



**New Quebec rules on GAAR, Shams,
« Specified Transactions », Prête-noms and
Voluntary Disclosure**

STEP

Thursday, February 13, 2020

Mtre Paul Ryan

Ravinsky Ryan Lemoine, LLP

Place du Canada

1010, De La Gauchetière Ouest

Suite 2100

Montréal (Québec) H3B 2N2

Telephone : (514) 866-3510

pryan@ravinskyryan.com

New Quebec rules on GAAR, Shams, « Specified Transactions », Prête-noms and Voluntary Disclosure

Summary

1. New Quebec rules on GAAR, Shams, « Specified Transactions » and Prête-noms
 - 1.1 Consequences for client (GAAR)
 - 1.2 Consequences for clients (Shams)
 - 1.3 « Specified Transactions »
 - 1.4 Consequences for Professionals
 - 1.5 Questions
 - 1.6 Prête-noms

New Quebec rules on GAAR, Shams, « Specified Transactions », Prête-noms and Voluntary Disclosure

Summary

2. New Quebec Voluntary Disclosure Program
3. Recent Jurisprudence on Taxpayer obligation to cooperate with a tax audit
 - 3.1 *MNR. v. Cameco*, 2019 FCA 67
 - 3.2 « Questionnaire » cases
 - 3.3 Other significant recent cases

New Quebec rules on GAAR, Shams, « Specified Transactions », Prête-noms and Voluntary Disclosure

1. New Quebec rules on GAAR, Shams, « Specified Transactions » and Prête-noms

1. New Quebec rules on GAAR, Shams, « Specified Transactions » and Prête-noms

- Since 2017 report by « Committee on Public Finance », government of Quebec attempting to « criminalize » tax evasion
- Criminal law is mostly a Federal jurisdiction, so alternative measures had to be found

1. New Quebec rules on GAAR, Shams, « Specified Transactions » and Prête-noms

- All Proposed legislation now tabled, but not yet adopted:
 - Bill 37 (GAAR) : will be adopted shortly
 - Bill 42 (Shams, « Specified Transactions » and Prête-noms)

1. New Quebec rules on GAAR, Shams, « Specified Transactions » and Prête-noms

- New consequences apply to:
 - Client
 - Associates of the enterprise (if client is an enterprise)
 - Directors
 - Officers
 - 50% or more Shareholders
 - Other corporations in which same Shareholder owns 50% or more of the issued shares
 - Advisers and/or Promoters (the whole firm!)

1. New Quebec rules on GAAR, Shams, « Specified Transactions » and Prête-noms

- Two types of consequences:
 - Tax consequences (penalties, extension of time to assess, etc.)
 - Government contracts (« Register of Enterprises Ineligible » - « RENA »)
 - Quebec only at this point, no Federal equivalent

1. New Quebec rules on GAAR, Shams, « Specified Transactions » and Prête-noms

1.1 Consequences for client (GAAR)

1.1 Consequences for client (GAAR)

- GAAR Tax consequences:
 - Time to assess is 6 years instead of 3 years
 - Client « incurs » 50% penalty (Quebec only)
- GAAR Other consequences
 - Client, Associates of the Enterprise and some related corporations go on RENA for 5 years
 - Taken into account for AMP authorization

1.1 Consequences for client (GAAR)

- All consequences may be avoided by filing a « Preventive Disclosure » (new Form TP-1079.DI-V since September 2019)
- **Retroactive application** to all audits commencing more than 59 days after Bill 37 is adopted
- « Preventive Disclosure » possible for past GAAR issues until then, unless audit already in progress

1. New Quebec rules on GAAR, Shams, « Specified Transactions » and Prête-noms

1.2 Consequences for clients (Shams)

1.2 Consequences for clients (Shams)

- Sham Tax Consequences:
 - Time to assess is 6 years instead of 3 years
 - 50% penalty, minimum \$25,000
- Sham Other Consequences:
 - Client, Associates of the Enterprise and some related corporations go on RENA for 5 years
 - Taken into account for AMP authorization

1.2 Consequences for clients (Shams)

- No Preventive Disclosure possible
- Applicable to transactions made after May 17, 2019
- Main issue is what is a Sham???

