

TREASURY DEPARTMENT TECHNICAL EXPLANATION OF THE CONVENTION  
BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND CANADA WITH RESPECT TO  
TAXES ON INCOME AND ON CAPITAL SIGNED AT WASHINGTON, D.C. ON  
SEPTEMBER 26, 1980, AS AMENDED BY THE PROTOCOL SIGNED AT OTTAWA ON  
JUNE 14, 1983 AND THE PROTOCOL SIGNED AT WASHINGTON ON MARCH 28, 1984.

GENERAL EFFECTIVE DATE UNDER ARTICLE XXX: 1 JANUARY 1985

INTRODUCTION

This is a technical explanation of the Convention between the United States and Canada signed on September 26, 1980, as amended by the Protocols signed on June 14, 1983 and March 28, 1984. ("the Convention"). References are made to the Convention and Protocol between Canada and the United States with respect to Income Taxes signed on March 4, 1942, as amended by the Convention signed on June 12, 1950, the Convention signed on August 8, 1956 and the Supplementary Convention signed on October 25, 1966 (the "1942 Convention"). These references are intended to put various provisions of the Convention into context. The technical explanation does not, however, provide a complete comparison between the Convention and the 1942 Convention. Moreover, neither the Convention nor the technical explanation is intended to have implications for the interpretation of the 1942 Convention.

The technical explanation is an official guide to the Convention. It reflects policies behind particular Convention provisions, as well as understandings reached with respect to the interpretation and application of the Convention.

TABLE OF ARTICLES

Article I-----	Personal Scope
Article II-----	Taxes Covered
Article III-----	General Definitions
Article IV-----	Residence
Article V-----	Permanent Establishment
Article VI-----	Income from Real Property
Article VII-----	Business Profits
Article VIII-----	Transportation
Article IX-----	Related Persons
Article X-----	Dividends
Article XI-----	Interest
Article XII-----	Royalties
Article XIII-----	Gains
Article XIV-----	Independent Personal Services
Article XV-----	Dependent Personal Services
Article XVI-----	Artistes and Athletes
Article XVII-----	Withholding of Taxes in Respect of Independent

	Personal Services
Article XVIII-----	Pensions and Annuities
Article XIX-----	Government Service
Article XX-----	Students
Article XXI-----	Exempt Organizations
Article XXII-----	Other Income
Article XXIII-----	Capital
Article XXIV-----	Elimination of Double Taxation
Article XXV-----	Non-Discrimination
Article XXVI-----	Mutual Agreement Procedure
Article XXVII-----	Exchange of Information
Article XXVIII-----	Diplomatic Agents and Consular Officers
Article XXIX-----	Miscellaneous Rules
Article XXX-----	Entry into Force
Article XXXI-----	Termination
Protocol 3-----	of 17 March, 1995
Protocol 4-----	of 29 July, 1997

## ARTICLE I

### Personal Scope

Article I provides that the Convention is generally applicable to persons who are residents of either Canada or the United States or both Canada and the United States. The word "generally" is used because certain provisions of the Convention apply to persons who are residents of neither Canada nor the United States.

## ARTICLE II

### Taxes Covered

Paragraph I states that the Convention applies to taxes "on income and on capital" imposed on behalf of Canada and the United States, irrespective of the manner in which such taxes are levied. Neither Canada nor the United States presently impose taxes on capital. Paragraph 1 is not intended either to broaden or to limit paragraph 2, which provides that the Convention shall apply, in the case of Canada, to the taxes imposed by the Government of Canada under Parts I, XIII, and XIV of the Income Tax Act and, in the case of the United States, to the Federal income taxes imposed by the Internal Revenue Code ("the Code").

National taxes not generally covered by the Convention include, in the case of the United States, the estate, gift, and generation-skipping transfer taxes, the Windfall Profits Tax, Federal unemployment taxes, social security taxes imposed under sections 1401, 3101, and 3111 of the Code, and the excise tax on insurance premiums imposed under Code section 4371. The Convention also does not generally cover the Canadian excise tax on net insurance premiums paid by residents of Canada for coverage of a risk situated in Canada, the Petroleum and Gas Revenue Tax (PGRT) and the Incremental Oil Revenue Tax (IORT). However, the Convention

has the effect of covering the Canadian social security tax in certain respects because under Canadian domestic tax law no such tax is due if there is no income subject to tax under the Income Tax Act of Canada. Taxes imposed by the states of the United States, and by the provinces of Canada, are not generally covered by the Convention. However, if such taxes are imposed in accordance with the provisions of the Convention, a foreign tax credit is ensured by paragraph 7 of Article XXIV (Elimination of Double Taxation).

Paragraph 2 contrasts with paragraph 1 of the Protocol to the 1942 Convention, which refers to "Dominion income taxes." In addition, unlike the 1942 Convention, the Convention does not contain a reference to "surtaxes and excess-profits taxes."

Paragraph 3 provides that the Convention also applies to any taxes identical or substantially similar to the taxes on income in existence on September 26, 1980 which are imposed in addition to or in place of the taxes existing on that date. Similarly, taxes on capital imposed after that date are to be covered.

It was agreed that Part I of the Income Tax Act of Canada is a covered tax even though Canada has made certain modifications in the Income Tax Act after the signature of the Convention and before the signature of the 1983 Protocol. In particular, Canada has enacted a low flat rate tax on petroleum production (the PGRT) which, at the time of the signature of the 1983 Protocol, is imposed generally at the statutory rate of 14.67 percent for the period June 1, 1982 to May 31, 1983, and at 16 percent thereafter, generally reduced to an effective rate of 11 percent or 12 percent after deducting a 25 percent resource allowance. The PGRT is not deductible in computing income for Canadian income tax purposes. This agreement is not intended to have implications for any other convention or for the interpretation of Code sections 901 and 903. Further, the PGRT and IORT are not taxes described in paragraphs 2 or 3.

Paragraph 4 provides that, notwithstanding paragraphs 2 and 3 the Convention applies to certain United States taxes for certain specified purposes: the accumulated earnings tax and personal holding company tax are covered only to the extent necessary to implement the provisions of paragraphs 5 and 8 of Article X (Dividends); the excise taxes imposed with respect to private foundations are covered only to the extent necessary to implement the provisions of paragraph 4 of Article XXI (Exempt Organizations); and the social security taxes imposed under sections 1401, 3101, and 3111 of the Code are covered only to the extent necessary to implement the provisions of paragraph 4 of Article XXIX (Miscellaneous Rules). The pertinent provisions of Articles X, XXI, and XXIX are described below. Canada has no national taxes similar to the United States accumulated earnings tax, personal holding company tax, or excise taxes imposed with respect to private foundations.

Article II does not specifically refer to interest, fines and penalties. Thus, each Contracting State may, in general, impose interest, fines, and penalties or pay interest pursuant to its domestic laws. Any question whether such items are being imposed or paid in connection with covered taxes in a manner consistent with provisions of the Convention, such as Article XXV (Non-Discrimination), may, however, be resolved by the competent authorities pursuant to Article XXVI (Mutual Agreement Procedure). See, however, the discussion below of the treatment of certain interest under Articles XXIX (Miscellaneous Rules) and XXX (Entry Into

Force).

### ARTICLE III General Definitions

Article III provides definitions and general rules of interpretation for the Convention. Paragraph 1(a) states that the term "Canada," when used in a geographical sense, means the territory of Canada, including any area beyond the territorial seas of Canada which, under international law and the laws of Canada, is an area within which Canada may exercise rights with respect to the seabed and subsoil and their natural resources. This definition differs only in form from the definition of Canada in the 1942 Convention; paragraph 1(a) omits the reference in the 1942 Convention to "the Provinces, the Territories and Sable Island" as unnecessary.

Paragraph 1(b)(i) defines the term "United States" to mean the United States of America. The term does not include Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, or any other United States possession or territory.

Paragraph 1(b)(ii) states that when the term "United States" is used in a geographical sense the term also includes any area beyond the territorial seas of the United States which, under international law and the laws of the United States, is an area within which the United States may exercise rights with respect to the seabed and subsoil and their natural resources.

Paragraph 1(c) defines the term "Canadian tax" to mean the taxes imposed by the Government of Canada under Parts I, XIII, and XIV of the Income Tax Act as in existence on September 26, 1980 and any identical or substantially similar taxes on income imposed by the Government of Canada after that date and which are in addition to or in place of the then existing taxes. The term does not extend to capital taxes, if and when such taxes are ever imposed by Canada.

Paragraph 1(d) defines the term "United States tax" to mean the Federal income taxes imposed by the Internal Revenue Code as in existence on September 26, 1980 and any identical or substantially similar taxes on income imposed by the United States after that date in addition to or in place of the then existing taxes. The term does not extend to capital taxes, nor to the United States taxes identified in paragraph 4 of Article II (Taxes Covered).

Paragraph 1(e) provides that the term "person" includes an individual, an estate, a trust, a company, and any other body of persons. Although both the United States and Canada do not regard partnerships as taxable entities, the definition in the paragraph is broad enough to include partnerships where necessary.

Paragraph 1(f) defines the term "company" to mean any body corporate or any entity which is treated as a body corporate for tax purposes.

The term "competent authority" is defined in paragraph 1(g) to mean, in the case of Canada, the Minister of National Revenue or his authorized representative and, in the case of the

United States, the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate. The Secretary of the Treasury has delegated the general authority to act as competent authority to the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service, who has re-delegated such authority to the Associate Commissioner (Operations). The Assistant Commissioner (Examination) has been delegated the authority to administer programs for simultaneous, spontaneous and industry wide exchanges of information. The Director, Foreign Operations District, has been delegated the authority to administer programs for routine and specific exchanges of information and mutual assistance in collection. The Assistant Commissioner (Criminal Investigations) has been delegated the authority to administer the simultaneous criminal investigation program with Canada.

Paragraph 1(h) defines the term "international traffic" to mean, with reference to a resident of a Contracting State, any voyage of a ship or aircraft to transport passengers or property (whether or not operated or used by that resident), except where the principal purpose of the voyage is transport between points within the other Contracting State. For example, in determining for Canadian tax purposes whether a United States resident has derived profits from the operation of ships or aircraft in international traffic, a voyage of a ship or aircraft (whether or not operated or used by that resident) that includes stops in both Contracting States will not be international traffic if the principal purpose of the voyage is to transport passengers or property from one point in Canada to another point in Canada.

Paragraph 1(i) defines the term "State" to mean any national State, whether or not a Contracting State.

Paragraph 1(j) establishes "the 1942 Convention" as the term to be used throughout the Convention for referring to the pre-existing income tax treaty relationship between the United States and Canada.

Paragraph 2 provides that, in the case of a term not defined in the Convention, the domestic tax law of the Contracting State applying to the Convention shall control, unless the context in which the term is used requires a definition independent of domestic tax law or the competent authorities reach agreement on a meaning pursuant to Article XXVI (Mutual Agreement Procedure). The term "context" refers to the purpose and background of the provision in which the term appears.

Pursuant to the provisions of Article XXVI, the competent authorities of the Contracting States may resolve any difficulties or doubts as to the interpretation or application of the Convention. An agreement by the competent authorities with respect to the meaning of a term used in the Convention would supersede conflicting meanings in the domestic laws of the Contracting States.

#### ARTICLE IV Residence

Article IV provides a detailed definition of the term "resident of a Contracting State." The definition begins with a person's liability to tax as a resident under the respective taxation laws of

the Contracting States. A person who, under those laws, is a resident of one Contracting State and not the other need look no further. However, the Convention definition is also designed to assign residence to one State or the other for purposes of the Convention in circumstances where each of the Contracting States believes a person to be its resident. The Convention definition is, of course, exclusively for purposes of the Convention.

Paragraph 1 provides that the term "resident of a Contracting State" means any person who, under the laws of that State, is liable to tax therein by reason of his domicile, residence, place of management, place of incorporation, or any other criterion of a similar nature. The phrase "any other criterion of a similar nature" includes, for U.S. purposes, an election under the Code to be treated as a U.S. resident. An estate or trust is, however, considered to be a resident of a Contracting State only to the extent that income derived by such estate or trust is liable to tax in that State either in its hands or in the hands of its beneficiaries. To the extent that an estate or trust is considered a resident of a Contracting State under this provision, it can be a "beneficial owner" of items of income specified in other articles of the Convention - e.g., paragraph 2 of Article X (Dividends).

Paragraphs 2, 3, and 4 provide rules to determine a single residence for purposes of the Convention for persons resident in both Contracting States under the rules set forth in paragraph 1. Paragraph 2 deals with individuals. A "dual resident" individual is initially deemed to be a resident of the Contracting State in which he has a permanent home available to him in both States or in neither, he is deemed to be a resident of the Contracting State with which his personal and economic relations are closer. If the personal and economic relations of an individual are not closer to one Contracting State than to the other, the individual is deemed to be a resident of the Contracting State in which he has an habitual abode. If he has such an abode in both States or in neither State, he is deemed to be a resident of the Contracting State of which he is a citizen. If the individual is a citizen of both States or of neither, the competent authorities are to settle the status of the individual by mutual agreement.

Paragraph 3 provides that if, under the provisions of paragraph 1, a company is a resident of both Canada and the United States, then it shall be deemed to be a resident of the State under whose laws (including laws of political subdivisions) it was created. Paragraph 3 does not refer to the State in which a company is organized, thus making clear that the tie-breaker rule for a company is controlled by the State of the company's original creation. Various jurisdictions may allow local incorporation of an entity that is already organized and incorporated under the laws of another country. Paragraph 3 provides certainty in both the United States and Canada with respect to the treatment of such an entity for purposes of the Convention.

Paragraph 4 provides that where, by reason of the provisions of paragraph 1, an estate, trust, or other person, other than an individual or a company, is a resident of both Contracting States, the competent authorities of the States shall by mutual agreement endeavor to settle the question and determine the mode of application of the Convention to such person. This delegation of authority to the competent authorities complements the provisions of Article XXVI (Mutual Agreement Procedure), which implicitly grant such authority.

Paragraph 5 provides a special rule for certain government employees, their spouses, and

dependent children. An individual is deemed to be a resident of a Contracting State if he is an employee of that State or of a political subdivision, local authority, or instrumentality of that State, is rendering services in the discharge of functions of a governmental nature in any State, and is subjected in the first-mentioned State to "similar obligations" in respect of taxes on income as are residents of the first-mentioned State. Paragraph 5 provides further that a spouse and dependent children residing with a government employee and also subject to "similar obligations" in respect of income taxes as residents of the first-mentioned State are also deemed to be residents of that State. Paragraph 5 overrides the normal tie-breaker rule of paragraph 2. A U.S. citizen or resident who is an employee of the U.S. government in a foreign country or who is a spouse or dependent of such employee is considered to be subject in the United States to "similar obligations" in respect of taxes on income as those imposed on residents of the United States, notwithstanding that such person may be entitled to the benefits allowed by sections 911 or 912 of the Code.

## ARTICLE V Permanent Establishment

Paragraph 1 provides that for the purposes of the Convention the term "permanent establishment" means a fixed place of business through which the business of a resident of a Contracting State is wholly or partly carried on. Article V does not use the term "enterprise of a Contracting State," which appears in the 1942 Convention. Thus, paragraph 1 avoids introducing an additional term into the Convention. The omission of the term is not intended to have any implications for the interpretation of the 1942 Convention.

Paragraph 2 provides that the term "permanent establishment" includes especially a place of management, a branch, an office, a factory, a workshop, and a mine, oil or gas well, quarry, or any other place of extraction of natural resources. Paragraph 3 adds that a building site or construction or installation project constitutes a permanent establishment if and only if it lasts for more than 12 months. Paragraph 4 provides that a permanent establishment exists in a Contracting State if the use of an installation or drilling rig or drilling ship in that State to explore for or exploit natural resources lasts for more than 3 months in any 12 month period, but not if such activity exists for a lesser period of time. The competent authorities have entered into an agreement under the 1942 Convention setting forth guidelines as to certain aspects of Canadian taxation of drilling rigs owned by U.S. persons that constitute Canadian permanent establishments. The agreement will be renewed when this Convention enters into force.

Paragraph 5 provides that a person acting in a Contracting State on behalf of a resident of the other Contracting State is deemed to be a permanent establishment of the resident if such person has and habitually exercises in the first-mentioned State the authority to conclude contracts in the name of the resident. This rule does not apply to an agent of independent status, covered by paragraph 7. Under the provisions of paragraph 5, a permanent establishment may exist even in the absence of a fixed place of business. If, however, the activities of a person described in paragraph 5 are limited to the ancillary activities described in paragraph 6, then a permanent establishment does not exist solely on account of the person's activities.

There are a number of minor differences between the provisions of paragraphs 1 through 5 and the analogous provisions of the 1942 Convention. One important deviation is elimination of the rule of the 1942 Convention which deems a permanent establishment to exist in any circumstance where a resident of one State uses substantial equipment in the other State for any period of time. The Convention thus generally raises the threshold for source basis taxation of activities that involve substantial equipment (and that do not otherwise constitute a permanent establishment). Another deviation of some significance is elimination of the rule of the 1942 Convention that considers a permanent establishment to exist where a resident of one State carries on business in the other State through an agent or employee who has a stock of merchandise from which he regularly fills orders that he receives. The Convention provides that a person other than an agent of independent status who is engaged solely in the maintenance of a stock of goods or merchandise belonging to a resident of the other State for the purpose of storage, display or delivery does not constitute a permanent establishment.

Paragraph 6 provides that a fixed place of business used solely for, or an employee described in paragraph 5 engaged solely in, certain specified activities is not a permanent establishment, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs 1, 2, and 5. The specified activities are:

- (a) the use of facilities for the purpose of storage, display, or delivery of goods or merchandise belonging to the resident whose business is being carried on;
- (b) the maintenance of a stock of goods or merchandise belonging to the resident for the purpose of storage, display, or delivery;
- (c) the maintenance of a stock of goods or merchandise belonging to the resident for the purpose of processing by another person;
- (d) the purchase of goods or merchandise, or the collection of information, for the resident; and
- (e) advertising, the supply of information, scientific research, or similar activities which have a preparatory or auxiliary character, for the resident.

Combinations of the specified activities have the same status as any one of the activities. Thus, unlike the OECD Model Convention, a combination of the activities described in subparagraphs 6(a) through 6(e) need not be of a preparatory or auxiliary character (except as required by subparagraph 6(e)) in order to avoid the creation of a permanent establishment. The reference in paragraph 6(e) to specific activities does not imply that any other particular activities - for example, the servicing of a patent or a know-how contract or the inspection of the implementation of engineering plans - do not fall within the scope of paragraph 6(e) provided that, based on the facts and circumstances, such activities have a preparatory or auxiliary character.

Paragraph 7 provides that a resident of a Contracting State is not deemed to have a permanent establishment in the other Contracting State merely because such resident carries on business in the other State through a broker, general commission agent, or any other agent of independent status, provided that such persons are acting in the ordinary course of their business.

Paragraph 8 states that the fact that a company which is a resident of one Contracting State controls or is controlled by a company which is either a resident of the other Contracting State or which is carrying on a business in the other State, whether through a permanent establishment or

otherwise, does not automatically render either company a permanent establishment of the other.

Paragraph 9 provides that, for purposes of the Convention, the provisions of Article V apply in determining whether any person has a permanent establishment in any State. Thus, these provisions would determine whether a person other than a resident of Canada or the United States has a permanent establishment in Canada or the United States, and whether a person resident in Canada or the United States, has a permanent establishment in a third State.

## ARTICLE VI Income from Real Property

Paragraph 1 provides that income derived by a resident of a Contracting State from real property situated in the other Contracting State may be taxed by that other State. Income from real property includes, for purposes of Article VI, income from agriculture, forestry or other natural resources. Also, while "income derived .... from real property" includes income from rights such as an overriding royalty or a net profits interest in a natural resource, it does not include income in the form of rights to explore for or exploit natural resources which a party receives as compensation for services (e.g., exploration services); the latter income is subject to the provisions of Article VII (Business Profits), XIV (Independent Personal Services), or XV (Dependent Personal Services), as the case may be. As provided by paragraph 3, paragraph 1 applies to income derived from the direct use, letting or use in any other form of real property and to income from the alienation of such property.

Generally speaking, the term "real property" has the meaning which it has under the taxation laws of the Contracting State in which the property in question is situated, in accordance with paragraph 2. In any case, the term includes any option or similar right in respect of real property, the usufruct of real property, and rights to explore for or to exploit mineral deposits, sources, and other natural resources. The reference to "rights to explore for or to exploit mineral deposits, sources and other natural resources" includes rights generating either variable (e.g., computed by reference to the amount of value or production) or fixed payments. The term "real property" does not include ships and aircraft.

Unlike Article XIII A of the 1942 Convention, Article VI does not contain an election to allow a resident of a Contracting State to compute tax on income from real property situated in the other State on a net basis. Both the Internal Revenue Code and the Income Tax Act of Canada generally allow for net basis taxation with respect to real estate rental income, although Canada does not permit such an election for natural resource royalties. Also, unlike the 1942 Convention which in Article XI imposes a 15 percent limitation on the source basis taxation of rental or royalty income from real property, Article VI of the Convention allows a Contracting State to impose tax on such income under its internal law. In Canada the rate of tax on resource royalties is 25 percent of the gross amount of the royalty, if the income is not attributable to a business carried on in Canada. In an exchange of notes to the Protocol, the United States and Canada agreed to resume negotiations, upon request by either country, to provide an appropriate limit on taxation in the State of source if either country subsequently increases its statutory tax rate now applicable to such royalties (25 percent in the case of Canada and 30 percent in the case of the

United States).

## ARTICLE VII Business Profits

Paragraph 1 provides that business profits of a resident of a Contracting State are taxable only in that State unless the resident carries on business in the other Contracting State through a permanent establishment situated in that other State. If the resident carries on, or has carried on, business through such a permanent establishment, the other State may tax such business profits but only so much of them as are attributable to the permanent establishment. The reference to a prior permanent establishment ("or has carried on") makes clear that a Contracting State in which a permanent establishment existed has the right to tax the business profits attributable to that permanent establishment, even if there is a delay in the receipt or accrual of such profits until after the permanent establishment has been terminated.

Any business profits received or accrued in taxable years in which the Convention has effect, in accordance with Article XXX (Entry Into Force), which are attributable to a permanent establishment that was previously terminated are subject to tax in the Contracting State in which such permanent establishment existed under the provisions of Article VII.

Paragraph 2 provides that where a resident of either Canada or the United States carries on business in the other Contracting State through a permanent establishment in that other State, both Canada and the United States shall attribute to that permanent establishment business profits which the permanent establishment might be expected to make if it were a distinct and separate person engaged in the same or similar activities under the same or similar conditions and dealing wholly independently with the resident and with any other person related to the resident. The term "related to the resident" is to be interpreted in accordance with paragraph 2 of Article IX (Related Persons). The reference to other related persons is intended to make clear that the test of paragraph 2 is not restricted to independence between a permanent establishment and a home office.

Paragraph 3 provides that, in determining business profits of a permanent establishment, there are to be allowed as deductions those expenses which are incurred for the purposes of the permanent establishment, including executive and administrative expenses, whether incurred in the State in which the permanent establishment is situated or in any other State. However, nothing in the paragraph requires Canada or the United States to allow a deduction for any expenditure which would not generally be allowed as a deduction under its taxation laws. The language of this provision differs from that of paragraph 1 of Article III of the 1942 Convention, which states that in the determination of net industrial and commercial profits of a permanent establishment there shall be allowed as deductions "all expenses, wherever incurred" as long as such expenses are reasonably allocable to the permanent establishment. Paragraph 3 of Article VII of the Convention is not intended to have any implications for interpretation of the 1942 Convention, but is intended to assure that under the Convention deductions are allowed by a Contracting State which are generally allowable by that State.

Paragraph 4 provides that no business profits are to be attributed to a permanent establishment of a resident of a Contracting State by reason of the use of the permanent establishment for merely purchasing goods or merchandise or merely providing executive, managerial, or administrative facilities or services for the resident. Thus, if a company resident in a Contracting State has a permanent establishment in the other State, and uses the permanent establishment for the mere performance of stewardship or other managerial services carried on for the benefit of the resident, this activity will not result in profits being attributed to the permanent establishment.

Paragraph 5 provides that business profits are to be attributed to a permanent establishment by the same method in every taxable period unless there is good and sufficient reason to change such method. In the United States, such a change may be a change in accounting method requiring the approval of the Internal Revenue Service.

Paragraph 6 explains the relationship between the provisions of Article VII and other provisions of the Convention. Where business profits include items of income which are dealt with separately in other Articles of the Convention, those other Articles are controlling.

Paragraph 7 provides a definition for the term "attributable to". Profits "attributable to" a permanent establishment are those derived from the assets or activities of the permanent establishment. Paragraph 7 does not preclude Canada or the United States from using appropriate domestic tax law rules of attribution. The "attributable to" definition does not, for example, preclude a taxpayer from using the rules of section 1, 864-4(c)(5) of the Treasury Regulations to assure for U.S. tax purposes that interest arising in the United States is attributable to a permanent establishment in the United States. (Interest arising outside the United States is attributable to a permanent establishment in the United States based on the principles of Regulations sections 1.864-5 and 1.864-6 and Revenue Ruling 75-253, 1975-2 C.B. 203.) Income that would be taxable under the Code and that is "attributable to" a permanent establishment under paragraph 7 is taxable pursuant to Article VII, however, even if such income might under the Code be treated as fixed or determinable annual or periodical gains or income not effectively connected with the conduct of a trade or business within the United States. The "attributable to" definition means that the limited "force-of-attraction" rule of Code section 864(c)(3) does not apply for U.S. tax purposes under the Convention.

## ARTICLE VIII Transportation

Paragraph 1 provides that profits derived by a resident of a Contracting State from the operation of ships or aircraft in international traffic are exempt from tax in the other Contracting State, even if, under Article VII (Business Profits), such profits are attributable to a permanent establishment. Paragraph 1 also provides that gains derived by a resident of a Contracting State from the alienation of ships, aircraft or containers (including trailers and related equipment for the transport of containers) used principally in international traffic are exempt from tax in the other Contracting State even if, under Article XIII (Gains), those gains would be taxable in that other State. These rules differ from Article V of the 1942 Convention, which conditions the exemption

in the State of source on registration of the ship or aircraft in the other State. Paragraph 1 also applies notwithstanding the provisions of Article XII (Royalties). Thus, to the extent that profits described in paragraph 2 would also fall within Article XII (Royalties) (e.g., rent from the lease of a container), the provisions of Article VIII are controlling.

Paragraph 2(a) provides that profits covered by paragraph 1 include profits from the rental of ships or aircraft operated in international traffic. Such rental profits are included whether the rental is on a time, voyage, or bareboat basis, and irrespective of the State of residence of the operator.

Paragraph 2(b) provides that profits covered by paragraph 1 include profits derived from the use, maintenance or rental of containers, including trailers and related equipment for the transport of containers, if such containers are used in international traffic.

Paragraph 2(c) provides that profits covered by paragraph 1 include profits derived by a resident of a Contracting State from the rental of ships, aircraft, or containers (including trailers and related equipment for the transport of containers), even if not operated in international traffic, as long as such profits are incidental to profits of such person referred to in paragraphs 1, 2(a), or 2(b).

Paragraph 3 states that profits derived by a resident of a Contracting State from a voyage of a ship where the principal purpose of the voyage is to transport passengers or property between points in the other Contracting State is taxable in that other State, whether or not the resident maintains a permanent establishment there. Paragraph 3 overrides the provisions of Article VII. Profits from such a voyage do not qualify for exemption under Article VIII by virtue of the definition of "international traffic" in paragraph 1(h) of Article III (General Definitions). However, profits from a similar voyage by aircraft are taxable in the Contracting State of source only if the profits are attributable to a permanent establishment maintained in that State.

Paragraph 4 provides that profits derived by a resident of a Contracting State engaged in the operation of motor vehicles or a railway as a common carrier or contract carrier, and attributable to the transportation of passengers or property between a point outside the other Contracting State and any other point are exempt from tax in that other State. In addition, profits of such a person from the rental of motor vehicles (including trailers) or railway rolling stock, or from the use, maintenance, or rental of containers (including trailers and related equipment for the transport of containers) used to transport passengers or property between a point outside the other Contracting State and any other point are exempt from tax in that other State.

Paragraph 5 provides that a resident of a Contracting State that participates in a pool, a joint business, or an international operating agency is subject to the provisions of paragraphs 1, 3, and 4 with respect to the profits or gains referred to in paragraphs 1, 3, and 4.

Paragraph 6 states that profits derived by a resident of a Contracting State from the use, maintenance, or rental of railway rolling stock, motor vehicles, trailers, or containers (including trailers and related equipment for the transport of containers) used in the other Contracting State for a period not expected to exceed 183 days in the aggregate in any 12-month period are exempt

from tax in that other State except to the extent that the profits are attributable to a permanent establishment, in which case the State of source has the right to tax under Article VII. The provisions of paragraph 6, unlike the provisions of paragraph 4, apply whether or not the resident is engaged in the operation of motor vehicles or a railway as a common carrier or contract carrier. Paragraph 6 overrides the provisions of Article XII (Royalties), which would otherwise permit taxation in the State of source in the circumstances described.

Gains from the alienation of motor vehicles and railway rolling stock derived by a resident of a Contracting State are not affected by paragraph 4 or 6. Such gains would be taxable in the other Contracting State, however, only if the motor vehicles or rolling stock formed part of a permanent establishment maintained there. See paragraphs 2 and 4 of Article XIII.

## ARTICLE IX Related Persons

Paragraph 1 authorizes Canada and the United States, as the case may be, to adjust the amount of income, loss, or tax payable by a person with respect to arrangements between that person and a related person in the other Contracting State. Such adjustment may be made when arrangements between related persons differ from those that would obtain between unrelated persons. The term "person" encompasses a company resident in a third State with, for example, a permanent establishment in a Contracting State.

Paragraph 2 provides that, for the purposes of Article IX, a person is deemed to be related to another person if either participates directly or indirectly in the management or control of the other or if any third person or persons participate directly or indirectly in the management or control of both. Thus, if a resident of any State controls directly or indirectly a company resident in Canada and a company resident in the United States, such companies are considered to be related persons for purposes of Article IX. Article IX and the definition of "related person" in paragraph 2 may encompass situations that would not be covered by provisions in the domestic laws of the Contracting States. Nor is the paragraph 2 definition controlling for the definition of "related person" or similar terms appearing in other Articles of the Convention. Those terms are defined as provided in paragraph 2 of Article III (General Definitions).

Paragraph 3 provides that where, pursuant to paragraph 1, an adjustment is made or to be made by a Contracting State, the other Contracting State shall make a corresponding adjustment to the income, loss, or tax of the related person in that other State, provided that the other State agrees with the adjustment and, within six years from the end of the taxable year of the person in the first State to which the adjustment relates, the competent authority of the other State has been notified in writing of the adjustment. The reference to an adjustment which "is made or to be made" does not require a Contracting State to formally propose an adjustment before paragraph 3 becomes pertinent. The notification required by paragraph 3 may be made by any of the related persons involved or by the competent authority of the State which makes or is to make the initial adjustment. The notification must give details regarding the adjustment sufficient to apprise the competent authority receiving the notification of the nature of the adjustment. If the requirements of paragraph 3 are complied with, the corresponding adjustment will be made by the other

Contracting State notwithstanding any time or procedural limitations in the domestic law of that State.

Paragraph 4 provides that in a case where the other Contracting State has not been notified as provided in paragraph 3 and if the person whose income, loss, or tax is being adjusted has not received notification of the adjustment within five and one-half years from the end of its taxable year to which the adjustment relates, such adjustment shall not be made to the extent that the adjustment would give rise to double taxation between the United States and Canada. Again, the notification referred to in this paragraph need not be a formal adjustment, but it must be in writing and must contain sufficient details to permit the taxpayer to give the notification referred to in paragraph 3.

If, for example, the Internal Revenue Service proposes to make an adjustment to the income of a U.S. company pursuant to Code section 482, and the adjustment involves an allocation of income from a related Canadian company, the competent authority of Canada must receive written notification of the proposed IRS adjustment within six years from the end of the taxable year of the U.S. company to which the adjustment relates. If such notification is not received in a timely fashion and if the U.S. company does not receive written notification of the adjustment from the IRS within 5-1/2 years from the end of its relevant taxable year, the IRS will unilaterally recede on the proposed section 482 adjustment to the extent that this adjustment would otherwise give rise to double taxation between the United States and Canada. The Internal Revenue Service will determine whether and to what extent the adjustment would give rise to double taxation with respect to income arising in Canada by examining the relevant facts and circumstances such as the amount of foreign tax credits attributable to Canadian taxes paid by the U.S. company, including any carry-overs and credits for deemed paid taxes.

Paragraph 5 provides that neither a corresponding adjustment described in paragraph 3 nor the canceling of an adjustment described in paragraph 4 will be made in any case of fraud, willful default, neglect, or gross negligence on the part of the taxpayer or any related person.

Paragraphs 3 and 4 of Article IX are exceptions to the "saving clause" contained in paragraph 2 of Article XXIX (Miscellaneous Rules), as provided in paragraph 3(a) of Article XXIX. Paragraphs 3 and 4 of Article IX apply to adjustments made or to be made with respect to taxable years for which the Convention has effect as provided in paragraphs 2 and 5 of Article XXX (Entry Into Force).

