



The Central Newspaper

Durham's Top Columnist

– Well Written, Well Read, Time Tested And Proven –

#1 Newspaper Across Durham Region

Champion of Freedom of Speech and Access To The Press.

YOU ARE READING

LOGIC

By *Joe Ingino*

BA. PSYCHOLOGY
EDITOR/PUBLISHER
CENTRAL NEWSPAPERS

ACCOMPLISHED WRITER/AUTHOR OF
OVER 800,000 COLUMNS

— According to AI —
“I live a dream in a nightmare world”
was coined by Joe Ingino, a Canadian editor, publisher, and local media figure based in Oshawa, Ontario.
He regularly uses this specific statement as a personal tagline and signature for his published newspaper columns and social media posts.

Joe Ingino

— INGINO MAKES HISTORY —

— 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 —

have no clue. Cliche words that gets them elected. Sadly, we the people are the ones to face the reality that is our municipal government. Personally, I do not think that good intentions should be part of job description. I think education and life experience should be at the top of the list. How are we to expect to make million if not billion dollar decision when those faced with that decision have never even come close to managing such portfolio. Many have not had jobs that would even remotely have them face the many administrative challenges faced with being a councillor. Good intentions are great but do not make the grade in my opinion. I have always advocated for less government. Get rid of the municipal government. They in modern times serve no real purpose. Across Durham for example. Many elected do not return phone calls. Many elected fail to truly perform their duty to address the publics best interest. Then why do we the taxpayers are forced to pay for municipal elect salaries that do not benefit taxpayers? We in many cases have no voice and we are always made to carry the cost of their decisions. This is wrong. Last week I introduced the thought of just having a regional government. More like administrators. Administrators that would feed all data into a server and Artificial Intelligent software would give the best and worst case scenarios. No more, expensive consultants. No more of the bad decisions. No more collusional type voting on possible kick back projects. It would be logical analysis based on business standards and academics. I did get many calls. Letters, of people attempting to spread fear... on how dare I suggest such thing. A.I is dangerous. A.I. will rule the world mentality. Personally those that think like that should educate themselves on the actual technology. Second. Technology is there to make life simpler. In reality there is no real intelligence. Only faster processing of information. Light speed cross referencing and mathematically give probability on any given event based on facts and pure logic. The human mind can't be that logical as bias and prejudices are part of the human DNA. We need to move towards education. For the old and the young. The young think they know it all and they don't and the old have given up on getting to know anything due to it's perceived complexity. We call it Artificial Intelligence due to the fact that the machine can process information faster than the human mind. That is can analyze based on theory, standards and raw logic. In reality A.I. is nothing short of a sophisticated browser. We should not be fearing it. We should be embarrassing it. We are the human factor that created technology. Even though we may be made to look like fools and easily manipulated due to our intellectual limitations and ignorance. We are still in control. We will always be. As the systems and logic models come from the raw human existence and not from a machine. Congrats to all the 2026 Election winners.



JOE INGINO

Proud Member of :



Royal Canadian 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



C.O.P.A. Canadian Owners and Pilots Association
Member Since 2026

City Of Oshawa Mayoral Candidate
2014, 2018, 2022,

City Of Oshawa Mayoral Candidate
2025, Member of Provincial Parliament candidate for The New Blue Party

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



We scrutinize Rouge Park land. Why not golf courses the size of airports?

