

OPINION
& EDITORIALS



The CENTRAL NEWSPAPER

Founder & Publisher: Joe Ingino

136 Simcoe St. N., Unit 4. Oshawa ON L1G 4S7

Tel: 905-432-2657

Email: newspaper@ocentral.com

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

Canada self-destructive war on success

By Marco Navarro-Genie

By treating our best and brightest as liabilities, we are actively guaranteeing our own economic decline. Elon Musk became the world's first trillionaire on June 12, his fortune crossing the line as SpaceX listed on the Nasdaq. Lost in the noise was a fact most Canadians would rather not dwell on. Elon Musk is Canadian. Musk acquired his citizenship in 1989 through his mother, Maye, born in Saskatchewan. He cleaned a boiler room near Vancouver, laboured on a cousin's farm, and spent two years at Queen's University in Kingston before transferring to the University of Pennsylvania and never moving back. Asked years later why he had crossed the Atlantic, Musk said he came to North America for the chance to do great things in technology. Read the geography in that sentence. North America, and in practice the United States. Silicon Valley held the capital, the customers, and the tolerance for risk. Canada held the doorway. Honesty requires a concession. Musk did not flee Canadian hostility in 1992. The technological frontier ran through California, and almost any founder chasing it would have gone where he went. Canada lost him that year to opportunity, not to malice. The malice came later, and it ran the other way. In February 2025, a parliamentary petition sponsored by New Democrat MP Charlie Angus demanded that Ottawa revoke Musk's citizenship and void his passport. The petition gathered more than 360,000 signatures, among the largest the Commons had ever recorded. The Citizenship Act permits no such thing, so the campaign changed nothing in law. The sentiment it recorded is the point. What mattered was not what the petition could do but what it revealed. Grant the petitioners their strongest grievance. A Trump administration was musing aloud about annexing Canada, threatening tariffs, and seating at its centre a Canadian who had poured his fortune into American politics. Set against that provocation, the response still shrinks. The annexation talk was presidential bluster, not a column of armour at the border, and the petition answered it by demanding Ottawa strip a man of his nationality. The alarm outran the threat. Notice the instrument it reached for. Confronted with a successful son who had cast his lot with the other side, the reflex was expulsion rather than contest, and the country applies that reflex to far more than people. Consider the same disposition at the national scale. What appeared in miniature in the petition appears more broadly in the country's treatment of investment and enterprise. Between 2015 and 2024, by the Royal Bank of Canada's own reckoning, more than \$1 trillion in net investment left the country, the largest capital exodus in Canadian history. For every dollar that came in, two went out, and RBC ranked Canada dead last in the G7 for investment at home.

The money did not evaporate. It went hunting, as Musk did, for higher returns and a warmer welcome, mostly south of the border. The capital was never even absent. Canadian firms sat on more than \$1 trillion in cash they declined to deploy at home. The country was not short of money. It was short of reasons to keep it. Here the irony sharpens to a point. The same RBC study named six sectors in which Canada must find some \$1.8 trillion over the coming decade to lead the G7 in growth. One of those six is space, a field in which Canada once punched above its weight through achievements such as the Canadarm. Canada produced the founder of the world's dominant space company, watched him build it under another flag, moved to cancel his nationality, and now learns from its largest bank that space ranks among the industries in which the country trails and must spend a fortune to rejoin. Canada exiled the asset and kept the invoice. Could SpaceX have risen on Canadian soil? Most likely not. It survives on NASA and Pentagon contracts no Canadian firm could win, and Tesla drew on venture pools whose Canadian counterparts stay shallow to this day. Canada could not have built Musk's companies in the 1990s, and it has spent the decade since manufacturing the reasons the next founder will leave: uncompetitive taxes, a regulatory thicket that turns projects into endurance tests, a federal posture that treats resource development as something to apologize for. Capital reads these signals the way water reads a slope. The petition and the exodus rhyme. A confident country claims its successful and competes to hold it. An insecure one treats achievement as a problem to manage, reaches for the instruments of expulsion, a revoked passport in one case and a punishing fiscal regime in the other, and then wonders why the builders and their money keep settling somewhere friendlier. Canadians tell themselves a flattering story that the world quietly longs to be Canadian. The Musk episode shatters the story. Canada produced a Canadian who conquered the commercial world, and the instinct was to disown him. Canada did not lose Elon Musk to America. It practically gave him away, for the same reasons it keeps giving away its capital, and then asked for the passport back. A country that cannot keep its builders keeps only the grievance.

