



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

---

# Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics

EVIDENCE

**NUMBER 018**

Monday, November 24, 2025

---

Chair: John Brassard





## Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics

Monday, November 24, 2025

• (1100)

[English]

**The Chair (John Brassard (Barrie South—Innisfil, CPC)):** Good morning, everyone. I'm going to call the meeting to order.

I want to welcome everyone to meeting number 18 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics.

[Translation]

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(3)(h), the motion adopted by the committee on Wednesday, September 17, 2025, and the order of reference of October 28, 2025, the committee is resuming its review of the Conflict of Interest Act.

[English]

I'd like to welcome our witness for today. From Brookfield Corporation, we have Mr. Justin Beber, chief operating officer.

Mr. Beber, you have up to five minutes for your opening statement.

Sir, the floor is yours. Go ahead, please.

**Linda Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, Lib.):** Just before—

[Translation]

**The Chair:** Do you wish to speak now?

[English]

**Linda Lapointe:** Yes, if it's possible.

[Translation]

**The Chair:** Is this a point of order?

**Linda Lapointe:** It probably is.

[English]

**The Chair:** I'm not going to give you the floor unless you indicate to me what you want the floor for.

**Linda Lapointe:** It's about the letter that was put on social media, on X. It was in English. We don't have that letter.

Do you have that letter?

**The Chair:** Do we have that letter, Nancy?

**The Clerk of the Committee (Nancy Vohl):** It's not the work of the committee.

**Linda Lapointe:** I think it's from Mr. Barrett and the team.

[Translation]

**Michael Barrett (Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands—Rideau Lakes, CPC):** I am not obliged to make sure that the private messages I inform the other committee members of are in both official languages. A member from our party has a copy in French.

[English]

For our purposes, it's private correspondence that we chose to share. It's not the work of the committee.

If the member opposite, Mr. Chair, would like a copy in French, I'm happy to furnish her with it.

It doesn't speak to the privileges of members of this committee, and I would say it's certainly not a question of privilege.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

**Linda Lapointe:** I have another question.

Did you receive an answer to that letter and to what you were asking?

**The Chair:** Madame Lapointe, before we begin, you raised your hand. I'm going to take this as a point of order, which I expect it is. Mr. Barrett answered the question.

Let me say, from my standpoint, that letter was not done by the chair on behalf of the committee. It was sent to Mr. Beber and Brookfield on the part of committee members from the Conservative Party. There was certainly, from my standpoint, no obligation for the letter to be in both official languages. It wasn't on behalf of the committee, Madame Lapointe.

**Linda Lapointe:** Did they receive an answer?

**The Chair:** I believe that an answer was distributed this morning. Let me check with the clerk.

**Linda Lapointe:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** As I suspected, the response from Brookfield to the Conservative member's letter was sent to every member's P9 this morning directly from Brookfield. It wasn't sent to the clerk or through the clerk. It was sent in both official languages as well.

I've asked the clerk to send that response to all members of the committee.

**Linda Lapointe:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Mr. Beber, you have up to five minutes to address the committee. Go ahead, sir.

Thank you.

**Justin Beber (Chief Operating Officer, Brookfield Corporation):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chair and members of the committee, I am pleased to appear before you today in order to assist the committee, in whatever extent and to whatever extent I can, in your study of the Conflict of Interest Act.

My name is Justin Beber, and I serve as chief operating officer and a member of the executive committee at Brookfield.

Let me begin by repeating Brookfield's respect for this committee and its important work. As an international company with roots in Canada, we recognize the significance of transparent and robust frameworks in maintaining public trust in our institutions.

By way of background, Brookfield is one of the largest investors in Canada. We are owners and operators of critical infrastructure and other assets and businesses across the country. We have over 600 direct employees in Canada, and our operating businesses employ more than 15,000 people from coast to coast. In 2024 alone, we, together with our consolidated businesses, remitted over \$750 million in federal tax. This does not even include other types of tax paid in Canada, including provincial, municipal and school taxes where they apply.

We have grown to become a global company, but our heritage is in Canada. We are proud to be invested in so many critical sectors of the Canadian economy, including midstream energy infrastructure, renewable power, financial services and real estate, to name only a few.

When Mark Carney made his decision to run for the leadership of the Liberal Party of Canada, even before he became Prime Minister, we sought expert advice to review our policies and procedures to ensure we remain on the right side of the rules at all times. Mr. Carney departed Brookfield on January 16 of this year, the same day on which he formally announced his candidacy for the party leadership. Since then, at no point has anyone at Brookfield spoken with the Prime Minister about Brookfield business.

We understand the increased interest in the management of potential conflicts, and I am pleased to be here to talk about Brookfield's approach to compliance and the priority we place on ensuring integrity across our business. As chief operating officer, I have primary oversight of Brookfield's corporate operations, including legal and compliance activities and human resources, which include our compensation programs. I am fully prepared to assist in any way that might help advance the committee's work.

In particular, I am happy to discuss the items raised in the correspondence received from certain committee members on Saturday night, including the composition and management of our funds. I'm also happy to discuss our general approach to executive compensation, subject to the restrictions related to personal privacy that I outlined in my response letter.

The committee members' letter also expressed interest in lobbying activities that may be conducted by companies we work with. As I noted in my response, as a general matter Brookfield does not direct or manage government engagement or advocacy efforts by

our portfolio companies. However, I am happy to discuss our approach to compliance in this area, which is something we take very seriously.

In closing, Brookfield is committed to supporting the committee's important work in a manner that is reflective of our company's role as an international investor and business owner. While our company and personnel are not subject to the Conflict of Interest Act and we do not administer blind trusts for public office holders or act as trustees for such arrangements, we are prepared to share whatever perspective we can.

I look forward to your questions. Thank you very much.

• (1105)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Beber. I appreciate your being under time so that we can get to questions.

We're going to start with Mr. Barrett for six minutes.

Go ahead, Mr. Barrett.

**Michael Barrett:** At Brookfield, when Brookfield's value increases, the value of stock options and deferred share units also increases. That's how these instruments work. Is that correct?

**Justin Beber:** Yes. When our share price increases, the value of those instruments does increase, yes.

**Michael Barrett:** That basic reality doesn't change simply because those instruments would be placed in a blind trust. The value would still rise when the value of Brookfield rises. Is that correct?

**Justin Beber:** Yes.

**Michael Barrett:** If someone holds Brookfield options and units in a blind trust or not, they personally benefit when Brookfield performs well. Isn't that right?

**Justin Beber:** Anybody who holds those instruments, whether during employment or following employment, derives the benefit from those instruments. That's correct.

**Michael Barrett:** Also, any instrument can be sold, bought back, cash-settled or unwound in an instance where, for example, Parliament required, by law, divestment by sale. That possibility exists. Is that correct?

**Justin Beber:** The Prime Minister would have certain instruments as part of our long-term incentive plans. There are certain instruments that are less liquid than others. I'm happy to get into the details of that if you wish.

• (1110)

**Michael Barrett:** I would, but the premise is what I need to settle. They can be sold, bought back, cash-settled or unwound. It is possible should it be a requirement. Is that correct?

**Justin Beber:** Yes, it's possible.

**Michael Barrett:** Thank you.

They're long-dated. We get that. However, that's generally how compensation contracts work. That's not something unique to Mr. Carney, since you brought him up.

**Justin Beber:** Long-term...yes. In some cases, it's exercisable in shorter horizons, and in some cases, the ultimate value is received far into the future.

**Michael Barrett:** Can you explain briefly how stock options or deferred share units and notional long-term incentive plans work at Brookfield? What drives their value?

**Justin Beber:** Yes, I would be happy to, and I will try to be brief.

Helpfully, all disclosure relating to Brookfield stock options and deferred share units is disclosed in detail in our public filing, so it's very much available.

In a nutshell, stock options are rights to acquire shares of Brookfield at a certain price. Those exist and, during their pendency, are exercisable subject to vesting, because when we award them, people take subject to vesting schedules. Therefore, even though you were awarded them, they have to vest during the time you are with Brookfield, and then they're exercisable for stock that can then be sold into the market.

Deferred share units are slightly different. They also track the value of a Brookfield share, but they are not actually shares. When they mature, they are paid out to the individual, based on the value of the share at that time. They are the second component to some of our LTIP programs.

**Michael Barrett:** Are you able to give us an approximate value range of the options and deferred share units that Mr. Carney still holds?

**Justin Beber:** As I said in my response letter, that's personal and private information. That's not something that Brookfield is permitted to disclose to the committee.

**Michael Barrett:** I will say that you enjoy parliamentary privilege while you're at this table, and this committee is not constrained in its ability to request information or documents. However, I'll move on for the moment.

**Justin Beber:** Okay.

**Michael Barrett:** Increases in Brookfield's performance increase the value of the instruments that Mark Carney still holds, so he makes more when Brookfield does better. Is that correct?

**Justin Beber:** In relation to the stock options and deferred share units...yes. As the value of Brookfield increases, the value of those instruments increase. There are also carried interest entitlements that relate more specifically to funds we manage.

**Michael Barrett:** Speaking of funds, the global transition fund is one that Mr. Carney was directly involved in. Are you able to provide us with details of the investments inside it that drive the value of his position or of those who hold a position in it?

**Justin Beber:** I believe you're referring to Brookfield global transition fund I, which was launched during the time that the Prime Minister was with Brookfield. I can confirm that all of the

investments made in that fund are contained in the annexure to the commissioner's screen document, which has been published.

**Michael Barrett:** We're going to have to come back to some of this, but this is my last question. With the Prime Minister still holding compensation that rises with Brookfield's performance, how would Canadians be able to have confidence that a blind trust and a private screen are enough to protect the public interest? You agreed that when Brookfield does better, the Prime Minister is going to do better.

