



Canada's Bill C 22: How Much Freedom Will Canadians Give Away?
 By Dale Jodoin
 Columnist

George Orwell warned people years ago about governments watching their own citizens. Movies like V for Vendetta showed ordinary people slowly giving away freedom because they were frightened and wanted protection. Back then, most people treated stories like that as fiction. Something dramatic. Something that could never really happen here. Ten years ago, most Canadians probably would have laughed this conversation off. Today, more people are starting to wonder if those stories were less about fantasy and more about warning signs. Most people imagine freedom disappearing all at once. Soldiers in the streets. Chaos. Loud moments nobody could miss. Real life usually does not work that way. Rights disappear quietly. One new law. One new power. One more piece of information collected. Small things at first. Small enough that people barely notice until years later when the country suddenly feels different. That is why Bill C 22 is making many Canadians uneasy. The federal government calls Bill C 22 the "Lawful Access Act." Ottawa says the bill is needed to help police deal with terrorism, organized crime, child exploitation, and growing online threats. The government argues criminals now hide behind encrypted apps, private messaging systems, and digital services that investigators struggle to access. The bill passed second reading in the House of Commons on April 20, 2026, and has now moved to the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security for more study. Committee hearings began on May 7. Ottawa says the bill is simply about bringing policing into the digital age. A growing number of Canadians hear something else. People are being told they need to hand over a little more privacy to feel safe. Meanwhile many Canadians already feel less safe than they did years ago. Violent crime keeps making headlines. Random attacks happen in broad daylight. Drug overdoses continue climbing. Car thefts spread through communities across the country. Families already feel worn down. Bills keep rising. Trust keeps dropping. People are tired, and tired people sometimes give away freedoms they would have fought for years earlier. That may be the most dangerous part of all. Many Canadians are now asking a question government leaders do not seem eager to answer. If governments already hold major powers today, why does the country still feel like it is slipping in so many places? That question sits at the center of the debate around Bill C 22. One section of the bill raising concern involves metadata collection and retention. Under the proposed law, telecom and digital service providers could be required to keep certain user information for up to one year. That may include location data, communication times, connection records, and device information. Most people never think about metadata until somebody explains what it can actually reveal. It sounds like a boring technical term, but privacy experts warn metadata can tell a detailed story about a person's life without reading one private message. It can show where someone travels, who they contact, when they are active, and patterns in their daily routine. Supporters of the bill say this information could help police solve crimes faster and identify dangerous suspects before more people get hurt. Most Canadians want criminals caught. Most people want children protected. Most people understand police need tools to deal with modern crime. But many Canadians worry about what happens after these powers are created. History shows governments change. Laws stay. That concern is not only coming from Conservatives. Some Liberal and NDP voters are also questioning how much access any government should have to private digital information. This debate is becoming bigger than party politics. It is about trust. It is about limits. It is about whether Canadians still believe privacy matters in a country that keeps asking them to trade pieces of it away. There is also concern about what Bill C 22 could mean for Canada's technology future. Companies like Apple and Meta have already raised concerns about laws that may pressure companies to weaken encrypted systems or create ways into private communications. Encryption protects banking information, passwords, health records, personal files, and private conversations. Once trust in those systems weakens, people begin wondering who else may eventually gain access. That should concern Canadians. If companies begin seeing Canada as a difficult place to invest or operate, they may pull back services, delay investment, or avoid expanding here altogether. That could leave Canadians with fewer choices, weaker services, and higher costs. Most people may not think about encryption every day, but they will notice if services disappear or become more expensive. Civil liberties groups are also warning there may not be enough oversight built into the legislation. Canadians are being asked to trust institutions with larger amounts of personal information at a time when public trust already feels badly shaken in many parts of the country. This is why many critics believe all political parties should slow down and seriously examine Bill C 22 before pushing it further ahead. Privacy affects everyone regardless of political views. Once governments gain more access to people's private lives, every Canadian lives under that new reality. At its heart, this debate is not really about apps or phones. It is about how much freedom Canadians are willing to trade for promises of safety from institutions that openly admit they still cannot fully keep the public safe. That question may help decide what kind of country Canada becomes over the next few years.