1. New Quebec rules on GAAR, Shams, « Specified Transactions » and Prête-noms

1.3 « Specified Transactions »

1.3 « Specified Transactions »

- Shortcut vs needing to adopt new legislation
- List of « Specified Transactions » will be made public and updated periodically (Revenue Quebec will also publish lists of « Included Transactions » and « Excluded Transactions » within each « Specified Transaction »)

1.3 « Specified Transactions »

- Mandatory Disclosure:
 - By Adviser or Promoter, who commercializes or promotes the concept (generic only, no names)
 - By Client who participates in transaction that is significantly similar to a « Specified Transaction »

1.3 « Specified Transactions »

The later of:

- Within 60 days from **beginning** of transaction (even if not completed)

OR

- Within 120 days of addition of transaction to list of « Specified Transactions »

Disclosure is only mandatory if the carrying out of a transaction begins **AFTER** the date of the addition of a Specified Transaction to the list

1.3 « Specified Transactions »

- Consequences for Client:
 - \$1,000 per day penalty (min. \$10,000, maximum \$100,000)
 - Penalty of 50% of the tax benefit (even if not yet used)
 - The timely production of a « Mandatory Disclosure » will be considered as a « Preventive Disclosure » for GAAR penalty purposes

1.3 « Specified Transactions »

- Possible to be hit by two different 50% penalties if no « Mandatory Disclosure » is filed and GAAR applies
- Could eventually be attacked
- Disguised prohibition to transact?

1.3 « Specified Transactions »

- Nothing on the list yet (RQ must technically wait for the adoption of Bill 42)
- RQ is said to consider 30 different types of transactions

1. New Quebec rules on GAAR, Shams, « Specified Transactions » and Prête-noms

1.4 Consequences for Professionals

1.4 Consequences for Professionals

Category/ Description	Promoter/ Adviser	Penalty	RENA/ AMP Authorization	Possible « Preventive Disclosure »
GAAR	Promoter	100% of fees	YES (if penalty applied)	YES (by client only)
Sham	Adviser and Promoter	100% of fees	YES (if penalty applied)	NO
Specified Transactions (Generic type disclosure)	Adviser who commercializes a « Specified Transaction » similar from one client to another or Promoter who promotes the « Specified Transaction »	\$1,000 per day Min. \$10,000 Max. \$ 100,000 100% of fees from clients to whom transaction has been commercialized or promoted	NO (unless GAAR or Sham determined to apply)	N/A

1. New Quebec rules on GAAR, Shams, « Specified Transactions » and Prête-noms

1.5 Questions

1.5 Questions

- Meaning of « *Adviser* », « *Promoter* » and « *Adviser who promotes* »
- What fees are taken into account for penalty to professional?
- What is a Sham?

1.5.1 « Adviser »

- Definition of « Adviser » (S. 1079.8.1 TA)
“adviser” in respect of a transaction means a person or partnership that provides help, assistance or advice regarding the design or implementation of the transaction, or that commercializes or promotes it;

1.5.2 « Promoter »

- Definition of « Promoter » (S. 1079.9 TA)

1079.9. For the purposes of this Title and section 1006.1,

“promoter” of a transaction or a series of transactions means a person or a partnership in respect of which the following conditions are met:

(a) the person or partnership commercializes the transaction or series of transactions, promotes it or otherwise supports its development or the interest it generates;

*(b) the person or partnership receives or is entitled to receive, directly or indirectly, a consideration for the commercialization, promotion or support, or another person or partnership related to, or associated with, the person or partnership receives or is entitled to so receive such a consideration;
and*

(c) it is reasonable to consider that the person or partnership assumes an important role in the commercialization, promotion or support;

1.5.3 « *Adviser who commercializes* »

- Addressed by RQ at CTF Convention Roundtable in December 2019
- « *Through his behavior, the adviser encourages or favors the use of the transaction, he supports its growth and the interest it generates* »

1.5.4 What fees are considered?

- Addressed by RQ at CTF Convention Roundtable in December 2019
- 100% of fees for series of transactions even if involved only in part of series
- Intent (or absence thereof) will be considered for Sham aspect for professionals

1.5.5 Meaning of Sham


- Sham concept not much in use since adoption of GAAR
- Will now come back to the forefront

1.5.5 Meaning of Sham


- Basic jurisprudence
- Sham vs. Recharacterization of legal nature of transaction (ex: lease vs sale, loan vs gift, etc.)
- 4 recent examples with trusts
- Recent example involving a purchase with an option to buy back granted to Vendor
- Other recent example in a case of accommodation invoices

1.5.5 Meaning of Sham

What it should be



1.5.5 Meaning of Sham



1.5.5 Meaning of Sham

- *Common law concept*
- Civil Code has « *simulation* » concept:

1451. Simulation exists where the parties agree to express their true intent, not in an apparent contract, but in a secret contract, also called a counter letter.

Between the parties, a counter letter prevails over an apparent contract.