**Justin Beber:** That's a very fair question.

**The Chair:** I need a quick response, and if you can't—

**Justin Beber:** I think it's based on whether or not the conflicts can be managed, and I'm happy to talk about that further.

**The Chair:** Thank you, sir.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Lapointe, you have the floor for six minutes.

Mr. Beber, I believe you speak both official languages.

• (1115)

[*English*]

Maybe put your earpiece in, just in case. Thank you.

Go ahead, Ms. Lapointe.

[*Translation*]

**Linda Lapointe:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Welcome to the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics, Mr. Beber. We are pleased to have you with us.

In your experience, whether at Brookfield or elsewhere in the business world, have you ever had any interaction with the federal conflict of interest regime or the Conflict of Interest Act?

**Justin Beber:** Thank you for the question.

[*English*]

Brookfield, as a private enterprise, is not subject to the Conflict of Interest Act, so we have not had interaction on this particular matter as a result.

[*Translation*]

**Linda Lapointe:** Did you have any previously?

**Justin Beber:** No.

**Linda Lapointe:** Right, thank you.

Do you think that Brookfield's tax situation is relevant to our study of the Conflict of Interest Act?

[English]

**Justin Beber:** My view is that since the Conflict of Interest Act really does not apply to private enterprise and its implementation and adjudication should be the purview of the government, the Ethics Commissioner and the other government apparatuses that exist in order to manage those who enter government and exit government, I would say that private enterprise likely has little to say about those mechanics.

[Translation]

**Linda Lapointe:** Thank you.

In the course of our study, witnesses have told us the expression “tax haven” is not a technical term and in reality any country could be accused of being one, including Canada.

From your experience in the business world, is that an accurate description of the international tax environment?

[English]

**Justin Beber:** No. I think that's a gross mis-characterization of our global taxation system. We at Brookfield, like many sophisticated institutional investors, invest all over the world. We invest in large businesses in their home jurisdictions. When we do that, we are buying businesses with employees, large management teams and assets on the ground. Those businesses pay tax in their jurisdictions.

The caricature of the taxation system as being in tax havens is not apt, because what we are actually trying to do is create tax transparency so that after-tax proceeds from those companies can then be returned to investors with no friction and then tax is paid by those investors in their home jurisdictions.

The tax legislation in Canada recognizes that. It affords institutional investors, such as ourselves, to utilize those frameworks in order to compete globally and in order to ensure that our investors are receiving the maximum after-tax proceeds that we can generate.

[Translation]

**Linda Lapointe:** Thank you.

Since we began this study, we have mostly heard our colleagues on this committee saying that your company avoids paying a substantial portion of its income tax in Canada.

What would you like to say to the Canadians watching us now who might be concerned about these accusations, given the extensive scope of Brookfield's activities in Canada?

[English]

**Justin Beber:** As I said, what I would want everybody to know and what all of our investors all over the world—our shareholders, our clients and some of the most sophisticated institutional investors in the world—know, is that contrary to some of these so-called publications, we pay all taxes that are due and payable in all jurisdictions in which we operate.

As I mentioned before, the structures that we put in place actually facilitate the payment of taxes in the appropriate jurisdictions where they should be paid.

• (1120)

[Translation]

**Linda Lapointe:** What measures does your company adopt to make sure it pays all taxes it is required to pay in Canada?

[English]

**Justin Beber:** We have very significant reporting and tracking across all of our businesses. We are meticulous in ensuring that our records are always up to date. We have strong governance principles in place with all of our businesses.

As soon as we onboard a new company, they become part of Brookfield, and the reporting lines are implemented immediately. We have, in fact, people inside of Brookfield, internal auditors, who are also checking the work and ensuring that all of our procedures are operating properly.

[Translation]

**Linda Lapointe:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. Lapointe.

[English]

Mr. Beber, make sure you have your earpiece on, please.

[Translation]

Mr. Thériault, the floor is yours for six minutes.

**Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

In an exchange of emails and letters that I would venture to characterize as rather extensive, Brookfield asked why it had to testify here, given that the subject of this committee's study is the review of the Conflict of Interest Act. I would therefore like to begin by clarifying our mandate.

We are directed to consider the need to expand the scope of the act. We want to enhance transparency, prevent conflicts of interest, avoid potential or apparent conflicts of interest, regulate public office holders' ownership of assets in tax havens and limit the availability of blind trusts.

You will understand that with witnesses telling us that Brookfield is the tax avoidance champion, when we knew, given the Prime Minister's declaration of interests, that he has interests in Brookfield, your presence here is obligatory.

I would like a short answer.

[English]

**Justin Beber:** I appreciate the spirit in which you—

[Translation]

**Luc Thériault:** Mr. Chair, I would like Mr. Beber to keep his earpiece in and to have someone show him how to put it on. If he is constantly putting it down and putting it back on, we will be wasting time.

[English]

**The Chair:** Mr. Beber, it may not look good on TV, but I suggest that you put your earpiece on so that you can hear the entirety of the question and any comments that come your way.

It's just easier that way. I do the same thing sometimes.

**Justin Beber:** It was suggested to me that I might wind up hearing myself in my ear.

**The Chair:** You could, and at that point you can take it off, but just make sure for the entirety of the question that you keep it on for the comments.

**Justin Beber:** Thank you. I apologize.

[Translation]

**The Chair:** Mr. Thériault, I have stopped the clock.

[English]

Mr. Beber, you can respond to Mr. Thériault's comment. I'll start the clock right now.

Thank you.

**Justin Beber:** I was simply going to say that we respect the spirit in which this committee is undertaking its work.

First and foremost, the reports that you've heard are completely false. I've tried to explain, in response to some of the questions we've already received, that Brookfield pays all applicable taxes. We have demonstrated systems and structures in place to do that. We do want to be helpful in your quest to assess whether or not your current rules apply and apply effectively.

[Translation]

**Luc Thériault:** Are you telling us here that Brookfield does not practise tax avoidance, something that is entirely legal?

We are talking about tax avoidance, not tax evasion.

Is that what you are telling us, yes or no?

• (1125)

[English]

**Justin Beber:** We practise tax planning the way any other company practises tax planning.

[Translation]

**Luc Thériault:** What I understand is that you do not want to use the term “tax avoidance”, which is an entirely technical term.

You are not the only ones to practise tax avoidance, presumably. I agree that it is legal.

Here, we need to speak clearly: The fact that something is legal does not mean it is morally acceptable. You will understand our concern, since a study by the Canada Revenue Agency shows that the federal government is being cheated out of \$26 billion a year in income and other taxes. In the tax avoidance category, we are talking about \$3 billion a year, which is no small sum.

So I would like us to look at the question of a global minimum tax.

How much time do I have left, Mr. Chair?

**The Chair:** You have one minute and 40 seconds.

**Luc Thériault:** So I will review the history a bit later.

Does Brookfield benefit from the exemption of American companies from the global minimum tax established by Mr. Carney?

[English]

**Justin Beber:** No, to the best of my knowledge, we are subject to all those rules in every jurisdiction in which we operate.

[Translation]

**Luc Thériault:** What do you mean by “to my knowledge”?

Does that mean that it may be but you are not aware of it?

[English]

**Justin Beber:** I think it would be unlikely, but I did not—

[Translation]

**Luc Thériault:** What do you mean by “unlikely”?

Are you not able to answer the question with certainty today?

[English]

**Justin Beber:** I'm happy to say that Brookfield complies with all laws across the globe relating to tax.

[Translation]

**Luc Thériault:** Six months before the decision made by the OECD, the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, to exempt American companies from the global minimum tax, and before Canada adopted that measure, Mr. Carney moved his head office to New York.

Six months later, he announced that American companies are exempt from the global minimum tax, and you say that you do not benefit from that.

That is what you are telling us this morning, that you do not benefit from that.

Is that correct?

[English]

**The Chair:** Give a very quick response, please.

**Justin Beber:** Absolutely not, and we didn't move anything. I'd love the opportunity to talk—

[Translation]

**Luc Thériault:** So why do it?

[English]

**The Chair:** No, that's it. Thank you.

You may get the opportunity, Mr. Beber. It won't be from me. It may be from some other members of the committee.

That concludes the first round, and we're going to go to the second round, beginning with Mr. Cooper for five minutes—that's 300 seconds.

I just also want you to be mindful of the interpreters, please. Ask the question. Give the response. Ask the next question. That'll just make sure that the interpreters...that everything's in sync here.

Go ahead for five minutes.

**Michael Cooper (St. Albert—Sturgeon River, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you, Mr. Beber. I want to ask you some questions about carried interest payments that you alluded to earlier.

Mr. Carney's ethics disclosure indicates that he is entitled to carried interest payments, which are essentially future bonus pay from the Brookfield global transition fund I, which he helped set up. Mr. Carney also co-chaired the Brookfield global transition fund II, as well as the catalytic transition fund.

Is Mr. Carney entitled to carried interest payments with respect to those funds?

**Justin Beber:** No, he's not. The reason for that is that we were in the process of setting up those funds when Mr. Carney decided to leave Brookfield to pursue the Liberal leadership, and we had not yet instituted any allocation of carry from those funds. Those funds had not yet been raised.

When we talk about launching a fund, we're starting the marketing of that fund. They had not yet reached a conclusion, or even an initial closing of those funds. Therefore, we hadn't allocated any carry. Had he stayed with Brookfield, he certainly would have been entitled to some.

• (1130)

**Michael Cooper:** Thank you for that.

Of course, he is entitled to carried interest payments in respect of the first fund, Brookfield transition fund I. I want to confirm that this fund is registered in Bermuda.

