

TAXADVISOR

Capital Punishment

As recent tax cases illustrate, writing off business expenses can be an exercise fraught with danger

COURT REPORT

BY JAMIE GOLOMBEK



If you conduct your advisory practice through an employee-employer relationship, as opposed to being self-employed, no doubt you're aware that your ability to deduct expenses is much more restrictive than if you

owned your own business.

Each year, several tax cases make their way to Tax Court in which employees attempt to write off otherwise legitimate expenses but are told they can't because of technical rules in the *Income Tax Act*.

The most recent case, *Paes v The Queen* (2007 TCC 311), was released last month and serves as a valuable reminder to employees of the types of expenses that may or

may not be deducted.

Ken Paes was a commissioned salesman for Superpages, a company that sells advertising to businesses. In 2003, he earned a base salary of \$53,000 and reported commissions of over \$42,000.

On his 2003 tax return, he wrote off over \$27,000 of employment expenses, most of which the CRA allowed. However, the agency denied about \$5,000 of

these expenses, including office expenses for the purchase of presentation equipment, a printer, phone and cabinet as well as seminar and training expenses for a real estate sales seminar, a motivational lecture and a basic HTML course.

The CRA claimed that the office expenses should be classified as "capital" and therefore not deductible and that the seminar and training fees were not incurred for business purposes, nor was Paes required to attend these seminars as part of his employment.

OFFICE EXPENSES

Paes argued that in order to earn his income as a salesperson, work-

ing out of his home office, he needed to use a "table, chairs, cabinet, computer, printer, telephone among other equipment."

The problem, however, is that under the *Income Tax Act*, an employee who earns commissions can only deduct certain expenses but specifically cannot deduct "outlays, losses or replacements of capital or payments on account of capital," except capital cost allowance on vehicles and airplanes.

Paes testified that he failed "to see any rationale why there is discrepancy in the treatment of deductibility between motor vehicle expenses and office equipment expenses. Both are critical elements in earning income."

This issue has arisen most recently in the *Emmons* case (see my previous column, "Expenses for Advice," *AER* June 2006) in which a broker's computer costs were found to be of a capital nature and therefore not deductible.

It also received national attention in the 2004 Supreme Court of Canada ruling in *Gifford*, a case involving a broker who was unable to deduct the cost of buying another broker's client list. The Supreme Court publicly highlighted this unfairness, saying that, "... employees are treated differently than taxpayers earning income from business ... is not novel nor readily seen as fair ... This seemingly inequitable result for [Gifford] is the result of the structure of the [Income Tax] Act."

The judge quoted the *Gifford* case and found that Paes was not entitled to claim the capital cost of any of his office supplies.

SEMINAR AND TRAINING EXPENSES

Paes also deducted the costs of motivational and a real estate sales seminars he attended. He testified that at these seminars, he learned "sales techniques and sold advertising to real estate agents." Paes felt that the training he received in those seminars "has directly helped [him] in his present position as [a] salesperson."

The Canada Revenue Agency in its Interpretation Bulletin IT-357R2, "Expenses of Training" distinguishes between deductible and non-deductible training costs. The CRA states that training costs are not deductible as a current expense if they are considered "capital expenditures." This occurs "where the training results in a lasting benefit to the taxpayer, i.e., where a new skill or qualification is acquired." By contrast, where "the training is taken merely to maintain, update or upgrade an already existing skill or qualification, the

Continued on page 12



SMALL IS THE NEW BIG.

EASY IP IS THE AFFORDABLE, ALL-IN-ONE HOSTED IP TELEPHONY SOLUTION THAT GIVES YOU THE RESOURCES TO COMPETE LIKE A BIG COMPANY.

Small businesses get big capabilities with a complete hosted IP communications solution from Rogers. Easy IP is an exclusive, all-in-one solution that's easy to use and simple to deploy, with a predictable monthly charge that won't leave you guessing. Voice, Internet and e-mail are combined with highly effective productivity applications like:

- **Mobile Integration** – Your mobile phone and desk phone are linked, allowing you to toggle between the two with simultaneous ringing and a single voicemail box.
- **Web-based Admin Tools** – It's easy to move, add and delete users and control call routing without a service call.
- **Hot Desking** – Sit at any desk in your office and log into an IP phone. Your extension will ring there and your voicemail will follow you.

- Local landline service and long distance minutes
- Dedicated business Internet and e-mail service
- New Mitel 5224 IP telephones
- No up-front costs
- Free installation*
- Pain-free transition from your existing phone system with a network assessment and upgrade at no charge, if required
- Seamless integration with your mobile phone

From **\$74** per seat per month

EASY IP BRINGS YOU ONE STEP CLOSER TO **YOU**^{UNLTD}

Plus, save more with an optional wireless service bundle.

