Sender's Fax:

6533 5700

Sender's DID:

6530 0229

Sender's Email:

represent@lawsoc.org.sg

Our Ref:

LS/10/PubConsult(COP)09-38/AC.rk.V1(090714)

Your Ref:

14 July 2009

Ministry of Finance 100 High Street #10-01 The Treasury Singapore 179434

BY E-MAIL ONLY

E-mail: NG Hui Li@mof.gov.sg No. of pages: 3 pages (including this page)

Attention: Ms Ng Hui Li

Deputy Director 1 (Tax Policy)

Dear Ms Ng

PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON INCOME TAX (AMENDMENT) BILL 2009

We refer to your e-mail request dated 22 June 2009 inviting the Law Society to provide our feedback on the public consultation on the Income Tax (Amendment) Bill 2009.

An ad hoc committee was appointed to review the consultation paper.

We are pleased to enclose our ad hoc committee's feedback on the matter for your consideration.

Thank you for giving the Law Society the opportunity to give our views on the matter.

Yours sincerely

Alvin Chen

Director, Representation and Law Reform Department

Encl.



39 South Bridge Road Singapore 058673 Tel: 6538 2500 Fax: 6533 5700 Email: lawsoc@lawsoc.org.sg Website: www.lawsociety.org.sg

Council Members 2009

Michael Hwang, SC (President) Wong Meng Meng, SC (Vice President)
Malathi Das (Vice President) Gary Pryke (Treasurer)

Rajan Menon Lok Vi Ming, SC Young Chee Foong Wong Siew Hong Dilhan Pillay Sandrasegara Leo Cheng Suan Yap Teong Liang Stefanie Yuen Thio Joseph Tan Chin Aik Rajan Chettiar Lisa Sam Anand Nalachandran Christopher Koh Lee Terk Yang Laura Liew Wilma Muhundan Vanessa Sandhu

Secretariat Chief Executive Officer Chua Lik Teng

Representation & Law Reform Alvin Chen

Conduct Ambika Rajendram Vimala Chandrarajan

Compliance

Kenneth Goh

Pro Bono Services

Lim Tanguy Wong Peck Lin

Communications/ Membership Interests Shawn Toh

Continuing Professional Development Julia Wan

Publications

Sharmaine Lau

Finance Jasmine Liew Clifford Hang

Information Technology James Lim

Public Consultation of The Draft Income Tax (Amendment) Bill 2009 - Submission of Comments

Date Submitted:					
Name:		For non-individuals, please identify the company, institution or association and provide the name of a contact person.			
Contact Details:		E.g. DID, fax, email address			
Summary of feedback:					
	Details:				
No.	Tax Change ^a	Comments ^b	Proposed change to draft Income Tax (Amendment) Bill		
1	Tax treatment of profit or loss arising from certain real property disposals. Clause 5 of the draft Bill.	It ought to be axiomatic that all profits or losses arise from acquisition and disposal. Neither acquisition nor disposal alone results in any profit or loss.	Delete as being of no advantage whatsoever; positively damaging.		
		The taxation of a property transaction depends on the income or capital flavour of the acquisition of the property together with its disposal.			
		The view that one might form of whether an acquisition-and-disposal is or is not of an income nature can depend on — indeed will be influenced by — the person's previous — or perhaps even subsequent — property acquisitions and disposals.			
		The process involves considering or comparing the similarities or dissimilarities between transactions.			
		The proposal to use the disposal ends of two different property transactions as the determinant of liability is certainly novel. That is about as useful or logical as comparing two different acquisitions or, indeed, the one acquisition in one transaction with the disposal in another transaction.			
		Firstly, then, the proposed amendment is harmful to the basic jurisprudence of the principal Act and the case law.			

Public Consultation of The Draft Income Tax (Amendment) Bill 2009 -**Submission of Comments**

		Secondly, the clear and invidious implication is to jeopardise fact situations presently not in doubt under the existing law. Thirdly, it is defective as a "four-year rule" (on the assumption that such was the intention). Cf the three-year rule under the now-deleted ss 10G & F of the principal Act, or the existing Income Tax (Approved Investment Companies) Regulations. Taxpayers would find a three-year rule of the kind found in other countries — and which previously operated in Singapore under the now-deleted ss 10G & F — to be much more explicable.	
2	Review of tax treatment of management fees under section 12(7)(c), etc. Clause 7 of the draft Bill.	It is logical and praiseworthy to exclude income unconnected with any business or permanent establishment in Singapore from the deemed-source provisions in s 12(6) of the principal Act. Likewise we applaud the statutory exclusion of technical and management fees unconnected with any business or permanent establishment in Singapore from the deemed-source provisions in s 12(7) of the principal Act. The proposed amendment surpasses the existing 32-year-old press statement.	None.
3	Arm's length principle. Clause 25 of the draft Bill.	The arm's length principle is the international transfer pricing standard agreed between countries that is to be used by multinational enterprises and the tax authorities of their respective host countries. It ensures the proper allocation of revenues between two different tax authorities. The proposed amendment is only half-finished since it omits essential elements of the arm's length principle. Also, the result is mischief if additional profits are included in the profits of one person without a corresponding adjustment in the profits of the other.	Firstly, it has to be stated that the arm's length principle applies in the international context. Secondly, where profits are included in the income of one person and taxed accordingly, then there has to be a corresponding downward adjustment in the profits of the other person.

 ^a To quote the title of the tax change as well as the relevant Section(s) of the draft Income Tax (Amendment) Bill 2009. Please refer to the Summary Table for reference.
 ^b Illustrations and diagrams could be attached as Annexes.