## ARTICLE X Dividends

Paragraph 1 allows a Contracting State to impose tax on its residents with respect to dividends paid by a company which is a resident of the other Contracting State.

Paragraph 2 limits the amount of tax that may be imposed on such dividends by the Contracting State in which the company paying the dividends is resident if the beneficial owner of the dividends is a resident of the other Contracting State. The limitation is 10 percent of the gross

amount of the dividends if the beneficial owner is a company that owns 10 percent or more of the voting stock of the company paying the dividends; and 15 percent of the gross amount of the dividends in all other cases. Paragraph 2 does not impose any restrictions with respect to taxation of the profits out of which the dividends are paid.

Paragraph 3 defines the term "dividends," as the term is used in this Article. Each Contracting State is permitted to apply its domestic law rules for differentiating dividends from interest and other disbursements.

Paragraph 4 provides that the limitations of paragraph 2 do not apply if the beneficial owner of the dividends carries on business in the State in which the company paying the dividends is a resident through a permanent establishment or fixed base situated there, and the stock holding in respect of which the dividends are paid is effectively connected with such permanent establishment or fixed base. In such a case, the dividends are taxable pursuant to the provisions of Article VII (Business Profits) or Article XIV (Independent Personal Services), as the case may be. Thus, dividends paid in respect of holdings forming part of the assets of a permanent establishment or fixed base or which are otherwise effectively connected with such permanent establishment or fixed base (i.e., dividends attributable to the permanent establishment or fixed base) will be taxed on a net basis using the rates and rules of taxation generally applicable to residents of the State in which the permanent establishment or fixed base is situated.

Paragraph 5 imposes limitations on the right of Canada or the United States, as the case may be, to impose tax on dividends paid by a company which is a resident of the other Contracting State. The State in which the company is not resident may not tax such dividends except insofar as they are paid to a resident of that State or the holding in respect of which the dividends are paid is effectively connected with a permanent establishment or fixed base in that State. In the case of the United States such dividends may also be in the hands of a U.S. citizen and certain former citizens, pursuant the "saving clause" of paragraph 2 of Article XXIX (Miscellaneous Rules). In addition, the Contracting State in which the company is not resident may not subject such company's undistributed profits to any tax. See, however, paragraphs 6, 7, and 8 which, in certain circumstances, qualify the rules of paragraph 5. Neither paragraph 5 nor any other provision of the Convention restricts the ability of the United States to apply the provisions of the Code concerning foreign personal holding companies and controlled foreign corporations.

Paragraph 6 provides that, notwithstanding paragraph 5, a Contracting State in which is maintained permanent establishment or permanent establishments of a company resident in the other Contracting State may impose tax on such company's earnings, in addition to the tax that would be charged on the earnings of a company resident in that State. The additional tax may not, however, exceed 10 percent of amount of the earnings which have not been subjected to such additional tax in previous taxation years. Thus, Canada, which has a branch profits tax in force, may impose that tax up to the 10 percent limitation in the case of a United States company with one or more permanent establishments in Canada. This branch profits tax may be imposed notwithstanding other rules of the Convention, including paragraph 6 of Article XXV (Non-Discrimination).

For purposes of paragraph 6, the term "earnings" means the excess of business profits attributable to all permanent establishments for a year and previous years over the sum of:

- (a) business losses attributable to such permanent establishments for such years;
- (b) all taxes on profits, whether or not covered by the Convention (e.g., provincial taxes on profits and provincial resource royalties (which Canada considers "taxes") in excess of the mineral resource allowance provided for under the law of Canada), other than the additional tax referred to in paragraph 6;
- (c) profits reinvested in such State; and
- (d) \$500,000 (Canadian, or its equivalent in U.S. dollars) less any amounts deducted under paragraph 6(d) with respect to the same or a similar business by the company or an associated company.

The deduction under paragraph 6(d) is available as of the first year for which the Convention has effect, regardless of the prior earnings and tax expenses, if any, of the permanent establishment. The \$500,000 deduction is taken into account after other deductions, and is permanent. For the purpose of paragraph 6, references to business profits and business losses include gains and losses from the alienation of property forming part of the business property of a permanent establishment. The term "associated company" includes a company which directly or indirectly controls another company or two companies directly or indirectly controlled by the same person or persons, as well as any two companies that deal with each other not at arm's length. This definition differs from the definition of "related persons" in paragraph 2 of Article IX (Related Persons).

Paragraph 7 provides that, notwithstanding paragraph 5, a Contracting State that does not impose a branch profits tax as described in paragraph 6 (i.e., under current law, the United States) may tax a dividend paid by a company which is a resident of the other Contracting State if at least 50 percent of the company's gross income from all sources was included in the computation of business profits attributable to one or more permanent establishments which such company had in the first-mentioned State. The dividend subject to such a tax must, however, be attributable to profits earned by the company in taxable years beginning after September 26, 1980 and the 50 percent test must be met for the three-year period preceding the taxable year of the company in which the dividend is declared (including years ending on or before September 26, 1980) or such shorter period as the company had been in existence prior to that taxable year. Dividends will be deemed to be distributed, for purposes of paragraph 7, first out of profits of the taxation year of the company in which the distribution is made and then out of the profits of the preceding year or years of the company. Paragraph 7 provides further that if a resident of the other Contracting State is the beneficial owner of such dividends, any tax imposed under paragraph 7 is subject to the 10 or 15 percent limitation of paragraph 2 or the rules of paragraph 4 (providing for dividends to be taxed as business profits or income from independent personal services), as the case may be.

Paragraph 8 provides that, notwithstanding paragraph 5, a company which is a resident of Canada and which, absent the provisions of the Convention, has income subject to tax by the United States may be liable for the United States accumulated earnings tax and personal holding company tax. These taxes can be applied, however, only if 50 percent or more in value of the outstanding voting shares of the company is owned, directly or indirectly, throughout the last half of its taxable year by residents of a third State or by citizens or residents of the United States,

other than citizens of Canada who are resident in the United States but who either do not have immigrant status in the United States or who have not been resident in the United States for more than three taxable years. The accumulated earnings tax is applied to accumulated taxable income calculated without the benefits of the Convention. Similarly, the personal holding company tax is applied to undistributed personal holding company income computed as if the Convention had not come into force.

Article X does not apply to dividends paid by a company which is not a resident of either Contracting State. Such dividends, if they are income of a resident of one of the Contracting States, are subject to tax as provided in Article XXII (Other Income).

## ARTICLE XI

### Interest

Paragraph 1 allows interest arising in Canada or the United States and paid to a resident of the other State to be taxed in the latter State. Paragraph 2 provides that such interest may also be taxed in the Contracting State where it arises, but if a resident of the other Contracting State is the beneficial owner, the tax imposed by the State of source is limited to 15 percent of the gross amount of the interest.

Paragraph 3 provides a number of exceptions to the right of the source State to impose a 15 percent tax under paragraph 2. The following types of interest beneficially owned by a resident of a Contracting State are exempt from tax in the State of source:

- (a) interest beneficially owned by a Contracting State, a political subdivision, or a local authority thereof, or an instrumentality of such State, subdivision, or authority, which interest is not subject to tax by such State;
- (b) interest beneficially owned by a resident of a Contracting State and paid with respect to debt obligations issued at arm's length which are guaranteed or insured by such State or a political subdivision thereof, or by an instrumentality of such State or subdivision (not by a local authority or an instrumentality thereof), but only if the guarantor or insurer is not subject to tax by that State;
- (c) interest paid by a Contracting State, a political subdivision, or a local authority thereof, or by an instrumentality of such State, subdivision, or authority, but only if the payor is not subject to tax by such State; and
- (d) interest beneficially owned by a seller of equipment, merchandise, or services, but only if the interest is paid in connection with a sale on credit of equipment, merchandise, or services and the sale was made at arm's length.

Whether such a transaction is made at arm's length will be determined in the United States under the facts and circumstances. The relationship between the parties is a factor, but not the only factor, taken into account in making this determination. Furthermore, interest paid by a company resident in the other Contracting State with respect to an obligation entered into before September 26, 1980 is exempt from tax in the State of source (irrespective of the State of residence of the beneficial owner), provided that such interest would have been exempt from tax in the Contracting State of source under Article XII of the 1942 Convention. Thus, interest paid by a

United States corporation whose business is not managed and controlled in Canada to a recipient not resident in Canada or to a corporation not managed and controlled in Canada would be exempt from Canadian tax as long as the debt obligation was entered into before September 26, 1980. The phrase "not subject to tax by that State" in paragraph 3(a), (b), and (c) refers to taxation at the Federal levels of Canada and the United States.

The phrase "obligation entered into before the date of signature of this Convention" means:

- (1) any obligation under which funds were dispersed prior to September 26, 1980;
- (2) any obligation under which funds are dispersed on or after September 26, 1980, pursuant to a written contract binding prior to and on such date, and at all times thereafter until the obligation is satisfied; or
- (3) any obligation with respect to which, prior to September 26, 1980, a lender had taken every action to signify approval under procedures ordinarily employed by such lender in similar transactions and had sent or deposited for delivery to the person to whom the loan is to be made written evidence of such approval in the form of a document setting forth, or referring to a document sent by the person to whom the loan is to be made that sets forth, the principal terms of such loan.

Paragraph 4 defines the term "interest," as used in Article XI, to include, among other things, debt claims of every kind as well as income assimilated to income from money lent by the taxation laws of the Contracting State in which the income arises. In no event, however, is income dealt with in Article X (Dividends) to be considered interest.

Paragraph 5 provides that neither the 15 percent limitation on tax in the Contracting State of source provided in paragraph 2 nor the various exemptions from tax in such State provided in paragraph 3 apply if the beneficial owner of the interest is a resident of the other Contracting State carrying on business in the State of source through a permanent establishment or fixed base, and the debt claim in respect of which the interest is paid is effectively connected with such permanent establishment or fixed base (i.e., the interest is attributable to the permanent establishment or fixed base). In this case, interest income is to be taxed in the Contracting State of source as business profits - that is, on a net basis.

Paragraph 6 establishes the source of interest for purposes of Article XI. Interest is considered to arise in a Contracting State if the payer is that State, or a political subdivision, local authority, or resident of that State. However, in cases where the person paying the interest, whether a resident of a Contracting State or of a third State, has in a State other than that of which he is a resident a permanent establishment or fixed base in connection with which the indebtedness on which the interest was paid was incurred, and such interest is borne by the permanent establishment or fixed base, then such interest is deemed to arise in the State in which the permanent establishment or fixed base is situated and not in the State of the payer's residence. Thus, pursuant to paragraphs 6 and 2, and Article XXII (Other Income), Canadian tax will not be imposed on interest paid to a U.S. resident by a company resident in Canada if the indebtedness is incurred in connection with, and the interest is borne by, a permanent establishment of the company situated in a third State. "Borne by" means allowable as a deduction in computing taxable income.

Paragraph 7 provides that in cases involving special relationships between persons Article XI does not apply to amounts in excess of the amount which would have been agreed upon between persons having no special relationship; any such excess amount remains taxable according to the laws of Canada and the United States, consistent with any relevant provisions of the Convention.

Paragraph 8 restricts the right of a Contracting State to impose tax on interest paid by a resident of the other Contracting State. The first State may not impose any tax on such interest except insofar as the interest is paid to a resident of that State or arises in that State or the debt claim in respect of which the interest is paid is effectively connected with a permanent establishment or fixed base situated in that State. Thus, pursuant to paragraph 8 the United States has agreed not to impose tax on certain interest paid by Canadian companies to persons not resident in the United States, to the extent that such companies would pay U.S.- source interest under Code section 861(a)(1)(C) but not under the source rule of paragraph 6. It is to be noted that paragraph 8 is subject to the "saving clause" of paragraph 2 of Article XXIX (Miscellaneous Rules), so the United States may in all events impose its tax on interest received by U.S. citizens.

## ARTICLE XII

### Royalties

Generally speaking, under the 1942 Convention royalties, including royalties with respect to motion picture films, which are derived by a resident of one Contracting State from sources within the other Contracting State are taxed at a maximum rate of 15 percent in the latter State; copyright royalties are exempt from tax in the State of source, if the resident does not have a permanent establishment in that State. See Articles II, III, XIII C, and paragraph 1 of Article XI of the 1942 Convention, and paragraph 6(a) of the Protocol the 1942 Convention.

Paragraph 1 of Article XII of the Convention provides that a Contracting State may tax its residents with respect to royalties arising in the other Contracting State. Paragraph 2 provides that such royalties may also be taxed in the Contracting State in which they arise, but that if a resident of the other Contracting State is the beneficial owner of the royalties the tax in the Contracting State of source is limited to 10 percent of the gross amount of the royalties.

Paragraph 3 provides that, notwithstanding paragraph 2, copyright royalties and other like payments in respect of the production or reproduction of any literary, dramatic, musical, or artistic work, including royalties from such works on videotape or other means of reproduction for private (home) use, if beneficially owned by a resident of the other Contracting State, may not be taxed by the Contracting State of source. This exemption at source does not apply to royalties in respect of motion pictures, and of works on film, videotape or other means of reproduction for use in connection with television broadcasting. Such royalties are subject to tax at a maximum rate of 10 percent in the Contracting State in which they arise, as provided in paragraph 2 (unless the provisions of paragraph 5, described below, apply).

Paragraph 4 defines the term "royalties" for purposes of Article XII. "Royalties" means

payments of any kind received as consideration for the use of or the right to use any copyright of literary, artistic, or scientific work, including motion pictures, and works on film, videotape or other means of reproduction for use in connection with television broadcasting, any patent, trademark, design or model, plan, secret formula or process, or any payment for the use of or the right to use tangible personal property or for information concerning industrial, commercial, or scientific experience. The term "royalties" also includes gains from the alienation of any intangible property or rights described in paragraph 4 to the extent that such gains are contingent on the productivity, use, or subsequent disposition of such intangible property or rights. Thus, a guaranteed minimum payment derived from the alienation of (but not the use of) any right or property described in paragraph 4 is not a "royalty." Any amounts deemed contingent on use by reason of Code section 871(e) are, however, royalties under paragraph 2 of Article III (General Definitions), subject to Article XXVI (Mutual Agreement Procedure). The term "royalties" does not encompass management fees, which are covered by the provisions of Article VII (Business Profits) or XIV (Independent Personal Services), or payments under a bona fide cost - sharing arrangement. Technical service fees may be royalties in cases where the fees are periodic and dependent upon productivity or a similar measure.

Paragraph 5 provides that the 10 percent limitation on tax in the Contracting State of source provided by paragraph 2, and the exemption in the Contracting State of source for certain copyright royalties provided by paragraph 3, do not apply if the beneficial owner of the royalties carries on business in the State of source through a permanent establishment or fixed base and the right or property in respect of which the royalties are paid is effectively connected with such permanent establishment or fixed base (i.e., the royalties are attributable to the permanent establishment or fixed base). In that event, the royalty income would be taxable under the provisions of Article VII (Business Profits) or XIV (Independent Personal Services), as the case may be.

Paragraph 6 establishes rules to determine the source of royalties for purposes of Article XII. The first rule is that royalties arise in a Contracting State when the payer is that State, or a political subdivision, local authority, or resident of that State. Notwithstanding that rule, royalties arise not in the State of the payer's residence but in any State, whether or not a Contracting State, in which is situated a permanent establishment or fixed base in connection with which the obligation to pay royalties was incurred, if such royalties are borne by such permanent establishment or fixed base. Thus, royalties paid to a resident of the United States by a company resident in Canada for the use of property in a third State will not be subject to tax in Canada if the obligation to pay the royalties is incurred in connection with, and the royalties are borne by, a permanent establishment of the company in a third State. "Borne by" means allowable as a deduction in computing taxable income.

A third rule, which overrides both the residence rule and the permanent establishment rule just described, provides that royalties for the use of, or the right to use, intangible property or tangible personal property in a Contracting State arise in that State. Thus, consistent with the provisions of Code section 861(a)(4), if a resident of a third State pays royalties to a resident of Canada for the use of or the right to use intangible property or tangible personal property in the United States, such royalties are considered to arise in the United States and are subject to taxation by the United States consistent with the Convention. Similarly, if a resident of Canada

pays royalties to a resident of a third State, such royalties are considered to arise in the United States and are subject to U.S. taxation if they are for the use of or the right to use intangible property or tangible personal property in the United States. The term "intangible property" encompasses all the items described in paragraph 4, other than tangible personal property.

Paragraph 7 provides that in cases involving special relationships between persons the benefits of Article XII do not apply to amounts in excess of the amount which would have been agreed upon between persons with no special relationship; any such excess amount remains taxable according to the laws of Canada and the United States, consistent with any relevant provisions of the Convention.

Paragraph 8 restricts the right of a Contracting State to impose tax on royalties paid by a resident of the other Contracting State. The first State may not impose any tax on such royalties except insofar as they arise in that State or they are paid to a resident of that State or the right or property in respect of which the royalties are paid is effectively connected with a permanent establishment or fixed base situated in that State. This rule parallels the rule in paragraph 8 of Article XI (Interest) and paragraph 5 of Article X (Dividends). Again, U.S. citizens remain subject to U.S. taxation on royalties received despite this rule, by virtue of paragraph 2 of Article XXIX (Miscellaneous Rules).

## ARTICLE XIII

### Gains

Paragraph 1 provides that Canada and the United States may each tax gains from the alienation of real property situated within that State which are derived by a resident of the other Contracting State. The term "real property situated in the other Contracting State" is defined for this purpose in paragraph 3 of this Article. The term "alienation" used in paragraph 1 and other paragraphs of Article XIII means sales, exchanges and other dispositions or deemed dispositions (e.g., change of use, gifts, distributions, death) that are taxable events under the taxation laws of the Contracting State applying the provisions of the Article.

Paragraph 2 of Article XIII provides that the Contracting State in which a resident of the other Contracting State "has or had" a permanent establishment or fixed base may tax gains from the alienation of personal property constituting business property if such gains are attributable to such permanent establishment or fixed base. Unlike paragraph 1 of Article VII (Business Profits), paragraph 2 limits the right of the source State to tax such gains to a twelve-month period following the termination of the permanent establishment or fixed base.

Paragraph 3 provides a definition of the term "real property situated in the other Contracting State." Where the United States is the other Contracting State, the term includes real property (as defined in Article VI (Income from Real Property)) situated in the United States and a United States real property interest. Thus, the United States retains the ability to exercise its full taxing right under the Foreign Investment in Real Property Tax Act (Code section 897). (For a transition rule from the 1942 Convention, see paragraph 9 of this Article.)

Where Canada is the other Contracting State, the term means real property (as defined in Article VI) situated in Canada; shares of stock of a company, the value of whose shares consists principally of Canadian real property; and an interest in a partnership, trust or estate, the value of which consists principally of Canadian real property. The term "principally" means more than 50 percent. Taxation in Canada is preserved through several tiers of entities if the value of the company's shares or the partnership, trust or estate is ultimately dependent principally upon real property situated in Canada.

Paragraph 4 reserves to the Contracting State of residence the sole right to tax gains from the alienation of any property other than property referred to in paragraphs 1, 2, and 3.

Paragraph 5 states that, despite paragraph 4, a Contracting State may impose tax on gains derived by an individual who is a resident of the other Contracting State if such individual was a resident of the first-mentioned State for 120 months (whether or not consecutive) during any period of 20 consecutive years preceding the alienation of the property, and was a resident of that State at any time during the 10-year period immediately preceding the alienation of the property. The property (or property received in substitution in a tax-free transaction in the first-mentioned State) must have been owned by the individual at the time he ceased to be a resident of the first-mentioned State.

Paragraph 6 provides a rule to coordinate Canadian and United States taxation of gains from the alienation of a principal residence situated in Canada. An individual (not a citizen of the United States) who was a resident of Canada and becomes a resident of the United States may determine his liability for U.S. income tax purposes in respect of gain from the alienation of a principal residence in Canada owned by him at the time he ceased to be a resident of Canada by claiming an adjusted basis for such residence in an amount no less than the fair market value of the residence at that time. Under paragraph 2(b) of Article XXX, the rule of paragraph 6 applies to gains realized for U.S. income tax purposes in taxable years beginning on or after the first day of January next following the date when instruments of ratification are exchanged, even if a particular individual described in paragraph 6 ceased to be a resident of Canada prior to such date. Paragraph 6 supplements any benefits available to a taxpayer pursuant to the provisions of the Code, e.g., section 1034.

Paragraph 7 provides a rule to coordinate U.S. and Canadian taxation of gains in circumstances where an individual is subject to tax in both Contracting States and one Contracting State deems a taxable alienation of property by such person to have occurred, while the other Contracting State at that time does not find a realization or recognition of income and thus defers, but does not forgive taxation. In such a case the individual may elect in his annual return of income for the year of such alienation to be liable to tax in the latter Contracting State as if he had sold and repurchased the property for an amount equal to its fair market value at a time immediately prior to the deemed alienation. The provision would, for example, apply in the case of a gift by a U.S. citizen or a U.S. resident individual which Canada deems to be an income producing event for its tax purposes but with respect to which the United States defers taxation while assigning the donor's basis to the donee. The provision would also apply in the case of a U.S. citizen who, for Canadian tax purposes, is deemed to recognize income upon his departure from Canada, but not to a Canadian resident (not a U.S. citizen) who is deemed to recognize such

income. The rule does not apply in the case death, although Canada also deems that to be a taxable event, because the United States in effect forgives income taxation of economic gains at death. If in one Contracting State there are losses and gains from deemed alienations of different properties, then paragraph 7 must be applied consistently in the other Contracting State within the taxable period with respect to all such properties. Paragraph 7 only applies, however, if the deemed alienations of the properties result in a net gain.

Paragraph 8 concerns the coordination of Canadian and U.S. rules with respect to the recognition of gain on corporate organizations, reorganizations, amalgamations, divisions, and similar transactions. Where a resident of a Contracting State alienates property in such a transaction, and profit, gain, or income with respect to such alienation is not recognized for income tax purposes in the Contracting State of residence, the competent authority of the other Contracting State may agree, pursuant to paragraph 8, if requested by the person who acquires the property, to defer recognition of the profit, gain, or income with respect to such property for income tax purposes. This deferral shall be for such time and under such other conditions as are stipulated between the person who acquires the property and the competent authority. The agreement of the competent authority of the State of source is entirely discretionary and will be granted only to the extent necessary to avoid double taxation of income. This provision means, for example, that the United States competent authority may agree to defer recognition of gain with respect to a transaction if the alienator would otherwise recognize gain for U.S. tax purposes and would not recognize gain under Canada's law. The provision only applies, however, if alienations described in paragraph 8 result in a net gain. In the absence of extraordinary circumstances the provisions of the paragraph must be applied consistently within a taxable period with respect to alienations described in the paragraph that take place within that period.

Paragraph 9 provides a transitional rule reflecting the fact that under Article VIII of the 1942 Convention gains from the sale or exchange of capital assets are exempt from taxation in the State of source provided the taxpayer had no permanent establishment in that State. Paragraph 9 applies to deemed, as well as actual, alienations or dispositions. In addition, paragraph 9 applies to a gain described in paragraph 1, even though such gain is also income within the meaning of paragraph 3 of Article VI. Paragraph 9 will apply to transactions notwithstanding section 1125(c) of the Foreign Investment in Real Property Tax Act, Public Law 96-499 (“FIRPTA”).

Paragraph 9 applies to capital assets alienated by a resident of a Contracting State if

- (a) that person owned the asset on September 26, 1980 and was a resident of that Contracting State on September 26, 1980 (and at all times after that date until the alienation), or
- (b) the asset was acquired by that person in an alienation of property which qualified as a non-recognition transaction for tax purposes in the other Contracting State.

For purposes of subparagraph 9(b), a non-recognition transaction is a transaction in which gain resulting therefrom is, in effect, deferred for tax purposes, but is not permanently forgiven. Thus, in the United States, certain tax-free organizations, reorganizations, liquidations and like kind exchanges will qualify as non-recognition transactions. However, a transfer of property at death will not constitute a non-recognition transaction, since any gain due to appreciation in the property is permanently forgiven in the United States due to the fair market value basis taken by

the recipient of the property. If a transaction is a non-recognition transaction for tax purposes, the transfer of non-qualified property, or "boot," which may cause some portion of the gain on the transaction to be recognized, will not cause the transaction to lose its character as a non-recognition transaction for purposes of subparagraph 9(b). In addition, a transaction that would have been a non-recognition transaction in the United States but for the application of sections 897(d) and 897(e) of the Code will also constitute a non-recognition transaction for purposes of subparagraph 9(b). Further, a transaction which is not a non-recognition transaction under U.S. law, but to which non-recognition treatment is granted pursuant to the agreement of the competent authority under paragraph 8 of this Article, is a non-recognition transaction for purposes of subparagraph 9(b). However, a transaction which is not a non-recognition transaction under U.S. law does not become a non-recognition transaction for purposes of subparagraph 9(b) merely because the basis of the property in the hands of the transferee is reduced under section 1125(d) of FIRPTA.

The benefits of paragraph 9 are not available to the alienation or disposition by a resident of a Contracting State of an asset that

(a) on September 26, 1980 formed part of the business property of a permanent establishment or pertained to a fixed base which a resident of that Contracting State had in the other Contracting State,

(b) was alienated after September 26, 1980 and before the alienation in question in any transaction that was not a non-recognition transaction, as described above, or

(c) was owned at any time prior to the alienation in question and after September 26, 1980 by a person who was not a resident of that same Contracting State after September 26, 1980 while such person held the asset.

Thus, for example, in order for paragraph 9 to be availed of by a Canadian resident who did not own the alienated asset on September 26, 1980, the asset must have been owned by other Canadian residents continuously after September 26, 1980 and must have been transferred only in transactions which were non-recognition transactions for U.S. tax purposes.

The availability of the benefits of paragraph 9 is illustrated by the following examples. It should be noted that the examples do not purport to fully describe the U.S. and Canadian tax consequences resulting from the transactions described therein. Any condition for the application of paragraph 9 which is not discussed in an example should be assumed to be satisfied.

*Example 1.* A, an individual resident of Canada, owned an appreciated U.S. real property interest on September 26, 1980. On January 1, 1982, A transferred the U.S. real property interest to X, a Canadian corporation, in exchange for 100 percent of X's voting stock. A's gain on the transfer to X is exempt from U.S. tax under Article VIII of the 1942 Convention. Since the transaction qualifies as a non-recognition transaction for U.S. tax purposes, as described above, X is entitled to the benefits of paragraph 9, pursuant to subparagraph 9(b), upon a subsequent disposition of the U.S. real property interest occurring after the entry into force of this Convention. If A's transfer to X had instead occurred after the entry into force of this Convention, A would be entitled to the benefits of paragraph 9, pursuant to subparagraph 9(a), with respect to U.S. taxation of that portion of the gain resulting from the transfer to

X that is attributable on a monthly basis to the period ending on December 31 of the year in which the Convention enters into force (or a greater portion of the gain as is shown to the satisfaction of the U.S. competent authority). X would be entitled to the benefits of paragraph 9 pursuant to subparagraph 9(b), upon a subsequent disposition of the U.S. real property interest.

*Example 2.* The facts are the same as in *Example 1*, except that A is a corporation which is resident in Canada. Assuming that the transfer of the U.S. real property interest to X is a section 351 transaction or a tax-free reorganization for U.S. tax purposes, the results are the same as in *Example 1*.

*Example 3.* The facts are the same as in *Example 1*, except that X is a U.S. corporation. If the transfer to X by A took place on January 1, 1982, A's gain on the transfer to X would be exempt from tax under Article VIII of the 1942 Convention and A would be entitled to the benefits of paragraph 9, pursuant to subparagraph 9(b), upon a subsequent disposition of the stock of X occurring after the entry into force of this Convention. If the transfer to X by A took place after the entry into force of this Convention, A would be entitled to the benefits of paragraph 9, pursuant to subparagraph 9(a), with respect to U.S. taxation (if any) of the gain resulting from the transfer to X, and would also be entitled to the benefits of paragraph 9, pursuant to subparagraph 9(b), upon a subsequent disposition of the stock of X. For several reasons, including the fact that X is a U.S. corporation, paragraph 9 has no impact on the U.S. tax consequences of a subsequent disposition by X of the U.S. real property interest in either case.

*Example 4.* B, a corporation resident in Canada, owns all of the stock of C, which is also a corporation resident in Canada. C owns a U.S. real property interest. After the Convention enters into force, B liquidates C in a section 332 liquidation. The transaction is treated as a non-recognition transaction for U.S. tax purposes under the definition of a non-recognition transaction described above. C is entitled to the benefits of paragraph 9, pursuant to subparagraph 9(a), with respect to gain taxed (if any) under section 897(d), and B is entitled to the benefits of paragraph 9, pursuant to subparagraph 9(b), upon a subsequent disposition of the U.S. real property interest. Generally, the United States would not subject B to tax upon the liquidation of C.

*Example 5.* The facts are the same as in *Example 4*, except that C is a U.S. corporation. B is entitled to the benefits of paragraph 9, pursuant to subparagraph 9(a), with respect to U.S. taxation (if any) of the gain resulting from the liquidation of C. B is not entitled to the benefits of paragraph 9 upon a subsequent disposition of the U.S. real property interest since that asset was held after September 26, 1980 by a person who was not a resident of Canada. The U.S. tax consequences to C are governed by the internal law of the United States.

*Example 6.* D, an individual resident of the United States, owns Canadian real estate. On January 1, 1982, D transfers the Canadian real estate to E, a corporation resident in

Canada, in exchange for all of E's stock. This transfer is treated as a taxable transaction under the Income Tax Act of Canada. However, D's gain on the transfer is exempt from Canadian tax under Article VIII of the 1942 Convention. D is not entitled to the benefits of subparagraph 9(b) upon a subsequent disposition of the stock of E since the stock was not transferred in a transaction which was a non-recognition transaction for Canadian tax purposes. E is not entitled to Canadian benefits under this paragraph since, *inter alia*, it is a Canadian resident. (However, under Canadian law, both D and E would have a basis for tax purposes equal to the fair market value of the property at the time of D's transfer). If the transfer to E had taken place after entry into force of this Convention, D would be entitled to the benefits of paragraph 9, pursuant to subparagraph 9(a), with respect to Canadian tax resulting from the transfer to E, but would not be entitled to the benefits of subparagraph 9(b) upon a subsequent disposition of the E stock. (Note that E could seek to have the transaction treated as a non-recognition transaction under paragraph 8 of this Article, with the result that, if the competent authority agrees, D will take a carryover basis in the stock of E and be entitled to the benefits of subparagraph 9(b) upon a subsequent disposition thereof).

- Example 7.* The facts are the same as in *Example 6*, except that E is a U.S. corporation. This transaction is also a recognition event under Canadian law at the shareholder level. The results are generally the same as in *Example 6*. However, if the transfer to E had been granted non-recognition treatment in Canada pursuant to paragraph 8, both D and E would be entitled to the benefits of paragraph 9 for Canadian tax purposes, pursuant to subparagraph 9(b), upon subsequent dispositions of the stock of E or the Canadian real estate, respectively.
- Example 8.* F, an individual resident of the United States, owns all of the stock of G, a Canadian corporation, which in turn owns Canadian real estate. F causes G to be amalgamated in a merger with another Canadian corporation. This is a non-recognition transaction under Canadian law and F is entitled, for Canadian tax purposes, to the benefits of paragraph 9, pursuant to subparagraph 9(b) upon a subsequent disposition of the stock of the other Canadian corporation.
- Example 9.* H, a U.S. corporation, owns all of the stock of J, another U.S. corporation. J owns Canadian real estate. H liquidates J. For Canadian tax purposes, no tax is imposed on H as a result of the liquidation and H received a fair market value basis in the Canadian real estate. Accordingly, since gain has been forgiven due to the fair market value basis (rather than postponed in a non-recognition transaction), H would not be entitled to the benefits of subparagraph 9(b) upon the subsequent disposition of the Canadian real estate. Canada would impose a tax on J, but J would be entitled to the benefits of paragraph 9, pursuant to subparagraph 9(a), with respect to Canadian tax imposed on the liquidation.
- Example 10.* The facts are the same as in *Example 9*, except that J is a Canadian corporation. Paragraph 9 does not affect the Canadian taxation of J. While H is subject to Canadian tax on the liquidation of J, H is entitled to the benefits of paragraph 9,

pursuant to subparagraph 9(a), with respect to such Canadian taxation. H will take a fair market value basis (rather than have gain postponed in a non-recognition transaction) in the Canadian real estate for Canadian tax purposes and is thus not entitled to the benefits of paragraph 9 upon a subsequent disposition of the Canadian real estate (since, *inter alia*, the gain has been forgiven due to the fair market value basis).

*Example 11.* K, a U.S. corporation, owns the stock of L, another U.S. corporation, which in turn owns Canadian real estate. K causes L to be merged into another U.S. corporation. For Canadian tax purposes, such a transaction treated as a recognition event, but Canada will not impose a tax on K under its internal law. Canada would impose tax on L, but L is entitled to the benefits of paragraph 9, pursuant to subparagraph 9(a), with respect to Canadian taxation of gain resulting from the merger. The acquiring U.S. corporation would take a fair market value basis in the Canadian real estate, and would thus not be entitled to the benefits of subparagraph 9(b) upon subsequent disposition of the real estate. (Note that the acquiring U.S. corporation could seek to obtain non-recognition treatment under paragraph 8 of this Article, with the results that, if approved by the competent authority it would obtain a carryover basis in the property and be entitled to the benefits of subparagraph 9(b) upon a subsequent disposition of the Canadian real estate.)

