torture
- assisting the rehabilitation of victims of torture
- possibly sending food and clothing
- study circles, lectures, publication and dissemination of information
- intercession with those responsible for torture.

(A.B., vol. 1, p. 36)

[14] On October 17, 1986, the ACAT sent the Minister the text of the aforesaid General Bylaws, asking him to inform it of any anomaly (A.B., vol. 1, p. 35).

[15] On December 15, 1996, "Consulting and Audit Canada" sent a report to the Charities Division of Revenue Canada (now the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency). This report reached the following conclusion:

[translation]

Conclusion

In our opinion, the activities of the organization are related in part to its objects: in part, since the objects do not refer to interventions with governments. The principal activity of the organization, the sending of letters to heads of government, is political in nature.

We leave it to Revenue Canada to determine the degree to which the organization's activities conform to the *Income Tax Act* and the regulations thereunder.

(A.B., vol. 1, p. 48)

[16] On November 21, 2000, following numerous exchanges and meetings with representatives of the ACAT, the Minister sent the ACAT a notice of intention to revoke its registration. It is this notice that is being appealed. I reproduce here some extensive excerpts:

[translation]

At the time of its initial application, we were concerned with the fact that the wording of the objects of the ACAT might enable it to pursue purposes of a political nature (see our letter dated April 23, 1985, enclosed). We refused to register the ACAT at that time. In order to be registered as a charity, therefore, the ACAT made some significant amendments to the objects contained in its letters patent. In amending its objects, the ACAT undertook not to pursue political purposes. For example, Object 3 in its supplementary letters patent limits the material assistance the ACAT may provide to:

- (a) sending letters of encouragement to the victims of torture;
- (b) sending food and clothing to the victims of torture; and
- (c) assisting the victims of torture in their rehabilitation.

On the strength of the legal principle *inclusio unius est exclusio alterius*, i.e. the inclusion of one is the exclusion of all others, we agreed that this change in the objects of the ACAT prevented it from pursuing purposes of a political nature. It was within that perspective that we had agreed to register the ACAT as a charity.

...

We have concluded from the audit that the ACAT has been asking its members and the public to send letters or other written communications to governments for the avowed purpose (letter of March 30, 1998) of "pressuring the established authorities" to act in accordance with the opinions of the ACAT concerning questions of public or political interest. In light of the court rulings and the information circular, we must conclude that the ACAT has engaged in political activities. This principle remains true and applicable notwithstanding the fact that the pressures exerted on the authorities are based on the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*.

...

As we discussed earlier, the purposes for which the ACAT was registered are very limited. They do not support the use of political methods to assist persons who are victims of violations of their fundamental rights. The political activities that the ACAT could conduct, therefore, had to be incidental to the achievement of the specific purposes for which it was registered, including sending letters of encouragement to the victims of torture, sending food and clothing to the victims of torture and assisting the victims of torture in their rehabilitation. Pressuring governments and influencing public opinion do not appear on the list of the purposes for which the ACAT has been registered. Instead, these activities indicate that the ACAT has added some political objects to its mandate. As stated in our letter of January 16, 1998 (enclosed):

"The principal objective of the ACAT is therefore the abolition of torture throughout the world but also solidarity with tortured prisoners and their families. Along the way, the ACAT has incorporated in its initial mandate the fight against capital punishment, an ultimate torture that takes people back to the *lex talionis*, or an eye for an eye."

Clearly, following its registration as a charity, the ACAT has not hesitated to reincorporate some political purposes in its mandate. Furthermore, it has had no difficulty in availing itself of all the political means at its disposal in order to achieve its political purposes.

...

In *McGovern v. Attorney General*, *supra* [[1982] c. 321], Mr. Justice Slade more or less consolidated in the case law a non-exhaustive list of the "categories of political purposes". From the audit, it appears to us that of the five categories of political purposes listed by Mr. Justice Slade (at page 340 of the judgment), the activities conducted by the ACAT may be connected to the following four categories:

- "ii. to procure changes in the laws of this country;
- iii. to procure changes in the laws of a foreign country;
- iv. to procure a reversal of government policy or of particular decisions of governmental authorities of this country;
- v. to procure a reversal of government policy or of particular decisions of governmental authorities of a foreign country;"

The *McGovern* judgment has often been cited in the Canadian cases and the aforesaid passage was explicitly incorporated in Canadian law in *Human Life International in Canada v. M.N.R.* [1998] 3 F.C. 202 (C.A.) (Application for leave to appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada dismissed, 21-9-99, [1998] S.C.C.A. No. 246 (QL) and also in *Alliance for Life v. M.N.R.* [1999] 3 F.C. 504 (C.A.). The latter two judgments have confirmed, moreover, that in Canadian charities law there is a sixth category of political activities, one that encompasses activities aimed at influencing public opinion on some social issues. It is our opinion that some activities of the ACAT can be linked to this category of political activities.

The audit showed that the ACAT has ceased to conform to the criteria in the Act by using political methods to achieve purposes of a political nature. The methods used, such as letter-writing and postcard campaigns, are activities considered to be political activities. This observation must necessarily lead to another: that the ACAT has breached the rule that the investment of its resources must be devoted exclusively to charitable purposes and activities. Accordingly, the ACAT's registration as a registered charity cannot be maintained.

...

Among other things, the political activities conducted by the ACAT included, entirely or in part:

- interventions with governments to support persons in prison;
- sending letters to governments;
- postcard campaigns;
- Intervention Commission;
- publications in newspapers;
- petitions
- media advertisements
- publication and distribution of leaflets; and

· information kiosks and public tables.

