

Legislative
Assembly
of Ontario



Assemblée
législative
de l'Ontario

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

A-40

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

A-40

**Standing Committee on
Government Agencies**

Intended appointments

1st Session
43rd Parliament

Thursday 12 December 2024

**Comité permanent des
organismes gouvernementaux**

Nominations prévues

1^{re} session
43^e législature

Jeudi 12 décembre 2024

Chair: David Smith
Clerk: Isaiah Thorning

Président : David Smith
Greffier : Isaiah Thorning

Hansard on the Internet

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. The address is:

<https://www.ola.org/>

Index inquiries

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7400.

Le Journal des débats sur Internet

L'adresse pour faire paraître sur votre ordinateur personnel le Journal et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative en quelques heures seulement après la séance est :

Renseignements sur l'index

Adressez vos questions portant sur des numéros précédents du Journal des débats au personnel de l'index, qui vous fourniront des références aux pages dans l'index cumulatif, en composant le 416-325-7400.

House Publications and Language Services
Room 500, West Wing, Legislative Building
111 Wellesley Street West, Queen's Park
Toronto ON M7A 1A2
Telephone 416-325-7400
Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario



Service linguistique et des publications parlementaires
Salle 500, aile ouest, Édifice du Parlement
111, rue Wellesley ouest, Queen's Park
Toronto ON M7A 1A2
Téléphone, 416-325-7400
Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

CONTENTS

Thursday 12 December 2024

Subcommittee report	A-369
Intended appointments.....	A-369
Ms. Hayleigh Cudmore	A-369

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE DE L'ONTARIO

STANDING COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

COMITÉ PERMANENT DES ORGANISMES GOUVERNEMENTAUX

Thursday 12 December 2024

Jeudi 12 décembre 2024

The committee met at 0900 in room 151.

The Chair (Mr. David Smith): Good morning, everyone. The Standing Committee on Government Agencies will now come to order. We are joined by staff from legislative research, Hansard and broadcast and recording. As always, all comments by members and witnesses should go through the Chair.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

The Chair (Mr. David Smith): The first item of business will be the adoption of the subcommittee report, which was distributed in advance. We have the subcommittee report dated Thursday, December 5, 2024. Could I please have a motion? Recognizing MPP Martin. Go ahead, please.

Mrs. Robin Martin: I move adoption of the subcommittee report on intended appointments dated Thursday, December 5, 2024, on the order-in-council certificate dated November 29, 2024.

The Chair (Mr. David Smith): Any discussion? Are members ready to vote? All those in favour? Opposed? That motion is carried.

INTENDED APPOINTMENTS

MS. HAYLEIGH CUDMORE

Review of intended appointment, selected by official opposition party: Hayleigh Cudmore, intended appointee as member, Assessment Review Board.

The Chair (Mr. David Smith): Our intended appointment today is Hayleigh Cudmore, nominated as member of the Assessment Review Board. You may make an initial statement at your discretion. Following this, there will be questions from the members of the committee. With those questions, we will start with the government, followed by the official opposition, with 15 minutes allotted to each recognized party. Any time you take in your statement will be deducted from the allotted time to the government side.

You may proceed, Ms. Cudmore.

Ms. Hayleigh Cudmore: Honourable members of the Standing Committee on Government Agencies, good morning. Thank you for inviting me to appear in front of you today. I'm happy to be here today to discuss my qualifications to be a part-time member of the Assessment Review Board, as well as a cross-appointment to the HRTO.

My name is Hayleigh Cudmore. My pronouns are she/her. I hope that following the hearing this morning, you conclude that my background and my skill set have prepared me to be a fair adjudicator. In my opening statement, I'll discuss my education and professional background, as well as the skills I possess which merit a successful appointment. I'll then welcome your questions.

