Holding Companies in Canada

A Canadian Decision Guide for Business Owners

(Educational only. Not individualized advice.)

insightplanning.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Who This Guide Is For / Who It's Not For 4
How to Use This Guide 5
Reality Check 6
The True Decision at Hand 7

PART I - STRUCTURAL FOUNDATION

What a Holding Company Actually Is 8
The Six Common Objectives 9

PART II - TAX ARCHITECTURE OVERVIEW

Tax Architecture Overview 10
Intercorporate Dividends 11
Passive Investment Income and the Small Business Deduction 12
Refundable Dividend Tax on Hand (RDTOH) 13
Capital Dividend Account (CDA) 14
Subsection 55(2) Considerations 15
Section 85 Rollovers 16
Associated Corporations 17
Tax on Split Income (TOSI) 17

PART III - TRADE-OFFS AND STRUCTURAL TENSIONS

Trade-Offs and Tensions 18
Simplicity vs Optionality 19
Deferral vs Personal Liquidity 19
Risk Separation vs Timing Risk 20
Investing Surplus vs SBD Grind Exposure 21
Estate Flexibility vs Share Structure Complexity 21

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART IV - PATTERNS AND SCENARIOS

When a HoldCo Typically Adds Real Value 22

When a HoldCo Adds Unnecessary Complexity 23

The Decision Matrix 24

Scenario 1: The Surplus Accumulator 25

Scenario 2: The Risk Separator 26

Scenario 3: The Corporate Investor 27

Scenario 4: The Sale-Probability Owner 28

Scenario 5: The Existing HoldCo Owner 29

PART V - GOVERNANCE AND MAINTENANCE

Common Implementation Failures 30

What Good Looks Like 31

Governance and Maintenance 32

Professional Coordination Notes 33

Structural Review Questions 34

Who This Guide Is For / Who It's Not For

This guide is for

- Canadian owners of operating companies who are considering adding a holding company to their structure
- Owners who may be incorporated professionals or small business owners, without needing different rules for each
- Owners who already have a holding company and want to pressure-test whether it still serves its purpose
- Readers who want to ask better questions of their accountant and lawyer before changing structure

This guide is not for

- Early-stage businesses with minimal retained earnings and no realistic near-term surplus accumulation
- Readers looking for a "how to set up a HoldCo" checklist
- Readers looking for aggressive tax avoidance
- DIY implementation without professional coordination

What this guide will do:

help you understand what a holding company is, why people use one, what it introduces, and how to decide if it belongs in your plan.

What it will not do:

give you step-by-step implementation instructions, numeric tax modeling, or product recommendations.

How to Use This Guide

Skim mode (30-45 minutes)

If you are early in the decision:

1. Read the Reality Check
2. Read "The True Decision at Hand"
3. Read Trade-Offs & Tensions
4. Read "When It Adds Value" and "When It Adds Complexity"
5. Use the Decision Matrix and your advisor questions

Deep mode (90-150 minutes)

If you are closer to action:

1. Read the Tax Architecture Overview
2. Work through the Scenarios (and pick the one that matches you most)
3. Use the "What Good Looks Like" standards
4. Review the Governance section and complexity thresholds
5. Decide whether your objective is strong enough to justify the structure

This guide is designed to help you decide, not to overwhelm you.

Reality Check

A holding company is easy to create.

A holding company is not always easy to justify.

Most structural mistakes in Canadian corporate planning are not caused by bad intentions. They are caused by unclear objectives.

A holding company becomes useful when it has a defined job inside a broader plan.

It becomes harmful when it becomes a default.

> The biggest structural risk is not "missing a tax strategy."
>
> It is building complexity you do not need, then living inside it for years.

This guide is built around one principle:

Structure should serve strategy. Not replace it.

The True Decision at Hand

Many owners start with one question:

"Should I set up a holding company?"

