



Private Wealth and Private Client

PRO In-Depth

Private Wealth and Private Client: Canada

[Save & file](#) | [Forward](#) | [Print](#) | [Share](#) | [Ask Lexy](#)

06 August 2025

O'Sullivan Estate Lawyers LLP

By Margaret R O'Sullivan, Marly J Peikes and Namratha Sankar



Introduction

The current Canadian wealth situation

Canada is facing an existential threat which has no precedent as the Trump tariffs have literally pulled the rug out from under the Canadian economy, but as well combined with threats to our political independence and sovereignty of US annexation. Our economic interdependence and integration with the United States expanded in the post-war era relying on the friendship and goodwill of our dominant neighbour to the south. But no more can this continue in the same way. As our newly elected Prime Minister Mark Carney has bluntly stated: 'They are out to break us'.

As Canada with haste tries to forge new trade and strategic relationships outside the United States and engage in major nation-building capital projects to strengthen the country, remove internal trade barriers, improve transportation over land and sea, and substantially increase spending on defence to protect our sovereignty, Canada is being challenged like it has never been before. And there is no time to waste.

The Canadian housing crisis continues, and our newly-elected government is keen to address it and has announced major proposals. Immigration has been cut to ease pressure as the prior government policy which increased immigration to unprecedented levels was a major contributor to the housing crisis and inflation.

Canada has a productivity crisis which must be reversed which is ever more challenging as the Trump tariffs kick in which will hollow-out many sectors of our economy, at least in the short to mid-term, and gross domestic product will likely decline. The challenge is whether the country can unite to pivot as quickly as possible to meet the existential threat the new United States administration has posed.

No doubt, many of the proposals will require a significant increase in government spending which will put huge pressure on tax rates. The government has a delicate balancing act to deal with. It must help to grow the economy and incentivise entrepreneurs and the corporate sector which points to lower rates, and at up to an almost 55 per cent top personal tax rate, there is little room to increase personal tax rates.

Private clients in Canada face a very uncertain future as they must now factor the long-term prospects for Canada in their wealth planning calculations. This uncertainty is destabilising, and many high net worth persons could choose to decamp entirely and become non-residents for tax purposes, resulting in large capital outflows.

Whenever there is uncertainty, professional advisers usually only become more busy, and such is the case in private client practice, which has never been busier or more challenging.

Key factors in respect of private clients

Canada's constitutional system is a federal one, with a clear division of powers between different levels of government. Its primary legal heritage for all provinces and territories, with the exception of Quebec, is based on English common law; Quebec's is based on civil law.

From the private client perspective, Canada offers the stability of a highly developed legal and court system and charter-based human rights protections. Property law, including succession, is a matter of provincial and territorial jurisdiction. Many modern and innovative concepts affecting private clients have been pioneered or progressed ahead of other jurisdictions in Canadian law, including equalisation of property between spouses on marital breakdown and death in several Canadian provinces and territories recognising marriage as an equal economic partnership, recognition of common law spouses' and same-sex spouses' property and support rights, same-sex marriage and medical assistance in dying.

Many Canadian jurisdictions have modern laws governing incapacity and substitute decision-making to take into account the need for a modern infrastructure to deal with an increasingly ageing population. Canada's multiculturalism and relatively open-door immigration policy, which are required to maintain positive population growth, expand the Canadian economy and are increasingly geared to attracting more entrepreneurs and skilled workers, have together created and contributed to a dynamic, sophisticated, diverse and innovative

Canadian culture. Post-pandemic, Canada was set to bring in almost 1.5 million new permanent residents by 2026 to boost Canada's post-pandemic economic recovery, but to address the current housing crisis and inflation this number has been scaled back as Canada faces a 'population trap'.

Year in review

1. The capital gains inclusion rate was to increase for capital gains realised on or after 25 June 2024 from 50 per cent to 66.6 per cent on the portion of realised capital gains each year that exceed C\$250,000 for individuals. As a result of this proposal, many Canadian tax payers crystallised their capital gains prior to that date. Later, the government announced it would delay introduction of the higher rate to 2026, and then later announced the increase would be cancelled. These “flip-flops” in tax policy have created significant uncertainty, financial costs and compliance challenges for both taxpayers and their professional advisers.
2. The new trust reporting rules have been a compliance nightmare for many Canadians and their advisers, in particular regarding bare trusts, and their scope. Due to confusion and lack of guidance from Canada Revenue Agency, when the new rules came into effect in 2024, four days before the filing deadline in 2024, it announced that bare trusts were not required to file a tax return for the 2023 tax year. Proposed legislation was released on 12 August 2024 to be effective commencing with the 2025 tax year to repeal the former rules to be replaced by a new set of bare trust reporting rules which a narrower scope.
3. There is a movement to increase corporate transparency and as a result of legislation passed in 2023, in British Columbia a new public registry that will contain all transparency register information including beneficial ownership will be available later in 2025 in an online platform searchable by the public.
4. As a result of the covid-19 pandemic, temporary changes were introduced allowing for virtual execution of wills and powers of attorney in most Canadian provinces and territories. Many made these changes permanent in order to adopt technology in the execution of wills and powers of attorney, including Ontario, British Columbia, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and in 2025, Alberta. In 2025, Nova Scotia introduced legislation to allow powers of attorney to be executed without being in the physical presence of the grantor. British Columbia recognises electronic wills, the first jurisdiction to do so, and Saskatchewan passed legislation in 2023 to do so as well, but it is not yet in effect.
5. Substantial compliance legislation allows a court to validate a document or writing as a will that would otherwise be invalid based on formal requirements, and Alberta, British Columbia, Manitoba, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Ontario, Prince Edward Island, Saskatchewan and Nunavut have such legislation. The case law continues to expand concerning what a court will consider to be a valid will, and in 2025 there was a court decision in which an iPad message was held to be a valid will.



Tax

Personal taxation

Federal and provincial or territorial income tax

Canada taxes Canadian residents on their worldwide income from all sources, and non-residents on certain Canadian-source income, subject to international tax treaties. Income for Canadian tax purposes includes income from employment, business, property, 50 per cent of capital gains, and various other income sources, less certain deductions.

Canada is a federal state consisting of 10 provinces and three territories. The provinces and territories also tax income generally on the same basis as the federal government, except for Quebec, and increased federal tax applies to certain income not earned in a province or territory. Canadian tax is levied at graduated rates of up to approximately 55 per cent in combined federal and provincial rates on taxable income, less applicable tax credits.

Canada taxes non-residents on income earned in Canada, notably income from business or employment in Canada, and from certain taxable Canadian property, including Canadian real estate. A withholding tax of 25 per cent is deducted from certain income payable to non-residents, subject to international tax treaties that reduce the applicable rates.

Capital gains regime

Unlike most jurisdictions, Canada has no gift or inheritance tax. Instead, it levies taxes on capital gains. Prior to 25 June 2024, 50 per cent of all capital gains are included in income upon actual disposition or deemed disposition. The Canadian federal budget in 2024 announced an increase in the capital gains inclusion rate from 50 per cent to 66.6 per cent for corporations and trusts, and 50 per cent to 66.6 per cent on the portion of realised capital gains each year that exceed C\$250,000 for individuals for capital gains realised on or after 25 June 2024, and proposed legislation had been introduced. However, the new Liberal government has announced it intends to cancel the 2024 budget proposals to increase the capital gains inclusion rate. There is an exemption for capital gains on a principal residence and a lifetime exemption for capital gains on qualified small business corporation shares and on qualified farm or fishing property (C\$1,250,000 as of 25 June 2025). The basic tax unit is the individual. Limited opportunities exist for income splitting, including through the use of trusts. Tax on capital gains may be deferred on certain transfers of property, for example, between spouses, or on rollover into private corporations in exchange for shares.

Developments relating to personal taxation

Provincial or territorial tax brackets for high earners

The combined provincial or territorial and federal tax rates for high earners in 2025 range from 44.5 per cent in Nunavut to 54.8 per cent in Newfoundland and Labrador. The highest tax rate in 2025 in Ontario is 53.53 per cent. In 2015, Alberta introduced graduated tax rates for taxpayers. Prior to the new rates, all Albertans paid tax based on a flat provincial tax rate of 10 per cent. As of 1 October 2015, the highest combined provincial and federal tax rate for Albertans has been 48 per cent. Over the past 10 years, there has been a significant increase in the top marginal rate. Combined rates in Ontario and Quebec in 2009 were below 50 per cent.

Alternative minimum tax

Canada has had an alternative minimum tax (AMT) since 1986, and it imposes a minimum level of tax on taxpayers who claim certain deductions, exemptions and tax credits that reduce tax they owe to low levels. The AMT rate has been increased commencing with the 2024 tax year to 20.5 per cent, and the basic exemption amount available to individuals and trusts for 2025 has been increased to C\$177,882 from C\$40,000 prior to 2024 and targets high-income individuals. The government projects that an additional C\$3 billion of tax revenue will be generated over five years.

Intergenerational small business and farm transfers

A private member's bill received royal assent on 29 June 2021 and limits the application of certain anti-avoidance rules that resulted in a sale of small business shares to an arm's-length purchaser being taxed at lower capital gains rates than a sale to a child or grandchild. The anti-avoidance rules operate so that the owner receives a dividend at higher rates. The result of the former rules was to penalise intergenerational sales because of this increased tax burden. The legislation levels the playing field so that a sale to a family member has the same level of tax as would a sale to an arm's-length purchaser, thereby facilitating intergenerational sales. However, the federal government later announced it would introduce legislation to safeguard against tax avoidance. Proposed amendments were introduced in the 2023 federal budget and received Royal Assent on 20 June 2024. The 2024 federal budget outlined further details, and later proposed legislation was introduced that includes new restrictions and additional requirements with the objective of ensuring that there is a genuine transfer of the business to the next generation.

Canadian Entrepreneur Incentive

The Canadian Entrepreneur Incentive (CEI) was announced in the 2024 federal budget. It is to be phased in over 10 years commencing 1 January 2025 when it came into effect. It allows entrepreneurs in certain industries, including construction, technology and manufacturing a reduced capital gains inclusion rate when



they sell a business on the first C\$2 million of gains phased in at C\$400,000 each year until it reaches C\$2 million in 2029. The reduced gains inclusion rate is one-third (as opposed to one-half) of capital gains.

Employee ownership trusts

The 2023 federal budget introduced a new trust called an employee ownership trust to facilitate the sale of a business to an employee group, which has favourable tax treatment and is a new concept in Canada, but which follows a growing trend in other jurisdictions including the United Kingdom and the US to increase employee ownership of businesses. This vehicle will potentially provide another option for business succession planning.

The new rules were enacted on 20 June 2024. There is a temporary tax exemption of up to C\$10 million of capital gains where there is a sale to an employee ownership trust for the tax years 2024 to 2026, subject to certain conditions.