I was born in Hamilton and raised in Oakville, Ontario. I was fortunate to find a passion for hockey early in my childhood, which guided most of my youth and young adulthood. I'll briefly discuss my athletic career and how it translates to the position I now pursue, and I'll speak to my education and legal training as well. I played NCAA division 1 hockey at Cornell University in Ithaca, New York, balancing life as a division 1 athlete at an elite institution. I went on to play professionally in the Canadian Women's Hockey League and the Professional Women's Hockey Players Association Dream Gap tour.

During my playing career, I took on a leadership role as co-chair of the CWHL Players Association, voicing player concerns to league officials. I was also fortunate to be a member of the national women's hockey team program. I competed for Canada internationally for several years at the junior and development levels, never cracking the big squad. I'm proud of my time in sport and the effort I put into advancing women in a traditionally male-dominated sphere. After my retirement, I went on to serve on the board of the Ontario Women's Hockey Association, again working towards advancing the interests of women and girls through sport.

My time in high-performance sport instilled in me skills which would serve me well first as a lawyer, and then hopefully as an adjudicator as well. First, as mentioned above, I learned to be efficient and effective with my time, managing competing interests. While continuing my national team pursuits, I attended law school at the University of Calgary and I began my law career. As an adjudicator cross-appointed to two tribunals—hopefully—I expect to manage multiple files towards resolution, keeping them moving efficiently and prioritizing important tasks.

The second thing I learned was about effective conflict management. From an early age, I had to become comfortable communicating when there was disagreement or heightened emotions. Whether it be with teammates, coaches or officials, I learned that calm, clear communication as well as checking biases can lead to effective reso-

lution. I'm confident that I would bring those skills as an adjudicator.

I'll now discuss my legal background, which will help me contribute to both boards. As mentioned, I attended law school at the University of Calgary. I articulated in Calgary with a national firm, and I began practising tax law there; that was where I started my career. I then moved home to Ontario, where I continued my tax practice.

Tax is a highly technical and sometimes difficult area of law. I gained competence navigating and applying a very technical statutory regime and complicated case law.

The most obvious translation of these skills to the positions I now seek is applying the ARB's mandate to fairly adjudicate disputes under the province's municipal taxation regime. However, I believe that operating in such an intricate statutory framework, I can break down and apply any new legislation that comes in front of me and gain competency quickly, including under the Human Rights Code.

In 2020, I sought an opportunity practising family law because I wanted to deal with on-the-ground, real-people legal problems a bit more as well as to hone my litigation skills. While practising family law, I participated in various dispute resolution processes, settlement discussions, mediation conferences and, of course, litigation as well. I found the path to resolution often involved clarifying and narrowing issues, and that's an essential skill for an adjudicator trying to resolve disputes both fairly and efficiently.

My family law practice also enhanced my soft skills, operating within an adversarial process. Family law often included self-represented parties, so I'm aware that many are also without counsel when appearing before the various tribunals, specifically the HRTO and ARB. With self-represented parties, it often takes time and effort to frame issues and kind of direct the process to make sure that the pertinent facts come out, and a balance has to be struck between directing the process while making sure that the self-rep feels heard.

While working at my family law firm, I'm proud to have established the firm's first diversity and inclusion committee, which, through education and conversation, pushed us to improve our navigation and interpretation of the legal system.

Finally, I'm a proud resident of Ontario, and I'm excited at the prospect of working for the people of the province. After spending time living in both the United States and Alberta, I am proud to call Ontario home.

My wife and I are currently raising three toddlers in Manotick, Ontario. If anyone's wondering, that includes a set of twins. Parenting my young family has been the most humbling and rewarding experience of my life. If I didn't have the ability to deal with competing interests and heightened emotions before, those three certainly sharpen those skills on a daily basis.

I'm excited about the opportunity to work as a part-time member of the Assessment Review Board and the Human Rights Tribunal of Ontario. As an adjudicator, I'd under-

take the roles with pride and with energy, and I'd treat all people with fairness, respect and courtesy.

Thank you for inviting me here today to discuss my qualifications. I look forward to your questions.

The Chair (Mr. David Smith): With the remaining time, I will now turn to the government side. First question, recognizing MPP Dowie: Go ahead, please.

