



Lisa Robinson

PICKERING CITY COUNCILLOR

WHEN THEY CAN'T CONTROL YOU, THEY TRY TO CONTROL YOUR REPUTATION

Character assassination is not an accident. It is a strategy — and it only works on people who have stopped thinking for themselves. There is a pattern to how toxic people operate, and once you have seen it up close you can never unsee it. First, they try to manage you. They want your vote, your silence, your cooperation. When flattery does not work, they escalate to pressure. When pressure does not work, they escalate to procedure — the meeting, the complaint, the process, the finding. And when even that fails to bend you, they arrive at the last tool they have. If they cannot control what you do, they will try to control what everybody thinks of you. This is the point people miss. The smear is not the beginning of a conflict. The smear is the admission of defeat in the conflict. It arrives only after every other method has failed. Nobody bothers to destroy the reputation of someone they can already control. They only reach for your name when they have run out of ways to reach for you. And notice how it is done. Not with an argument. Never with an argument — because an argument can be answered, and an answer might persuade someone. Instead, they reach for the labels that cannot be argued with, the words designed to end the conversation rather than start one. Words that make people afraid to be seen standing near you, let alone standing with you. That is the whole point. It is not aimed at your record. It is aimed at everybody else's willingness to hear your record.

THEN THERE ARE THE PEOPLE WHO WILL NEVER ACCEPT THE TRUTH

Here is the harder part, and the part I had to make peace with. You can correct the record. You can produce the transcript, the minutes, the recording, the receipt. You can put the full quote next to the clipped one and let anyone with eyes compare them. And there will still be people who are absolutely determined to misunderstand you. Not unable. Determined. Because for some people, your guilt is useful. It justifies a vote they already cast, a friendship they do not want to re-examine, a comfortable arrangement they would rather not look at too closely. The truth would cost them something, so they decline it. No amount of evidence competes with an incentive. So stop auditioning for their approval. You cannot reason a person out of a conclusion their interests depend on, and every hour spent trying is an hour stolen from the people who actually are listening. Correct the record once, plainly, for the honest onlooker — then get back to work. The determined misunderstander is not your jury. Your neighbours are.

THINK FOR YOURSELF — IT IS THE WHOLE BALLGAME

Now let me say something hopeful, because I did not write this to complain. Every one of these tactics — the label, the whisper, the pile-on — depends on one thing, and one thing only: a crowd that will not stop and check. A rumour has no engine of its own. It runs entirely on borrowed judgment. It moves only as far as good people are willing to carry it without asking a single question. Which means the remedy is not complicated, and it does not require a lawyer, a committee, or a title. It requires a citizen who pauses long enough to say: who told me this, what exactly did she say, and who benefits if I believe it? That pause is one of the most powerful things in a free society. It is where mobs go to die and where self-government begins. There is nothing brave about agreeing with the room; the room does not need your help. But a person willing to say "wait a moment — I would like to see that for myself" is doing the actual work of citizenship, and doing it in the only place it can be done, which is between their own two ears. Group-think asks almost nothing of you, and that is exactly what makes it so expensive. Every time we go along to get along, we hand a little more oxygen to the very people who are counting on us not to look. And every time one of us checks, that flame gets a little smaller. So do not take my word for it. I am not asking anyone to take my word for anything. Read the record. Watch the meeting. Ask the question you have been told is impolite to ask. Trust your own eyes over anybody's summary — including mine. Because a town full of people who think for themselves cannot be run by people who count on them not to. And that, in the end, is not a slogan. It is a safeguard — and it belongs to you.



5 Seconds Can Change Your Life

How do you rob a thief?

By Tom Reimer
Metalex Security

Question: How do you rob a thief? wouldn't that be nice if we could turn the tables, give those greedy, good for nothing, self entitled, thieving buggers a taste of the pain that is being inflicted on thousands of victims every year. I bet they would be furious, "how dare someone take my precious possessions that I have gained through all of my thieving ways" yah I'm talking to you, Sly and all your despicable brothers in arms. It all comes down to time, 5 seconds is all it takes to kick in a door, break or, crawl through a window that is unlatched or even worse left wide open, "the window of opportunity" in our last episode we provided some simple and extremely effective means to "FORTIFY" the most popular point of entry, the front entrance, I'm confident that we have eliminated the threat and Sly has used up at least a couple of minutes, he knows that he created some noise and attention! But still determined, So, what's next?

Well, let's at least get out of the field of vision, the side of the house has in most cases another door, this is where the builder has provided a laundry room and quite often tucked in behind the garage. If this is not fortified it may fall victim to a heavy kick or two so let's get out that toolbox and use the same defence mode for this door, a couple of "Guardian Flip Latches" extra long screws for the hinges and an extra long strike plate and screws on the lock side!

Now, that window beside the door, great for providing natural light in a dark corner of the house and also easy to crawl through, after making more noise on the second door with no success, Sly is still motivated and pumped up on adrenaline, two more minutes consumed but still determined to get what he wants, he grabs the chair or garbage can that's conveniently left at his disposal and he's in, well at least we have taken 4 of the average 8 to 10 minutes that a burglary takes according to "Stats Can" Its interesting to me when I think of home security I think of engineering standards, you need to test any product by breaking it first, putting it through extensive pressure, bending it until it breaks simply to find out the "breaking point" building it up to the point of resistance, then, providing a strength multiplier and that is your "fail safe" limit. Exactly the same principle applies to home security!

If you could continue to provide sufficient resistance to all points of entry you will come to a point that Sly will buzz off! in this case we took away 4 minutes of the precious 8 needed and you still suffered a loss, 4 minutes of hell! you have been violated!

