

The CENTRAL NEWSPAPER

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



LOGIC

Joe Ingino

“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 -

63 Million Insults And Our Mayor Thanks Them...

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

What is wrong with Oshawa... It has got so bad that even the Generals Hockey Team management has publicly asked that fans bathe before attending games as some have complained that Oshawa fans stink. Even though management retracted the statement. It STILL STINKS. That they would make such a statement public in the first place...

But they are not to blame as we do suck and we do stink... as how can any one thank GM for investing 63 million when they are responsible for our Oshawa's economic demise. For the loss of over 30,000 good paying jobs. For the decay in quality of life in Oshawa.

Not to mention the environmental mess they have left Oshawa. Yes, folks. "They Have Left", as anyone that thinks GM has any influence on our local workforce as they once did... has to go get their heads checked.

The days when GM workers could buy a house, a car a cottage and be able to send their kids to University are long gone. This recent announcement is a total insult to Oshawa and all it's Citizens. Yet, we have our phantom Mayor drop to his media knees and thank GM as if they are doing something great for Oshawa.

In reality GM use of the lands they so claim they own.... That they rightly pay taxes on. According to record. GM was awarded those lands for as long as they produce cars in Oshawa.

Once GM pulls out or stopped producing cars. Those lands default back to the City of Oshawa.

This means we the taxpayers own those properties that are worth billions of dollars. Unfortunately in many cases an equivalent price tag for environmental clean up goes with it.

Then you ask. Why is GM tossing us a token.... Simple. GM by putting those lands as their ownership possess great financial gain.

If they loose title. This means a loss to the company books. Not to mention the possibility of having to clean the polluted lands.

It makes business sense to cut a cheque for a few millions to keep the status quo and keep draining Oshawa. No one can say that they are not producing cars.

I can tell you one thing. Oshawa has no leadership. Thank God that Carter is not coming back. The danger is that if a guy like Titto as he is being groomed to replace "yes" man Carter with "Si" man Titto. We are in for the economical spiral of our lives. You can be assure our taxes will continue to skyrocket and our quality of life slip to new lows.

You wonder... how can I make such bold statements... Well think of this way. Titto has sat on council for what 20 years. What has he contributed. I live in his ward. I have yet to see him in my office or at my residence. He does not even return phone calls. I am his City Newspaper and he does not return calls. Imagine how he treats the average taxpayer.

In 2026 we need to clean out the old and bring in the new. Guys like Giberson, Kerr, Mckonkey, Neil don't belong in politics as all they done for Oshawa is sit on their hands and contributed little or nothing. Giberson a third rate musician and before politics a dead beat. How can you expect anything. Kerr an actor... self professed teacher and Mckonkey a realtor... They are and were over their heads when it comes to dealing with million dollar decisions. Giberson and Kerr had 2 terms to clean downtown and they done nothing. If I am wrong. I publicly challenge them to prove me wrong by writing a letter to the editor with their accomplishments. Councillors like Nicholson, Chapman, Lee... They should have never been politics. Nicholson is distant voice that is not representative of the people of Oshawa. Chapman, should have done the honorable thing and retired. He is not management material and as his leadership qualities... I bring to question as he has done nothing to improve the quality of life in Oshawa. He should know better. As for Lee. I am so disappointed. He has truly done nothing for his ward and he truly does not belong in politics.

Then what is left. Gray and Marks. If we have to pick an incumbent for Mayor...and the choice is Titto vs Gray. My money is on Gray. As for Marks. He has potential but sits watching the political storms come and go and is restrained from making a difference. The one guy with potential... 62 Million, please

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



Canada's Defence Strategy Is a Start — However, Parliament Must Finish the Job

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

Canada has released a new defence industrial strategy. It is ambitious. It is overdue. However, it will fail unless Parliament is prepared to confront the structural dysfunction that has plagued our defence policy for decades.

I write this not as a commentator from the sidelines, but as a former Member of Parliament who sat on the defence committee and witnessed firsthand the recurring cycle of announcements, consultations, delays, cost escalations, and strategic drift. We have seen white papers come and go. We have seen procurement "resets." We have heard promises of reform. The problem has never been the absence of strategy documents. The problem has been the absence of execution. The new strategy recognizes something fundamental: defence is no longer simply about purchasing equipment. It is about sovereignty, industrial capacity, and geopolitical credibility. It correctly links military capability with economic resilience. It acknowledges that Canada cannot continue to outsource critical security functions and remain strategically relevant. However, here is the uncomfortable truth: strategy without structural reform will simply produce another decade of underperformance.

The Procurement Paralysis - During my time on the defence committee, one issue resurfaced constantly: procurement paralysis. Projects that should take five years take fifteen. Requirements are rewritten repeatedly. Risk aversion becomes policy. Accountability diffuses across departments until no one is responsible for outcomes.

Canada's allies move. Canada studies. - Meanwhile, the men and women of the Armed Forces wait. We ask them to deploy to Bosnia, Afghanistan and recently Latvia, patrol the Arctic, assist in domestic emergencies, and contribute to NATO reassurance missions. Yet too often we equip them with platforms at the end of their service life, delayed replacements, or capability gaps papered over by temporary fixes.

