



**This Is Why The Central Is Number One Across The Region**  
**Our Top Notch Local Columnist**  
*Keeping You Informed*



**When the Weather Becomes the Argument**

By Dale Jodoin  
 Columnist

I've been listening to the noise for years now. Every storm is proof of something. Every heat wave is a warning. Every cold snap is either evidence or denial depending on who's talking. Snow falls in a place that "never" had snow before and suddenly it's the end of the world. Then summer runs hot and dry and we're told deserts are creeping closer. Turn on the television and it feels like the sky is either burning or about to freeze solid. It's always urgent. Always dramatic. Always now. I'm not writing this as someone waving a sign. I'm writing this as someone who reads history before reading headlines. Because history has weather too.

There was a time called the Little Ice Age. Winters stretched long and bitter across Europe. Rivers froze hard enough to walk across. Crops failed again and again. People starved quietly. In 1816, after Mount Tambora erupted, snow fell in June across parts of North America. They called it the Year Without a Summer. Farmers planted fields and watched everything die. Food prices soared. Anger followed hunger. That happened long before carbon taxes. Long before gas engines. Long before politicians learned how powerful environmental language could be. Then there were warmer centuries. The Medieval Warm Period allowed farming in places that later became too cold. Vikings settled Greenland. Vineyards stretched farther north. The planet has always moved in cycles, like breathing in and out. So when someone says the weather has never done this before, I slow down. That does not mean nothing is happening today. Temperatures have risen since the late 1800s. Arctic sea ice has declined in recent decades. Sea levels have edged upward. Satellites, surface readings, ice cores, they all show change. Most climate scientists agree that human industry, especially fossil fuel use, contributes to warming. That part deserves honesty. But honesty must run both ways. What unsettles people is not the data. It's the tone. Every flood becomes proof of collapse. Every wildfire becomes a moral judgment. Every question becomes denial. Regular families are not sitting at kitchen tables debating atmospheric chemistry. They are trying to afford groceries. They are watching heating bills climb in winter. They are feeling fuel costs ripple through everything they buy. When policies meant to save the planet raise everyday costs, people notice. They notice when carbon pricing shows up on their bills. They notice when farmers say input costs are rising. They notice when governments speak of sacrifice while global emissions continue rising elsewhere. Canada tightens. Parts of Europe tighten. Meanwhile China emits more total carbon than any other nation. India grows. The United States remains high on a per person basis. Global emissions do not disappear just because one country sets targets. That tension fuels frustration. It is fair to ask whether policies are effective. It is fair to ask whether they are balanced. It is fair to ask whether working families are carrying more weight than large industrial players. What is not fair is shutting down those questions. Yes, the climate changes naturally. Yes, humans now influence it. Both can be true. Oceans shift heat across the planet. Solar cycles rise and fall. Volcanoes inject particles into the sky. These forces still exist. Climate systems are complex. They do not respond to one cause alone. We have also heard dire warnings before. Acid rain would destroy forests forever. The ozone hole would bring catastrophe. A coming ice age was once discussed. Some environmental concerns were real and addressed. Others were exaggerated. The world did not end. That history makes people cautious. There are claims about secret weather control programs spraying the skies. There is no solid, credible evidence supporting large scale secret operations controlling daily weather patterns. Extraordinary claims require extraordinary proof. Without that proof, they remain claims. There are debates about lab grown meat, methane from cattle, new technologies aimed at reducing emissions. Those discussions deserve transparency. Long term effects should be studied carefully. Innovation should not move faster than understanding. But fear should not be the engine. Fear makes people compliant. Fear moves markets. Fear wins elections. If you tell citizens the planet will collapse within a decade, they may accept policies without scrutiny. If you tell them disagreement equals ignorance, they may stop speaking. A healthy society does the opposite. It questions loudly. It reads broadly. It allows disagreement without exile. We are not fragile creatures waiting for extinction. Humanity has survived ice ages, plagues, revolutions, failed harvests, and wars. We have endured heat and cold, drought and flood. We adapt. We build differently. We learn from mistakes. What we cannot survive is intellectual laziness. Blind denial helps no one. Saying there is no warming at all ignores strong evidence. Blind acceptance helps no one either. Accepting every policy as necessary without examining costs and benefits weakens democracy. The truth lives in the middle, uncomfortable and complicated. The climate is changing. Humans influence it. Natural cycles continue. Governments respond. Some responses are sensible. Some are flawed. Some may be more about revenue than results. That deserves scrutiny. Plant a tree if you want. Recycle because you care. Conserve energy where it makes sense. Protect your land and water because they belong to your children. But keep your mind active. Read history. Read science. Read independent voices. Notice who profits from the alarm. Notice who profits from denial. Notice who becomes wealthier while ordinary people tighten their belts. Balance is strength. We will survive warming years and cooling years. We will survive new technologies and flawed policies. We will survive loud headlines and political speeches. But survival with dignity requires vigilance. A free country does not demand silence. It demands engagement. Ask questions never accept what a government is giving you because they're getting comfortable making money off your hard work



**Most Resumes Do Not Fail Screening. They Fail Trust.**

By Nick Kossovan

The crux of all hiring decisions comes down to one word: trust. AI, combined with a growing number of malicious actors in the job market, has eroded trust between employers and job seekers, an issue that is worsening.