Mr. Andrew Dowie: Hayleigh, thank you so much for joining us today. We're here looking specifically to the Assessment Review Board as part of this hearing.

I wanted to see if you'd elaborate a bit on your past experience with adjudication that you mentioned, so just your general professional experience that ties into the assessment review process and how it's prepared you for the role that you've been nominated for.

Ms. Hayleigh Cudmore: In terms of my professional background, I have never been an adjudicator before, and I don't hold out that I have been. But my experience thus far lends itself well to the skills needed to be an ARB member.

First, as I mentioned in my opening statement, I've gained competency under complex tax statutes, albeit not the Assessment Act. That wasn't where my practice lay. But I always say that if you can become comfortable under the Income Tax Act, you can become comfortable under any statute. So I'll talk about my technical competency, and then the second part is kind of the dispute resolution processes that I've been a part of. I'll speak to those as well.

First, under the competencies, I'll never forget, when I was starting my tax practice—I had a great mentor, and I had to write a memo for him. The memo was okay, but I remember it going to him; it was about some provision dealing with paid-up capital. I remember he took the big Income Tax Act and put it in front of me. It's this thick. He took his pencil and he took his highlighter, and he went through: "This is how you break down legislative provisions." I took that with me for the rest of my career, so far.

0910

So I think getting comfortable under a statutory regime is something that I'm excited to do and I think I can do. And so, when I switched to family law, multiple provincial statutes, I was able to quickly get up to speed on them as well.

In terms of my litigation skills that I can bring into being an adjudicator, I'm comfortable navigating rules and procedure. That would be the first thing. I understand that in order to be an effective adjudicator, you have to be able to direct your process and you have to know what's going on. I think one of the big parts of that is—I know under the ARB's rules, there's a conferencing system, and I've seen the effectiveness of settlement conferences and case conferences.

Everyone has to come to those prepared. If the parties aren't prepared, it's not going to be effective and it's not going to get to where you need to go. At the same time, the impartial parties, whether it be a judge, an adjudicator, a mediator—whoever it is—they've got to do their background work too because they've got to know that we want

to get something out of this process. And so, I see there's a conferencing system, and I think being able to use things like that effectively, using the rules of procedure effectively, is something that I can bring to the table.

And then in terms of the soft skills of litigation, I mentioned it before, but self-represented parties need to be heard, and I get that. A lot of my previous experience—someone comes in to you and they have their story, and you have to have the skills to get to the pertinent facts, so make them feel heard but get the pertinent facts that meet the legal test. I have extensive experience doing that, because you have to let someone get something off their chest, and then drill down. “Okay, but what do we need? What do we need to know to meet the legal test and answer the question?” I think that's something that I certainly bring, is that fact-finding through people skills.

So while I admittedly don't have background as an adjudicator, I have those litigation skills that I think I can translate into this role.

The Chair (Mr. David Smith): Recognizing MPP Pinsonneault: Go ahead, please.

Mr. Steve Pinsonneault: Thank you for putting your name forward. What knowledge or experience do you have with property assessment and tax issues, particularly in Ontario?

Ms. Hayleigh Cudmore: So what I have is what I've gained through this process. I understand the Assessment Review Board's mandate. I understand it was established under the Assessment Act to hear property assessment and classifications. I understand the general process to hear appeals, and that the board is there to resolve disagreements.

In terms of the nuts and bolts of the legislation and the problems, I've been a self-study a bit. I've been reading a lot of decisions. But I look forward to the onboarding process. I really look forward to that, should I get through here today, to really sink my teeth into that training, to work under that legislative regime

In terms of my knowledge, my knowledge thus far needs to be augmented, but I'm excited for that, and I think I'll be a quick study on that.

Mr. Steve Pinsonneault: Thank you for that.

Ms. Hayleigh Cudmore: Of course.

The Chair (Mr. David Smith): Recognizing MPP Pang: Go ahead, please.