**Justin Beber:** Yes, I believe that one is.

**Michael Cooper:** Is the Brookfield transition fund II also registered in Bermuda?

**Justin Beber:** I don't have that information at hand.

**Michael Cooper:** I would note a March 26, 2025, CBC News report that indicates that the Ontario business registry indicates that the "governing jurisdiction" for the Brookfield global transition fund I and the Brookfield global transition fund II is Bermuda.

I presume you're not disputing that.

**Justin Beber:** I won't dispute that.

**Michael Cooper:** I would also ask that you confirm that the catalytic transition fund is registered in the Cayman Islands.

**Justin Beber:** I can take that away and make sure that I'm not misspeaking on which jurisdiction it's part of.

**Michael Cooper:** I think you know the answer to that. It's yes.

I want to ask you a little bit about the schedule of payments with respect to carried interest from the Brookfield transition fund I. When does the fund mature?

**Justin Beber:** Transition fund I would have a maturity of 10 years plus a two-year possible extension, which would take it to 2032 to 2034, I believe.

**Michael Cooper:** It would be at that time that the carried interest payments would be paid out.

**Justin Beber:** It would be towards that.

I would say that, regardless of where the fund is established, everything that I mentioned in relation to Ms. Lapointe's question holds for everything in that fund.

**Michael Cooper:** In terms of what is in that fund, there are new investments in that fund. Is that correct?

**Justin Beber:** There are investments in that fund. They're not necessarily new.

**Michael Cooper:** If there were new investments in that fund, would that potentially increase the value of carried interest payments?

**Justin Beber:** If additional capital were to be invested in that fund, it could, if they're good investments.

**Michael Cooper:** Brookfield CEO Bruce Flatt was quoted in a National Post article dated March 15, 2025, in which he described carried interest payments in the following way:

Put simply, carried interest is our share of the profits realized on an entire fund, subject to that fund exceeding a minimum target return for clients. If we meet fund expectations, we get 20% of the profits.

You would agree that's an accurate characterization of how carried interest works in respect to the fund.

**Justin Beber:** I think that's a fair summary. The "subject to" is a very significant part of how carried interest works.

**Michael Cooper:** Right. Brookfield ideally would ideally get 20% of the profits if the threshold had been met or exceeded.

In terms of carried interest payments to the managing partners, what is the range? What is the per cent of that 20%?

**Justin Beber:** It completely ranges by fund, because—

**Michael Cooper:** I'm asking with respect to the Brookfield transition fund I.

**The Chair:** I need a quick response, Mr. Beber, please.

**Justin Beber:** It's a proportion of the total that Brookfield is entitled to.

**Michael Cooper:** What is that portion?

**The Chair:** You may have to come back to that, Mr. Cooper.

Thank you.

Ms. Church, go ahead for five minutes, please.

**Leslie Church (Toronto—St. Paul's, Lib.):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Welcome, Mr. Beber.

Mr. Beber, picking up on a few points that were raised by my colleagues across the table, You were cut off on your answer about the move of Brookfield Asset Management. Can you elaborate on what you were going to say in terms of the implications of that transfer of structure?

**Justin Beber:** Yes, thank you.

I was in the process of explaining that nothing, in fact, moved in relation to the designation of New York as our principal office for the purposes of the asset management business. That asset management business was launched close to 30 years ago, and we grew it within Brookfield Corporation for close to 25 years. We launched it in Canada, but as I think the committee is well aware, it has become a global alternative asset manager.

The scale of that has been driven in large part by the clients we have and the jurisdictions in which we've had those opportunities. The United States, being one of the principal capitals of the world in investment flows, drew a lot of our business into the U.S. organically as the business evolved. When we decided to launch Brookfield Asset Management as its own separate publicly traded company, at the same time, the S&P, which regulates which companies are in or out of various indices, changed its rules and made it easier for Canadian companies like ours to possibly qualify for inclusion in U.S. indices.

We were already in possession of a company—we were already a company at Brookfield Asset Management—with significant girth and presence in the United States, and we designated our New York office, which already existed, as that principal office, which perhaps is something we should have done beforehand, but certainly the change in rules made that beneficial to us. Nothing moved. We changed the designation of our principal office. No people moved. No assets moved. No investments changed.

• (1135)

**Leslie Church:** Thank you for that.

That's a great way to segue into asking you to talk to me a little bit about Brookfield's headquarters. You're headquartered in Canada, in Toronto. Is that correct?

**Justin Beber:** Brookfield Corporation is, yes.

**Leslie Church:** You're one of Canada's largest employers and companies. Is that correct?

**Justin Beber:** We are.

**Leslie Church:** How many employees do you have as a company?

**Justin Beber:** Across Brookfield and our portfolio companies, we have over 15,000 employees.

**Leslie Church:** How much federal tax do you pay in Canada? You mentioned it in your opening remarks.

**Justin Beber:** It was \$750 million last year.

**Leslie Church:** Would you say that you are proudly Canadian?

**Justin Beber:** We are proudly Canadian.

**Leslie Church:** Let me ask you about another topic that my colleagues opposite have raised around conflicts of interest. Presumably you have to deal with conflicts of interest in a corporate context.

**Justin Beber:** Sometimes.

**Leslie Church:** What are some of the tools that you use to manage conflicts inside Brookfield?

**Justin Beber:** I appreciate that question.

Conflicts do arise from time to time, and our view is that there are certain principles that must be applied when they do arise. The first is transparency. We have systems in place to ensure that when conflicts arise, they're identified. Once a conflict is identified, there are really only two ways to resolve a conflict. One is to avoid it altogether, to terminate it in some fashion. The other is to have it consented to or approved by an unconflicted decision-maker. We have significant processes and procedures in place to ensure that once they're identified, they are resolved through one of those two means.

**Leslie Church:** Do you use blind trusts, or are you familiar with the blind trust in the sense that we would use it here in the federal context?

**Justin Beber:** After having been invited here, I am loosely familiar with those.

**Leslie Church:** You would appreciate that, in the federal context, a public office holder who comes under the act, when they establish a blind trust, is considered to have divested their controlled assets.

**Justin Beber:** Yes.

**Leslie Church:** They're not allowed to give direction to a trustee on that front, so there can be no knowledge if the assets are held, if they're sold or if they're converted.

My colleague Mr. Barrett suggested earlier that if shares are held, the holder benefits, but there's a big assumption built into that: Once the assets are in the trust, the public office holder has no knowledge what those assets are. Would you agree with that?

**The Chair:** You're over time.

I need a quick response, please.

**Justin Beber:** I would... I apologize. I'm not sure.

**The Chair:** Maybe we can come back to it, then. We're 25 seconds over.

• (1140)

[Translation]

Mr. Thériault, the floor is yours for five minutes.

**Luc Thériault:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Beber, tax avoidance is a practice that happens.

[English]

**Justin Beber:** I'm sorry. Could you repeat the question?

[Translation]

**Luc Thériault:** Tax avoidance is a practice that happens.

[English]

**Justin Beber:** I can only speak to Brookfield. There is no tax avoidance at Brookfield.

[Translation]

**Luc Thériault:** I imagine you are familiar with the OECD.

At the G20, the OECD decided to adopt a policy to combat tax avoidance globally. Companies must therefore pay a minimum tax of 15%. This is precisely to protect ourselves against tax avoidance. When they use tax avoidance, they do not pay their fair share in the country where they operate. The reason this policy was adopted must be that tax avoidance happens.

If you are part of the business world and you want to be transparent, you can't say that you are speaking solely on behalf of Brookfield. The OECD, an organization you are familiar with, has decided to adopt a global minimum tax.

It was no accident that the OECD did this, but you are saying that it does not concern Brookfield.

What comments do you have on that?

[English]

**Justin Beber:** Mr. Thériault, I am not an expert in tax policy. I'm aware of the global minimum tax—

[Translation]

**Luc Thériault:** Excuse me for interrupting you, Mr. Beber.

I am somewhat surprised, since Brookfield insisted that you be here today. According to Brookfield, you are an expert, and you are able to answer all our questions. You don't have to be an expert to understand what the OECD is doing and to understand the global problem it is trying to solve.

I have a lot of reservations about the way you are testifying today. You are using very technical terms and you are avoiding questions. Tax gets avoided and then we get questions being avoided. This makes me very sad, because I expected something else from you.

I am going to move on to another subject now.

You tell us that beyond a shadow of a doubt, your name change in the United States has nothing to do with the OECD measure. You say it did not benefit you and you are paying the 15% minimum tax.

If I understand correctly, what you are telling us is that Brookfield is paying the 15% minimum tax.

[English]

**Justin Beber:** We are paying all applicable taxes in every jurisdiction, including any jurisdictions where we're required to implement a global minimum tax.

Mr. Thériault, I will say as well that the reason the change had no impact on Brookfield was that Brookfield Asset Management Limited, both before and after the designation, remained a British Columbia company and, therefore, a taxpayer in Canada—

[Translation]

**Luc Thériault:** Excuse me for interrupting you, but I have limited speaking time.

I will repeat my question, because you are not answering it.

Does Brookfield pay its global minimum tax, which is 15%?

You say that Brookfield pays all its taxes. I am asking you: Does it pay the minimum tax, which is 15%?

[English]

**Justin Beber:** Yes, in every jurisdiction where it applies.

[Translation]

**Luc Thériault:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Thériault.

Mr. Gourde, the floor is yours for five minutes.

**Jacques Gourde (Lévis—Lothbinière, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Beber, Brookfield has investment projects more or less everywhere in the world, including in Canada.

Do you have any projects relating to rare minerals such as lithium?