...

Having regard to the conclusion of the audit, in which "the principal activity of the ACAT, the sending of letters to heads of governments, is political in nature," it is not unreasonable in the circumstances to conclude that the proportion of resources devoted to the political activities accounts for about 50% of all the ACAT's available resources. In any event, it must be observed, on the basis of a pro rata attribution of the ACAT's expenditures, that more than 10% of the expenses and resources are definitely being invested in political activities, that is, much more than the 10% suggested in paragraph 15 of information circular 87-1.

...

Moreover, you have failed to demonstrate, in the letters of March 30, 1998, and September 5, 2000, or during our meeting of May 10, 2000, that the ACAT's information activities could be viewed as contributing to the advancement of education. The courts have not agreed that merely stimulating thinking suffices to advance education.

(A.B., vol. 3, pp. 419-24)

Analysis

[17] The painstaking review of the legislation and the cases undertaken by my colleague, Mr. Justice Stone, in *Alliance for Life v. M.N.R.*, [1999] 3 F.C. 504 (C.A.), allows me to substantially shorten my reasons and go directly to the point.

[18] Essentially, the ACAT submits (1) that its purposes are *prima facie* charitable, the material assistance given torture victims constituting a purpose specifically included in the preamble to the *Charitable Uses Act, 1601*, (U.K.) 43 Eliz. 1, c. 4 (the Statute of Elizabeth), "[...for the relief or redemption of Prisoners or Captives...]"; (2) that its activities, which include *inter alia* letter and postcard writing campaigns, constitute charitable activities since they are directly related to the material assistance to victims of torture; the fact that one of the means used is to communicate with certain political actors does not convert these activities into political activities; (3) that the Minister, in his opinion, confused the concepts of purposes and activities; and (4) that the Minister was mistaken on the appropriate meaning of the expression "political activities" since the abolition of torture promotes the public welfare, constitutes a value that is universally recognized in today's law, is not simply a controversial social issue and transcends the arena of political debate.

[19] As I understand these submissions, taken as a whole, the ACAT is urging this Court to decide that the nobility and national and international recognition of a cause defended by a charity justifies the use of pressure tactics which, in the context of a socially or politically controversial cause, would not be accepted because they would be comparable to political activities.

- the Minister's procedure

[20] The procedure the Minister must follow when he is asked to register a charity or revoke its registration was explained by Mr. Justice Iacobucci in paragraphs 152 to 159 and 194 of his reasons in *Vancouver Society of Immigrant and Visible Minority Women v. M.N.R.*, [1999] 1 S.C.R. 10 (*Vancouver Society*). I will summarize it in a few lines:

- The inquiry must focus not only on the activities of the organization but also on its purposes;

- In principle, the organization must be constituted exclusively for charitable purposes; however, it will not be disqualified solely because one of the purposes is non-charitable if that purpose, in reality, is only a means to carry out the charitable purposes; in other words, this purpose is not an end in itself, but is ancillary to the charitable purposes rather than a collateral purpose;
- It is necessary to consider the nature of the activities presently carried on by the organization as a potential indicator of whether it has since adopted other purposes;
- The organization may engage in political activities so long as they are ancillary to the charitable purposes and/or they do not account for more than a percentage, estimated at about 10% by the Minister, of the overall activities of the organization.

[21] That is the procedure that was followed by the Minister in the case at bar. He satisfied himself, before allowing registration, that the legal and jurisprudential requirements had been fulfilled, even going so far as to impose on the ACAT some substantial alterations in the statement of its objectives and warning it against the use of pressure tactics that he considered political.

[22] He then asked himself, at the time of the audit, whether the organization's activities had not taken on a political connotation at that point. He observed that some of the ACAT's activities constituted means of pressuring political authorities in Canada and abroad. He then concluded that the ACAT, in devoting itself to such pressure tactics, had become transformed into a pressure group, which, he said, constituted a political purpose in itself and warranted its disqualification. He further concluded that these pressure tactics constituted political activities, that these political activities constituted about 50% of the ACAT's activities, and that this consequently was an additional cause for disqualification.

- standard of review

[23] The Minister's conclusions to the effect that some of the ACAT's activities constituted means of pressuring the political authorities, that these activities represented some 50% of the ACAT's overall activities and that the ACAT, through these activities, had become, among other purposes, a pressure group, are essentially conclusions of fact. This Court, which is hearing an appeal from the Minister's decision, cannot intervene in regard to these conclusions unless there has been a clear or palpable error. No such error has been demonstrated. I note, moreover, that the ACAT has never denied that some of its activities constituted pressure tactics.

[24] However, the characterization of these pressure tactics as political activities within the meaning of the cases and the Act is a conclusion of law, and the standard of correctness is the appropriate one. The respective counsel agree on this standard of review. This is an appeal; there is no privative clause; the issue is one of law in regard to which the Minister has no particular expertise, and it has not yet been formally decided by the Canadian courts; and the applicable response to this question of law will have repercussions that go far beyond the context of this litigation (see *Harvard College v. Canada (Commissioner of Patents)*, 2002 SCC 76, para. 148 to 150).

- change of course in the activities carried on and the purposes pursued

[25] It is obvious that in this case the ACAT, once registered, was not upfront with the Minister, in that it pursued purposes and engaged in activities - whether characterized as charitable or political activities - for which there was no prior indication in its supplementary letters patent or its bylaws at the time it was recognized as a charity.

