





**Around the Coffee Table with Dale Jodoin**  
**Parliament Discovers the Internet**

By Dale Jodoin  
Columnist

Tomorrow's news may arrive carrying another suitcase full of shiny new words. Looksmaxing. Tradwives. The manosphere. Harmful content. Digital radicalization. Anti Feminist ideology. Most Canadians will hear these terms while making coffee, getting children ready for school, heading to work, checking on an elderly parent or wondering why the car suddenly needs another repair. Regular people do not wake up in the morning asking whether their neighbours have entered the manosphere. They are too busy trying to remember what day the recycling goes out.

The House of Commons Standing Committee on the Status of Women released a report called Confronting Anti Feminist Ideologies in Canada. It examines internet trends, online influencers, looksmaxing, tradwife content and speech on social media. I tried saying looksmaxing out loud three times. By the third attempt, I felt as if I should either be joining a gym or ordering something from a drive through. "Yes, I would like one looksmaxing, a medium coffee and whatever option has fewer wrinkles."

Looksmaxing generally means trying to improve your appearance. That can become unhealthy or extreme online, especially when young people are told they will never be good enough. That deserves attention. But improving your appearance is not automatically radical. Getting a haircut, exercising, wearing better clothes or finally throwing out the shirt your wife has hated since 1998 is simply called living. Then there is the tradwife movement. This usually involves women online promoting traditional marriage, homemaking, cooking and raising children. Some people may dislike that choice. Others may admire it. But a woman wanting to stay home with her children is not automatically being controlled, brainwashed or recruited into some dangerous movement. Feminism was supposed to mean women had choices. That includes the choice to build a career, stay home, do both or change direction halfway through life.

The manosphere sounds like a glass dome where men are kept until they learn how to load the dishwasher correctly. In reality, it is a broad label for online spaces where men discuss dating, masculinity, relationships and personal frustrations. Some of those spaces contain hatred and threats. Others contain lonely men struggling to talk about their problems. Government must be able to tell the difference. There are radicals online. There are people who threaten women, spread hatred and encourage violence. Women should be protected from them. Children should also be protected from predators, exploitation and people who use the internet to target the vulnerable. That is where the discussion needs to become more serious. Real women and children are being trafficked, sexually exploited, assaulted, threatened and abused. Some are lured online. Some disappear. Some are forced into situations they never chose. These are not fashionable words invented for a committee meeting. These are crimes, and they destroy lives. Canada should focus its strongest laws, police resources and public attention on those who commit real crimes against women and children. Traffickers, predators, violent offenders and those who distribute abusive material should face serious consequences. Protecting victims should never become secondary to debating whether a homemaking video or a man's negative dating advice belongs under a new political label.

The report contains 14 recommendations, including more online regulation, public education, digital literacy, programs for men and boys and further research. Canadians can read the complete report at: <https://www.ourcommons.ca/DocumentViewer/en/45-1/FEWO/report-6/> The committee study page, including meetings, witnesses and submitted briefs, can be found at: <https://www.ourcommons.ca/committees/en/FEWO/StudyActivity?studyActivityId=13147239>

A committee report is not a law. It does not make homemaking, exercise, traditional marriage or criticism of feminism illegal. But reports can shape future policies, programs and legislation, so people should pay attention to the language being used. Regular Canadians do not spend their lives sorting their neighbours into ideological boxes. They judge people by how they behave. A kind man is a kind person. A cruel man is a cruel person. A woman who works outside the home is making her choice. A woman who chooses to stay home is making her own choice. Ottawa should protect freedom while going after genuine criminals. It should spend less time turning ordinary choices into suspicious movements and more time stopping the people who prey on women and children. That is not anti feminist. That is common sense.



**Who Do You Think Owns the Hiring Process?**  
**(Hint: It's Not the Job Seeker)**

By Nick Kossovan

Desperation-monetizing career grifters, better known as self-proclaimed career coaches, sell the comforting fiction that the job seeker is at the centre of the hiring process. They peddle platitudes such as "interviewing the company" and "knowing your worth" to keep their predatory billing engines humming. It is a seductive, fragile illusion of control, but a dangerous one to believe. What these grifters never acknowledge is that the hiring process is the employer's exclusive prerogative. The employer owns their business; hence, they own their hiring process—designing it as they see fit—and make the final decisions. The job seeker, who bears none of the financial or operational risk that the employer is responsible for, is in no position to dictate how an employer should hire or what constitutes "being qualified."