[English]

**Justin Beber:** No, we do not have direct investments in lithium, to my knowledge.

[Translation]

**Jacques Gourde:** Do you have investment projects relating to housing?

[English]

**Justin Beber:** Yes, we do.

[Translation]

**Jacques Gourde:** Do you have investment projects in the railway sector in Canada, such as high-speed rail?

Might that interest Brookfield?

[English]

**Justin Beber:** We don't necessarily target passenger rail, but we do have cargo rail.

• (1145)

[Translation]

**Jacques Gourde:** Do you have interests or investments in clean energy?

[English]

**Justin Beber:** Yes, we do. We have a large renewable—

[Translation]

**Jacques Gourde:** Do you have investments in nuclear projects?

[English]

**Justin Beber:** Yes, we do, through our investment in Westinghouse.

[Translation]

**Jacques Gourde:** Do you have projects in the data storage field?

[English]

**Justin Beber:** Yes, we do.

[Translation]

**Jacques Gourde:** Do you have projects in the artificial intelligence field?

[English]

**Justin Beber:** Yes, we do.

[Translation]

**Jacques Gourde:** A lot of projects in these various fields are also found in the federal budget.

In order to go ahead, will some of these projects require permits or exemptions from environmental requirements?

Will negotiations with indigenous communities have to be undertaken for some of these projects?

Would it help the Brookfield fund if the government gave it assistance to carry out these projects?

[English]

**Justin Beber:** We would have to apply for whatever permits are required. We don't expect to be treated any differently than any other business in doing that.

We do it through our portfolio companies, which I'm happy to explain.

[Translation]

**Jacques Gourde:** Given that the Prime Minister left Brookfield on January 16, which is what you said in your statement, would it be reasonable to think he was aware of Brookfield's broad investment strategies for the next five to ten years?

[English]

**Justin Beber:** Our investments tend to be very chunky investments in large-scale companies.

Our pipeline of opportunities tends to shift over time. The pipeline of opportunities one month may be very different from another month. He wouldn't know what—

[Translation]

**Jacques Gourde:** My question is simple. When Mark Carney left Brookfield on January 16, 2025, to become leader of the Liberal Party and then prime minister, was he aware of the Brookfield fund's strategies?

Since he was the vice-president, he must have been aware of something.

[English]

**Justin Beber:** Certainly. I thought you were asking about specific investment opportunities.

He was certainly aware of the strategies that we were pursuing in our funds. We're actually very public about it. Anybody who reads our disclosure would understand what our strategy is.

[Translation]

**Jacques Gourde:** Can the federal budget help certain parts of the investment fund to materialize, given the fact that the federal government will be facilitating projects?

[English]

**Justin Beber:** I'm not close to every single portfolio company we have. We have over 2,000 businesses that we own as part of all of our funds and our investment strategies.

What I can say is that Brookfield, like any other business, and our portfolio companies, like any other businesses, will assess policy. They're informed of policy at the same time as everybody else. They will react in the manner that is in their best interests.

[Translation]

**Jacques Gourde:** If all of Brookfield's investment sectors that I listed are similar to the sectors that appear in the federal budget, is that purely by chance or is it because maybe that is something that has to be done?

Is it a matter of convergence?

[English]

**Justin Beber:** I can't speak to what the Prime Minister has in mind. We don't speak with the Prime Minister about policy or any other matters that would impact Brookfield's business.

In reviewing the policies that the Prime Minister has espoused, I would say they're good for a host of different industries. How it plays out for any particular company is very uncertain.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Beber.

[Translation]

Thank you, Mr. Gourde.

[English]

Mr. Saini, go ahead for five minutes, please.

**Gurbux Saini (Fleetwood—Port Kells, Lib.):** Thank you, Mr. Beber, for coming.

We had experts here in the past from a tax point of view. Tax avoidance is not illegal in Canada. Any company that wants to do business in any country wants to make sure that where they invest will be profitable, whether it's Cayman Islands, Bermuda or Canada.

Our taxes are so very good. Lots of companies are investing in Canada today, because we need them. We need businesses to grow. We need the economy to grow.

Is there anything wrong with what my opponents have been asking about all of these times?

• (1150)

**Justin Beber:** Is there anything wrong? I would say that, no, tax policy is engineered to ensure Canada remains competitive. Every country, certainly in developed economies, has the same objective.

It's a competitive world. We have to be able to compete on a level playing field with other companies, but we do it in accordance with and in applying all rules and complying with those rules.

**Gurbux Saini:** Has Brookfield ever been charged criminally or under tax laws for being a bad corporation?

**Justin Beber:** No.

**Gurbux Saini:** As long as you are doing business in Canada or across the world in a fair way, I don't understand what my colleagues on the other side are having difficulty with.

**Justin Beber:** I would agree. There are rules in place that govern all companies in terms of the way they invest internationally. Those rules are there to facilitate economic productivity while also ensuring that all corporate players pay their fair share of taxes. There should be nothing wrong with that, and that is how Brookfield conducts its business.

**Gurbux Saini:** Thank you.

In conflicts of interest, we deal with screens and we deal with blind trusts. As chief operating officer of a big corporation in the private sector, do you have such things in place?

**Justin Beber:** As I mentioned before, we address conflicts of interest through the same types of systems that I see being implemented with respect to the blind trusts.

They're not the same. I don't want to give the committee an indication that they're the same, but underlying them are the same principles: that one needs transparency to ensure the conflicts that exist are identified, and that they are then addressed appropriately, whether it's through a blind trust, a screen or any other mechanism.

**Gurbux Saini:** If we wanted to change tax law, it is up to the Parliament of Canada. It's not up to the Conflict of Interest Act to change those laws. Parliament, when they see fit, will make sure those changes are made. For people to accuse, well, we are trying to...that's the duty of the Parliament of Canada and the Income Tax Act.

Could I have your comment on that, please?

**Justin Beber:** Yes, I fully agree. I think we're conflating two very different matters or topics—a piece of legislation that is designed to manage and oversee the behaviour of personnel who enter government and how anything they bring to their office from their history is addressed, versus tax policy, which is a completely separate topic.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Saini.

Mr. Beber, we're going next to Mr. Barrett for five minutes.

[Translation]

We will now move on to Mr. Sari.

We will then conclude the first hour of the meeting.

[English]

Mr. Barrett, you have five minutes. Go ahead, please.

**Michael Barrett:** Just to follow up on a few points, has Brookfield Global ever been criminally charged with anything like bribery, for example?

• (1155)

**Justin Beber:** Charged...? No.

**Michael Barrett:** Has there ever been an investigation for bribery against Brookfield Asset Management?

**Justin Beber:** Nothing that has not been found to be completely false.

**Michael Barrett:** Were there charges?

**Justin Beber:** No, there were no charges.

**Michael Barrett:** There was no investigation into bribery in Brazil?

**Justin Beber:** Again, that was found to be completely false and, in fact, the person who was alleging is now in jail.

**Michael Barrett:** Okay.

Is Brookfield registering investment funds to a bike shop in Bermuda good for Canada and what impact does that have on the payment of taxes in Canada?

**Justin Beber:** As I've said before, first and foremost, we have businesses that do have a presence in Bermuda. Those are part of an overall investment structure that allows investors to pool their capital in jurisdictions where we can achieve tax transparency so that businesses that we own can pay taxes in the jurisdictions in which those businesses operate. Then, those after-tax proceeds can be delivered to investors in the jurisdictions where they are based and pay taxes as well.

**Michael Barrett:** Is your answer that it's good for Canada to register funds to a bike shop in Bermuda?

**Justin Beber:** I'm not passing judgment on what's good or not. I'm saying what these rules are implemented to achieve.

**Michael Barrett:** Are you able to provide us with a list of investments in the catalytic transition fund and the global transition funds I and II? Is that something you're able to furnish to the committee?

**Justin Beber:** The committee has the list of the investments in global transition I. Global transition II and catalytic are irrelevant.

**Michael Barrett:** Are you able to provide us with a list of the investments in the three funds that I've mentioned?

**Justin Beber:** I would have to go back and check.

**Michael Barrett:** Do you have to check if you have them or check if you'll do it?

**Justin Beber:** I'll take it under advisement.

**Michael Barrett:** I'd like the list. I'd like the list of the investments in the funds.

How was the long-term performance pay structured when Mr. Carney was at Brookfield? Are you able to tell us what metrics determined that pay?

**Justin Beber:** While he was an employee of Brookfield?

**Michael Barrett:** Yes.

**Justin Beber:** Like every executive, Mr. Carney was entitled to a compensation package that was comprised of several components. He would have been entitled to a base salary, a short-term annual bonus, which is generally expressed as a percentage of that salary, and then the long-term incentive plans that align all of our executives with our shareholders and our clients, both in the funds and in the overall performance at Brookfield.

**Michael Barrett:** When Mr. Carney left Brookfield, did he retain his unvested interest on standard terms, or were any of his arrangements modified because he was entering public life?

**Justin Beber:** He left on standard terms. He terminated his employment on January 16. He took everything that was vested and departed.

**Michael Barrett:** Can you tell us what role Mr. Carney personally played in Brookfield securing financing from the central bank for the People's Republic of China?

**Justin Beber:** I think you're referring to clients who have invested in our transition strategy. That would have been the same as all of the senior executives associated with the transition fund.

**Michael Barrett:** In the past few months have there been any decisions of the federal government, tax credits or policy measures, that have increased the value of Brookfield businesses in which the Prime Minister still holds an interest? If you have more than one example, just one example is fine.

**Justin Beber:** I can't think of any.

**Michael Barrett:** In November, Brookfield announced \$100 billion in AI infrastructure expansion, \$650 million in renewable power and major U.S. nuclear activity through Westinghouse.