1.5.5 Meaning of Sham

- « *Prête-nom* » (nominee agreement) is a form of « *simulation* », but usually not a Sham
- Sham is an aggravated form of « *simulation* » (intent to deceive the tax authorities)
- « *Mandate* » concept can also be considered, both for « *Prête-nom* » and Sham purposes

1.5.5.1 Basic definition

Snook v. London & West Riding Investments Ltd., [1967] 1 All E.R. 518

As regards the contention of the plaintiff that the transactions between himself, Auto-Finance, Ltd. and the defendants were a “sham”, it is, I think, necessary to consider what, if any, legal concept is involved in the use of this popular and pejorative word. I apprehend that, if it has any meaning in law, **it means acts done or documents executed by the parties to the “sham” which are intended by them to give to third parties or to the court the appearance of creating between the parties legal rights and obligations different from the actual legal rights and obligations (if any) which the parties intend to create.** One thing I think, however, is clear in legal principle, morality and the authorities . . . that for acts or documents to be a “sham”, with whatever legal consequences follow from this, **all the parties thereto must have a common intention that the acts or documents are not to create the legal rights and obligations which they give the appearance of creating.** No unexpressed intentions of a “shammer” affect the rights of a party whom he deceived. . . .

1.5.5.1 Basic definition

- Some Court decisions seem to cast a wider net:

Antle v. Canada, 2010 FCA 280

[20] *In so holding, the Tax Court judge misconstrued the notion of intentional deception in the context of a sham. The required intent or state of mind is not equivalent to mens rea and need not go so far as to give rise to what is known at common law as the tort of deceit (compare MacKinnon v. Regent Trust Company Limited, (2005), J.L.Rev. 198 (CA) at para. 20). **It suffices that parties to a transaction present it as being different from what they know it to be.** That is precisely what the Tax Court judge found.*

1.5.5.2 Sham vs Recharacterization of transactions

- Excellent analysis by Owen J. of TCC in *Cameco* (2018 TCC 195) and *Lee* (2018 TCC 230) cases:
 - No Sham if Recharacterization made on the basis of facts and terms disclosed in contract
 - Sham if Recharacterization results from « outside facts » discovered by tax authorities

1.5.5.2 Sham vs Recharacterization of transactions

Cameco Corporation v. The Queen, (2018 TCC 195)

[585] In *Continental Bank Leasing Corp. v. Canada*, [1998 CanLII 794 \(SCC\)](#), [1998]2 S.C.R. 298 (“*Continental Bank*”), the Supreme Court of Canada interpreted Estey J.’s comments in *Stubart* to mean that the **“sham doctrine will not be applied unless there is an element of deceit in the way a transaction was either constructed or conducted.”**

[586] The Court in *Continental Bank* held that the determination of whether a sham exists precedes and is distinct from the correct legal characterization of a transaction. **If the transaction is a sham, the true nature of the transaction must be determined from extrinsic evidence (i.e., evidence other than the document(s) papering the transaction). If the transaction is not a sham, the correct legal characterization of the transaction can be determined with reference to the document(s) papering the transaction.**

1.5.5.2 Sham vs Recharacterization of transactions

Cameco Corporation v. The Queen, (2018 TCC 195)

[598] *As observed in Continental Bank, the factual presentation of the legal rights and obligations of parties to a transaction is not the same as the legal characterization of that transaction. **Consequently, a sham does not exist if the parties present the legal rights and obligations to the outside world in a factually accurate manner (i.e., in a manner that reflects the true intentions of the parties) but identify the legal character of the transaction incorrectly. For example, calling a contract a lease when its actual legal effect is a sale is not evidence of a sham provided the terms and conditions of the contract accurately reflect the legal rights and obligations intended by the parties.***

- RQ acknowledged this interpretation at the CTF December 2019 Roundtable

1.5.5.3 Recent cases involving Trusts

- *Antle v. Canada*, 2010 FCA 280
- *Lee v. R.*, 2018 TCC 230
- *Laplante v. R.*, 2017 TCC 118
- *Caplan c. ARQ*, 2019 QCCQ 3269

1.5.5.3.1 *Antle v. Canada*, 2010 FCA 280

- Ultimate sale of shares to a 3rd party:
 - Transfer of shares to discretionary Barbados Spousal Trust (Barbados Trustee)
 - Sale of shares by Trust to Wife (no tax in Canada, high ACB to Wife)
 - Wife sells to 3rd party (no gain)
 - Money finds its way to Husband's Holdco

1.5.5.3.1 *Antle v. Canada*, 2010 FCA 280

- All transactions in December 1999
- Trust ended in January 2000

1.5.5.3.1 *Antle v. Canada*, 2010 FCA 280

- Distinctive factors:
 - Trustee signed the transactional documents before he even signed the Trust Agreement
 - All of the funds were handled in the in-trust account of a lawyer, none of the funds was ever in the Trust's possession
 - Trustee was inexperienced
 - Trustee never met with the Settlor
 - Trustee had no control over the shares
 - The Trust existed only for a short duration

1.5.5.3.1 *Antle v. Canada*, 2010 FCA 280

- FCA concludes that Trust was a Sham, as no real discretion given to Trustee, who had to follow pre-arranged transactions

1.5.5.3.1 *Antle v. Canada*, 2010 FCA 280

[19] The Tax Court judge found as a fact that both the appellant and the trustee knew with absolute certainty that the latter had no discretion or control over the shares. Yet both signed a document saying the opposite. The Tax Court judge nevertheless held that they did not have the requisite intention to deceive.