Mr. Billy Pang: Mr. Chair, through you, the ARB is responsible for making impartial decisions regarding property assessments. So whatever decisions you are making can impact a family. We don't know how much and how deep, but how would you ensure that your decisions are fair and unbiased?

Ms. Hayleigh Cudmore: I think that's a very important part of being an adjudicator, is ensuring there's a fair process.

There are a couple of pieces to that. One piece is being able to come in with an open mind—an open mind with background knowledge. I think that's a special thing in itself. You have to understand the facts and you have to understand the legislation, and then you have to come in

with an open mind. I've done that in my previous practice. I think you have to approach each problem understanding everyone's point of view. If you block yourself off early, you're not going to reach the right resolution. So I think that's a big part of ensuring a fair process. As I mentioned with there being a lot of self-represented parties, you have to make sure everyone feels heard. That's something I'll bring to the table.

And then another part of a fair process is, when the decision is rendered, making sure it's clear, it's in plain language, it's concise. If you have someone coming to you—this is probably, maybe, their only interaction with the justice system, and so as the public-facing part of that, you have to make sure what comes back at them is digestible. So I've worked at writing in plain language, and I think what I'll be able to do is write clear, concise decisions so that, whatever the outcome, this person feels like they had a fair process.

The Chair (Mr. David Smith): Recognizing MPP Hamid: Go ahead, please.

MPP Zee Hamid: Thank you for being here. Just to build up on what MPP Pang asked: How would you ensure transparency and accountability in the decisions made by the ARB?

Ms. Hayleigh Cudmore: I think the first piece of transparency is, again, that ability to understand what's happening in the hearing process and then understand the decision that comes out of it. I think transparency goes hand in hand with consistency to an extent too. So I think you have to make sure that you get a good grasp on the legislation to make sure that decisions are coming out consistent.

For someone joining a board, in the early part, a lot of that is going to come from speaking to colleagues because you don't have all of the background that they have. But if the board can render consistent decisions, I think that's a really important thing.

MPP Zee Hamid: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair (Mr. David Smith): Recognizing MPP Sarrazin: Go ahead, please.

Mr. Stéphane Sarrazin: Chair, through you: What is your understanding of the importance of impartiality and integrity in the work of the ARB, and how would you maintain these qualities in a challenging and high-pressure environment?

Ms. Hayleigh Cudmore: Impartiality and integrity: I think what I like about your question is the high-pressure environment in that everyone can say that they're going to approach something impartially, but when—

The Chair (Mr. David Smith): Thank you very much. That concludes the time on the government side for answering that question.

I'm sure you have a few more points you'd like to make, but now we will turn to the official opposition and recognizing MPP Pasma.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Thank you very much for being here this morning, Ms. Cudmore. I realize it's not the most comfortable experience and the timelines are quite strict, as you've just seen, but it is a very important part of the

democratic process so that the people of Ontario can have confidence that appointments are being made based on merit and not connections to the government and that people have the qualifications they need to perform well in the roles that they're being appointed to. So we appreciate that you've made the time to be here this morning.

I have a question about your résumé, because the résumé that you submitted for your application ends in October 2020, which is four years ago—

Interjection.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Yes—with Thorsteinssons LLP. So I'm wondering what you've done since October 2020.

Ms. Hayleigh Cudmore: My apologies that that is the copy you have, and I can certainly pick up from October 2020. In October 2020, I started working at Stoner and Co., which is a family law firm in Burlington, Ontario. I worked there up until I went on my maternity leave. I had twins. So I just want to make sure you have these dates right: They were born in October. I had to go off work in August. They have you go off early. Anyway, so, October 2020 to August 2023: Stoner and Co. Family Law, Burlington, Ontario—I'm happy to elaborate on my family practice. I am so sorry and confused as to why that's not in front of you. Do you want me to talk about what it entailed or—

Ms. Chandra Pasma: No, no, that's okay.

Ms. Hayleigh Cudmore: Okay. I apologize.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Is it family requirements that the Law Society of Ontario says you're not practising law currently?