Would you agree that government policy in these areas could increase the value of the Prime Minister's Brookfield linked compensation?

**Justin Beber:** That's a very tangential line to draw. It will all depend on whether this is good for.... Nuclear, we believe, is an incredibly important component—

• (1200)

**Michael Barrett:** Yes, I support nuclear energy. I'm just wondering if it will improve the Prime Minister's financial position personally.

**Justin Beber:** There is no way to tell whether it will or not.

**Michael Barrett:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

[Translation]

Mr. Sari, the floor is yours for five minutes.

[English]

**Abdelhaq Sari (Bourassa, Lib.):** Thank you so much, Mr. Chair.

Thank you so much, Mr. Beber.

As a Quebec MP, I prefer to speak in French. If you can put your earpiece in, it will be all right. Thank you so much.

[Translation]

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you for being with us, Mr. Beber. Thank you for your answers.

My objective on this committee is always to make information as accessible as possible, especially for those in the public who are watching us. I think you do have some experience, whether in

terms of governance, generally speaking, or in terms of corporate management. For the benefit of the people watching us, I would like to contribute to getting a bit of transparency.

Given your background in governance and corporate management, and especially in relation to compliance, have you ever had to deal with a situation comparable to the one we are talking about today?

Have you ever had to manage things, whether up close or from a distance, involving laws or public regimes relating to the situation we are in here, whether to understand the requirements imposed or to make sure your company's practices are consistent with those laws?

[English]

**Justin Beber:** If I understand the question correctly, I don't have any personal experience and no one at Brookfield has any personal experience with formation of legislation, evaluation of legislation—whether legislation is suitable—or the creation of legislation. What we do at Brookfield is take that legislation and determine what procedures and steps are needed in order to comply with it.

Is that a fair answer to your question?

[Translation]

**Abdelhaq Sari:** I am interested in Brookfield's positions, but given that you are here as a witness, I would like the committee to have the benefit of your experience. Generally speaking, you do have some experience in governance mechanisms.

When a public office holder puts their assets in a blind trust, they do not have access to information and they are not able to influence its management or governance.

As an ordinary person, I wonder about something.

Do you think this tool is actually effective?

Can it get the intended results, when it comes to preventing any possibility of interference or benefits in connection with those assets?

[English]

**Justin Beber:** It's very hard for me to opine on matters that involve legislation and government apparatus that I'm not very familiar with. From my review of some of the committee's materials, I'm generally aware of the framework that has been put in place and that is being administered for the Prime Minister.

What I've tried to say is that the blind trust is a component of that. I understand it. It's really the components in total that will dictate whether or not this committee determines that the apparatus that has been put in place will be effective or not. It includes the screening. It includes who's making the decisions in order to ensure that decisions are being made on an unconflicted basis.

[Translation]

**Abdelhaq Sari:** Thank you.

I am going to stay in the same field, the private sector. My next question is to help the committee write its report, and also to help the people watching us understand the situation better.

Everywhere in the world, there are mechanisms to prevent this kind of conflict of interest or appearance of conflict of interest.

Once again, I want to look at the measures or structures in place to ensure that an officer will be completely separated from their assets, for example, blind trusts or conflict of interest screens.

In your experience, are those measures actually credible? Are they effective or just sufficient?

If the committee were to recommend other measures, what would you propose?

• (1205)

[English]

**Justin Beber:** I think the structure that has been put in place can function appropriately. It's one that the private sector does not traditionally use.

I apologize for repeating myself, but what will ultimately determine whether a system, or a process and procedures, to resolve conflicts is successful is whether or not it provides for that transparency and a procedure to adjudicate the conflicts, whether that's removing them or seeking appropriate approvals for them.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Beber. We're way over time on that one.

Mr. Beber, that concludes our first hour and round. If you need a break, I'm going to invite you to do that now. I can suspend the meeting for a couple of minutes if you need a break.

Are you good to go?

**Justin Beber:** Yes.

**The Chair:** We're going to continue our second hour with Mr. Cooper for six minutes.

Go ahead, please.

**Michael Cooper:** Mr. Beber, I want to follow up on carried interest payments. I asked you about the proportion that those entitled to them would receive. You said there would be a range.

I presume that the payment would be consistent with industry standards. Would that be fair? Would it be in line with industry standards?

**Justin Beber:** Yes, that's fair.

**Michael Cooper:** I would note that a managing partner would generally be entitled, as I understand it, to about 3%. That is the industry standard. I would note that Brookfield transition fund I is a \$15-billion fund.

If Brookfield gets 20% of the profits, and 3% of that 20% is what could apply or would be in line with what Mr. Carney would stand to gain, he would stand to make tens of millions of dollars in future bonus pay from Brookfield transition fund I.

**Justin Beber:** I don't think you're using the right math, because what is industry standard would be very much based on how large the fund is.

**Michael Cooper:** Are you disputing that Mr. Carney stands to make millions, if not tens of millions, of dollars?

**Justin Beber:** Look, our investments may be very, very successful—

**Michael Cooper:** Yes, so you're not disputing that.

**Justin Beber:** I'm not saying one way or the other.

**Michael Cooper:** You're not disputing that.

**Justin Beber:** It's certainly not a fact.

**Michael Cooper:** Thank you.

With respect to SEC filings, there are 141 investors in Brookfield global transition fund I. You indicated that this committee has—

**Justin Beber:** I'm sorry. Where did you get that information from?

**Michael Cooper:** It's from SEC filings. That is the number that I have. If that number is not accurate, you can state the correct number.

**Justin Beber:** I don't have that detailed information.

**Michael Cooper:** You seem to have some detailed information, because you told the committee moments ago that you have a list of all the LPs, a list of all the investments.

**Justin Beber:** That's because I reviewed the annexure to the document that the Ethics Commissioner released publicly.

**Michael Cooper:** What we have in the annexure is the reference to Mr. Carney's interest in that fund, reference to the fact that he is entitled to carried interest payments.

What we don't have is a breakdown of what the LPs are in the fund. We don't have that.

**Justin Beber:** The identity of the LPs...?

**Michael Cooper:** We don't have that. Would you undertake to provide this committee with the identity of the LPs?

• (1210)

**Justin Beber:** We don't disclose the identity of the LPs in every single fund that we have. I don't think there's any reason to do so here.

**Michael Cooper:** I think there is a reason to do so here in that Mr. Carney stands to make millions, if not tens of millions, of dollars from future bonus pay based upon the performance of that fund.

Mr. Carney knows which public policy decisions might impact upon fund success, which in turn impacts his future bonus pay. These represent conflicts of interest, or potential conflicts of interest, and at the present time they are hidden conflicts of interest because Mr. Carney hasn't revealed what those holdings are, even though he helped set up the fund—

**Justin Beber:** I misunderstood your question. You're asking me what the fund has invested in.

**Michael Cooper:** I want to know what the fund has invested in, what the LPs are, what the holdings are. I want to know what's in the fund.

**Justin Beber:** Okay. We're just confusing terminology.

What I told you is that in the annexure, the fund's holdings at each of the companies that BGTF I holds is in the annexure, each company. There's only one, by the way, that is in Canada. It's a company called Entropy. Entropy is held by BGTF I.

**Michael Cooper:** The fund's holdings are not in the annexure. I'm just asking you to provide us with a list of those holdings.

**Justin Beber:** I'm sorry. Let me be more clear.

BGTF I has invested in 20 businesses, roughly, and the names of each of those businesses are listed in the annexure.

**Michael Cooper:** Who are the LPs?

**Justin Beber:** Again, we don't disclose the identity of our LPs. The identity of the LPs has nothing to do with the value that the fund will undertake. We manage the fund. We make the investment decisions. Those investment decisions have been made. We own those companies in that fund.

If those companies do well and we do well in stewarding them, in driving value through them, then BGTF I will do well.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Cooper.

Mr. Beber, the requests coming from some members of the committee are being documented by the clerk, and they will be forwarded to you as a request.

**Justin Beber:** Thank you. I've been trying to write them down. I appreciate it.

**The Chair:** We're keeping track. Thank you.

[Translation]

Ms. Lapointe, you have the floor for six minutes.

**Linda Lapointe:** Thank you very much. I'll be sharing my time with Mr. Saini.

Mr. Beber, you said earlier that businesses face stiff global competition. Witnesses have told us that shifting profits internationally to reduce taxes is a form of tax competition, where countries compete to offer a more advantageous tax climate in order to stimulate their own economic growth. Governments must therefore strike a balance between growth and fairness.

Do you agree with that characterization of international tax competition?

[English]

**Justin Beber:** I fully agree that the global investment environment is excessively competitive. We work hard every single day to identify investment opportunities, which we bring to our clients.

Yes, we're aware that countries also compete for those investment dollars and undertake strategies and policies to attract capital in very legitimate ways in order to ensure that they are attractive places in which to deploy capital. We, as well as all of our peers and other international investors, pay close attention to those policies, particularly when they align with our sectors of focus.

[Translation]

**Linda Lapointe:** Thank you.

How would you assess Canada's position in this competition context? Are we leaning too far one way or the other?

[English]

**Justin Beber:** I think Canada is a very attractive place to invest. There are always more ways in which Canada can ensure that it is competitive. We are big investors in Canada, as I've said. The current government has made it very clear that it's very focused on that.

[Translation]

**Linda Lapointe:** Earlier, you talked about "LPs".

What is that, exactly?

[English]

**Justin Beber:** LP is the term typically used for investors we bring into the fund. They're our clients. We call them LPs, which is short for limited partners, because most of the pooled capital vehicles we create are limited partnerships. It's a standard aggregating vehicle to bring those investors in. One shouldn't confuse LPs for the assets we hold in the fund.