1.5.5.3.2 *Lee v. R.*, 2018 TCC 230

- Quebec truffle
- Trust created in Quebec on December 10, 2003 (Trustee is a retired CPA)
- Gift of Preferred Shares to Trust on December 11, 2003 (FMV \$18 Million)
- Request for redemption of shares by Trustee on December 12, 2003
- Distribution of \$16 Million to Beneficiary of Trust on December 12, 2003 (via promissory note)
- Loan of \$18 Million by Trust to Corporation on December 12, 2003, with 4% interest

1.5.5.3.2 *Lee v. R.*, 2018 TCC 230

- TCC: Trust was not a Sham, as Trustee in full control of situation and could have decided otherwise

1.5.5.3.2 *Lee v. R.*, 2018 TCC 230

- Distinctive factors :
 - Experienced Trustee
 - Trustee analyzed the plan proposed by KPMG on his own before implementing it
 - Trustee received a cheque to constitute the Trust, which he deposited in an account opened for the Trust, of which he was the only signatory
 - Trustee retained the services of experts to help him with the constitution of the Trust and to execute the subsequent transactions
 - Shares really transferred to the Trust
 - Both the Trust and the loan lasted for a few years
 - Trustee and Settlor met a few times and had numerous discussions

1.5.5.3.2 *Lee v. R.*, 2018 TCC 230

[68] The Respondent appears to be applying the concept of sham as a sort of step transaction doctrine to disregard the creation of the Trust. That is neither correct nor appropriate. A sham involves an element of deceit—the parties must intend to give to third parties the appearance of creating between them legal rights and obligations different from the legal rights and obligations, if any, that the parties actually intend to create. An allegation of sham is an allegation that the parties to the alleged sham have been deceitful because they know that the actual legal rights and obligations created by them, if any, differ from the legal rights and obligations presented to the outside world.

1.5.5.3.2 *Lee v. R.*, 2018 TCC 230

[69] *Creating legal (or equitable) relationships to give effect to a tax plan is not the perpetration of a sham. In this case, there was no deceit on the part of the Appellant or Mr. Paris regarding the legal relationships created under Québec law. The Deed and other relevant documentation reflect precisely the legal rights and obligations intended by the parties to those documents. Indeed, the tax plan would not work if just one of the steps necessary to implement that plan was not legally effective.*

1.5.5.3.3 *Laplante v. R.*, 2017 TCC 118

- Estate Freeze in 2004, with creation of Trust
- Sale of shares in 2008, with substantial gain
- Allocation of significant portions of gain (\$75,000 to \$375,000) to several Laplante family members
- Donation of allocated proceeds back to Mr Laplante at family Christmas party

1.5.5.3.3 *Laplante v. R.*, 2017 TCC 118

- Additional allocation of \$4,512.50 to each Beneficiary (fee for services?)
- Minimum tax due by each Beneficiary (approximately \$20,000) paid by Mr Laplante; Beneficiaries allowed to keep subsequent refunds

1.5.5.3.3 *Laplante v. R.*, 2017 TCC 118

- TCC:
 - Amounts reported by Beneficiaries as « *agents* » for Mr Laplante
 - « *Mandate* » agreement hidden from RQ
 - « *Simulation* » as per Civil Code
 - Sham word not explicitly acknowledged
 - 100% of gain taxed in Mr Laplante's hands

1.5.5.3.4 *Caplan c. ARQ.*, 2019 QCCQ 3269

- Reorg and creation of Trust in 2011
- Allocations of income to young adult children between 2011 and 2014 (from \$30,000 to \$55,000 per child per year)
- Funds immediately remitted to Father

1.5.5.3.4 *Caplan c. ARQ.*, 2019 QCCQ 3269

- Father argued that funds were used by him for the benefit of the children, but no precise evidence
- Father signed « acknowledgement of debt », but wrong date inserted

1.5.5.3.4 *Caplan c. ARQ.*, 2019 QCCQ 3269

- CQ :
 - Children were acting as « *accommodators* » for Father, either as « *agents* » or as « *Prête-noms* »
 - All income attributed to Father
 - « *Simulation* » (no explicit Sham conclusion)

1.5.5.3.4 *Caplan c. ARQ.*, 2019 QCCQ 3269

- If a Sham:
 - What is the « *series* »?
 - Which professionals are involved?
 - What fees are at stake?