Ms. Hayleigh Cudmore: I'm not. My status has switched to not practising, yes.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Okay, but you're still at Stoner, or are you on family leave?

Ms. Hayleigh Cudmore: Family leave—I was on family leave, and then now it's switched to not practising. I'm no longer employed by them, yes.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: So, essentially, you have three years of family law experience since October 2020.

Ms. Hayleigh Cudmore: Yes.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Okay—

Ms. Hayleigh Cudmore: Well, I—sorry. I'm not—to correct you: I had another mat leave in there as well. It's happened very fast, yes. Sorry.

0920

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Yes. I am also a mother of three, including twins, so I know how that mat leave experience works.

Ms. Hayleigh Cudmore: You have twins?

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I won't ask you all about who came first and how did you make a decision to have another one, because that's a whole other thing—

Ms. Hayleigh Cudmore: We could go on about that, but we're not going to. Okay. Got it.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: So, you've got three years, then, of tax-related experience, but it's income tax.

Ms. Hayleigh Cudmore: Yes.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: You said this morning that what you have on property tax is what you've gained through

the process of applying. You are also being cross-appointed to the Human Rights Tribunal of Ontario, but you don't have human rights law experience. You've got income tax and family law experience, and we know that—

Mr. Andrew Dowie: Chair, point of order.

The Chair (Mr. David Smith): Yes, point of order.

Mr. Andrew Dowie: Today, we are speaking about the Assessment Review Board, not the Human Rights Tribunal of Ontario—just hoping for the questioning to be related to the ARB.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I haven't even had the opportunity to pose the question. You allowed me to talk about family law; the cross-appointment also affects the appointee's ability to carry out her law. Maybe I can get to the question, Chair, and then you can determine whether or not the question is in order.

The Chair (Mr. David Smith): Yes, I would want to think that that is correct. I'm listening to the question, and I want to see where it's going, but I think it's fair that you get an opportunity to continue your question.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Thank you, Chair.

We know that the Human Rights Tribunal has a large backlog. Tribunal Watch has said it's because appointees don't have experience in human rights law and it's taking them a long time to come up to speed in human rights law.

Two appointments where you don't have experience in the type of law that is being adjudicated—how, with this steep learning curve, are you going to manage to take on this role at the Assessment Review Board and ensure that applicants are getting a fair hearing in a reasonable amount of time? Especially given that we know individual families' income situation is affected by the decisions that are made—but so is the income situation of small municipalities who are waiting sometimes a long time for a decision to be made so that they know what their budget is—how will you manage to juggle these competing priorities, the steep learning curve and make sure that people are getting fairness in terms of the amount of time they wait for a hearing?

Ms. Hayleigh Cudmore: Yes, I understand the question and I understand where you're coming from.

I can't really speak to the backlogs. I am aware of them. I'm not appointed to the tribunal yet, so I can't really speak to them. That's a bit more on the policy side issue. I've spoken to my qualifications for the ARB, and I don't hold myself out to have a municipal tax assessment practice, so I understand what you're saying.

I can speak to the HRTTO appointment. If that's where you want the question to go, I'm happy to go there. Again, I don't hold myself out to have previously had a human rights practice, but under the Human Rights Code, looking at the appointment of adjudicators, there are three parts. There is the experience part, and I understand that. There's also aptitude for impartial adjudication. There's aptitude for applying alternative adjudicative practices and procedures.

In terms of aptitude for impartial adjudication, I have spoken on this. But I have, from an early age, dealt with

emotionally charged situations and checking biases, so I'm comfortable that I'll bring these skills as an adjudicator. In terms of assessing evidence and credibility, again, I think the next piece of it is the aptitude to apply the adjudicative process and alternative adjudicative processes; again, I've spoken to those. I haven't received my formal training yet, but I understand that both the HRTO and the ARB have these alternative dispute resolution mechanisms, which I am confident I can apply.