Today, everyone's resume looks great. Same buzzwords. Same frameworks. Same: "I managed," "I built," "I scaled." Miraculously, every candidate is strategic, results-driven and cross-functional. With AI, it is easy to create a slick veneer of tripe, filled with buzzwords from the job posting, at best, making hollow promises. Most job seekers, especially bad actors, focus on looking smooth.

In contrast, savvy job seekers focus on presenting evidence—quantifying their impact on their employer's business (read: profitability)—to build trust.

ATSs and, to a large extent, humans struggle to distinguish between effort, outcomes, and mimicking the job posting; therefore, hiring managers and recruiters seek job seekers who do what most don't: quantify, with numbers, the friction they caused in their previous employer's business.

What does "Led a team of inside sales reps to achieve sales quota" mean? What value does this sentence offer? Does it build any trust or credibility? The same for:

- "Managed and maintained the organization's social media accounts to strengthen Wayne Enterprises' online presence."
- "Managed the team calendar."
- "Handled customer inquiries."
- "Filed reports."
- "Supported sales and marketing efforts."
- "Improved office efficiency."
- "Hard worker with a go-getter attitude." (Isn't every jobseeker?)

These sentences list duties and opinions ("Employers don't hire opinions; they hire results") instead of what employers want to see: your accomplishments (read: results). Moreover, they fail to answer the critical "so what?" question.

Hiring managers and recruiters aren't asking, "Is this candidate impressive?" They're asking, "Can I trust this person to deliver the results we need?" Most resumes and LinkedIn profiles don't fail screening. They fail trust.

A highly effective job search strategy is to concentrate intensely on demonstrating to recruiters and employers that you are results-oriented. Candidates who come across as trustworthy, result-driven, and reliable, and who aren't afraid to own their results, are the ones employers swoon over.

A common job search myth, perpetuated by a sense of entitlement, is that one's experience, which is subjective, speaks for itself. It doesn't. Experience only holds value for an employer if the person with the "experience" can be trusted to produce measurable results. Job seekers need to understand that hiring doesn't occur in a reflective environment that gives a job seeker, who's a stranger to the hiring manager, the benefit of the doubt. Hiring occurs under pressure. Resumes and LinkedIn profiles are rapidly scrutinized for evidence of impact at prior employers. When a resume or LinkedIn profile doesn't provide evidence of impact, it becomes, without a second thought, a "No."

Hiring isn't mysterious, as many would like you to believe, especially those who benefit—make money—from you believing it is. It's layered. The first layer is answering the question every hiring manager asks themselves when scanning a resume: "What has this person achieved?" If what you've achieved leads the hiring manager to think, "[Name] could be someone we can use here," then the candidate moves on to the second layer, determining whether you can be trusted.

AI or not, resumes never tell someone's full story. As I pointed out at the beginning, the job market abounds with bad actors and job seekers who exaggerate or outright lie about their experience and qualifications, or whose behaviour (personality traits) isn't conducive to being an employer's ideal employee. Nowadays, employers understandably seek a comprehensive view of a candidate, so they:

- Google the candidate—check their digital footprint (read: behaviour)—and review their social media activity (articles, blogs, comments, posts), especially on LinkedIn, to determine whether they're interview-worthy. Does the candidate's online presence raise any questions? Are they associated with (written, commented on, reposted) any industry- or profession-related articles or blogs? What charitable activities do they engage in? Do any illicit or questionable activities appear?

· Look them in the eye, listen, and observe how they communicate during the interview. Speaking for myself, a lack of communication skills—the ability to articulate with confidence—is a non-negotiable requirement when I hire. The way a candidate communicates with me—I'll also ask candidates to write something to gauge their written communication skills and how they think (writing is thinking)—is how they'll communicate with customers, prospects, and their colleagues.

"The ability to communicate is critical to building relationships, to leadership, and to learning." Sheryl Sandberg, American technology executive, philanthropist and writer.

- Ensure the applicant can walk their talk by asking them to take an assessment test or complete an assignment. I've lost count of how many candidates I've interviewed who talked a good game but didn't pass an assessment or submit a subpar assignment.

Resumes and LinkedIn profiles have always contained a great deal of fluff, embellishments, and falsehoods. As employers grow increasingly weary of job seekers' claims, the core issue job seekers face is communicating their value in a few seconds and convincing employers they can be trusted. Job seekers who empathize with employers, have trust issues, and therefore focus on building credibility to gain trust will be far ahead of their competition.