1.5.5.3.5 *Paletta & al v. The Queen*, 2019 TCC 205

- Feature Movies produced by 20th Century Fox
- Partnership created to acquire movies just after completion, but before commercial release
- Substantial « print & advertising » expenses required to be incurred (\$82 Million for main movie)

1.5.5.3.5 *Paletta & al v. The Queen*, 2019 TCC 205

- 20th Century Fox entity has option to re-purchase movie for cost plus P & A expenses (less 3%)
- Option exercised:
 - Substantial business loss for Partnership
 - Corresponding capital gain, with reserve

1.5.5.3.5 *Paletta & al v. The Queen*, 2019 TCC 205

- CRA claims that option was a Sham, as it was pre-arranged and clear to all that 20th Century Fox entity would exercise the option

1.5.5.3.5 Paletta & al v. The Queen, 2019 TCC 205

[243] In light of all of the above, I find that the Appellants invested in the Six Iron and Swilcan Partnerships solely to avail themselves of the tax savings that the promoters led them to believe they could expect and that they felt secure in the knowledge that Fox had agreed to reacquire the films prior to their commercial release.

[244] Accordingly, I conclude that the options were shams designed to mask the parties' agreement that Fox would reacquire the films prior to their commercial release.

1.5.5.3.5 *Paletta & al v. The Queen*, 2019 TCC 205

[245] *Consequently, the P&A expenses allegedly borne by the partnerships were not incurred for the purpose of earning income. Likewise, the financing and other expenses incurred by the Appellants with respect to their partnership interests are not deductible.*

[246] *As a result of this finding, I conclude that the Appellants did not realize a gain of any kind in connection with the disposition of their partnership units because their proceeds of disposition were less than their adjusted cost base. I note that the Respondent conceded this point in the event that I should accept this theory of sham.*

1.5.5.3.6 *TricomCanada Inc. v. Canada*, 2017 FCA 95

- Gold selling business
- Tricom buys « scrap gold », used gold jewelry and impure gold bars, from four Suppliers and resells it to its only client, in Albertas
- Revenue Quebec denied the ITCs (\$994,730.97) with respect to the purchases made in 2012

1.5.5.3.6 *TricomCanada Inc. v. Canada*, 2017 FCA 95

- Revenue Quebec claims that the four Suppliers are not the real Suppliers, but are used to hide the real identity of other suppliers
- Did not have the knowledge, the personnel or the equipment to supply the « scrap gold »
- Businesses with modest financial means supplying Millions of \$ in gold
- The checks to the Suppliers were all cashed at cheques-cashing centers

1.5.5.3.6 *TricomCanada Inc. v. Canada*, 2017 FCA 95

- The TCC concluded that the transactions were a Sham
- The invoices received from the Suppliers were therefore accommodation invoices
- The Corporation was involved in fraudulent activities to hide the identity of its real suppliers
- The TCC refuses to grant the Corporation the ITCs it claimed
- The TCC's decision has been confirmed by the FCA

1.5.5.4 Recent examples of questions asked by the tax authorities in Trust audits

February 2019 (addressed to the Trust)

- The accounting records (the Trial Balance, detailed general ledger, accounting spreadsheets, adjustment entries and the detail of the grouping of accounts presented in the financial statements)
- The financial statements
- The list of all bank accounts and all the account statements, monthly statements, cheques, paystubs, deposit slips of the Trust

1.5.5.4 Recent examples of questions asked by the tax authorities in Trust audits

February 2019 (continued)

- The minute book
- Trust Agreement
- Purpose and reasons why the Trust was constituted

1.5.5.4 Recent examples of questions asked by the tax authorities in Trust audits

April 2019 (addressed to the Trust)

- List of assets and liabilities of the Trust as at December 31 for each of the years under audit
- Proof of receipt of the amounts distributed by the Trust, including dividends and redemption proceeds of shares
- Proof of the distribution of the original silver ingot when the Trust was liquidated

1.5.5.4 Recent examples of questions asked by the tax authorities in Trust audits

November 2019 (Addressed to Beneficiaries)

- Proof of receipt of the income attributed by the Trust during the year

1.5.5.4 Recent examples of questions asked by the tax authorities in Trust audits

- **See the Questionnaire from the CRA dated 2015**

1. New Quebec rules on GAAR, Shams, « Specified Transactions » and Prête-noms

1.6 Prête-noms

1.6 Prête-noms

- Prête-noms that have a tax impact must now be disclosed on Form TP-1079.PN-V
- Box 26 will disappear from CO-17
- Deadline is 90 days after adoption of Bill 42