Canada's First Nations water policy defies common sense

By Brian Giesbrecht

Billions in taxpayer dollars won't solve a policy that ignores the real issue "Everyone in Canada should have access to reliable, safe and clean drinking water." That's the claim the Assembly of First Nations (AFN) National Chief Cindy Woodhouse Nepinak makes when she demands \$44.2 billion to address the water needs of Canada's 3,426 reserves, instead of the \$4.6 billion proposed by Indigenous Services Minister Mandy Gull-Masty in Bill C-37, the First Nations Clean Water Act. Indians on reserves deserve clean water. The real question is how to provide it. Can Canada realistically build and maintain modern water systems in every remote settlement, regardless of cost or geography? Most Canadians pay for the water they use. On reserves, taxpayers pay the bill. But why? There is no reference to water in any of the numbered treaties. Governments have nevertheless assumed responsibility for paying for water services on reserves. It is a policy choice, not a treaty obligation. With Bill C-37, Ottawa wants to upgrade water treatment plants and wastewater systems. It estimates that addressing the remaining 36 to 38 long-term drinking water advisories will require roughly \$778 million. The AFN says far more money is needed. But after decades of spending billions, Canadians should ask whether the problem is a lack of funding or a policy that ignores geography. Mismanagement by some band councils has contributed to past failures. Treatment plants are poorly maintained and money is misspent. But geography is just as important. Providing municipal services to tiny communities on remote Canadian Shield rock is enormously expensive. Wawakapewin is a case in point. A reserve in northern Ontario still under a boil-water advisory, it has 37 people in 15 homes. A treatment plant there could cost as much as \$1 million per home because all heavy equipment, electrical components and specialized engineers must be flown in by charter or hauled over seasonal ice roads. It is far cheaper to fly in bottled water. Flying in designer water from Paris might even be cheaper. But Wawakapewin produces nothing of value. There is virtually no employment. The community is entirely dependent on government for survival. Were these not government-supported reserves, the population would have moved elsewhere long ago.

At what point does building permanent infrastructure for tiny, isolated communities become less practical than helping people move to places where schools, jobs and municipal services already exist? The late Gordon Gibson, a former British Columbia cabinet minister, spent much of his life arguing that governments should relocate entire remote communities nearer to job centres, keeping families together while educators helped them adjust before moving on to employment in the cities. It would give young people access to education, employment and opportunity instead of permanent dependence. Instead, the AFN has encouraged residents of economically hopeless communities to stay put. It clings to the unrealistic notions of the 1996 Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, which held that places like Wawakapewin were "nations" destined to become prosperous if only more money and powers envisioned under the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) were granted. The results speak for themselves. Such communities grow ever more dependent, and dysfunction like addiction only increases.

Shamattawa, in northern Manitoba, is now suing Ottawa over water. The suit will probably succeed, more money will be spent, and nothing will change. Shamattawa has a rapidly growing youth population and one of the highest rates of fetal alcohol spectrum disorder in the world.

Instead of demanding more money and more race-based powers, why don't the chiefs make demands on each other? Why not help young people move where education and employment are possible, and graduate the engineers, doctors and tradesmen their communities need so badly? Indigenous people are five per cent of Canada's population but fewer than one per cent of engineers. Ottawa continues to respond to failing policies with more funding while avoiding the harder question of whether the policy itself needs to change. Some wise person defined insanity as doing the same thing over and over, expecting a different result. Someone should tell that to Ottawa and the Chiefs.

Letters To The Editor:

WHAT IS ON YOUR MIND? Send letters to newspaper@ocentral.com

Dear Editor:

This letter is in regards to your editorial "Tale of the Candidates," that appeared in the June 16th Central. The essential message in this editorial was that neither of the two candidates running for Mayor of Oshawa "should be in politics, because they both had their chance at real change and both have failed." Please understand that I fully support your right to publish an opinion, regardless of whether or not I agree with it. The reason that I am writing is to advise that you need to publish a further editorial to fully explain and to validate your position.

