

Media Prep Sheet: Newstalk 1010 Roundtable Round 1 Panellist

Location: In Studio - 260 Richmond Street (299 Queen Street West), the greeting producer's name is Jessie Lorraine

Date: Monday, May 1, 2017

Time: 7:30 Arrival Time & Briefing – 7:47AM Live on air commercial free until 8AM

Premier,

Monday morning you will be joining John Moore on his show Moore in the Morning on Newstalk 1010. This won't be a traditional interview, you will be a panellist on The Roundtable: Round 1. Every morning John assembles a group of regulars (which sometimes includes the likes of Yvan Baker and Tim Hudak) to chat about, argue over and opine on the top news stories of the day. You participated in a similar roundtable on Ryan Doyle's show last summer.

The other panellists joining you and John on Monday are Lorrie Goldstein, Christie Blatchford and James Laidlaw. I have included their bios below and for Lorrie and Christie I have included their most recent columns.

Although Lorrie and Christie don't agree with you politically, they do respect you, so the conversation will be tough, but I think respectful. They will most likely challenge you when they think they are being given message track or talking points. MPP Baker wanted me to pass along that using personal stories and anecdotes really helps with this criticism.

We will not know the topics for discussion until Sunday night or Monday morning at 7AM. But remember, this isn't a typical interview, so much of what you will say will come from your core beliefs and common sense (although last time you agreed with Adrienne Batra on something and we ALL got thrown for a loop!). We will also have time to talk about the topics and you'll be able to jot down brief notes and bring them in with you.

If budget related issues come up, which they most likely will, you can go back to that one pager of messaging that you've been using for all your interviews. I have included that below. I have also included a transcript of Patrick Brown's interview with Jerry Agar following the budget.

Please let me know if you have any questions – 647-299-5435.

Have a great weekend!

Jenn

ROUNDTABLE BIOS

Lorrie Goldstein



Lorrie Goldstein

Toronto Sun - Lorrie Goldstein is Acting Comment Editor of the Toronto Sun. He joined the Sun in 1978, working as a general assignment reporter, feature writer, Toronto City Hall reporter, Queen's Park reporter, columnist and bureau chief, City Editor and Editorial Page Editor. His main focus is on Toronto, Ontario, Canadian and global politics, with a special interest in the many controversies surrounding the issue of global warming.

Lorrie may try to throw you off your game by references the price of things like milk and gas and asking you what that is. I've included some of that here:

Price of Milk – At the Loblaws the price of a 2L carton of milk is about \$4. A 4L bag of milk is about \$4.50-\$5

Price of Gas – A litre of gas in Toronto (average) has been in and around \$1.12/\$1.15

Unemployment Rate – The unemployment rate in Ontario is 6.4 (our unemployment rate has been below the national average for 24 months)

Lorrie was in the budget lock-up and wrote the following column:

If you believe Ontario Premier Kathleen Wynne's claim that through her sound fiscal management she has balanced the province's books and can now spend more on public services, I have a bridge in Brooklyn I'd like to sell you.

Progressive Conservative leader Patrick Brown rightly called Wynne's budget a "Hail Mary pass" Thursday, cooked up by a Liberal government desperately trying to clean up the financial mess it's made of the province's books for the past 14 years, in time for next year's election.

Brown said despite Wynne's claim of a balanced budget – the first since 2008 – the Liberals are actually hiding a \$5 billion operating deficit.

He said they're covering it up with one-time sales of government assets valued at \$1 billion, \$2 billion from cap and trade, \$1.5 billion in federal "Trudeau trust fund" cash and by counting \$500 million in pension assets as revenue, an accounting trick rejected by Ontario Auditor General Bonnie Lysyk.

Beyond these shell games, the Liberals are massively increasing borrowing over the next three years, hiking it by \$18 billion to \$96.5 billion. That's 23% higher than the \$78.5 billion the Liberals said they would need just one year ago.

This, no doubt, will be part of their political slush fund for bribing us with our own money in Wynne's next budget, which will come down shortly before next year's election in June.

It's the same trick Wynne is using to "lower" our electricity bills starting June 1 by 17% (plus the earlier 8% HST cut on Jan. 1) by racking up \$25 billion in new debt to be paid back by taxpayers.

Despite Wynne's claim of balancing the budget this year, Ontario's total debt will still increase by \$11.5 billion in 2017-18 to \$311.9 billion, with another hike of \$12 billion next year, because of debt servicing costs.

Since the Liberals came to power in 2003, when the provincial debt was \$138.8 billion, they have added a staggering \$173.1 billion in debt, a 125% increase in 14 years, far outstripping inflation and population growth.