Revised federal legislation on the taxation of trusts and new reporting requirements for trusts

Certain estates and testamentary trusts are taxed at graduated rates applicable to individuals, while trusts established during a person's lifetime are generally taxed at the top of marginal tax rates applicable to individuals. In 2016, graduated rates for certain estates and testamentary trusts were eliminated. Now, the top marginal rate is applied to testamentary trusts and certain estates. However, graduated rates continue to be available to 'graduated rate estates' for 36 months and to certain testamentary trusts having disabled beneficiaries who are eligible for the federal disability tax credit. In addition, the taxation year end for testamentary trusts is now 31 December, and testamentary trusts are required to make instalment payments of income tax.

New trust reporting rules were introduced in July 2018, the implementation of which was delayed and which are now effective for taxation years ending on or after 31 December 2023 further to federal Bill C-32, which received Royal Assent on 15 December 2022. Accordingly, 2024 was the first year for reporting under the new rules for many trusts.

The legislation also requires a bare trust to file a tax return and provide disclosure of information. However, four days before the filing deadline, Canada Revenue Agency announced that bare trusts would not have to file a tax return for the 2023 tax year. There was significant confusion and criticism of the overly broad scope of the original bare trust reporting requirements, resulting in a proposed repeal of the reporting rules in proposed legislation released on 12 August 2024, to be effective for the tax year ending after 31 December 2024. The former rules are to be replaced by a new set of bare trust reporting rules with a narrower scope. Only



arrangements that constitute a deemed trust will be subject to the bare trust reporting rules and require that there be a separation of legal and beneficial ownership and that the owner can reasonably be considered to act as agent for those who have the benefit of the property. Exceptions would also include family members holding a joint account together where they hold for their own use and for each other.

The new rules require the identity of settlors, trustees and beneficiaries and those who have control over trustee decisions to pay income or capital, such as a protector, to be reported to the government. As well as this, all trusts (with limited exceptions) must file a tax return. There are proposed amendments released by the government on 12 August 2024 to be effective for the tax year ending after 30 December 2024 to expand the list of exceptions, including trusts whose assets had a fair market value of less than C\$50,000 throughout the year regardless of the nature of the assets; statutory trusts; trusts where the trust and each beneficiary are related party/family members, the fair market value of the trusts assets were less than C\$250,000, and the assets are limited to certain categories including money, publicly listed securities, and personal use property; as well as certain professional's trust accounts. Previously, a trust was required to file a tax return only if it had tax to pay or made distributions to the beneficiaries in a year and further to CRA administrative relief if the income received by the trust was less the C\$500. Non-resident trusts that are required to file a trust tax return are also subject to the new disclosure rules. There are significant penalties for non-compliance of the greater of C\$2500 or 5 per cent of the highest fair market value of the trust's assets. With the onset of these new obligations, it is incumbent on trustees to gather the necessary information.

Residence of trusts for tax purposes

The Supreme Court of Canada in 2012 clarified the law on the factual tax residence of a trust in *Fundy Settlement v. Canada*.¹ The Supreme Court of Canada held that the residence of a trust is where the central management and control of the trust occurs, a significant change from the former focus on a trustee's residence. *Discovery Trust v. Canada*² was the first decision to apply the test that was articulated in *Fundy Settlement*. In *Discovery Trust*, the court held that the beneficiaries' involvement in the administration of the trust did not result in the trust being resident in the province in which the beneficiaries resided, as the trustee still made all decisions with respect to the administration of the trust. Instead, the court held that the trust was resident in the province in which the trustee resided. The Canada Revenue Agency (CRA) position in determining the location of the central management and where control of a trust takes place includes a review of whether the control rests with the trustee or someone else.³



In addition to factual residence, trusts may also be subject to statutory deemed residence rules for Canadian tax purposes. Trusts that are not factually resident in Canada may be deemed resident in Canada for certain tax purposes, including computing the trust's income. Deemed residence may apply to a trust if it has a Canadian-resident contributor or beneficiary.

Principal residence rules

In the Canadian system, capital gains are subject to taxation, and arise on the disposition of capital property. The capital gain is the difference between the property's adjusted cost base plus costs of disposal, and the proceeds of disposition. The adjusted cost is the actual cost of the property, subject to certain adjustments. Proceeds of disposition are, generally, the actual proceeds, but are subject to certain deeming provisions that will deem the proceeds to be equal to the fair market value of the property in respect of dispositions that are not at arm's length. A property is exempt from taxation on capital gains in the years that it is designated a principal residence.

Since 3 October 2016, both individuals and trusts must report the disposition of a principal residence and make a principal residence designation in the prescribed form and manner. The period in which the CRA can reassess beyond the normal reassessment period is indefinitely extended if the disposition of a property is not reported and a penalty applies for late filing. For dispositions on or after 3 October 2016, an individual who is a non-resident of Canada in the year of acquisition of a principal residence loses the bonus exemption year when calculating the principal residence exemption.

As of 2016, only certain eligible trusts may designate a property as a principal residence for any year of ownership after 2016. Eligible trusts include qualified disability trusts, alter ego trusts, spousal or common law partner trusts, joint spousal and joint common law partner trusts, and certain trusts for the exclusive benefit of the settlor during the settlor's lifetime. Eligible trusts also include 'orphan' trusts where the settlor died before the start of the year; the eligible beneficiary is a minor child whose parent died before the start of the year and is a minor child of the settlor, even if the other parent is living; and at least one beneficiary of the trust is a resident of Canada during the year and is a specified beneficiary of the trust for the year.

There is continued speculation that the government may in future introduce a number of tax reforms to address income inequality, including curtailing the principal residence exemption so that it is no longer unlimited, but instead is capped. Canada is one of the very few Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

(OECD) countries that allow for a full exemption. Criticism has been levelled that a full exemption results in increased income inequality, because the owners of high-value homes receive a windfall by allowing them to be untaxed.

Non-resident purchasers of residential properties

To date, three Canadian provinces – Ontario, British Columbia and Nova Scotia – have enacted additional land transfer taxes that apply to foreign buyers. As of 21 April 2017, the Ontario government introduced a 15 per cent tax on the value of the consideration when a residential property in the Greater Golden Horseshoe area is purchased or acquired by individuals who are not citizens or permanent residents of Canada, foreign corporations, or taxable trustees of trusts involving foreign individuals or corporate trustees or beneficiaries. As of 30 March 2022, the rate was increased to 20 per cent and expanded to apply to all residential properties purchased across Ontario, called Non-Resident Speculation Tax and later as of 25 October 2022 further increased to 25 per cent. Residential property is defined as land that contains between one and six single family residences. The Toronto Municipal Non-Resident Speculation Tax came into effect for all transfers registered commencing 1 January 2025 and applies in addition to the generally applicable land transfer taxes payable on Toronto properties at a rate of 10 per cent. In 2022, Toronto also implemented an empty-home tax of 1 per cent which increased to 3 per cent in 2025.

As of 2 August 2016, British Columbia enacted a similar 15 per cent property transfer tax payable by foreign individuals, corporations or taxable trustees in addition to the general property transfer tax of approximately 2.5 per cent on transfers of residential property located in the metro Vancouver regional district (Vancouver district). The 2018 British Columbia budget introduced an increase to the tax to 20 per cent, effective as of 21 February 2018, and expanded the tax outside the Vancouver district to cover several other regions. British Columbia also has an annual speculation and vacancy tax that has a rate of between 0.5 to 2 per cent for certain foreign owners, and it applies to residential properties in certain areas of the province. In 2017, Vancouver also implemented an empty-home tax, which is 3 per cent in 2025. On 1 April 2022, Nova Scotia introduced the Provincial Deed Transfer Tax which applies to all non-residents of Nova Scotia buying a residential property and requires an increased land transfer tax be paid of 5 per cent of the purchase price.

A 1 per cent federal tax effective 1 January 2022 on foreign-owned vacant property under the underused housing tax (UHT) rules is important to understand and comply with, as many Canadian and foreign owners will have filing obligations even if they are exempt from paying tax, and face stiff penalties for not filing a UHT return. The first return was due 20 April 2023. However, the CRA announced penalties will be waived for the 2022 calendar year if required returns are filed and tax paid by 31 October 2023. Additional relief was

announced in the autumn of 2023 and enacted as of 20 June 2024, which excludes certain owners from filing obligations starting with the 2023 returns. The objective of the tax is to discourage housing speculation and vacancy of homes in major urban centres. The 2022 federal budget took aim at foreign purchasers and proposed a ban on foreign buyers of residential real estate for a period of two years in an effort to deal with the housing crisis and housing affordability. Legislation is in effect under the Prohibition on the Purchase of Residential Property by Non-Canadians Act, which bans certain foreign buyers from 1 January 2023 until 31 December 2025. On 4 February 2024, the government announced its intention to extend the existing ban on foreign ownership for an additional two years to 1 January 2027.

General anti-avoidance rule in respect of income tax

The Income Tax Act (Tax Act) contains a general anti-avoidance rule (GAAR), which may be applied to deny a tax benefit otherwise available under the Tax Act where certain conditions are met. In considering whether the GAAR applies, a court will generally consider whether there was a tax benefit, whether the transaction (or series of transactions) giving rise to the tax benefit was an avoidance transaction and whether the avoidance transaction giving rise to the tax benefit was abusive. The 2023 federal budget proposed changes to the GAAR, including to reduce the threshold for determining whether a transaction is an avoidance transaction from a 'primary purpose' test to 'one of the main purposes' test. In addition, a rule regarding economic substance has been introduced that provides that if an avoidance transaction that significantly lacks economic substance is indicative (but not conclusive), then the transaction is a misuse or an abuse. A penalty will apply to a transaction that is subject to the GAAR of 25 per cent of the tax benefit.

The new rules came into effect with the passage of Bill C-59, which received Royal Assent on 20 June 2024 and apply to transactions that occur on or after 1 January 2024.

Whistle-blower rules, audit initiatives and compliance measures

The CRA launched the offshore tax informant programme in January 2014, under which the CRA will enter in a contract to provide financial compensation to individuals who provide information that leads to the assessment and collection of additional federal taxes in excess of C\$100,000, provided all recourse rights associated with the assessment have expired and the non-compliant activity involves property located outside Canada or certain other foreign elements. As of 2020, the CRA has assessed over C\$60 million in additional taxes. Banks and other financial intermediaries are required to report international electronic funds transfers of C\$10,000 and over to the CRA. Such transfers are currently reported to Canada's Financial Transactions and Reports Analysis Centre of Canada (FINTRAC). The CRA's related party audit programme (RPAP) is now



known as the global high-wealth (GHW) program, under which those, including high net worth individuals (generally, who control more than C\$50 million) and related entities, have been asked to provide detailed information and supporting documents about Canadian and foreign interests. The CRA approach is to audit an entire group of entities, not just a single tax payer, including trusts, partnerships and corporations. Thresholds relating to value and complexity have been relaxed, and groups not under audit are also being asked for such information.