1.6 Prête-noms

- Penalty of \$1,000 plus \$100 per day, up to \$5,000
- Time to assess tax consequences arising out of Prête-nom situation is suspended while Form TP-1079.PN-V is not filed

1.6 Prête-noms

- Administrative exclusion for interest in personal-use real estate (maximum 50% of FMV) held by parent as agent for child, to meet Bank financing requirements
- Small space in section 1 of Form TP-1079.PN-V for reason for Prête-nom

New Quebec rules on GAAR, Shams, « Specified Transactions », Prête-noms and Voluntary Disclosure

2. New Quebec Voluntary Disclosure Program

2. New Quebec Voluntary Disclosure Program

- Interpretation Bulletin ADM.4/R8
- In force since December 20, 2019

2. New Quebec Voluntary Disclosure Program

- Essentially, a carbon copy of CRA Program adopted in March 2018
- « General Program » and « Limited Program »
- « Intentional element » is the key factor to distinguish between the two

2. New Quebec Voluntary Disclosure Program

- No more anonymous filings
- « Final Product » (including amended declarations and payment) must be ready before opening of DV is accepted
- Advisers who have helped must be denounced

2. New Quebec Voluntary Disclosure Program

	General Program	Limited Program
Non-Statute Barred Years	Full interest	Full interest
Other Years up to 6	50% interest reduction	50% interest reduction
Years 7 to 10	No interest	50% interest reduction
Years older than 10	No interest	50% interest reduction for most recent 10 years

2. New Quebec Voluntary Disclosure Program

- Certain penalties may be maintained in Limited Program:
 - Late-filing penalties for QST and DAS
 - Possible 59.2.2 LAF penalty

2. New Quebec Voluntary Disclosure Program

59.2.2. Every person who fails to report an income equal to or greater than \$500 (in this section referred to as “unreported income”) in the fiscal return filed by that person for a taxation year and has already made such an omission for any of the three preceding taxation years incurs a penalty equal to the lesser of

(a) 10% of the unreported income; and

(b) the amount determined by the formula $0.5 \times (A - B)$.

2. New Quebec Voluntary Disclosure Program

59.2.2. (...)

In the formula in the first paragraph,

(a) A is an amount equal to the excess amount that would be determined for the taxation year under the first paragraph of section 1049 of the Taxation Act ([chapter I-3](#)) if that section applied in respect of the unreported income; and

(b) B is any amount deducted or withheld under section 1015 of the Taxation Act that may reasonably be considered to be in respect of the unreported income.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, no person shall incur, in respect of the same omission, both the penalty under the first paragraph and the penalty under section 1049 of the Taxation Act.

2. New Quebec Voluntary Disclosure Program

- VD may be refused:
 - If any 3rd party under audit for facts that are sufficiently related to the facts disclosed
 - RQ already has information in its possession (even if unknown to the Taxpayer) concerning the Taxpayer

2. New Quebec Voluntary Disclosure Program

- Expect decisions to be rendered very late in the process:
 - Whether the VD qualifies
 - The applicable Program (General vs Limited)
- RQ reserves the right to come back on its acceptance, even after signing an agreement and issuing the required notices of assessment, if new facts come to light

2. New Quebec Voluntary Disclosure Program

- 2nd VD will be considered only in very exceptional circumstances
- No 2nd VD possible, if first one rejected because of incomplete documentation

2. New Quebec Voluntary Disclosure Program

- Long list of exclusions in paragraph 6, including:
 - Declarations by Partnerships and Nonprofits
 - Situations where no tax is payable
 - Late or modified elections
 - Issues with new rules concerning GAAR and Shams

New Quebec rules on GAAR, Shams, « Specified Transactions », Prête-noms and Voluntary Disclosure

3. Recent Jurisprudence on Taxpayer obligation to cooperate with a tax audit

3. Recent Jurisprudence on Taxpayer obligation to cooperate with a tax audit

231.1 (1) An authorized person may, at all reasonable times, for any purpose related to the administration or enforcement of this Act,

(a) inspect, audit or examine the books and records of a taxpayer and any document of the taxpayer or of any other person that relates or may relate to the information that is or should be in the books or records of the taxpayer or to any amount payable by the taxpayer under this Act, and

3. Recent Jurisprudence on Taxpayer obligation to cooperate with a tax audit

231.1 (1) (...)

(c) subject to subsection 231.1(2), enter into any premises or place where any business is carried on, any property is kept, anything is done in connection with any business or any books or records are or should be kept, and

(d) require the owner or manager of the property or business and any other person on the premises or place to give the authorized person all reasonable assistance and to answer all proper questions relating to the administration or enforcement of this Act and, for that purpose, require the owner or manager to attend at the premises or place with the authorized person.

