



The Quiet Majority: When Survival Replaces Voice

By Dale Jodoin
Columnist

I am a columnist . I deal in facts, not noise. And here is a hard one to sit with. Most Canadians are not part of the fight you see every day. They are trying to survive. That is not a slogan. That is the reality showing up at kitchen tables across this country. Bills stacked. Phones buzzing with payment reminders. People doing the math in their heads before they even get out of bed. Something has shifted. You can feel it. This is not just about politics anymore. It is about pressure. The kind that builds slowly, then all at once. The kind that makes people pull back from everything except what keeps them afloat. Rent is high. Food costs more than it should. Gas prices jump without warning. One week it feels manageable. The next, it does not. A simple drive to work turns into a quiet stress you carry all day. People are not arguing about big ideas. They are asking simple questions. Can I afford groceries this week. Can I fill the tank. Can I keep the lights on. That is where the country is sitting right now. And while that is happening, something else is going on at the same time. There are voices with time, energy, and support pushing hard for attention, for change, for recognition. Some of that is fair. Some of it is needed. But it is loud. Constant. Hard to ignore. And then there is everyone else. The majority. They are not pushing anything. They are not organizing. They are not showing up to every debate. They are working. Raising families. Looking after aging parents. Trying to hold their lives together. They are not silent because they do not care. They are silent because they are overwhelmed. That difference matters. When you are stretched thin, you do not take on extra weight. You drop what you can. And for many Canadians, what gets dropped is the larger conversation. Not out of anger. Out of survival. But silence has consequences. When the majority steps back, the conversation does not stop. It shifts. The loudest voices fill the space. Policies get shaped. Narratives get built. Decisions move forward. And the people who stepped back look up one day and think, when did this happen That is where the unease starts. It is not loud anger. It is something quieter. A feeling that things are moving without you. That your daily struggle does not count the same way. That your problems are too ordinary to matter. Because being able to pay your bills is not seen as an urgent policy. But it is urgent to the people living it. Look at the systems people rely on. Education is under strain. Parents worry about what their kids are learning, but also about what is missing. Classrooms are stretched. Teachers are doing what they can, but it feels like something is slipping. Then there is health care. This is where the fear turns real. People are afraid to go to the hospital. Not because they doubt the people working there, but because they know what they might face. Long waits. No doctors available. Hours that turn into a full day sitting in a chair, watching the clock. And it is worse when it is not you. It is your father struggling to breathe. Your wife is in pain. Your child with a fever that will not break. You sit there, waiting, hoping nothing gets worse before someone can help. That stays with people. It changes how they think. It changes what they fear. So when another debate starts, when another issue demands attention, people look at their own lives and think, I cannot carry that too. That is how the quiet majority is formed. Not by choice. By pressure. At the same time, there is a growing push to tell people how they should think, what they should say, what they should support. Even when the intention is to help, the delivery can feel forced. That creates a quiet resistance. People do not argue. They do not protest. They step back further. They nod, stay polite, and return to their lives. But here is where it gets dangerous. When the majority steps away, even for good reason, it leaves the direction of the country in fewer hands. Not necessarily bad hands, but fewer. That is how imbalance grows. A small group, driven and active, can shape the path. A large group, tired and silent, can lose its influence without even noticing. And over time, that gap widens. The country starts to feel unfamiliar, not because it changed overnight, but because most people were not part of the change as it happened. That is the quiet shift happening right now. It is not loud. It is not dramatic. It is slow. And that is what makes it harder to see. Most Canadians are not extreme. They are not hateful. They are not looking for conflict. They want stability. They want fairness. They want a chance to live without constant pressure closing in on them. They wake up tired. They go to work. They come home and try to make things work again the next day. If you listen, really listen, you hear the same line everywhere. I do not have a problem with anyone. I just want to live my life. That should mean something. But right now, it is getting lost. Because systems do not respond to quiet. They respond to pressure. So the people who are struggling the most, the ones holding everything together, are also the ones least heard. That is not just unfair. It is risky. A country cannot stay balanced if its majority is too tired to take part. It cannot stay steady if the people carrying the weight feel like they are not part of the direction. Eventually, something gives. Not all at once. Not with a bang. But slowly. People disconnect. Trust fades. The sense of shared ground weakens. And when that happens, it becomes harder to bring things back together. This is not about picking sides. It is about recognizing what is happening before it goes too far. The quiet majority is not the problem. But if it stays quiet for too long, it may not recognize the country it helped build. And by then, speaking up will feel a lot harder than it does today.