[26] For example, the sending of letters and postcards to political figures and governments in relation not only to torture but also to the death penalty, excision, antipersonnel mines, etc., does not appear in any of the "objects" sought, the "means of action" proposed, or the "activities" listed at the time of the ACAT's registration, in August 1986. I note, for example, that the third objective stated in the supplementary letters patent of August 25, 1986, mentions "sending letters of encouragement" to the victims. This "sending" of letters of encouragement becomes a "means of action" in the General Bylaws adopted in September 1986, once the registration had been authorized by the Minister, and these means of action refer, for the first time, to "intercession with those responsible for torture". I note as well that in amending its objectives to satisfy the Minister, the ACAT removed any reference to capital punishment. This mailing, the Minister has concluded, accounts for 50% of the ACAT's activities.

[27] The evidence of a change of course is overwhelming. For example, in a letter sent to Mr. Rock, a government minister, on November 29, 1995, the ACAT says its goal is "[translation] primarily to fight torture, the death penalty and murders by 'social cleansing' of street children", asks the minister to "[translation] introduce a provision in the *Criminal Code* clearly indicating that excision is a crime", and expresses the opinion that "[translation] Canada must send a very clear message to the nationals of countries practising excision" (A.B., vol. 2, p. 184).

[28] In a letter sent to Prime Minister Chrétien on February 7, 1996, which targeted "[translation] torture and the disappearance of street children" in Guatemala, the ACAT urged the prime minister to link the repayment of debts incurred by Guatemala and the evolution of trade relations between the two countries "[translation] to respect for human rights in general and children in particular" (A.B., vol. 2, p. 186).

[29] In a letter to the President of Honduras, February 29, 1996, the ACAT deplored the fact that children are jailed together with adults and urged the Honduran government "to open new centres for children and juveniles" (A.B., vol. 2, p. 187).

[30] In January 1996, the ACAT urged its members to ask Mr. Ouellet, a government minister, "[translation] (1) to prohibit throughout Canadian territory the production, stockpiling, sale, transfer and use of these [antipersonnel] mines and their components; (2) to exercise its leadership within the United Nations framework with a view to promoting such prohibition at the international level..." (A.B., vol. 2, p. 197).

[31] In December 1994, the ACAT suggested that its members write the President of Mexico asking him to intervene "[translation] promptly with the local authorities concerned to have a comprehensive inquiry conducted into the brutality displayed by the police forces during the demonstration of last November 16 in Palenque" (A.B., vol. 2, p. 199).

[32] I give these examples, not to criticize these positions or interventions, but as illustrations of the kind of activities the ACAT was warned against prior to its registration and that it has resolutely applied itself to carrying on once its registration was obtained. The Minister was very definitely justified in concluding that the activities announced prior to the registration were not the activities carried on after registration.

[33] That being said, the Minister based his decision to revoke the registration not on the fact that the ACAT has carried on activities other than those announced but on the fact that these other activities were political, so the question still remains: is this type of activities political in nature?

- political purposes and activities

[34] Two things must be taken as given in the law of charities. The first is that the best intentions in the world do not suffice:

WOULD DO NOT SUFFICE.

However, the mere fact that an organization may have philanthropic purposes of an excellent character does not by itself entitle it to acceptance as a charity in law.

(*McGovern v. Attorney General*,

[1981] 3 All E.R. 493 (Div. Ch.), Slade J., p. 500)

The second is that charities and politics do not sit well together:

Although a "moving subject" the law of charity has not looked particularly kindly upon political purposes or activities being accepted as charitable.

(*Alliance for Life*, para. 35)

[35] The English and Canadian courts have consistently been aware of the fact that while, in general, charities and politics were not reconcilable, it was equally necessary, in practice, to acknowledge that in real life they are not mutually exclusive. The more omnipresent the state, the harder it is to overlook the political mechanisms when one is engaged in charitable work. Striving for political realism, the courts, followed by the Parliament of Canada, have developed these concepts of incidental or ancillary political objects and activities without which many if not most of the charities nowadays could not operate. It is apparent from the decisions that the adjective "political" has the same meaning, whether it is attached to "purposes" or to "activities". I will use "political purposes" and "political activities" interchangeably.

(a) jurisprudence

[36] The most complete analysis to date of the concept of "political purposes" is that made by Mr. Justice Slade in *McGovern* (*supra*, para. 35), in which he established the following non-exhaustive list of inadmissible "political purposes":

(2) Trusts for political purposes falling within the spirit of this pronouncement include (inter alia) trusts of which a direct and principal purpose is either- (i) to further the interests of a particular political party, or

(ii) to procure changes in the laws of this country, or

(iii) to procure changes in the laws of a foreign country, or

(iv) to procure a reversal of government policy or of particular decisions of governmental authorities in this country, or

(v) to procure a reversal of government policy or of particular decisions of governmental authorities in a foreign country.

This categorisation is not intended to be an exhaustive one, but I think it will suffice for the purposes of this judgment.

(pp. 508-509)

[37] This description of political purposes was expressly approved by this Court in *Positive Action Against Pornography v. M.N.R.*, [1988] 2 F.C. 340 (C.A.), (*per* Stone J.A.), p. 353; in *Human Life International in Canada Inc. v. M.N.R.*, [1998] 3 F.C. 202 (C.A.), (*per* Strayer J.A.), p. 217, and in *Alliance for Life*, *supra*, (*per* Stone J.A.), para. 36, 37, 61 to 66. I note that in *Alliance for Life*, Stone J.A. said:

I am not aware that the categorization of "political purposes" of Slade J. in *McGovern*, *supra*, has been seriously questioned.