• (1215)

[Translation]

**Linda Lapointe:** Thank you very much.

I'll now hand off to my colleague Mr. Saini.

[English]

**The Chair:** You have three minutes. Go ahead.

**Gurbux Saini:** The whole discussion seems to be around Mr. Carney and his benefits. If anybody held that position—you, me or Mr. Cooper—would they still have the same exact benefits that Mr. Carney had, or was Mr. Carney exceptionally different from the rest of your people who hold those positions?

**Justin Beber:** First, as I mentioned before, Mr. Carney was compensated like any senior executive occupying his role. His departure was a completely ordinary course. We were obviously keenly aware of why he was departing, and we took legal advice in relation to what we needed to do.

As far as his compensation was concerned, he left with what any other employee of Brookfield would leave with. He left with his vested, long-term incentive plan instruments, and nothing more.

**Gurbux Saini:** Thank you.

As a Canadian, I am very proud that we have a leader who has a vision and who is thinking 10 years ahead of time so that we as a country can get back on our footing as a strong, competitive nation doing business with countries. I find questions on the opposite side to be that Mr. Carney is some kind of guy who's a crook and nothing more than that. I find it very disturbing.

I'd like to hear your viewpoint on that.

**Justin Beber:** I had the opportunity to work with Mr. Carney over five years. I found him to be an exceptionally talented executive and a person of great integrity. I know that a lot of work has been implemented to the ethics screen that was put in place, and I know that he would want it to work.

**Gurbux Saini:** We had people from the Prime Minister's Office and from Privy Council. We had the Ethics Commissioner. Our standards when dealing with blind trusts and conflicts are the gold standard in the world. They are top-notch. Do you have any suggestion on whether we could improve them any better?

**The Chair:** Please give a very quick response. We're over time.

**Justin Beber:** I think the mechanism in place makes a lot of sense. I don't have any additional recommendations.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Beber.

[Translation]

Mr. Thériault, you have the floor for six minutes.

**Luc Thériault:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

In an article published on March 29, investigative journalists Jean-François Cloutier and Anne Caroline Desplanques mentioned that Brookfield Asset Management—where Mr. Carney was president until January—had not paid a penny in taxes in three years, according to its financial statements.

The journalists relied on figures that Brigitte Alepin, a tax expert at the Université du Québec en Outaouais, obtained from documents filed with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission. They show that when Mr. Carney was at the helm, Brookfield Asset Management paid zero taxes between 2022 and 2024, while reporting a billion dollars in profits.

According to the article, and I quote:

Tax expert Brigitte Alepin...says that taxes are paid elsewhere at Brookfield, but the complex structure of the business, with entities in various countries, makes their analysis almost impossible for an outsider. She feels that Carney owes the public an explanation, especially since Brookfield appears to have a strong presence in tax havens such as Bermuda, Barbados and the Cayman Islands. No fewer than 14 companies linked to Brookfield are named in the Pandora Papers of the International Consortium of Investigative Journalists.

Are those people wrong?

How do you explain that? We're talking about the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, after all.

• (1220)

[English]

**Justin Beber:** I don't have the report you're referring to. There are many reasons that there may be misunderstandings relating to the types of disclosure you're referring to. In fact, many publications—not many, but some—have completely misconstrued the reporting we have done.

One of the main misunderstandings of those who perhaps are not as well informed in terms of how the tax rules work is that we aggregate, under international financial reporting standards, all income from across every business that we own and control. We aggregate all of that income, yet when we report our taxes, we report only the taxes that are proportionate to us. Therefore, there is a significant amount of tax being paid by our partners, others who own

investments in these very same businesses, that doesn't get reflected in our statements. That tends to be a big misunderstanding as to our own reporting.

As I tried to explain, our businesses pay significant tax in all the jurisdictions in which they operate. We may not be picking up in our own reporting every single dollar of tax that's paid, because we don't own those businesses entirely.

[Translation]

**Luc Thériault:** How much tax did Brookfield pay from 2022 to 2024?

[English]

**Justin Beber:** I told you that in Canada alone, we paid \$750 million in tax in 2024, one year.

[Translation]

**Luc Thériault:** Could you provide us with a written response to the question I just asked you regarding the tax paid by Brookfield from 2022 to 2024 and the statement filed with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission?

[English]

**Justin Beber:** I'll have to take that under advisement.

[Translation]

**Luc Thériault:** Section 20 of the Conflict of Interest Act defines “controlled assets”, for the purposes of the act, as “assets whose value could be directly or indirectly affected by government decisions or policy”. It goes on to list assets that fall into that category, including publicly traded securities of corporations, foreign government securities and stock options.

Mr. Carney therefore has a direct financial interest in Brookfield that puts him in a conflict of interest or, at the very least, an apparent conflict of interest, insofar as the stock options he holds in Brookfield Corporation and Brookfield Asset Management are deferred. A number of newspapers, including the National Post, estimated the value of these deferred stock options at \$6.8 million in December 2024, and we learned that they will expire in 2033-34.

If Brookfield is making money, Mr. Carney doesn't know how much that adds to the value of the assets he has in his blind trust, but he knows full well that his wealth is increasing. In fact, he did not divest himself of it, because by 2033-34, he will probably no longer be prime minister and his wealth will have increased considerably—partly because of the political and economic direction in which he is currently taking Canada.

• (1225)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Thériault.

We will now move on to the second round of questions.

Mr. Gourde, you have the floor for five minutes.

**Jacques Gourde:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Beber, where does the Prime Minister's vision come from, after spending five years at Brookfield?

Is it possible that his work in this organization whose goals are economic—let's face it—has shaped his thinking for the future, even in his role as prime minister?

[*English*]

**Justin Beber:** Mr. Carney came to Brookfield after a career at Goldman Sachs, after having been appointed Governor of the Bank of Canada by Prime Minister Harper, and Governor of the Bank of England by Prime Minister Cameron. I think when he—

[*Translation*]

**Jacques Gourde:** I'm going to stop you there, because we all know the story.

There is a very strange ethical situation here.

Are there many vice-presidents at your company who became prime ministers practically the day after they resigned?

[*English*]

**Justin Beber:** Not at Brookfield...no.

[*Translation*]

**Jacques Gourde:** Usually, when a prime minister leaves political life, that kind of job may be offered to him for his next career. Here, the opposite is true. Mr. Carney had a thriving career in business and investment funds, and he decided to leave a very lucrative job to become Prime Minister of Canada. It pays well. He makes about \$420,000 a year, but he must have made a lot more at Brookfield.

That being said, he holds deferred stock options. The Conflict of Interest Act seems unclear in this regard, because this is an unprecedented situation. We are talking about a prime minister who stands to receive a fortune, millions of dollars, from an investment fund following his tenure as prime minister.

We don't know if that will last two, five, seven or 10 years, but we do know that he has the opportunity to influence investments and create public-private partnerships with companies funded by Brookfield, which will indirectly increase its share capital in the future.

Doesn't this situation make you uncomfortable, given that Brookfield is a highly respected firm worldwide?

You risk creating something that you won't be very proud of, ethically speaking.

[*English*]

**Justin Beber:** I don't think it's appropriate for a private enterprise to opine to government as to how the government should be regulating this matter.

What I can tell you is that we at Brookfield are very comfortable that the rules that apply to us, which cover lobbying and our interactions with government and public office holders, are clear, and we are highly capable of ensuring that we comply with them.

[*Translation*]

**Jacques Gourde:** It's unheard of, because there are no rules. You could follow the rules, but there are none. This is the first time

we've seen a sitting prime minister who holds equity in investment funds, which could be subsidized by government initiatives.

It's not your fault, Mr. Beber. The situation is truly unprecedented. I don't think we've ever seen this anywhere in the world, and it's happening here in Canada. Our Prime Minister can influence Canadian policy, he can help these funds, and he can doubtless negotiate with indigenous communities. There will be regulations under which Canadians will pay to help companies extract perhaps minerals, oil, a whole host of things.

Canadians are the ones who will foot the bill, and Brookfield and the companies it funds will reap the benefits. Canada's deficit equals the profits of the companies in Brookfield. This is unheard of.

Are you still comfortable with that possibility?

• (1230)

[*English*]

**The Chair:** I need a very quick response. It always seems to get to you with a very quick response, Mr. Beber, but I need a quick one.

**Justin Beber:** We're able to comply with the laws that apply to Brookfield. We do that every single day, and we expect all of our companies to do the same.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Ms. Church, you have five minutes. Go ahead.

**Leslie Church:** Thank you, Mr. Beber. You've been a very patient participant in this late-season fishing expedition.

I want to give you an opportunity to answer a question about how Brookfield is managing its interactions with the Prime Minister and with government. You touched on this earlier, but maybe you could expand a little bit in terms of how the company as a whole is treating this relationship.

**Justin Beber:** As I mentioned, when the Prime Minister decided to terminate his employment with Brookfield, we sought expert advice in terms of ensuring that the rules and regulations that apply to Brookfield as a private enterprise continue to be robust and appropriate to our organization.

I'd say that compliance comes from strong culture and tone at the top. We have, whether it's anti-bribery and corruption, health and safety or whatever the requirements, strong policies and procedures that we put in place in order to manage the application of those regulations across our business. We do that through training of our employees across all of our 2,500 employees, and that training occurs annually. At the end of every year, at least annually, we seek certification from employees that they have complied with those programs.

On top of that, we then—and I mentioned it earlier—have a team of internal auditors, close to 100 across the globe, who help us test and ensure that our processes are appropriate and that any areas for improvement are addressed.

Now, more broadly, with our portfolio companies, we have over 2,000 businesses at any given point in time that we manage across all of our strategies. Those businesses are managed through a governance framework that ensures that management of those businesses are capable, tasked and empowered to run their businesses in the best interest of that business.

