

The CENTRAL NEWSPAPER

Well Written, Well Read - Time Tested And Proven - #1 Newspaper Across Durham Region - Supporting Local Businesses



Canada’s Economic Revival
Requires Breaking the
Provincial Regulatory Cartel

by Maj (ret’d) CORNELIU, CHISU, CD, PMSC
FEC, CET, P.Eng.
Former Member of Parliament
Pickering-Scarborough East

Canada likes to describe itself as a single national economy. In reality, it operates more like a loose confederation of protected markets, each guarded by provincially self-regulated bodies whose original public-interest purpose has quietly morphed into something else: gatekeeping. In an era of slowing productivity, labour shortages, and intensifying global competition, this model has become obsolete. Worse, it has turned into a bureaucratic brake on economic revival.

This regulatory paralysis is most visible—and most damaging—in the treatment of foreign-trained professionals, one of Canada’s most underutilized economic assets. Every year, Canada deliberately selects and admits tens of thousands of internationally educated engineers, doctors, nurses, architects, and skilled tradespeople under immigration programs explicitly designed to address labour shortages. Yet upon arrival, many discover that the real barrier was never immigration policy, but provincial regulatory bodies that treat foreign credentials with reflexive suspicion and procedural inertia.

The result is a quiet national scandal. Highly qualified professionals drive taxis, work survival jobs, or abandon their fields altogether while Canada continues to claim—often in the same breath—that it faces critical skills shortages. This is not anecdotal. Statistics Canada and multiple provincial auditors have documented persistent underemployment and earnings gaps among internationally trained professionals, even years after arrival. The problem is not a lack of competence; it is a lack of regulatory adaptability.

Provincial self-regulatory bodies insist they are protecting public safety. In practice, many operate on a presumption of incompetence unless applicants can reproduce, at great cost and delay, credentials they already hold—sometimes from jurisdictions with standards equal to or higher than Canada’s. Experience gained abroad is discounted. Exams are duplicated. “Canadian experience” requirements still linger despite repeated political promises to abolish them. Appeals processes are opaque, timelines stretch into years, and outcomes vary arbitrarily by province.

This dysfunction carries a double economic cost. First, Canada wastes human capital it has already screened, selected, and welcomed. Second, it actively discourages future talent. Global labour markets are competitive and informed. When internationally trained professionals learn that recognition in Canada is slow, unpredictable, and fragmented by province, they choose Australia, the United Kingdom, or the United States instead. At a moment when advanced economies are competing aggressively for skilled workers, Canada signals hesitation and distrust. However, the problem does not stop with immigrants. The same regulatory rigidity that blocks an engineer trained in Germany or a nurse trained in the Philippines also obstructs mobility between Ontario and Alberta, or Nova Scotia and British Columbia. Protectionism, once normalized, rarely confines itself to one group. Foreign-trained professionals merely expose a deeper structural flaw in Canada’s regulatory architecture.

For decades, Canada tolerated this fragmentation because growth masked inefficiency. That era is over. Productivity has stagnated for more than ten years. Business investment per worker lags well behind peer countries. Major projects—housing, infrastructure, energy—are delayed not by lack of capital or demand, but by regulatory complexity layered across provincial boundaries. At the centre of this dysfunction sits a uniquely Canadian phenomenon: provincially self-regulated professional and occupational regimes.

Self-regulation was originally justified on sound principles. Professions such as engineering, medicine, and law require technical expertise and ethical standards best maintained by peers rather than politicians. However, over time, many of these bodies drifted from public protection toward institutional self-preservation. Entry barriers hardened. Credential recognition slowed. Interprovincial mobility became an administrative maze. What was once oversight now functions as an economic toll booth.

The economic cost is no longer theoretical. The Parliamentary Budget Officer has estimated that Canada’s internal trade barriers impose an economic penalty equivalent to a four per cent tariff we levy on ourselves. This is not the work of foreign competitors, but of Canadian governments and delegated regulators constraining other Canadians. No serious country seeking growth would tolerate such a self-inflicted handicap.