A good guide has to help you gain clarity across a cluster of related questions:

1. Should I set up a holding company?
2. Should I move retained earnings into one?
3. Is my current structure still appropriate?
4. When does a holding company create more risk than value?
5. How should a holding company fit into long-term planning?

Those questions are similar, but they are not the same. They also sit underneath a deeper set of decision drivers:

- What objective am I trying to accomplish?
- What trade-offs am I accepting?
- What changes if passive investment income grows?
- What changes if the business is sold?
- What changes on death or incapacity?
- What complexity am I willing to maintain?

If you get those right, "HoldCo or not" becomes clearer.

What a Holding Company Actually Is

A holding company (HoldCo) is a separate corporation that typically:

- Owns shares of another corporation (usually an operating company, OpCo)
- Receives dividends from OpCo
- Holds investments, cash, or other assets
- May own insurance policies
- May sit inside broader estate or succession planning

A HoldCo is NOT automatically:

- A tax shelter
- Asset protection
- A requirement of being incorporated
- A sign of maturity or sophistication

The simplest mental model

- OpCo earns business income & risk.
- HoldCo receives dividends & holds assets.
- Owner controls both structures.

The practical implication

Once you add a HoldCo, you now have:

- Another corporation
- Tax attributes to track
- Another set of filings
- Professional coordination

The decision is not the incorporation step. The decision is accepting the long-term system.

The Six Common Objectives

Holding companies are usually introduced to accomplish one or more of these objectives:

1. Deferral and capital compounding (keeping funds corporate longer)
2. Separating surplus from operating risk (conditional)
3. Building a corporate investment pool (with tax regime consequences)
4. Estate and succession flexibility (often via share structuring)
5. Sale preparation (purification and post-sale planning, where appropriate)
6. Insurance planning integration (where corporate insurance is relevant)

A holding company without a clear objective gets complicated:

- Complexity creep
- Unclear governance
- Confusing tax outcomes
- Poor decision timing later

Before you ask "Should I have one?", ask: What is it supposed to do for me?

Tax Architecture Overview

(Conceptual, not technical. Enough to ask better questions.)

This section explains what exists in the Canadian system and why it matters.

You do not need to become an expert.

You do need to understand the existence of the rules and what they can change.

> Most of the "value" in holding company structures comes from how these rules interact. If you ignore the architecture, the structure often becomes a liability rather than an asset.

Intercorporate Dividends

In general, intercorporate dividends between connected Canadian corporations can be deductible, which is why owners can move after-tax corporate funds from OpCo to HoldCo without immediate personal taxation.

Why this matters

If your objective is to:

- move surplus out of OpCo
- invest surplus
- separate surplus from operating risk

then the dividend pathway is the "pipe" that makes that possible.

What can complicate this

Canadian anti-avoidance rules can apply when dividends are part of a series of transactions intended to change the character of surplus. Subsection 55(2) is a key example, and it is especially relevant around reorganizations and sale planning.

You do not need to master 55(2). You do need to know it exists, and that it is a reason professional coordination matters.

Passive Investment Income and the Small Business Deduction

(The most common surprise)

Corporate investment income is not taxed the same way as active business income. And it can affect your access to lower small business tax rates.

Canada's passive income rules can reduce a CCPC's Small Business Deduction business limit on a straight-line basis when adjusted aggregate investment income (AAII) of the corporation and associated corporations is between $50,000 and $150,000.

Why this matters

Owners often assume: "Invest in HoldCo and keep OpCo clean."

But the passive income grind looks at the associated group. In many cases, passive income earned in HoldCo can reduce OpCo's access to the Small Business Deduction.

The decision impact

If your plan includes building a large corporate investment pool, the passive income regime is not a side detail. It can become a central driver of after-tax outcomes and planning trade-offs.

Refundable Dividend Tax on Hand (RDTOH)

(Why corporate investment tax feels "high")

Canada uses refundable tax mechanisms to limit long-term advantages of earning passive investment income inside corporations.

RDTOH is an account that generally accumulates the refundable portion of certain taxes and is reduced when a corporation receives a dividend refund.