I think the last piece—and I understand where you're coming from—is experience, knowledge and training. Of course, this is where my experience is the thinnest, but what I can say is that lived experience counts for something. I dedicated my early life to a male-dominated sport and, within that sphere, I became a leader. I saw where progress was needed. Myself and my counterparts, we had to do things. We had to do constant community outreach—I'm not complaining about that—but things that we saw that our male counterparts didn't have to do. So I've lived these experiences of understanding that the world isn't always built for you necessarily.

The sport that grew me as a leader in diversity and inclusion initiatives, as well as mental health initiatives—I started my career working at a national firm not only as a woman but also as a lesbian. Although I, thankfully, never experienced overt discrimination, I'm acutely aware of second-guessing everyday actions that comes with being an other. I'm acutely aware of that.

More recently, I helped build our firm's diversity, equity and inclusion committee. That included bringing in guest speaker Dr. Courtney Szto from Queen's University to speak about anti-racism and the law, forcing members of my firm to have conversations they've never had before about structural and systemic challenges in the legal system. This is something I'm very proud of, bringing this to my firm.

In terms of, again, lived experience, especially before the HRTO, but having an open mind before any board: I'm currently raising three children in a same-sex family. I never want it to seem like I'm complaining or that that makes me understand everyone's lived experience, because obviously it doesn't. But I have had to many times correct another parent that I meet who asks what my husband does or about the children's father. I have to correct them and say, "Well, my wife does X, Y or Z, and the children have a donor." It's not a big deal on a daily basis; it's something that—it happens. But it gives me a foundation of empathy, I think is what it gives me, and understanding that you need to have an open mind to everyone's lived experience. The world maybe hasn't set them up for everything depending on who they are, if that makes sense.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I can appreciate that you have lived experience in that area, but that's different than being able to navigate the complex law that accompanies human rights and discrimination. Then also, at the same time, the complexities of property law that you have not yet exercised—

Mrs. Robin Martin: Chair, point of order.

The Chair (Mr. David Smith): There's a point of order. Go ahead, MPP Martin.

Mrs. Robin Martin: My apologies for interrupting, but the question is clearly about HRTO—

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I didn't get to ask the question yet.

Mrs. Robin Martin: Well, you just mentioned the HRTO. We've already had a long exegesis on the HRTO when we're here to talk about the ARB appointment. I'd just like us to get back to the ARB appointment because that's what we're here to decide on.

The Chair (Mr. David Smith): I want to remind the member about her time. It's not allotted all day; it's a time constraint. As a result of that, I'm still listening for the point to come out. So could you go on fast-forward to get that point across so we can move out of that area?

Ms. Chandra Pasma: Yes, I was definitely trying to.

The Chair (Mr. David Smith): Be cautious. You're going close to the line there.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: My question was, given that you have two areas of complex law where you have not practised before, how are you going to learn the area of property law quickly enough that you will be able to make decisions that do not require applicants to the Assessment Review Board to wait an unreasonable amount of time to receive a decision?

Ms. Hayleigh Cudmore: I understand the premise of your question and I understand the problem that you're highlighting in terms of time for a litigant to get an answer. What I'll say is this: While there is a problem with backlogs and time, I'm ready to be the solution. It's my understanding that there's an extensive onboarding process that gets adjudicators ready to hear these disputes. I'm excited for that. I'm a lifelong learner. As I've mentioned, I've navigated tax statutes before and I think I can bring that into my learning. I think my learning will actually be quick—not unreasonably fast. I'll take my time to understand it, but I think I'll be a quick study and I think I'll be part of the solution.

Ms. Chandra Pasma: I'll turn the rest of the time over to MPP Glover.

The Chair (Mr. David Smith): Thank you very much. Recognizing MPP Glover: Go ahead, please.

Mr. Chris Glover: The Assessment Review Board that you're applying for is problematic. The Auditor General report in 2017 highlighted a number of problems, including unresolved appeals dating back to 1998. The delays in resolving large-dollar appeals has led to uncertainty about the income for municipalities. The annual caseload statistics that are reported have been overstated for many years. The Auditor General reported that the overstatement is predicted to be up to 507%. So they're saying they're doing a wonderful job but we're not actually able to do it—in that report.