1 866-RBS-2141 • rogers.com/easyip

ROGERSTM

SOLUTIONS FOR SMALL BUSINESS: VOICE • DATA • INTERNET • WIRELESS VOICE AND E-MAIL

*Free installation offer available until August 31, 2007. Pricing is based on the number of users under the service agreement. Price shown applies for 25 to 49 users. Number of long distance minutes included varies depending on the number of users. Pricing includes use of Mitel 5224 IP phones for the duration of the agreement. Free network upgrade may include router, POE Switch and up to 300 feet of cabling per handset but excludes cabling to peripheral devices. Offer may not be combined with other offers. Not all services available in all areas. Speak with your Rogers account manager for details or see rogers.com/easyip. ©Rogers Communications Inc. used under license. © 2007

ADVISOR OPINION

A Bird in the Hand

Investors would rather see one investment vehicle outperform, rather than watch many underperform

GUEST COLUMN

BY JOHN DE GOEY



Most advisors I know recommend picking stocks or selecting actively managed mutual funds as a responsible way to build a portfolio. I confess that I haven't heard many compelling reasons as to why. That's especially true in the context of advisors insisting they take a long-term view while aiming to help their clients make "smart" decisions with their money.

Although there are many definitions of "long-term view," let's use 20 years as a time horizon. Over that period, what per cent of actively managed funds end up beating the return of a suitable investment-eligible market proxy? Studies on this subject indicate

the consensus answer is "less than 20%." To make matters worse, no one has yet devised a method where the outperformers can be reliably identified in advance. It seems the performance results are random and best explained by chance.

Here's where it gets dicey. If only 20% of the funds available in 2007 have a 20-year track record that beats their benchmark, what percentage of the funds that were available in 1987 fall into the same category? What if, instead of starting at the end and working backward, we reversed the process?

Many people would agree that it is probable to assume that over half the funds that existed in 1987 no longer exist – either merged or closed as a result of poor performance. From the 1987 group, that leaves less than half of less than 20% beating their investable

benchmark over a long timeframe.

If you are one of 1,000 people in a marathon and you finish 100th, while 500 others fail to finish, you would normally be said to finish in the top 10% of those who started; not the top 20% of those who finished. My sense is that many advisors ignore survivorship bias when thinking through their product recommendations.

Of course, the story (and the logic) is the same for individual stock pickers, but there's no reliable data on that subject, so the extent to which people using individual securities do better or worse than those using funds will likely never be known. The facts are these:

- ❶ Most advisors counsel clients to beat the benchmark;
- ❷ The large majority of those who try to do so fail as a direct result of having tried;

❸ Those that succeed are not reliably identifiable and the outcomes look random.

Do advisors counsel clients to buy lottery tickets or frequent casinos? So would any one of those advisors who recommend actively managed products please give me a rational, research-based reason for doing so?

It seems to me that if you were to recommend ten "bird in the hand" investment vehicles that were all certain to slightly underperform their benchmark over a long timeframe, many investors would find that preferable to trying for "two in the bush." They would rather see one outperform and nine others underperform if some of those nine were likely to underperform by a wide margin.

The question is: do you present that to them? **AER**

John J. De Goey, CFP is a Senior Financial Advisor with Burgeonvest Securities Limited (BSL) and author of The Professional Financial Advisor II. The views expressed are not necessarily shared by BSL.

Capital Punishment

Continued from page 9

related costs are not considered to be capital in nature."

The judge determined that Paes' courses were of a capital nature and that he was not entitled to a deduction.

CANADA EMPLOYMENT CREDIT

If you find yourself in the same position as Paes, keep in mind that in last year's budget, the federal government introduced some relief with the new "Canada Employment Credit," designed to give "Canadians a break on what it costs to work, recognizing expenses for things such as home computers, uniforms and supplies."

For 2007 the CEC amount is \$1,000, which translates into a non-refundable tax credit of \$155 (equal to 15.5% of \$1,000). **AER**

Jamie Golombek, CA, CPA, CFP, CLU, TEP is the vice-president, taxation & estate planning, at AIM Trimark Investments in Toronto. jamie.golombek@aimtrimark.com

RSPs are never out of season

Help your clients kick-start their investing – and defer payments – with an AGF Trust RSP loan

Offer your clients something that no one else can

With AGF Trust's one-of-a-kind RSP loan payment deferral program, your clients can maximize their RSP contributions today and defer their first loan payment until May 2008*.

AGF Trust's RSP loan program still offers the same benefits you've come to expect:

- online applications, available 24/7
- best-of-class customer support, from 8:00AM to 11:00PM ET
- no income verification for loans up to \$50,000¹
- the option to allocate a portion of the client's loan proceeds to a Registered Education Savings Plan

This offer is only available until October 31, 2007.

Please contact your AGF sales representative for more information.



What are you doing after work?®

* The May deferral option is only available on loans with terms of 36 months or greater. Although payments can be deferred up to May 2008, interest accrues from the date of funding. AGF Trust RSP Loans are subject to clients meeting AGF Trust Company lending criteria. The RSP loans are offered by AGF Trust Company, a wholly owned subsidiary of AGF Management Limited.

¹ AGF Trust reserves the right to ask for proof of income based on your client's application details and credit history.