Paragraph 9 provides that where a resident of Canada or the United States is subject to tax pursuant to Article XIII in the other Contracting State on gains from the alienation of a capital asset, and if the other conditions of paragraph 9 are satisfied, the amount of the gain shall be reduced for tax purposes in that other State by the amount of the gain attributable to the period during which the property was held up to and including December 31 of the year in which the documents of ratification are exchanged. The gain attributable to such person is normally determined by dividing the total gain by the number of full calendar months the property was held by such person, including, in the case of an alienation described in paragraph 9(b), the number of months in which a predecessor in interest held the property, and multiplying such monthly amount by the number of full calendar months ending on or before December 31 of the year in which the instruments of ratification are exchanged.

Upon a clear showing, however, a taxpayer may prove that a greater portion of the gain was attributable to the specified period. Thus, in the United States the fair market value of the alienated property at the treaty valuation date may be established under paragraph 9 in the manner and with the evidence that is generally required by U.S. Federal Income, estate, and gift tax regulations. For this purpose a taxpayer may use valid appraisal techniques for valuing real estate such as the comparable sales approach (see Rev. Proc. 79-24, 1979-1 C.B. 565) and the reproduction cost approach. If more than one property is alienated in a single transaction each property will be considered individually.

A taxpayer who desires to make this alternate showing for U.S. tax purposes must so indicate on his U.S. income tax return for the year of the sale or exchange and must attach to the return a statement describing the relevant evidence. The U.S. competent authority or his authorized delegate will determine whether the taxpayer has satisfied the requirements of

paragraph 9.

The amount of gain which is reduced by reason of the application of paragraph 9 is not to be treated for U.S. tax purposes as an amount of "non-taxed gain" under section 1125(d)(2)(B) of FIRPTA, where that section would otherwise apply. (Note that gain not taxed by virtue of the 1942 Convention is "non-taxed gain".)

U.S. residents, citizens and former citizens remain subject to U.S. taxation on gains as provided by the Code notwithstanding the provisions of Article XIII, other than paragraphs 6 and 7. See paragraphs 2 and 3(a) of Article XXIX (Miscellaneous Rules).

#### ARTICLE XIV Independent Personal Services

Article XIV concerns the taxation of income derived by an individual in respect of the performance of independent personal services. Such income may be taxed in the Contracting State of which such individual is a resident. It may also be taxed in the other Contracting State if the individual has or had a fixed base regularly available to him in the other State for the purpose of performing his activities, but only to the extent that the income is attributable to that fixed base. The use of the term "has or had" ensures that a Contracting State in which a fixed base existed has the right to tax income attributable to that fixed base even if there is a delay between the termination of the fixed base and the receipt or accrual of such income.

Unlike Article VII of the 1942 Convention, which provides a limited exemption from tax at source on income from independent personal services, Article XIV does not restrict the exemption to persons present in the State of source for fewer than 184 days. Furthermore, Article XIV does not allow the \$5,000 exemption at source of the 1942 Convention, which was available even if services were performed through a fixed base. However, Article XIV provides complete exemption at source if a fixed base does not exist.

#### ARTICLE XV Dependent Personal Services

Paragraph 1 provides that, in general, salaries, wages, and other similar remuneration derived by a resident of a Contracting State in respect of an employment are taxable only in that State unless the employment is exercised in the other Contracting State. If the employment is exercised in the other Contracting State, the entire remuneration derived therefrom may be taxed in that other State but only if, as provided by paragraph 2, the recipient is present in the other State for a period or periods exceeding 183 days in the calendar year, or the remuneration is borne by an employer who is a resident of that other State or by a permanent establishment or fixed base which the employer has in that other State. However, in all cases where the employee earns \$10,000 or less in the currency of the State of source, such earnings are exempt from tax in that State. "Borne by" means allowable as a deduction in computing taxable income. Thus, if a Canadian resident individual employed at the Canadian permanent establishment of a U.S.

company performs services in the United States, the income earned by the employee from such services is not exempt from U.S. tax under paragraph 1 if such income exceeds \$10,000 (U.S.) because the U.S. company is entitled to a deduction for such wages in computing its taxable income.

Paragraph 3 provides that a resident of a Contracting State is exempt from tax in the other Contracting State with respect to remuneration derived in respect of an employment regularly exercised in more than one State on a ship, aircraft, motor vehicle, or train operated by a resident of the taxpayer's State of residence. The word "regularly" is intended to distinguish crew members from persons occasionally employed on a ship, aircraft, motor vehicle, or train. Only the Contracting State of which the employee and operator are resident has the right to tax such remuneration. However, this provision is subject to the "saving clause" of paragraph 2 of Article XXIX (Miscellaneous Rules), which permits the United States to tax its citizens despite paragraph 3.

Article XV states that its provisions are overridden by the more specific rules of Article XVIII (Pensions and Annuities) and Article XIX (Government Services).

## ARTICLE XVI Artistes and Athletes

Article XVI concerns income derived by a resident of a Contracting State as an entertainer, such as a theatre, motion picture, radio, or television artiste, or a musician, or as an athlete, from his personal activities as such exercised in the other Contracting State. Article XVI overrides Articles XIV (Independent Personal Services) and XV (Dependent Personal Services) to allow source basis taxation of an entertainer or athlete in cases where the latter Articles would not permit such taxation. Thus, paragraph 1 provides that certain income of an entertainer or athlete may be taxed in the State of source in all cases where the amount of gross receipts derived by the entertainer or athlete, including expenses reimbursed to him or borne on his behalf, exceeds \$15,000 in the currency of that other State for the calendar year concerned. For example, where a resident of Canada who is an entertainer derives income from his personal activities as an entertainer in the United States, he is taxable in the United States on all such income in any case where his gross receipts are greater than \$15,000 for the calendar year. Article XVI does not restrict the right of the State of source to apply the provisions of Articles XIV and XV. Thus, an entertainer or athlete resident in a Contracting State and earning \$14,000 in wages borne by a permanent establishment in the other State may be taxed in the other State as provided in Article XV

Paragraph 2 provides that where income in respect of personal activities exercised by an entertainer or an athlete accrues not to the entertainer or athlete himself but to another person, that income may, notwithstanding the provisions of Article VII (Business Profits), Article XIV, and Article XV, be taxed in the Contracting State in which the activities are exercised. The anti-avoidance rule of paragraph 2 does not apply if it is established by the entertainer or athlete that neither he nor persons related to him participate directly or indirectly in the profits of the other person in any manner, including the receipt of deferred remuneration, bonuses, fees, dividends,

partnership distributions, or other distributions.

Thus, if an entertainer who is a resident of Canada is under contract with a company and the arrangement between the entertainer and the company provides for payments to the entertainer based on the profits of the company, all of the income of the company attributable to the performer's U.S. activities may be taxed in the United States irrespective of whether the company maintains a permanent establishment in the United States. Paragraph 2 does not affect the rule of paragraph 1 that applies to the entertainer or athlete himself.

Paragraph 3 provides that paragraphs 1 and 2 of Article XVI do not apply to the income of an athlete in respect of an employment with a team which participates in a league with regularly scheduled games in both Canada and the United States, nor do those paragraphs apply to the income of such a team. Such an athlete is subject to the rules of Article XV. Thus, the athlete's remuneration would be exempt from tax in the Contracting State of source if he is a resident of the other Contracting State and earns \$10,000 or less in the currency of the State of source, or if he is present in that State for a period or periods not exceeding in the aggregate 183 days in the calendar year, and his remuneration is not borne by a resident of that State or a permanent establishment or fixed base in that State. In addition, a team described in paragraph 3 may not be taxed in a Contracting State under paragraph 2 of this Article solely by reason of the fact that a member of the team may participate in the profits of the team through the receipt of a bonus based, for example, on ticket sales. The employer may be taxable pursuant to other articles of the Convention, such as Article VII.

Paragraph 4 provides that, notwithstanding Articles XIV and XV, an amount paid by a resident of a Contracting State to a resident of the other State as an inducement to sign an agreement relating to the performance of the services of an athlete may be taxed in the first-mentioned State. However, the tax imposed may not exceed 15 percent of the gross amount of the payment. The provision clarifies the taxation of signing bonuses in a manner consistent with their treatment under U.S. interpretations of the 1942 Convention. Amounts paid as salary or other remuneration for the performance of the athletic services themselves are not taxable under this provision but are subject to the provisions of paragraphs 1 and 3 of this Article, or Articles XIV or XV, as the case may be. The paragraph covers all amounts paid (to the athlete or another person) as an inducement to sign an agreement for the services of an athlete, such as a bonus to sign a contract not to perform for other teams. An amount described in this paragraph is not to be included in determining the amount of gross receipts derived by an athlete in a calendar year for purposes of paragraph 1. Thus, if an athlete receives a \$50,000 signing bonus and a \$12,000 salary for a taxable year, the State of source would not be entitled to tax the salary portion of the receipt of the athlete for that year under paragraph 1 of this Article.

## ARTICLE XVII

### Withholding of Taxes in Respect of Personal Services

Article XVII confirms that a Contracting State may require withholding of tax on account of tax liability with respect to remuneration paid to an individual who is a resident of the other Contracting State, including an entertainer or athlete, in respect of the performance of

independent personal services in the first-mentioned State. However, withholding with respect to the first \$5,000 (in the currency of the State of source) of such remuneration paid in that taxable year by each payor shall not exceed 10 percent of such payment. In the United States, the withholding described in paragraph 1 relates to withholding with respect to income tax liability and does not relate to withholding with respect to other taxes, such as social security taxes. Nor is the paragraph intended to suggest that withholding in circumstances not specifically mentioned, such as withholding with respect to dependent personal services, is precluded by the Convention.

Paragraph 2 provides that in any case where the competent authority of Canada or the United States believes that withholding with respect to remuneration for the performance of personal services is excessive in relation to the estimated tax liability of an individual to that State for a taxable year, it may determine that a lesser amount will be deducted or withheld. In the case of independent personal services, paragraph 2 may thus result in a lesser withholding than the maximum authorized by paragraph 1.

Paragraph 3 states that the provisions of Article XVII do not affect the liability of a resident of a Contracting State for taxes imposed by the other Contracting State. The Article deals only with the method of collecting taxes and not with substantive tax liability.

Article XVIII A of the 1942 Convention authorizes the issuance of regulations to specify circumstances under which residents of the United States temporarily performing personal services in Canada may be exempted from deduction and withholding of United States tax. This provision is omitted from the Convention as unnecessary. The Code and regulations provide sufficient authority to avoid excessive withholding of U.S. income tax. Further, paragraph 2 provides for adjustments in the amount of withholding where appropriate.

## ARTICLE XVIII Pensions and Annuities

Paragraph 1 provides that a resident of a Contracting State is taxable in that State with respect to pensions and annuities arising in the other Contracting State. However, the State of residence shall exempt from taxation the amount of any such pension that would be excluded from taxable income in the State of source if the recipient were a resident thereof. Thus, if a \$10,000 pension payment arising in a Contracting State is paid to a resident of the Contracting State and \$5,000 of such payment would be excluded from taxable income as a return of capital in the first-mentioned State if the recipient were a resident of the first-mentioned State, the State of residence shall exempt from tax \$5,000 of the payment. Only \$5,000 would be so exempt even if the first-mentioned State would also grant a personal allowance as a deduction from gross income if the recipient were a resident thereof. Paragraph 1 imposes no such restriction with respect to the amount that may be taxed in the State of residence in the case of annuities.

Paragraph 2 provides rules with respect to the taxation of pensions and annuities in the Contracting State in which they arise. If the beneficial owner of a periodic pension payment is a resident of the other Contracting State, the tax imposed in the State of source is limited to 15 percent of the gross amount of such payment. Thus, the State of source is not required to allow a

deduction or exclusion for a return of capital to the pensioner, but its tax is limited in amount in the case of a periodic payment. Other pension payments may be taxed in the State of source without limit.

In the case of annuities beneficially owned by a resident of a Contracting State, the Contracting State of source is limited to a 15 percent tax on the portion of the payment that would not be excluded from taxable income (i.e., as a return of capital) in that State if the beneficial owner were a resident thereof.

Paragraph 3 defines the term "pensions" for purposes of the Convention to include any payment under a superannuation, pension, or retirement plan, Armed-Forces retirement pay, war veterans pensions and allowances, and amounts paid under a sickness, accident, or disability plan. Thus, the term "pension" includes pensions paid by private employers as well as any pension paid by a Contracting State in respect of services rendered to that State. A pension for government service is covered. The term "pensions" does not include payments under an income averaging annuity contract or benefits paid under social security legislation. The latter benefits are taxed, pursuant to paragraph 5, only in the Contracting State paying the benefit. Income derived from an income averaging annuity contract is taxable pursuant to the provisions of Article XXII (Other Income).

Paragraph 4 provides that, for purposes of the Convention, the term "annuities" means a stated sum paid periodically at stated times during life or during a specified number of years, under an obligation to make payments in return for adequate and full consideration other than services rendered. The term does not include a payment that is not periodic or any annuity the cost of which was deductible for tax purposes in the Contracting State where the annuity was acquired. Items excluded from the definition of "annuities" are subject to the rules of Article XXII.

Paragraph 5, as amended by the 1984 Protocol, provides that benefits under social security legislation in Canada or the United States paid to a resident of the other Contracting State are taxable only in the State in which the recipient is resident. However, the State of residence must exempt from taxation one-half of the total amount of such benefits paid in a taxable year. Thus, if U.S. social security benefits are paid to a resident of Canada, the United States will exempt such benefits from tax and Canada will exempt one-half of the benefits from taxation. The exemption of one-half of the benefits in the State of residence is an exception to the saving clause under subparagraph 3(a) of Article XXIX (Miscellaneous Rules). The United States will not exempt U.S. social security benefits from tax if the Canadian resident receiving such benefits is a U.S. citizen. If a U.S. citizen and resident receives Canadian social security benefits, Canada will not tax such benefits and the United States will exempt from tax one-half of the total amount of such benefits. The United States will also exempt one-half of Canadian social security benefits from tax if the recipient is a U.S. citizen who is a resident of Canada, under paragraph 7 of Article XXIX. Paragraph 5 encompasses benefits paid under social security legislation of a political subdivision, such as a province of Canada.

Paragraph 6(a) provides that only the State of which a person is resident has the right to tax alimony and other similar amounts (including child support payments) arising in the other

Contracting State and paid to such person. However, under paragraph 6(b), the State of residence shall exempt from taxation the amount that would be excluded from taxable income in the State of source if the recipient were a resident thereof. Thus, if child support payments are made by a U.S. resident to a resident of Canada, Canada shall exempt from tax the amount of such payments which would be excluded from taxable income under section 71(b) of the Internal Revenue Code. Paragraph 6 does not define the term "alimony"; the term is defined pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 2 of Article III (General Definitions).

Article XVIII does not provide rules to determine the State in which pensions, annuities, alimony, and other similar amounts arise. The provisions of paragraph 2 of Article III are used to determine where such amounts arise for purposes of determining whether a Contracting State has the right to tax such amounts.

Paragraphs 1, 3, 4, 5(b) and 6(b) of Article XVIII are, by reason of paragraph 3(a) of Article XXIX (Miscellaneous Rules), exceptions to the "saving clause." Thus, the rules in those paragraphs change U.S. taxation of U.S. citizens and residents.

#### ARTICLE XIX Government Service

Article XIX provides that remuneration, other than a pension, paid by a Contracting State or political subdivision or local authority thereof to a citizen of that State in respect of services rendered in the discharge of governmental functions shall be taxable only in that State. (Pursuant to paragraph 5 of Article IV (Residence), other income of such a citizen may also be exempt from tax, or subject to reduced rates of tax, in the State in which he is performing services, in accordance with other provisions of the Convention.) However, if the services are rendered in connection with a trade or business, then the provisions of Article XIV (Independent Personal Services), Article XV (Dependent Personal Services), or Article XVI (Artistes and Athletes), as the case may be, are controlling. Whether functions are of a governmental nature may be determined by a comparison with the concept of a governmental function in the State in which the income arises.

Pursuant to paragraph 3(a) of Article XXIX (Miscellaneous Rules), Article XIX is an exception to the "saving clause." As a result, a U.S. citizen resident in Canada and performing services in Canada in the discharge of functions of a governmental nature for the United States is taxable only in the United States on remuneration for such services.

This provision differs from the rules of Article VI of the 1942 Convention. For example, Article XIX allows the United States to impose tax on a person other than a citizen of Canada who earns remuneration paid by Canada in respect of services rendered in the discharge of governmental functions in the United States. (Such a person may, however, be entitled to an exemption from U.S. tax as provided in Code section 893.) Also, under the provisions of Article XIX Canada will not impose tax on amounts paid by the United States in respect of services rendered in the discharge of governmental functions to a U.S. citizen who is ordinarily resident in Canada for purposes other than rendering governmental services. Under paragraph 1 of Article VI

of the 1942 Convention, such amounts would be taxable by Canada.

## ARTICLE XX Students

Article XX provides that a student, apprentice, or business trainee temporarily present in a Contracting State for the purpose of his full-time education or training is exempt from tax in that State with respect to amounts received from outside that State for the purpose of his maintenance, education, or training, if the individual is or was a resident of the other Contracting State immediately before visiting the first-mentioned State. There is no limitation on the number of years or the amount of income to which the exemption applies.

The Convention does not contain provisions relating specifically to professors and teachers. Teachers are treated under the Convention pursuant to the rules established in Articles XIV (Independent Personal Services) and XV (Dependent Personal Services), in the same manner as other persons performing services. In Article VIII A of the 1942 Convention there is a 2-year exemption in the Contracting State of source in the case of a professor or teacher who is a resident of the other Contracting State.

## ARTICLE XXI Exempt Organizations

Paragraph 1 provides that a religious, scientific, literary, educational, or charitable organization resident in a Contracting State shall be exempt from tax on income arising in the other Contracting State but only to the extent that such income is exempt from taxation in the Contracting State in which the organization is resident. Since this paragraph, and the remainder of Article XXI, deal with entities that are not normally taxable, the test of "resident in" is intended to be similar - but cannot be identical - to the one outlined in paragraph 1 of Article IV (Residence). Paragraph 3 provides that paragraph 1 does not exempt from tax, income of a trust, company, or other organization from carrying on a trade or business, or income from a "related person" other than a person referred to in paragraph 1 or 2.

Paragraph 2 provides that a trust, company, or other organization that is resident in a Contracting State constituted and operated exclusively to administer or provide employee benefits or benefits for the self-employed under one or more funds or plans established to provide pension or retirement benefits or other employee benefits is exempt from taxation on dividend and interest income arising in the other Contracting State in a taxable year, if the income of such, organization is generally exempt from taxation for that year in the Contracting State in which it is resident. In addition, a trust, company, or other organization resident in a Contracting State and not taxed in a taxable year in that State shall be exempt from taxation in the other State in that year on dividend and interest income arising in that other State if it is constituted and operated exclusively to earn, income for the benefit of an organization described in the preceding sentence. Pursuant to paragraph 3 the exemption at source provided by paragraph 2 does not apply to dividends or interest from carrying on trade or business or from a "related person," other than a person referred

to in paragraph 1 or 2. The term "related person" is not necessarily defined by paragraph 2 of Article IX (Related Persons).

Paragraph 4 provides an exemption from U.S. excise taxes on private foundations in the case of a religious, scientific, literary, educational, or charitable organization which is resident in Canada but only if such organization has received substantially all of its support from persons other than citizens or residents of the United States.

Paragraph 5 provides that contributions by a citizen or resident of the United States to an organization which is resident in Canada and is generally exempt from Canadian tax are treated as charitable contributions, but only if the organization could qualify in the United States to receive deductible contributions if it were resident in (i.e., organized in) the United States. Paragraph 5 generally limits the amount of contributions made deductible by the Convention to the income of the U.S. citizen or resident arising in Canada, as determined under the Convention. In the case of contributions to a college or university at which the U.S. citizen or resident or a member of his family is or was enrolled, the special limitation to income arising in Canada is not required. The percentage limitations of Code section 170 in respect of the deductibility of charitable contributions apply after the limitations established by the Convention. Any amounts treated as charitable contributions by paragraph 5 which are in excess of amounts deductible in a taxable year pursuant to paragraph 5 may be carried over and deducted in subsequent taxable years, subject to the limitations of paragraph 5.

Paragraph 6 provides rules for purposes of Canadian taxation with respect to the deductibility of gifts to a U.S. resident organization by a resident of Canada. The rules of paragraph 6 parallel the rules of paragraph 5. The current limitations in Canadian law provide that deductions for gifts to charitable organizations may not exceed 20 percent of income. Excess deductions may be carried forward for one year.

The term "family" used in paragraphs 5 and 6 is defined in paragraph 2 of the Exchange of Notes accompanying the Convention to mean an individual's brothers and sisters (whether by whole or half-blood, or by adoption), spouse, ancestors, lineal descendants, and adopted descendants. Paragraph 2 of the Exchange of Notes also provides that the competent authorities of Canada and the United States will review procedures and requirements for organizations to establish their exempt status under paragraph 1 of Article XXI or as an eligible recipient of charitable contributions or gifts under paragraphs 5 and 6 of Article XXI. It is contemplated that such review will lead to the avoidance of duplicative administrative efforts in determining such status and eligibility.

The provisions of paragraph 5 and 6 generally parallel the rules of Article XIII D of the 1942 Convention. However, paragraphs 5 and 6 permit greater deductions for certain contributions to colleges and universities than do the provisions of the 1942 Convention.

## ARTICLE XXII

### Other Income

Paragraph 1 provides that a Contracting State of which a person is a resident has the sole right to tax items of income, wherever arising, if such income is not dealt with in the prior Articles of the Convention. If such income arises in the other Contracting State, however, it may also be taxed in that State. The determination of where income arises for this purpose is made under the domestic laws of the respective Contracting States unless the Convention specifies where the income arises (e.g., paragraph 6 of Article XI (Interest)) for purposes of determining the right to tax, in which case the provisions of the Convention control.

Paragraph 2 provides that to the extent that income distributed by an estate or trust resident in one Contracting State is deemed under the domestic law of that State to be a separate type of income “arising” within that State, such income distributed to a beneficiary resident in the other Contracting State may be taxed in the State of source at a maximum rate of 15 percent of the gross amount of such distribution. Such a distribution will, however, be exempt from tax in the State of source to the extent that the income distributed by the estate or trust was derived by the estate or trust from sources outside that State. Thus, in a case where the law of Canada treats a distribution made by a trust resident in Canada as a separate type of income arising in Canada, Canadian tax is limited by paragraph 2 to 15 percent of the gross amount distributed to a U.S. resident beneficiary. Although the Code imposes tax on certain domestic trusts (e.g., accumulation trusts) and such trusts are residents of the United States for purposes of Article IV (Residence) and paragraph 2 of Article XXII, paragraph 2 does not apply to distributions by such trusts because, pursuant to Code sections 667(e) and 662(b), these distributions have the same character in the hands of a nonresident beneficiary as they do in the hands of the trust. Thus, a distribution by a domestic accumulation trust is not a separate type of income for U.S. purposes. The taxation of such a distribution in the United States is governed by the distribution's character, the provisions of the Code and the provisions of the Convention other than the provision in paragraph 2 limiting the tax at source to 15 percent.

## ARTICLE XXIII Capital

Although neither Canada nor the United States currently has national taxes on capital, Article XXIII provides rules for the eventuality that such taxes might be enacted in the future. Paragraph 1 provides that capital represented by real property (as defined in paragraph 2 of Article VI (Income From Real Property)) owned by a resident of a Contracting State and situated in the other Contracting State may be taxed in that other State.

Paragraph 2 provides that capital represented by either personal property forming part of the business property of a permanent establishment or personal property pertaining to a fixed base in a Contracting State may be taxed in that State.

Paragraph 3 provides that capital represented by ships and aircraft operated by a resident of a Contracting State in international traffic and by personal property pertaining to the operation of such ships and aircraft are taxable only in the Contracting State of residence.

Paragraph 4 provides that all elements of capital other than those covered by paragraphs 1,

2, and 3 are taxable only in the Contracting State of residence. Thus, capital represented by motor vehicles or railway cars, not pertaining to a permanent establishment or fixed base in a Contracting State, would be taxable only in the Contracting State of which the taxpayer is a resident.

#### ARTICLE XXIV Elimination of Double Taxation

Paragraph 1 provides the general rules that will apply under the Convention with respect to foreign tax credits for Canadian taxes paid or accrued. The United States undertakes to allow to a citizen or resident of the United States, or to a company electing under Code section 1504(d) to be treated as a domestic corporation, a credit against the Federal income taxes imposed by the Code for the appropriate amount of income tax paid or accrued to Canada. In the case of a company which is a resident of the United States owning 10 percent or more of the voting stock of a company which is a resident of Canada (which for this purpose does not include a company electing under Code section 1504(d) to be treated as a domestic corporation), and from which it receives dividends in a taxable year, the United States shall allow as a credit against income taxes imposed by the Code the appropriate amount of income tax paid or accrued to Canada by the Canadian company with respect to the profits out of which such company paid the dividends.

The direct and deemed-paid credits allowed by paragraph 1 are subject to the limitations of the Code as they may be amended from time to time without changing the general principle of paragraph 1. Thus, as is generally the case under U.S. income tax conventions, provisions such as Code sections 901(c), 904, 905, 907, 908, and 911 apply for purposes of computing the allowable credit under paragraph 1. In addition, the United States is not required to maintain the overall limitation currently provided by U.S. law.

The term “income tax paid or accrued” is defined in paragraph 7 of Article XXIV to include certain specified taxes which are paid or accrued. The Convention only provides a credit for amounts paid or accrued. The determination of whether an amount is paid or accrued is made under the Code. Paragraph 1 provides a credit for these specified taxes whether or not they qualify as creditable under Code section 901 or 903. A taxpayer who claims credit under the Convention for Canadian taxes made creditable solely by paragraph 1 is not, as a result of the Protocol, subject to a per-country limitation with respect to Canadian taxes. Thus, credit for such Canadian taxes would be computed under the overall limitation currently provided by U.S. law. (However, see the discussion below of the source rules of paragraphs 3 and 9 for a restriction on the use of third country taxes to offset the U.S. tax imposed on resourced income.)

A taxpayer claiming credits for Canadian taxes under the Convention must apply the source rules of the Convention, and must apply those source rules in their entirety. Similarly, a taxpayer claiming credit for Canadian taxes which are creditable under the Code and who wishes to use the source rules of the Convention in computing that credit must apply the source rules of the Convention in their entirety.

Paragraph 3 provides source rules for purposes of applying Article XXIV. Profits, income

or gains of a resident of a Contracting State which may be taxed in the other Contracting State in accordance with the Convention, for reasons other than the saving clause of paragraph 2 of Article XXIX (Miscellaneous Rules) (e.g., pensions and annuities taxable where arising pursuant to Article XVIII (Pensions and Annuities)), are deemed to arise in the latter State. This rule does not, however, apply to gains taxable under paragraph 5 of Article XIII (Gains) (i.e., gains taxed by a Contracting State derived from the alienation of property by a former resident of that State). Gains from such an alienation arise, pursuant to paragraph 3(b), in the State of which the alienator is a resident. Thus, if in accordance with paragraph 5 of Article XIII, Canada imposes tax on certain gains of a U.S. resident such gains are deemed, pursuant to paragraphs 2 and 3(b) of Article XXIV, to arise in the United States for purposes of computing the deduction against Canadian tax for the U.S. tax on such gain. Under the Convention such gains arise in the United States for purposes of the United States foreign tax credit. Paragraph 3(b) also provides that profits, income, or gains arise in the Contracting State of which a person is a resident if they may not be taxed in the other Contracting State under the provisions of the Convention (e.g., alimony), other than the "saving clause" of paragraph 2 of Article XXIX.

Paragraph 9 provides clarification that the source rules of this Article shall not be used to determine the credit available against U.S. tax for foreign taxes other than income taxes paid or accrued to Canada (i.e., taxes of third countries). Thus, creditable third country taxes may not offset the U.S. tax on income treated as arising in Canada under the source rules of the Convention. A person claiming credit for income taxes of a third country may not rely upon the rules of paragraphs 3 and 6 for purposes of treating income that would otherwise have a U.S. source as having a foreign source. Thus, if the taxpayer elects to compute the foreign tax credit for any year using the special source rules set forth in paragraphs 3 and 6, paragraph 9 requires that a separate limitation be computed for taxes not covered by paragraph 1 without regard to the source rules of paragraphs 3 and 6, and the credit for such taxes may not exceed such limitation. The credit allowed under this separate limitation may not exceed the proportion of the Federal income taxes imposed by the Code that the taxpayer's taxable income from foreign sources (under the Code) not included in taxable income arising in Canada (and not in excess of total foreign source taxable income under the Code) bears to the taxpayer's worldwide taxable income. In any case the credit for taxes covered by paragraph 1 and the credit for other foreign taxes is limited to the amount allowed under overall limitation computed by aggregating taxable income arising in Canada and other foreign source taxable income.

If creditable Canadian taxes exceed the proportion of U.S. tax that taxable income arising in Canada bears to the entire taxable income, such taxes may qualify to be absorbed by any excess in the separate limitation computed with respect to other taxes.

In a case where a taxpayer has different types of income subject to separate limitations under the Code (e.g., section 904(d)(1)(B) DISC dividends) the Convention rules just described apply in the context of each of the separate Code limitations.

A taxpayer may, for any year, claim a credit pursuant to the rules of the Code. In such case, the taxpayer would be subject to the limitations established in the Code, and would forego the rules of the Convention that determine where taxable income arises. In addition, any Canadian taxes covered by paragraph 1 which are not creditable under the Code would not be credited.

Thus, where a taxpayer elects to use the special source rules of this Article to compute the foreign tax credit for any year, the following computations must be made:

- Step 1(a):* Compute a hypothetical foreign tax credit limitation for Canadian income and taxes using the source rules of the Convention.
- Step 1(b):* Compute a hypothetical foreign tax credit limitation for third country income and taxes using the source rules of the Code.
- Step 1(c):* Compute an overall foreign tax credit limitation using the source rules of the Convention to the extent they resource Canadian source income as U.S. source income or U.S. source income as Canadian source income, and using the source rules of the Code with respect to any other income.
- Step 2:* Allocate the amount of creditable Canadian taxes to the amount of the limitation computed under step 1(a), and allocate the amount of creditable third country taxes to the amount of the limitation computed under step 1(b). The amount of credit to be so allocated may not exceed the amount of the respective limitation.

*Step 3:*

(1) If the total credits allocated under step 2 exceed the amount of the limitation computed under step 1(c), the amount of allowable credits must be reduced to that limitation (see Rev. Rule. 82-215, 1982-2 C.B. 153 for the method of such reduction).

(2) If the total credits allocated under step 2 are less than the amount of the limitation computed under step 1(c), then

(a) any amount of creditable Canadian taxes in excess of the amount of the step 1(a) limitation may be credited to the extent of the excess of the step 1(c) limitation over the total step 2 allocation, and

(b) any amount of third country taxes in excess of the amount of the step 1(b) limitation may not be credited.

The following examples (in which the taxpayer's U.S. tax rate is presumed to be 46%) illustrate the application of the source rules of Article XXIV:

*Example 1.*

(a) A U.S. corporate taxpayer has for the taxable year \$100 of taxable income having a U.S. source under both the Convention and the Code; \$100 of taxable income having a Canadian source under both the Convention and the Code; \$50 of taxable income having a Canadian source under the Convention but a U.S. source under the Code (see, for example, paragraph 1 of Article VII (Business Profits) and paragraph 3(a) of Article XXIV); and \$80 of taxable income having a foreign (non-Canadian) source under the Code. The taxpayer pays \$75 of Canadian income taxes and \$45 of third country income taxes. All the foreign source income of the taxpayer constitutes "other" income described in Code section 904(d)(1)(C).



Code; \$80 of taxable income having a foreign (non-Canadian) source under the Code; and (\$50) of loss allocated or apportioned to Canadian source income. The taxpayer pays \$50 of foreign (non-Canadian) income taxes, and \$20 of Canadian income taxes.

The source rules of the Convention are applied as follows to compute the taxpayer's foreign tax credit:

Step 1(a):  $\frac{\$ 50 \text{ (Canadian source taxable income under Contention)}}{\$230 \text{ (total taxable income)}}$   
x \$105.80 = \$23 limit for Canadian taxes.

Step 1(b):  $\frac{\$ 80 \text{ (third country source taxable income under Code)}}{\$230 \text{ (total taxable income)}}$   
x \$105.80 = \$36.80 limit for third country taxes.

Step 1(c):  $\frac{\$130 \text{ (overall foreign taxable income under source rules described above)}}{\$230 \text{ (total taxable income)}}$   
x \$105.80 = \$59.80 total limit.

Step 2: Since the taxpayer paid \$20 of Canadian income taxes, he may credit that amount in full since the step 1(a) limit is \$23. Since the step 1(b) limit is \$36.80, the taxpayer may credit \$36.80 of the \$50 foreign income taxes paid.

