



Leg To Stand On

By Wayne and Tamara

My husband applied for a position through an employment agency. He was shortlisted and told by the agency he met all the client requirements. Later the agency informed him he wasn't picked for an interview, and my husband asked why. Their response was, "We would like to know, too."

Only then was it revealed it was a company where he had a personal issue with one of the employees. The company manager revealed my husband has a reputation for chatting up women. A few months back the woman, her husband, my husband and myself met and resolved all the issues and concerns we had.

My husband contacted the manager and told him it was uncalled for to put his integrity in a bad light with the agency. The manager replied my husband is the ideal candidate, but the decision came from his boss at the head office.

Yes, my husband made a mistake, but should his work professionalism be judged? This has ruined any further prospects with the employment agency. My husband believes the manager's conduct was unethical and this is not fair.

Valera

Valera, you are concealing information. We don't know what happened with the woman, whether your husband is currently employed, or what profession we are talking about. We can only assume you're glossing over facts because they don't help your cause.

Whatever happened was serious enough to require a meeting with a woman, her husband, your husband and you. In addition, your husband's actions with other women have involved inappropriate behavior.

It's obvious your husband has no legal remedies against this woman, other women, the employment agency or the manager. The employment agency learned of your husband's conduct only because he asked them to find out. He brought this on himself. The remarkable thing is the manager of the hiring company told the truth instead of falling back on corporate doubletalk.

When you married your husband, you hitched your wagon to someone else's star. Some stars fade, some stars fall, and some stars die. Rather than defending him, consider the impact of his behavior on your life and your future.

In some countries television shows cannot be aired unless bad acts are shown to be punished. As far as we can tell, your husband is bearing the consequences of his own actions, which is the way the world is supposed to work yet often doesn't.

Wayne & Tamara

Irreconcilable Difference

I have been in a relationship with my girlfriend two years. I love her dearly, who she is and the great times we have together. My problem is I have a healthy, active sex drive and she does not.

Making love is an important part of a relationship, and since we only physically communicate once every six or eight weeks, it gives me the feeling of eventual relationship doom. That thought scares me because I don't want to lose her.

When I try talking to her about it, she gets upset and won't discuss it. I always end up feeling like a creep and telling myself sex isn't everything. Then my frustration builds, along with sadness and longing for that connection. I am not one to cheat, but I can't imagine a life without intimacy.

Aaron

Aaron, you went shopping for a dog and brought home a cat. Now you want the cat to bark like a dog. That can never happen.

In relationships many people focus on the prize part, not the negative part. But the shine wears off prizes quickly, leaving only the negatives. Each of you needs a person suited to your genuine self, not someone who must make incessant compromises to be with you.

Though your current relationship is not meant to be, you should respect this woman's honesty. Many people, both male and female, conceal their disinterest in sex until after a wedding.





Do You Really Want to Know?

Common Sense Health – Diana Gifford-Jones

Medicine is entering a new era. Increasingly, both physicians and patients can investigate the future. A blood sample, a genetic profile or an analysis of biological markers can offer clues about a person's susceptibility to heart disease, cancer, Alzheimer's, diabetes and a growing list of other conditions.

The potential for better lives is undeniable. But how do you know when to learn more? What will it really mean for you? And at what cost?

The completion of the Human Genome Project in 2003 mapped the human genetic blueprint. That achievement facilitated efforts to understand how our inherited characteristics, biological markers and environmental exposures might determine our future health.

Today, genetic testing can identify certain inherited mutations associated with substantial disease risks. Researchers can also calculate polygenic risk scores, combining information from hundreds or thousands of genetic variations to estimate susceptibility to common diseases. Blood biomarkers offer another window, sometimes revealing biological changes before a person experiences any symptoms.

But using tests to calculate a probability is not the same thing as identifying a genuine medical warning. Neither genetic predisposition, biomarkers, nor higher statistical risk amount to a diagnosis.

And then there is human nature.

Imagine being told at 55 of an elevated risk of developing Alzheimer's disease. There may be no reliable way to determine whether you will actually develop it, or when. Currently, there is no intervention proven to prevent it. Yet the knowledge will stick with you, day in and day out. Are you happy to know it?