What you need to understand

- The system is designed so that some corporate tax paid on investment income may be refunded when taxable dividends are paid out.
- The ability to recover refundable taxes depends on how and when dividends are paid.
- "Tracking" matters. Errors can lead to trapped tax.

Budget changes introduced rules that generally limit dividend refunds to cases where a private corporation pays non-eligible dividends, with specific exceptions.

You do not need to calculate RDTOH. You do need to understand it as a governance item in a HoldCo that invests.

Capital Dividend Account (CDA)

Why it shows up in HoldCo planning

The CDA is a notional account that tracks certain non-taxable corporate amounts that may be distributed as tax-free capital dividends if the proper election is made.

CRA guidance notes CDA balances may be visible in My Business Account for corporations that have filed Form T2054 or requested verification.

The election mechanism is made using Form T2054.

Why this matters

CDA shows up in:

- corporate investment portfolios that realize capital gains
- corporate-owned insurance planning (death benefit mechanics)
- certain corporate reorganizations

If CDA is part of your structure, you need a clean process. Not because it is complex day-to-day, but because errors can be costly and difficult to unwind.

Subsection 55(2) Considerations

55(2) is an anti-avoidance rule that can recharacterize certain intercorporate dividends in certain circumstances.

This matters most when:

- dividends are part of a series of transactions
- a reorganization is occurring
- a sale is planned
- surplus extraction is being engineered

> It is not the daily operating rule for every HoldCo. It is the "edge-of-structure" rule you need to respect during major events.

The more you use a HoldCo as a planning platform for major events, the more coordination matters.

Section 85 Rollovers

Section 85 is commonly used to transfer assets or shares to a corporation on a tax-deferred basis, subject to elections and documentation.

You do not need to know the mechanics. You do need to understand the role it often plays:

- Getting OpCo shares into HoldCo
- Moving assets into HoldCo
- Structuring reorganizations cleanly

This is lawyer-accountant territory, but owners should understand that these moves are not "informal."

Associated Corporations

The concept of "associated corporations" connects:

- SBD access
- passive income grind exposure
- certain tax integrations

Many owners plan as if HoldCo and OpCo are separate in every meaningful way. Legally, they are separate corporations. For many tax rules, the associated group is what matters.

This is why you can "do something" in HoldCo and still affect OpCo outcomes.

Tax on Split Income (TOSI)

Tax on Split Income (TOSI) rules can limit the effectiveness of paying income to certain family members through corporate structures.

Holding companies do not bypass TOSI. They can still be part of family share structures, but the decision has to be made inside the actual rules.

> For most owners, the key point is this: If your HoldCo plan depends on paying family members income, the structure should be reviewed carefully through TOSI.

Trade-Offs and Tensions

(This is where "institutional" lives.)

A holding company decision is rarely about one benefit. It is about accepting a set of trade-offs in exchange for a specific advantage.

Trade today's simplicity for tomorrow's potential flexibility.

Simplicity vs Optionality

What you gain

- flexibility over time
- a platform for investing surplus
- a structure that can support future planning events

What you accept

- another tax return
- another set of attributes to track (CDA, RDTOH, share structure details)
- more coordination cost
- more "structural inertia" once built

A HoldCo often becomes difficult to remove not because it is impossible, but because it becomes intertwined with other decisions.

Deferral vs Personal Liquidity

What you gain

- a larger pool of corporate capital compounding inside the structure

What you accept

- personal tax is deferred, not eliminated
- personal cash needs still dictate withdrawals
- withdrawals create dividend planning questions later

A HoldCo works best when the owner has:

- stable personal cash flow
- predictable withdrawal needs
- discipline around leaving capital corporate when appropriate

Risk Separation vs Timing Risk

What you gain

- the possibility of separating surplus from operating risk

What you accept

- it is not automatic protection
- timing matters
- guarantees and claims can reduce effectiveness
- transfers done too late can create legal and ethical issues

A HoldCo is not "asset protection." It can be part of a risk separation strategy, when implemented early and maintained properly.