Also, when the Liberals came into power in 2003, the province's debt to GDP ratio, a key indicator of economic health, was at a reasonable 27%.

Today, it's at 37.5% and while Wynne has pledged to reduce that ratio to pre-recession levels, her budget contains no plan for doing so.

Despite Wynne's and Sousa's happy talk, there's no free lunch.

Public debt is simply deferred tax hikes and service cuts to be paid by future generations – our children and grandchildren – who will pay tomorrow for the reckless spending of Ontario's Liberals today.

CORRECTION: *An earlier version of my column stated that Ontario Finance Minister Charles Sousa had not provided revenue and expense estimates for how the government will achieve balanced budgets in 2018-19 and 2019-20 in Thursday's budget. This was incorrect and I apologize to Minister Sousa.*

Christie Blachford



Christie Blachford was born in Quebec and studied journalism at Ryerson University in Toronto. She has written for all four Toronto-based newspapers. She has won a National Newspaper Award for column writing and in 2008 won the Governor-General's Literary Award in non-fiction.

for her book *Fifteen Days: Stories of Bravery, Friendship, Life and Death from Inside the New Canadian Army*.

Below is Christie's most recent story:

Christie Blatchford: The uncomfortable questions once again being asked of Ontario's chief pathologist

To borrow from the immortal words of the Talking Heads in Once in a Lifetime, "And you may ask yourself, well, how did I get here?"

How can it be that almost a decade after the Goudge inquiry released its report into the messy trail left behind by former SickKids' pathologist Dr. Charles Smith, the white knight who rode in to build Ontario a new forensic service and save the day is now being asked uncomfortably familiar questions?

The white knight, of course, is Dr. Michael Pollanen, Ontario's chief forensic pathologist since 2006, the year that allegations about Smith reached a critical mass and prompted a sweeping coroner's review. It found that Smith had reached dubious conclusions of foul play in 20 child autopsies, some of which ended in wrongful convictions.

That in turn led to the Goudge inquiry, headed by now-retired Ontario Court of Appeal Justice Stephen Goudge, who concluded in 2008 that Smith had "actively misled" his superiors, "made false and misleading statements in court" and exaggerated his expertise.

Compare that to the language reluctantly used last month by Ontario Superior Court Justice Anne Molloy to describe Pollanen.

She found that he had failed to properly prepare before testifying and "nevertheless expressed an opinion with certainty"; had "offered opinions beyond his area of expertise"; looked for ways to shore up those opinions; and "started from a position that this was a case of abuse, which he then sought to prove."

In other words, Molloy was suggesting, like his disgraced predecessor Smith, Pollanen did not approach the case with an open mind and was "thinking dirty."

The former boy wonder – he hung out at the old forensic pathology department as a teenager – had testified before Molloy in a voir dire at the trial of Joel France.

The 39-year-old France was accused of second-degree murder in the July 14, 2013 death of two-year-old Nicholas Cruz, the child of his live-in girlfriend.

At the preliminary hearing in October of 2014, Pollanen testified that the lethal injury to the little boy — he died of septic shock, secondary to a rupture of his intestinal wall — had been caused by "a significant force," likely a "punch, a kick or a stomp" to his abdomen.

In cross-examination he flatly told France's lawyer, Nathan Gorham, that a short fall, say from the edge of a crib, could not have caused the injuries.

Pollanen brought up the fact that “this is actually an area that has been studied in the medical literature. It’s — in the medical literature you look (it) up...”

And that literature, Pollanen said, showed that “falls in childhood are innocuous. They’re trivial.”

He was unequivocal.

But Gorham did what he suggested, and reviewed the literature, and by the time Pollanen testified at the pre-trial before Molloy, Gorham had his ducks in order.

Pollanen brought a new supplementary report with him, which he said he wrote to survey the literature and answer the hypothesis that a short fall could have caused the little boy’s injury.

But in cross-examination, Gorham asked that very question. Pollanen said it was possible, but that in his opinion it had not.

Gorham then showed him a volume of 26 scholarly articles, many of which cited examples of children suffering perforated intestines after falls from a short height.

Pollanen hadn’t seen 23 of them before.

He acknowledged his answer at the preliminary hearing was wrong, and that he hadn’t looked at the literature.

Molloy was clearly shocked.

As she put it once, “he started his task with the mindset that this child had been the victim of assault and he approached everything thereafter from that mindset, including his testimony in court...”

She also pronounced Pollanen’s answers around how long he’d belatedly spent doing the literature review “evasive and disingenuous.”