The dilemma applies to numerous predictive tests. A result can trigger further investigations, repeat testing, specialist consultations and sometimes invasive procedures. An uncertain finding can become a medical problem simply because somebody has discovered it. The technical term for one aspect of this is overdiagnosis: identifying abnormalities that in the end do not cause symptoms or shorten a person's life.

So before agreeing to any predictive test, establish your ground rules.

First, ask whether the result is sufficiently reliable to mean anything. Is it identifying a well-established genetic mutation, or merely calculating a statistical association? What is the absolute risk, rather than, say, an alarm-sounding percentage increase?

Second, ask whether the information changes anything. Is there an established treatment, a preventive measure or a surveillance programme that would improve your prospects? If the answer is no, what exactly are you gaining?

Third, consider the psychological cost. Some people find knowledge empowering. Others find uncertainty exhausting. There is no virtue in concluding that everyone benefits from knowing their statistical chances of developing a devastating illness.

Finally, consider whether you want this information to become part of your medical history, and who might have access to it. Genetic information can have implications beyond the individual, including for family members who may share the same inherited characteristics.

None of this is an argument against appropriate testing. If a family history suggests an inherited cancer syndrome, for example, genetic counselling and testing may be vital. If a biomarker identifies a treatable condition early enough to make a difference, refusing to investigate would be foolish. But there is a difference between testing because there is a good medical reason and testing simply because the technology makes it possible.

I would rather see people concentrate on what they can influence: maintaining a healthy weight, exercising, eating sensibly, avoiding tobacco, moderating alcohol and keeping up with preventive care. None of these guarantees a long life. But they offer clear benefits.

We should welcome discoveries that allow us to prevent disease and save lives. But we should also preserve the freedom to decline information that offers no practical benefit.



Dead and Gone...

Cash

By Gary Payne, MBA

Take a Canadian bill out of your wallet and look at the words printed on it.

"THIS NOTE IS LEGAL TENDER."

It's a reassuring little declaration. The Bank of Canada has been printing those words on our banknotes since 1969. You might reasonably assume they mean a business has to accept the money you're holding. They don't.

According to the Bank of Canada, there is no law requiring a business to accept cash. A store can decide it only wants debit or credit cards. Your twenty-dollar bill is still perfectly good money. The person behind the counter just doesn't have to take it.

In 2009, Canadians paid cash for 54 per cent of their purchases. By 2025, that figure had fallen to just 18 per cent, down from 21 per cent the year before. And the decline appears to be picking up speed.

In an October report, Payments Canada found that the number of cash transactions fell seven per cent in 2025, compared with two per cent the previous year. The Bank of Canada, meanwhile, cautions that more data is needed to know whether the latest decline will last.

For many of us, the change has been almost effortless. We tap a card or wave a phone without giving it much thought. Sometimes weeks pass without handling a dollar. But not everyone has made that transition. Canadians earning less than $45,000 a year still make nearly a quarter of their purchases with cash. Among those earning more than $85,000, the figure is less than 14 per cent. Older Canadians and people living in rural communities also use cash more frequently. In places like Uxbridge, Brock and Scugog, where getting to a bank branch can mean a drive into town, that matters.

Around 1981, I had a paper route. I saved the money I earned to buy myself a Sony Walkman, which was a pretty big purchase for a kid back then. I don't remember exactly what it cost, but I remember saving for it. That money was mine, earned delivering newspapers, and I could see myself getting closer to something I really wanted. There was a time when having twenty dollars in your pocket meant you had twenty dollars to spend. Today, the money we earn is often little more than a number on a screen. It moves between accounts, appears on statements and disappears with a tap. We rarely see it, let alone hold it.

Yet Canadians aren't quite ready to let cash go. The Bank of Canada found that 80 per cent have no plans to stop using it. Most businesses still accept it, too. But there's a difference between having the option to pay cash and having the right to use it. When I finally had enough for that Walkman, nobody needed to approve the transaction. The money was mine..