Investing Surplus vs SBD Grind Exposure

What you gain

- corporate investing capacity
- long-term capital accumulation potential

What you accept

- passive investment income can reduce small business tax benefits across the associated group
- tracking and dividend strategy matters
- structural outcomes change as investment income grows

This is one of the most important "future drift" risks in HoldCo planning.

Estate Flexibility vs Share Structure Complexity

What you gain

- tools for future succession planning
- potential for freezes, trust structures, and differentiated control/value frameworks

What you accept

- share structures can become difficult for families to understand
- governance can become unclear
- professional management becomes more important as the structure evolves

When a HoldCo Typically Adds Real Value

(Patterns, not rules.)

A HoldCo is more likely to be justified when most of the following are true:

- You consistently generate surplus after paying yourself and reinvesting in the business
- Surplus is likely to accumulate meaningfully over years, not months
- You have a long time horizon for the operating company
- You have a clear plan for surplus capital (invest, reserve, insure, future acquisition, future succession)
- You are prepared to maintain structure and tracking
- You have coordinated advisors who can keep the structure coherent over time

A HoldCo is often a better fit for owners with:

- retained earnings that are becoming a meaningful part of their balance sheet
- a desire to build a corporate investment pool intentionally
- a realistic probability of a sale, freeze, or succession event in the medium-to-long term

When a HoldCo Adds Unnecessary Complexity

(Again, patterns.)

A HoldCo is less likely to be justified when most of the following are true:

- Retained earnings are minimal or inconsistent
- Surplus is regularly withdrawn personally anyway
- You do not have a clear surplus plan
- The operating business is still unstable or cash-flow fragile
- You do not want additional administration
- You are adding a HoldCo "just in case" without defined events
- Passive investment income is rising toward grind thresholds and you are not prepared to manage the trade-offs

> Unnecessary complexity is not just a cost. It becomes a decision fog that makes future choices harder.

The Decision Matrix

(A structured way to decide if the structure is earning its keep.)

Use this as a pressure-test. No single line decides it. The pattern does.

Dimension 1: Objective clarity	Do you have one clear reason this structure exists? Can you state it in one sentence? Would the structure still make sense if tax rates changed modestly?
Dimension 2: Capital scale	Is retained earnings accumulation meaningful, and likely to stay meaningful? Is the corporate balance sheet becoming a planning asset, not just operating fuel?
Dimension 3: Discipline and behavior	Are you likely to leave funds corporate to compound? Or will you withdraw most surplus personally anyway?
Dimension 4: Risk profile	Is OpCo exposed to meaningful operating liability? Would separating surplus earlier reduce business fragility?
Dimension 5: Passive income trajectory	Is corporate investing likely to grow toward or beyond passive thresholds over time? Are you prepared for the trade-offs?
Dimension 6: Event likelihood	Is a sale, freeze, succession, or major restructuring realistically on the horizon?
Dimension 7: Coordination capacity	Do you have an accountant and lawyer who coordinate well? Are you willing to maintain governance and documentation?
Dimension 8: Complexity tolerance	Are you the kind of owner who keeps systems clean over years? Or do you prefer simplicity even at the cost of some optionality?

If this matrix points toward "maybe," the next step is usually not to implement. It is to clarify the objective and pressure-test alternative paths.

Scenario 1: The Surplus Accumulator

(No clear objective yet)

Profile: OpCo is profitable. Retained earnings are growing. Owner hears "you should set up a HoldCo." Objective is vague: "tax efficiency" and "asset protection."

What a HoldCo can accomplish

- Create a path to move surplus out of OpCo through intercorporate dividends
- Provide a separate corporate pocket for investments
- Enable future structural options

What it introduces

- Compliance and tracking requirements
- The need to define a dividend policy
- The need to monitor passive income grind risk over time

Decision traps

- Building structure before defining purpose
- Investing in HoldCo without understanding future grind exposure
- Assuming "asset protection" is automatic

Coordination focus

- Clarify the objective in plain language
- Confirm association impacts
- Confirm the dividend pathway and governance process

Institutional decision take: In this scenario, the best first move is often not "incorporate HoldCo." It is "define objective and capital policy."