Molloy ruled he couldn’t give his opinion on whether an assault had caused the boy’s injuries and couldn’t say the required force was “significant” — a decision that knocked the stuffing out of the Crown’s theory that France deliberately administered the fatal blow. After the ruling, prosecutors and defence lawyers reached a plea bargain, with France pleading guilty to manslaughter for failing to get Nicholas medical help.

It was a bolt out of the blue – a stunning, uncharacteristic and eerily familiar flaw in a man who prided himself on being the anti-Charles Smith.

Yet there were early signs that some of the same trappings that led to Smith becoming virtually unassailable in court for so long – deferential if not reverential treatment, a growing self-confidence and the simple fact that scientists can often bedazzle lawyers with scientific language — may have been in play for Pollanen too.

In 2002, a Baltimore lawyer named J. Wyndal Gordon filed a formal complaint against Pollanen with the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario, alleging that Pollanen had “attempted to mask his credentials and deceive others” by not explicitly declaring that he was at the time a

post-graduate student and visiting medical examiner training at the Chief Medical Examiner's Office for Washington.

It was only while he was there, in 2001, that his licence to practise kicked in.

Pollanen had testified about the cause of death in a so-called "shaken baby" case that sent a man to jail. (He was re-tried last year and was convicted again.)

It's unclear what, if anything, happened as a result of the complaint. College spokeswoman Kathryn Clarke said this week that unless a screening committee has concerns and refers the matter to a hearing, complaints aren't made public. "Dr. Pollanen," she said, "does not have a complaints/discipline history reportable on the public register."

In 2002, Pollanen testified at the coroner's inquest into the death of Lana Lewis, a 45-year-old Toronto mother of three who died on Sept. 12, 1996, about two weeks after her last visit to her chiropractor for a neck manipulation.

In the course of the sometimes heated and controversial case, Pollanen changed his opinion as to the cause of death: he first said the death was linked to chiropractic neck manipulation, then said it wasn't. But what is most interesting in hindsight is how carefully Pollanen answered questions about his credentials from Amani Oakley, then a wet-behind-the-ears lawyer representing the Lewis family.

She asked about his testimony in other criminal cases and said, "So they (the courts) were aware you were a student?" to which Pollanen answered, virtually each and every time, "My CV was presented at each occasion where I gave evidence."

Oakley's point — and she was berated for it by the other lawyers, most of whom represented individual chiropractors or their professional bodies — was that he'd "permitted assumptions to stand ... that he was qualified in areas he was not."

Several lawyers even demanded she be forced to apologize to the jury for daring to question Pollanen's expertise.

In the end, the jurors deemed Lewis's death an "accident," meaning they believed it was linked to the chiropractic treatment she'd had.

Pollanen hasn't yet commented upon Molloy's criticism and is out of the country until Monday.

However, Dr. Toby Rose, Ontario's deputy chief forensic pathologist, said that it isn't just pathologists' reports that are subject to peer review, but also "court transcripts following expert testimony of forensic pathologists, which will be the case in this instance as well."

She said, "I also want to stress that (we take) all judgments by the courts very seriously," and that in addition, complaints and concerns are reviewed by the Death Investigation Oversight Council, an oversight body.

James Laidlaw



According to his Social Media profiles, James is the National Director Sales Trackman Canada. He is an active parent & husband, music lover, and brown belt. For the purposes of the Roundtable, James is the Peoples Pundit on Newstalk 1010. James became the people's pundit after winning an on-air competition on Newstalk 1010 a few years ago.

BUDGET MESSAGING

- What we are trying to do with this budget and as a government is speak to the very real concerns that people in Ontario have right now
- Yes, our economy is in a strong position and our budget is balanced—these are good things and I'd like to thank Minister Sousa for his hard work getting us here
- But the reality is that we both know people are anxious about their jobs and their futures
- They worry about the soaring cost of housing, the rise in part-time work and decline in benefits
- So what you're seeing today is the foundation of our plan to address these anxieties
- There's no better place to start than investing in health care—and we've invested deeply
- OHIP+ will give everyone 24 years old and under free access to prescription drugs, filling a serious gap that's been created because so many jobs no longer provide this coverage for families—it's the biggest change to Medicare in Ontario in a generation
- We are investing in major capital hospital projects around the province and giving a big boost to hospital operating budgets which is going to mean lower wait times
- We're investing in education—right through the system, starting with more child care spaces

