

The CENTRAL NEWSPAPER

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



“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 -
It’s Immoral
Derek Giberson Has To GO in 2026

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

Is it just me? I drive down our downtown core and my heart aches. Watching people sleeping on the street. Temperatures hovering around - 2. Watching this injustice. This suffering in Canada puts my mind in a state of panic. I look at these people and can't believe that we are allowing this to happen. These people could be any one of us.

To think that when a fellow citizen falls that low in their luck and there is no support... It is wrong and immoral. I ran for office in 2018 and 2022 to put an end to this. I was not successful. Maybe I should be more like those elected and be cold and uncaring. How can any elected official take a taxpayers dime in payment knowing the suffering that is going on right on our streets... In Oshawa we have two representatives. What have they done in the two terms they served? NOTHING. It appears that 'NOTHING' in todays society is and accomplishment. Yet, people are defying on our streets from the cold and from drug over usage. This is unacceptable. For example. We have the likes of wanna be rock star, City councillor Derek Giberson. What has he done for the downtown in the two terms he has served.

I can tell you. He has spent your taxpayers resources in persecuting local downtown merchants like this newspaper and failed. He has spent your tax dollars on hearings and procedural mumbo jumbo against citizens. He has failed. I would estimate to the tune of over \$300,000. Money that should have gone to shelter people living on the street. No instead this councillor chooses to push for 'safe site' injection sites. This in my book is unacceptable. This local councillor does not belong in municipal politics as he is directly responsible for the poor condition of our core.

He in my opinion is directly responsible for all the failed business in our core. This councillor has failed us so much... that he allowed millions to be wasted on 'Veterans Park'. A newly erected park smack downtown. A property that could have been turned into a much needed indoor garage. A facility that could have housed thousands of people from the cold until a more concrete solution is found.

Giberson in my opinion is a disgrace to our City. He had the opportunity to do great things and he wasted them on persecuting those he does not like. He uses your resource to make go no place points... and he has failed on his attempt time and time again. HE HAS TO GO IN 2026.

The homeless problem is not going to go any place. If anything it is going to get worst. This new economic Pandemic takes no prisoners.

When we see one person on the street. There 10 others that are living with friends, family or in their cars. I have spoken to many of them. Their stories have resemblances as the outcome is unfortunate. Most of them never thought that they would end up on the street. Many have lost jobs, have little or not family. Others suffered/suffer some sort of disability decease. Just this week the Federal government gave millions to the Ukraine to fight a never ending or impossible war to win. Why has the government not used that money to fight our home front war of hunger and the homeless.

Here is what I would do with just a million: 1. Secure a place to in-houe at least 1,000 people. It can be done. Look at most bomb shelters. A facility that would offer shower, cafeteria and medical assistance. 2. Partner with the University to have their health student practice at the shelter. 3. Make it mandatory that all grocery store send over their almost expired foods. Partner with industry and trade to fund the purchase of staple foods. 4. Create work programs through the City in the works department and other. 5. Create un-used hospital wards as treatment centers for those with addictions and or mental health. 6. Partner with the Provincial and Federal Governments for hands on programs that would be directed to special squads to get people off the streets and into these 'rejuvenation' facilities. The homeless situation can be managed. Stop voting in nose drips like Giberson. We need real leadership. For real problems. In 2026 make the right change and stop rewarding failure.

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

A Stronger Canadian Economy Is Possible

if We Confront Our Provincial Barriers

by Maj (ret'd) CORNELIU, CHISU, CD, PMSC
FEC, CET, P.Eng.

Former Member of Parliament
Pickering-Scarborough East

Canada's economic challenge is not a mystery. Productivity has stagnated for over a decade, business investment per worker has fallen to half the U.S. level, and major projects—whether housing developments, transmission lines, or resource corridors—take too long and cost too much.

What is less often acknowledged is the structural cause behind many of these problems: a fragmented federation where provincial legislation frequently pulls the national economy in different directions. For decades, Canada has tolerated a patchwork system in which goods legal in one province can be blocked in another, where a nurse or engineer licensed in Alberta cannot easily work in Ontario, and where a manufacturer must redesign packaging simply to sell the same product across provincial borders. Each of these irritants may seem trivial in isolation, but together they represent a profound drag on competitiveness. The Parliamentary Budget Officer estimates the cost of internal trade barriers to be equivalent to a 4% tariff we impose on ourselves—a hidden tax on productivity and prosperity. No other advanced economy erects so many internal walls inside a single country.

The irony is that Canadians talk endlessly about trade diversification abroad while ignoring the inefficiencies at home. We spend years negotiating market access with Europe or Asia, yet a company in Manitoba still struggles to sell construction materials freely to Quebec or Nova Scotia. The obstacle is not geography—it is governance.

Why has this problem proven so difficult to solve? The answer lies in Canada's unique constitutional architecture. Provinces guard their jurisdiction fiercely, and for good reasons rooted in history and identity. Health care, education, and natural resources are provincial responsibilities; so too are many forms of licensing and regulation. The federal government cannot simply override provincial rules without igniting constitutional conflict.