Job Seekers Stop Fighting Business Realities Employers Want to See the Potential ROI of Hiring You
 By Nick Kossovian

Every second you spend on LinkedIn "raising awareness" about how the hiring system is supposedly broken or ranting about unicorn-hunting recruiters is a second you're choosing to stay unemployed. Employers don't care about your grievances; they have a business to run within the constraints of economic realities. By publicly and privately resisting the transactional realities that keep businesses and economies alive, you're not being a martyr; rather, you're showing employers you'd be difficult to manage. The employer-employee relationship is more asymmetrical and transactional than ever, and completely indifferent to your personal needs. Getting hired requires refraining from playing the oldest unproductive game of all—making excuses for why you're a victim—and instead showing employers how you can contribute to their profitability. Increasingly, I see job seekers who treat their job search like a shopping list for their lifestyle and expect employers to be their parents. Before they've proven—shown their track record of accomplishments and results—how they'll add value to the employer's bottom line or solve their problem(s), they demand remote work, six-figure salaries, and unlimited vacation. Employers aren't charities; it's not their concern that your rent went up, your car insurance doubled, or that you "believe" you work better from a beach in Mexico. An employer is a profit-seeking entity that has a fiduciary responsibility to its current employees and shareholders. Therefore, if you're not showing employers quantifiable numbers for how you've generated revenue, reduced costs, or removed risks for your past employers, you're just noise, similar to the noise chamma baboons make when arguing, which describes most job seekers. Even if you spend five percent of your day fighting the following variables, you're leading equity. Accept them—don't deny them—pivot and keep moving forward. The Economy- The economy is indifferent to your bills. Inflation and interest rates are macroeconomic constants; complaining about the "cost of living" during a job search, or the reason you deserve a raise, is a rookie mistake that signals entitlement rather than value. Employers pay for the ROI of a role, not the cost of your lifestyle. You're responsible for your financial management; the economy will not adjust to fund your personal overhead. AI and Automation Disruption - CEOs have a fiduciary responsibility to replace expensive, inefficient human processes with streamlined technology. This isn't an inhumane act; it's just business. In the emerging economy, you're either the employee leveraging AI to deliver 5x the value, or you're the overhead to be phased out. As a job seeker, instead of mourning the "old ways," show employers how you can leverage the "new ways." "Unfair" Hiring Processes - Nepotism and favouritism have always existed and will always exist, as every human is biased in some way or another. You can't change the "who you know" culture of a company you don't own, hence referrals always get priority. Your best move is to create a resume, envision a "Master Value Document," and a LinkedIn profile so compelling that being "well-connected" is no longer your competitors' only advantage. If you can't be the nephew, become the person who's too valuable to overlook. Aging - The 'ageism' shield is for those who refuse to adapt. Employers don't fear your age; they fear your overhead and your inability to learn. Pivot from 'seniority' to 'certainty.' Offer employers, indisputably, the proven reliability that a 27-year-old can't fake. If you market yourself as a relic, don't be surprised when you're treated like one. Change is Inevitable - In his 1973 book, Reflections on the Human Condition, Eric Hoffer wrote, "In times of change, learners inherit the earth, while the learned find themselves beautifully equipped to deal with a world that no longer exists." Nostalgia doesn't pay the bills, and 'experience' is a trap if not accompanied by constant evolution. If you can't explain to your interviewer what you've done to rebuild your skillset over the last 12 months, you're a dinosaur waiting for the asteroid. Rather than just 'handling' change, employers want to see that you thrive on it and are willing to master the tools that are terrifying many of their employees. The Golden Rule - If there's one business reality that's pointless to oppose, it's the Golden Rule: Whoever has the gold makes the rules. If you want to dictate your employment terms, start your own business. Until then, you're playing the employer's game on their turf by their rules. It's not necessary to like the employer's rules, but you must abide by them, especially during their hiring process, to be hired. Arguing with business realities has the consequence of you always losing. Essentially, you are telling yourself comforting lies, or buying into comforting lies being told, to make yourself feel better about not getting what you want. Public outbursts on LinkedIn aren't the answer. The only thing such behaviour does is signal to employers that you are unable to manage your emotions, making you a high-risk hire. Resisting business realities is why many job seekers are experiencing prolonged unemployment; your best job search strategy is to refrain from complaining and focus on proving to employers that you can contribute to their profitability.

New Episodes Every Tuesday!

THE Mr. X Files

With John Mutton

Subscribe on YouTube and Spotify

Scan with your phone to go directly to The Mr.X Files

OCN

READ #1 DURHAM'S NEWSPAPER

www.OCentral.com

Serving Durham For Over 30 Years