Step 3: Although the total taxes credited under step 2 (\$56.80) is less than the taxpayer's total limit of \$59.80, no additional credits may be claimed since the only excess taxes are third country income taxes, and those may not be used to offset any excess limitation in step 3. The \$13.20 of foreign taxes not allowed as a credit is available as a foreign tax credit carryover.

*Example 3:* The facts are the same as in *Example 2*, except that foreign (non-Canadian) operations result in a loss of (\$30) rather than taxable income of \$80, and no foreign (non-Canadian) income taxes are paid. The taxpayer's credit is computed as follows:

Step 1(a):  $\frac{\$ 50}{\$120} \times \$55.20 = \$23$  limit for Canadian taxes.

Step 1(b): Since there is no third country source taxable income under the Code, the limit for third country income taxes is zero.

Step 1(c):  $\frac{\$ 20}{\$120} \times \$55.20 = \$9.20$  total limit.

Step 2: Since the taxpayer paid \$20 of Canadian income tax, he may tentatively credit that amount in full since the step 1(a) limit is \$23.

Step 3: Since the total taxes credited under step 2 (\$20) exceeds the taxpayer's total limit

of \$9.20, the taxpayer must reduce the total amount claimed as a credit of \$9.20. The remaining \$10.80 of Canadian income taxes are available as a foreign tax credit carryover.

*Example 4.* The facts are the same as in *Example 2*, except that the first \$100 of taxable income mentioned in *Example 2* has a Canadian source under both the Convention and the Code.

Step 1(a):  $\frac{\$50}{\$120} \times \$105.80 = \$23$  limit for Canadian taxes.

Step 1(b):  $\frac{\$80}{\$120} \times \$105.80 = \$36.80$  limit for third country income taxes.

Step 1(c):  $\frac{\$130}{\$230} \times \$105.80 = \$59.80$  total limit.

Step 2: The taxpayer credits the \$20 of Canadian income tax and \$36.80 of third country income tax.

Step 3: As explained in *Example 2*, the taxpayer's total credit is limited to \$56.80. In this case, however, if the Canadian taxes covered by the Convention are creditable under the Code, the taxpayer could elect the Code limitation of \$59.80 ( $\frac{\$130}{\$230} \times \$105.80$ ),

which is more advantageous than the Convention limitation because that limitation does not permit third country income taxes to be credited against the U.S. tax on income arising in Canada under the Convention.

*Example 5.* The facts are the same as in *Example 2*, except that the corporation pays \$25 of Canadian income taxes and \$12 of foreign (non-Canadian) income taxes. Under step 2, the taxpayer would credit \$23 of the \$25 of Canadian income taxes and the full \$12 of third country income taxes. Since the total amount of income taxes credited under step 2 is \$35, which is less than the taxpayer's total limit of \$59.80, the taxpayer may credit an amount of Canadian income taxes up to the \$24.80 excess. Here, the taxpayer may claim a credit for the additional \$2 of Canadian income taxes not credited under step 2, and has a total credit of \$37.

*Example 6.*

(a) A U.S. corporate taxpayer has for the taxable year \$100 of taxable income having a Canadian source under the Convention and the Code; \$50 of taxable income having a Canadian source under the Convention but a U.S. source under the Code; \$80 of taxable income having a foreign (non-Canadian) source under the Code; and (\$50) of loss allocated or apportioned to U.S. source income. The taxpayer pays \$65 of Canadian income taxes, and \$45 of third country income taxes.

Step 1(a):  $\frac{\$150}{\$180} \times \$82.80 = \$69$  limit for Canadian income taxes.

Step 1(b):  $\frac{\$80}{\$180} \times \$82.80 = \$36.80$  limit for third country income taxes.

Step 1(c):  $\frac{\$180}{\$180} \times \$82.80 = \$82.80$  total limit.

Step 2: The taxpayer tentatively credits the \$65 of Canadian income taxes against the \$69 limit of step 1(a), and \$36.80 of the \$45 of third country income taxes against the \$36.80 limit of step 1(b).

Step 3: Since the total amount of credits tentatively allowed under step 2 (\$101.80) exceeds the taxpayer's total limit of \$82.80 under step 1(c), the taxpayer's allowable credit is reduced to \$82.80 under the method provided by Rev. Rul. 82-215.

(b) If the taxpayer had paid only \$40 of Canadian income taxes, the total credits tentatively allowed under step 2 is \$76.80. Although that amount is less than the \$82.80 total limit under step 1(c), no additional taxes may be credited since the taxpayer only has excess third country income taxes. The \$8.20 of excess third country income taxes would be allowed as a foreign tax credit carryover.

The general rule for avoiding double taxation in Canada is provided in paragraph 2. Pursuant to paragraph 2(a) Canada undertakes to allow to a resident of Canada a credit against income taxes imposed under the Income Tax Act for the appropriate amount of income taxes paid or accrued to the United States. Paragraph 2(b) provides for the deduction by a Canadian company, in computing taxable income, of any dividend received out of the exempt surplus of a U.S. company which is an affiliate. The provisions of paragraphs 2(a) and (b) are subject to the provisions of the Income Tax Act as they may be amended from time to time without changing the general principle of paragraph 2. Paragraph 2(c) provides that where Canada imposes a tax on the alienation of property pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 5 of Article XIII (Gains), Canada will allow a credit for the income tax paid or accrued to the United States on such gain.

The rules of paragraph 1 are modified in certain respects by rules in paragraphs 4 and 5 for income derived by United States citizens who are residents of Canada. Paragraph 4 provides two steps for the elimination of double taxation in such a case. First, paragraph 4(a) provides that Canada shall allow a deduction from (credit against) Canadian tax in respect of income tax paid or accrued to the United States in respect of profits, income, or gains which arise in the United States (within the meaning of paragraph 3(a)); the deduction against Canadian tax need not, however, exceed the amount of income tax that would be paid or accrued to the United States if the individual were not a U.S. citizen, after taking into account any relief available under the Convention.

The second step, as provided in paragraph 4(b), is that the United States allows as a credit against United States tax, subject to the rules of paragraph 1, the income tax paid or accrued to Canada after the Canadian credit for U.S. tax provided by paragraph 4(a). The credit so allowed by the United States is not to reduce the portion of the United States tax that is creditable against

Canadian tax in accordance with paragraph 4(a).

The following example illustrates the application of paragraph 4.

*Example A*

- A U.S. citizen who is a resident of Canada earns \$175 of income from the performance of independent personal services, of which \$100 is derived from services performed in Canada and \$75 from services performed in the United States. That is his total world-wide income.

If he were not a U.S. citizen, the United States could tax \$75 of that amount under Article XIV (Independent Personal Services). By reason of paragraph 3(a), the \$75 that may be taxed by the United States under Article XIV is deemed to arise in the United States. Assume that the U.S. tax on the \$75 would be \$25 if the taxpayer were not a U.S. citizen.

- However, since the individual is a U. S. citizen, he is subject to U.S. tax on his worldwide income of \$175. After excluding \$75 under section 911, his taxable income is \$100 and his U.S. tax is \$40.

- Because he is a resident of Canada, he is also subject to Canadian tax on his world-wide income. Assume that Canada taxes the \$175 at \$75.

- Canada will credit against its tax of \$75 the U.S. tax at source of \$25, leaving a net Canadian tax of \$50.

- The United States will credit against its tax of \$40 the Canadian tax net of credit, but without reducing its source basis tax of \$25; thus, the allowable credit is  $\$40 - \$25 = \$15$ .

- To use a credit of \$15 requires Canadian source taxable income of \$37.50 ( $\$37.50/\$100 \times \$40 = \$15$ ). Without any special treaty rule, Canadian source taxable income would be only \$25 (\$100 less the section 911 exclusion of \$75). Paragraph 6 provides for resourcing an additional \$12.50 of income to Canada, so that the credit of \$15 can be fully used.

Paragraph 5 provides special rules for the elimination of double taxation in the case of dividends, interest, and royalties earned by a U.S. citizen resident in Canada. These rules apply notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 4, but only as long as the law in Canada allows a deduction in computing income for the portion of any foreign tax paid in respect of dividends, interest, or royalties which exceeds 15 percent of the amount of such items of income, and only with respect to those items of income. The rules of paragraph 4 apply with respect to other items of income; moreover, if the law in force in Canada regarding the deduction for foreign taxes changes, the provisions of paragraph 5 shall not apply and the U.S. foreign tax credit for Canadian taxes and the Canadian credit for U.S. taxes will be determined solely pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 4.

The calculations under paragraph 5 are as follows. First, the deduction allowed in Canada in computing income shall be made with respect to U.S. tax on the dividends, interest and royalties before any foreign tax credit by the United States with respect to income taxes paid or accrued to Canada. Second, Canada shall allow a deduction from (credit against) Canadian tax for U.S. tax paid or accrued with respect to the dividends, interest, royalties, but such credit need not exceed 15 percent of the gross amount of such items income that have been included in computed

income for Canadian tax purposes. (The credit may, however, exceed the amount of tax that the United States would be entitled to levy under the Convention upon a Canadian resident who is not a U.S. citizen.) Third, for purposes of computing the U.S. tax on such dividends, interest, and royalties, the United States shall allow as a credit against the U.S. tax the income tax paid or accrued to Canada after the 15 percent credit against Canadian tax for income tax paid or accrued to the United States. The United States is in no event obliged to give a credit for Canadian income tax which will reduce the U.S. tax below 15 percent of the amount of the dividends, interest, and royalties.

The rules of paragraph 5 are illustrated by the following examples.

*Example B*

- A U.S. citizen who is a resident of Canada has \$100 of royalty income arising in the United States. The tentative U.S. tax before foreign tax credit is \$40.

- Canada, under its law, allows a deduction for the U.S. tax in excess of 15 percent or, in this case, a deduction of \$25 (\$40 - \$15). The Canadian taxable income is \$75 and the Canadian tax on that amount is \$35.

- Canada gives a credit of \$15 (the maximum credit allowed is 15 percent of the gross royalty taken into Canadian income) and collects a net tax of \$20.

- The United States allows a credit for the net Canadian tax against its tax in excess of 15 percent. Thus, the maximum credit is \$25 (\$40 - \$15). But since the net Canadian tax paid was \$20, the usable credit is \$20.

- To be able to use a credit of \$20 requires Canadian source taxable income of \$50 (50% of the U.S. tentative tax of \$40). Under paragraph 6, \$50 of the U.S. royalty is resourced to be of Canadian source. The credit of \$20 may then be offset against the U.S. tax of \$40, leaving a net U.S. tax of \$20.

- The combined tax paid to both countries is \$40, \$20 to Canada and \$20 to the United States.

*Example C*

A U.S. citizen who is a resident of Canada receives \$200 of income with respect to personal services performed within Canada and \$100 of royalty income arising within the United States. Taxable income for U.S. purposes, taking into account the rules of Code section 911, is \$220. U.S. tax (before foreign tax credits) is \$92. The \$100 of royalty income is deemed to bear U.S. tax (before foreign tax credits) of \$41.82

$$\begin{array}{r} (\$100 \times \$92). \\ \$220 \end{array}$$

Under Canadian law, a deduction of \$26.82 (the excess of \$41.82 over 15 percent of the \$100 royalty income) is allowed in computing income. The Canadian tax on \$273.18 of income (\$300 less the \$26.82 deduction) is \$130. Canada then gives a credit against the \$130 for \$15 (the U.S. tax paid or accrued with respect to the royalty, \$41.82, but limited to 15 percent of the gross amount of such income, or \$15), leaving a final Canadian tax of \$115. Of the \$115, \$30.80 is

attributable to the royalty

$$\frac{(\$ 73.18 (\$100 \text{ royalty less } \$26.82 \text{ deduction}) \times \$115)}{(\$273.18 (\$300 \text{ income less } \$26.82 \text{ deduction}))}$$

Of this amount, \$26.82 is creditable against U.S. tax pursuant to paragraph 5. (Although the U.S. allows a credit for the Canadian tax imposed on the royalty, \$30.80, the credit may not reduce the U.S. tax below 15 percent of the amount of the royalty. Thus, the maximum allowable credit is the excess of \$41.82, the U.S. tax imposed on the royalty income, over \$15, which is 15 percent of the \$100 royalty). The remaining \$3.98 (the Canadian tax of \$30.80 less the credit allowed of \$26.82) is a foreign tax credit carryover for U.S. purposes, subject to the limitations of paragraph 5. (An additional \$50.18 of Canadian tax with respect to Canadian source services income is creditable against U.S. tax pursuant to paragraphs 3 and 4(b). The \$50.18 is computed as follows: tentative U.S. tax (before foreign tax credits) is \$92; the U.S. tax on Canadian source services income is \$50.18 (\$92 less the U.S. tax on the royalty income of \$41.82); the limitation on the services income is:

$$\frac{\$120 (\text{taxable income from services}) \times \$92}{\$220 (\text{total taxable income})}$$

or \$50.18. The credit for Canadian tax paid on the services income is therefore \$50.18; the remainder of the Canadian tax on the services income, or \$34.02, is a foreign tax credit carryover for U.S. purposes, subject to the limitations of paragraph 5).

Paragraph 6 is necessary to implement the objectives of paragraphs 4(b) and 5(c). Paragraph 6 provides that where a U.S. citizen is a resident of Canada, items of income referred to in paragraph 4 or 5 are deemed for the purposes of Article XXIV to arise in Canada to the extent necessary to avoid double taxation of income by Canada and the United States consistent with the objectives of paragraphs 4(b) and 5(c). Paragraph 6 can override the source rules of paragraph 3 to permit a limited resourcing of income. The principles of paragraph 6 have effect, pursuant to paragraph 3(b) of Article XXX (Entry Into Force), for taxable years beginning on or after January 1, 1976. See the discussion of Article XXX below.

The application of paragraph 6 is illustrated by the following example.

#### *Example D*

The facts are the same as in *Example C*. The United States has undertaken, pursuant to paragraph 5(c) and paragraph 6, to credit \$26.82 of Canadian taxes on royalty income that has a U.S. source under both paragraph 3 and the Internal Revenue Code. (As illustrated in *Example C*, the credit, however, only reduces the U.S. tax on the royalty income which exceeds 15 percent of the amount of such income included in computing U.S. taxable income.) Pursuant to paragraph 6, for purposes of determining the U.S. foreign tax credit limitation under the Convention with respect to Canadian taxes,

$$\frac{\$ 64.13 (\underline{A}) \times \$92}{\$220} = \$26.82; \quad A = \$64.13$$

of taxable income with respect to the royalties is deemed to arise in Canada.

Paragraph 7 provides that any reference to "income tax paid or accrued" to Canada or the United States includes Canadian tax or United States tax, as the case may be. The terms "Canadian tax" and "United States tax" are defined in paragraphs 1(c) and 1(d) of Article III (General Definitions). References to income taxes paid or accrued also include taxes of general application paid or accrued to a political subdivision or local authority of Canada or the United States which are not imposed by such political subdivision or local authority in a manner inconsistent with the provisions of the Convention and which are substantially similar to taxes of Canada or the United States referred to in paragraphs 2 and 3(a) of Article II (Taxes Covered).

In order for a tax imposed by a political subdivision or local authority to fall within the scope of paragraph 7, such tax must apply to individuals, companies, or other persons generally, and not only to a particular class of individuals or companies or a particular type of business. The tax must also be substantially similar to the national taxes referred to in paragraphs 2 and 3(a) of Article II. Finally, the political subdivision or local authority must apply its tax in a manner not inconsistent with the provisions of the Convention. For example, the political subdivision or local authority must not impose its tax on a resident of the other Contracting State earning business profits within the political subdivision or local authority but not having a permanent establishment there. It is understood that a Canadian provincial income tax that satisfied the conditions of paragraph 7 on September 26, 1980 also satisfied the conditions of that paragraph on June 14, 1983 - i.e., no significant changes have occurred in the taxes imposed by Canadian provinces.

Paragraph 8 relates to the provisions of Article XXIII (Capital). It provides that where a resident of a Contracting State owns capital which, in accordance with the provisions of Article XXIII, may be taxed in the other Contracting State, the State of residence shall allow as a deduction from (credit against) its tax on capital an amount equal to the capital tax paid in the other Contracting State. The deduction is not, however, to exceed that part of the capital tax, computed before the deduction, which is attributable to capital which may be taxed in the other State.

#### ARTICLE XXV Non-discrimination

Paragraphs 1 and 2 of Article XXV protect individual citizens of a Contracting State from discrimination by the other Contracting State in taxation matters. Paragraph 1 provides that a citizen of a Contracting State who is a resident of the other Contracting State may not be subjected in that other State to any taxation or requirement connected with taxation which is other or more burdensome than the taxation and connected requirements imposed on similarly situated citizens of the other State.

Paragraph 2 assures protection in a case where a citizen of a Contracting State is not a resident of the other Contracting State. Such a citizen may not be subjected in the other State to any taxation or requirement connected to taxation which is other or more burdensome than the taxation and connected requirements to which similarly situated citizens of any third State are subjected. The reference to citizens of a third State "in the same circumstances" includes

consideration of the State of residence. Thus, pursuant to paragraph 2, the Canadian taxation with respect to a citizen of the United States resident in, for example, the United Kingdom may not be more burdensome than the taxation of a U.K. citizen resident in the United Kingdom. Any benefits available to the U.K. citizen by virtue of an income tax convention between the United Kingdom and Canada would be available to the U.S. citizen resident in the United Kingdom if he is otherwise in the same circumstances as the U.K. citizen.

Paragraph 3 assures that, in computing taxable income, an individual resident of a Contracting State will be entitled to the same deduction for dependents resident in the other Contracting State that would be allowed if the dependents were residents of the individual's State of residence. The term "dependent" is defined in accordance with the rules set forth in paragraph 2 of Article III (General Definitions). For U.S. tax purposes, paragraph 3 does not expand the benefits currently available to a resident of the United States with a dependent resident in Canada. See Code section 152(b)(3).

Paragraph 4 allows a resident of Canada (not a citizen of the United States) to file a joint return in cases where such person earns salary, wages, or other similar remuneration as an employee and such income is taxable in the United States under the Convention. Paragraph 4 does not apply where the resident of Canada earns wages which are exempt in the United States under Article XV (Dependent Personal Services) or earns only income taxable by the United States under provisions of the Convention other than Article XV.

The benefit provided by paragraph 4 is available regardless of the residence of the taxpayer's spouse. It is limited, however, by a formula designed to ensure that the benefit is available solely with respect to persons whose U.S. source income is entirely, or almost entirely, wage income. The formula limits the United States tax with respect to wage income to that portion of the total U.S. tax that would be payable for the taxable year if both the individual and his spouse were United States citizens as the individual's taxable income (determined without any of the benefits made available by paragraph 4, such as the standard deduction) bears to the total taxable income of the individual and his spouse. The term "total United States tax" used in the formula is total United States tax without regard to any foreign tax credits, as provided in subparagraph 4(a). (Foreign income taxes may, however, be claimed as deductions in computing taxable income, to the extent allowed by the Code.) In determining total taxable income of the individual and his spouse, the benefits made available by paragraph 4 are taken into account, but a deficit of the spouse is not.

The following example illustrates the application of paragraph 4.

A, a Canadian citizen and resident, is married to B who is also a Canadian citizen and resident. A earns \$12,000 of wages taxable in the U.S. under Article XV (Dependent Personal Services) and \$2,000 of wages taxable only in Canada. B earns \$1,000 of U.S. source dividend income, taxed by the United States at 15 percent pursuant to Article X (Dividends). B also earns \$2,000 of wages taxable only in Canada. A's taxable income for U.S. purposes, determined without regard to paragraph 4, is \$11,700 (\$12,000 - \$2,000 (Code sections 151(b) and 873(b)(3)) + \$1,700 (Code sections 63)). The U.S. tax (Code section 1(d)) with respect to such income is \$2,084.50. The total U.S. tax payable by A and B if both were U.S. citizens and all their income

arose in the United States would be \$2,013 under Code section 1(a) on taxable income of \$14,800 (\$17,000 - \$200 (Code section 116) - \$2,000 (Code section 151)). Pursuant to paragraph 4, the U.S. tax imposed on A's wages from U.S. sources is limited to B's U.S. tax liability with respect to the U.S. source dividends remains \$150.

$$\begin{array}{l} \$1,591.36 (\$11,700 \times \$2,013). \\ \quad \quad \quad \$14,800 \end{array}$$

The provisions of paragraph 4 may be elected on a year-by-year basis. They are purely computational and do not make either or both spouses residents of the United States for the purpose of other U.S. income tax conventions. The rules relating to the election provided by U.S. law under Code section 6013(g) (see section 1.6013-6 of the Treasury Regulations) do not apply to the election described in this paragraph.

Paragraph 5 protects against discrimination in a case where the capital of a company which is a resident of one Contracting State is wholly or partly owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by one or more residents of the other Contracting State. Such a company shall not be subjected in the State of which it is a resident to any taxation or requirement connected therewith which is other or more burdensome than the taxation and connected requirements to which are subjected to other similar companies which are residents of that State but whose capital is wholly or partly owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by one or more residents of a third State.

Paragraph 6 protects against discrimination in the case of a permanent establishment which a resident of one Contracting State has in the other Contracting State. The taxation of such a permanent establishment by the other Contracting State shall not be less favorable than the taxation of residents of that other State carrying on the same activities. The paragraph specifically overrides the provisions of Article XXIV (Elimination of Double Taxation), thus ensuring that permanent establishments will be entitled to relief from double taxation on a basis comparable to the relief, afforded to similarly situated residents. Paragraph 6 does not oblige a Contracting State to grant to a residents of the other Contracting State any personal allowances, reliefs, and reductions for taxation purposes on account of civil status or family responsibilities which it grants to its own residents. In addition, paragraph 6 does not require a Contracting State to grant to a company which is a resident of the other Contracting State the same tax relief that it grants to companies which are resident in the first-mentioned State with respect to intercorporate dividends. This provision is merely clarifying in nature, since neither the United States nor Canada would interpret paragraph 6 to provide for granting the same relief in the absence of a specific denial thereof. The principles of paragraph 6 would apply with respect to a fixed base as well as a permanent establishment. Paragraph 6 does not, however, override the provisions of Code section 906.

Paragraph 7 concerns the right of a resident of a Contracting State to claim deductions for purposes of computing taxable profits in the case of disbursements made to a resident of the other Contracting State. Such disbursements shall be deductible under the same conditions as if they had been made to a resident of the first-mentioned State. Thus, this paragraph does not require Canada to permit a deduction to a Canadian trust for disbursements made to a nonresident beneficiary out of income derived from a business in Canada or Canadian real property; granting

such a deduction would result in complete exemption by Canada of such income and would put Canadian trusts with nonresident beneficiaries in a better position than if they had resident beneficiaries. These provisions do not apply to amounts to which paragraph 1 of Article IX (Related Persons), paragraph 7 of Article XI (Interest), or paragraph 7 of Article XII (Royalties) apply. Paragraph 7 of Article XXV also provides that, for purposes of determining the taxable capital of a resident of a Contracting State, any debts of such person to a resident of the other Contracting State shall be deductible under the same conditions as if they had been contracted to a resident of the first-mentioned State. This portion of paragraph 7 relates to Article XXIII (Capital).

Paragraph 8 provides that, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 7, a Contracting State may enforce the provisions of its taxation laws relating to the deductibility of interest, in force on September 26, 1980, or as modified subsequent to that date in a manner that does not change the general nature of the provisions in force on September 26, 1980; or which are adopted after September 26, 1980, and are designed to ensure that nonresidents do not enjoy a more favorable tax treatment under the taxation laws of that State than that enjoyed by residents. Thus Canada may continue to limit the deductions for interest paid to certain nonresidents as provided in section 18(4) of Part 1 of the Income Tax Act.

Paragraph 9 provides that expenses incurred by citizens or residents of a Contracting State with respect to any Convention, including any seminar, meeting, congress, or other function of similar nature, held in the other Contracting State, are deductible for purposes of taxation in the first-mentioned State to the same extent that such expenses would be deductible if the convention were held in that first-mentioned State. Thus, for U.S. income tax purposes an individual who is a citizen or resident of the United States and who attends a convention held in Canada may claim deductions for expenses incurred in connection with such convention without regard to the provisions of Code section 274(h). Section 274(h) imposes special restrictions on the deductibility of expenses incurred in connection with foreign conventions. A claim for a deduction for such an expense remains subject, in all events, to the provisions of U.S. law with respect to the deductibility of convention expenses generally (e.g., Code sections 162 and 212). Similarly, in the case of a citizen or resident of Canada attending a convention in the United States, paragraph 9 requires Canada to allow a deduction for expenses relating to such convention as if the convention had taken place in Canada.

Paragraph 10 provides that, notwithstanding the provisions of Article II (Taxes Covered), the provisions of Article XXV apply in the case of Canada to all taxes imposed under the Income Tax Act; and, in the case of the United States, to all taxes imposed under the Code. Article XXV does not apply to taxes imposed by political subdivisions or local authorities of Canada or the United States.

Article XXV substantially broadens the protection against discrimination provided by the 1942 Convention, which contains only one provision dealing specifically with this subject. That provision, paragraph 11 of the Protocol to the 1942 Convention, states that citizens of one of the Contracting States residing within the other Contracting State are not to be subjected to the payment of more burdensome taxes than the citizens of the other State.

The benefits of Article XXV may affect the tax liability of a U.S. citizen or resident with respect to the United States. See paragraphs 2 and 3 of Article XXIX (Miscellaneous Rules).

## ARTICLE XXVI Mutual Agreement Procedure

Paragraph 1 provides that where a person considers that the actions of one or both of the Contracting States will result in taxation not in accordance with the Convention, he may present his case in writing to the competent authority of the Contracting State of which he is a resident or, if he is a resident of neither Contracting State, of which he is a national. Thus, a resident of Canada must present to the Minister of National Revenue (or his authorized representative) any claim that such resident is being subjected to taxation contrary to the Convention. A person who requests assistance from the competent authority may also avail himself of any remedies available under domestic laws.

Paragraph 2 provides that the competent authority of the Contracting State to which the case is presented shall endeavor to resolve the case by mutual agreement with the competent authority of the other Contracting State, unless he believes that the objection is not justified or he is able to arrive at a satisfactory unilateral solution. Any agreement reached between the competent authorities of Canada and the United States shall be implemented notwithstanding any time or other procedural limitations in the domestic laws of the Contracting States, except where the special mutual agreement provisions of Article IX (Related Persons) apply, provided that the competent authority of the Contracting State asked to waive its domestic time or procedural limitations has received written notification that such a case exists within six years from the end of the taxable year in the first-mentioned State to which the case relates. The notification may be given by the competent authority of the first-mentioned State, the taxpayer who has requested the competent authority to take action, or a person related to the taxpayer. Unlike Article IX, Article XXVI does not require the competent authority of a Contracting State to grant unilateral relief to avoid double taxation in a case where timely notification is not given to the competent authority of the other Contracting State. Such unilateral relief may, however, be granted by the competent authority in its discretion pursuant to the provisions of Article XXVI and in order to achieve the purposes of the Convention. In a case where the provisions of Article IX apply, the provisions of paragraphs 3, 4, and 5 of that Article are controlling with respect to adjustments and corresponding adjustments of income, loss, or tax and the effect of the Convention upon time or procedural limitations of domestic law. Thus, if the provisions of paragraph 2 of Article XXVI do not independently authorize such relief.

Paragraph 3 provides that the competent authorities of the Contracting States shall endeavor to resolve by mutual agreement any difficulties or doubts arising as to the interpretation or application of the Convention. In particular, the competent authorities may agree to the same attribution of profits to a resident of a Contracting State and its permanent establishment in the other Contracting State; the same allocation of income, deductions, credits, or allowances between persons; the same determination of the source of income; the same characterization of particular items of income; a common meaning of any term used in the Convention; rules, guidelines, or procedures for the elimination of double taxation with respect to income distributed

by an estate or trust, or with respect to a partnership; or to increase any dollar amounts referred to in the Convention to reflect monetary or economic developments. The competent authorities may also consult and reach agreements on rules, guidelines, or procedures for the elimination of double taxation in cases not provided for in the Convention.

The list of subjects of potential mutual agreement in paragraph 3 is not exhaustive; it merely illustrates the principles set forth in the paragraph. As in the case of other U.S. tax conventions, agreement can be arrived at in the context of determining the tax liability of a specific person or in establishing rules, guidelines, and procedures that will apply generally under the Convention to resolve issues for classes of taxpayers. It is contemplated that paragraph 3 could be utilized by the competent authorities, for example, to resolve conflicts between the domestic laws of Canada and the United States with respect to the allocation and apportionment of deductions.

Paragraph 4 provides that each Contracting State will endeavor to collect on behalf of the other State such amounts as may be necessary to ensure that relief granted by the Convention from taxation imposed by the other State does not enure to the benefit of persons not entitled to such relief. Paragraph 4 does not oblige either Contracting State to carry out administrative measures of a different nature from those that would be used by Canada or the United States in the collection of its own tax or which would be contrary to its public policy.

Paragraph 5 confirms that the competent authorities of Canada and the United States may communicate with each other directly for the purpose of reaching agreement in the sense of paragraphs 1 through 4.

## ARTICLE XXVII Exchange of Information

Paragraph 1 authorizes the competent authorities to exchange the information necessary for carrying out the provisions of the Convention or the domestic laws of Canada and the United States concerning taxes covered by the Convention, insofar as the taxation under those domestic laws is not contrary to the Convention. The authority to exchange information granted by paragraph 1 is not restricted by Article I (Personal Scope), and thus need not relate solely to persons otherwise covered by the Convention. It is contemplated that Article XXVII will be utilized by the competent authorities to exchange information upon request, routinely, and spontaneously.

Any information received by a Contracting State pursuant to the Convention is to be treated as secret in the same manner as information is obtained under the taxation laws of that State. Such information shall be disclosed only to persons or authorities, including courts and administrative bodies, involved in the assessment or collection of, the administration and enforcement in respect of, or the determination of appeals in relation to, the taxes covered by the Convention and the information may be used by such persons only for such purposes. (In accordance with paragraph 4, for the purposes of this Article the Convention applies to a broader range of taxes than those covered specifically by Article II (Taxes Covered).

In specific cases a competent authority providing information may, pursuant to paragraph 3, impose such other conditions on the use of information as are necessary. Although the information received by persons described in paragraph 1 is to be treated as secret, it may be disclosed by such persons in public court proceedings or in judicial decisions.

The provisions of paragraph 1 authorize the U.S. competent authority to continue to allow the General Accounting Office to examine tax return information received from Canada when GAO is engaged in a study of the administration of U.S. tax laws pursuant to a directive of Congress. However, the secrecy requirements of paragraph 1 must be met.

If a Contracting State requests information in accordance with Article XXVII, the other Contracting State, shall endeavor, pursuant to paragraph 2, to obtain the information to which the request relates in the same manner as if its own taxation were involved, notwithstanding the fact that such States does not need the information. In addition, the competent authority requested to obtain information shall endeavor to provide the information in the particular form requested, such as depositions of witnesses and copies of unedited original documents, to the same extent such depositions and documents can be obtained under the laws or administrative practices of that State with respect to its own taxes.

Paragraph 3 provides that the provisions of paragraphs 1 and 2 do not impose on Canada or the United States the obligation to carry out administrative measures at variance with the laws and administrative practice of either State; to supply information which is not obtainable under the laws or in the normal course of the administration of either State; or to supply information which would disclose any trade, business, industrial, commercial, or professional secret or trade process, or information the disclosure of which would be contrary to public policy. Thus, Article XXVII allows, but does not obligate, the United States and Canada to obtain and provide information that would not be available to the requesting State under its laws or administrative practice or that in different circumstances would not be available to the State requested to provide the information. Further, Article XXVII allows a Contracting State to obtain information for the other Contracting State even if there is no tax liability in the State requested to obtain the information. Thus, the United States will continue to be able to give Canada tax information even if there is no U.S. tax liability at issue.

Paragraph 4 provides that, for the purposes of Article XXVII, the Convention applies, in the case of Canada, to all taxes imposed by the Government of Canada on estates and gifts and under the Income Tax Act and, in the case of the United States, to all taxes imposed under the Internal Revenue Code. Article XXVII does not apply to taxes imposed by political subdivisions or local authorities of the Contracting States. Paragraph 4 is designed to ensure that information exchange will extend to most national level taxes on both sides, and specifically to information gathered for purposes of Canada's taxes on estates and gifts (not effective for deaths or gifts after 1971). This provision is intended to mesh with paragraph 8 of Article XXX (Entry Into Force), which terminates the existing estate tax convention between the United States and Canada.

#### ARTICLE XXVIII

## Diplomatic Agents and Consular Officers

Article XXVIII states that nothing in the Convention affects the fiscal privileges of diplomatic agents or consular officers under the general rules of international law or under the provisions of special agreements. However, various provisions of the Convention could apply to such persons, such as those concerning exchange of information, mutual agreement, and non-discrimination.

### ARTICLE XXIX Miscellaneous Rules

Paragraph 1 states that the provisions of the Convention do not restrict in any manner any exclusion, exemption, deduction, credit, or other allowance accorded by the laws of a Contracting State in the determination of the tax imposed by that State. Thus, if a deduction would be allowed for an item in computing the taxable income of a Canadian resident under the Code, such deduction is available to such person in computing taxable income under the Convention. Paragraph 1 does not, however, authorize a taxpayer to make inconsistent choices between rules of the Code and rules of the Convention. For example, if a resident of Canada desires to claim the benefits of the "attributable to" rule of paragraphs 1 and 7 of Article VII (Business Profits) with respect to the taxation of business profits of a permanent establishment, such person must use the "attributable to" concept consistently for all items of income and deductions and may not rely upon the "effectively connected" rules of the Code to avoid U.S. tax on other items of attributable income. In no event are the rules of the Convention to increase overall U.S. tax liability from what liability would be if there were no convention.