Behind the polite performance of the interview, your interviewer is seeking clinical answers to the questions bouncing around in their head:

- Are you qualified or overqualified? (Being overqualified comes with many hiring risks.)
- Are you a fit? (No manager wants to police a culture clash.)
- Are you someone they can trust?
- Are you someone whom they believe? (You aren't just talking a "good game.")
- Are you teachable?
- Are you someone who'll be easy to manage?
- Are you someone who'll stick around, or will you bolt the moment the going gets tough?
- Can you be relied on, or are you fragile and will ask for a mental health day because it's raining?
- Are you a team player or will you utter the toxic phrase, "It's not my job"?

How you describe yourself on your resume or in an interview is nothing more than your curated opinion of yourself. Employers don't hire opinions. They don't care that you self-identify as a "motivated self-starter" or a "dynamic leader." They hire predictable results. This is why you must show quantitative metrics, such as average deal size, contract renegotiation savings, budgets managed, revenue growth, audience reach, or customer retention rates, to support your claims. Employers hire candidates they believe will protect, and ideally enhance, their profitability without disrupting workflows or upsetting the current team. This is where the divide between the perpetual job seeker and the successful candidate widens into a chasm. Vague job seekers get ignored. Specific ones get hired. When you use vague, generalized language, you're expecting hiring managers to do the heavy lifting of figuring out what you actually do and the value you bring. This expectation is a form of passive entitlement. Hiring managers and recruiters are not in the business of solving riddles. A vague resume says, "I'm a hardworking communications professional." A specific resume says, "I managed a team of four to deliver three provincial marketing campaigns that increased inbound leads by 22%." Specificity removes the guesswork, replaces opinion with evidence, and respects the employer's time. While the final decision always rests with the employer, you are far from powerless. You can't force an employer's hand, but you can heavily stack the deck in your favour. Your qualifications are for the employer to judge, but how you're perceived by recruiters and hiring managers is entirely your responsibility. Tilting the odds in your favour starts with mastering three foundational pillars that shape how you're perceived. The first pillar is your professional image and digital footprint. If your resume piques an employer's interest, they'll Google you and scrutinize your LinkedIn profile and online activity to determine whether you're interview-worthy. If your online presence is non-existent, inconsistent, or worse, controversial, you're not getting called. Make no mistake, in 2026, curating and maintaining a clean, professional, and consistent digital footprint is required to get green-lighted for an interview. The second pillar is profitability. Every hire is an investment, and in business, investments must yield a return. The employer must believe you'll deliver results that positively impact their bottom line. Whether you're in sales, operations, or administration, your job is to show how your presence either makes the company money, saves the company money, or optimizes the time of those who do. The third and final pillar is proving you're a low-risk hire. Hiring's an expensive, time-consuming, and risky endeavour. A bad hire can disrupt team morale, hurt productivity, and make the decision-maker look bad, a fear that shouldn't be underestimated. Hiring isn't about finding the perfect candidate; it's about risk mitigation. Because the hiring process is a process of elimination, recruiters and hiring managers actively look for reasons to eliminate you. As a job seeker, your job is to present yourself as reliable, adaptable, easy to manage, and resilient, making you a safe bet to hire.

The job market is an employer's market by design; an asymmetrical relationship in which those writing the paycheques dictate the terms. Always has been, always will be. Accepting this structural reality isn't a capitulation; it's a calibration. Once you've abandoned the illusion of control over who gets hired and focus entirely on managing your image, demonstrating you'll positively influence the bottom line, and lowering hiring risk, you'll stop being a job seeker begging for a job and become the candidate employers can't afford to miss out on.

DURHAM'S #1 NEWSPAPER

**The Central**

THE VOICE OF DURHAM REGION

Your Community. Your Voice. Your Newspaper.

**SURVIVED COVID.**  
HARSH ECONOMIC TIMES.  
AND  
**NEVER QUIT.**  
Through every challenge.  
**WE KEPT PRINTING.**



**WE ARE TIME TESTED**  
Proven. Trusted. For Generations.



**INDUSTRY RESPECTED**  
Committed to Excellence in Journalism.



**GLOBALLY RECOGNIZED**  
Local Stories. Global Impact.



**BUILT ON TRUST. DRIVEN BY COMMUNITY.**  
Committed to Durham. Always.