3. Recent Jurisprudence on Taxpayer obligation to cooperate with a tax audit

3.1 *MNR. v. Cameco*, 2019 FCA 67

3.1 *MNR. v. Cameco*, 2019 FCA 67

- New *Cameco* decision (2019 FCA 67)
 - Bad facts make bad law
 - Transfer Pricing
 - Case before Tax Court for other years
 - Right to only one examination on discovery

3.1 *MNR. v. Cameco*, 2019 FCA 67

- Audit for subsequent years
- CRA wants to conduct verbal interviews with 25 employees (including employees of foreign subsidiaries)
- *Cameco* refuses to cooperate, but would have accepted written questions

3.1 *MNR. v. Cameco*, 2019 FCA 67

- **First level (Federal Court)**
 - Request related to Tax Court case for previous years
 - One cannot do indirectly...

3.1 *MNR. v. Cameco*, 2019 FCA 67

- **Second level (Federal Court of Appeal)**
 - Goes much further
 - Verbal interviews during an audit are not mandatory for the Taxpayer
 - Written questions (vs pre-existing information)?

3.1 *MNR. v. Cameco*, 2019 FCA 67

- On whether the Taxpayer or his employees can be compelled to answer questions:

[12] *Applying the modern approach to statutory interpretation (Re Rizzo & Rizzo Shoes Ltd., 1998 CanLII 837 (SCC), [1998] 1 S.C.R. 27 at para. 21, 154 D.L.R. (4th) 193; Bell Express Vu Limited Partnership v. Rex, 2002 SCC 42 (CanLII), [2002] 2 S.C.R. 559), paragraph 231.1(1)(a) cannot be interpreted so as to permit the Minister to compel oral interviews of a taxpayer or its employees concerning its tax liability. Neither the text, nor the context nor the legislative history of paragraph 231.1(1)(a) supports the Minister's position.*

3.1 *MNR. v. Cameco*, 2019 FCA 67

- On whether the Taxpayer or his employees can be compelled to answer questions:

[13] *There is a caveat to this, and it arises from [paragraph 231.1\(1\)\(d\)](#). **If records, of any sort, are the object of the auditor’s interest**, Parliament has made clear that questions may be asked, and the assistance of the Court sought, **to compel answers as to the taxpayer’s knowledge of their provenance and location**. That is not what is sought in this case.*

[18] *The power is to “inspect, audit or examine”. Neither “inspect” nor “examine” suggests a power to compel a person to answer questions. To the contrary, their ordinary meaning is one of self-directed inquiry, in this case in respect of “the book and records” of the taxpayer. When two or more words that are capable of analogous meaning are coupled together they take their colour from each other, the more general being restricted to a sense analogous to the less general: R. Sullivan, *Sullivan on the Construction of Statutes* (6th ed. 2014) at 230 (Sullivan) citing *R. v. Goulis*, [1981] O.J. No. 637, 233 O.R. (2d) 55, at 61 (C.A.).*

3.1 *MNR. v. Cameco*, 2019 FCA 67

- On options available to CRA if Taxpayer or his employees refuse to answer questions:

[28] *I also agree with the Minister that all taxpayers should fully cooperate with reasonable requests arising in the course of an audit. However, the fact that I have concluded that the Minister does not have the power to compel a taxpayer to answer questions at the audit stage does not mean that the audit power has been rendered toothless in the face of recalcitrant taxpayers. It remains open to the Minister to make inferences when no answer is given. **The Minister is also free to make assumptions and to assess on that basis. The tax liability arising from the Minister's assessment is statutorily deemed to be valid and binding (subject to appeal or reassessment) (s. 152(8)), and in any appeal in the Tax Court of Canada, the onus rests with the taxpayer to destroy any factual assumptions the Minister has made** (Sarmadi v. Canada, 2017 2019 FCA 67 (CanLII) Page: 12 FCA 131 at para. 31). The Minister may also demand that large corporate taxpayers such as Cameco pay 50% of the assessed tax immediately (s. 225.1(7)).*

3.1 *MNR. v. Cameco*, 2019 FCA 67

- On options available to CRA if Taxpayer or his employees refuse to answer questions:

[29] *Further, paragraph 231.1(1)(a) is not the only source of the Minister's investigatory powers. The Minister may enter into the business premises of a taxpayer (s. 231.1(1)(c)), seek information and documents from third parties (s. 231.2), examine any property, process or matter relating to the taxpayer or any other person (s. 231.1(1)(b)), enter a dwelling-house with a warrant (ss. 231.1(2), 231.1(3)), authorize a formal inquiry (s. 231.4), and, if necessary, come to the Federal Court to compel the taxpayer to provide any access, assistance, information or document sought by the Minister under section 231.1 or 231.2 (s. 231.7).*