(para. 61)

[38] To the five categories listed by Slade J., which, I recall, are not exhaustive, this Court added, in *Human Life International*, *supra*, activities designed primarily to sway public opinion on important social issues:

[12] With respect to the legal test employed by the Minister, it is stated in his decision which is under attack, as quoted above, that according to the jurisprudence activities designed essentially to sway public opinion on a controversial social issue are not charitable but are political. Counsel for the respondent agreed that there was no jurisprudence precisely saying that but he felt it to be a fair interpolation of the existing jurisprudence. I believe that the jurisprudence generally supports the proposition that activities primarily designed to sway public opinion on social issues are not charitable activities.

...

The same rationale leads me to conclude that this kind of advocacy of opinions on various important social issues can never be determined by a court to be for a purpose beneficial to the community. Courts should not be called upon to make such decisions as it involves granting or denying legitimacy to what are essentially political views: namely what are the proper forms of conduct, though not mandated by present law, to be urged on other members of the community?

(Strayer J.A., para. 12)

The purposes pursued in that case dealt with respect for and protection of human life, in particular through natural methods of reproduction.

[39] The courts have so far been concerned primarily with political purposes in cases where the purpose sought was socially or politically controversial and necessarily required changes of a statutory nature in regard to which the courts did not wish to intervene because it would force them to take a position and thereby compromise their impartiality. Accordingly, counsel for the appellant warned the Court against blindly applying these principles to the particular context of this case in which, they said, the ultimate objective - the abolition of torture - is uncontroversial and the pressure tactics used do not necessitate any statutory change since they are simply aimed at affirming principles that are recognized in Canadian and international law.

[40] I am not persuaded that the abolition of torture is an issue that is entirely uncontroversial today. While it is evident, on its face, that the abolition of torture is an objective that is itself eminently laudable and that an organization devoted to it is, *prima facie*, a charity, the issue does nevertheless raise certain questions of a factual and legal nature.

[41] In the facts of this case, I am not certain, when I see the kind of causes espoused by the ACAT, of the precise meaning it gives to the word "torture". If it understands this word to include such treatments as the death penalty and excision, these are definitely matters of controversy. In law, although the abolition of torture is a principle recognized in Canadian and international law (see *Suresh v. Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2002 SCC 1), the Supreme Court of Canada itself accepts that there can be derogations, albeit not "easily", from this "emerging, if not established" peremptory norm of customary international law (*Suresh*, para. 65) and that, "in exceptional circumstances, deportation to face torture might be justified" (*ibid.*, para. 78).

[42] Consequently, I doubt the appellant's assertion that the abolition of torture transcends the arena of political debates, but I prefer to base my decision on the following considerations.

[43] It is true, as the appellant's counsel note, that Slade J., in *McGovern*, did not hold that the abolition of torture was a political purpose. Among other purposes, he was considering the one described in a charitable foundation established by certain members of Amnesty International:

2C. Procuring the abolition of torture or inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

[44] One of the arguments raised by the foundation was the following:

The next question of construction which arises in relation to cl 2C of the trust deed concerns the meaning of the phrase 'procuring the abolition of'. On the footing that cl 2C had no application to capital punishment, counsel for the plaintiffs submitted that there was no evidence that 'torture or inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment' was lawful in any country and that it was highly unlikely that any country's legal system specifically permits any such treatment or punishment. More customarily, he suggested, such treatment or punishment or torture would be administered in practice by the executive agencies of the government without any express authority conferred on them by the law of the country concerned. In these circumstances he suggested that the phrase 'procuring the abolition of' should not be construed as specifically referring to the procurement of changes in the law, either of this country or of any foreign state. In his submission it should be construed rather as referring to the elimination of these practices in a much more general sense, and thus as a trust of compassion, for the purpose of protecting human beings in any part of the world from the suffering and distress which would otherwise be inflicted on them by these practices.

(pp. 516-517)

[45] Slade J. rejected the argument in these words:

I find myself unable to accept this suggested construction of cl 2C. If it had stopped with the word 'torture', there would have been much to be said for the view that the phrase 'procuring the abolition of' should not be construed as referring specifically to the procurement of changes in the law. However, I think the subsequent reference to the word 'punishment' really puts the matter beyond doubt. In its context, this word, to my mind, primarily connotes punishment by process of law and, as I have indicated, is wide enough to include capital and corporal punishment by such process. Correspondingly, the phrase 'procuring the abolition of' necessarily includes the procurement of appropriate reforming legislation, which is the first and most obvious way to put an end to such forms of punishment.

(p. 517)

(Emphasis added)

[46] This comment is of course made only in *obiter* and Slade J. in any event confined himself to saying that the words "procuring the abolition of torture" could not be construed "as referring specifically to the procurement of changes in the law". He did not go so far as to say that these could not be construed as requiring changes in conduct or policy. But he had already held, as I will note in a moment, that a request for a change in conduct or policy is not compatible with a charitable purpose.

[47] I digress. In *McGovern*, something other than torture was found in the description of the purposes being pursued - and that was fatal. In the case at bar, the description of the activities being carried on includes, for example, the death penalty, excision, antipersonnel mines, the jailing of children together with adults, and police brutality. This could be just as fatal.

[48] Returning to *McGovern*, I am of the opinion that Slade J. decided, in a context other than that of torture, that the pursuit of a change in conduct or policy is no more authorized in charity law than a change in legislation. Another purpose, in fact, that was in dispute was the following:

2B. Attempting to secure the release of Prisoners of Conscience.