Labour mobility illustrates the absurdity. Canada faces acute shortages in construction, health care, engineering, and advanced manufacturing. Yet a professional licensed and competent in one province often cannot work seamlessly in another without months of paperwork, duplicative fees, and discretionary approval. Defenders of the status quo argue that standards differ and public safety is at risk. That argument collapses under scrutiny. Canadian provinces educate professionals to broadly similar national benchmarks, and accreditation bodies already operate at national or international levels. If a professional is competent in one province, the presumption should be competence everywhere in Canada—subject only to narrow, clearly justified exceptions.

Housing provides a stark example. Canada’s housing shortage is now a national emergency. Governments promise faster construction, yet skilled trades and professionals remain trapped behind provincial certification walls. Red Seal programs exist, but implementation is uneven. Municipal approvals vary wildly. Engineers, planners, and inspectors face province-specific rules layered on top of local ones. The result is predictable: delays, cost overruns, and fewer homes built. Energy and infrastructure face similar constraints. Canada speaks confidently about electrification, clean growth, and industrial renewal, yet struggles to mobilize talent across provinces to deliver projects on time. Regulatory inertia is no longer a technical issue; it is a strategic vulnerability.

Other federations have confronted this challenge. Australia moved decisively toward mutual recognition of occupational credentials decades ago. The European Union, despite its complexity, has made professional mobility a core economic principle across sovereign states. Canada, by contrast, still tolerates internal barriers that would be unthinkable at an international negotiating table.

The irony is striking. Canadian governments celebrate trade diversification abroad while tolerating protectionism at home. We negotiate for years to reduce tariffs with Europe or Asia, then quietly allow domestic regulators to block Canadian workers and firms at provincial borders. This is not federalism at its best; it is fragmentation disguised as autonomy. The solution is not to abolish standards or politicize professions. It is to modernize governance. Provinces should be required—by federal legislation if necessary—to adopt automatic mutual recognition for licensed professionals and trades. Self-regulatory bodies should retain authority over ethics and discipline, but not over interprovincial or international market access. Economic mobility is a national interest. Ottawa already has constitutional tools it is reluctant to use. The federal government can attach conditions to funding, harmonize national frameworks, and enforce the spirit of the Canadian Free Trade Agreement. What it lacks is political resolve. Provinces, for their part, must recognize that regulatory sovereignty without economic growth is an empty victory. Canada does not suffer from a lack of talent, capital, or ambition. It suffers from institutional inertia. Every month a skilled worker waits for recognition, every project stalled by duplicative rules, every firm deterred by regulatory uncertainty compounds our productivity problem.

If Canada is serious about economic revival, it must confront an uncomfortable truth: the era of provincially self-regulated silos is over. What once protected the public now too often protects incumbents. Reform will provoke resistance—from regulators, associations, and political actors invested in the status quo. So let us understand that resistance for what it is: not a defence of safety or quality, but a defence of control.

Economic renewal requires mobility, speed, and scale. Do you think Canada can afford to keep regulating itself into irrelevance?

“I live a dream in a nightmare world”

Always Remember That The Cosmic Blueprint Of Your Life Was Written In Code Across The Sky At The Moment You Were Born. Decode Your Life By Living It Without Regret or Sorrow.

- ONE DAY AT A TIME -

CHINESE WET DREAM!!!