Paragraph 2 provides a "saving clause" pursuant to which Canada and the United States may each tax its residents, as determined under Article IV (Residence), and the United States may tax its citizens (including any former citizen whose loss of citizenship had as one of its principal purposes the avoidance of tax, but only for a period of 10 years following such loss) and companies electing under Code section 1504(d) to be treated as domestic corporations, as if there were no convention between the United States and Canada with respect to taxes on income and capital.

Paragraph 3 provides that, notwithstanding paragraph 2, the United States and Canada must respect certain specified provisions of the Convention in regard to residents, citizens, and section 1504(d) companies. Paragraph 3(a) lists certain paragraphs and Articles of the Convention that represent exceptions to the "saving clause" in all situations; paragraph 3(b) provides a limited further exception for students who have not acquired immigrant status in the State where they are temporarily present.

Paragraph 4 provides relief with respect to social security taxes imposed on employers, employees, and self-employed persons under Code sections 1401, 3101, and 3111. Income from personal services not subject to tax by the United States under the provisions of this Convention or the 1942 Convention is not to be considered wages or net earnings from self-employment for purposes of the U.S. social security taxes with respect to taxable years of the taxpayer not barred

by the statute of limitations relating to refunds (under the Code) ending on or before December 31 of the year before the year in which the Social Security Agreement between Canada and the United States (signed in Ottawa on March 11, 1981) enters into force. Thus, if that agreement enters into force in 1986, a resident of Canada earning income from personal services and such person's employer may apply for refunds of the employee's and employer's shares of U.S. social security tax paid attributable to the employee's income from personal services that is exempt from U.S. tax by virtue of this Convention or the 1942 Convention. In this example, the refunds would be available for social security taxes paid with respect to taxable years not barred by the statute of limitations of the Code ending on or before December 31, 1985. For purposes of Code section 6611, the date of overpayment with respect to refunds of U.S. tax pursuant to paragraph 4 is the later of the date on which the Social Security Agreement between Canada and the United States enters into force and the date on which instruments of ratification of the Convention are exchanged.

Under certain limited circumstances, an employee may, pursuant to paragraph 5 of Article XXX (Entry Into Force), claim an exemption from U.S. tax on wages under the 1942 Convention for one year after the Convention comes into force. The provisions of paragraph 4 would not, however, provide an exemption from U.S. social security taxes for such year.

Paragraph 4 does not modify existing U.S. statutes concerning social security benefits or funding. The Social Security Act requires the general funds of the Treasury to reimburse the social security trust funds on the basis of the records of wages and self-employment income maintained by the Social Security Administration. The Convention does not alter those records. Thus, any refunds of tax made pursuant to paragraph 4 would not affect claims for U.S. quarters of coverage with respect to social security benefits. And such refunds would be charged to general revenue funds, not social security trust funds.

Paragraph 5 provides a method to resolve conflicts between the Canadian and U.S. treatment of individual retirement accounts. Certain Canadian retirement plans which are qualified plans for Canadian tax purposes do not meet Code requirements for qualification. As a result, the earnings of such a plan are currently included in income, for U.S. tax purposes, rather than being deferred until actual distributions are made by the plan. Canada defers current taxes on the earnings of such a plan but imposes tax on actual distributions from the plan. Paragraph 5 is designed to avoid a mismatch of U.S. taxable income and foreign tax credits attributable to the Canadian tax on such distributions. Under the paragraph a beneficiary of a Canadian registered retirement savings plan may elect to defer U.S. taxation with respect to any income accrued in the plan but not distributed by the plan, until such time as a distribution is made from the plan or any substitute plan. The election is to be made under rules established by the competent authority of the United States. The election is not available with respect to income accrued in the plan which is reasonably attributable to contributions made to the plan by the beneficiary while he was not a Canadian resident.

Paragraph 6 provides rules denying the benefits of the Convention in certain situations where both countries believed that granting benefits would be inappropriate. Paragraph 6(a) provides that Articles VI (Income from Real Property) through XXIV (Elimination of Double Taxation) shall not apply to profits, income or gains derived by a trust which is treated as the

income of a resident of a Contracting State (see paragraph 1 of Article IV (Residence)), if a principal purpose of the establishment, acquisition or maintenance of the trust was to obtain a benefit under the Convention or the 1942 Convention for persons who are not residents of that State. For example, the provision could be applied to a case where a nonresident of the United States created a United States trust to derive dividend income from Canada and a principal purpose of the establishment or maintenance of the trust was to obtain the reduced rate of Canadian tax under Article X (Dividends) for the nonresident. Paragraph 6(b) provides that Articles VI through XXIV shall not apply to Canadian nonresident owned investment companies, as defined in section 133 of the Income Tax Act, or under a similar provision that is subsequently enacted. This provision operates to deny the benefits of the Convention to a Canadian nonresident owned investment company, and does not effect the grant of benefits to other persons. Thus, for example, a dividend paid by such a company to a shareholder who is a U.S. resident is subject to the reduced rates of tax provided by Article X. The denial of the benefits of Articles VI through XXIV in such cases applies notwithstanding any other provision of the Convention. A Canadian nonresident owned investment company may, however, be entitled to claim the benefits of the 1942 Convention for an additional one-year period, pursuant to paragraph 5 of Article XXX (Entry Into Force). Where the provisions of this paragraph apply, the Contracting State in which the income arises may tax such income under its domestic law.

Paragraph 7 provides rules for the U.S. taxation of Canadian social security benefits paid to a resident of Canada who is a U.S. citizen. These rules are described in the discussion of paragraph 5 of Article XVIII (Pensions and Annuities).

### ARTICLE XXX Entry into Force

Paragraph 1 provides that the Convention is subject to ratification in accordance with the procedures of Canada and the United States. The exchange of instruments of ratification is to take place at Ottawa as soon as possible.

Paragraph 2 provides, subject to paragraph 3, that the Convention shall enter into force upon the exchange of instruments of ratification. It has effect, with respect to source State taxation of dividends, interest, royalties, pensions, annuities, alimony, and child support, for amounts paid or credited on or after the first day of the second calendar month after the date on which the instruments of ratification are exchanged. For other taxes, the Convention takes effect for taxable years beginning on or after January 1 next following the date when instrument of ratification are exchanged. In the case of relief from United States social security taxes provided by paragraph 4 of Article XXIX (Miscellaneous Rules), the Convention also has effect for taxable year before the date on which instrument of ratification are exchanged.

Paragraph 3 provides special effective date rules for foreign tax credit computations with respect to tax paid or accrued to Canada. Paragraph 3(a) provides that the tax on 1971 undistributed income on hand imposed by Part IX of the Income Tax Act of Canada is considered to be an "income tax" for distribution made on or after January 1, 1972 and before January 1, 1979. Any such tax which is paid or accrued under U.S. standards is considered be imposed at the

time of distribution and on the recipient of the distribution, in the proportion that the distribution out of undistributed income with respect to which the tax has been paid bears to 85 percent of undistributed income. A person claiming a credit for tax pursuant to paragraph 3(a) is obligated to compute the amount of the credit in accordance with that paragraph.

Paragraph 3(b) provides that the principles of paragraph 6 of Article XXIV (Elimination of Double Taxation), which provides for resourcing of certain dividend, interest, and royalty income to eliminate double taxation of U.S. citizens residing in Canada, have effect for taxable years beginning on or after January 1, 1976. The paragraph is intended to grant the competent authorities sufficient flexibility to address certain practical problems that have arisen under the 1942 Convention. It is anticipated that the competent authorities will be guided by paragraphs 4 and 5 of Article XXIV in applying paragraph 3(b) of Article XXX. Paragraph 3(c) provides that the provisions of paragraph 1 of Article XXIV (and the source rules of that Article) shall have effect for taxable years beginning on or after January 1, 1981.

Any claim for refund based on the provisions of paragraph 3 may be filed on or before June 30 of the calendar year following the year in which instruments of ratification are exchanged, notwithstanding statutes of limitations or other rules of domestic law to the contrary. For purposes of Code section 6611, the date of overpayment is the date on which instruments of ratification are exchanged, with respect to any refunds of U.S. tax pursuant to paragraph 3.

Paragraph 4 provides that, subject to paragraph 5, the 1942 Convention ceases to have effect for taxes for which the Convention has effect under the provisions of paragraph 2. For example, if under paragraph 2 the Convention were to have effect with respect to taxes withheld at source on dividends paid as of October 1, 1984, the 1942 Convention will not have effect with respect to such taxes.

Paragraph 5 modifies the rule of paragraph 4 to allow all of the provisions of the 1942 Convention to continue to have effect for the period through the first taxable year with respect to which the provisions of the Convention would otherwise have effect under paragraph 2(b), if greater relief from tax is available under the 1942 Convention than under the Convention. Paragraph 5 applies to all provisions of the 1942 Convention, not just those provisions of the convention for which the Convention takes effect under paragraph 2(b) of this Article. Thus, for example, assume that the Convention has effect, pursuant to paragraph 2(b), for taxable years of a taxpayer beginning on or after January 1, 1985. Further assume that a U.S. resident with a taxable year beginning on April 1 and ending on March 31 receives natural resource royalties from Canada which are subject to a 25% tax under Article VI (Income from Real Property) of the Convention, as amended by the Protocol, and Canada's internal law, but which would be subject to a 15% tax under Article XI of the 1942 Convention. Pursuant to paragraph 5, the greater benefits of the 1942 Convention would continue to apply to royalties paid or credited to the U.S. resident through March 31, 1986.

Paragraph 6 provides that the 1942 Convention terminates on the last of the dates on which it has effect in accordance with the provisions of paragraphs 4 and 5.

Paragraph 7 terminates the Exchange of Notes between the United States and Canada of

August 2 and September 17, 1928 providing for relief from double taxation of shipping profits. The provisions of the Exchange of Notes no longer have effect for taxable years beginning on or after January 1 following the exchange of instruments of ratification of the Convention. The 1942 Convention, in Article V, had suspended the effectiveness of the Exchange of Notes.

Paragraph 8 terminates the Convention between Canada and the United States for the Avoidance of Double Taxation with Respect to Taxes on the Estates of Deceased Persons signed on February 17, 1961. The provisions of that Convention cease to have effect with respect to estates of persons deceased on or after January 1 of the year following the exchange of instruments of ratification of the Convention.

#### ARTICLE XXXI Termination

Paragraph 1 provides that the Convention shall remain in force until terminated by Canada or the United States.

Paragraph 2 provides that either Canada or the United States may terminate the Convention at any time after 5 years from the date on which instruments of ratification are exchanged, provided that notice of termination is given through diplomatic channels at least 6 months prior to the date on which the Convention is to terminate.

Paragraph 3 provides a special termination rule in situations where Canada or the United States changes its taxation laws and the other Contracting State believes that such change is significant enough to warrant modification of the Convention. In such a circumstance, the Canadian Ministry of Finance and the United States Department of the Treasury would consult with a view to resolving the matter. If the matter cannot be satisfactorily resolved, the Contracting State requesting an accommodation because of the change in the other Contracting State's taxation laws may terminate the Convention by giving the 6 months' prior notice required by paragraph 2, without regard to whether the Convention has been in force for 5 years.

Paragraph 4 provides that, in the event of termination, the Convention ceases to have effect for tax withheld at source under Articles X (Dividends), XI (Interest), XII (Royalties), and XVIII (Pensions and Annuities), and under paragraph 2 of Article XXII (Other Income), with respect to amounts paid or credited on or after the first day of January following the expiration of the 6 month period referred to in paragraph 2. In the case of other taxes, the Convention shall cease to have effect in the event of termination with respect to taxable years beginning on or after January 1 following the expiration of the 6 month period referred to in paragraph 2.

#### PROTOCOL 3

Treasury Department Technical Explanation of the Protocol Amending the Convention Between the United States of America and Canada with Respect to Taxes on Income and on Capital Signed at Washington on September 26, 1980, as Amended by the Protocols

Signed on June 14, 1983 and March 28, 1984

The Protocol, signed at Washington on March 17, 1995 (the "Protocol"), amends the Convention Between the United States of America and Canada with Respect to Taxes on Income and on Capital, signed at Washington on September 26, 1980, as amended by the Protocols signed on June 14, 1983 and March 28, 1984 (collectively referred to as the "Convention"). This technical explanation is an official guide to the Protocol. It explains policies behind particular provisions, as well as understandings reached during the negotiations with respect to the interpretation and application of the Protocol. The technical explanation is not intended to provide a complete comparison between the Protocol and the Articles of the Convention that it amends. To the extent that the Convention has not been amended by the Protocol, the Technical Explanation of the Convention remains the official explanation. References to "he" or "his" should be read to mean "he" or "she" or "his" or "her."

## ARTICLE 1

Article 1 of the Protocol amends Article II (Taxes Covered) of the Convention. Article II identifies the taxes to which the Convention applies. Paragraph 1 of Article 1 replaces paragraphs 2 through 4 of Article II of the Convention with new paragraphs 2 and 3. For each Contracting State, new paragraph 2 of Article II specifies the taxes existing on the date of signature of the Protocol to which the Convention applies. New paragraph 3 provides that the Convention will also apply to taxes identical or substantially similar to those specified in paragraph 2, and to any new capital taxes, that are imposed after the date of signature of the Protocol.

New paragraph 2(a) of Article II describes the Canadian taxes covered by the Convention. As amended by the Protocol, the Convention will apply to all taxes imposed by the Government of Canada under the Income Tax Act.

New paragraph 2(b) of Article II amends the provisions identifying the U.S. taxes covered by the Convention in several respects. The Protocol incorporates into paragraph 2(b) the special rules found in paragraph 4 of Article II of the present Convention. New paragraph 2(b)(iii) conforms the rule previously found in paragraph 4(c) of Article II to the amended provisions of Article XXIV (Elimination of Double Taxation), under which Canada has agreed to grant a foreign tax credit for U.S. social security taxes. In addition, the Protocol adds a fourth special rule to reflect the addition to the Convention of new Article XXIX B (Taxes Imposed by Reason of Death) and related provisions in new paragraph 3(g) of Article XXVI (Mutual Agreement Procedure).

Article 1 of the Protocol also makes minor clarifying, nonsubstantive amendments to paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Article.

## ARTICLE 2

This Article of the Protocol amends paragraphs 1(c) and 1(d) of Article III (General

Definitions) of the Convention. These paragraphs define the terms "Canadian tax" and "United States tax," respectively. The present Convention defines "Canadian tax" to mean the Canadian taxes specified in paragraph 2(a) or 3(a) of Article II (Taxes Covered), i.e., Canadian income taxes. It similarly defines the term "United States tax" to mean the U.S. taxes specified in paragraph 2(b) or 3(a) of Article II, i.e., U.S. income taxes.

As amended by the Protocol, paragraph 2(a) of Article II of the Convention covers all taxes imposed by Canada under its Income Tax Act, including certain taxes that are not *income* taxes. As explained below, paragraph 2(b) is similarly amended by the Protocol to include certain U.S. taxes that are not *income* taxes. It was, therefore, necessary to amend the terms "Canadian tax" and "United States tax" so that they would continue to refer exclusively to the *income* taxes imposed by each Contracting State. The amendment to the definition of the term "Canadian tax" ensures, for example, that the Protocol will not obligate the United States to give a foreign tax credit under Article XXIV (Elimination of Double Taxation) for covered taxes other than income taxes.

The definition of "United States tax," as amended, excludes certain United States taxes that are covered in Article II only for certain limited purposes under the Convention. These include the accumulated earnings tax, the personal holding company tax, foundation excise taxes, social security taxes, and estate taxes. To the extent that these are to be creditable taxes in Canada, that fact is specified elsewhere in the Convention. A Canadian income tax credit for U.S. social security taxes is provided in new paragraph 2(a)(ii) of Article XXIV (Elimination of Double Taxation). A Canadian income tax credit for the U.S. estate taxes is provided in paragraph 6 of new Article XXIX B (Taxes Imposed by Reason of Death).

### ARTICLE 3

Article 3 of the Protocol amends Article IV (Residence) of the Convention. It clarifies the meaning of the term "resident" in certain cases and adds a special rule, found in a number of recent U.S. treaties, for determining the residence of U.S. citizens and "green card" holders.

The first sentence of paragraph 1 of Article IV sets forth the general criteria for determining residence under the Convention. It is amended by the Protocol to state explicitly that a person will be considered a resident of a Contracting State for purposes of the Convention if he is liable to tax in that Contracting State by reason of citizenship. Although the sentence applies to both Contracting States, only the United States taxes its nonresident citizens in the same manner as its residents. Aliens admitted to the United States for permanent residence ("green card" holders) continue to qualify as U.S. residents under the first sentence of paragraph 1, because they are taxed by the United States as residents, regardless of where they physically reside.

U.S. citizens and green card holders who reside outside the United States, however, may have relatively little personal or economic nexus with the United States. The Protocol adds a second sentence to paragraph 1 that acknowledges this fact by limiting the circumstances under which such persons are to be treated, for purposes of the Convention, as U.S. residents.

Under that sentence, a U.S. citizen or green card holder will be treated as a resident of the United States for purposes of the Convention, and, thereby, be entitled to treaty benefits, only if

(1) the individual has a substantial presence, permanent home, or habitual abode in the United States, and

(2) the individual's personal and economic relations with the United States are closer than those with any third country.

If, however, such an individual is a resident of both the United States and Canada under the first sentence of the paragraph, his residence for purposes of the Convention is determined instead under the "tie-breaker" rules of paragraph 2 of the Article.

The fact that a U.S. citizen who does not have close ties to the United States may not be treated as a U.S. resident under Article IV of the Convention does not alter the application of the saving clause of paragraph 2 of Article XXIX (Miscellaneous Rules) to that citizen. However, like any other individual that is a resident alien under U.S. law, a green card holder is treated as a resident of the United States for purposes of the saving clause only if he qualifies as such under Article IV.

New paragraph 1(a) confirms that the term "resident" of a Contracting State includes the Government of that State or a political subdivision or local authority of that State, as well as any agency or instrumentality of one of these governmental entities. This is implicit in the current Convention and in other U.S. and Canadian treaties, even where not specified.

New paragraph 1 also clarifies, in subparagraph (b), that trusts, organizations, or other arrangements operated exclusively to provide retirement or employee benefits, and other not-for-profit organizations, such as organizations described in section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code, are residents of a Contracting State if they are constituted in that State and are generally exempt from income taxation in that State by reason of their nature as described above. This change clarifies that the specified entities are to be treated as residents of one of the Contracting States. This corresponds to the interpretation that had previously been adopted by the Contracting States. Such entities, therefore, will be entitled to the benefits of the Convention with respect to the other Contracting State, provided that they satisfy the requirements of new Article XXIX A (Limitation on Benefits) (discussed below).

Article 3 of the Protocol adds a sentence to paragraph 3 of Article IV of the current Convention to address the residence of certain dual resident corporations. Certain jurisdictions allow local incorporation of an entity that is already organized and incorporated under the laws of another country. Under Canadian law, such an entity is referred to as having been "continued" into the other country. Although the Protocol uses the Canadian term, the provision operates reciprocally. The new sentence states that such a corporation will be considered a resident of the State into which it is continued. Paragraph 5 of Article 21 of the Protocol governs the effective date of this provision.

## ARTICLE 4

Article 4 of the Protocol amends paragraphs 3 and 4 of Article IX (Related Persons) of the Convention. Paragraph 1 of Article IX authorizes a Contracting State to adjust the amount of income, loss, or tax payable by a person with respect to arrangements between that person and a related person in the other Contracting State, when such arrangements differ from those that would obtain between unrelated persons. Under the present Convention, if an adjustment is made or to be made by a Contracting State under paragraph 1, paragraph 3 obligates the other Contracting State to make a corresponding adjustment if two conditions are satisfied:

(1) the other Contracting State agrees with the adjustment made or to be made by the first Contracting State, and

(2) the competent authority of the other Contracting State has received notice of the first adjustment within six years of the end of the taxable year to which that adjustment relates.

If notice is not given within the six-year period, and if the person to whom the first adjustment relates is not notified of the adjustment at least six months prior to the end of the six-year period, paragraph 4 of Article IX of the present Convention requires that the first Contracting State withdraw its adjustment, to the extent necessary to avoid double taxation.

Article 4 of the Protocol amends paragraphs 3 and 4 of Article IX to prevent taxpayers from using the notification requirements of the present Convention to avoid adjustments. Paragraph 4, as amended, eliminates the requirement that a Contracting State withdraw an adjustment if the notification requirement of paragraph 3 has not been met. Paragraph 4 is also amended to delete the requirement that the taxpayer be notified at least six months before expiration of the six-year period specified in paragraph 3.

As amended by the Protocol, Article IX also explicitly authorizes the competent authorities to relieve double taxation in appropriate cases, even if the notification requirement is not satisfied. Paragraph 3 confirms that the competent authorities may agree to a corresponding adjustment if such an adjustment is not otherwise barred by time or procedural limitations such as the statute of limitations. Paragraph 4 provides that the competent authority of the State making the initial adjustment may grant unilateral relief from double taxation in other cases, although such relief is not obligatory.

## ARTICLE 5

Article 5 of the Protocol amends Article X (Dividends) of the Convention, paragraph 1 of Article 5 amends paragraph 2(a) of Article X to reduce from 10 percent 5 percent the maximum rate of tax that may be imposed by a Contracting State on the gross amount of dividends beneficially owned by a company resident in the other Contracting State that owns at least 10 percent of the voting stock of the company paying the dividends. The rate at which the branch profits tax may be imposed under paragraph 6 is also reduced by paragraph 1 of Article 5 from 10 percent to 5 percent. Under the entry-into-force provisions of Article 21 of the Protocol, these reductions will be phased in over a three-year period.

Paragraph 2 of Article 5 of the Protocol replaces paragraph 7 of Article X of the Convention with a new paragraph 7. Paragraph 7 of the existing Convention is no longer relevant

because it applies only in the case where a Contracting State does not impose a branch profits tax. Both Contracting States now do impose such a tax.

New paragraph 7 makes the 5 percent withholding rate of new paragraph 2(a) inapplicable in certain situations. Under new paragraph 7(b), dividends paid by U.S. regulated investment companies (RICs) are denied the 5 percent withholding rate even if the Canadian shareholder is a corporation that would otherwise qualify as a direct investor by satisfying the 10-percent ownership requirement. Consequently, all RIC dividends to Canadian beneficial owners are subjected to the 15 percent rate that applies to dividends paid to portfolio investors.

Dividends paid by U.S. real estate investment trusts (REITs) to Canadian beneficial owners are also denied the 5 percent rate under the rules of paragraph 7(c). REIT dividends paid to individuals who own less than a 10 percent interest in the REIT are subject to withholding at a maximum rate of 15 percent. Paragraph 7(c) also provides that dividend distributions by a REIT to an estate or a testamentary trust acquiring the interest in the REIT as a consequence of the death of an individual will be treated as distributions to an individual, for the five-year period following the death. Thus, dividends paid to an estate or testamentary trust in respect of a holding of less than a 10 percent interest in the REIT also will be entitled to the 15 percent rate of withholding, but only for up to five years after the death. REIT dividends paid to other Canadian beneficial owners are subject to the rate of withholding tax that applies under the domestic law of the United States (i.e., 30 percent).

The denial of the 5 percent withholding rate at source to all RIC and REIT shareholders, and the denial of the 15 percent rate to most shareholders of REITs, is intended to prevent the use of these nontaxable conduit entities to gain unjustifiable benefits for certain shareholders. For example, a Canadian corporation that wishes to hold a portfolio of U.S. corporate shares may hold the portfolio directly and pay a U.S. withholding tax of 15 percent on all of the dividends that it receives. Alternatively, it may place the portfolio of U.S. stocks in a RIC, in which the Canadian corporation owns more than 10 percent of the shares, but in which there are enough small shareholders to satisfy the RIC diversified ownership requirements. Since the RIC is a pure conduit, there are no U.S. tax costs to the Canadian corporation of interposing the RIC as an intermediary in the chain of ownership. It is unlikely that a 10 percent shareholding in a RIC will constitute a 10 percent share holding in any company from which the dividends originate. In the absence of the special rules in paragraph 7(b), however, interposition of a RIC would transform what should be portfolio dividends into direct investment dividends taxable at source by the United States only at 5 percent. The special rules of paragraph 7 prevent this.

Similarly, a resident of Canada may hold U.S. real property directly and pay U.S. tax either at a 30 percent rate on the gross income or at the income tax rates specified in the Internal Revenue Code on the net income. By placing the real estate holding in a REIT, the Canadian investor could transform real estate income into dividend income and thus transform high-taxed income into much lower-taxed income. In the absence of the special rule, if the REIT shareholder were a Canadian corporation that owned at least a 10 percent interest in the REIT, the withholding rate would be 5 percent; in all other cases, it would be 15 percent. In either event, with one exception, a tax rate of 30 percent or more would be significantly reduced. The exception is the relatively small individual Canadian investor who might be subject to U.S. tax at a rate of only 15

percent on the net income even if he earned the real estate income directly. Under the rule in paragraph 7(c), such individuals, defined as those holding less than a 10 percent interest in the REIT, remain taxable at source at a 15 percent rate.

Subparagraph (a) of paragraph 7 provides a special rule for certain dividends paid by Canadian non-resident-owned investment corporations ("NROs"). The subparagraph provides for a maximum rate of 10 percent (instead of the standard rate of 5 percent) for dividends paid by NROs that are Canadian residents to a U.S. company that owns 10 percent or more of the voting stock of the NRO and that is the beneficial owner of the dividend. This rule maintains the rate available under the current Convention for dividends from NROs. Canada wanted the withholding rate for direct investment NRO dividends to be no lower than the maximum withholding rates under the Convention on interest and royalties, to make sure that a foreign investor cannot transform interest or royalty income subject to a 10 percent withholding tax into direct dividends qualifying for a 5 percent withholding tax by passing it through to an NRO.

## ARTICLE 6

Article 6 of the Protocol amends Article XI (Interest) of the Convention. Paragraph 1 of the Article reduces the general maximum withholding rate on interest under paragraph 2 of Article XI from 15 percent to 10 percent.

Paragraph 3 of Article XI of the Convention provides that, notwithstanding the general withholding rate applicable to interest payments under paragraph 2, certain specified categories of interest are exempt from withholding at source. Paragraph 2 of Article 6 of the Protocol amends paragraph 3(d) of the Convention, which deals with interest paid on indebtedness arising in connection with a sale on credit of equipment, merchandise, or services. The exemption provided by that paragraph in the Convention is broadened under the Protocol to apply to interest that is beneficially owned either by the seller in the underlying transaction, as under the present Convention, or by any beneficial owner of interest paid with respect to an indebtedness arising as a result of the sale on credit of equipment, merchandise, or services. This exemption, however, does not apply in cases where the purchaser is related to the seller or the debtor is related to the beneficial owner of the interest. The negotiators agreed that this exemption is subject, as are the other provisions of the Convention, to any anti-avoidance rules applicable under the respective domestic law of the Contracting States.

The reference to "related persons" in paragraph 3(d) of Article XI of the Convention, as amended, is a change from the present Convention, which refers to "persons dealing at arm's length." The term "related person" as used in this Article is not defined for purposes of the Convention. Accordingly, the meaning of the term, and, therefore, the application of this Article, will be governed by the domestic law of each Contracting State (as is true with the use of the term "arm's length" under the current Convention) under the interpretative rule of paragraph 2 of Article III (General Definitions). The United States will define the term "related person" as under section 482 of the Internal Revenue Code, to include organizations, trades, or businesses (whether or not incorporated, whether or not organized in the United States, and whether or not affiliated) owned or controlled directly or indirectly by the same interests. The Canadian definition of

"related persons" is found in section 251 of the Income Tax Act.

Paragraph 3 of Article 6 of the Protocol adds a new paragraph 9 to Article XI of the Convention. Although the definition of "interest" in paragraph 4 includes an excess inclusion with respect to a residual interest in a real estate mortgage investment conduit (REMIC) described in section 86OG of the Internal Revenue Code, new paragraph 9 provides that the reduced rates of tax at source for interest provided for in paragraphs 2 and 3 do not apply to such income. This class of interest, therefore, remains subject to the statutory 30 percent U.S. rate of tax at source. The legislation that created REMICs in 1986 provided that such excess inclusions were to be taxed at the full 30 percent statutory rate, regardless of any then-existing treaty provisions to the contrary. The 30 percent rate of tax on excess inclusions received by residents of Canada is consistent with this expression of Congressional intent.

## ARTICLE 7

Article 7 of the Protocol modifies Article XII (Royalties) of the Convention by expanding the classes of royalties exempt from withholding of tax at source. Paragraph 3, as amended by the Protocol, identifies four classes of royalty payments arising in one Contracting State and beneficially owned by a resident of the other that are exempt at source:

(1) subparagraph (a) preserves the exemption in paragraph 3 of the present Convention for copyright royalties in respect of literary and other works, other than certain such payments in respect of motion pictures, videotapes, and similar payments;

(2) subparagraph (b) specifies that computer software royalties are also exempt;

(3) subparagraph (c) adds royalties paid for the use of, or the right to use, patents and information concerning industrial, commercial, and scientific experience, other than payments in connection with rental or franchise agreements; and

(4) subparagraph (d) allows the Contracting States to reach an agreement, through an exchange of diplomatic notes, with respect to the application of paragraph 3 of Article XII to payments in respect of certain live broadcasting transmissions.

The specific reference to software in subparagraph (b) is not intended to suggest that the United States views the term "copyright" as excluding software in other U.S. treaties (including the current treaty with Canada).

The negotiators agreed that royalties paid for the use of, or the right to use, designs or models, plans, secret formulas, or processes are included under subparagraph 3(c) to the extent that they represent payments for the use of, or the right to use, information concerning industrial, commercial, or scientific experience. In addition, they agreed that royalties paid for the use of, or the right to use, "know-how," as defined in paragraph 11 of the Commentary on Article 12 of the OECD Model Income Tax Treaty, constitute payments for the use of, or the right to use, information concerning industrial, commercial, or scientific experience. The negotiators further agreed that a royalty paid under a "mixed contract," "package fee," or similar arrangement will be treated as exempt at source by virtue of paragraph 3 to the extent of any portion that is paid for the use of, or the right to use, property or information with respect to which paragraph 3 grants an exemption.

The exemption granted under subparagraph 3(c) does not, however, extend to payments made for information concerning industrial, commercial, or scientific experience that is provided in connection with a rental or franchise agreement. For this purpose, the negotiators agreed that a franchise is to be distinguished from other arrangements resulting in the transfer of intangible property. They agreed that a license to use intangibles (whether or not including a trademark) in a territory, in and of itself, would not constitute a franchise agreement for purposes of subparagraph 3(c) in the absence of other rights and obligations in the license agreement or in any other agreement that would indicate that the arrangement in its totality constituted a franchise agreement. For example, a resident of one Contracting State may acquire a right to use a secret formula to manufacture a particular product (e.g., a perfume), together with the right to use a trademark for that product and to market it at a non-retail level, in the other Contracting State. Such an arrangement would not constitute a franchise in the absence of any other rights or obligations under that arrangement or any other agreement that would indicate that the arrangement in its totality constituted a franchise agreement. Therefore, the royalty payment under that arrangement would be exempt from withholding tax in the other Contracting State to the extent made for the use of, or the right to use, the secret formula or other information concerning industrial, commercial, or scientific experience; however, it would be subject to withholding tax at a rate of 10 percent, to the extent made for the use of, or the right to use, the trademark.

The provisions of paragraph 3 do not fully reflect the U.S. treaty policy of exempting all types of royalty payments from taxation at source, but Canada was not prepared to grant a complete exemption for all types of royalties in the Protocol. Although the Protocol makes several important changes to the royalty provisions of the present Convention in the direction of bringing Article XII into conformity with U.S. policy, the United States remains concerned about the imposition of withholding tax on some classes of royalties and about the associated administrative burdens. In this connection, the Contracting States have affirmed their intention to collaborate to resolve in good faith any administrative issues that may arise in applying the provisions of subparagraph 3(c). The United States intends to continue to pursue a zero rate of withholding for all royalties in future negotiations with Canada, including discussions under Article 20 of the Protocol, as well as in negotiations with other countries.

As noted above, new subparagraph 3(d) enables the Contracting States to provide an exemption for royalties paid with respect to broadcasting through an exchange of notes. This provision was included because Canada was not prepared at the time of the negotiations to commit to an exemption for broadcasting royalties. Subparagraph 3(d) was included to enable the Senate to give its advice and consent in advance to such an exemption, in the hope that such an exemption could be obtained without awaiting the negotiation of another full protocol. Any agreement reached under the exchange of notes authorized by subparagraph 3(d) would lower the withholding rate from 10 percent to zero and, thus, bring the Convention into greater conformity with established U.S. treaty policy.

Paragraph 2 of Article 7 of the Protocol amends the rules in paragraph 6 of Article XII of the Convention for determining the source of royalty payments. Under the present Convention, royalties generally are deemed to arise in a Contracting State if paid by a resident of that State.