Slade J. held that this purpose was inadmissible, in these words:

Even giving the wording of cl 2B the beneficent construction to which it is entitled, I cannot construe it in the manner suggested. If in construing the sub-clause one rejects, as I have done, the possibility that the activities of the trustees thereunder may be unlawful or may consist of attempts to procure changes in the local laws, it is obvious that the primary activity contemplated by cl 2B is the imposition of moral pressure on governments or governmental authorities. The crucial difference between the nature of the trust of cl 2B and the relevant trust in *Jackson v. Phillips* is that in the latter case the pressure was to be directed by the trustees against individual persons, rather than governments, with a view to obtaining the 'voluntary manumission' of the slaves belonging to such individuals. In the present case, the persons who are effecting the imprisonment or detention of prisoners of conscience in a foreign country will, ex hypothesi, normally be the governments or governmental authorities concerned exercising a judicial, penal or administrative function, or in some cases acting quite outside the law. I do not think that the trust can be construed as being one of which the main purpose is merely to influence public opinion in the country where the imprisonment is taking place. Its very terms suggest the direction of moral pressure or persuasion against governmental authorities.

(pp. 513-514)

(Emphasis added)

[49] I am not bound by Slade J.'s reasoning, of course, but it does seem extremely persuasive to me.

[50] The appellant also seeks support in the remarkable decision of Justice Gray of the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts, rendered in 1867 in *Jackson v. Phillips* (1867), 96 Mass. 539. The case involved a testamentary trust which had as one of its objects

the preparation and circulation of books, newspapers, the delivery of speeches, lectures, and such other means as ... will create a public sentiment that will put an end to negro slavery in this country.

(p. 541)

[51] Justice Gray held that the emancipation of the slaves was very definitely a charitable purpose within the purview of the Statute of Elizabeth, more specifically within the meaning of the words "relief or redemption of prisoners and captives" and he ruled the trust valid because, "as between master and slave" (p. 564), it was established that the master had the right to emancipate his slave and that

The manner stated of putting an end to slavery is not by legislation or political action, but by creating a public sentiment, which rather points to moral influence and voluntary manumission. The means specified are the usual means of public instruction, by books and newspapers, speeches and lectures. Other means are left to the discretion of the trustees, but there is nothing to indicate that they are not designed to be of a kindred nature.

(p. 565)

[52] Justice Gray's decision, to be sure, supports the proposition that the abolition of torture of prisoners, like the emancipation of the slaves, is in itself a charitable purpose within the meaning of the Statute of Elizabeth, but it does not support - quite the contrary - the proposition that this purpose is one of charity when the means employed consist of pressuring governments. As Slade J. notes, in *McGovern*, at page 514,

... the pressure (in *Jackson v. Phillips*) was to be directed by the trustees against individual persons, rather than governments, with a view to obtaining the "voluntary manumission" of the slaves belonging to such individuals.

[53] I conclude that, in light of the case law, the exercise of moral pressure on governments is a political purpose or activity.

(b) the Parliament of Canada

[54] This conclusion is strengthened, in my opinion, by the very language of the Canadian income tax legislation. The parties' counsel drew attention to the relevant legislation only in passing. However, this legislation is highly significant, in my view.

[55] I ought to have begun with this legislation, for it is wiser, as a general rule, to examine the legislation before examining the ordinary law. I did not do so in this instance because the law of charity is perceived essentially as judge-made law, which it no doubt is in England, where Parliament does not seem to have intervened since 1601, but to a lesser degree in Canada since 1986.

[56] Indeed, in 1986, Parliament went to the trouble of adding a provision to the *Income Tax Act* that in my opinion codifies the ordinary law that I have just analyzed, and that helps to resolve in a much more certain and satisfying way the issue that is before us. As might be guessed, this is subsection 149.1(6.2), which made its appearance through the *Act to amend the Income Tax Act*, S.C. 1986, c. 6, s. 85:

149.1 (6.2) For the purposes of the definition "charitable organization" in subsection 149.1(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.

149.1 (6.2) Pour l'application de la définition de « oeuvre de bienfaisance » au paragraphe (1), l'oeuvre qui consacre presque toutes ses ressources à des activités de bienfaisance est considérée comme y consacrant la totalité si les conditions suivantes sont réunies :

a) elle consacre la partie restante de ses ressources à des activités politiques;

b) ces activités politiques sont accessoires à ses activités de bienfaisance;

c) ces activités politiques ne comprennent pas d'activités directes ou indirectes de soutien d'un parti politique ou d'un candidat à une charge publique ou d'opposition à l'un ou à l'autre.

[27] This provision was mentioned only in passing in *Positive Action* (at p. 555) and in a footnote in *Human Life* (at page 222, note 6). In *Alliance for Life*, it was the subject of the following two comments by Stone J.A.:

[35] Although a "moving subject" the law of charity has not looked particularly kindly upon political purposes or activities being accepted as charitable. The Act reflects this attitude in subsection 149.1(6.2) with respect to activities by laying down a requirement that political activities be "ancillary and incidental" to charitable activities and that the organization remain obliged to devote "substantially all" of its resources to those activities. "Substantially all" has been interpreted by Revenue Canada as meaning that no more than 10% of an organization's resources measured over a period of time is to be spent on permitted political activities. Revenue Canada interprets the words "political activities" as embracing a "wide range of activities that have in common the goal of bringing about changes in law and policy". There remains, as we shall see, some difficulty of determining what activities are "political" in this branch of the law.

...