Scenario 2: The Risk Separator

(Operating risk is real)

Profile: OpCo carries meaningful operating liability. Owner wants surplus separated from the operating balance sheet. Retained earnings are material and growing.

What a HoldCo can accomplish

- Receive dividends from OpCo and hold surplus away from daily operating risks
- Build a corporate reserve or investment pool

What it introduces

- The need for regular decisions about surplus movement
- Timing risk (late transfers are not the same as early planning)
- Potential weakening of perceived "protection" if guarantees exist

Decision traps

- Waiting too long to move surplus
- Overconfidence in structural protection
- Failure to align legal realities with business realities

Coordination focus

- Lawyer-led review of risk and guarantee realities
- Accountant review of dividend capacity and clean movement
- Governance rule: decide surplus movement intentionally, not reactively

Institutional decision take: A HoldCo can support risk separation, but it is only as effective as: timing, discipline, legal structuring, and guarantee management.

Scenario 3: The Corporate Investor

(Passive income becomes the driver)

Profile: Owner is building a corporate investment pool. Investments may grow beyond modest levels. Owner wants compounding and optionality.

What a HoldCo can accomplish

- Separate investing from operations
- Create a platform for investments, reserves, and long-term planning
- Enable future reorganization flexibility

What it introduces

- Passive income grind exposure across the associated group
- Need for tracking RDTOH logic and dividend refund dynamics
- Governance need: how dividends are paid, and why

Decision traps

- Ignoring passive income thresholds until they erode SBD access
- Confusing "corporate investing" with "tax-free investing"
- Poor dividend planning leading to trapped refundable taxes

Coordination focus

- Annual passive income monitoring
- Confirm associated group implications
- Set governance around dividend decisions and tracking

Institutional decision take: In this scenario, HoldCo is often justified, but only if the owner accepts: ongoing monitoring, structural governance, and a clear understanding that outcomes change as investment income grows.

Scenario 4: The Sale-Probability Owner

(5-10 year horizon)

Profile: Owner may sell in 5-10 years. Wants optionality and clean structure. May hear about "purification" and QSBC outcomes.

What a HoldCo can accomplish

- Provide a framework to move surplus out of OpCo over time
- Support cleaner operating balance sheet if managed intentionally
- Create a platform for future planning steps that may be relevant

What it introduces

- More complexity in reorganizations
- More need to respect anti-avoidance rules during planning events (including 55(2))
- More need for coordinated legal and tax work

Decision traps

- Event-driven planning too late
- Layering structure without an integrated sale plan
- Misunderstanding what "clean" really means for future events

Coordination focus

- Keep reorganizations professional-led
- Maintain clean records and purpose
- Avoid "informal" structural moves that become future friction

Institutional decision take: A HoldCo can be helpful when sale probability is real, but the value depends on: timing, coordination, and disciplined surplus management.

Scenario 5: The Existing HoldCo Owner

(Structure drift and complexity creep)

Profile: HoldCo exists. It was set up years ago. Objective is unclear now. Multiple accounts, investments, maybe insurance, maybe real estate. Owner is not sure what is where or why.

What a HoldCo can accomplish now

- It may still be useful, but it needs a purpose reset
- It may hold meaningful assets that require governance and clarity

What it introduces now

- Ongoing administration
- Risk of mis-tracked CDA or refundable tax accounts
- Governance drift and professional siloing

Decision traps

- Treating the structure as permanent without periodic review
- Adding more layers instead of simplifying
- Failing to document why past steps were taken

Coordination focus

- Accountant-led inventory of tax attributes
- Lawyer-led review of share structure and governance
- Owner-led reset of objective and decision policy

Institutional decision take: The best use of this scenario is a structural audit: what assets are held, what tax attributes exist, what the objective is now, and whether simplification is possible.