An aggressive tax planning reporting regime generally requires advisers to report to the CRA information concerning certain transactions on Form RC312 by 30 June of the following year. Reportable transactions or a reportable series of transactions will generally include an avoidance transaction or series of transactions for the purposes of GAAR if they feature two of the following: contingent fees, confidentiality protection or contractual protection. Where the Form is not filed, a denial of tax benefits and possible penalties may result.

New reporting requirements have been introduced including 'notifiable transactions' which apply to individuals, corporations, trusts and partnerships. The rules apply to transactions occurring after 21 June 2023 for reportable and notifiable transactions and included in the list are certain transactions to avoid a deemed disposal of trust property, which can impact 21-year planning under Canadian rules for which there is a deemed disposition of trust property for certain trusts every 21 years. Guidance was published by CRA on 5 July 2023 and further guidance was made on 15 August 2024.

Possible upcoming tax reforms

There is significant speculation about what tax reform measures might be introduced in future. But what is needed most is comprehensive tax reform and the newly-elected government has promised an overall review which will be important in strategically creating the right incentives to grow the economy and create economic self-sufficiency. Possible tax reforms include curtailing the principal residence exemption previously discussed. It is possible that the rate of graduated sales tax for higher income earners could also be increased. There has been significant professional writing and media discussion about the introduction of a wealth tax, estate tax or inheritance tax, or some combination of them. An annual wealth tax was proposed by the New Democratic Party (NDP) in both the 2019 and 2021 federal elections, and the NDP also introduced a motion to the House of Commons in 2020 for an annual wealth tax, but it was defeated. In July 2021, the Parliamentary Budget Office released a report that considered the revenue that could be generated on a 1 per cent tax on family net wealth over C\$20 million and on a one-time wealth tax.



Cross-border structuring

Immigration to Canada

Canada relies heavily on immigration and offers certain tax concessions to immigrants. These same concessions, along with the lack of gift and inheritance tax, make Canada an attractive destination. Upon immigration to Canada, an individual receives a step up in the tax cost of his or her capital property (excluding taxable Canadian property), which eliminates Canadian tax liability for capital gains accrued to that point. In some cases, it may be possible to transfer a foreign-registered pension plan into a Canadian-registered retirement savings plan on a tax-free basis.

Non-resident trusts and immigration trusts

Certain non-resident trusts established by non-resident settlors, provided various conditions are met, may be exempt from Canadian taxes and can distribute trust capital to Canadian-resident beneficiaries tax-free, which provides tax-planning opportunities where a non-resident trust is situated in a low-tax jurisdiction. However, the opportunities for trust planning with non-resident trusts have been significantly curtailed by revised Section 94 of the Tax Act, which deems certain trusts with Canadian-resident contributors or Canadian-resident beneficiaries to be Canadian-resident and taxable on their worldwide income. Where a trust is deemed to be Canadian-resident, Canadian-resident contributors and beneficiaries may be liable for the trust's Canadian income tax, along with the trust itself.

Previously, an immigration trust could be set up to benefit an immigrant to Canada and his or her family, and the income and capital gains in the immigration trust could accrue tax-free for up to 60 months following immigration. If the trust was settled in a foreign jurisdiction (including a low-tax offshore jurisdiction) with foreign trustees who held the foreign investment assets, there could be significant tax savings depending on the applicable tax rates. However, this planning opportunity was unexpectedly eliminated as a result of the 2014 federal budget. Immigration trusts, including those established prior to the legislative changes, are now subject to Canadian tax on their worldwide income, and the 60-month exemption from the deemed residence rule is eliminated.

Emigration from Canada

A taxpayer emigrating from Canada must pay a departure tax, which taxes gains on his or her property accrued during his or her Canadian residency, subject to exceptions including for certain Canadian situs property and retirement plans. Payment of the departure tax may be deferred upon providing security to the CRA.

Tax treaties

Canada is party to many bilateral tax treaties, which in part aim to prevent double taxation of income. Among other benefits, Canada's tax treaties generally include tiebreaker rules for determining tax residency for treaty purposes and to reduce the amount of withholding tax otherwise payable by taxpayers who are entitled to benefit under such treaties. Often, the withholding tax is reduced to 15 per cent from 25 per cent, and in certain cases to zero per cent. Owing, however, to variations in the internal taxation laws of treaty nations, there can be mismatches in tax credits and timing that are not addressed in the treaties. In 2014, Canada ratified an intergovernmental agreement (IGA) relating to the US Foreign Account Tax Compliance Act (FATCA), a US law that imposes strict reporting requirements to the US taxing authority, including on financial institutions located in Canada. Canada has also implemented the OECD Common Reporting Standard (CRS), which is based on FATCA. As of 1 July 2017, financial institutions located in Canada are subject to the CRS and are required to provide the CRA with certain information pertaining to accounts and account holders. Information exchanges commenced in June 2018. On 20 April 2020, the CRA released detailed revised guidance on FATCA and the CRS and further guidance on 5 April 2024.

Foreign investment entity and foreign trust rules

Foreign trust rules designed to more effectively tax Canadian residents' passive investment, including income arising through non-resident trusts, have been enacted, following numerous amendments to draft legislation over a protracted period. The non-resident trust rules deem a trust to be resident in Canada if there is a Canadian-resident contributor, broadly defined, or a Canadian-resident beneficiary who meets certain requirements, and require tax to be withheld on distributions from trusts deemed Canadian-resident, subject to exceptions. An election may be made to treat a portion of the trust as non-resident that will not generally be taxable in Canada. Provisions for taxing offshore investment funds have also been enacted, along with transitional provisions for those who filed under proposed foreign investment entity rules that were never enacted. Additional reporting requirements for certain non-resident trusts and, as noted previously, new reporting rules, were introduced in 2018.

Canadian taxpayers holding specified foreign property outside Canada with a cost amount of C\$100,000 or more are required to provide more detailed information about such property on a revised Form T1135, a foreign income verification statement including names of the countries and institutions where assets are held, foreign income earned on the assets and a maximum cost amount of the assets in the applicable year. If Form T1135 is filed late or contains certain errors or omissions, the normal reassessment period is extended for three years, and severe penalties apply for failure to file.



Regulatory issues

Regulation of banking and related industries

A significant portion of Canada's private wealth services are highly concentrated in the hands of six major Canadian national banks. In 2017, *Bloomberg Markets* magazine ranked four Canadian banks among the world's top-10 strongest banks with US\$100 billion or more of assets. No other country dominated the list as Canada did, and Canada continues to shine when it comes to international recognition of the strength and stability of its banking sector. In general, the major Canadian banks are better capitalised and have more liquidity given tight regulation. In June 2023, capital ratios were increased to 3.5 per cent by 50 base points in view of rising borrowing costs, high debt levels and stress on the financial system. Banking is federally regulated by the Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions Canada, while the related investment industry, trust companies and insurance firms are regulated both federally and provincially. Canada's major banks are strongly capitalised and tend to have relatively conservative lending policies compared to other banking institutions.

In 1986, the federal government began to eliminate the four pillars of Canadian finance: Canada's traditional regulatory separation between banks, trust companies, insurance companies and investment companies. Numerous acquisitions of investment firms and trust companies by the six largest Canadian banks followed. In 1998, the proposed merger of two of the largest major Canadian banks was rejected by the federal government. In the past decade, Canada's major banks have expanded significantly into the United States. Canada's major banks offer an increasing array of services, including daily banking, investment services, financial planning and insurance, and wealth management, which tend to be fairly uniform among the banks.

For Canada, deregulation resulted in a flurry of mergers and acquisitions in the 1990s, leading to consolidation and the three largest insurance companies controlling about two-thirds of the domestic market.

Issues affecting holders of active business interests

Corporate taxation

Corporate tax rates declined for small businesses' active business income between 2007 and 2017 but have substantially increased since then, making Canada far less competitive than previously, particularly given the substantial decrease in the US corporate tax rates, the United States being Canada's largest trading partner. The combined net federal and provincial corporate tax rates applicable to general corporations' active business income in 2025 range between 23 and 31 per cent.



Preferential tax treatment is offered to small business corporations, which benefit from a reduced combined federal and provincial tax rate of between 9 and 12.2 per cent on at least the first C\$500,000 of its active business income and in some jurisdictions a higher threshold. A small business corporation is a Canadian-controlled private corporation (CCPC) carrying on active business in Canada. The small business income limit is reduced on a straight-line basis for CCPCs that alone or as members of an associated group have taxable capital employed in Canada of between C\$10 million and C\$50 million in the previous year. Taxable capital is generally comprised of the corporation's retained earnings, surpluses and advances.

In 2018, amendments to tax legislation were enacted to reduce the small business deduction in the case of corporations that have more than C\$50,000 per year of passive investment income. These changes follow the 2017 taxation changes that target corporations that accumulate income that had benefited from the low small business tax rate. The small business limit for CCPCs and associated corporations is reduced on a straight-line basis for CCPCs that earn between C\$50,000 and C\$150,000 of investment income such that the small business limit would be completely eliminated where a corporation earns C\$150,000 of investment income per year. For this purpose, a definition of investment income or adjusted aggregate investment income (AII) was introduced. Generally, AII will exclude taxable capital gains from the sale of active investments and investment income that is incidental to the business. These exclusions are included for the purpose of protecting investment interests in the Canadian innovation industry. Ontario and New Brunswick subsequently decided they would not create parallel legislation and instead have preserved the small business limit at the provincial level.

Shares of a small business corporation are eligible for a lifetime capital gains exemption of C\$1,250,000 for 2025, indexed for inflation starting in 2026, as are certain qualified farm and fishing properties.

Investment income earned in a CCPC is taxed at very high rates. For instance, in 2025, CCPCs in Prince Edward Island, the province with the highest provincial tax rate for investment income earned in CCPCs, will pay income taxes on their investment income at a rate of 54.7 per cent. In other provinces, CCPC investment income is taxed at rates ranging between 46.7 per cent in Alberta and 53.7 per cent in Newfoundland and Labrador. General corporations (non-CCPCs), who do not benefit from the small business deduction pay tax on their investment income at lower rates – at combined federal and provincial rates of up to 31 per cent in 2025.

For extracting corporate income by way of dividends, a gross-up dividend tax credit (an enhanced tax credit in the case of dividends funded by the corporation's active business income that did not benefit from the small business tax rate) and a corporate refundable tax mechanism (in the case of corporations that earn investment

income) is provided to avoid double taxation of income earned in the corporation that is subsequently paid to its individual shareholders, who are taxed at their marginal tax rates.

The 2017 tax amendments made significant changes to shareholder taxation. The changes make dividends received by individual shareholders taxable at the top marginal rates (these provisions being called a tax on split income (TOSI)), unless the shareholders receiving the dividends can show substantial labour or capital contributions to the operations of the business of the corporation. For example, TOSI will not apply to a business owner's spouse or common-law partner aged 65 or older; shareholders over the age of 18 who make a substantial labour contribution to the corporation's business of at least 20 hours per week; and shareholders over the age of 25 who own 10 per cent or more interest in the corporation that earns less than 90 per cent of its income from the provision of services. The shares cannot be shares of a professional corporation. Those shareholders who do not meet these 'bright line' tests will face a 'reasonableness' test review by the CRA.