Now in some cases it may not be your front door that is the first point of entry, if you back on to a school yard or a wooded area then, Patio doors, family room windows and the basement may be the preferred point of entry. On my next episode to the world of resisting Sly and his cohorts, we will go back to that laundry room window, look at "Target Hardening" that point of entry and then move on the forest and school yard dwellers. The answer to the question, how do you rob a thief? Simple, you take away their time!

Not on my watch, Sly. stay tuned!



THE Mr. X Files

By John Mutton

CENTRAL EXCLUSIVE

Karmageddon

Municipal Elections Aren't About Left or Right - They're About Getting It Right

By Mr. 'X' ~ John Mutton, Former Mayor of Clarington
CENTRAL EXCLUSIVE

As we move deeper into a municipal election, I think we need to remind ourselves of something that is becoming increasingly lost in today's political environment: Municipal government should be about the good of the community - not party politics. I have met candidates in this election who would probably describe themselves as being on the right. I have met candidates from the left. I have met centrists. And I have met others who simply don't fit comfortably into any political box. In my view, some of the strongest candidates are the ones who don't start the conversation by asking whether an idea is conservative, liberal, left-wing or right-wing. They ask a much simpler question: Is it good for our community? That is the kind of thinking municipal government desperately needs. Fiscal Responsibility Is Not a Political Ideology There are people across the political spectrum who possess an excellent sense of fiscal responsibility. You don't need a Conservative membership card to understand a balance sheet. You don't need a Liberal membership card to understand infrastructure. And you don't need an NDP membership card to care about social programs. In fact, perhaps municipal government works best when councillors leave their party cards at the door. Every person elected to council has a responsibility to treat taxpayers' money prudently. That isn't right-wing. It isn't left-wing. It's responsible government. But fiscal responsibility also doesn't mean cutting everything in sight. Quite the opposite. The purpose of controlling spending is to ensure that we have the financial capacity to properly fund the things municipal government is actually responsible for delivering. Fiscal Responsibility and Social Responsibility Can Coexist This is where I think our political conversation has gone badly off course. Some people have been conditioned to believe that fiscal responsibility and social responsibility are competing philosophies. They aren't. A municipality can be fiscally disciplined while also caring deeply about its residents. We need good roads. We need bridges and sidewalks. We need safe drinking water and wastewater infrastructure. We need fire protection and emergency services. We need parks, recreation and community infrastructure. And municipalities have important responsibilities connected to housing, transit and social services, particularly at the regional level. These things cost money. A lot of money. And if municipal governments continually expand into discretionary programs and activities while their core infrastructure deteriorates, eventually something has to give. Usually, it is the taxpayer. Review What Government Is Actually Doing That is why I continue to advocate for a comprehensive services and mandate review. Put everything municipal government does on the table. Ask what is legislatively required. Ask what is essential to the operation and safety of the community. Ask what delivers measurable value to residents. And then have the courage to ask another question: What are we spending money on that municipal government does not need to be doing? That doesn't automatically mean eliminating every discretionary service. Some discretionary programs provide tremendous community value. But every dollar should have to compete for priority. If a program is consuming taxpayer dollars while roads, bridges, fire services, housing responsibilities or other essential infrastructure are underfunded, council should be prepared to reconsider that spending. And here is the part people sometimes miss: Saving money in one area can allow us to spend more where people genuinely need it. A services review isn't necessarily about spending less. It is about spending better. If we eliminate programs that no longer make sense and redirect those dollars into infrastructure, housing, emergency services, recreation or social programs where municipalities have genuine responsibilities, we can simultaneously become more fiscally responsible and more socially responsible. The Best Candidates Challenge Their Own Side Media and social media have increasingly conditioned people to line up on one side or the other. Left versus right. Conservative versus progressive. Us versus them. Municipal government cannot afford that mentality. The candidates who have impressed me most during this election are those prepared to challenge the conventional thinking of whichever political camp they may personally come from. A fiscally conservative candidate should still be able to say: "This social program is necessary, it is working, and we should properly fund it." A socially progressive candidate should be equally capable of saying: "This program isn't working, it isn't a municipal priority, and taxpayers shouldn't continue paying for it." That isn't abandoning your principles. That is leadership. Fix the Roads and Strengthen the Social Fabric There should be nothing contradictory about wanting excellent infrastructure and strong social infrastructure. There should be nothing contradictory about demanding value for taxpayers while protecting vulnerable residents. And there should be nothing contradictory about reducing unnecessary spending while increasing investment in services that actually matter. That is what mature municipal government looks like. The next generation of municipal leaders should not be elected because they perfectly represent the political left or political right. They should be elected because they understand budgets, infrastructure, community needs and the responsibility that comes with spending someone else's money. They should understand that every dollar wasted on yesterday's political pet project is a dollar that cannot repair tomorrow's bridge, support a housing initiative, improve a park, replace aging infrastructure or strengthen an essential service. Leave the Party Cards at the Door Municipal councils don't need ideological warriors. They need problem solvers. They need people willing to examine every program, every service and every expenditure without first asking which political tribe will applaud the decision. Fiscal responsibility without social responsibility can lose sight of the people government exists to serve. Social responsibility without fiscal responsibility eventually becomes financially unsustainable. Good municipal government requires both. So as voters evaluate candidates in this election, perhaps the question shouldn't be: Is this candidate left-wing or right-wing? Perhaps the better questions are: Can they manage our money? Do they understand what municipal government is responsible for? Will they protect our infrastructure? Will they care for the people who genuinely need municipal services? And will they have the courage to stop spending money on things that no longer make sense? Those are not left-wing principles. They are not right-wing principles. They are community principles. And municipal elections should ultimately be about one thing: Not left. Not right. Moving our community forward.