[64] It seems to me that political activities may well be "ancillary and incidental" despite the fact they involve the advocacy of a particular point of view on controversial social issues. This surely must depend on the scope of the organization's objectives and the activities undertaken in pursuit thereof. It may well be that a charitable organization would want to adopt a relatively strong and controversial posture in order to effectively advance its charitable objectives even to the extent, if necessary, of advocating a change of law or policy or of administrative decisions, without incurring the risk of losing its status as a registered charity. The key consideration initially must be whether the activities actually engaged in, though apparently controversial, remain "ancillary and incidental" to the charitable activities.

(footnotes omitted)

(Emphasis added)

[58] The defects that Parliament sought to overcome in enacting subsection 149.1(6.2) are identified in the comments made by the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Finance, Mr. Claude Lanthier, on September 19, 1985 (p. 6813):

There has been one issue in particular that was of some concern to the volunteer sector, namely the definition of "political activities", because it meant that certain charitable organizations were unable to be recognized as such for tax purposes, while others were concerned they might lose their status.

... 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100 101 102 103 104 105 106 107 108 109 110 111 112 113 114 115 116 117 118 119 120 121 122 123 124 125 126 127 128 129 130 131 132 133 134 135 136 137 138 139 140 141 142 143 144 145 146 147 148 149 150 151 152 153 154 155 156 157 158 159 160 161 162 163 164 165 166 167 168 169 170 171 172 173 174 175 176 177 178 179 180 181 182 183 184 185 186 187 188 189 190 191 192 193 194 195 196 197 198 199 200 201 202 203 204 205 206 207 208 209 210 211 212 213 214 215 216 217 218 219 220 221 222 223 224 225 226 227 228 229 230 231 232 233 234 235 236 237 238 239 240 241 242 243 244 245 246 247 248 249 250 251 252 253 254 255 256 257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265 266 267 268 269 270 271 272 273 274 275 276 277 278 279 280 281 282 283 284 285 286 287 288 289 290 291 292 293 294 295 296 297 298 299 300 301 302 303 304 305 306 307 308 309 310 311 312 313 314 315 316 317 318 319 320 321 322 323 324 325 326 327 328 329 330 331 332 333 334 335 336 337 338 339 340 341 342 343 344 345 346 347 348 349 350 351 352 353 354 355 356 357 358 359 360 361 362 363 364 365 366 367 368 369 370 371 372 373 374 375 376 377 378 379 380 381 382 383 384 385 386 387 388 389 390 391 392 393 394 395 396 397 398 399 400 401 402 403 404 405 406 407 408 409 410 411 412 413 414 415 416 417 418 419 420 421 422 423 424 425 426 427 428 429 430 431 432 433 434 435 436 437 438 439 440 441 442 443 444 445 446 447 448 449 450 451 452 453 454 455 456 457 458 459 460 461 462 463 464 465 466 467 468 469 470 471 472 473 474 475 476 477 478 479 480 481 482 483 484 485 486 487 488 489 490 491 492 493 494 495 496 497 498 499 500 501 502 503 504 505 506 507 508 509 510 511 512 513 514 515 516 517 518 519 520 521 522 523 524 525 526 527 528 529 530 531 532 533 534 535 536 537 538 539 540 541 542 543 544 545 546 547 548 549 550 551 552 553 554 555 556 557 558 559 560 561 562 563 564 565 566 567 568 569 570 571 572 573 574 575 576 577 578 579 580 581 582 583 584 585 586 587 588 589 590 591 592 593 594 595 596 597 598 599 600 601 602 603 604 605 606 607 608 609 610 611 612 613 614 615 616 617 618 619 620 621 622 623 624 625 626 627 628 629 630 631 632 633 634 635 636 637 638 639 640 641 642 643 644 645 646 647 648 649 650 651 652 653 654 655 656 657 658 659 660 661 662 663 664 665 666 667 668 669 670 671 672 673 674 675 676 677 678 679 680 681 682 683 684 685 686 687 688 689 690 691 692 693 694 695 696 697 698 699 700 701 702 703 704 705 706 707 708 709 710 711 712 713 714 715 716 717 718 719 720 721 722 723 724 725 726 727 728 729 730 731 732 733 734 735 736 737 738 739 740 741 742 743 744 745 746 747 748 749 750 751 752 753 754 755 756 757 758 759 760 761 762 763 764 765 766 767 768 769 770 771 