There are generally two kinds of dividends that can be paid to individual shareholders of CCPCs: eligible and non-eligible dividends. Generally, eligible dividends are funded by the corporation's income that did not benefit from the small business tax rate. Eligible and non-eligible dividends are taxed at different rates in the hands of individual shareholders. For instance, in 2025 in Ontario, the highest individual tax rate on eligible dividends is 39.34 per cent and that on non-eligible dividends is 47.74 per cent. As part of the current tax integration rules, when a corporation pays a dividend to its shareholders, it may be able to receive a tax refund that is based on the corporation's notional refundable dividend tax on hand (RDTOH) account, which is calculated in reference to the corporation's investment income. New rules introduced in 2018 that apply to taxation years after 2018 limit CCPCs' access to the RDTOH refund to the payment of non-eligible dividends, with an exception for that portion of the RDTOH that arises from the corporation's eligible portfolio income. A tax-deferred transfer or rollover of certain eligible property to a taxable Canadian corporation for consideration, which must include shares of the corporation, is available, subject to certain conditions. The corporation may retain the shareholder's tax cost of the property or may elect a higher tax cost, within limits. Among other results, the corporation then assumes the tax liability relating to gains on the property, the payment of which is deferred to a later date.

The 2025 Liberal election platform included a proposal to conduct an expert review of the corporate tax system based on the principles of fairness, transparency, simplicity, sustainability and competitiveness. It will be interesting to see how the newly-elected Liberal government moves forward on this election promise.

Goods and services tax, provincial sales tax and harmonised sales tax

Federally, Canada levies a 5 per cent supply-side tax on most services and goods, including those made in Canada and imported, and certain property. Goods and services tax (GST) applies at all stages of production, subject to an input tax credit for tax paid at an earlier stage, and businesses are responsible for collecting and remitting the tax. The provinces and territories levy their own sales tax in addition to GST. Five provinces have harmonised GST with provincial sales tax, and this is known as harmonised sales tax. Combined, these taxes range from 5 per cent (in Alberta, British Columbia, Manitoba, the Northwest Territories, Nunavut, Quebec, Saskatchewan and Yukon) to 15 per cent (New Brunswick, Newfoundland and Labrador, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island).

Succession

Overview of succession in Canada

Provincial and territorial jurisdiction

In Canada, succession to property on death is generally a matter within the jurisdiction of the provinces and territories. Of Canada's 10 provinces and three territories, 12 are governed under common law, and one – the province of Quebec – under civil law. With respect to aboriginal Canadians who are subject to the Indian Act, succession to property on death falls within the jurisdiction of the federal government. Certain First Nations, however, have entered into self-government agreements that permit the enactment of individualised laws, including those that relate to succession. These two latter scenarios are beyond the scope of this chapter.

Conflicts of laws

Formal validity, which includes such matters as execution requirements for a will, and essential validity, which includes substantive issues like testamentary capacity, undue influence or whether the will properly disposes of property, is determined by conflicts of law principles. In respect of succession to movables, the conflict of law rules generally provide that the law of the testator's domicile at date of death applies, and in respect of succession to immovables, the law of the jurisdiction where the property is located typically applies. In several provinces, regarding formal validity, several provinces have expanded these rules by statute.

In April 2025, in the case of *Siebert Estate (Re)*,⁴ the BC Supreme Court had to determine whether a British Columbia will prepared by the deceased (who was domiciled in British Columbia and whose primary asset was real property in British Columbia) revoked an earlier jointly executed German will prepared by the deceased and her spouse who predeceased her. The court found that the issue of revocation of a will is a matter of the

essential validity of the will (as opposed to the formal validity). As British Columbia wills legislation does not contain choice of law rules applicable to the essential validity of a will, the common law choice of law rules were applied and the court determined that the British Columbia will revoked the German will.

For clients with certain connections to both Canada and a participating European Union Member State, it is important to consider the impact of the EU Succession Regulation (Regulation (EU) No. 650/2012), which is in effect for deaths post-17 August 2015, including as it relates to a person's ability to choose the law of his or her nationality to govern certain succession issues.

Probate or equivalent court process

The common law principle of testamentary freedom is the general rule in Canadian succession law, as modified by contract or legislation. After the testator's death, a will is typically submitted to probate or equivalent court process, whereby it is validated and the executors' appointment as legal representatives is confirmed. In this process, the will and supporting documents, which may include a detailed asset listing, become public. In a 2021 decision,⁵ the Supreme Court of Canada confirmed Canada's fundamental principle of open court proceedings and upheld the appellant court's decision lifting a sealing order to probate files, the estate trustees having unsuccessfully argued that the court files should be sealed to protect the privacy and dignity of the victims of violence.

Probate fees are typically levied in the form of a flat fee, or tax based on a percentage of estate assets (e.g., approximately 1.5 per cent in Ontario). In some provinces, in particular those with a high-rate structure to probate a will, the option of creating a second, non-probate will that governs private company shares and other assets that do not require a court grant of probate to administer is often used to minimise probate fees and tax. A Quebec notarial will not need to be submitted to probate in that province. Manitoba abolished probate fees effective 1 July 2020 as well as provincial sales tax on the preparation of wills.

Once probate has been granted, the resulting certificate, grant or other like document is used by the personal representative to deal with third-party institutions and entities in the process of transferring title to the personal representative and gathering in the assets.

Legislative provisions for validity

Each province and territory has its own set of rules regarding the formal requirements that must be met to make and modify wills. Alberta, British Columbia, Manitoba, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, Saskatchewan, Nunavut and, most recently, Ontario, are substantial compliance jurisdictions. The Quebec Civil

Code provides guidance to the court for reconstituting a will upon demand.⁶ Newfoundland and Labrador, Yukon and the Northwest Territories are strict compliance jurisdictions. Substantial compliance provisions vary from province to province, but allow a court to validate a document or writing that would otherwise be invalid based on formal writing requirements.

There have been numerous recent cases dealing with substantial compliance legislation. Notably, in the recent case of *Haines v. Kuffner Estate*,⁷ the Saskatchewan court found that an iPad message was a valid will. In that case, a hospitalised patient who was too weak to write or speak and was on the brink of death sent her siblings a message on her iPad titled 'My holographic will', naming her executor and directing how her estate was to be distributed. In *Salmon v. Rombough*,⁸ an application was brought to validate notes in a notebook which was comprised of excerpts from the deceased's previous will photocopied and pasted into the notebook together with handwritten annotations. It was signed and dated but otherwise noncompliant with statutory execution formalities. The Ontario court concluded that the notes together with the 2012 will was a valid testamentary document. In *Cooper Estate*,⁹ the deceased died before his draft will was finalised and executed. The British Columbia court found that the portion of the draft will which revoked the deceased's earlier will was valid, however, the balance of the draft will was invalid and as a result, the deceased's estate would pass as on an intestacy.

Across Canada, the validity of pour-over clauses has been considered. A pour-over clause is a clause in a testator's will that typically names a trust created during the testator's lifetime as a beneficiary under the testator's will. In 2019 in *Quinn Estate v. Rydland*, the British Columbia Court of Appeal found a pour-over clause to be invalid where it poured into a trust that could be amended, and had been amended after the date of the will.¹⁰ The British Columbia Supreme Court found that *Quinn* turned on whether the pour-over clause is to an amendable or revocable trust and whether there was the mere possibility of an amendment, and not whether there was an actual amendment.¹¹ In contrast, in *MacCallum Estate*,¹² the Nova Scotia Supreme Court distinguished *Quinn* on the basis that there had been no amendment to the trust in that case. Ontario has favoured the British Columbia approach in the decision of *Vilenski v. Weinrib-Wolfman*,¹³ where the Ontario Superior Court held that pour-over clauses are not valid if they pour over to a trust that is revocable or amendable, even if the trust existed prior to the will and was never actually amended. Recently, in British Columbia, the court amended a pour-over will to be applicable to the deceased's California assets only. In *Re Estate of Church*,¹⁴ the deceased prepared a will and subsequently purchased a property in California. A living trust was created to deal with the assets in California. The deceased prepared a subsequent will which left the entire residue of the estate to the California trust. In usual circumstances, this pour-over will would have revoked the earlier will and created an intestacy as pour-over clauses are not considered valid in British



Columbia if the pour-over is to a trust which can be amended or revoked. The parties sought to rectify the pour-over will and the court allowed the rectification such that the pour-over will would only apply to the disposition of the deceased's California-situate assets.

Legislative provisions for succession on intestacy

In an event of intestacy, each province and territory provides for a scheme of property division, typically between the testator's surviving spouse and children – if any – failing which to other relatives as specified. Some provinces allocate the spouse a preferential share prior to dividing the estate between spouse and children. In this context, spouses are married spouses, including same-sex married spouses and, in some provinces and two territories, de facto spouses, providing certain conditions are met. In Quebec, starting 30 June 2025, a de facto spouse will inherit on an intestacy if they were in a parental union with the deceased – meaning they lived together as a couple, presented themselves publicly as such, and became parents of the same child by birth or adoption on or after that date.¹⁵ With the exception of Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland, a separated spouse is excluded from inheriting under intestacy laws provided certain conditions are met. A court process for letters of administration or equivalent provides for the appointment of estate trustees on intestacy.

In Ontario, the preferential share was increased from C\$200,000 to C\$350,000 for deaths that occurred on 1 March 2021 or later. British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba also make a distinction in determining the share to which a surviving spouse is entitled on an intestacy based on whether there was common issue with the deceased or issue from a different relationship.