However, if the obligation to pay the royalties was incurred in connection with a permanent establishment or a fixed base in one of the Contracting States that bears the expense, the royalties are deemed to arise in that State.

The Protocol continues to apply these basic rules but changes the scope of an exception provided under the present Convention. Under the present Convention, a royalty paid for the use of, or the right to use, property in a Contracting State is deemed to arise in that State. Under the Protocol, this "place of use" exception applies only if the Convention does not otherwise deem the royalties to arise in one of the Contracting States. Thus, the "place of use" exception will apply only if royalties are neither paid by a resident of one of the Contracting States nor borne by a permanent establishment or fixed base in either State. For example, if a Canadian resident were to grant franchise rights to a resident of Chile for use in the United States, the royalty paid by the Chilean resident to the Canadian resident for those rights would be U.S. source income under this Article, subject to U.S. withholding at the 10 percent rate provided in paragraph 2.

The rules of this Article differ from those provided under U.S. domestic law. Under U.S. domestic law, a royalty is considered to be from U.S. sources if it is paid for the use of, or the privilege of using, an intangible within the United States; the residence of the payor is irrelevant. If paid to a nonresident alien individual or other foreign person, a U.S. source royalty is generally subject to withholding tax at a rate of 30 percent under U.S. domestic law. By reason of paragraph 1 of Article XXIX (Miscellaneous Rules), a Canadian resident would be permitted to apply the rules of U.S. domestic law to its royalty income if those rules produced a more favorable result in its case than those of this Article. However, under a basic principle of tax treaty interpretation recognized by both Contracting States, the prohibition against so-called "cherry-picking," the Canadian resident would be precluded from claiming selected benefits under the Convention (e.g., the tax rates only) and other benefits under U.S. domestic law (e.g., the source rules only) with respect to its royalties. See, e.g., Rev. Rul. 84-17, 1984-1 C.B. 308. For example, if a Canadian company granted franchise rights to a resident of the United States for use 50 percent in the United States and 50 percent in Chile, the Convention would permit the Canadian company to treat all of its royalty income from that single transaction as U.S. source income entitled to the withholding tax reduction under paragraph 2. U.S. domestic law would permit the Canadian company to treat 50 percent of its royalty income as U.S. source income subject to a 30 percent withholding tax and the other 50 percent as foreign source income exempt from U.S. tax. The Canadian company could choose to apply either the provisions of U.S. domestic law or the provisions of the Convention to the transaction, but would not be permitted to claim both the U.S. domestic law exemption for 50 percent of the income and the Convention's reduced withholding rate for the remainder of the income.

Royalties generally are considered borne by a permanent establishment or fixed base if they are deductible in computing the taxable income of that permanent establishment or fixed base.

Since the definition of "resident" of a Contracting State in Article IV (Residence), as amended by Article 3 of the Protocol, specifies that this term includes the Contracting States and their political subdivisions and local authorities, the source rule does not include a specific reference to these governmental entities.

## ARTICLE 8

Article 8 of the Protocol broadens the scope of paragraph 8 of Article XIII (Gains) of the Convention to cover organizations, reorganizations, amalgamations, and similar transactions involving either corporations or other entities. The present Convention covers only transactions involving corporations. The amendment is intended to make the paragraph applicable to transactions involving other types of entities, such as trusts and partnerships.

As in the case of transactions covered by the present Convention, the deferral allowed under this provision shall be for such time and under such other conditions as are stipulated between the person acquiring the property and the competent authority. The agreement of the competent authority of the State of source is entirely discretionary and, when granted, will be granted only to the extent necessary to avoid double taxation.

## ARTICLE 9

Article 9 of the Protocol amends Article XVIII (Pensions and Annuities) of the Convention. Paragraph 3 of Article XVIII defines the term "pensions" for purposes of the Convention, including the rules for the taxation of cross-border pensions in paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Article, the rules in paragraphs 2 and 3 of Article XXI (Exempt Organizations) for certain income derived by pension funds, and the rules in paragraph 1(b)(i) of Article IV (Residence) regarding the residence of pension funds and certain other entities. The Protocol amends the present definition by substituting the phrase "other retirement arrangement" for the phrase "retirement plan." The purpose of this change is to clarify that the definition of "pensions" includes, for example, payments from Individual Retirement Accounts (IRAs) in the United States and to provide that "pensions" includes, for example, Registered Retirement Savings Plans (RRSPs) and Registered Retirement Income Funds (RRIFs) in Canada. The term "pensions" also would include amounts paid by other retirement plans or arrangements, whether or not they are qualified plans under U.S. domestic law; this would include, for example, plans and arrangements described in section 457 or 414(d) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Paragraph 2 of Article 9 of the Protocol amends paragraph 5 of Article XVIII to modify the treatment of social security benefits under the Convention. Under the amended paragraph, benefits paid under the U.S. or Canadian social security legislation to a resident of the other Contracting State, or, in the case of Canadian benefits, to a U.S. citizen, are taxable exclusively in the paying State. This amendment brings the Convention into line with current U.S. treaty policy. Social security benefits are defined, for this purpose, to include tier 1 railroad retirement benefits but not unemployment benefits (which therefore fall under Article XXII (Other Income) of the Convention). Pensions in respect of government service are covered not by this rule but by the rules of paragraphs 1 and 2 of Article XVIII.

The special rule regarding U.S. citizens is intended to clarify that only Canada, and not the United States, may tax a social security payment by Canada to a U.S. citizen not resident in the

United States. This is consistent with the intention of the general rule, which is to give each Contracting State exclusive taxing jurisdiction over its social security payments. Since paragraph 5 is an exception to the saving clause, Canada will retain exclusive taxing jurisdiction over Canadian social security benefits paid to U.S. residents and citizens, and vice versa. It was not necessary to provide a special rule to clarify the taxation of U.S. social security payments to Canadian citizens, because Canada does not tax on the basis of citizenship and, therefore, does not include citizens within the scope of its saving clause.

A new paragraph 7 is added to Article XVIII by Article 9 of the Protocol. This paragraph replaces paragraph 5 of Article XXIX (Miscellaneous Rules) of the present Convention. The new paragraph makes reciprocal the rule that it replaced and expands its scope, so that it no longer applies only to residents and citizens of the United States who are beneficiaries of Canadian RRSPs. As amended, paragraph 7 applies to an individual who is a citizen or resident of a Contracting State and a beneficiary of a trust, company, organization, or other arrangement that is a resident of the other Contracting State and that is both generally exempt from income taxation in its State of residence and operated exclusively to provide pension, retirement, or employee benefits. Under this rule, the beneficiary may elect to defer taxation in his State of residence on income accrued in the plan until it is distributed or rolled over into another plan. The new rule also broadens the types of arrangements covered by this paragraph in a manner consistent with other pension-related provisions of the Protocol.

## ARTICLE 10

Article 10 of the Protocol amends Article XXI (Exempt Organizations) of the Convention. Paragraph 1 of Article 10 amends paragraphs 2 and 3 of Article XXI. The most significant changes are those that conform the language of the two paragraphs to the revised definition of the term "pension" in paragraph 3 of Article XVIII (Pensions and Annuities). The revision adds the term "arrangement" to "trust, company or organization" in describing the residents of a Contracting State that may receive dividend and interest income exempt from current income taxation by the other Contracting State. This clarifies that IRAs, for example, are eligible for the benefits of paragraph 2, subject to the exception in paragraph 3, and makes Canadian RRSPs and RRIFFs, for example, similarly eligible (provided that they are operated exclusively to administer or provide pension, retirement, or employee benefits).

The other changes, all in paragraph 2, are intended to improve and clarify the language. For example, the reference to "tax" in the present Convention is changed to a reference to "income taxation." This is intended to clarify that if an otherwise exempt organization is subject to an excise tax, for example, it will not lose the benefits of this paragraph. In subparagraph 2 (b), the phrase "not taxed in a taxable year" was changed to "generally exempt from income taxation in a taxable year" to ensure uniformity throughout the Convention; this change was not intended to disqualify a trust or other arrangement that qualifies for the exemption under the wording of the present Convention.

Paragraph 2 of Article 10 adds a sentence to paragraph 5 of Article XXI of the Convention. The paragraph in the present Convention provides that a U.S. citizen or resident may

deduct, for U.S. income tax purposes, contributions made to Canadian charities under certain circumstances. The added sentence makes clear that the benefits of the paragraph are available to a company that is a resident of Canada but is treated by the United States as a domestic corporation under the consolidated return rules of section 1504(d) of the Internal Revenue Code. Thus, such a company will be able to deduct, for U.S. income tax purposes, contributions to Canadian charities that are deductible to a U.S. resident under the provisions of the paragraph.

Paragraph 3 of Article 10 amends paragraph 6 of Article XXI of the Convention to replace references to "deductions" for Canadian tax purposes with references to "relief" from tax. These changes clarify that the provisions of paragraph 6 apply to the credit for charitable contributions allowed under current Canadian law. The Protocol also makes other non-substantive drafting changes to paragraph 6.

## ARTICLE 11

Article 11 of the Protocol adds a new paragraph 3 to Article XXII (Other Income) of the Convention. This Article entitles residents of one Contracting State who are taxable by the other State on gains from wagering transactions to deduct losses from wagering transactions for the purposes of taxation in that other State. However, losses are to be deductible only to the extent that they are incurred with respect to wagering transactions, the gains on which could be taxable in the other State, and only to the extent that such losses would be deductible if incurred by a resident of that other State.

This Article does not affect the collection of tax by a Contracting State. Thus, in the case of a resident of Canada, this Article does not affect, for example, the imposition of U.S. withholding taxes under section 1441 or section 1442 of the Internal Revenue Code on the gross amount of gains from wagering transactions. However, in computing its U.S. income tax liability on net income for the taxable year concerned, the Canadian resident may reduce its gains from wagering transactions subject to taxation in the United States by any wagering losses incurred on such transactions, to the extent that those losses are deductible under the provisions of new paragraph 3. Under U.S. domestic law, the deduction of wagering losses is governed by section 165 of the Internal Revenue Code. It is intended that the resident of Canada file a nonresident income tax return in order to substantiate the deduction for losses and to claim a refund of any overpayment of U.S. taxes collected by withholding.

## ARTICLE 12

Article 12 of the Protocol amends Article XXIV (Elimination of Double Taxation) of the Convention. Paragraph 1 of Article 12 amends the rules for Canadian double taxation relief in subparagraphs (a) and (b) of paragraph 2 of Article XXIV. The amendment to subparagraph (a) obligates Canada to give a foreign tax credit for U.S. social security taxes paid by individuals. The amendment to subparagraph (b) of paragraph 2 does not alter the substantive effect of the rule, but conforms the language to current Canadian law. Under the provision as amended, Canada generally continues to allow an exemption to a Canadian corporation for direct dividends

paid from the exempt surplus of a U.S. affiliate.

Paragraphs 4 and 5 of Article XXIV of the Convention provide double taxation relief rules, for both the United States and Canada, with respect to U.S. source income derived by a U.S. citizen who is resident in Canada. These rules address the fact that a U.S. citizen resident in Canada remains subject to U.S. tax on his worldwide income at ordinary progressive rates, and may, therefore, be subject to U.S. tax at a higher rate than a resident of Canada who is not a U.S. citizen. In essence, these paragraphs limit the foreign tax credit that Canada is obliged to allow such a U.S. citizen to the amount of tax on his U.S. source income that the United States would be allowed to collect from a Canadian resident who is not a U.S. citizen. They also oblige the United States to allow the U.S. citizen a credit for any income tax paid to Canada on the remainder of his income. Paragraph 4 deals with items of income other than dividends, interest, and royalties and is not changed by the Protocol. Paragraph 5, which deals with dividends, interest, and royalties, is amended by paragraph 2 of Article 12 of the Protocol.

The amendments to paragraph 5 of the Article make that paragraph applicable only to dividend, interest, and royalty income that would be subject to a positive rate of U.S. tax if paid to a Canadian resident who is not a U.S. citizen. This means that the rules of paragraph 4, not paragraph 5, will apply to items of interest and royalties, such as portfolio interest, that would be exempt from U.S. tax if paid to a non-U.S. citizen resident in Canada. Under paragraph 4, Canada will not allow a credit for the U.S. tax on such income, and the United States will credit the Canadian tax to the extent necessary to avoid double taxation.

Paragraph 2 of Article 12 of the Protocol makes further technical amendments to paragraph 5 of Article XXIV of the Convention. The existing Technical Explanation of paragraphs 5 and 6 of Article XXIV of the Convention should be read as follows to reflect the amendments made by the Protocol.

Paragraph 5 provides special rules for the elimination of double taxation in the case of dividends, interest, and royalties earned by a U.S. citizen resident in Canada. These rules apply notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 4, but only as long as the law in Canada allows a deduction in computing income for the portion of any foreign tax paid in respect of dividends, interest, or royalties which exceeds 15 percent of the amount of such items of income, and only with respect to those items of income. The rules of paragraph 4 apply with respect to other items of income; moreover, if the law in force in Canada regarding the deduction for foreign taxes is changed so as to no longer allow such a deduction, the provisions of paragraph 5 shall not apply and the U.S. foreign tax credit for Canadian taxes and the Canadian credit for U.S. taxes will be determined solely pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 4.

The calculations under paragraph 5 are as follows. First, the deduction allowed in Canada in computing income shall be made with respect to U.S. tax on the dividends, interest, and royalties before any foreign tax credit by the United States with respect to income tax paid or accrued to Canada. Second, Canada shall allow a deduction from (credit against) Canadian tax for U.S. tax paid or accrued with respect to the dividends, interest, and royalties, but such credit need not exceed the amount of income tax that would be paid or accrued to the United States on such items of income if the individual were not a U.S. citizen after taking into account any relief

available under the Convention. Third, for purposes of computing the U.S. tax on such dividends, interest, and royalties, the United States shall allow as a credit against the U.S. tax the income tax paid or accrued to Canada after the credit against Canadian tax for income tax paid or accrued to the United States. The United States is in no event obliged to give a credit for Canadian income tax which will reduce the U.S. tax below the amount of income tax that would be paid or accrued to the United States on the amount of the dividends, interest, and royalties if the individual were not a U.S. citizen after taking into account any relief available under the Convention.

The rules of paragraph 5 are illustrated by the following examples.

*Example B*

- A U.S. citizen who is a resident of Canada has \$100 of dividend income arising in the United States. The tentative U.S. tax before foreign tax credit is \$40.

- Canada, under its law, allows a deduction for the U.S. tax in excess of 15 percent or, in this case, a deduction of \$25 (\$40 - \$15). The Canadian taxable income is \$75 and the Canadian tax on that amount is \$35.

- Canada gives a credit of \$15 (the maximum credit allowed is 15 percent of the gross dividend taken into Canadian income) and collects a net tax of \$20.

- The United States allows a credit for the net Canadian tax against its tax in excess of 15 percent. Thus, the maximum credit is \$25 (\$40 - \$15). But since the net Canadian tax paid was \$20, the usable credit is \$20.

- To be able to use a credit of \$20 requires Canadian source taxable income of \$50 (50% of the U.S. tentative tax of \$40). Under paragraph 6, \$50 of the U.S. dividend is resourced to be of Canadian source. The credit of \$20 may then be offset against the U.S. tax of \$40, leaving a net U.S. tax of \$20.

- The combined tax paid to both countries is \$40, \$20 to Canada and \$20 to the United States.

*Example C*

- A U.S. citizen who is a resident of Canada receives \$200 of income with respect to personal services performed within Canada and \$100 of dividend income arising within the United States. Taxable income for U.S. purposes, taking into account the rules of Code section 911, is \$220. U.S. tax (before foreign tax credits) is \$92. The \$100 of dividend income is deemed to bear U.S. tax (before foreign tax credits) of \$41.82 ( $\$100/\$200 \times \$92$ ). Under Canadian law, a deduction of \$26.82 (the excess of \$41.82 over 15 percent of the \$100 dividend income) is allowed in computing income. The Canadian tax on \$273.18 of income (\$300 less the \$26.82 deduction) is \$130. Canada then gives a credit against the \$130 for \$15 (the U.S. tax paid or accrued with respect to the dividend, \$41.82 but limited to 15 percent of the gross amount of such income, or \$15), leaving a final Canadian tax of \$115. Of the \$115, \$30.80 is attributable to the

dividend:

$$\frac{\$73.18 (\$100 \text{ dividend less } \$26.82 \text{ deduction}) \times \$115}{\$273.18 (\$300 \text{ income less } \$26.82 \text{ deduction})}$$

Of this amount, \$26.82 is creditable against U.S. tax pursuant to paragraph 5. (Although the U.S. allows a credit for the Canadian tax imposed on the dividend, \$30.80, the credit may not reduce the U.S. tax below 15 percent of the amount of the dividend. Thus, the maximum allowable credit is the excess of \$41.82, the U.S. tax imposed on the dividend income, over \$15, which is 15 percent of the \$100 dividend.) The remaining \$3.98 (the Canadian tax of \$30.80 less the credit allowed of \$26.82) is a foreign tax credit carryover for U.S. purposes, subject to the limitations of paragraph 5. (An additional \$50.18 of Canadian tax with respect to Canadian source services income is creditable against U.S. tax pursuant to paragraphs 3 and 4(b). The \$50.18 is computed as follows: tentative U.S. tax (before foreign tax credits) is \$92; the U.S. tax on Canadian source services income is \$50.18 (\$92 less the U.S. tax on the dividend income of \$41.82); the limitation on the services income is:

$$\frac{\$120 (\text{taxable income from services}) \times \$92}{\$220 (\text{total taxable income}),}$$

or \$50.18. The credit for Canadian tax paid on the services income is therefore \$50.18; the remainder of the Canadian tax on the services income, or \$34.02, is a foreign tax credit carryover for U.S. purposes, subject to the limitations of paragraph 5.)

Paragraph 6 is necessary to implement the objectives of paragraphs 4(b) and 5(c). Paragraph 6 provides that where a U.S. citizen is a resident of Canada, items of income referred to in paragraph 4 or 5 are deemed for the purposes of Article XXIV to arise in Canada to the extent necessary to avoid double taxation of income by Canada and the United States consistent with the objectives of paragraphs 4(b) and 5(c). Paragraph 6 can override the source rules of paragraph 3 to permit a limited resourcing of income. The principles of paragraph 3 have effect, pursuant to paragraph 3(b) of Article XXX (Entry Into Force) of the Convention, for taxable years beginning on or after January 1, 1976. See the discussion of Article XXX below.

The application of paragraph 6 is illustrated by the following example.

#### *Example D*

The facts are the same as in Example C. The United States has undertaken, pursuant to paragraph 5(c) and paragraph 6, to credit \$26.82 of Canadian taxes on dividend income that has a U.S. source under both paragraph 3 and the Internal Revenue Code. (As illustrated in Example C, the credit, however, only reduces the U.S. tax on the dividend income which exceeds the amount of income tax that would be paid or accrued to the United States on such income if the individual were not a U.S. citizen after taking into account any relief available under the Convention. Pursuant to paragraph 6, for purposes of determining the U.S. foreign tax credit limitation under the Convention with respect to Canadian taxes,

$$\$64.13 (\underline{\text{A}} \times \$92 - \$26.82; \text{A} = \$64.13)$$

of taxable income with respect to the dividends is deemed to arise in Canada.

Paragraph 3 of Article 12 of the Protocol makes a technical amendment to paragraph 7 of Article XXIV. It conforms the reference to U.S. and Canadian taxes to the amended definitions of "United States tax" and "Canadian tax" in subparagraphs (c) and (d) of paragraph 1 of Article III (General Definitions). No substantive change in the effect of the paragraph is intended.

Paragraph 4 of Article 12 of the Protocol adds a new paragraph 10 to Article XXIV of the Convention. This paragraph provides for the application of the rule of "exemption with progression" by a Contracting State in cases where an item of income of a resident of that State is exempt from tax in that State by virtue of a provision of the Convention. For example, where under Canadian law a tax benefit, such as the goods and services tax credit, to a Canadian resident individual is reduced as the income of that individual, or the individual's spouse or other dependent, increases, and any of these persons receives U.S. social security benefits that are exempt from tax in Canada under the Convention, Canada may, nevertheless, take the U.S. social security benefits into account in determining whether, and to what extent, the benefit should be reduced.

New Article XXIX B (Taxes Imposed by Reason of Death), added by Article 19 of the Protocol, also provides relief from double taxation in certain circumstances in connection with Canadian income tax imposed by reason of death and U.S. estate taxes. However, subparagraph 7(c) of Article XXIX B generally denies relief from U.S. estate tax under that Article to the extent that a credit or deduction has been claimed for the same amount in determining any other tax imposed by the United States. This restriction would operate to deny relief, for example, to the extent that relief from U.S. income tax is claimed under Article XXIV in respect of the same amount of Canadian tax. There is, however, no requirement that relief from U.S. tax be claimed first (or exclusively) under Article XXIV. Paragraph 6 of Article XXIX B also prevents the claiming of double relief from Canadian income taxation under both that Article and Article XXIV, by providing that the credit provided by Article XXIX B applies only after the application of the credit provided by Article XXIV.

## ARTICLE 13

Article 13 of the Protocol amends Article XXV (Non-Discrimination) of the Convention. Paragraph 1 of Article 13 amends paragraph 3 of Article XXV to conform the treaty language to a change in Canadian law. The paragraph is intended to allow the treatment of dependents under the income tax law of a Contracting State to apply with respect to dependents who are residents of the other Contracting State. As drafted in the present Convention, the rule deals specifically only with deductions; the amendments made by the Protocol clarify that it also applies to the credits now provided by Canadian law.

Paragraph 2 of Article 13 of the Protocol amends paragraph 10 of Article XXV of the Convention to broaden the scope of the non-discrimination protection provided by the Convention. As amended, Article XXV will apply to all taxes imposed by a Contracting State.

Under the present Convention, non-discrimination protection is limited in the case of Canadian taxes to taxes imposed under the Income Tax Act. As amended by the Protocol, non-discrimination protection will extend, for example, to the Canadian goods and services tax and other Canadian excise taxes.

#### ARTICLE 14

Article 14 of the Protocol makes two changes to Article XXVI (Mutual Agreement Procedure) of the Convention. First, it adds a new subparagraph 3(g) specifically authorizing the competent authorities to provide relief from double taxation in certain cases involving the distribution or disposition of property by a U.S. qualified domestic trust or a Canadian spousal trust, where relief is not otherwise available.

Article 14 also adds a new paragraph 6 to Article XXVI (Mutual Agreement Procedure). Paragraph 6 provides for a voluntary arbitration procedure, to be implemented only upon the exchange of diplomatic notes between the United States and Canada. Similar provisions are found in the recent U.S. treaties with the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands, and Mexico. Paragraph 6 provides that where the competent authorities have been unable, pursuant to the other provisions of Article XXVI, to resolve a disagreement regarding the interpretation or application of the Convention, the disagreement may, with the consent of the taxpayer and both competent authorities, be submitted for arbitration, provided the taxpayer agrees in writing to be bound by the decision of the arbitration board. Nothing in the provision requires that any case be submitted for arbitration. However, if a case is submitted to an arbitration board, the board's decision in that case will be binding on both Contracting States and on the taxpayer with respect to that case.

The United States was reluctant to implement an arbitration procedure until there has been an opportunity to evaluate the process in practice under other agreements that allow for arbitration, particularly the U.S.-Germany Convention. It was agreed, therefore, as specified in paragraph 6, that the provisions of the Convention calling for an arbitration procedure will not take effect until the two Contracting States have agreed through an exchange of diplomatic notes to do so. This is similar to the approach taken with the Netherlands and Mexico. Paragraph 6 also provides that the procedures to be followed in applying arbitration will be agreed through an exchange of notes by the Contracting States. It is expected that such procedures will ensure that arbitration will not generally be available where matters of either State's tax policy or domestic law are involved.

Paragraph 2 of Article 20 of the Protocol provides that the appropriate authorities of the Contracting State will consult after three years following entry into force of the Protocol to determine whether the diplomatic notes implementing the arbitration procedure should be exchanged.

#### ARTICLE 15

Article 15 of the Protocol adds to the Convention a new Article XXVI A (Assistance in

Collection). Collection assistance provisions are included in several other U.S. income tax treaties, including the recent treaty with the Netherlands, and in many U.S. estate tax treaties. U.S. negotiators initially raised with Canada the possibility of including collection assistance provisions in the Protocol, because the Internal Revenue Service has claims pending against persons in Canada that would be subject to collection under these provisions. However, the ultimate decision of the U.S. and Canadian negotiators to add the collection assistance article was attributable to the confluence of several unusual factors.

Of critical importance was the similarity between the laws of the United States and Canada. The Internal Revenue Service, the Justice Department, and other U.S. negotiators were reassured by the close similarity of the legal and procedural protections afforded by the Contracting States to their citizens and residents and by the fact that these protections apply to the tax collection procedures used by each State. In addition, the U.S. negotiators were confident, given their extensive experience in working with their Canadian counterparts, that the agreed procedures could be administered appropriately, effectively, and efficiently. Finally, given the close cooperation already developed between the United States and Canada in the exchange of tax information, the U.S. and Canadian negotiators concluded that the potential benefits to both countries of obtaining such assistance would be immediate and substantial and would far outweigh any cost involved.

Under paragraph 1 of Article XXVI A, each Contracting State agrees, subject to the exercise of its discretion and to the conditions explicitly provided later in the Article, to lend assistance and support to the other in the collection of revenue claims. The term "revenue claim" is defined in paragraph 1 to include all taxes referred to in paragraph 9 of the Article, as well as interest, costs, additions to such taxes, and civil penalties. Paragraph 9 provides that, notwithstanding the provisions of Article II (Taxes Covered) of the Convention, Article XXVI A shall apply to all categories of taxes collected by or on behalf of the Government of a Contracting State.

Paragraph 2 of the Article requires the Contracting State applying for collection assistance (the "applicant State") to certify that the revenue claim for which collection assistance is sought has been "finally determined." A revenue claim has been finally determined when the applicant State has the right under its internal law to collect the revenue claim and all administrative and judicial rights of the taxpayer to restrain collection in the applicant State have lapsed or been exhausted.

Paragraph 3 of the Article clarifies that the Contracting State from which assistance was requested (the "requested State") has discretion as to whether to accept a particular application for collection assistance. However, if the application for assistance is accepted, paragraph 3 requires that the requested State grant assistance under its existing procedures as though the claim were the requested State's own revenue claim finally determined under the laws of that State. This obligation under paragraph 3 is limited by paragraph 7 of the Article, which provides that, although generally treated as a revenue claim of the requested State, a claim for which collection assistance is granted shall not have any priority accorded to the revenue claims of the requested State.

Paragraph 4 of Article XXVI A provides that, when the United States accepts a request for assistance in collection, the claim will be treated by the United States as an assessment as of the time the application was received. Similarly, when Canada accepts a request, a revenue claim shall be treated as an amount payable under the Income Tax Act, the collection of which is not subject to any restriction.

Paragraph 5 of the Article provides that nothing in Article XXVI A shall be construed as creating in the requested State any rights of administrative or judicial review of the applicant State's finally determined revenue claim. Thus, when an application for collection assistance has been accepted, the substantive validity of the applicant State's revenue claim cannot be challenged in an action in the requested State. Paragraph 5 further provides, however, that if the applicant State's revenue claim ceases to be finally determined, the applicant State is obligated to withdraw promptly any request that had been based on that claim.

Paragraph 6 provides that, as a general rule, the requested State is to forward the entire amount collected to the competent authority of the applicant State. The ordinary costs incurred in providing collection assistance will normally be borne by the requested State and only extraordinary costs will be borne by the applicant State. The application of this paragraph, including rules specifying which collection costs are to be borne by each State and the time and manner of payment of the amounts collected, will be agreed upon by the competent authorities, as provided for in paragraph 11.

Paragraph 8 provides that no assistance is to be given under this Article for a claim in respect of an individual taxpayer, to the extent that the taxpayer can demonstrate that he was a citizen of the requested State during the taxable period to which the revenue claim relates. Similarly, in the case of a company, estate, or trust, no assistance is to be given to the extent that the entity can demonstrate that it derived its status as such under the laws in force in the requested State during the taxable period to which the claim relates.

Subparagraph (a) of paragraph 10 clarifies that Article XXVI A supplements the provisions of paragraph 4 of Article XXVI (Mutual Agreement Procedure). The Mutual Agreement Procedure paragraph, which is more common in U.S. tax treaties, provides for collection assistance in cases in which a Contracting State seeks assistance in reclaiming treaty benefits that have been granted to a person that is not entitled to those benefits. Subparagraph (b) of paragraph 10 makes clear that nothing in Article XXVI A can require a Contracting State to carry out administrative measures of a different nature from those used in the collection of its own taxes, or that would be contrary to its public policy (*ordre public*).

Paragraph 11 requires the competent authorities to agree upon the mode of application of Article XXVI A, including agreement to ensure comparable levels of assistance to each of the Contracting States.

Paragraph 3 of Article 21 of the Protocol allows collection assistance under Article XXVI A to be sought for revenue claims that have been finally determined at any time within the 10 years preceding the date on which the Protocol enters into force.

## ARTICLE 16

Article 16 of the Protocol amends Article XXVII (Exchange of Information) of the Convention. Paragraph 1 of Article 16 amends paragraph 1 of Article XXVII. The first change is a wording change to make it clear that information must be exchanged if it is "relevant" for carrying out the provisions of the Convention or of the domestic laws of the Contracting States, even if it is not "necessary." Neither the United States nor Canada views this as a substantive change. The second amendment merely conforms the language of the paragraph to the language of Article II (Taxes Covered), as amended, by referring to the taxes "to which the Convention applies" rather than to the taxes "covered by the Convention."

The Protocol further amends paragraph 1 to allow a Contracting State to provide information received from the other Contracting State to its states, provinces, or local authorities, if it relates to a tax imposed by that state, province, or local authority that is substantially similar to a national-level tax covered under Article II (Taxes Covered). However, this provision does not authorize a Contracting State to request information on behalf of a state, province, or local authority. The Protocol also amends paragraph 1 to authorize the competent authorities to release information to any arbitration panel that may be established under the provisions of new paragraph 6 of Article XXVI (Mutual Agreement Procedure). Any information provided to a state, province, or local authority or to an arbitration panel is subject to the same use and disclosure provisions as is information received by the national Governments and used for their purposes.

Paragraph 2 of Article 16 amends paragraph 4 of Article XXVII, which describes the applicable taxes for the purposes of this Article. Under the present Convention, the Article applies in Canada to taxes imposed by the Government of Canada under the Income Tax Act and on estates and gifts and in the United States to all taxes imposed under the Internal Revenue Code. The Protocol broadens the scope of the Article to apply to "all taxes imposed by a Contracting State." This change allows information to be exchanged, for example, with respect to Canadian excise taxes, as is the case with respect to U.S. excise taxes under the present Convention. Paragraph 4 is also amended to authorize the exchange of information with respect to other taxes, to the extent relevant to any other provision of the Convention.

## ARTICLE 17

Article 17 of the Protocol amends Article XXIX (Miscellaneous Rules) of the Convention. Paragraph 1 of Article 17 modifies paragraph 3(a), the exceptions to the saving clause, to conform the cross-references in the paragraph to changes in other parts of the Convention. The paragraph also adds to the exceptions to the saving clause certain provisions of Article XXIX B (Taxes Imposed by Reason of Death). Thus, certain benefits under that Article will be granted by a Contracting State to its residents and, in the case of the United States, to its citizens, notwithstanding the saving clause of paragraph 2 of Article XXIX.

Paragraph 2 of Article 17 replaces paragraphs 5 through 7 of Article XXIX of the present

Convention with three new paragraphs. (Paragraph 5 in the present Convention was moved to paragraph 7 of Article XVIII (Pensions and Annuities), and paragraphs 6 and 7 were deleted as unnecessary.) New paragraph 5 provides a rule for the taxation by Canada of a Canadian resident that is a shareholder in a U.S. S corporation. The application of this rule is relatively limited, because U.S. domestic law requires that S corporation shareholders be either U.S. citizens or U.S. residents. Therefore, the rule provided by paragraph 5 would apply only to an S corporation shareholder who is a resident of both the United States and Canada (i.e., a "dual resident" who meets certain requirements), determined before application of the "tie-breaker" rules of Article IV (Residence), or a U.S. citizen resident in Canada. Since the shareholder would be subject to U.S. tax on its share of the income of the S corporation as it is earned by the S corporation and, under Canadian statutory law, would be subject to tax only when the income is distributed, there could be a timing mismatch resulting in unrelieved double taxation. Under paragraph 5, the shareholder can make a request to the Canadian competent authority for relief under the special rules of the paragraph. Under these rules, the Canadian shareholder will be subject to Canadian tax on essentially the same basis as he is subject to U.S. tax, thus eliminating the timing mismatch.

The Protocol adds to Article XXIX a new paragraph 6, which provides a coordination rule for the Convention and the General Agreement on Trade in Services ("GATS"). Paragraph 6(a) provides that, for purposes of paragraph 3 of Article XXII (Consultation) of the GATS, a measure falls within the scope of the Convention only if the measure relates to a tax

(1) to which Article XXV (Non-Discrimination) of the Convention applies, or  
(2) to which Article XXV does not apply and to which any other provision of the Convention applies, but only to the extent that the measure relates to a matter dealt with in that other provision.