3.1 *MNR. v. Cameco*, 2019 FCA 67

- Issues still outstanding:
 - Peremptory demands and Court Orders
 - Written questions?
 - Questionnaire pertaining to foreign accounts and assets

3.1 *MNR. v. Cameco*, 2019 FCA 67

- Peremptory Demands
- **231.2 (1)** Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Minister may, subject to subsection (2), for any purpose related to the administration or enforcement of this Act (including the collection of any amount payable under this Act by any person), of a listed international agreement or, for greater certainty, of a tax treaty with another country, by notice served personally or by registered or certified mail, require that any person provide, within such reasonable time as is stipulated in the notice,
 - (a) any information or additional information, including a return of income or a supplementary return; or
 - (b) any document.

3.1 *MNR. v. Cameco*, 2019 FCA 67

- **May 31, 2019 Statement by CRA:**
 - CRA in disagreement with *Cameco* ruling, but will not appeal
 - CRA still believes that Taxpayers are under obligation to cooperate and answer questions
 - CRA will otherwise have to use its power to assess based on assumptions or on an arbitrary basis

3. Recent Jurisprudence on Taxpayer obligation to cooperate with a tax audit

3.2 « Questionnaire » cases

3.2 « Questionnaire » cases

- Two recent (and contradictory) decisions by Federal Court
- *Cameco* argument apparently not raised in either of the cases

3.2.1 *MNR v. Lin* (2019 FC 646)

- Taxpayer refuses to complete Questionnaire
- Request by CRA for a Court Order forcing the Taxpayer to answer
- Taxpayer pleads that unclear that he is the real target of the audit, as Questionnaire also seeking information concerning « related entities »
- Federal Court refuses to issue Order

3.2.2 *MNR v. Charles and Claire Friedman* (2019 FC 1583)

- Montreal Taxpayers in their 80's
- Plead same argument as in *Lin*
- Also plead violation of their Charter right against self-incrimination
- Alternatively, seeking Order from Court that anything they provide cannot subsequently be used against them in criminal proceedings

3.2.2 *MNR v. Charles and Claire Friedman* (2019 FC 1583)

- Despite exactly similar letter as in *Lin*, Court reaches opposite conclusion
- Clear that Mr and Mrs Friedman are the main targets of the audit
- Open to Taxpayers to provide incomplete answers concerning other entities (for example, if information not available)
- Possible for CRA to contest at that point

3.2.2 *MNR v. Charles and Claire Friedman* (2019 FC 1583)

- File is a regular audit, not a criminal investigation, as the « predominant purpose » is not to initiate criminal proceedings
- Taxpayers' request for Charter protection is premature
- Whether the information provided could ultimately be used against the Taxpayers in eventual criminal proceedings can be decided at that time (if it ever happens)
- In line with Quebec Jurisprudence (*Berger Case*, 2016 QCCA 226)

3.2 « Questionnaire » cases

- More and more of them
- Some direct (mostly CRA's Quebec City TSO)
- Some more general to start (Rimouski, Winnipeg, etc.)

3.2 « Questionnaire » cases

- Various sources of information:
 - Informants
 - Tax Information Exchange Agreements
 - Inbound or Outbound transfers of above \$10,000 (including VD cases)
 - Transactions or transfers offshore in Canadian currency

3.2 « Questionnaire » cases

- Difficult balancing act
- T1135 penalties can be very harsh:
 - Minimum \$2,500 per year
 - Possibly 5% of capital per year (if gross negligence)
 - Penalties carry interest federally
 - CRA has some discretion as to:
 - Number of years for which penalty will be assessed
 - Type of penalty that will be assessed

3. Recent Jurisprudence on Taxpayer obligation to cooperate with a tax audit

3.3 Other significant recent cases

3.3 Other significant recent cases

- *MNR v. Les Développements Béarence Inc.*,
2019 FC 22
- In certain circumstances, a Taxpayer under audit cannot be compelled to create new documents, (and incur costs), when the existing documents are sufficient to establish the Taxpayer's obligations under the ITA

3.3 Other significant recent cases

- *BP Canada Energy Company v. MNR, 2017 FCA 61*
- Accountants' worksheets evaluating the tax risks, as required by Securities Commission reporting, not accessible by CRA
- CRA has to respect its published policies

3.3 Other significant recent cases

- *MNR v. Atlas Tubes Canada ULC*, 2018 FC 1086
- Accountants' tax due diligence report, upon the acquisition of a corporation, is accessible to CRA
- Under appeal before FCA, as perceived to be in contradiction with *BP Canada Case*

New Quebec rules on GAAR, Shams, « Specified Transactions », Prête-noms and Voluntary Disclosure

THANK YOU!