As of 1 January 2017, under Part III of the *Succession Law Reform Act*¹⁶ in Ontario, Section 47(1) was amended to state that for the purposes of determining the beneficiaries on intestacy, the deceased's descendants and relatives conceived and born alive after the deceased's date of death shall inherit as if they were born during the deceased's lifetime and survived, provided specific statutory conditions are met.¹⁷

Legislative provisions for dependants' support

In all provinces, a dependant can claim support from the deceased's estate, provided he or she stands in a certain relationship with the deceased (typically including a spouse, de facto spouse or minor child) and the deceased was providing him or her with support or had a support obligation at the time of death. In the recent Ontario case of *Shapiro v. Shapiro*,¹⁸ in considering whether the applicant husband was receiving support from the deceased wife during her lifetime, the court highlighted that support need not be direct financial support and can include physical or need support. In Nova Scotia, a de facto spouse is only considered a dependant if registered



as a domestic partner.¹⁹ When considering whether a de facto spouse is considered a dependant, the constitutionality of the distinction between a couple registered as a domestic partnership and a couple in an unregistered common law relationship was upheld in the 2020 decision of *LeBlanc v. Cushing Estate*.²⁰

The quantum of support is determined circumstantially and with judicial discretion, usually taking into account needs and means,²¹ and, in some cases, the dependant's accustomed standard of living.²² Some provinces recognise a moral entitlement to share in a deceased's estate and will vary the distribution in a will or award support on this basis.²³ Recently, in British Columbia, the court had to balance what is just and equitable in the exercise of testamentary freedom. In *Lam v. Law Estate*,²⁴ the court varied a will which, based on the evidence put forward, it found to be biased on the basis of gender. The deceased's son received inter-vivos and testamentary gifts totalling almost C\$3 million while the deceased's daughter was given gifts worth approximately C\$170,000 and a 50 per cent share in one of the testator's properties. The court opined that while a will-maker is not obligated to provide equally for each of their children, the language of British Columbia wills variation legislation confers a broad discretion on the court in determining what is 'just and equitable' that may raise questions regarding 'the equities as between the beneficiaries.' Notably, the only court-ordered variation to the will was to increase the daughter's 50 per cent share in the property to 85 per cent as the court could not justify a bigger variation. Recent decisions have also shown that support may be awarded to a dependant in spite of an existing domestic contract if its terms have become unfair with the passage of time.²⁵

In Canada, it appears that cases involving entitlement to support in modern non-traditional relationships (usually involving de facto spouses) are on the rise, including in several decisions in Alberta²⁶ and British Columbia.²⁷

Legislative provisions for matrimonial property rights on death

Property law in Canada falls under the jurisdiction of the provinces and territories; thus the availability and scheme of statutory property division claims by surviving spouses upon death of a spouse vary throughout Canada. The matrimonial property regimes of most provinces and territories provide a surviving spouse with property rights on a first spouse's death. For example, in Ontario, a surviving spouse has a right to elect to claim against the deceased spouse's estate to notionally equalise the property acquired during marriage as between the two of them. If such an equalisation claim is made, he or she thereby loses entitlements, if any, under the deceased spouse's will and to certain other benefits. In all of the provinces and territories except for British Columbia, Alberta, Prince Edward Island and the Yukon, a statutory claim for division of property on death of a spouse is available to legally married spouses, and in New Brunswick, Newfoundland and Labrador; Ontario and Quebec, claims for division of property on death of a spouse are available to legally married spouses only,



as well as, in the case of Quebec, the survivor of a couple who have entered into a civil union, and the remaining provinces and territories extend its availability to surviving de facto spouses provided the specific requirements of the governing legislation have been met.

Key legislative or case law changes affecting succession

Gifts in wills and public policy

Two Canadian lower court decisions (one decision from New Brunswick and another from an Ontario court) limited testamentary freedom by altering gifts in wills for public policy reasons. The New Brunswick decision of *McCorkill v. Streed*²⁸ had the effect of striking an unconditional bequest to a racist corporation on the basis of public policy. This decision was upheld on appeal and an application for leave to appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada was dismissed.²⁹ In the Ontario decision of *Spence v. BMO Trust Co.*,³⁰ a court struck the entire will of a testator who was survived by two adult daughters (neither of whom qualified as dependants) where one daughter was entirely left out of the distribution of the estate. The will stated the testator had excluded the daughter because she had not communicated with him for years. Based on affidavit evidence, however, the court concluded that the real reason for the daughter's exclusion was that she had had a child with a man of a different race. Again, the doctrine of public policy was employed and the entire will was struck down with the result that both daughters shared in the estate equally on intestacy. The Ontario Court of Appeal reversed the decision, thereby confirming in this instance that testators do not have any obligation to benefit persons who they have no legal obligation to support or otherwise benefit (e.g., non-dependent adult children).³¹ In a 2019 Nova Scotia case, the court held that testamentary freedom is a decision of fundamental personal choice, which is protected under the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. The court 'read down' Nova Scotia legislation that would otherwise have given non-dependant adult children of a testator the right to make a claim for support as a dependant of their parent's estate to exclude them.³² The Nova Scotia Court of Appeal overturned the trial decision and dismissed the case based on evidentiary issues for a public interest standing case,³³ which leaves the door open for a further constitutional challenge.

Public policy does not tolerate a wrongdoer profiting from or being compensated for their wrong.³⁴ This principle is often referred to as the 'criminal forfeiture rule' or 'slayer rule'.³⁵ In the context of succession law, where a crime causes the death of a testator, the rule disentitles the person responsible for the testator's death from taking any benefit from that victim's estate. Notably, the rule may be invoked when a person is found criminally responsible for the testator's death or on a balance of probabilities by a civil court, even where a criminal conviction has not been entered.³⁶ The Court of King's Bench of Alberta recently found that while a



summary judgment to void a gift based on the Slayer Rule could be possible, the Applicant did not meet the evidentiary burden for a summary determination which would have otherwise been sufficient if the Respondent had been convicted of a crime.³⁷

Mutual wills

In a 2016 Ontario lower court decision, two spouses executed wills simultaneously leaving everything to the survivor of them, followed by an identical gift to their four children (each spouse having two children from a prior marriage). After the husband's death, the wife made a new will and gifted her estate to her two adult children, then she subsequently died. On an application commenced by the husband's two adult children, the court found that while there was not a direct written or oral agreement that the spouses' original wills were mutual wills, as a result of the extrinsic evidence presented – including with respect to the family context – an oral contract had existed between the spouses and, by virtue of it, neither spouse was entitled to vary his or her will without the consent of the other spouse. The court held that the estate of the surviving spouse was to be divided among all four children.³⁸ In a similar case, the testator and his wife executed wills without receiving legal advice. The testator left his entire estate to his wife and, if she predeceased him, the estate went to his two stepchildren. The wife died and, two days later, the testator executed a will leaving his entire estate to his biological children. The testator's stepchildren brought an application regarding the validity of the second will, questioning the capacity of the testator. However, the court found no evidence or agreement to support the argument that mutual wills existed between the couple. The second will was valid.³⁹ The Ontario Court of Appeal recently reinforced that there must be clear evidence of a mutual wills agreement for wills to be found to be mutual, and that the onus on the party alleging a mutual wills agreement is 'heavy'.⁴⁰

Cross-border developments

Changes to US transfer tax

Canada is home to many dual citizens, including US–Canadian citizens. Many Canadians own holiday, real or personal property in the United States, or spend significant time in the United States. A number of Canadians are, as a result, subject to the US transfer tax regime (US estate, gift and generation-skipping transfer taxes) and are attentive to any changes related to it. Following the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012, which became law on 2 January 2013, the US exemption from estate tax was US\$5 million, indexed for inflation, and the maximum rate of US estate tax increased from 35 to 40 per cent, both permanently, subject to future legislation.



On 22 December 2017, President Trump signed into law the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, which temporarily doubles the federal estate and gift tax exemption to US\$13.99 million for 2025, indexed for inflation. The increase is effective until 31 December 2025. Unless permanent legislation is enacted, the exemption will return to the pre-2018 regime on 1 January 2026. Proposed legislation would increase the exemption to US\$15 million commencing in 2026 and make the increase permanent. Where applicable, the US estate and gift tax exemption remains unified.

Income tax-related reporting requirements

FATCA, introduced to combat offshore tax evasion, affects Canadians with US connections and Canadian financial institutions. Final regulations under FATCA set out detailed reporting and withholding requirements for non-US financial institutions with respect to accounts with certain US connections, including those beneficially owned by US citizens. Information to be reported includes identifying information, and information about the values of accounts and transaction amounts. Other non-US entities (and certain Canadian trusts) are also required to report the ownership or beneficial interests of US citizens.

Under FATCA, such information is generally required to be provided directly to the US Internal Revenue Service (IRS) by non-US financial institutions and entities. Canada has in effect a Model 1 type IGA with the United States. Designed to ease compliance with FATCA, the IGA modifies FATCA's provisions in respect of Canadian financial institutions and other Canadian entities, and expands the tax information exchange provisions between Canada and the United States. Pursuant to the IGA, Canadian financial institutions generally report information to the CRA rather than directly to the IRS, although they are generally required to register with the IRS to obtain an identification number. By complying with the IGA, Canadian financial institutions avoid a 30 per cent withholding requirement under FATCA on certain payments to them. In addition, certain Canadian-registered plans are exempt from reporting under the IGA, and local financial institutions may be entitled to additional relief.

A self-reporting scheme applies to US persons (including US citizens, green card holders and certain persons who spend a substantial amount of time in the United States) in Canada and elsewhere that may require reporting of non-US bank and financial accounts on a report of foreign bank and financial accounts. Under FATCA, US persons must generally also report certain non-US financial assets exceeding threshold values on a statement of specified foreign financial assets (Form 8938), filed with their tax returns.



In June 2015, Canada signed the multilateral competent authority agreement (MCAA), which provides for a coordinated arrangement for the automatic exchange of financial account information among various countries. Under the MCAA, Canada agreed to implement the OECD's CRS. As of 1 July 2017, financial institutions located in Canada are subject to the CRS and are required to provide the CRA with certain information pertaining to accounts and account holders. The first information exchanges took place in June 2018. The CRS is based on FATCA and is similar in effect.

Uniform substitute decision-making legislation

The Uniform Law Conference of Canada (ULCC) adopted the Uniform Interjurisdictional Recognition of Substitute Decision-Making Documents Act (Uniform Act) in August 2016.

The Uniform Act is a joint project of the ULCC and the Uniform Law Commission of the United States (ULC), which was undertaken to promote cross-border portability and utility of substitute decision-making documents for property and personal care. The ULC adopted its version of the Uniform Act in July 2014, and US states may now consider enacting it internally. To date, Idaho, Connecticut and Alaska have enacted it. It is up to each Canadian province and territory to consider adopting and implementing the Uniform Act. This new uniform legislation in each jurisdiction marks a significant step forward in promoting cross-border effectiveness of powers of attorney.

Under the ULCC Uniform Act, which differs from the ULC one, a substitute decision-making document will be formally valid if it complies with any of the following:

- a. the law indicated in the document;
- b. the law of the jurisdiction in which it was executed;
- c. the jurisdiction in which the individual was habitually resident; or
- d. the law of the place where it is to be used.

In the Canadian Uniform Act, the application of the governing law can only be refused if its application would be manifestly contrary to the public policy of the enacting province or territory, which the notes to the Uniform Act indicate in matters relating to personal care, including specific medical procedures. The Uniform Acts provide for the ability of a third party to rely on a document as well as, subject to certain exceptions, the obligation of third parties within a reasonable time to accept a substitute decision-making document and not require an additional or different form of authority. It also provides for a court order mandating acceptance and liability for legal costs for refusal to accept a substitute decision-making document in violation of each Uniform Act. Little progress has been forthcoming to adopt the Canadian Uniform Act. The Alberta Law Reform Institute reviewed it and conducted a broad consultation, but there was no broad support for its implementation.



Recognition of foreign trusts

The Hague Convention of the Law Applicable to Trusts and on Their Recognition, adopted in 1984 by the Hague Conference on Private International Law, was ratified by Canada and is in effect in all Canadian common law provinces.