Jim Lee, the newcomer, is a name that I don't recognize. Tito-Dante Marimpietri is a long-standing name in Oshawa, and will likely win, simply due to his name recognition. However, since you disapprove of both of them, you need to offer very specific examples as to exactly what they have done or have failed to do during their time in office -- we need specific incidents, details, and deeds, not just the vague generalities that you wrote, which are nothing less than meaningless character smears. Again, not necessarily disagreeing with you, Joe, just asking you to validate your opinion with facts.

Also, if no one else steps forward to run for Mayor, and if Jim and Tito remain as the only two candidates, then you also must provide us your advice as to what you recommend at the voting booth -- to check the less onerous of the two, to leave both names unchecked, or even to write in another name. Because like it not, one of these two people will become Oshawa's next Mayor. I look forward to your follow-up opinion in the next Central, complete with full details and specifics of the shortcomings of both Mayoral candidates, along with your voting advice..

Thank You,
Marvin Sandomirsky

Dear Editor:

From the Salem News Insider... I suggest that this is worth circulating...

John Adams and Thomas Jefferson Both Died on July 4, 1826; Was it Providence?

That is: Was it just a historical coincidence that two of the central characters in the American revolution both died on the same day—exactly 50 years after the signing of the Declaration of Independence? Albert Mohler: Americans at that time were astounded—and modern Americans should pause to think. Here were two of the most central figures in American history—once friends, then enemies, then friends again—whose personal contributions to American independence were beyond question. They had served together, at times eagerly and at times awkwardly.... The vast majority of Americans alive at the time saw the deaths of Adams and Jefferson as a sign of God's providence in the American experience.... It's an old debate, but the observance of July 4, 2026, the 250th anniversary of the American experience, is also the bicentennial of July 4, 1826, when the old patriots, Jefferson and Adams both died.... This has to be a good and healthy opportunity for today's Americans to understand anew what is at stake. It's all either coincidence or providence. What is your answer? (World).

PAL

Dear Editor:

For decades, politicians talked about unlocking the Ring of Fire.They studied it. They delayed it. They made promises they never kept.The Ontario PCs are getting it done.Today, we broke ground on the Webequie Supply Road, a major milestone that puts us years ahead of schedule in connecting the Ring of Fire to the rest of Ontario.The Ring of Fire is a once-in-a-generation opportunity that will create more than 70,000 good-paying jobs, strengthen our economy and help make Ontario a global leader in critical minerals. These minerals are essential for everything from advanced manufacturing and electric vehicles to national defence. Instead of letting other countries lead, we're making sure those jobs and investments are created right here in Ontario.And we're doing it the right way. We're working in partnership with First Nations to build lasting infrastructure, create new economic opportunities and support true economic reconciliation. While previous Liberal governments spent years talking, our Ontario PC team is putting shovels in the ground, building the roads Northern Ontario needs and creating opportunities for future generations.We're protecting Ontario. We're creating jobs. And we're building a stronger, more self-reliant future for our province.

Thank you for standing with our Ontario PC team.

Sincerely, Doug Ford

Dear Editor:

Hello from planet reality. I live downtown Oshawa. It is an election year and it appears that the politicians are out buzzing trying to harvest votes. I am having a real hard time deciding who to vote for the downtown ward. Also it appears we have no choice for Mayor. The inbred incumbents are jockeying for better pay and offer the same nothing we been getting. I would not vote in the one of those running that were already in council. Look at that disgrace of a 'Veterans' park.

Whose brilliant idea was to waste millions on a over inflated childrens play area now being used by the homeless visiting from Memorial Park.

These are the candidates. Incompetents that can't realize that the last thing we need downtown is another park.

On any given day. Homeless and drug addicts are all over. I would never take family to that filth. God know what you can catch from sitting on those benches. It turns my stomach.

You hear the politician boasting on all they have done. What great prosperity Oshawa offers. Where? Are they blind? Ignorant of the facts? Or so far out of touch with reality that they are attempting to blind us with their arrogance and fibs?

I have an idea. I think that municipal leaders should work off minimum wage. Mayor to donate his/her/it/them/they..... wages to better the core.

Let's see how many of the free loaders already registered quickly drop out. We don't need 11 council members?

We have Mayors powers. All we need is one mayor. Let him/her take the responsibility and civil duty to serve his community.

Archie Arnolds, Oshawa

SEND LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

 newspaper@ocentral.com

or

mail to 136 Simcoe St. North Suite 4 Oshawa