However, the result is a federation of 13 economic silos, loosely connected by federal transfers and national standards that are often voluntary or weakly enforced. The Canadian Free Trade Agreement (CFTA), meant to replace the 1995 Agreement on Internal Trade, was supposed to create a truly national marketplace. In practice, it has been timid. It relies on consensus, includes too many exemptions, and lacks meaningful penalties for non-compliance. The CFTA's dispute-settlement process moves at a glacial pace, and its rulings are easily ignored. The outcome is predictably inefficient. Entrepreneurs face redundant approvals, transport companies navigate conflicting weight and safety rules, and engineers or tradespeople are forced to obtain multiple provincial certifications. These frictions add cost, discourage mobility, and undermine the very idea of a single Canadian economy. The solution is not to centralize power in Ottawa but to apply a simple, proven principle: mutual recognition. This model, used effectively in the European Union and Australia, holds that if a product, profession, or process is lawful in one jurisdiction, it is lawful in all—unless a province can demonstrate a compelling public-interest reason to refuse it. Mutual recognition preserves provincial autonomy while creating a seamless market for goods, services, and labour. It eliminates duplication without demanding uniformity. A nurse licensed in Saskatchewan would automatically be eligible to work in Nova Scotia; a builder approved in British Columbia could operate in Ontario under the same standards; a bottle of wine legal for sale in Quebec could be shipped freely to Alberta or Prince Edward Island. For housing and skilled trades, this reform could be transformative. Canada cannot meet its national housing targets if electricians, plumbers, and heavy-equipment operators spend months waiting for their credentials to transfer. A fast-lane system for high-demand professions—engineers, nurses, welders, teachers, truck drivers—would immediately boost labour mobility and help address regional shortages. Provinces would retain oversight of quality and safety but remove needless administrative delay. Large-scale projects face a similar maze of overlapping federal and provincial rules. A mine, pipeline, or power line might undergo two or three separate environmental reviews, each with different timelines, consultation processes, and documentation. This redundancy serves no one: not investors, not Indigenous communities, and not the environment.

A single "one-project, one-assessment" model—jointly administered by the most competent jurisdiction—would shorten approval times without lowering standards. Early, continuous Indigenous engagement and revenue-sharing agreements would ensure both legitimacy and local benefit. The objective is not to weaken environmental protection but to make it predictable, transparent, and fast. Certainty, not deregulation, is what unlocks investment.

Federalism is a partnership, not a hierarchy. Yet Ottawa has tools it rarely uses effectively—especially the spending power. The federal government transfers tens of billions annually to provinces for infrastructure, housing, and skills training. Those dollars should come with performance conditions tied to efficiency: streamlined permitting, faster credential recognition, or adoption of national data standards. Such conditional partnerships would respect provincial choice—provinces could opt out—but the public would see clearly who is supporting national growth and who is standing in the way. Taxpayers have a right to expect that federal funds produce national, not merely local, benefits. A First Ministers' Scorecard, published quarterly, could track measurable indicators: project-approval timelines, housing completions, interprovincial freight delays, and credential-transfer times. Transparency is a powerful motivator; what gets measured gets fixed. Modern economic policy must also integrate Indigenous participation as a structural component not as an afterthought. Indigenous communities are often central to resource and infrastructure corridors, yet they face complex regulatory hurdles and limited access to capital. Federal and provincial governments should support Indigenous Project Offices that provide technical assistance, equity partnerships, and standardized benefit-agreement templates. Empowerment—through ownership and consent—creates predictability for all parties. While federal incentives can help, true progress depends on provincial initiative. Each legislature should adopt its own Mutual Recognition Act, stating that goods and credentials valid elsewhere in Canada are presumed valid locally. Provinces could harmonize building and electrical codes, publish red-tape reduction targets, and commit to public "no net new regulation" rules. Interprovincial compacts—formal agreements between two or more provinces—could advance shared priorities like energy corridors, labour mobility, or procurement standards. The Western Premiers' Agreement and the New West Partnership once showed promise; similar regional blocs could revive the spirit of cooperation.

In conclusion, these goals are ambitious but fully attainable if governments align around a single vision: one country, one economy, many governments. Canada's productivity problem will not be solved by more subsidies or slogans. It requires political courage—the willingness of premiers and ministers to trade a measure of control for collective prosperity. The prize is immense: higher living standards, faster growth, and a stronger federation that competes globally rather than bickers internally.

If Canada was able to build a transcontinental railway in the 19th century and a universal health system in the 20th, surely it can build a truly unified economy in the 21st. The obstacles are not technical but political—and they are entirely within our power to remove. A stronger Canadian economy is within reach. But it will remain out of grasp until we confront the provincial barriers that quietly hold us back. The time to act is now. The time for national coherence has arrived.