Applicable changes affecting personal property

Same-sex marriage and Quebec civil unions

In 2005, Canada legalised same-sex marriage and, as a result, a broad array of statutory and common law rights have been available to same-sex married spouses, including rights to share in an estate upon intestacy and any rights to property division under provincial family law statutes. Quebec also solemnises a civil union for same-sex or opposite-sex couples, which confers similar rights to marriage.

Rights of de facto spouses

For unmarried de facto spouses, Canada recognises a limited subset of legal rights. De facto spouses are treated similarly to married spouses for various purposes, including taxation and certain government benefits, but significant gaps remain in respect of property rights on relationship breakdown and death, although this varies by province and territory. On 1 January 2020, Alberta introduced the Matrimonial Property Act,⁴¹ which provides that the same property division rules will apply to both married spouses and couples in a relationship of interdependence. From 30 June 2025 onwards, in Quebec de facto spouses will inherit on an intestacy if they were in a parental union with the deceased and as well have a right to equalisation of the parental union patrimony upon termination of the parental union, including on death.

Spousal support provisions for de facto spouses in Quebec

In 2013, the Supreme Court of Canada delivered its decision in *Quebec (Attorney General) v. A*,⁴² also known as *Lola v. Eric*. Lola (not her real name) claimed spousal support and property rights from her billionaire de facto spouse Eric. The province of Quebec has a greater percentage of de facto spouses than any other province (approximately 42.7 per cent in 2021, with the national average being 22.7 per cent), and there are few legal rights provided to these spouses on relationship breakdown.⁴³ While a majority of the Supreme Court agreed with the Quebec Court of Appeal in finding that Article 585 of the Quebec Civil Code, which does not provide spousal support for de facto spouses, although it provides for support among married or civil union spouses, discriminates against de facto spouses on equality grounds, the discrimination is justified on the principle of respecting individual couples' choice and autonomy. However, as of 30 June 2025, there will be a distinction



between de facto spousal relationships with children and those without. The new regime in Quebec allows the surviving spouse of a de facto spousal relationship with children to obtain a compensatory allowance⁴⁴ if they believe they have been impoverished after having contributed, in property or services, to the enrichment of their spouse over the course of their 'community of life.' The court may order the payment of a benefit to the surviving spouse to compensate for their contribution to the deceased's property (called 'patrimony' in Quebec). If, in the opinion of the court, certain criteria are met, the compensatory allowance will be paid, all at once or by instalments, before the partition of the estate, since it is a debt owed to the surviving spouse.

Common law property division for de facto spouses

In *Kerr v. Baranow* and *Vanasse v. Seguin*,⁴⁵ the Supreme Court reviewed the principles of unjust enrichment and resulting trust applicable to de facto spouses on relationship breakdown. After a relationship of over 25 years, Ms Kerr claimed property and support entitlements. Both parties had worked and Mr Baranow had cared for Ms Kerr after she had suffered a stroke. The Court reviewed the law of unjust enrichment applicable to de facto spouses not included in most provincial statutory property division schemes. The elements of the claim are enrichment of one spouse, the corresponding deprivation of another and absence of juristic reason (such as a contract), and remedies have included a constructive trust and monetary amounts, including amounts relating to value received. Where appropriate, the claimant should be treated as a co-venturer in a joint family venture and should share the couple's mutual gains. Indicia of a joint family venture include mutual effort, economic integration, intention and priority to the family, and there must also be a link between the contribution and wealth accumulated. A new trial was ordered in *Kerr* regarding unjust enrichment. A monetary remedy is not limited to a value-received approach, and in *Vanasse*, the Supreme Court upheld a monetary award granted at trial to a partner who had cared for a young family and given up career opportunities during a 12-year relationship.

Discretionary trust interests as matrimonial property

British Columbia's Family Law Act, SBC 2011 is the first Canadian family law statute to expressly address discretionary trust interests in the division of family property by categorising certain beneficial interests in property held in discretionary trusts as excluded property. Problems with the original wording of the Act have been rectified by amendments that came into force on 26 May 2014, thereby clarifying that only the increase in value of the spouse's beneficial interest in a discretionary trust will be subject to division on separation (rather than the increase in value of all of the property in the trust, as originally drafted). The issue of whether an interest in a discretionary trust can be included for the purpose of calculating a spouse's net family property was examined in the 2022 British Columbia case, *Cottrell v. Cottrell*.⁴⁶ The Court differentiated between a



beneficial interest in discretionary trust property and the actual property held in a trust. Only the increase in the beneficial interest will be considered family property under British Columbia's family law legislation. In this case, the beneficiary's discretionary interest was uncertain as she did not have the ability to compel a distribution. The Court held that the claimant had the burden of proving that the beneficiary's interest in the trust increased (as opposed to the value of the property held in the trust), and in this case the claimant did not meet this burden. Valuation of these interests on separation will continue to remain a live and litigious issue in British Columbia and throughout Canada, as evidenced by reported decisions in Saskatchewan,⁴⁷ Alberta⁴⁸ and Ontario.⁴⁹ The recent case of *Lang-Newlands v. Newlands*⁵⁰ provides an in-depth analysis by the Ontario court of the factors that need to be considered in the valuation of a beneficiary's interest in a trust.

Legal presumptions relating to jointly held property clarified and effect of transfer examined

In two companion cases, *Pecore v. Pecore*⁵¹ and *Madsen Estate v. Saylor*,⁵² the Supreme Court of Canada clarified the common law presumptions of resulting trust and advancement, which are legal presumptions subject to being rebutted on the civil standard of proof. The Court clarified that a recipient of gratuitously transferred personal property is generally presumed to hold it on resulting trust for the donor. The presumption that the property so transferred is advanced to the donor that has historically applied to certain family relationships, applies to transfers between a parent and minor child (and not from parent to adult child). This legal presumption may be rebutted, and the onus is on the party alleging the gratuitous transfer was intended as a gift.

Joint ownership continues to be a legal minefield in the context of estates and estate planning across the country.⁵³ The court will look at various factors when considering whether the presumption has been rebutted, including evidence of intention, tax treatment of the property, and contribution of funds. Court decisions continue to highlight the importance of providing clear evidence of intention, whether that is through supporting documentation or a third party.

The 2020 Ontario Superior Court of Justice decision in *Calmusky v. Calmusky*⁵⁴ added a further dimension to the presumption of resulting trust when it applied the presumption of a resulting trust to a registered account designated to an adult beneficiary. However, in the 2021 Ontario Superior Court decision in *Mak (Estate) v. Mak*, the Court came to the opposite conclusion and held a resulting trust cannot apply to a beneficiary designation of such a plan.⁵⁵ A 2021 Nova Scotia decision also declined to follow *Calmusky*.⁵⁶ In addition, a 2021 Alberta decision held that a beneficiary designation of a tax-free savings account is testamentary in nature, and, referring to *Mak*, a resulting trust cannot apply to it.⁵⁷ These conflicting decisions have left uncertainty for lawyers and financial advisers with respect to beneficiary designations.



Adding more uncertainty to joint ownership, in the decision of *Marley v. Salga*,⁵⁸ the Ontario Superior Court expanded the ways in which spouses can sever a joint tenancy through a course of dealing. In this case, the deceased and his widow owned their matrimonial home as joint tenants with right of survivorship. The deceased dealt with his one-half interest in the home under his will and the Court relied on evidence to support that the widow had knowledge of the deceased's steps to deal with his one-half interest, which the Court held evidenced a mutual intention to hold the home as equal tenants-in-common. This decision was upheld at the Ontario Court of Appeal.⁵⁹

A 2023 Ontario decision serves as a 'cautionary tale' for those who may not understand the implications of joint ownership and gifting. In *Jackson v. Rosenberg*,⁶⁰ the applicant transferred his primary residence into joint names with the respondent for no consideration. Subsequently, the applicant took steps to sever the joint tenancy (resulting in him and the respondent each owning a 50 per cent share of the property) as he ultimately did not want the respondent to have any rights to the property during his lifetime. He had simply wanted the property to pass automatically on his death without the need to pay probate fees in Ontario of approximately 1.5 per cent of the property. The applicant then argued that the respondent held her 50 per cent share in trust for him during his lifetime. The court agreed with the applicant and made the following analyses: Where the joint tenancy is as a result of a gratuitous transfer of the real property, if it is not a true joint tenancy, the transfer may lead to a resulting trust (as discussed in the earlier paragraphs of this section), or the transfer may be a gift of the right of survivorship alone (meaning that the transferee is only entitled to what remains of the property if they survive the transferor). The latter type of gift cannot be revoked but the transferor could render the gift valueless by disposing of the property. The court concluded that by severing the title to the property, the applicant eliminated the gift of the right of survivorship with respect to the applicant's 50 per cent share (and the share would pass per his Will). With respect to the respondent's 50 per cent share, the court concluded that the presumption of resulting trust applied to this interest during the applicant's lifetime, but the respondent's 50 per cent share of whatever equity remained in the property after the applicant died would pass to her. This case is a reminder for individuals to take note of the complexities of joint ownership before creating such arrangements for the sole purpose of saving probate fees.

In Quebec, there is no equivalent to joint tenancy or rights of survivorship. In *Gauthier v. Gauthier*,⁶¹ the deceased and his son signed an account-opening agreement in Florida that held the deceased's inheritance. The will named the deceased's three children as beneficiaries, but the son submitted that the account agreement left the inheritance to him, or, in the alternative, that his father intended to gift the account. The Court did not apply *Pecore*, but rather looked to the deceased's intentions. The Court held that the deceased did not intend to gift the account.



Legal presumption of advancement as between spouses in BC

In *HCF v. DTF*,⁶² the British Columbia Superior Court made a compelling finding that the presumption of advancement is an outdated concept and cannot co-exist with the property division scheme under the Family Law Act. The Court held that the husband who owned excluded property was able to retain that exclusion on separation notwithstanding that he gifted it to his wife. The 2019 British Columbia Court of Appeal decision of *Namdarpour v. Vahman*⁶³ illustrated that the presumption of advancement is an evidentiary presumption that may operate where the judge is unable to reach a conclusion about the transferor's actual intention. However, for cases brought on or after 11 May 2023, the amended sections of the British Columbia Family Law Act, which provides that the presumption of advancement must not be applied in questions of ownership of property as between spouses, will apply.⁶⁴

Exempting certain matrimonial property from the equalisation regime

The 2012 Ontario Court of Appeal decision in *Spencer v. Riesberry*⁶⁵ held that in the circumstances, a matrimonial property held by a family trust where one of the beneficiaries resided did not qualify as a matrimonial home for the purposes of Ontario's Family Law Act and excluded it from the equalisation calculation as the beneficiary in question did not have an interest in the property within the meaning of the Act (although the value of the interest in the trust was still included for the purposes of the calculation). This case represents a frustration of the matrimonial home protection contained in the Act, as well as a potential circumvention of the usual requirements for the spouse's consent on the sale or encumbrance of a matrimonial home and the right of possession for the non-titled spouse.