We started, before our asset management business was launched, as owner-operators of businesses. Our bias to investing is to ensure that decision-making is as close to the business as possible. We don't want people in Canada making decisions about how port operations should work in Sydney. We are looking at a framework where we provide governance and we provide oversight. In some cases where we have to be stringent, such as anti-bribery and corruption, we ensure that all of our businesses adopt very specific policies. Otherwise, we want to make sure that the businesses are able to operate freely and in the best interests of the company.

As far as lobbying is concerned, which is what applies to Brookfield, we ensure that those businesses adopt rules and policies similar to ours but managed at the portfolio company. Management teams of those portfolio companies are accountable to us as normally sitting on their boards to ensure that all of those processes and procedures are in place, just like we are accountable to our board for the same.

• (1235)

**Leslie Church:** Maybe changing tack for a moment, how many shareholders are there in Brookfield, a ballpark number?

**Justin Beber:** There are thousands.

**Leslie Church:** Are there tens of thousands?

**Justin Beber:** There are tens of thousands.

**Leslie Church:** I'm interested because, in our conflict of interest framework federally, we look at instances where there is a broad class of persons affected or an issue that affects a matter of general application. It's interesting that there are that many.

You also mentioned that you have reviewed the Prime Minister's screen in annex A. My colleagues were asking you about the global transition fund. Is it your understanding that the investments from that fund are listed in annex A as part of the Prime Minister's screen?

**Justin Beber:** They are.

**Leslie Church:** Thank you very much.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. Church.

[Translation]

Mr. Thériault, you have the floor for five minutes.

**Luc Thériault:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Brookfield owns railways, natural gas processing plants, gas pipelines and a company that designs, builds and operates nuclear power plants. It also holds an interest in the oil sands and is involved in port facilities. Bill C-5 covers all these sectors.

You said earlier that Mr. Carney was very familiar with Brookfield's vision, strategies and perspectives.

Were you surprised to see that one of the first things Mr. Carney did as prime minister was to move Bill C-5, which precisely targets Brookfield's areas of activity?

[English]

**Justin Beber:** Those sectors are critical to the health of the Canadian economy. Am I surprised that the Prime Minister would seek to ensure that critical industries of our country are being maintained and, indeed, enhanced? No.

I haven't read Bill C-5 in detail, but in response to your direct question, I would say that we read legislation and policy, the same as everybody else does. However, these are critical industries that are very important to the Canadian economy.

[Translation]

**Luc Thériault:** Do you think Brookfield should withdraw from those projects to avoid putting Mr. Carney in a conflict of interest?

Are you of the opinion that, when Brookfield is the primary contractor, Mr. Carney should recuse himself every time a decision is required?

[English]

**Justin Beber:** What I would say to that is that it's, again, very difficult, as a private enterprise, to make recommendations as to how government should address it when conflicts occur among members of government. It would be unfortunate if private enterprise were impacted.

[Translation]

**Luc Thériault:** If I understand correctly, you agree we are at least in an apparent conflict of interest, perhaps even in a conflict of interest.

Is that right?

[English]

**Justin Beber:** Look, it's not for us, as a private enterprise, to weigh in on these types of considerations. All I can speak to is how we conduct our business.

[Translation]

**Luc Thériault:** Bill C-5 suspends a multitude of laws implemented over the years to uphold the highest environmental standards. Furthermore, all it takes is a single minister to consider a project as being in the national interest to set all those laws aside.

That is what Bill C-5 does. It means a company can present a project to the Prime Minister, say it's in the national interest, and those laws will be set aside, including C-5. That is the current legislative context.

Even if you don't want to stand in for parliamentarians, do you understand the nature of the work we have to do?

Do you understand that, objectively, the Prime Minister's first decision contains an apparent conflict of interest, since he has long-term stock purchase options, meaning deferred stock purchase options?

Do you agree?

• (1240)

[*English*]

**Justin Beber:** I appreciate the question, and I know you've asked it in several ways. I appreciate that you're passionate about it. What I will say is that I'm here because we do respect the work of this committee. I'm here to try to help, as much as I can, as an executive of a private enterprise who has never had any involvement with government.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

[*Translation*]

Thank you, Mr. Thériault.

[*English*]

Mr. Barrett, go ahead for five minutes.

**Michael Barrett:** Do you know Mr. Carney?

**Justin Beber:** I do.

**Michael Barrett:** When was the last time you spoke, texted, emailed or exchanged letter mail with him?

**Justin Beber:** I'm here to tell you that no one at Brookfield has communicated with the Prime Minister in relation to Brookfield or its business. That's what we're required to monitor. That's what I'm here to confirm.

**Michael Barrett:** My question was, when was the last time you communicated with the Prime Minister? You're required to answer.

**Justin Beber:** I met with.... I'm happy to answer—

**Michael Barrett:** You obfuscated with your first response, sir, so I'm giving you the precision that you're required to answer the question, and it is directly when you last communicated with Mr. Carney.

**Justin Beber:** Since he departed office, I have met with him only once.

**Michael Barrett:** What was the nature of the meeting?

**Justin Beber:** I contacted him to have a discussion about the rise in hate incidents, particularly anti-Semitism, across Canada.

**Michael Barrett:** What was the date of the contact and the date of the meeting?

**Justin Beber:** I contacted him a couple of weeks before that, maybe more, and the date of the meeting was Friday, October 3 or 4.

**Michael Barrett:** Did you meet in person or virtually?

**Justin Beber:** I met in person with him. I took the afternoon off and I came to Ottawa on my own dime.

**Michael Barrett:** Okay. Did you meet with him here or in the Prime Minister's Office on Wellington?

**Justin Beber:** I believe it was the Prime Minister's Office.

**Michael Barrett:** Is that in this building here or—because he has a couple—the one down the street from us?

**Justin Beber:** It's on the corner.

**Michael Barrett:** Okay. Thank you very much.

It doesn't hurt to have a Prime Minister financially tied to Brookfield's passive performance. Is that correct?

**Justin Beber:** Again, I'm not here to opine on what is appropriate or not as it relates to considerations on how political figures, public office holders, govern themselves.

**Michael Barrett:** Mr. Carney holds Brookfield-linked assets in a so-called blind trust, and I'll say, as you confirmed earlier, that we know some of those are there because they're “less liquid”. I think that was the term you used. Is that right? Was it less liquid?

**Justin Beber:** I would describe those as less liquid, yes.

**Michael Barrett:** We know they're still there.

Many of the portfolio companies that Brookfield has lobby the government. Now, Mr. Carney's compensation, based on those assets held in trust, rises when those companies do well. When they lobby for an outcome that they're seeking, a favourable outcome for their business, and his government grants it, his personal financial position improves.

• (1245)

**Justin Beber:** I think you should say “it”, though, because there's only one. There's only one company in that list that's in Canada.

**Michael Barrett:** Okay, and that company is...?

**Justin Beber:** It's Entropy.

**Michael Barrett:** If the Prime Minister sold all of his Brookfield-linked assets instead of keeping them in trust, there would be no conflict to manage. Is that correct?

**Justin Beber:** I think that's probably a correct statement, yes.

**Michael Barrett:** What we have isn't a Brookfield problem. The reason you're here is that the Prime Minister has a financial interest in the performance of this company.

What we've said—what I've said—is that to restore Canadians' flagging confidence in democratic institutions and in their elected officials, there ought to be a regime in place whereby party leaders who are represented in the House of Commons divest by way of sale of their controlled assets. Then we avoid the perception and we avoid the risk, and then there isn't a need to manage conflicts.

That's why we're here. We're looking for information, because it's very opaque, and Canadians don't understand. It should be possible to hold two views at the same time: You want an investment in nuclear technology, but you also want to be certain that the decision was made because it's best for the country and it's not going to personally benefit any elected official.

**The Chair:** Thank you. We'll leave it right there.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Sari, you have the floor for five minutes.

**Abdelhaq Sari:** Thank you very much.

First of all, I just want to correct something for the folks listening to us. Individuals came to testify here and clearly explained to us that Mr. Carney withdraws from all conversations related to investments that may be of interest to Brookfield. We still had those conversations. They were very reassuring for us.

I would nonetheless like to know something about Brookfield. We will put measures in place on our side, but on your side, what are you putting in place now that someone with close ties to Brookfield holds the office of Prime Minister?

At Brookfield, what are you doing to avoid all conflicts of interest?

[English]

**Justin Beber:** At Brookfield—and I've said this before—we're responsible for ensuring that any interactions with public office holders, whether it's the Prime Minister or any other public office holder, are appropriately administered, appropriately vetted, recorded in our logs and tracked by us. We do the same for any....

That's why I can come to this committee and confirm that we've had no interactions with the Prime Minister in relation to Brookfield or any of our businesses. That's what we do. We track any interaction with public officials, and when we are required to, we register.

[Translation]

**Abdelhaq Sari:** Are those registered interactions public?

Are they recorded only to meet your internal management needs?

[English]

**Justin Beber:** Registration becomes public, yes.

[Translation]

**Abdelhaq Sari:** Can the committee members access this type of registration or register?

[English]

**Justin Beber:** Yes, there's a registry of anyone who has registered under that legislation. That's publicly available.

[Translation]

**Abdelhaq Sari:** I will summarize the situation for folks listening to us. We now know the Prime Minister recuses himself every time a decision is required. Mr. Sabia and Mr. Blanchard told us that as well. Furthermore, a certain screen was already in place.

As for Brookfield, there's a great deal of transparency about the fact that there are no longer any interactions with the Prime Minister or his office. I think that's very important.