Being a 'Culture Fit' is Your Most Persuasive Selling Point

By Nick Kossovan

Having a resume and LinkedIn profile that clearly showcase your qualifications and a track record of driving profitability is merely the prerequisite for securing an interview; being a 'culture fit' is what ultimately gets you hired. Being a culture fit isn't just a vague platitude; it's an employer's safeguard. The last thing a hiring manager wants, something I've done more than once, is to hire someone who ends up disrupting a well-functioning team. Conveying your intent to integrate is your most persuasive 'why you should hire me' selling point. A candidate's ability is subjective; compatibility is bankable. Walking into an interview with an attitude, which I've encountered often, that your interviewer wants to hear how you'll "disrupt" the status quo, is a recipe for a "we went with another candidate" email. Your ego might have you believing you're a visionary, but in reality, you're a threat. Hiring managers don't wake up hoping to find someone who will dismantle their existing workflows, antagonize current employees, and disrupt a team dynamic that took years to build. Employers want solutions, not projects. They want a human asset that generates an immediate return on investment, not a liability that requires an HR-led cleanup crew six months down the line. Job seekers who believe they "know better than the employer" have a toxic mindset that contributes to the attitude pollution in today's job market. Many job seekers have bought into the Silicon Valley folklore that every company is a stagnant pond waiting for a 'change agent' to stir its waters. Profitable businesses operate with proven processes and, as much as possible, a rhythmic culture. They wouldn't be profitable if they didn't. When a candidate comes across as a self-proclaiming 'visionary' who'll 'shake things up,' a hiring manager doesn't see innovation; they see someone who'll be difficult to manage. Hiring decisions are calculated risks; a hiring manager's primary responsibility to their employer is to mitigate those risks. No responsible hiring manager will gamble their department's stability on a cowboy when there are candidates who offer the same skills and experience with zero friction. More than once, I've seen what was thought to be a brilliant hire escorted out within months because they refused to fit in. Their "impressive" qualifications meant nothing when they disrupted a well-functioning team dynamic, causing a dip in productivity and requiring the manager to spend more time resolving conflicts than hitting targets. As Adam Grant, a professor at the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania, popularized during the promotion of his book Think Again: The Power of Knowing What You Don't Know, "The most effective teams aren't the ones with the smartest people, but the ones with the most cohesive ones." The phrase "go along to get along" doesn't indicate weakness; rather, it is a savvy job search strategy that signals you respect the workplace social contract and the team's existing ROI. According to a 2023 LinkedIn Talent Solutions report, 92% of recruiters prioritize adaptability and collaboration over raw technical skill. Recruiters, especially hiring managers, aren't seeking mavericks who'll rewrite the playbook from day one. They are looking to hire candidates who can read and understand the playbook, execute the plays, and earn the trust of their colleagues and management team BEFORE suggesting improvements. Integration is the prerequisite for influence. A candidate who shows a desire to help the team (employer) achieve its goals is a good hire, not a risky one. Candidate A: Pitches an overhaul of your processes. (I've interviewed many 'Candidate A.')

Candidate B: Asks questions that show they're keen on supporting the current work rhythm. Who will a hiring manager likely hire? Candidate A, who will likely be a high-maintenance liability, or Candidate B, who'll get the job done without disrupting the team? I'm not suggesting that during an interview you become a 'yes person'; I'm suggesting that you demonstrate a clear understanding of how the employer's business operates and succeeds, along with a willingness to help it grow. Employers aren't looking for a 'hero' to save them; okay, maybe some are, but that's reserved for the C-Suite positions. Employers are looking for candidates who'll help them win more (read: increase their profitability), which doesn't mean tearing their processes apart, being the proverbial bull in a china shop. In 2026, helping an employer grow means having professional maturity and emotional intelligence, especially at a time when everyone is afraid for their jobs and change is angst-inducing, to build on what's already working. If you're getting interviews, a feat to be commended, but not getting any offers, take a hard look at your messaging. Are you presenting yourself as a catalyst for chaos or as a foundation for growth? Are you talking about "revolutionizing" or "optimizing"? The former sounds like a threat, while the latter sounds like a partner. With the economy becoming more volatile, employers are searching for professionals who can walk into a room, analyze the situation, and contribute without causing a ripple, at least not a large one. Based on my experience, the best candidates, those I'm glad I hired, pitch optimizing, not revolutionizing.

PICKERING CLASSIC 2026

CHARITY CRICKET TOURNAMENT

★ SATURDAY, JULY 4 ★

10 AM TO 10 PM

Trophy Presentation and Ceremony at 10 pm

Bay Ridges Kinsmen Park
705 Sandy Beach Road, Pickering

★ ALL PROCEEDS GO TO PICKERING FOOD BANK ★

1ST PRIZE- \$1500
2ND PRIZE- \$750
\$400 ENTRY FEE PER TEAM

To register or for more info:
pickeringcricketclassic@gmail.com