The Supreme Court of Canada decision in *Yared v. Karam*⁶⁶ found that a family home held in a trust that one spouse controls can be included in a married couple's family patrimony to be divided equally between the spouses on the breakdown of a marriage. A family patrimony, which is unique to Quebec, is created when a couple marries and includes the property belonging to spouses that they use to meet their family's needs. Under Quebec's Civil Code, 'rights which confer use' are included in the family patrimony, and the Court held that the control that the trustee had over the trust property gave him rights that confer use. This case illustrates Quebec's treatment of trusts in the family law context and how the civil law regime in Quebec differs from the common law regime in the rest of Canada.

Proprietary estoppel

The equitable claim of proprietary estoppel was successfully used in two 2014 Ontario cases as the basis for a cause of action in respect of an unfulfilled or reneged promise or assurance relating to a cottage property.⁶⁷ In both *Clarke v. Johnson and Love v. Schumacher*, the equity resulted in the appropriate remedy being, based on the facts and the exercise of judicial discretion, a proprietary one in the form of an exclusive, irrevocable and time-specific licence (as a monetary award was found in both instances to be inappropriate or insufficient). In both decisions, the courts followed the modern UK test to establish proprietary estoppel, being the establishment of three criteria: encouragement or acquiescence in respect of land; detrimental reliance; and unconscionability.

A third case arising in British Columbia, resulting in a successful proprietary estoppel claim involving a horse farm that saw the trial judge award the entire horse farm to the applicant, was remitted back to the trial judge to assess the outstanding claims of unjust enrichment and express or implied trust, as well as the proportionality of the trial judge's remedy to the proprietary estoppel claim.⁶⁸ *Cowper-Smith v. Morgan*⁶⁹ is a British Columbia appellate court decision in which the proprietary estoppel claim was unsuccessful as the person against whom the claim was advanced did not own the property in question at the time the assurance or representation was made. On appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada, the court ruling clarified the test for proprietary estoppel and expanded its scope. The British Columbia appellate court decision was overturned and the Court found that proprietary estoppel had been established by the appellants. The Court found that reliance on an expectation to enjoy a right or benefit over a property, even without an interest in such property, is reasonable.

Recently, an Ontario Court of Appeal case examined whether the doctrine of proprietary estoppel would be applicable to an agreement to sell the family farm to the child, which was reneged on by the parents when they sold the farm to a third party. In *Metske v. Metske*,⁷⁰ the Court of Appeal held that proprietary estoppel cannot be established without a representation or assurance, and the representation or assurance must be clear, unambiguous, and intended to be taken seriously in order to satisfy the test. By contrast, the evidence established that the parents had consistently indicated that the son would have to pay fair market value to acquire the dairy farm, and there was no guarantee that the farm would be transferred to the son. There was also no clear representation regarding the terms on which the farm would be transferred, as the parties had not agreed on the purchase price, how it would be determined, or the terms on which the purchase price would be paid. The court did not make a finding of proprietary estoppel in this case and concluded that it is not enough to establish a mere willingness to negotiate and an agreement to pursue an agreement in the future, but there needs to be actual assurance that the affected property will be transferred.

Execution of estate planning documents during the covid-19 pandemic and beyond

Each province and territory has its own formal requirements for making a valid will and powers of attorney. In every province and territory except for Quebec, the law requires a will to be in writing and signed at the end by the will-maker in the presence of two witnesses, who each in turn sign the will in the presence of the will-maker and each other (Manitoba also has additional requirements of initialling each page). A similar process must be followed for a continuing or enduring power of attorney for property and for personal care, although the number of witnesses varies from one to two among the provinces and territories.

To address the problem of executing estate planning documents during the covid-19 pandemic, all of the provinces and territories except for Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, Yukon, the Northwest Territories and Nunavut, released emergency orders that temporarily allowed for the virtual execution of wills and powers of attorney by means of 'audio-visual communication technology'. Quebec's emergency legislation allowed electronic signing of notarial wills, which are wills that a notary prepares and that the will-maker signs in the virtual presence of the notary and another witness.

Some provinces have gone so far as making permanent changes to their legislation to adopt technology in the execution of estate planning documents. Ontario, British Columbia, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and most recently, Alberta allow for the virtual execution of wills and powers of attorney. Nova Scotia has just introduced a Bill which is yet to come into force and allows for powers of attorney to be witnessed without being in the presence of the grantor. Some of the provinces also require that one of the witnesses should be a lawyer. Interestingly, Alberta's remote witnessing legislation provides that a lawyer needs to provide legal advice and services in relation to the execution of the documents but does not specify that one of the witnesses should be a lawyer.

British Columbia recognises electronic wills that are created on a computer and signed electronically and for which there is no printed copy, the first Canadian jurisdiction to do so. On 17 May 2023, Saskatchewan became the second jurisdiction in Canada to pass legislation authorising the use of electronic wills but as of this date it is unknown when it will come into force. It seems as though it is only a matter of time before other provinces follow suit (Alberta is also currently considering electronic wills).

Wealth structuring and regulation

Common vehicles for wealth structuring

Trusts and holding companies are perhaps two of the most common vehicles used in wealth structuring.

Trusts



Income splitting

Trusts can be established *inter vivos* or *by will*. *Inter vivos* trusts are often used to split income with family members, where the trust earns income and acts as a conduit to allocate income, including taxable capital gains, among beneficiaries who are subject to lower rates. Effective planning involves careful attention to the possible application of the attribution rules, which can attribute income back to a high-tax rate taxpayer.

Trusts used in conjunction with an 'estate freeze'

Trusts are also commonly used in conjunction with an estate freeze to hold growth property for future generations, such as common shares of a private company that are expected to grow in value, and thereby defer taxation on any gains until the future rather than until the death of the founder. This can achieve significant tax savings. The use of a trust can allow for control of the timing of distribution of property, for selection of beneficiaries and for general wealth protection purposes. Generally, a fully discretionary trust is used for such purposes.

Trusts as will substitutes

Trusts are also increasingly used as will substitutes, in particular 'alter ego' and 'joint partner' trusts that are specifically defined under Canadian income tax legislation and allow persons aged 65 and over, provided certain conditions are met, to roll over capital property on a tax-deferred basis, as opposed to triggering capital gains. Alter ego and joint partner trusts are often used to provide for succession to property on the death of the spouse or spouses as a substitute to a will. They may offer benefits such as:

- a. avoiding expensive court fees, probate taxes and the protracted court probate process;
- b. more privacy than a will;
- c. ensuring capital succession to property on death; and
- d. protection against estate litigation, including will challenges and other claims arising on death.

Trusts may also offer an effective and sophisticated vehicle to manage assets on incapacity as a primary alternative to a power of attorney.

Use of testamentary trusts for income splitting and other benefits

Testamentary trusts (trusts created under a will) have been used to provide for income splitting after the testator's death. Certain estates and testamentary trusts are taxed at the graduated rates applicable to individuals, whereas trusts established during a lifetime are subject to the top marginal tax rates applicable to individuals. Prior to 2016, testamentary trusts allowed for income splitting between the trust and one or more beneficiaries, which resulted in significant tax savings. However, commencing in 2016, testamentary trusts with exceptions



for graduated rate estates and for qualified disability trusts are subject to the top tax rate applicable to individuals and, consequently, the above tax benefits have been eliminated, although it will still be possible to 'sprinkle' income among a group of beneficiaries of a discretionary testamentary trust if the trust terms permit. In addition, the use of a testamentary trust may provide for capital succession planning and can safeguard against beneficiaries' matrimonial and creditor claims, among other benefits.

Multiple wills used to minimise probate fees

Multiple wills are increasingly used in certain provinces to minimise estate administration tax and probate fees. For example, in Ontario, estate administration tax is approximately 1.5 per cent of the value of estate assets. Assets are often segregated under two wills: a primary will and a secondary will. Assets that generally do not require a probated will to administer by way of proof of executors' authority to third parties, such as financial institutions and purchasers of land property, are segregated under a secondary will. The secondary will would typically include private company shares, family loans, tangible personal property and beneficial trust interests. Only the primary will is typically probated, and applicable tax or court fees are then based on the value of the assets passing under the primary will, which is generally expected to be a more modest asset value base.

Holding companies

Holding companies are a common feature of Canadian estate planning. They are often used to hold investment assets, including US securities and certain other US situs assets to protect against exposure to US estate tax, to defer tax on active business income where shares of an active business are held by the holding company, to split income, including in conjunction with use of a family trust, and for asset protection and retirement planning.

Potential tax advantages of holding companies

The utility of an investment holding company to earn investment income at a lower tax rate than if earned personally will depend on changing tax rates, which historically have at certain times offered tax advantages and at other times have been neutral and less advantageous.

Holding companies are also used in conjunction with probate fee and estate tax minimisation strategies as outlined above. Private company shares can pass under a secondary will, which typically may not need to be probated, thereby saving fees and tax, which can be significant where the shares have a high value. There is potential for double taxation on death where assets are held in a holding company, because a deceased person will be subject to personal taxation on the deemed disposition of the shares of the holding company giving rise



to possible taxable capital gains, and also the same gains may be reflected in the holding company's underlying assets, on which tax will be paid at the corporate level on the sale of the assets or wind-up of the company. It is therefore necessary to implement proper post-mortem tax planning to avoid potential double taxation on death.

Anti-money laundering regime and new transparency requirements

The Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) and Terrorist Financing Act came into effect in 2001. It introduced requirements for a compliance regime, record-keeping, client identification and reporting. Reporting entities must implement a compliance regime, keep certain records, obtain certain client identification and report suspicious transactions to an independent agency, the FINTRAC. Certain other financial transactions, as well as terrorist property, must also be reported. All regulated entities, starting from 1 June 2021, are required to obtain and take reasonable steps to confirm the accuracy of beneficial ownership information they obtain, and not just in certain sectors. Reporting entities include financial institutions such as banks, trust companies, loan companies, life insurance companies, brokers and agents, securities dealers, accountants and accounting firms carrying out certain transactions, real estate brokers, and certain others. The legislation imposes harsh financial and criminal penalties, including imprisonment, for failure to report. Reporting entities have to send large cash transaction reports to the FINTRAC when they receive an amount of C\$10,000 or more in cash in the course of a single transaction, and financial entities, money service businesses and casinos have to report incoming and outgoing international electronic funds transfers of C\$10,000 or more in a single transaction.

In the past few years, initiatives to require company, trust and real estate transparency have been prolific on the global stage. In Canada, they form a backdrop to recent legislative proposals and changes. In 2018, the federal government introduced legislation that came into effect on 13 June 2019, which amended the Canada Business Corporations Act to require that corporations collect and keep a register of specified information regarding those who have significant control over a corporation, including registered shareholders, beneficial owners of shares and persons who have direct or indirect influence, and as a result have control over the corporation. The information was not to be publicly available, but available to directors, shareholders and creditors of the corporation. In the 19 April 2021 federal budget, the government finally announced it would build and implement a publicly accessible corporate beneficial ownership registry. Legislative amendments to the Canada Business Corporations Act (CBCA) were introduced on 22 March 2023 to create a public beneficial ownership registry, which will provide certain details on the beneficial owners of Canadian corporations to the public, and on 22 January 2024 the CBCA was further amended with respect to disclosure of beneficial ownership. Currently, it is possible to search individuals who have significant control on the corporation's public profile.