In any event, I will repeat that you nonetheless have a certain amount of experience in governance, Mr. Beber.

I do not want to have a debate about a company and a prime minister. I want to come back to the fact that we want to set up a model and processes that can apply to the future, because contexts will change. I don't want to apply something solely to the situation of Brookfield and Mr. Carney. I really want some advice from you.

What should we do? Is it possible to set up other measures?

In that respect, what recommendations could you make to the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics?

• (1250)

[English]

**Justin Beber:** I appreciate the question.

As I've said before, it's not for us, as a private enterprise, to opine on what is appropriate among government officials in dealing with these conflicts. What I've said is that we, as a private enterprise, respect the rules that apply to private enterprise. I believe that it should be for government to determine what is appropriate for administering these matters at government.

I understand that what has been implemented has been in place for quite some time. It was suggested to me that this was actually implemented two decades ago in similar circumstances. To your point, yes, these instances, in a variety of cases, can arise.

[Translation]

**Abdelhaq Sari:** Mr. Chair, I would like to conclude my turn with an observation, rather than a question.

Mr. Beber, I'm very familiar with your experience and background, and I'm grateful for your testimony.

That said, I think we really should have listened to you more. You are right; as the representative of a private company, you have nothing to add. We really should have worked on aspects other than one-off situations or baseless accusations for which we have no proof.

Thank you very much, Mr. Beber.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Sari.

[English]

Mr. Cooper, you have five minutes.

**Michael Cooper:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Beber, you stated earlier that there are 2,000 Brookfield owned and operated companies. I would note that only 103 of these companies have been publicly disclosed by Mr. Carney and are subject to his ethics screen. In other words, 95% of Brookfield companies are not the subject of the ethics screen.

Will you undertake to provide a list of the 1,900 other Brookfield companies?

**Justin Beber:** I presume that in conversations and discussions with the Ethics Commissioner that list was produced based on—

**Michael Cooper:** I'm asking you. Will you undertake to provide us with a copy of that list?

When a Brookfield company makes money, Brookfield makes money. You said that. Consistent with that, the success of any of these companies contributes to the value of Mr. Carney's stock options. I would submit that it is of material interest. Canadians do deserve the right to know what these other 1,900 companies are, 95% of which are not subject to the ethics screen.

Again, will you undertake to provide that list?

**Justin Beber:** A great many of those would have no ties to Canada.

**Michael Cooper:** The answer is no. Is that your answer?

**Justin Beber:** I will take it away.

**Michael Cooper:** You'll take that under advisement.

**Justin Beber:** Sure. I will.

**Michael Cooper:** Okay. You stated, in answer to my previous round, that the 20 companies that are part of the holdings of the Brookfield transition fund I are listed in annexure A. The problem with that is that they aren't identified as being part of the holdings of that fund, so we don't know what those companies are by looking at annex A.

I would submit that is a problem from the standpoint of transparency because these companies are disproportionately the most lucrative part of Mr. Carney's future bonus pay.

Will you undertake to provide a list that specifically sets out the holdings in that fund so that we can see exactly what they are, because there is no transparency?

• (1255)

**Justin Beber:** There would be perfect transparency to the Ethics Commissioner. I think that question should be addressed to the Ethics Commissioner.

**Michael Cooper:** I think there's an interest for Canadians to know—

**Justin Beber:** I understand.

**Michael Cooper:** —a level of public transparency. You can provide us with a list. You already know what the 20 companies are.

**Justin Beber:** I think that should first be addressed to the Ethics Commissioner.

**Michael Cooper:** I'm asking you, so your answer is no.

**Justin Beber:** My answer is that you should be speaking to the Ethics Commissioner about it because there is perfect transparency within.

**Michael Cooper:** I will take that as a no, that you're not prepared to undertake that.

I also asked you the question, what are the LPs? You said unequivocally that Brookfield doesn't release the names of LPs. I would submit that is a real problem here.

I'll tell you why. Mr. Carney set up the fund. This is a \$15-billion fund. We're talking about deep pockets here, formed with investments based on the deep relationships that Mr. Carney has. I think Canadians deserve to know who is invested in Mr. Carney's future bonus pay.

I note that a Fitch ratings report shows that 21% of those funds are—the pool of the funds—banks and 23% are from sovereign wealth funds. Is Mr. Carney beholden to the Qatar Investment Authority? Is he beholden to the Saudis? Is he beholden to the Bank of China? We know he got a \$276-million loan from the Bank of China when he was the chair of Brookfield in November 2024.

I would submit that it is material, and I would therefore, on that basis, ask that you to provide the names of those LPs.

**Justin Beber:** I've already answered that question.

**Michael Cooper:** The answer is no.

**Justin Beber:** That's not the answer that I gave.

**Michael Cooper:** Then provide an answer.

**Justin Beber:** I said that we would take that under advisement.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Cooper.

[Translation]

Ms. Lapointe, you have the floor for five minutes.

**Linda Lapointe:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Thank you again for being with us, Mr. Beber.

We are reviewing the Conflict of Interest Act. I would therefore like to have your comments on the ethics and conflict of interest rules in the world of business.

What tools are used, mainly at Brookfield, to avoid these conflicts?

[English]

**Justin Beber:** Yes, I'd be happy to. As I mentioned, we assess conflicts and conflict adjudication is premised on three key principles. One is ensuring that the conflict is identified, so we need transparency. Secondly, in the resolution of a conflict, it's that we're able to reduce the conflict, terminate it or seek informed, appropriate consent or approvals.

We have a strong compliance regime in place that ensures that everyone across Brookfield is attuned to the transparency and is able to identify those conflicts. When they're identified, we have systems in place to then address them. Those systems include ensuring that they are reviewed by a committee of some of the most senior people within Brookfield to ensure that the conflict is being addressed in an appropriate manner. We are subject to very stringent rules relating to conflicts of interest, as an SEC-registered investment adviser.

We either have procedures through which the conflict is vetted and determined to be consistent with the procedures and rules we have in place, or we are required to go and seek the informed consent of unconflicted decision-makers.

• (1300)

[*Translation*]

**Linda Lapointe:** The intent of the next question I had for you was to improve my understanding, but your answer clearly explained things.

Have you personally participated in implementing or managing the tools or systems you talked about?

[*English*]

**Justin Beber:** I'm the chair of our conflicts committee, and I'm very much a part of the systematization of our conflicts protocols.

[*Translation*]

**Linda Lapointe:** In your experience, did the systems you talked about effectively reduce the risk of conflicts of interest?

[*English*]

**Justin Beber:** We believe that they are. We've been undertaking these procedures for decades, as we've operated our business.

[*Translation*]

**Linda Lapointe:** What ethics rules do you have in place at Brookfield?

[*English*]

**Justin Beber:** Our ethics, our culture and the rules that we operate by are really fundamentally ingrained in everything we do.

We invest on behalf of institutions, individuals, pensioners and sovereign wealth funds. We do that with a keen eye on ensuring that we do it with transparency. We undertake everything we do in compliance with all laws and we do it with the best interests.... Our sole focus is ensuring that we are operating the business in the best interests of those investors.

[*Translation*]

**Linda Lapointe:** In government, we use blind trusts. Sometimes, we also set up screens, as is the case for the Prime Minister.

Does this type of system exist in the private sector?

[*English*]

**Justin Beber:** Yes, on occasion, screens are used in order to separate people with different types of information. We call them information barriers. Sometimes those are permanent and sometimes, less frequently, they are episodic, to address very specific circumstances.

[*Translation*]

**Linda Lapointe:** Who's in charge of managing those barriers?

[*English*]

**Justin Beber:** Generally, it would be the governance and compliance groups who will articulate very specific procedures that are expected to be implemented in order to ensure that all activity during the period is respected. In the case of permanent...it's even more segregated, and the rules would ensure that any interaction across the wall is supervised and authorized before any "wall crossing", which is the terminology we use.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

[*Translation*]

Thank you, Ms. Lapointe.

[*English*]

Mr. Beber, I want to thank you, on behalf of the committee, for your testimony today.

As I mentioned earlier, the clerk has made note of some of the requests that have come from committee members for the production of information. Typically, what I like to do is put a date on it in terms of a response. When the clerk sends you or a representative of Brookfield the information that has been requested, I am going to put on a deadline for the receipt of that information, just so that you're aware.

Thank you again for your testimony today. I'm going to dismiss you, Mr. Beber, because I do have some committee business to deal with.

It should go very quickly. All members of the committee have received the study budget for the upcoming AI study. I don't expect that there are any problems with that. Can I see a nodding of heads that I have committee's approval for the amount of \$27,500 for the upcoming study?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Chair:** That's been approved.

I have no other business before us, so I am going to adjourn the meeting. Thank you, everyone.







Published under the authority of the Speaker of  
the House of Commons

---

### SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

---

The proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees are hereby made available to provide greater public access. The parliamentary privilege of the House of Commons to control the publication and broadcast of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees is nonetheless reserved. All copyrights therein are also reserved.

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the Copyright Act. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the Copyright Act.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

---

Also available on the House of Commons website at the following address: <https://www.ourcommons.ca>

Publié en conformité de l'autorité  
du Président de la Chambre des communes

---

### PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

---

Les délibérations de la Chambre des communes et de ses comités sont mises à la disposition du public pour mieux le renseigner. La Chambre conserve néanmoins son privilège parlementaire de contrôler la publication et la diffusion des délibérations et elle possède tous les droits d'auteur sur celles-ci.

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la Loi sur le droit d'auteur. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre des communes.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la Loi sur le droit d'auteur.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

---

Aussi disponible sur le site Web de la Chambre des communes à l'adresse suivante :  
<https://www.noscommunes.ca>