Under paragraph 6(b), notwithstanding paragraph 3 of Article XXII of the GATS, any doubt as to the interpretation of subparagraph (a) will be resolved under paragraph 3 of Article XXVI (Mutual Agreement Procedure) of the Convention or any other procedure agreed to by both Contracting States.

GATS generally obliges its Members to provide national treatment and most-favored-nation treatment to services and service suppliers of other Members. A very broad exception from the national treatment obligation applies to direct taxes. An exception from the most-favored-nation obligation applies to a difference in treatment resulting from an international agreement on the avoidance of double taxation (a "tax agreement") or from provisions on the avoidance of double taxation in any other international agreement or arrangement by which the Member is bound.

Article XXII(3) of GATS specifically provides that there will be no access to GATS procedures to settle a national treatment dispute concerning a measure that falls within the scope of a tax agreement. This provision preserves the exclusive application of nondiscrimination obligations in the tax agreement and clarifies that the competent authority mechanism provided by the tax agreement will apply, instead of GATS procedures, to resolve nondiscrimination disputes involving the taxation of services and service suppliers.

In the event of a disagreement between Members as to whether a measure falls within the

scope of a tax agreement that existed at the time of the entry into force of the Agreement establishing the World Trade Organization, Article XXII(2), footnote 11, of GATS reserves the resolution of the dispute to the Contracting States under the tax agreement. In such a case, the issue of the scope of a tax agreement may be resolved under GATS procedures (rather than tax treaty procedures) only if both parties to the existing tax agreement consent. With respect to subsequent tax agreements, GATS provides that either Member may bring the jurisdictional matter before the Council for Trade In Services, which will refer the matter to arbitration for a decision that will be final and binding on the Members.

Both Canada and the United States agree that a protocol to a convention that is grandfathered under Article XXII(2), footnote 11, of GATS is also grandfathered. Nevertheless, since the Protocol extends the application of the Convention, and particularly the nondiscrimination article, to additional taxes (e.g., some non-income taxes imposed by Canada), the negotiators sought to remove any ambiguity and agreed to a provision that clarified the scope of the Convention and the relationship between the Convention and GATS.

The purpose of new paragraph 6(a) of the Convention is to provide the agreement of the Contracting States as to the measures considered to fall within the scope of the Convention in applying Article XXII(3) of GATS between the Contracting States. The purpose of new paragraph 6(b) is to reserve the resolution of the issue of the scope of the Convention for purposes of Article XXII(3) of GATS to the competent authorities under the Convention rather than to settlement under GATS procedures.

The Protocol also adds to Article XXIX a new paragraph 7, relating to certain changes in the law or treaty policy of either of the Contracting States. Paragraph 7 provides, first, that in response to a change in the law or policy of either State, the appropriate authority of either State may request consultations with its counterpart in the other State to determine whether a change in the Convention is appropriate. If a change in domestic legislation has unilaterally removed or significantly limited a material benefit provided by the Convention, the appropriate authorities are instructed by the paragraph to consult promptly to consider an appropriate amendment to the Convention. The "appropriate authorities" may be the Contracting States themselves or the competent authorities under the Convention. The consultations may be initiated by the authority of the Contracting State making the change in law or policy or by the authority of the other State. Any change in the Convention recommended as a result of this process can be implemented only through the negotiation, signature, ratification, and entry into force of a new protocol to the Convention.

## ARTICLE 18

### *In general.*

Article 18 of the Protocol adds a new Article XXIX A (Limitation on Benefits) to the Convention. Article XXIX A addresses the problem of "treaty shopping" by requiring, in most cases, that the person seeking U.S. treaty benefits not only be a Canadian resident but also satisfy other tests. In a typical case of treaty shopping, a resident of a third State might establish an entity

resident in Canada for the purpose of deriving income from the United States and claiming U.S. treaty benefits with respect to that income. Article XXIX A limits the benefits granted by the United States under the Convention to those persons whose residence in Canada is not considered to have been motivated by the existence of the Convention. Absent Article XXIX A, the entity would be entitled to U.S. benefits under the Convention as a resident of Canada, unless it were denied benefits as a result of limitations (e.g., business purpose, substance-over-form, step transaction, or conduit principles or other anti-avoidance rules) applicable to a particular transaction or arrangement. General anti-abuse provisions of this sort apply in conjunction with the Convention in both the United States and Canada. In the case of the United States, such anti-abuse provisions complement the explicit anti-treaty-shopping rules of Article XXIX A. While the anti-treaty-shopping rules determine whether a person has a sufficient nexus to Canada to be entitled to treaty benefits, general anti-abuse provisions determine whether a particular transaction should be recast in accordance with the substance of the transaction.

The present Convention deals with treaty-shopping in a very limited manner, in paragraph 6 of Article XXIX, by denying benefits to Canadian residents that benefit from specified provisions of Canadian law. The Protocol removes that paragraph 6 from Article XXIX, because it is superseded by the more general provisions of Article XXIX A.

The Article is not reciprocal, except for paragraph 7. Canada prefers to rely on general anti-avoidance rules to counter arrangements involving treaty-shopping through the United States.

The structure of the Article is as follows: paragraph 1 states that, in determining whether a resident of Canada is entitled to U.S. benefits under the Convention, a "qualifying person is entitled to all of the benefits of the Convention, and other persons are not entitled to benefits, except where paragraphs 3, 4, or 6 provide otherwise. Paragraph 2 lists a number of characteristics, any one of which will make a Canadian resident a qualifying person. These are essentially mechanical tests. Paragraph 3 provides an alternative rule, under which a Canadian resident that is not a qualifying person under paragraph 2 may claim U.S. benefits with respect to those items of U.S. source income that are connected with the active conduct of a trade or business in Canada. Paragraph 4 provides a limited "derivative benefits" test for entitlement to benefits with respect to U.S. source dividends, interest, and royalties beneficially owned by a resident of Canada that is not a qualifying person. Paragraph 5 defines certain terms used in the Article. Paragraph 6 requires the U.S. competent authority to grant benefits to a resident of Canada that does not qualify for benefits under any other provision of the Article, where the competent authority determines, on the basis of all factors, that benefits should be granted. Paragraph 7 clarifies the application of general anti-abuse provisions.

### ***Individuals and governmental entities***

Under paragraph 2, the first two categories of qualifying persons are

- (1) individual residents of Canada, and
- (2) the Government of Canada, a political subdivision or local authority thereof, or an agency or instrumentality of that Government, political subdivision, or local authority.

It is considered unlikely that persons falling into these two categories can be used, as the

beneficial owner of income, to derive treaty benefits on behalf of a third-country person. If a person is receiving income as a nominee on behalf of a third-country resident, benefits will be denied with respect to those items of income under the articles of the Convention that grant the benefit, because of the requirements in those articles that the beneficial owner of the income be a resident of a Contracting State.

***Publicly traded entities.***

Under subparagraph (c) of paragraph 2, a Canadian resident company or trust is a qualifying person if there is substantial and regular trading in the company's principal class of shares, or in the trust's units, on a recognized stock exchange. The term "recognized stock exchange" is defined in paragraph 5(a) of the Article to mean, in the United States, the NASDAQ System and any stock exchange registered as a national securities exchange with the Securities and Exchange Commission, and, in Canada, any Canadian stock exchanges that are "prescribed stock exchanges" under the Income Tax Act. These are, at the time of signature of the Protocol, the Alberta, Montreal, Toronto, Vancouver, and Winnipeg Stock Exchanges. Additional exchanges may be added to the list of recognized exchanges by exchange of notes between the Contracting States or by agreement between the competent authorities.

Certain companies owned by publicly traded corporations also may be qualifying persons. Under subparagraph (d) of paragraph 2, a Canadian resident company will be a qualifying person, even if not publicly traded, if more than 50 percent of the vote and value of its shares is owned (directly or indirectly) by five or fewer persons that would be qualifying persons under subparagraph (c). In addition, each company in the chain of ownership must be a qualifying person or a U.S. citizen or resident. Thus, for example, a Canadian company that is not publicly traded but that is owned, one-fourth each, by three companies, two of which are Canadian resident corporations whose principal classes of shares are substantially and regularly traded on a recognized stock exchange, will qualify under subparagraph (d).

The 50-percent test under subparagraph (d) applies only to shares other than "debt substitute shares." The term "debt substitute shares" is defined in paragraph 5 to mean shares defined in paragraph (e) of the definition in the Canadian Income Tax Act of "term preferred shares" (see section 248(1) of the Income Tax Act), which relates to certain shares received in debt-restructuring arrangements undertaken by reason of financial difficulty or insolvency. Paragraph 5 also provides that the competent authorities may agree to treat other types of shares as debt substitute shares.

***Ownership/base erosion test.***

Subparagraph (e) of paragraph 2 provides a two-part test under which certain other entities may be qualifying persons, based on ownership and "base erosion." Under the first of these tests, benefits will be granted to a Canadian resident company if 50 percent or more of the vote and value of its shares (other than debt substitute shares), or to a Canadian resident trust if 50 percent or more of its beneficial interest, is *not* owned, directly or indirectly, by persons other than qualifying persons or U.S. residents or citizens. The wording of these tests is intended to make clear that, for example, if a Canadian company is more than 50 percent owned by a U.S. resident

corporation that is, itself, wholly owned by a third-country resident other than a U.S. citizen, the Canadian company would not pass the ownership test. This is because more than 50 percent of its shares is owned indirectly by a person (the third-country resident) that is not a qualifying person or a citizen or resident of the United States.

For purposes of this subparagraph (e) and other provisions of this Article, the term "shares" includes, in the case of a mutual insurance company, any certificate or contract entitling the holder to voting power in the corporation. This is consistent with the interpretation of similar limitation on benefits provisions in other U.S. treaties.

The second test of subparagraph (e) is the so-called "base erosion" test. A Canadian company or trust that passes the ownership test must also pass this test to be a qualifying person. This test requires that the amount of expenses that are paid or payable by the Canadian entity in question to persons that are not qualifying persons or U.S. citizens or residents, and that are deductible from gross income, be less than 50 percent of the gross income of the company or trust. This test is applied for the fiscal period immediately preceding the period for which the qualifying person test is being applied. If it is the first fiscal period of the person, the test is applied for the current period.

The ownership/base erosion test recognizes that the benefits of the Convention can be enjoyed indirectly not only by equity holders of an entity, but also by that entity's obligees, such as lenders, licensors, service providers, insurers and reinsurers, and others. For example, a third-country resident could license technology to Canadian-owned Canadian corporation to be sub licensed to a U.S. resident. The U.S. source royalty income of the Canadian corporation would be exempt from U.S. withholding tax under Article XII (Royalties) of the Convention (as amended by the Protocol). While the Canadian corporation would be subject to Canadian corporation income tax, its taxable income could be reduced to near zero as a result of the deductible royalties paid to the third-country resident. If, under a Convention between Canada and the third country, those royalties were either exempt from Canadian tax or subject to tax at a low rate, the U.S. treaty benefit with respect to the U.S. source royalty income would have flowed to the third-country resident at little or no tax cost, with no reciprocal benefit to the United States from the third country. The ownership/base erosion test therefore requires both that qualifying persons or U.S. residents or citizens substantially own the entity and that the entity's deductible payments be made in substantial part to such persons.

### ***Other qualifying persons.***

Under subparagraph (f) of paragraph 2, a Canadian resident estate is a qualifying person, entitled to the benefits of the Convention with respect to its U.S. source income.

Subparagraphs (g) and (h) specify the circumstances under which certain types of not-for-profit organizations will be qualifying persons. Subparagraph (g) of paragraph 2 provides that a not-for-profit organization that is a resident of Canada is a qualifying person, and thus entitled to U.S. benefits, if more than half of the beneficiaries, members, or participants in the organization are qualifying persons or citizens or residents of the United States. The term "not-for-profit organization" of a Contracting State is defined in subparagraph (b) of paragraph 5 of the Article to

mean an entity created or established in that State that is generally exempt from income taxation in that State by reason of its not-for-profit status. The term includes charities, private foundations, trade unions, trade associations, and similar organizations.

Subparagraph (h) of paragraph 2 specifies that certain organizations described in paragraph 2 of Article XXI (Exempt Organizations), as amended by Article 10 of the Protocol, are qualifying persons. To be a qualifying person, such an organization must be established primarily for the purpose of providing pension, retirement, or employee benefits to individual residents of Canada who are (or were, within any of the five preceding years) qualifying persons, or to citizens or residents of the United States. An organization will be considered to be established "primarily" for this purpose if more than 50 percent of its beneficiaries, members, or participants are such persons. Thus, for example, a Canadian Registered Retirement Savings Plan ("RRSP") of a former resident of Canada who is working temporarily outside of Canada would continue to be a qualifying person during the period of the individual's absence from Canada or for five years, whichever is shorter. A Canadian pension fund established to provide benefits to persons employed by a company would be a qualifying person only if most of the beneficiaries of the fund are (or were within the five preceding years) individual residents of Canada or residents or citizens of the United States.

The provisions of paragraph 2 are self-executing, unlike the provisions of paragraph 6, discussed below. The tax authorities may, of course, on review, determine that the taxpayer has improperly interpreted the paragraph and is not entitled to the benefits claimed.

***Active trade or business test.***

Paragraph 3 provides an eligibility test for benefits for residents of Canada that are not qualifying persons under paragraph 2. This is the so-called "active trade or business" test. Unlike the tests of paragraph 2, the active trade or business test looks not solely at the characteristics of the person deriving the income, but also at the nature of the activity engaged in by that person and the connection between the income and that activity. Under the active trade or business test, a resident of Canada deriving an item of income from the United States is entitled to benefits with respect to that income if that person (or a person related to that person under the principles of Internal Revenue Code section 482) is engaged in an active trade or business in Canada and the income in question is derived in connection with, or is incidental to, that trade or business. Income that is derived in connection with, or is incidental to, the business of making or managing investments will not qualify for benefits under this provision, unless those investment activities are carried on with customers in the ordinary course of the business of a bank, insurance company, registered securities dealer, or deposit-taking financial institution.

Income is considered derived "in connection" with an active trade or business in the United States if, for example, the income-generating activity in the United States is "upstream," "downstream," or parallel to that conducted in Canada. Thus, if the U.S. activity consisted of selling the output of a Canadian manufacturer or providing inputs to the manufacturing process, or of manufacturing or selling in the United States the same sorts of products that were being sold by the Canadian trade or business in Canada, the income generated by that activity would be treated as earned in connection with the Canadian trade or business. Income is considered

"incidental" to the Canadian trade or business if, for example, it arises from the short-term investment of working capital of the Canadian resident in U.S. securities.

An item of income will be considered to be earned in connection with or to be incidental to an active trade or business in Canada if the income is derived by the resident of Canada claiming the benefits directly or indirectly through one or more other persons that are residents of the United States. Thus, for example, a Canadian resident could claim benefits with respect to an item of income earned by a U.S. operating subsidiary but derived by the Canadian resident indirectly through a wholly-owned U.S. holding company interposed between it and the operating subsidiary. This language would also permit a Canadian resident to derive income from the United States through one or more U.S. residents that it does not wholly own. For example, a Canadian partnership in which three unrelated Canadian companies each hold a one-third interest could form a wholly-owned U.S. holding company with a U.S. operating subsidiary. The "directly or indirectly" language would allow otherwise available treaty benefits to be claimed with respect to income derived by the three Canadian partners through the U.S. holding company, even if the partners were not considered to be related to the U.S. holding company under the principles of Internal Revenue Code section 482.

Income that is derived in connection with, or is incidental to, an active trade or business in Canada, must pass an additional test to qualify for U.S. treaty benefits. The trade or business in Canada must be substantial in relation to the activity in the United States that gave rise to the income in respect of which treaty benefits are being claimed. To be considered substantial, it is not necessary that the Canadian trade or business be as large as the U.S. income-generating activity. The Canadian trade or business cannot, however, in terms of income, assets, or other similar measures, represent only a very small percentage of the size of the U.S. activity.

The substantiality requirement is intended to prevent treaty-shopping. For example, a third-country resident may want to acquire a U.S. company that manufactures television sets for worldwide markets; however, since its country of residence has no tax treaty with the United States, any dividends generated by the investment would be subject to a U.S. withholding tax of 30 percent. Absent a substantiality test, the investor could establish a Canadian corporation that would operate a small outlet in Canada to sell a few of the television sets manufactured by the U.S. company and earn a very small amount of income. That Canadian corporation could then acquire the U.S. manufacturer with capital provided by the third-country resident and produce a very large number of sets for sale in several countries, generating a much larger amount of income. It might attempt to argue that the U.S. source income is generated from business activities in the United States related to the television sales activity of the Canadian parent and that the dividend income should be subject to U.S. tax at the 5 percent rate provided by Article X of the Convention, as amended by the Protocol. However, the substantiality test would not be met in this example, so the dividends would remain subject to withholding in the United States at a rate of 30 percent.

In general, it is expected that if a person qualifies for benefits under one of the tests of paragraph 2, no inquiry will be made into qualification for benefits under paragraph 3. Upon satisfaction of any of the tests of paragraph 2, any income derived by the beneficial owner from the other Contracting State is entitled to treaty benefits. Under paragraph 3, however, the test is

applied separately to each item of income.

***Derivative benefits test.***

Paragraph 4 of Article XXIX A contains a so-called "derivative benefits" rule not generally found in U.S. treaties. This rule was included in the Protocol because of the special economic relationship between the United States and Canada and the close coordination between the tax administrations of the two countries.

Under the derivative benefits rule, a Canadian resident company may receive the benefits of Articles X (Dividends), XI (Interest), and XII (Royalties), even if the company is not a qualifying person and does not satisfy the active trade or business test of paragraph 3. To qualify under this paragraph, the Canadian company must satisfy both

- (i) the base erosion test under subparagraph (e) of paragraph 2, and
- (ii) an ownership test.

The derivative benefits ownership test requires that shares (other than debt substitute shares) representing more than 90 percent of the vote and value of the Canadian company be owned directly or indirectly by either

- (i) qualifying persons or U.S. citizens or residents, or
- (ii) other persons that satisfy each of three tests. The three tests that must be satisfied by these other persons are as follows:

First, the person must be a resident of a third State with which the United States has a comprehensive income tax convention and be entitled to all of the benefits under that convention. Thus, if the person fails to satisfy the limitation on benefits tests, if any, of that convention, no benefits would be granted under this paragraph. Qualification for benefits under an active trade or business test does not suffice for these purposes, because that test grants benefits only for certain items of income, not for all purposes of the convention.

Second, the person must be a person that would qualify for benefits with respect to the item of income for which benefits are sought under one or more of the tests of paragraph 2 or 3 of this Convention, if the person were a resident of Canada and, for purposes of paragraph 3, the business were carried on in Canada. For example, a person resident in a third country would be deemed to be a person that would qualify under the publicly-traded test of paragraph 2 of this Convention if the principal class of its shares were substantially and regularly traded on a stock exchange recognized either under the treaty between the United States and Canada or under the treaty between the United States and the third country. Similarly, a company resident in a third country would be deemed to satisfy the ownership/base erosion test of paragraph 2 under this hypothetical analysis if, for example, it were wholly owned by an individual resident in that third country and most of its deductible payments were made to individual residents of that country (i.e., it satisfied base erosion).

The third requirement is that the rate of U.S. withholding tax on the item of income in respect of which benefits are sought must be at least as low under the convention between the person's country of residence and the United States as under this Convention.

***Competent authority discretion.***

Paragraph 6 provides that when a resident of Canada derives income from the United States and is not entitled to the benefits of the Convention under other provisions of the Article, benefits may, nevertheless be granted at the discretion of the U.S. competent authority. In making a determination under this paragraph, the competent authority will take into account all relevant facts and circumstances relating to the person requesting the benefits. In particular, the competent authority will consider the history, structure, ownership (including ultimate beneficial ownership), and operations of the person. In addition, the competent authority is to consider

- (1) whether the creation and existence of the person did not have as a principal purpose obtaining treaty benefits that would not otherwise be available to the person, and
- (2) whether it would not be appropriate, in view of the purpose of the Article, to deny benefits.

The paragraph specifies that if the U.S. competent authority determines that either of these two standards is satisfied, benefits shall be granted.

For purposes of implementing paragraph 6, a taxpayer will be expected to present his case to the competent authority for an advance determination based on the facts. The taxpayer will not be required to wait until it has been determined that benefits are denied under one of the other provisions of the Article. It also is expected that, if and when the competent authority determines that benefits are to be allowed, they will be allowed retroactively to the time of entry into force of the relevant treaty provision or the establishment of the structure in question, whichever is later (assuming that the taxpayer also qualifies under the relevant facts for the earlier period).

***General anti-abuse provisions.***

Paragraph 7 was added at Canada's request to confirm that the specific provisions of Article XXIX A and the fact that these provisions apply only for the purposes of the application of the Convention by the United States should not be construed so as to limit the right of each Contracting State to invoke applicable anti-abuse rules. Thus, for example, Canada remains free to apply such rules to counter abusive arrangements involving "treaty-shopping" through the United States, and the United States remains free to apply its substance-over-form and anti conduit rules, for example, in relation to Canadian residents. This principle is recognized by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development in the Commentaries to its Model Tax Convention on Income and on Capital, and the United States and Canada agree that it is inherent in the Convention. The agreement to state this principle explicitly in the Protocol is not intended to suggest that the principle is not also inherent in other tax conventions, including the current Convention with Canada.

ARTICLE 19

***In general.***

Article 19 of the Protocol adds to the Convention a new Article XXIX B (Taxes Imposed by Reason of Death). The purpose of Article XXIX B is to better coordinate the operation of the death tax regimes of the two Contracting States. Such coordination is necessary because the United States imposes an estate tax, while Canada now applies an income tax on gains deemed realized at death rather than an estate tax. Article XXIX B also contains other provisions designed to alleviate death taxes in certain situations.

For purposes of new Article XXIX B, the term "resident" has the meaning provided by Article IV (Residence) of the Convention, as amended by Article 3 of the Protocol. The meaning of the term "resident" for purposes of Article XXIX B, therefore, differs in some respects from its meaning under the estate, gift, and generation-skipping transfer tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code.

### ***Charitable bequests.***

Paragraph 1 of new Article XXIX B facilitates certain charitable bequests. It provides that a Contracting State shall accord the same death tax treatment to a bequest by an individual resident in one of the Contracting States to a qualifying exempt organization resident in the other Contracting State as it would have accorded if the organization had been a resident of the first Contracting State. The organizations covered by this provision are those referred to in paragraph 1 of Article XXI (Exempt Organizations) of the Convention. A bequest by a U.S. citizen or U.S. resident (as defined for estate tax purposes under the Internal Revenue Code) to such an exempt organization generally is deductible for U.S. estate tax purposes under section 2055 of the Internal Revenue Code, without regard to whether the organization is a U.S. corporation. However, if the decedent is not a U.S. citizen or U.S. resident (as defined for estate tax purposes under the Internal Revenue Code), such a bequest is deductible for U.S. estate tax purposes, under section 2106(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code, only if the recipient organization is a U.S. corporation. Under paragraph 1 of Article XXIX B, a U.S. estate tax deduction also will be allowed for a bequest by a Canadian resident (as defined under Article IV (Residence)) to a qualifying exempt organization that is a Canadian corporation. However, paragraph 1 does not allow a deduction for U.S. estate tax purposes with respect to any transfer of property that is not subject to U.S. estate tax.

### ***Unified credit.***

Paragraph 2 of Article XXIX B grants a "pro rata" unified credit to the estate of a Canadian resident decedent, for purposes of computing U.S. estate tax. Although the Congress anticipated the negotiation of such *pro rata* unified credits in Internal Revenue Code section 2102(c)(3)(A), this is the first convention in which the United States has agreed to give such a credit. However, certain exemption provisions of existing estate and gift tax conventions have been interpreted as providing a pro rata unified credit.

Under the Internal Revenue Code, the estate of a nonresident not a citizen of the United States is subject to U.S. estate tax only on its U.S. situs assets and is entitled to a unified credit of \$13,000, while the estate of a U.S. citizen or U.S. resident is subject to U.S. estate tax on its entire worldwide assets and is entitled to a unified credit of \$192,800. (For purposes of these Internal

Revenue Code provisions, the term "resident" has the meaning provided for estate tax purposes under the Internal Revenue Code.) A lower unified credit is provided for the former category of estates because it is assumed that the estate of a nonresident not a citizen generally will hold fewer U.S. situs assets, as a percentage of the estate's total assets, and thus will have a lower U.S. estate tax liability. The pro rata unified credit provisions of paragraph 2 increase the credit allowed to the estate of a Canadian resident decedent to an amount between \$13,000 and \$192,800 in appropriate cases, to take into account the extent to which the assets of the estate are situated in the United States. Paragraph 2 provides that the amount of the unified credit allowed to the estate of a Canadian resident decedent will in no event be less than the \$13,000 allowed under the Internal Revenue Code to the estate of a nonresident not a citizen of the United States (subject to the adjustment for prior gift tax unified credits, discussed below). Paragraph 2 does not apply to the estates of U.S. citizen decedents, whether resident in Canada or elsewhere, because such estates receive a unified credit of \$192,800 under the Internal Revenue Code.

Subject to the adjustment for gift tax unified credits, the pro rata credit allowed under paragraph 2 is determined by multiplying \$192,800 by a fraction, the numerator of which is the value of the part of the gross estate situated in the United States and the denominator of which is the value of the entire gross estate wherever situated. Thus, if half of the entire gross estate (by value) of a decedent who was a resident and citizen of Canada were situated in the United States, the estate would be entitled to a pro rata unified credit of \$96,400 (provided that the U.S. estate tax due is not less than that amount). For purposes of the denominator, the entire gross estate wherever situated (i.e., the worldwide estate, determined under U.S. domestic law) is to be taken into account for purposes of the computation. For purposes of the numerator, an estate's assets will be treated as situated in the United States if they are so treated under U.S. domestic law. However, if enacted, a technical correction now pending before the Congress will amend U.S. domestic law to clarify that assets will not be treated as U.S. situs assets for purposes of the pro rata unified credit computation if the United States is precluded from taxing them by reason of a treaty obligation. This technical correction will affect the interpretation of both this paragraph 2 and the analogous provisions in existing conventions. As currently proposed, it will take effect on the date of enactment.

Paragraph 2 restricts the availability of the pro rata unified credit in two respects. First, the amount of the unified credit otherwise allowable under paragraph 2 is reduced by the amount of any unified credit previously allowed against U.S. gift tax imposed on any gift by the decedent. This rule reflects the fact that, under U.S. domestic law, a U.S. citizen or U.S. resident individual is allowed a unified credit against the U.S. gift tax on lifetime transfers. However, as a result of the estate tax computation, the individual is entitled only to a total unified credit of \$192,800, and the amount of the unified credit available for use against U.S. estate tax on the individual's estate is effectively reduced by the amount of any unified credit that has been allowed in respect of gifts by the individual. This rule is reflected by reducing the amount of the pro rata unified credit otherwise allowed to the estate of a decedent individual under paragraph 2 by the amount of any unified credit previously allowed with respect to lifetime gifts by that individual. This reduction will be relevant only in rare cases, where the decedent made gifts subject to the U.S. gift tax while a U.S. citizen or U.S. resident (as defined under the Internal Revenue Code for U.S. gift tax purposes).

Paragraph 2 also conditions allowance of the pro rata unified credit upon the provision of all information necessary to verify and compute the credit. Thus, for example, the estate's representatives will be required to demonstrate satisfactorily both the value of the worldwide estate and the value of the U.S. portion of the estate. Substantiation requirements also apply, of course, with respect to other provisions of the Protocol and the Convention. However, the negotiators believed it advisable to emphasize the substantiation requirements in connection with this provision, because the computation of the pro rata unified credit involves certain information not otherwise relevant for U.S. estate tax purposes.

In addition, the amount of the pro rata unified credit is limited to the amount of U.S. estate tax imposed on the estate. See section 2102(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code.

### ***Marital credit.***

Paragraph 3 of Article XXIX B allows a special "marital credit" against U.S. estate tax in respect of certain transfers to a surviving spouse. The purpose of this marital credit is to alleviate, in appropriate cases, the impact of the estate tax marital deduction restrictions enacted by the Congress in the Technical and Miscellaneous Revenue Act of 1988 ("TAMRA"). It is the firm position of the U.S. Treasury Department that the TAMRA provisions do not violate the non-discrimination provisions of this Convention or any other convention to which the United States is a party. This is because the estate--not the surviving spouse--is the taxpayer, and the TAMRA provisions treat the estates of nonresidents not citizens of the United States in the same manner as the estates of U.S. citizen and U.S. resident decedents. However, the U.S. negotiators believed that it was not inappropriate, in the context of the Protocol, to ease the impact of those TAMRA provisions upon certain estates of limited value.

Paragraph 3 allows a non-refundable marital credit in addition to the pro rata unified credit allowed under paragraph 2 (or, in the case of a U.S. citizen or U.S. resident decedent, the unified credit allowed under U.S. domestic law). However, the marital credit is allowed only in connection with transfers satisfying each of the five conditions set forth in paragraph 3. First, the property must be "qualifying property," i.e., it must pass to the surviving spouse (within the meaning of U.S. domestic law) and be property that would have qualified for the estate tax marital deduction under U.S. domestic law if the surviving spouse had been a U.S. citizen and all applicable elections specified by U.S. domestic law had been properly made. Second, the decedent must have been, at the time of death, either a resident of Canada or the United States or a citizen of the United States. Third, the surviving spouse must have been, at the time of the decedent's death, a resident of either Canada or the United States. Fourth, if both the decedent and the surviving spouse were residents of the United States at the time of the decedent's death, at least one of them must have been a citizen of Canada. Finally, to limit the benefits of paragraph 3 to relatively small estates, the executor of the decedent's estate is required to elect the benefits of paragraph 3, and to waive irrevocably the benefits of any estate tax marital deduction that would be allowed under U.S. domestic law, on a U.S. Federal estate tax return filed by the deadline for making a qualified domestic trust election under Internal Revenue Code section 2056A(d). In the case of the estate of a decedent for which the U.S. Federal estate tax return is filed on or before the date on which this Protocol enters into force, this election and waiver must be made on any return filed to claim a refund pursuant to the special effective date applicable to such estates

(discussed below).

Paragraph 4 governs the computation of the marital credit allowed under paragraph 3. It provides that the amount of the marital credit shall equal the lesser of

- (i) the amount of the unified credit allowed to the estate under paragraph 2 or, where applicable, under U.S. domestic law (before reduction for any gift tax unified credit), or
- (ii) the amount of U.S. estate tax that would otherwise be imposed on the transfer of qualifying property to the surviving spouse.

For this purpose, the amount of U.S. estate tax that would otherwise be imposed on the transfer of qualifying property equals the amount by which

- (i) the estate tax (before allowable credits) that would be imposed if that property were included in computing the taxable estate exceeds
- (ii) the estate tax (before allowable credits) that would be imposed if the property were not so included.

Property that, by reason of the provisions of paragraph 8 of this Article, is not subject to U.S. estate tax is not taken into account for purposes of this hypothetical computation.

Finally, paragraph 4 provides taxpayers with an ordering rule. The rule states that, solely for purposes of determining any other credits (e.g., the credits for foreign and state death taxes) that may be allowed under U.S. domestic law to the estate, the marital credit shall be allowed after such other credits.

In certain cases, the provisions of paragraphs 3 and 4 may affect the U.S. estate taxation of a trust that would meet the requirements for a qualified terminable interest property ("QTIP") election, for example, a trust with a life income interest for the surviving spouse and a remainder interest for other family members. If, in lieu of making the QTIP election and the qualified domestic trust election, the decedent's executor makes the election described in paragraph 3(d) of this Article, the provisions of Internal Revenue Code sections 2044 (regarding inclusion in the estate of the second spouse of certain property for which the marital deduction was previously allowed), 2056A (regarding qualified domestic trusts), and 2519 (regarding dispositions of certain life estates) will not apply. To obtain this treatment, however, the executor is required, under paragraph 3, to irrevocably waive the benefit of any marital deduction allowable under the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the trust.

The following examples illustrate the operation of the marital credit and its interaction with other credits. Unless otherwise stated, assume for purposes of illustration that H, the decedent, and W, his surviving spouse, are Canadian citizens resident in Canada at the time of the decedent's death. Assume further that all conditions set forth in paragraphs 2 and 3 of this Article XXIX B are satisfied (including the condition that the executor waive the estate tax marital deduction), that no deductions are available under the Internal Revenue Code in computing the U.S. estate tax liability, and that there are no adjusted taxable gifts within the meaning of Internal Revenue Code section 2001(b) or 2101(c). Also assume that the applicable U.S. domestic estate and gift tax laws are those that were in effect on the date the Protocol was signed.

*Example 1.* H has a worldwide gross estate of \$1,200,000. He bequeaths U.S. real property worth \$600,000 to W. The remainder of H's estate consists of Canadian situs property. H's estate would be entitled to a pro rata unified credit of \$96,400 ( $= \$192,800 \times (\$600,000/\$1,200,000)$ ) and to a marital credit in the same amount (the lesser of the unified credit allowed (\$96,400) and the U.S. estate tax that would otherwise be imposed on the property transferred to W (\$192,800 [tax on U.S. taxable estate of \$600,000])). The pro rata unified credit and the marital credit combined would eliminate all U.S. estate tax with respect to the property transferred to W.