772 773 774 775 776 777 778 779 780 781 782 783 784 785 786 787 788 789 790 791 792 793 794 795 796 797 798 799 800 801 802 803 804 805 806 807 808 809 810 811 812 813 814 815 816 817 818 819 820 821 822 823 824 825 826 827 828 829 830 831 832 833 834 835 836 837 838 839 840 841 842 843 844 845 846 847 848 849 850 851 852 853 854 855 856 857 858 859 860 861 862 863 864 865 866 867 868 869 870 871 872 873 874 875 876 877 878 879 880 881 882 883 884 885 886 887 888 889 890 891 892 893 894 895 896 897 898 899 900 901 902 903 904 905 906 907 908 909 910 911 912 913 914 915 916 917 918 919 920 921 922 923 924 925 926 927 928 929 930 931 932 933 934 935 936 937 938 939 940 941 942 943 944 945 946 947 948 949 950 951 952 953 954 955 956 957 958 959 960 961 962 963 964 965 966 967 968 969 970 971 972 973 974 975 976 977 978 979 980 981 982 983 984 985 986 987 988 989 990 991 992 993 994 995 996 997 998 999 1000 1001 1002 1003 1004 1005 1006 1007 1008 1009 1010 1011 1012 1013 1014 1015 1016 1017 1018 1019 1020 1021 1022 1023 1024 1025 1026 1027 1028 1029 1030 1031 1032 1033 1034 1035 1036 1037 1038 1039 1040 1041 1042 1043 1044 1045 1046 1047 1048 1049 1050 1051 1052 1053 1054 1055 1056 1057 1058 1059 1060 1061 1062 1063 1064 1065 1066 1067 1068 1069 1070 1071 1072 1073 1074 1075 1076 1077 1078 1079 1080 1081 1082 1083 1084 1085 1086 1087 1088 1089 1090 1091 1092 1093 1094 1095 1096 1097 1098 1099 1100 1101 1102 1103 1104 1105 1106 1107 1108 1109 1110 1111 1112 1113 1114 1115 1116 1117 1118 1119 1120 1121 1122 1123 1124 1125 1126 1127 1128 1129 1130 1131 1132 1133 1134 1135 1136 1137 1138 1139 1140 1141 1142 1143 1144 1145 1146 1147 1148 1149 1150 1151 1152 1153 1154 1155 1156 1157 1158 1159 1160 1161 1162 1163 1164 1165 1166 1167 1168 1169 1170 1171 1172 1173 1174 1175 1176 1177 1178 1179 1180 1181 1182 1183 1184 1185 1186 1187 1188 1189 1190 1191 1192 1193 1194 1195 1196 1197 1198 1199 1200 1201 1202 1203 1204 1205 1206 1207 1208 1209 1210 1211 1212 1213 1214 1215 1216 1217 1218 1219 1220 1221 1222 1223 1224 1225 1226 1227 1228 1229 1230 1231 1232 1233 1234 1235 1236 1237 1238 1239 1240 1241 1242 1243 1244 1245 1246 1247 1248 1249 1250 1251 1252 1253 1254 1255 1256 1257 1258 1259 1260 1261 1262 1263 1264 1265 1266 1267 1268 1269 1270 1271 1272 1273 1274 1275 1276 1277 1278 1279 1280 1281 1282 1283 1284 1285 1286 1287 1288 1289 1290 1291 1292 1293 1294 1295 1296 1297 1298 1299 1300 1301 1302 1303 1304 1305 1306 1307 1308 1309 1310 1311 1312 1313 1314 1315 1316 1317 1318 1319 1320 1321 1322 1323 1324 1325 1326 1327 1328 1329 1330 1331 1332 1333 1334 1335 1336 1337 1338 1339 1340 1341 1342 1343 1344 1345 1346 1347 1348 1349 1350 1351 1352 1353 1354 1355 1356 1357 1358 1359 1360 1361 1362 1363 1364 1365 1366 1367 1368 1369 1370 1371 1372 1373 1374 1375 1376 1377 1378 1379 1380 1381 1382 1383 1384 1385 1386 1387 1388 1389 1390 1391 1392 1393 1394 1395 1396 1397 1398 1399 1400 1401 1402 1403 1404 1405 1406 1407 1408 1409 1410 1411 1412 1413 1414 1415 1416 1417 1418 1419 1420 1421 1422 1423 1424 1425 1426 1427 1428 1429 1430 1431 1432 1433 1434 1435 1436 1437 1438 1439 1440 1441 1442 1443 1444 1445 1446 1447 1448 1449 1450 1451 1452 1453 1454 1455 1456 1457 1458 1459 1460 1461 1462 1463 1464 1465 1466 1467 1468 1469 1470 1471 1472 1473 1474 1475 1476 1477 1478 1479 1480 1481 1482 1483 1484 1485 1486 1487 1488 1489 1490 1491 1492 1493 1494 1495 1496 1497 1498 1499 1500 1501 1502 1503 1504 1505 1506 1507 1508 1509 1510 1511 1512 1513 1514 1515 1516 1517 1518 1519 1520 1521 1522 1523 1524 1525 1526 1527 1528 1529 1530 1531 1532 1533 1534 1535 1536 1537 1538 1539 1540 1541 1542 1543 1544 1545 1546 1547 1548 1549 1550 1551 1552 1553 1554 1555 1556 1557 1558 1559 1560 1561 1562 1563 1564 1565 1566 1567 1568 1569 1570 1571 1572 1573 1574 1575 1576 1577 1578 1579 1580 1581 1582 1583 1584 1585 1586 1587 1588 1589 1590 1591 1592 1593 1594 1595 1596 1597 1598 1599 1600 1601 1602 1603 1604 1605 1606 1607 1608 1609 1610 1611 1612 1613 1614 1615 1616 1617 1618 1619 1620 1621 1622 1623 1624 1625 1626 1627 1628 1629 1630 1631 1632 1633 1634 1635 1636 1637 1638 1639 1640 1641 1642 1643 1644 1645 1646 1647 1648 1649 1650 1651 1652 1653 1654 1655 1656 1657 