Common Implementation Failures

(Where good intentions create bad structures.)

These patterns show up repeatedly in Canadian planning:

1. Default structuring	HoldCo added "because that's what people do."
2. Objective drift	The reason it was created is no longer relevant, but the structure remains.
3. Passive income surprise	Corporate investing grows, and SBD access is eroded unexpectedly.
4. Tracking failure	CDA and RDTOH attributes exist, but processes are unclear.
5. Siloed professionals	Accountant and lawyer work in parallel, not together.
6. Event-driven panic	Sale or succession planning begins late, forcing complexity quickly.
7. "Asset protection" overconfidence	Structure is assumed protective regardless of guarantees and timing.

A strong holding company structure is rarely "smart." It is usually just well-governed.

What Good Looks Like

(Standards, not tactics.)

A holding company structure is usually in good condition when:

Objective is explicit

- One sentence. Clear. Durable.

Records and attributes are clean

- CDA is tracked when relevant
- RDTOH understanding exists when investing is significant
- Dividend decisions are intentional, not accidental

Passive income is monitored

- Especially as investments grow over time

Share structure is understood

- Control and value are clear
- Ownership is documented
- Future changes are planned, not improvised

Professional coordination is real

- Accountant and lawyer understand the same objective
- Planning steps are documented
- Owner understands the "why," not just the "what"

Governance is scheduled

- The structure is reviewed periodically
- The owner knows what triggers a review

Governance and Maintenance

(Why HoldCos become either quiet assets or noisy liabilities.)

A holding company is not "set and forget."

It needs governance in three layers:

1) Annual monitoring (light)

- passive income level and trend
- SBD access grind exposure
- dividend alignment with plan
- new asset acquisition / funding
- major life or business changes

2) Event-driven review (heavy)

Triggers for deeper review:

- sale probability increases
- major acquisition or financing
- passive income growth spikes
- priority changes
- insurance/estate changes

3) Structure reset (rare, but important)

A reset is justified when: structure no longer matches objective, complexity exceeds benefit, or the owner no longer wants to maintain the system.

Good governance is not complicated. It is consistent.

Professional Coordination Notes

(Neutral, collaborative, clear.)

Holding company decisions usually involve:

Accountant	Tax compliance, dividend pathway feasibility, passive income monitoring, and attributes like RDTOH/CDA.
Corporate lawyer	Corporate organization, share structure, reorganizations, legal sequencing, and governance clarity.
Estate planning counsel	Continuity planning, incapacity/death outcomes, and alignment with wills and trusts.
Insurance specialist	Corporate ownership implications, estate integration, and clarity on insurance purpose.
Advisory team	Objective setting, capital allocation discipline, decision timing, and trade-off coordination.

The owner's role is not to do the technical work. The owner's role is to keep the objective clear and demand coordination around it.

Structural Review Questions

(Use these with your advisors.)

1. What is the single objective this HoldCo is meant to serve?
2. If that objective disappeared, would we still keep the structure?
3. How does passive income affect our operating company tax position over time?
4. What tax attributes exist today (CDA, RDTOH), and are they tracked cleanly?
5. What happens to this structure if the business is sold?
6. What happens on death or incapacity?
7. Are there guarantees or legal realities that reduce any perceived risk separation?
8. What annual governance process ensures this remains healthy?
9. What would simplification look like if we wanted it later?
10. What is the cost of complexity here, in time, coordination, and risk?

When you can answer these calmly, your decision quality improves.

The Natural Next Step

If you're still unsure, that's normal. The decisions covered here often involve family dynamics, taxes, or long-term consequences that aren't always obvious at first glance.

Many people choose to review decisions like this with a trusted professional who can help them pressure-test assumptions, surface trade-offs, and understand what's at stake before acting.

Educational information only. This guide is not tax, legal, or investment advice.
Personal circumstances vary and professional advice should be obtained before acting.