*Example 2.* H has a worldwide gross estate of \$1,200,000, all of which is situated in the United States. He bequeaths U.S. real property worth \$600,000 to W and U.S. real property worth \$600,000 to a child, C. H's estate would be entitled to a pro rata unified credit of \$192,800 ( $= \$192,800 \times \$1,200,000/\$1,200,000$ ) and to a marital credit of \$192,800 (the lesser of the unified credit (\$192,800) and the U.S. estate tax that would otherwise be imposed on the property transferred to W (\$235,000, i.e., \$427,800 [tax on U.S. taxable estate of \$1,200,000] less \$192,800 [tax on U.S. taxable estate of \$600,000])). This would reduce the estate's total U.S. estate tax liability of \$427,800 by \$385,600.

*Example 3.* H has a worldwide gross estate of \$700,000, of which \$500,000 is real property situated in the United States. H bequeaths U.S. real property valued at \$100,000 to W. The remainder of H's gross estate, consisting of U.S. and Canadian situs real property, is bequeathed to H's child, C. H's estate would be entitled to a pro rata unified credit of \$137,714 ( $\$192,800 \times \$500,000/\$700,000$ ). In addition, H's estate would be entitled to a marital credit of \$34,000, which equals the lesser of the unified credit (\$137,714) and \$34,000 (the U.S. estate tax that would otherwise be imposed on the property transferred to W before allowance of any credits, i.e., \$155,800 [tax on U.S. taxable estate of \$500,000] less \$121,800 [tax on U.S. taxable estate of \$400,000])).

*Example 4.* H has a worldwide gross estate of \$5,000,000, \$2,000,000 of which consists of U.S. real property situated in State X. State X imposes a state death tax equal to the federal credit allowed under Internal Revenue Code section 2011. H bequeaths U.S. situs real property worth \$1,000,000 to W and U.S. situs real property worth \$1,000,000 to his child, C. The remainder of H's estate (\$3,000,000) consists of Canadian situs property passing to C. H's estate would be entitled to a pro rata unified credit of \$77,120 ( $\$192,800 \times \$2,000,000/\$5,000,000$ ). H's estate would be entitled to a state death tax credit under Internal Revenue Code section 2102 of \$99,600 (determined under Internal Revenue Code section 2011(b) with respect to an adjusted taxable estate of \$1,940,000). H's estate also would be entitled to a marital credit of \$77,120, which equals the lesser of the unified credit (\$77,120) and

\$435,000 (the U.S. estate tax that would otherwise be imposed on the property transferred to W before allowance of any credits, i.e., \$780,000 [tax on U.S. taxable estate of \$2,000,000] less \$345,800 [tax on U.S. taxable estate of \$1,000,000]).

*Example 5.*

The facts are the same as in Example 4, except that H and W are Canadian citizens who are resident in the United States at the time of H's death. Canadian Federal and provincial income taxes totaling \$500,000 are imposed by reason of H's death. H's estate would be entitled to a unified credit of \$192,800 and to a state death tax credit of \$300,880 under Internal Revenue Code sections 2010 and 2011(b), respectively. Under paragraph 6 of Article XXIX B, H's estate would be entitled to a credit for the Canadian income tax imposed by reason of death, equal to the lesser of \$500,000 (the Canadian taxes paid) or \$1,138,272 (\$2,390,800 (tax on \$5,000,000 taxable estate) less total of unified and state death tax credits (\$493,680) x \$3,000,000/\$5,000,000). H's estate also would be entitled to a marital credit of \$192,800, which equals the lesser of the unified credit (\$192,800) and \$550,000 (the U.S. estate tax that would otherwise be imposed on the property transferred to W before allowance of any credits, i.e., \$2,390,800 (tax on U.S. taxable estate of \$5,000,000) less \$1,840,800 [tax on U.S. taxable estate of \$4,000,000]).

***Canadian treatment of certain transfers.***

The provisions of paragraph 5 relate to the operation of Canadian law. They are intended to provide deferral ("rollover") of the Canadian tax at death for certain transfers to a surviving spouse and to permit the Canadian competent authority to allow such deferral for certain transfers to a trust. For example, they would enable the competent authority to treat a trust that is a qualified domestic trust for U.S. estate tax purposes as a Canadian spousal trust as well for purposes of certain provisions of Canadian tax law and of the Convention. These provisions do not affect U.S. domestic law regarding qualified domestic trusts. Nor do they affect the status of U.S. resident individuals for any other purpose.

***Credit for U.S. taxes.***

Under paragraph 6, Canada agrees to give Canadian residents and Canadian resident spousal trusts (or trusts treated as such by virtue of paragraph 5) a deduction from tax (i.e., a credit) for U.S. Federal or state estate or inheritance taxes imposed on U.S. situs property of the decedent or the trust. This credit is allowed against the income tax imposed by Canada, in an amount computed in accordance with subparagraph 6(a) or 6(b).

Subparagraph 6(a) covers the first set of cases---where the U.S. tax is imposed upon a decedent's death. Subparagraph 6(a)(i) allows a credit for U.S. tax against the total amount of Canadian income tax payable by the decedent in the taxable year of death on any income, profits, or gains arising in the United States (within the meaning of paragraph 3 of Article XXIV

(Elimination of Double Taxation)). For purposes of subparagraph 6(a)(i), income, profits, or gains arising in the United States within the meaning of paragraph 3 of Article XXIV include gains deemed realized at death on U.S. situs real property and on personal property forming part of the business property of a U.S. permanent establishment or fixed base. (As explained below, these are the only types of property on which the United States may impose its estate tax if the estate is worth \$1.2 million or less.) Income, profits, or gains arising in the United States also include income and profits earned by the decedent during the taxable year of death, to the extent that the United States may tax such amounts under the Convention (e.g., dividends received from a U.S. corporation and wages from the performance of personal services in the United States).

Where the value of the decedent's entire gross estate exceeds \$1.2 million, subparagraph 6(a)(ii) allows a credit against the Canadian income tax on any income, profits, or gains from any U.S. situs property, in addition to any credit allowed by subparagraph 6(a)(i). This provision is broader in scope than is the general rule under subparagraph 6(a)(i), because the United States has retained the right to impose its estate tax on all types of property in the case of larger estates.

Subparagraph 6(b) provides rules for a second category of cases----where the U.S. tax is imposed upon the death of the surviving spouse. In these cases, Canada agrees to allow a credit against the Canadian tax payable by a trust for its taxable year during which the surviving spouse dies on any income, profits, or gains

- (i) arising in the United States on U.S. situs real property or business property, or
- (ii) from property situated in the United States.

These rules are intended to provide a credit for taxes imposed as a result of the death of the surviving spouse in situations involving trusts. To the extent that taxes are imposed on the estate of the surviving spouse, subparagraph 6(a) would apply as well. In addition, the competent authorities are authorized to provide relief from double taxation in certain additional circumstances involving trusts, as described above in connection with Article 14 of the Protocol.

The credit allowed under paragraph 6 is subject to certain conditions. First, where the decedent was a U.S. citizen or former citizen (described in paragraph 2 of Article XXIX (Miscellaneous Rules)), paragraph 6 does not obligate Canada to provide a credit for U.S. taxes in excess of the amount of U.S. taxes that would have been payable if the decedent had not been a U.S. citizen or former citizen. Second, the credit allowed under paragraph 6 will be computed after taking into account any deduction for U.S. income tax provided under paragraph 2(a), 4(a), or 5(b) of Article XXIV (Elimination of Double Taxation). This clarifies that no double credit will be allowed for any amount and provides an ordering rule. Finally, because Canadian domestic law does not contain a definition of U.S. situs property for death tax purposes, such a definition is provided for purposes of paragraph 6. To maximize coordination of the credit provisions, the Contracting States agreed to follow the U.S. estate tax law definition as in effect on the date of signature of the Protocol and, subject to competent authority agreement, as it may be amended in the future.

***Credit for Canadian taxes.***

Under paragraph 7, the United States agrees to allow a credit against U.S. Federal estate tax imposed on the estate of a U.S. resident or U.S. citizen decedent, or upon the death of a surviving spouse with respect to a qualified; domestic trust created by such a decedent (or the decedent's executor or surviving spouse). The credit is allowed for Canadian Federal and provincial income taxes imposed at death with respect to property of the estate or trust that is situated outside of the United States. As in the case under paragraph 6, the competent authorities also are authorized to provide relief from double taxation in certain cases involving trusts (see discussion of Article 14, above).

The amount of the credit generally will be determined as though the income tax imposed by Canada were a creditable tax under the U.S. estate tax provisions regarding credit for foreign death taxes, in accordance with the provisions and subject to the limitations of Internal Revenue Code section 2014. However, subparagraph 7(a) clarifies that a credit otherwise allowable under paragraph 7 will not be denied merely because of inconsistencies between U.S. and Canadian law regarding the identity of the taxpayer in the case of a particular taxable event. For example, the fact that the taxpayer is the decedent's estate for purposes of U.S. estate taxation and the decedent for purposes of Canadian income taxation will not prevent the allowance of a credit under paragraph 7 for Canadian income taxes imposed by reason of the death of the decedent.

In addition, subparagraph 7(c) clarifies that the credit against the U.S. estate tax generally may be claimed only to the extent that no credit or deduction is claimed for the same amount of Canadian tax in determining any other U.S. tax. This makes clear, for example, that a credit may not be claimed for the same amount under both this provision and Article XXIV (Elimination of Double Taxation). To prevent double taxation, an exception to this restriction is provided for certain taxes imposed with respect to qualified domestic trusts. Subject to the limitations of subparagraph 7(c), the taxpayer may choose between relief under Article XXIV, relief under this paragraph 7, or some combination of the two.

### ***Relief for small estates.***

Under paragraph 8, the United States agrees to limit the application of its estate tax in the case of certain small estates of Canadian resident decedents. This provision is intended to eliminate the "trap for the unwary" that exists for such decedents, in the absence of an estate tax convention between the United States and Canada. In the absence of sophisticated estate tax planning, such decedents may inadvertently subject their estates to U.S. estate tax liability by holding shares of U.S. corporate stock or other U.S. situs property. U.S. resident decedents are already protected in this regard by the provisions of Article XIII (Gains) of the present Convention, which prohibit Canada from imposing its income tax on gains deemed realized at death by U.S. residents on such property.

Paragraph 8 provides relief only in the case of Canadian resident decedents whose entire gross estates wherever situated (i.e., worldwide gross estates determined under U.S. law) have a value, at the time of death, not exceeding \$1.2 million. Paragraph 8 provides that the United States may impose its estate tax upon property forming part of such estates only if any gain on alienation of the property would have been subject to U.S. income taxation under Article XIII (Gains). For estates with a total value not exceeding \$1.2 million, this provision has the effect of

permitting the United States to impose its estate tax only on real property situated in the United States within the meaning of Article XIII, and personal property forming part of the business property of a U.S. permanent establishment or fixed base.

*Saving clause exceptions.*

Certain provisions of Article XXIX B are included in the list of exceptions to the general "saving clause" of Article XXIX (Miscellaneous Rules), as amended by Article 17 of the Protocol. To the extent that an exception from the saving clause is provided for a provision, each Contracting State is required to allow the benefits of that provision to its residents (and, in the case of the United States, its citizens), notwithstanding the saving clause. General saving clause exceptions are provided for paragraphs 1, 5, and 6 of Article XXIX B. Saving clause exceptions are provided for paragraphs 2, 3, 4, and 7, except for the estates of former U.S. citizens referred to in paragraph 2 of Article XXIX.

*Effective dates.*

Article 21 of the Protocol contains special retrospective effective date provisions for paragraphs 2 through 8 of Article XXIX B and certain related provisions of the Protocol. Paragraphs 2 through 8 of Article XXIX B and the specified related provisions generally will take effect with respect to deaths occurring after the date on which the Protocol enters into force (i.e., the date on which the instruments of ratification are exchanged). However, the benefits of those provisions will also be available with respect to deaths occurring after November 10, 1988, provided that a claim for refund due as a result of these provisions is filed by the later of one year from the date on which the Protocol enters into force or the date on which the applicable period for filing such a claim expires under the domestic law of the Contracting State concerned. The general effective dates set forth in Article 21 of the Protocol otherwise apply.

It is unusual for the United States to agree to retrospective effective dates. In this case, however, the negotiators believed that retrospective application was not inappropriate, given the fact that the TAMRA provisions were the impetus for negotiation of the Protocol and that the negotiations commenced soon after the enactment of TAMRA. The United States has agreed to retrospective effective dates in certain other instances (e.g., in the case of the U.S.-Germany estate tax treaty). The retrospective effective dates apply reciprocally, so that they will benefit the estates of U.S. decedents as well as Canadian decedents.

## ARTICLE 20

Article 20 of the Protocol does not amend the text of the Convention. It states two understandings between the Contracting States regarding future action relating to matters dealt with in the Protocol. Paragraph 1 requires the appropriate authorities of the Contracting States to consult on two matters within three years from the date on which the Protocol enters into force. First, they will consult with a view to agreeing to further reductions in withholding rates on dividends, interest and royalties under Articles X, XI, and XII, respectively. This provision reflects the fact that, although the Protocol does significantly reduce withholding rates, the United

States remains interested in even greater reductions, to further open the capital markets and fulfill the objectives of the North American Free Trade Agreement. Second, the appropriate authorities of the Contracting States will consult about the rules in Article XXIX A (Limitation on Benefits). By that time, both Contracting States will have had an opportunity to observe the operation of the Article, and the United States will have had greater experience with the corresponding provisions in other recent U.S. tax conventions.

Paragraph 2 of Article 20 also requires consultations between the appropriate authorities, after the three-year period from the date on which the Protocol enters into force, to determine whether to implement the arbitration procedure provided for in paragraph 6 of Article XXVI (Mutual Agreement Procedure), added by Article 14 of the Protocol. The three-year period is intended to give the authorities an opportunity to consider how arbitration has functioned in other tax conventions, such as the U.S.-Germany Convention, before implementing it under this Convention.

## ARTICLE 21

Article 21 of the Protocol provides the rules for the entry into force of the Protocol provisions. The Protocol will be subject to ratification according to the normal procedures in both Contracting States and instruments of ratification will be exchanged as soon as possible. Upon the exchange of instruments, the Protocol will enter into force.

Paragraph 2(a) of Article 21 generally governs the entry into force of the provisions of the Protocol for taxes withheld at source, while paragraph 2(b) generally governs for other taxes. Paragraphs 3, 4, and 5 provide special rules for certain provisions.

Paragraph 2(a) provides that the Protocol generally will have effect for taxes withheld at source on dividends, interest, royalties, and pensions and annuities (other than social security benefits), under Articles X, XI, XII, and XVIII, respectively, with respect to amounts paid or credited on or after the first day of the second month following the date on which the Protocol enters into force (i.e., the date on which instruments of ratification are exchanged). However, with respect to direct investment dividends, the 5 percent rate specified in paragraph 2(a) of Article X will be phased in as follows:

- (1) for dividends paid or credited after the first day of the second month referred to above, and during 1995, the rate of withholding will be 7 percent;
- (2) for dividends paid or credited after the first day of the second month, and during 1996, the rate will be 6 percent; and
- (3) for dividends paid or credited after the first day of the second month and after 1996, the rate will be 5 percent.

For taxes other than those withheld at source and for the provisions of the Protocol relating to taxes withheld on social security benefits, the Protocol will have effect with respect to taxable years beginning on or after the first day of January following the date on which the Protocol enters into force. However, the rate of tax applicable to the branch tax under paragraph 6 of Article X (Dividends) will be phased in a manner similar to the direct investment dividend

withholding tax rate; that is, a rate of 6 percent will apply for taxable years beginning in 1996 and a rate of 5 percent will apply for taxable years beginning in 1997 and subsequent years.

Paragraph 3 of Article 21 provides a special effective date for the provisions of the new Article XXVI A (Assistance in Collection) of the Convention, introduced by Article 15 of the Protocol. Collection assistance may be granted by a Contracting State with respect to a request by the other Contracting State for a claim finally determined by the requesting State after the date that is ten years before the date of the entry into force of the Protocol. Thus, for example, if instruments of ratification are exchanged on July 1, 1995, assistance may be given by Canada under Article XXVI A for a claim that was finally determined in the United States at any time after July 1, 1985.

Paragraph 4 of Article 21 provides special effective date provisions for paragraphs 2 through 7 of the new Article XXIX B (Taxes Imposed by Reason of Death) of the Convention, introduced by Article 18 of the Protocol, and certain related provisions elsewhere in the Convention. These special effective date provisions are discussed above in connection with Article 18.

Finally, paragraph 5 of Article 21 provides a special effective date for paragraph 2 of Article 3 of the Protocol, which provides a new residence rule for certain "continued" corporations. Under paragraph 5, the new residence rule for such corporations will have effect for taxable years beginning on or after the first day of January following the date on which the Protocol enters into force.

## PROTOCOL 4

### DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY TECHNICAL EXPLANATION OF THE PROTOCOL BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND CANADA SIGNED AT OTTAWA ON JULY 29, 1997 AMENDING THE CONVENTION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND CANADA WITH RESPECT TO TAXES ON INCOME AND ON CAPITAL SIGNED AT WASHINGTON ON SEPTEMBER 26, 1980 AS AMENDED BY THE PROTOCOLS SIGNED ON JUNE 14, 1983, MARCH 28, 1984 AND MARCH 17, 1995

GENERAL EFFECTIVE DATE UNDER ARTICLE XXX: 1 JANUARY 1985

## INTRODUCTION

This document is a technical explanation of the Protocol Between the United States of America and Canada signed on July 29, 1997 (the "Protocol") amending the Convention Between the United States of America and Canada With Respect to Taxes on Income and on Capital Signed at Washington on September 26, 1980 as Amended by the Protocols Signed on June 14, 1983, March 28, 1984 and March 17, 1995 (the "Convention").

This technical explanation is an official guide to the Protocol. It reflects the policies

behind particular Protocol provisions, as well as understandings reached with respect to the application and interpretation of the Protocol. References in this technical explanation to “he” or “his” should be read to mean “he or she” or “his or her.”

## ARTICLE 1

Article 1 of the Protocol amends paragraph 3 of Article XIII (Gains) of the Convention. Paragraph 1 of Article XIII of the Convention provides that gains derived by a resident of a Contracting State from the alienation of real property situated within the other Contracting State may be taxed in that other State. The term “real property situated in the other Contracting State” is defined for this purpose in paragraph 3 of Article XIII of the Convention.

Under paragraph 3(a) of Article XIII of the Convention, real property situated in the United States includes real property (as defined in Article VI (Income from Real Property) of the Convention) situated in the United States and a United States real property interest. Under section 897(c) of the Internal Revenue Code (the “Code”) the term “United States real property interest” includes shares in a U.S. corporation that owns sufficient U.S. real property interests to satisfy an asset-ratio test on certain testing dates.

Under Paragraph 3(b) of Article XIII of the Convention, real property situated in Canada means real property (as defined in Article VI of the Convention) situated in Canada; shares of stock of a company, the value of whose shares consists principally of Canadian real property; and an interest in a partnership, trust or estate, the value of which consists principally of Canadian real property. The term “principally” means more than 50 percent.

Under the Code, stock of a foreign corporation is not considered a “United States real property interest.” Therefore, the United States does not tax a resident of Canada on the sale of stock of a foreign corporation, regardless of the composition of the corporation’s assets. Although the Convention permits Canada to tax a U.S. resident on the sale of stock of a company that is not a resident of Canada if the value of the company’s shares consists principally of Canadian real property, Canada does not currently impose such a tax. However, on April 26, 1995, amendments were proposed to the Canadian Income Tax Act that would impose Canadian income tax on gains realized on stock of certain companies that are not residents of Canada if

(i) more than 50 percent of the fair market value of all of the company’s properties consists of any combination of taxable Canadian property, Canadian resource property, timber resource property in Canada and income interests in Canadian trusts, and

(ii) more than 50 percent of the fair market value of the shares in question is derived directly or indirectly from any combination of real property located in Canada, Canadian resource property, and timber resource property in Canada.

This amendment is proposed to be effective as of April 26, 1995 with proration for gains that accrued before that date. Although the Canadian Parliament was dissolved before these amendments were passed, they are expected to be re-introduced in the current session with the same effective date.

The Protocol amends paragraphs 3(a) and 3(b)(ii) of Article XIII of the Convention to limit each State's right to tax the gains of a resident of the other State from the sale of stock of a real property holding company to cases where the company is resident in that State. Although the United States does not impose and is not currently considering imposing a tax under the Code on gains from the sale of stock of nonresident real property holding companies, the Protocol nevertheless amends the Convention to prohibit the imposition of such a tax on Canadian residents. Although Canada is considering imposing such a tax on gains from the sale of shares of companies that are not residents of Canada, this Protocol provision will cause the proposed amendments to the Canadian Income Tax Act to be inapplicable to U.S. residents who derive gains from the sale of stock of real property holding companies that are not residents of Canada. This provision will be retroactively effective to April 26, 1995, the date the previous Canadian legislation was proposed to be effective.

## ARTICLE 2

### *Paragraph 1*

Paragraph 1 of Article 2 of the Protocol amends paragraph 3 of Article XVIII (Pensions and Annuities) of the Convention to clarify that social security benefits paid by one Contracting State in respect of services rendered to that State or a subdivision or authority of that State are subject to the rules set forth in paragraph 5 of Article XVIII, and are not subject to Article XIX (Government Service). Thus, all social security benefits paid by a Contracting State will be subject to the same rules, regardless of whether the services were rendered to a private sector employer, the government, or both.

### *Paragraph 2*

Paragraph 2 of Article 2 of the Protocol amends paragraph 5 of Article XVIII of the Convention, which provides rules for the taxation of social security benefits (including tier 1 railroad retirement benefits but not including unemployment benefits), and reverses changes made by the third protocol to the Convention, which was signed on March 17, 1995 and generally took effect as of January 1, 1996 (the "1995 Protocol"). Under the Convention prior to amendment by the 1995 Protocol, the State of residence of the recipient of social security benefits had the exclusive right to tax social security benefits paid by the other State on a net basis but exempted 50 percent of the benefit. This was changed by the 1995 Protocol. Under the 1995 Protocol, effective January 1, 1996 benefits paid under the U.S. or Canadian social security legislation to a resident of the other Contracting State (or, in the case of Canadian benefits, paid to a U.S. citizen) are taxable exclusively in the paying State.

Canada and the United States impose different source-basis taxing regimes on social security benefits. Under Code section 871(a)(3), 85 percent of social security benefits paid to a nonresident alien are includible in gross income. The taxable portion of social security benefits is subject to the regular 30 percent withholding tax, with the result that the gross social security benefit is subject to an effective tax rate of 25.5 percent. This is a final payment of tax and

Canadian recipients of U.S. social security benefits, regardless of their level of income, may not elect to be taxed in the United States on a net basis at graduated rates.

In Canada, social security benefits paid to nonresidents are subject to a general withholding tax of 25 percent. However, Canada permits U.S. recipients of Canadian benefits to file a Canadian tax return and pay tax at regular graduated rates on their net income. As a result, low-income U.S. recipients of Canadian social security typically pay little or no tax on their benefits.

The Protocol returns to a system of residence-based taxation in which social security benefits are exclusively taxable in the State where the recipient lives. Social security benefits will generally be taxed as if they were benefits paid under the social security legislation in the residence State. Therefore, social security benefits will be taxed on a net basis at graduated rates and low-income recipients will not pay any tax on these benefits. However, the Protocol modifies the residence State's taxation of cross-border benefits in order to take into account how the benefits would have been taxed in the source State if paid to a resident of that State.

In the case of Canadian recipients of U.S. social security benefits, the Protocol provides that only 85 percent of these benefits will be subject to tax in Canada. This reflects the fact that, although in Canada social security benefits are fully includible, a maximum of 85 percent of United States social security benefits are includible in income for U.S. tax purposes. See Code section 86. This is also consistent with the taxation of social security benefits under the Convention prior to the effective date of the 1995 Protocol, since at the time the pre-1996 rule was adopted the United States included a maximum of 50 percent of the social security benefits in income.

In the case of U.S. recipients of Canadian social security benefits, the Protocol provides that the benefits will be taxed as if they were payments under the Social Security Act. Therefore, a maximum of 85 percent of the Canadian benefits will be included in the gross income of a U.S. recipient, even though the entire benefit would have been taxed by Canada if received by a Canadian resident. However, if the Canadian benefit is of a type that is not subject to Canadian tax when paid to a resident of Canada, it will not be subject to U.S. tax when received by a resident of the United States. This provision is necessary to take into account certain proposed changes to Canada's Old Age Security benefits. At present, Old Age Security benefits paid to U.S. residents are subject to both ordinary Canadian income tax and an additional "recovery tax" that has the effect of means-testing the benefit. Canada has proposed to change the Old Age Security benefit system so that the benefit would be means-tested at source and not subject to the recovery tax. Because the amount of such future benefits will have already been reduced to take into account the recipient's income, it would not be appropriate to subject such benefits to additional U.S. tax.

### ARTICLE 3

Article 3 of the Protocol contains the rules for bringing the Protocol into force and giving effect to its provisions.

### *Paragraph 1*

Paragraph 1 provides for the ratification of the Protocol by both Contracting States according to their constitutional and statutory requirements and instruments of ratification will be exchanged as soon as possible.

In the United States, the process leading to ratification and entry into force is as follows: Once a protocol has been signed by authorized representatives of the two Contracting States, the Department of State sends the protocol to the President who formally transmits it to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification, which requires approval by two-thirds of the Senators present and voting. Prior to this vote, however, it generally has been the practice for the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to hold hearings on the protocol and make a recommendation regarding its approval to the full Senate. Both Government and private sector witnesses may testify at these hearings. After receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, the protocol is returned to the President for his signature on the ratification document. The President's signature on the document completes the process in the United States.

### *Paragraph 2*

Paragraph 2 of Article 3 provides that the Protocol will enter into force on the date on which the instruments of ratification are exchanged. However, the date on which the Protocol enters into force will not be the date on which its provisions will take effect. Paragraph 2, therefore, also contains rules that determine when the provisions of the Protocol will have effect.

Under paragraph 2(a), Article 1 of the Protocol will have effect as of April 26, 1995. As discussed above, this is the date on which certain proposed amendments to Canadian law would be effective.

Under paragraph 2(b), Article 2 of the Protocol will have effect as of January 1, 1996, which is the date as of which the changes to the taxation of social security benefits that were implemented by the 1995 Protocol became effective. Consequently, the source-basis taxation of social security benefits that was implemented by the 1995 Protocol will be retroactively eliminated and recipients of cross-border social security benefits will be entitled to a refund of any source-State tax withheld on their benefits for 1996 and later years. This return to residence-basis taxation of social security benefits means that some high-income recipients of cross-border benefits may be required to pay additional taxes to their State of residence if their average tax rate on these benefits in their State of residence is higher than the current rate of source-State withholding tax. It is only for future years, however, that such high-income recipients of benefits will be subject to a higher rate of tax. No one will be subject to a higher rate of tax for the retroactive period. If, as a result of the change, the residence-State tax would exceed the amount of the refund otherwise due, there will be neither a refund of source-State tax nor the imposition of additional residence-State tax.

Subparagraphs (b)(i) and (ii) provide rules that determine how the retroactive effect of the Protocol will generally be implemented for the year in which the Protocol enters into effect. As

discussed below, these rules are required as a result of administrative limitations on the ability of the relevant Government organizations to effect the payment of refunds. Withholding taxes imposed by the United States on cross-border social security benefits are collected and administered by the Social Security Administration (SSA), not the Internal Revenue Service (IRS). However, any refunds of withholding tax improperly collected on social security benefits are ordinarily paid by the IRS. If the Protocol enters into force prior to September 1 of a calendar year, it is possible for the SSA to pay refunds of the tax withheld for the entire year directly to the individual Canadian recipient. If the Protocol enters into force after August 31 of a calendar year, it will not be possible for SSA to pay refunds of tax withheld for that year and refunds must be paid through the IRS.

Paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of Article 3 establish administrative procedures to govern the payment of refunds through the IRS, including rules to ensure that benefits will not be subject to a higher rate of tax in the residence State for the retroactive period. The taxes withheld on social security benefits paid for years after 1995 and prior to the calendar year in which the Protocol enters into force (referred to in the Protocol as “source-taxed benefits”) will be subject to the refund procedures set forth in paragraphs 3, 4, and 5, regardless of when the Protocol enters into force. Social security benefits paid for calendar years beginning after the Protocol enters into force will not be subject to the refund procedures set forth in paragraphs 3, 4, and 5 because source State tax will not be withheld.

If the Protocol enters into force after August 31 of a calendar year, subparagraph (b)(i) provides that social security benefits paid during such calendar year will be treated as benefits paid for calendar years ending before the year in which the Protocol enters into force (and thus will be treated as “source-taxed benefits”). In this case, the taxes withheld on these benefits will be subject to the refund procedures set forth in paragraphs 3, 4, and 5 of Article 3 and these benefits will not be subject to a higher rate of residence-State tax. If the Protocol enters into force before September 1 of a calendar year, subparagraph (b)(ii) provides that social security benefits paid during such calendar year will be treated as benefits paid for calendar years beginning after the year in which the Protocol enters into force. In this case, the taxes withheld on these benefits will be directly and automatically refunded by the source State and the potentially higher rate of residence-State tax will apply.

### *Paragraph 3*

Paragraph 3 of Article 3 of the Protocol provides rules governing the payment of refunds of source-State tax with respect to “source-taxed benefits.” In general, all applications for refund must be made to the competent authority of the source State within three years of entry into force of the Protocol.

Except as set forth in subparagraph (b) of paragraph 2, the retroactive effect of the Protocol is elective and applies only if a recipient of benefits applies for a refund of the tax paid or withheld. Consequently, if a recipient of benefits does not apply for a refund of the tax paid or withheld, the Protocol will not be given retroactive effect, except as set forth in subparagraph (b) of paragraph 2. If the residence-State tax that would be imposed on such source-taxed benefits is greater than the source-State tax imposed on such benefits, it is assumed that the recipient will not

apply for a refund of the source-State tax and such benefits will not be subject to the retroactive effect of the Protocol. Because the application for refund may be made on a year-by-year basis, the recipient may elect the most beneficial treatment for each year. Therefore, social security benefits will not be subject to a higher rate of tax for the retroactive period, except as set forth in subparagraph (b) of paragraph 2.

The refund procedure depends on the recipient's State of residence. In the case of U.S. residents who received Canadian social security benefits that were subject to Canadian tax, a U.S. resident who elects to have the Protocol apply retroactively will apply directly to the Canadian competent authority for the refund of any Canadian tax not previously refunded. On the receipt of such refund, the Canadian social security benefits will be includible in the U.S. resident's gross income for the years with respect to which the refund was paid. Consequently, the U.S. recipient may be required to file an amended U.S. income tax return for such years and pay U.S. tax on such benefits. Pursuant to Article XXVII (Exchange of Information) of the Convention, the Canadian competent authority will provide the U.S. competent authority with information regarding the payment of refunds.

In the case of Canadian residents who received U.S. social security benefits, the Canadian competent authority shall be the only person entitled to apply for a refund of the U.S. taxes withheld on such benefits. Individual residents of Canada will not apply directly to the IRS for refunds. However, the Canadian competent authority may base its applications on information received from individual Canadians, as well as on information to be provided by the United State competent authority. The Protocol provides that the Canadian competent authority shall apply for and receive all such refunds on behalf of individual residents of Canada and shall remit such refunds to individual residents of Canada after deducting any additional Canadian tax that may be imposed as a result of such social security benefits being subject to tax in Canada. The Canadian competent authority shall make such application for refund on behalf of an individual resident of Canada only if the additional Canadian tax that would be imposed is less than the amount of the U.S. tax to be refunded. If, with respect to an individual resident of Canada, the additional Canadian tax that would be imposed on the individual's social security benefits is equal to or greater than the U.S. tax withheld, the Canadian competent authority shall not apply for a refund of the U.S. tax withheld on the individual's benefits. This provision ensures that refunds of U.S. tax will be paid only when the refund will benefit an individual resident of Canada. A refund of U.S. tax will not be paid if it would simply result in a payment from the U.S. Treasury to the Government of Canada without any portion of the refund being paid to an individual resident of Canada.

#### *Paragraph 4*

Paragraph 4 provides that all taxes refunded as a result of the Protocol will be refunded without interest. Consequently, any additional taxes assessed as a result of the Protocol will be assessed without interest provided that the additional taxes are paid in a timely manner. However, interest and penalties on underpayments may be assessed for periods beginning after December 31 of the year following the year in which the Protocol enters into force.

*Paragraph 5*

Paragraph 5 provides that the competent authorities shall establish procedures for making or revoking the application for refund provided for in paragraph 3 and such other procedures as are necessary to ensure the appropriate implementation of the Protocol. It will be necessary to establish procedures for a taxpayer to revoke his application for refund because a taxpayer may apply for a refund and then determine that the residence-State tax imposed on his social security benefits pursuant to Article 2 of the Protocol exceeds the amount of source-State tax refunded. Such a taxpayer (or, in the case of a Canadian resident, the Canadian competent authority acting on behalf of such taxpayer) will be permitted to revoke his application for refund provided that the taxpayer returns the source-State refund and the three-year period established in paragraph 3 has not expired as of the date on which the revocation is filed. The competent authorities will also establish procedures to ensure that duplicate refunds are not paid.