No industrial strategy will fix this unless we tackle the governance architecture itself.

Procurement in Canada remains fragmented among multiple departments, each with distinct mandates and incentives. Public Services prioritizes process integrity. Treasury Board prioritizes cost control. National Defence prioritizes capability. Innovation departments prioritize industrial benefits. Each objective is legitimate. Together, they often produce gridlock.

If the new defence strategy is serious, it must be accompanied by a structural consolidation of procurement authority with clear lines of responsibility and measurable timelines.

Parliament must demand quarterly reporting on delivery milestones — not aspirational targets, but actual equipment in service.

Sovereignty Is Not a Slogan - The strategy's emphasis on "Build-Partner-Buy" is sound in principle. Canada must build more at home. We must partner intelligently with trusted allies. We must reduce overdependence on any single supplier. However, sovereignty is not achieved by rhetoric. It is achieved by capacity. Do we have domestic ammunition production sufficient to sustain high-intensity operations? Do we have secure supply chains for critical minerals essential to advanced weapons systems? Do we have cyber resilience robust enough to withstand coordinated state-backed attacks? Do we have Arctic infrastructure capable of sustained presence? In too many cases, the answer is: not yet. - The war in Ukraine exposed Western ammunition shortages. The pandemic exposed supply-chain fragility. Cyberattacks on critical infrastructure are no longer hypothetical. And the Arctic is no longer geopolitically quiet.

Canada cannot assume that allies will always have surplus capacity to compensate for our deficits. In a crisis, every country prioritizes its own national interest.

That is not cynicism. It is reality. - NATO Commitments and Strategic Credibility

For years, Canada struggled to meet NATO spending benchmarks. We debated percentages while capability gaps widened. The issue was never merely the 2 percent target. It was credibility. Alliances are sustained by contribution. Influence flows from commitment. When Canada underinvests, we reduce our voice at the table where strategic decisions are made.

If we aspire to shape NATO policy, Arctic security frameworks, or Indo-Pacific engagement, we must demonstrate that we are serious.

Defence spending is not charity to allies. It is an insurance policy for Canada. The Arctic Is the Test No region will test the new strategy more than the Arctic. Climate change is transforming northern geography. Shipping lanes are emerging. Strategic competitors are increasing activity. The Arctic is no longer a peripheral theatre. Canada's sovereignty in the North must be exercised, not merely asserted.

That requires:

- Persistent surveillance · Modernized NORAD capabilities · Air defence and interceptor readiness · Naval presence
- Infrastructure for sustained operations. Without these, sovereignty becomes symbolic.

The defence strategy speaks of industrial growth and technological innovation. Good. However, those investments must translate into tangible northern capability. If ten years from now our Arctic posture remains under-resourced and reactive, the strategy will have failed.

Parliament Must Reclaim Oversight - One lesson from my time on the defence committee is this: Parliament must be more assertive. Oversight cannot consist of occasional hearings and retrospective criticism. It must involve structured, ongoing scrutiny of timelines, cost escalations, industrial offsets, and capability delivery.

- We need: · Transparent procurement dashboards available to Parliament · Independent technical audits
- Clear accountability for missed milestones · Protection for whistleblowers within the procurement system

Without oversight, even well-designed strategies drift. - Defence as National Renewal

There is also an economic dimension that Canadians must understand. Defence industrial capacity is not a sunk cost. It is a driver of innovation. Advanced manufacturing, aerospace engineering, cyber security, artificial intelligence, and quantum research — all spill over into civilian industries. Defence investment, properly managed, strengthens national productivity.

For too long, Canada has treated defence spending as consumption rather than investment.

That mindset must change. The Risk of Complacency The greatest risk facing the new defence strategy is not opposition. It is complacency. We have seen ambitious frameworks before. We have seen cross-party consensus evaporate. We have seen fiscal pressures redirect attention. We have seen projects quietly deferred.

If this strategy becomes another binder on a shelf, Canada will drift further into strategic irrelevance. The world has changed dramatically in the past decade. The security environment is harsher. Great-power competition is more explicit. Technology is transforming warfare at unprecedented speed. Canada must adapt with equal urgency.

A Final Word

When I served on the defence committee, I was struck by the professionalism and dedication of our Armed Forces personnel. They do their duty without complaint. They operate with limited resources. They adapt continuously. The least Parliament can do is match that seriousness with institutional reform. Canada's new defence strategy is a necessary beginning. But it is only that — a beginning. If we are serious about sovereignty, credibility, and national resilience, we must move beyond announcements and deliver structural reform. Strategy is easy. Execution is leadership. And leadership, at this moment, is what Canada requires most

LOCAL COMMUNITY LEADERS KEEPING YOU INFORMED ~ READ IT HERE!!!

This feature is made available to all Elected Officials **FREE OF CHARGE** as part of The Central Commitment to KEEPING YOU THE TAXPAYER INFORMED.