By Joe Ingino BA. Psychology
Editor/Publisher Central Newspapers
ACCOMPLISHED WRITER/AUTHOR OF OVER 800 ,000
Published Columns in Canada and The United States

Not only is our country falling apart, being invaded through our ridiculous immigration policy. But now, it appears that our new Prime Minister is about to give us away to China. Carney could not negotiate with the long time neighbors to the south. So he thinks he is going to gain any leverage against the U.S. by elbowing it up with the Chinese. PEOPLE ARE LIVING ON OUR CITY STREETS. FOOD BANKS DEPENDENCY ARE AT AN ALL TIME HIGH. We in Canada have no real politics. The NDP have run aground. The PC can't even win their wards but expect to be voted Prime Minister. And the Liberals.... well they are finishing us off. Personally, the best thing that could happen to Canada is to become the 51st. The real threat is that if in the U.S. the democrats come back in power. Then the American empire will fall. This week the news reports read: Prime Minister Mark Carney arrived in Doha on Saturday as part of a push to attract foreign investment and deepen Canada's economic partnerships beyond its traditional allies. Carney's visit comes on the heels of his visit to China and follows the recent presentation of a new federal investment budget aimed at positioning Canada as a stable, attractive destination for global capital. Prime Minister Mark Carney stated that he has found “much alignment” with Chinese President Xi Jinping in their views on Greenland, which some experts say is a signal of a new pragmatism in Canadian foreign policy while facing what Carney called a “new world order.” This is our leader folks... The Chinese are not only laughing at us... but I am sure that they feel as if they won the ultimate lottery... Imagine, inviting the Chinese to take over Canada. It has been in the works for years. “I had discussions with President Xi about the situation in Greenland, about our sovereignty in the Arctic, about the sovereignty of the people of Greenland and the people of Denmark. And I found much alignment of views in that regard,” Carney told reporters after his meeting with Xi. The possibility of a forceful U.S. takeover of Greenland is raising many unprecedented questions — including how Canada, the European Union and NATO could respond or even retaliate against an ostensible ally. Here's what that could entail. EU trade, tech disruptions? Experts agree the biggest pressure points that can be used in the U.S. surround trade and technology. The European Parliament's trade committee is currently debating whether to postpone implementing the trade deal signed between Trump and the EU last summer to protest the threats against Greenland. An even bolder move would be triggering the EU's anti-coercion instrument — known as the “trade bazooka” — that would allow the bloc to hit non-member nations with tariffs, trade restrictions, foreign investment bans, and other penalties if that country is found to be using coercive economic measures. The likeliest — and potentially least harmful — scenario for retaliation in the event of an attack on Greenland, would be fines or bans against U.S. tech companies like Google, Meta and X operating in Europe. NATO response? A U.S. hostile takeover of Greenland would mean the “end” of the NATO alliance, experts and European leaders have said. In other words. They are not going to do a single thing. As “NO” NATO means that Europe is exposed. It means, China, Russia and anyone with ambitions to go on a war rampage. I think people need to look at what is going on in the world. Look at what took part in Venezuela. They went in. They flexed muscle and they got the job done. A historical beacon. The world may or may not be a better place. One thing. There is clear marker on who rules and those that are so into the financial rat race that has corrupted it's integrity and commitment to the millions of people you represent. I think the key to our success as a civilization is to rule with the best interest of the people. We have to start here at home. Put an end to those homeless...

JOE INGINO

Proud Member of :

Royal Legion 43

Member since 2014

MASON LODGE No 649

Oshawa Member since 2016

Moose Lodge 2132

Oshawa Lodge 2132/WOTM

Chapter 1759 Member since 2015

WING 420 Member since 2017

WE ARE OSHAWA

Member since 2015

Wheeling and Area

Chamber of Commerce

Member since 2000

Weirton Chamber of Commerce

Member since 2000

Wetzel County Chamber of Commerce

Member since 2000

Former

Kiwanis Westmount (Oshawa)

Former

Kinsmen of Oshawa

Member 2015 - of Courtice 2015,

Secretary 2017

Former

Courtice Lions Club

Member 2015 (Director)

Member of fundraising committee 2017

Chair of Membership 2017

Vice President -2017-18

Oshawa Naval Veterans

Club

Honorary 2025

2014, 2018, 2022,

City Of Oshawa Mayoral Candidate

2025, Member of Provincial Parliament Candidate for The New Blue Party

JOE INGINO IS AN ACCOMPLISHED WRITER/AUTHOR OF OVER 800,000 Published Columns in Canada and The United States