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

We scrutinize Rouge Park land. Why not golf courses the size of airports? In the Greater Toronto Area, few debates have been as intense—or as politically charged—as the future of farmland and green space around Rouge National Urban Park. For years, governments, environmental advocates and local communities have contested every hectare. The objective is clear: protect prime agricultural land, preserve ecosystems and manage the pressures of relentless urban expansion. Now, with the federal government stepping away from the long-proposed Pickering airport on lands held for decades by Transport Canada, the debate has entered a new phase. Thousands of acres of publicly owned farmland—adjacent to Rouge Park—are once again open to policy decisions. What should be done with them? It is an important question. But it is also an incomplete one. Because while we scrutinize every acre of public land in Rouge and Pickering, we continue to ignore a far larger reality—one that sits in plain sight across Durham Region and the eastern GTA. Golf courses. The land we choose not to see In Durham Region alone, golf courses occupy an estimated eight to 10 square kilometres of land. That is not a marginal figure. It is comparable to the footprint of Vancouver International Airport and not insignificant relative to Calgary International Airport or Edmonton International Airport. If a proposal were brought forward today to build an airport of that size on prime land in the GTA, it would trigger years of environmental assessments, legal challenges and public consultations. Yet that same scale of land already exists—distributed across golf courses—and it is almost entirely absent from serious policy discussion. This is not an oversight. It is a contradiction. A double standard The case for protecting Rouge Park and the Pickering lands rests on the value of Class 1 farmland—some of the most productive soil in Canada. This is a compelling argument. Food security, climate resilience and long-term economic sustainability depend on preserving such land. However, many golf courses sit on the same class of land. They are often former farms, converted over time into low-density recreational spaces serving a relatively small portion of the population. They occupy large, contiguous tracts—exactly the kind of land policymakers now argue is too valuable to lose. Yet, unlike farmland, golf courses are rarely subjected to the same scrutiny or policy pressure. If the principle is that prime land must be protected for the public good, it cannot be applied selectively. The Pickering paradox The cancellation of the Pickering airport proposal has created a rare opportunity. For decades, these federally owned lands were effectively frozen, reserved for infrastructure that never came. Now, they can be reimaged. Some argue they should remain entirely agricultural. Others propose integrating them into Rouge Park. Still others see an opportunity for carefully planned development to address the region's housing shortage. All of these positions are valid. However, they also reveal a deeper inconsistency. We are prepared to debate publicly owned farmland hectare by hectare, while ignoring privately held land of comparable scale that could offer greater flexibility. It is as if one category of land is considered strategic, while another is simply beyond discussion. Housing and hard choices The GTA's housing shortage is no longer theoretical. Governments are under pressure to increase supply, accelerate approvals and identify land for development. At the same time, there is strong resistance—rightly so—to building on protected farmland or environmentally sensitive areas. This is where the silence around golf courses becomes consequential. These lands are:

- already cleared and serviced
- often located near existing infrastructure
- large enough to support meaningful development

 Even partial repurposing—10 to 20 per cent of golf course land—could support tens of thousands of housing units across the region, while preserving recreational use. This is not about eliminating golf. It is about acknowledging that land use must evolve. Why the silence persists The answer is straightforward. Golf courses are politically comfortable. They are established, familiar and rarely controversial. They do not generate the same level of opposition as new development or infrastructure projects. In short, they are easy to ignore. However, good policy is not about avoiding difficult conversations. It is about confronting them—especially when they involve trade-offs of this magnitude. A question of fairness Public lands like Rouge Park and the Pickering lands are subject to intense scrutiny because they are meant to serve the broader public interest. Their use must be justified in terms of environmental value, agricultural productivity or public access. Golf courses, by contrast, are typically:

- privately owned or membership-based
- accessible to a limited segment of the population
- maintained with significant resource inputs

 This is not an argument against golf. It is an argument for consistency. If one category of land must justify its use in terms of public benefit, then all categories should be held to a comparable standard. Time for a coherent strategy The real issue is not golf courses—or even the Pickering lands. It is the absence of a coherent, region-wide land-use strategy. What we have instead is fragmentation:

- intense scrutiny of public land
- relative silence on large private land uses
- reactive decisions driven by pressure rather than planning

 A serious strategy would apply consistent criteria across all land uses, evaluate them based on long-term public benefit and explore multi-use models that integrate recreation, housing and green space. The broader test The debate over Rouge Park and the Pickering lands is necessary. However, its credibility depends on its scope. If we are willing to scrutinize public farmland hectare by hectare, we must also be willing to examine other large-scale land uses with equal rigour. Because in a region where land is finite and growth is inevitable, what we choose not to debate matters just as much as what we do. And silence, in this case, is not neutrality. It is a policy choice.