



# Reasonable expectation of profit is dead

For years the CCRA has been denying losses on taxpayer's investments because there was no reasonable expectation of profit. The following case highlights a Supreme Court decision that changed this rule and may provide investors with some tax relief in respect of such losses.

## The facts

On May 23, 2002, the Supreme Court of Canada (SCC) released its long-awaited decision in the case of *Brian J. Stewart v. the Queen*. In 1986, Mr. Stewart purchased four condominiums from which he earned rental income. All four condominiums were highly leveraged with Mr. Stewart paying only \$1,000 cash for each unit. Projections indicated that the properties would generate negative cash flows, as well as losses, for a 10-year period, before becoming profitable.

From 1990 to 1992, Mr. Stewart claimed total losses of over \$58,000 and used these losses to offset other income. These losses occurred primarily as a result of significant interest expense on the money borrowed to acquire the condominiums. The Canada Customs and Revenue Agency (CCRA) disallowed these losses on the basis that Mr. Stewart had no "reasonable expectation of profit" (REOP) and therefore no business was being carried on. If no business existed, then business losses cannot have arisen to be claimed against other income. Both the Tax Court of Canada and the Federal Court of Appeal upheld CCRA's position.

## The SCC's decision

The SCC reversed both lower courts' findings and found in favour of Mr. Stewart allowing the deduction of the losses. According to the court, "the reasonable expectation of profit test should not be accepted as the test to determine whether a taxpayer's activities constitute a source of income" (i.e., a business). Instead, the SCC introduced a two-stage approach that should be used to determine whether a taxpayer's activities constitute a source of business or investment income. Step one is to ascertain whether the taxpayer's activity is undertaken in "pursuit of profit" or is personal. If it is not personal, then the second test is whether the income earned is business or investment income.

The SCC introduced a two-stage approach that should be used to determine whether a taxpayer's activities constitute a source of business or investment income.



The first test is only relevant if there is some personal element to the activity. For example, if a condominium is purchased for investment purposes but a taxpayer uses it personally (or perhaps allows relatives to use it), then there may be a personal element to the investment. However, where the purchase of an investment property has no personal element, the taxpayer's pursuit of profit is established. As the SCC stated, "for what purpose would the taxpayer have spent his time and money in this activity if not for profit?"

Once it has been determined that the first test has been met and that the activity has a sufficient degree of commerciality to be actually considered a source of income, the next thing to consider is whether the expenses that created the loss are deductible (in the Stewart case, the interest expense).

### **Interest deductibility**

In the SCC's recent decision in the *Ludco* case, the taxpayer was permitted to deduct \$6 million of interest expense incurred for the purchase of shares despite the fact that only \$600,000 of dividends was received. In reviewing the wording of the Income Tax Act, which states that interest on borrowed money is deductible if it was borrowed "for the purpose of earning income," the SCC concluded that the Act does not say that the sole, main or primary purpose of an investment must be to earn income. In fact, the primary purpose may be to realize an ultimate capital gain. In other words, as long as one of the purposes of the purchase of the shares was to earn income (which was clearly evident from the fact that the taxpayer did receive dividends from these shares), then the interest was deductible.

In the Stewart case, CCRA argued that an anticipated capital gain should not be included in assessing whether a taxpayer had a reasonable expectation of profit. The SCC disagreed saying "the motivation of capital gains accords with the ordinary business person's understanding of 'pursuit of profit' and may be taken into account in determining whether the taxpayer's activity is commercial in nature." That being said, simply purchasing property in anticipation of an ultimate capital gain is not a source of income for the purposes of interest deductibility. However, an anticipated capital gain may be a factor in assessing whether there is a source of income.



## Implications for investors

This case, by confirming interest deductibility in these circumstances, is yet another win for the Canadian investor who deducts interest on money borrowed to purchase investments with a reasonable expectation of earning income but that, in fact, generate little, if any, income. In addition, this case has much wider application. The current denial of deductions by CCRA of losses generated by many tax shelters because of “no reasonable expectation of profit” will likely now be put on hold unless CCRA can come up with another weapon (for example, the general anti-avoidance rule) with which to attack these shelters. For the time being, however, it appears that the doctrine of REOP is dead.

For more information about this topic, contact your advisor, call us at **1.800.874.6275** or visit our website at **[www.aimtrimark.com](http://www.aimtrimark.com)**

AIM Trimark Investments is one of Canada’s largest mutual fund companies with over \$33 billion\*\* in assets under management. A subsidiary of U.K.-based AMVESCAP PLC, one of the world’s largest independent investment managers, AIM Trimark employs more than 900 people in its Calgary, Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver offices.

AMVESCAP is dedicated to helping people worldwide build their financial security, offering a broad array of investment solutions and services to individuals and institutional investors in 150 countries. Its securities trade on the London, Frankfurt, New York, Paris and Toronto stock exchanges. AIM Trimark and its associated companies under the AMVESCAP umbrella draw on the talents and expertise of more than 550 investment professionals in more than 25 countries to manage over \$500 billion\*\* in assets worldwide.

The information provided is general in nature and is provided with the understanding that it may not be relied upon as, nor considered to be, the rendering of tax, legal, accounting or professional advice. Readers should consult with their own accountants and/or lawyers for advice on the specific circumstances before taking any action.

Commissions, trailing commissions, management fees and expenses may all be associated with mutual fund investments. Mutual funds are not guaranteed, their values change frequently and past performance may not be repeated. Please read the prospectus before investing. Copies are available from your advisor or from AIM Funds Management Inc.

† AIM, the chevron logo and all associated trademarks are trademarks of A I M Management Group Inc., used under licence.

\* TRIMARK and all associated trademarks are trademarks of AIM Funds Management Inc.

Designed and paid for by AIM Trimark Investments. ©AIM Funds Management Inc., 2003. TBSCRRE(02/03)

\*\*As at December 31, 2002

5140 Yonge Street, Suite 900 Toronto, Ontario M2N 6X7

### Tax & Estate InfoService

Telephone: 416.590.9855 or 1.800.874.6275

Facsimile: 416.590.9868 or 1.800.631.7008

[inquiries@aimtrimark.com](mailto:inquiries@aimtrimark.com) **[www.aimtrimark.com](http://www.aimtrimark.com)**



**AIM TRIMARK™**