1658 1659 1660 1661 1662 1663 1664 1665 1666 1667 1668 1669 1670 1671 1672 1673 1674 1675 1676 1677 1678 1679 1680 1681 1682 1683 1684 1685 1686 1687 1688 1689 1690 1691 1692 1693 1694 1695 1696 1697 1698 1699 1700 1701 1702 1703 1704 1705 1706 1707 1708 1709 1710 1711 1712 1713 1714 1715 1716 1717 1718 1719 1720 1721 1722 1723 1724 1725 1726 1727 1728 1729 1730 1731 1732 1733 1734 1735 1736 1737 1738 1739 1740 1741 1742 1743 1744 1745 1746 1747 1748 1749 1750 1751 1752 1753 1754 1755 1756 1757 1758 1759 1760 1761 1762 1763 1764 1765 1766 1767 1768 1769 1770 1771 1772 1773 1774 1775 1776 1777 1778 1779 1780 1781 1782 1783 1784 1785 1786 1787 1788 1789 1790 1791 1792 1793 1794 1795 1796 1797 1798 1799 1800 1801 1802 1803 1804 1805 1806 1807 1808 1809 1810 1811 1812 1813 1814 1815 1816 1817 1818 1819 1820 1821 1822 1823 1824 1825 1826 1827 1828 1829 1830 1831 1832 1833 1834 1835 1836 1837 1838 1839 1840 1841 1842 1843 1844 1845 1846 1847 1848 1849 1850 1851 1852 1853 1854 1855 1856 1857 1858 1859 1860 1861 1862 1863 1864 1865 1866 1867 1868 1869 1870 1871 1872 1873 1874 1875 1876 1877 1878 1879 1880 1881 1882 1883 1884 1885 1886 1887 1888 1889 1890 1891 1892 1893 1894 1895 1896 1897 1898 1899 1900 1901 1902 1903 1904 1905 1906 1907 1908 1909 1910 1911 1912 1913 1914 1915 1916 1917 1918 1919 1920 1921 1922 1923 1924 1925 1926 1927 1928 1929 1930 1931 1932 1933 1934 1935 1936 1937 1938 1939 1940 1941 1942 1943 1944 1945 1946 1947 1948 1949 1950 1951 1952 1953 1954 1955 1956 1957 1958 1959 1960 1961 1962 1963 1964 1965 1966 1967 1968 1969 1970 1971 1972 1973 1974 1975 1976 1977 1978 1979 1980 1981 1982 1983 1984 1985 1986 1987 1988 1989 1990 1991 1992 1993 1994 1995 1996 1997 1998 1999 2000 2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024 2025 2026 2027 2028 2029 2030 2031 2032 2033 2034 2035 2036 2037 2038 2039 2040 2041 2042 2043 2044 2045 2046 2047 2048 2049 2050 2051 2052 2053 2054 2055 2056 2057 2058 2059 2060 2061 2062 2063 2064 2065 2066 2067 2068 2069 2070 2071 2072 2073 2074 2075 2076 2077 2078 2079 2080 2081 2082 2083 2084 2085 2086 2087 2088 2089 2090 2091 2092 2093 2094 2095 2096 2097 2098 2099 2100 2101 2102 2103 2104 2105 2106 2107 2108 2109 2110 2111 2112 2113 2114 2115 2116 2117 2118 2119 2120 2121 2122 2123 2124 2125 2126 2127 2128 2129 2130 2131 2132 2133 2134 2135 2136 2137 2138 2139 2140 2141 2142 2143 2144 2145 2146 2147 2148 2149 2150 2151 2152 2153 2154 2155 2156 2157 2158 2159 2160 2161 2162 2163 2164 2165 2166 2167 2168 2169 2170 2171 2172 2173 2174 2175 2176 2177 2178 2179 2180 2181 2182 2183 2184 2185 2186 2187 2188 2189 2190 2191 2192 2193 2194 2195 2196 2197 2198 2199 2200 2201 2202 2203 2204 2205 2206 2207 2208 2209 2210 2211 2212 2213 2214 2215 2216 2217 2218 2219 2220 2221 2222 2223 2224 2225 2226 2227 2228 2229 2230 2231 2232 2233 2234 2235 2236 2237 2238 2239 2240 2241 2242 2243 2244 2245 2246 2247 2248 2249 2250 2251 2252 2253 2254 2255 2256 2257 2258 2259 2260 2261 2262 2263 2264 2265 2266 2267 2268 2269 2270 2271 2272 2273 2274 2275 2276 2277 2278 2279 2280 2281 2282 2283 2284 2285 2286 2287 2288 2289 2290 2291 2292 2293 2294 2295 2296 2297 2298 2299 2300 2301 2302 2303 2304 2305 2306 2307 2308 2309 2310 2311 2312 2313 2314 2315 2316 2317 2318 2319 2320 2321 2322 2323 2324 2325 2326 2327 2328 2329 2330 2331 2332 2333 2334 2335 2336 2337 2338 2339 2340 2341 2342 2343 2344 2345 2346 2347 2348 2349 2350 2351 2352 2353 2354 2355 2356 2357 2358 2359 2360 2361 2362 2363 2364 2365 2366 2367 2368 2369 2370 2371 2372 2373 2374 2375 2376 2377 2378 2379 2380 2381 2382 2383 2384 2385 2386 2387 2388 2389 2390 2391 2392 2393 2394 2395 2396 2397 2398 2399 2400 2401 2402 2403 2404 2405 2406 2407 2408 2409 2410 2411 2412 2413 2414 2415 2416 2417 2418 2419 2420 2421 2422 2423 2424 2425 2426 2427 2428 2429 2430 2431 2432 2433 2434 2435 2436 2437 2438 2439 2440 2441 2442 2443 2444 2445 2446 2447 2448 2449 2450 2451 2452 2453 2454 2455 2456 2457 2458 2459 2460 2461 2462 2463 2464 2465 2466 2467 2468 2469 2470 2471 2472 2473 2474 2475 2476 2477 2478 2479 2480 2481 2482 2483 2484 2485 2486 2487 2488 2489 2490 2491 2492 2493 2494 2495 2496 2497 2498 2499 2500 2501 2502 2503 2504 2505 2506 2507 2508 2509 251