The decision-making process by members needs to be more transparent. Oral decisions represent approximately 80% of all board members' decisions. Knowing that you're coming into a board that's already fraught with

problems, how would you begin to address those problems that this board faces?

Ms. Hayleigh Cudmore: In terms of the problems you're highlighting, I don't have knowledge of them. I don't serve on the board yet.

Can you just clarify your question? Are you asking me to opine on process or—

Mr. Chris Glover: Have you ever gone into a board, or do you have other experience in trying to clean up an organization with this type of problem?

Ms. Hayleigh Cudmore: I haven't seen the Auditor General's report, and I think for me to weigh in on, as you say, "Cleaning up a board"—those are your words, not mine—I don't think that's something I can really speak to right now.

As an adjudicator, my job would be to take the facts in front of me and apply the law as I know it. I'm confident that I can do that. But in terms of the overarching policies surrounding the board, I don't think I'm the person to answer that question.

Mr. Chris Glover: I'm going to ask you some quick, uncomfortable but necessary questions. Have you ever been a member of the Progressive Conservative Party?

Ms. Hayleigh Cudmore: No.

Mr. Chris Glover: Have you ever donated to the Progressive Conservative Party?

Ms. Hayleigh Cudmore: No.

Mr. Chris Glover: Have you ever worked on a Conservative election campaign?

Ms. Hayleigh Cudmore: I have not.

Mr. Chris Glover: Did anyone ask you to submit an application for this position?

Ms. Hayleigh Cudmore: No.

Mr. Chris Glover: Those are all my questions. Thank you.

The Chair (Mr. David Smith): I want to thank you, Ms. Cudmore, for being here this morning to meet with the board. That's all for today. Thank you very much for being here.

We will now move onto concurrence. We will now consider the intended appointment of Hayleigh Cudmore, nominated as member of the Assessment Review Board.

The member will move concurrence—recognizing MPP Martin.

Mrs. Robin Martin: I move concurrence in the intended appointment of Hayleigh Cudmore, nominated as member of the Assessment Review Board.

The Chair (Mr. David Smith): Any discussion? Are members ready to vote? All in favour? Opposed? That motion is carried.

The deadline to review the intended appointments selected from the November 29, 2024, certificate is set to expire on December 29, 2024. Is there unanimous consent to extend the certificate by 30 days? I heard a no.

The deadline to review the intended appointments selected from the December 6, 2024, certificate is set to expire on January 5, 2025. Is there unanimous consent to extend the certificate by 30 days? I heard a no.

That concludes our business for today. This committee stands adjourned.

The committee adjourned at 0933.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Chair / Président

Mr. David Smith (Scarborough Centre / Scarborough-Centre PC)

Vice-Chair / Vice-Présidente

Ms. Chandra Pasma (Ottawa West–Nepean / Ottawa-Ouest–Nepean ND)

Mr. Andrew Dowie (Windsor–Tecumseh PC)

Mr. Chris Glover (Spadina–Fort York ND)

MPP Zee Hamid (Milton PC)

Ms. Sarah Jama (Hamilton Centre / Hamilton-Centre IND)

Mrs. Robin Martin (Eglinton–Lawrence PC)

Mr. Billy Pang (Markham–Unionville PC)

Ms. Chandra Pasma (Ottawa West–Nepean / Ottawa-Ouest–Nepean ND)

Mr. Steve Pinsonneault (Lambton–Kent–Middlesex PC)

Mr. David Smith (Scarborough Centre / Scarborough-Centre PC)

Ms. Laura Smith (Thornhill PC)

Substitutions / Membres remplaçants

Mr. Stéphane Sarrazin (Glengarry–Prescott–Russell PC)

Clerk pro tem / Greffière par intérim

Ms. Tanzima Khan

Staff / Personnel

Ms. Lauren Warner, research officer,
Research Services