- And we're making university and college tuition absolutely free for 210,000 students, while others from middle-class homes will have much lower levels of student debt
- We are also focusing on those areas that will help make life more affordable through initiatives like our Fair Housing Plan and Fair Hydro Plan
- With this balanced budget we have the freedom and flexibility to respond to the new challenges people are facing in this new world
- We must make the right choices now to support the people of Ontario as we all navigate this turbulence and set our province on a course toward long-term success and I see this budget as the foundation for that
- There are some who look at this new world and say that government should just step back and stay out of it—let the market sort itself out—but those are not my values
- I believe there is a need for government to stand up and play an active role in building a fair society where there is more opportunity for everyone and more security too
- We cannot be idle or complacent where it comes to our economy and to trade
- We cannot simply assume that the jobs of tomorrow will be available to Ontarians
- This is the time for us to be focused, fair, and bold—to not simply describe and reassert our values, but to defend them and act on them
- That's what we've done with this budget and what you will continue to see us do over the days and months ahead

CITY OF TORONTO BUDGET MESSAGING

- No government in the history of this province has invested more in Toronto transit and housing and this budget continues with these unprecedented investments.
- The budget increases our already historic investment in infrastructure to \$190 billion over 13 years meaning additional infrastructure funding for transit, for housing, for schools, for hospitals, for bridges and for roads.
- All regions of this province including the City of Toronto will benefit from this additional \$30 Billion.

- For Toronto the budget includes \$130 million for social housing repair, \$340 million for homelessness prevention, \$130 million for affordable housing and we're also leveraging provincial land worth up to \$100M to build 2,000 new affordable housing units in the city.
- The budget doubles the City of Toronto's transit funding through the gas tax to \$340 Million per year.
- Let's also not forget all of the other projects we're currently funding in the City of Toronto.
- This includes \$5.3 billion for the Eglinton Crosstown, \$1.2 billion for the Finch West LRT and \$3.7 billion for GO RER within Toronto, which will enable SmartTrack.
- It also includes investments that are helping us get ready for the transit projects of tomorrow, including the \$150 million for planning and design work on the Toronto Relief Line and the more than \$55 million for the same work on the Yonge North Subway.
- We will continue to work with the federal government as phase two infrastructure investments outlined in the recent federal budget are implemented, including collaboration on additional new projects to benefit the City of Toronto

TRANSCRIPT – Patrick Brown on Newstalk 1010 with Jerry Agar – April 28, 2017

MPP: Patrick Brown

Media: Jerry Agar (Newstalk 1010)

Time: 10:50 AM

[START TRANSCRIPT]

Agar: I think what people really want to know from the Conservatives is, is what you would do differently, how would the budget look differently if you were doing it?

Brown:

- Well, first of all it would be a balanced budget, not a fictional one
- There is so much different we need to do with this government and, and, Jerry, I know you get that
- One of the starting points I would have is a value-for-money audit on the entire government, because the more I look at this government, the more examples—egregious examples—of waste we see
- And you name any department, I can give you examples of waste and, and frankly, we don't have a revenue problem, we have a spending problem with this government
- And what they're doing is they're hiding the debt as a way to confuse the public
- They put some of it—their hydro plan's not a hydro plan, it just borrows and they put that cost on the OPG
- Their infrastructure spending they call 'off-budget spending', but the debt still goes up

- It, it, it, it's all a shell game, and, and I think the people of Ontario want us to watch every taxpayer dollar properly
- And what I mean by that is I look at healthcare and I see these giant new LHINs where they're hiding—hir-, hiring—78 new executive vice-presidents, more bureaucracy at the expense of frontline care, more paper-pushers
- The last thing we need in healthcare is more paper-pushers, when we can't even afford nurses, you know—

Agar: Would you cancel that, if you became Premier?

Brown:

- I would absolutely cut the fat, administrative spending in healthcare
- Do I think we need 78 new LHIN vice presidents?—absolutely not, I would immediately stop that, we don't need more paper-pushers
- You know, I, I look at hydro, you, you want something I'd cancel right away?—I'd cancel the 'Bad Contracts Act'
- I look at the Green Energy Act, you know, we overpay by 9.2-billion so far and we're still doing it
- Jerry, we're spilling water power every day—Merrickville, Manitou, Niagara Falls—we're charging Ontarians to give it away
- We're giving it to Pennsylvania, New York and we're charging Ontarians for it
- So something I want to cancel, I want to cancel the Green Energy Act, which has been an unmitigated disaster

Agar: We do know that cancelling contracts can get very expensive, we saw that with the hydro plants that were going to be built and then not built. And I doubt that whether they have shown you the contract, do you know for sure that cancelling the contract would end up being cheaper for us than the contracts we have for wind, etcetera?