In December 2017, the Canadian finance ministers entered into an agreement to strengthen beneficial ownership transparency, which included a commitment on the part of the provinces to make legislative changes to require provincially incorporated corporations to maintain information on beneficial owners. Ten jurisdictions have forged ahead with legislative changes that contain similar requirements to those under the new federal legislation, and only four jurisdictions, Alberta and the three territories, have not proposed or implemented this type of legislation at the time of writing. In the autumn of 2019, Quebec began corporate transparency consultations, and in the 2020–2021 budget, the government introduced measures that would require enterprises to obtain information on beneficial owners for disclosure to the publicly accessible *Registraire des entreprises du Quebec*, and to make it possible to do research on an enterprise using the name and address of a natural person. On 8 June 2021, new legislation was passed and, as of 31 March 2023 is now in effect. In addition, in British Columbia on 11 May 2023 legislation was enacted allowing for the introduction of a new public registry that will contain all transparency register information that is searchable by the public; including beneficial ownership, and which is to be available in 2025 in an online platform.

On the real estate front, British Columbia's Land Owner Transparency Act together with the Land Owner Transparency Regulation came into force on 30 November 2020, which created a new public registry for beneficial ownership of real estate in the province. Corporations, trustees and partners are required to provide specified information on those who have a beneficial interest in land, a significant interest in a corporation that owns land or own an interest in land through a partnership, with certain restrictions. The stated intention of the registry is to prevent tax evasion, fraud and money laundering by ending anonymous or hidden ownership of real estate. The registry opened to the public on 30 April 2021. It remains to be seen whether this initiative will head east and roll out through other Canadian jurisdictions. In Quebec, in February 2019, a regulation was published that aimed at identifying non-resident purchasers of residential property. There is speculation that this is the first step towards a tax on non-residents, as currently exists in certain designated areas of British Columbia and now all of Ontario. In Ontario, since May 2017, additional disclosure has been required in making a real estate transfer pursuant to the Land Transfer Act, which includes disclosure of the beneficial ownership of the transferred property; however, this information is not publicly available.

With respect to trusts, as previously noted, new trust reporting and disclosure rules are in effect. All Canadian-resident trusts with very limited exceptions are required to file an annual T3 trust tax and information return commencing with the tax year 2023. The provision of this information erodes privacy in the use of trusts and will provide substantial information to the government that was previously not available to it.



Outlook and conclusions

In 2025, Canada is at a unique and unexpected crossroads as it tries to sharply pivot to redirect its economy and protect its political sovereignty as a result of the Trump administration's tariffs and threats of annexation.

Canada requires strong political leadership to forge the path ahead.

Private client practice is in increasingly high demand in Canada in this era of uncertainty given these threats to the Canadian economy and independence combined with globalisation and diversity of families. Private client practice is also much more complex and challenging putting pressure on, and more demand for, seasoned senior practitioners who have the experience, skills and wisdom to navigate high value complex matters.

Footnotes

1. ^ *Fundy Settlement v. Canada*, 2012 SCC 14, [2012] 1 SCR 520.
2. ^ *Discovery Trust v. Canada*, 2015 NLTD(G)86. Also see *The Herman Grad 2000 Family Trust v. Minister of Revenue*, 2016 ONSC 2402 and *Boettger v. Agence du revenu de Quebec*, 2017 QCCA 1670 (CanLii).
3. ^ CRA, Income Tax Folio S6-F1-C1, Residence of a Trust or Estate, 24 November 2015.
4. ^ *Sieber Estate (Re)*, 2025 BCSC 617.
5. ^ *Sherman Estate v. Donovan*, 2021 SCC 25.
6. ^ Sections 712-715, of the Civil Code of Quebec, CQLR c CCQ-1991.
7. ^ *Haines v. Kuffner Estate*, 2024 SKKB 51.
8. ^ *Salmon v. Rombough*, 2024 ONSC 1186.
9. ^ *Cooper Estate*, 2024 BCSC 218.
10. ^ *Quinn Estate v. Rydland*, 2019 BCCA 91.
11. ^ *Waslenchuk Estate*, 2020 BCSC 1929.
12. ^ *MacCallum Estate*, 2022 NSSC 34.
13. ^ *Vilenski v. Weinrib-Wolfman*, 2022 ONSC 2116.
14. ^ *Re Estate of Church*, 2024 BCSC 2490.
15. ^ Articles 521.20 and 653 of the Civil Code of Québec, CQLR c CCQ-1991 ("Quebec Civil Code").
16. ^ RSO 1990, c S26.
17. ^ *ibid.*, see Section 1.1(1).
18. ^ *Shapiro v. Shapiro*, 2025 ONSC 2781.
19. ^ Vital Statistics Act, RSNS 1989, c 494, Part II.
20. ^ *LeBlanc v. Cushing Estate*, 2020 NSSC 162.
21. ^ See, for example, *Bath v. Bath Estate*, 2016 BCSC 1239.
22. ^ See, for example, *McKenna Estate (Re)*, 2015 ABQB 37; *Morassut v. Jaczynski*, 2015 ONSC 502.
23. ^ See, for example, *Tippett v. Tippett Estate*, 2015 BCSC 291; *Philp v. Philp Estate*, 2017 BCSC 625; *Pascuzzi v. Pascuzzi*, 2022 BCSC 907; *Bautista v. Gutkowski Estate*, 2023 BCSC 1485.
24. ^ *Lam v. Law Estate*, 2024 BCSC 1561.



25. ^ See, for example, *McKenna Estate (Re)*, 2015 ABQB 37.
26. ^ *Riley Estate (Re)*, 2014 ABQB 725; *Umbach v. Lang Estate*, 2016 ABQB 16, 2016; *Wright v. Lemoine*, 2017 ABQB 395.
27. ^ *Re Richardson Estate*, 2014 BCSC 2162; *Coombes Estate (Re)*, 2015 BCSC 2050; *Kish v. Sobchak Estate*, 2016 BCCA 65; *Connor Estate*, 2017 BCSC 978.
28. ^ *McCorkill v. Streed*, 2014 NBQB 148 (discussed at length in *Spence v. BMO Trust Co*, 2016 ONCA 196).
29. ^ *Canadian Association for Free Expression v. Streed et al* (2015), 9 ETR (4th) 203 (NBCA); CanLII 34017 (SCC).
30. ^ *Spence v. BMO Trust Co*, 2015 ONSC 615.
31. ^ *Spence Estate (Re)* 2016 ONCA 196, application to the Supreme Court of Canada for leave to appeal dismissed 2016 CanLII 34005.
32. ^ *Lawen Estate v. Nova Scotia* (Attorney General, 2019 NSSC 162).
33. ^ *Nova Scotia (Attorney General) v. Lawen Estate*, 2021 NSCA 39 (leave to appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada was dismissed in January 2022).
34. ^ *Lundy v. Lundy*, 1895 CanLII 19 (SCC), [1895] 24 SCR 650.
35. ^ See: *Oldfield v. Transamerica Life Insurance Co. of Canada*, 2002 SCC 22; *The Bank of Nova Scotia Trust Company v. Rogers*, 2021 ONSC 1747.
36. ^ *Nordstrom v. Baumann* [1962] SCR 147.
37. ^ *Magnuson Estate*, 2023 ABKB 305.
38. ^ *Rammage v. Estate of Roussel*, 2016 ONSC, 1857.
39. ^ *Lavoie v. Trudel*, 2016 ONSC, 4141.
40. ^ *Gefen Estate v. Gefen*, 2022 ONCA 174.
41. ^ Matrimonial Property Act, RSA 2000, c M-8.
42. ^ 2013 SCC 5.
43. ^ Statistics Canada (2022) .
44. ^ Articles 521.20 and 521.43 of the Quebec Civil Code.
45. ^ [2011] SCJ No. 10.
46. ^ *Cottrell v. Cottrell*, 2022 BSCS 1607. This decision was appealed to the British Columbia Court of Appeal. The Court issued its ruling in December 2023, dismissing the appeal and upholding the trial court's decision.
47. ^ *Grosse v. Grosse*, 2015 SKCA 68.
48. ^ *Shopik v. Shopik*, 2014 ABQB 41 (CanLII).
49. ^ *Mudronja v. Mudronja*, 2014 ONSC, 6217, *Tremblay v. Tremblay*, 2016 ONSC 588.
50. ^ *Lang-Newlands v. Newlands*, 2024 ONSC 6285.
51. ^ *Pecore v. Pecore*, 2007 SCC 17, [2007] 1 SCR 795.
52. ^ *Madsen Estate v. Saylor*, 2007, SCC 18, [2007] 1 SCR 838.
53. ^ See: *Bradford v. Lyell*, 2013 SKQB 330 (CanLII); *Public Guardian and Trustee v. Cherneyko*, 2021 ONSC 107; *Sawdon Estate*, 2014 ONCA 101 (CanLII); *Mroz (Litigation guardian of) v. Mroz*, 2015 ONCA 171; *Andrade v. Andrade*, 2016 ONCA 368; *McKendry v. McKendry*, 2017 BCCA 48; *Laski v. Laski*, 2016 ONCA 337; *Kennedy v. Smith*, 2022 BCSC 1622.
54. ^ *Calmusky v. Calmusky*, 2020 ONSC 1506.
55. ^ *Mak (Estate) v. Mak*, 2021 ONSC 4415.



- 56. ^ *Fitzgerald Estate v. Fitzgerald*, 2021 NSSC 355.
- 57. ^ *Roberts v. Roberts*, 2021 ABQB 945.
- 58. ^ *Marley v. Salga*, 2019 ONSC 3527.
- 59. ^ *Marley v. Salga*, 2019 ONSA 104.
- 60. ^ *Jackson v. Rosenberg*, 2023 ONSC 4403.
- 61. ^ 2016 QCCS 2333.
- 62. ^ 2017 BCSC 1226.
- 63. ^ 2019 BCCA 153.
- 64. ^ Section 81.1(1) Family Law Act, SBC 2011, c 25.
- 65. ^ *Spencer v. Riesberry*, 2012 ONCA 418.
- 66. ^ *Yared v. Karam*, 2019 SCC 62.
- 67. ^ *Clarke v. Johnson*, 2014 ONCA 237 and *Love v. Schumacher Estate*, 2014 ONSC 4080.
- 68. ^ *Sabcy v. Rommel*, 2014 BCCA 360.2016 BCCA 200 (overturned).
- 69. ^ *Cowper-Smith v. Morgan*, 2017 SCC 61.
- 70. ^ *Metske v. Metske*, 2025 ONCA 418.