Brown:

- So Jerry, a few great points there, they will not share the major contracts
- There are 30 mega contracts that they got \$1.3 million in donations which is a scandal in itself
- Energy we don't need they benefited, the Liberal Party did
- We have only one copy that they accidentally leaked to us, the Samsung deal, they actually released it on a different release
- On that there was an exit clause for a billion and a half of surplus electricity that we could have taken
- If similar provisions exist in the other contracts we could be out of all our surplus energy
- But it's not just the old contracts, they keep signing new ones, Jerry, knowing that we don't need it they keep on signing new ones
- The day after their fair hydro plan or the borrowing plan, they proceeded with 1100 more
- They're about to proceed with LRP 2 and if the notice to proceed has not gone out, you can cancel with almost minimal costs
- And I have to say, why do they keep signing these deals?

- Is it because they're their friends, their supporters, their financial benefactors?
- Something smells in the province of Ontario that we're continuing to purchase and sign contracts for energy that we do not need; and we're giving it away to our competitors in the U.S.
- It stinks and I'm going to stop it

Agar: The NDP would do pretty much a universal drug plan, in the budget that came out yesterday the Liberals have promised a drug plan, which actually sounds better than it is because for a lot of the people under 25 they're already covered in one way or another anyways. What would you do with that?

Brown:

- Well Jerry, how about means testing?
- I look at Justin Bieber, he would qualify under their plan
- He's worth what—200-million-plus there or growing
- He'd get free coverage under them
- What irritates me about this, about this photo op they're doing on, on a drug plan
- We already have 7 drug benefit plans that they run, and they're not running properly
- So now they're going to create an eighth plan and with no means testing
- What that means, you've got millionaire kids, who are going to get their drugs covered
- But when you look at rare disorders, you look at orphaned patients, they get no help
- I, I think of the Madi Vanstone who wasn't, who wasn't going to be covered
- I think right now, there's a new drug for cystic fibrosis, approved by Health Canada, that's not available in Ontario
- It will not be covered for a person who can't afford it in the province of Ontario
- But a millionaire's kid is going to get their drugs covered

Agar: So you would cancel this program if it were in-place and the next election you won, I'm talking to Patrick Brown, the leader of the Progressive Conservatives; you would cancel this thing that they announced yesterday?

Brown:

- I'm going to fix the drug benefits in, in Ontario
- What I mean by that, is I'm not going to subsidize drugs for millionaire kids
- I'm not going to be paying for Justin Bieber's drug *inaudible* for millionaires
- I'm not going to be paying for their drugs
- I'm going to make sure those that actually need it are the ones we take care of
- I think of Madi Vanstone, that 12 year old who was on life *inaudible* who, who, who wasn't going to live unless she got help
- Those are the people that I want to fight for

Agar: Okay, John Tory is not happy, I think that up until now he has tried at least publicly to look as though he can get along with Kathleen Wynne, he may have started to give up on that, he

feels that this budget abandon Toronto, do you think that's fair and what would you do for the city?

Brown:

- I think John had made some very legitimate concerns and I think he's right to be upset
- So let's, let's talk about his two big concerns
- On Toronto Community Housing Corporation, he expected help
- You know, they could save 6.2-million-dollars-a-year simply by buying natural gas at the City of Toronto rates instead of being forced to buy under the province's scheme
- That would save 6.2 million
- The city has asked for it, the province has rejected that
- I think that's a fair request
- Another thing that council has put forward is people who are evicted from social housing, jails, those prisoners who are convicted
- So, convicted criminals, when they get released, they automatically get a spot
- And the provincial Liberals insist this is appropriate
- City Council has argued, 'is it?'
- Frankly, I agree with City Council that it's outrageous
- I don't know why the province continues to obstruct Toronto's request on that
- On infrastructure, remember Jerry in beginning interview I was talking about value for money

Agar: Yeah

Brown

- We're spending \$190 billion on infrastructural over the next 13 years
- Yet Kathleen Wynne making spending promises for 2030
- But on that value for money, the Auditor General did a report that didn't get a lot of attention
- And it said in December, we could be seeing cost overruns of 35 percent
- We were repaving a road on the 403 every 2 years instead of every 15 years
- You know we had companies getting contracts to build things like bridges
- They had no history in building
- Doing it wrong
- Because they don't actually monitor results
- We don't monitor – are you getting value for taxpayer dollars
- They culture I want to bring to Queen's Park is we're going to make sure every dollar that people pay in taxes gets spent appropriately
- And there's no better example of how it's wasted when I look at infrastructure
- So when John Tory says he's not seeing help on infrastructure, he's right
- Because it's being wasted by government that does not monitor what they spend

Host: Patrick Brown, leader of the Progressive Conservative. Thanks very much

Brown:

- My pleasure

[END TRANSCRIPT]