

Around the Coffee Table with Dale Jodoin

The End of Canada: A Hatred for One Man

By Dale Jodoin
Columnist

How do you talk about your country falling apart and still keep your voice down?

I am trying. But there comes a point when being polite starts to feel like helping people avoid the question.

My question is this: has hatred for Donald Trump become so useful to Canadian politicians that we are letting our own government escape responsibility?

Mark Carney leads the Liberal government. He owes Canadians answers about his decisions. Whatever Trump says tomorrow does not cancel that duty today.

Yet I believe the Liberals and commentators sympathetic to them have found a powerful weapon: make the Conservatives sound like Trump, then let hatred do the rest.

People sometimes call it “Trump syndrome.” I mean the habit of dragging every Canadian argument back to one American man until our own problems disappear behind his face.

You can hate Trump. That is your business. But why should that hatred buy Ottawa another excuse?

There are Canadians sitting at kitchen tables who feel something is badly wrong. They stretch groceries, put off repairs and wonder what kind of future their children will inherit. Then they hear another polished speech about how well things are going.

That gap makes people angry. Being told their anger is ignorance makes it worse.

I understand that anger. What wears me down is the feeling that asking an ordinary question now requires proving which political team you belong to first.

Where did the money go? Who got the contract? What did taxpayers receive? Why was that promise broken?

Those questions belong to everyone.

And when a government gets caught misleading the public, the response should be an explanation, a correction and consequences where warranted. It should never be a reminder that the opposition might be worse.

A different villain does not make a dishonest answer honest.

I want the same standard applied to Carney that his supporters would demand from a Conservative prime minister. No special discount because he speaks calmly. No extra credit because someone hates Trump.

Show us the results.

Borrowing deserves scrutiny. Corporate deals deserve scrutiny. So do laws that give the government more power over our lives. Explain the costs, publish the terms and show us the safeguards.

Do not sell me a promise and send my grandchildren the invoice.

And please, spare me the idea that questioning Ottawa means I care less about Canadian sovereignty.

A country belongs to its citizens. Its government answers to them.

That includes citizens who are angry, tired or unimpressed.

The news media have a responsibility here, too. CBC and private outlets should challenge claims from every party. When coverage substitutes a Trump comparison for examining a Canadian policy, I believe readers are being shortchanged.

Tell me what the proposal does. Tell me whether the numbers add up. Let me make up my mind.

I will not call every journalist I bought. That accusation needs proof. But I will ask whether the same tough questions reach every microphone.

I also know my Liberal voting neighbour loves this country. We may argue across the fence, but neither of us benefits when political loyalty becomes stronger than common sense.

That is where the conversation has to begin.

We cannot keep treating every criticism as betrayal and every election as permission to stop paying attention. Supporting a party does not require defending everything it does.

Sometimes loyalty to Canada means telling your own side it has failed.

That is the anger I want Ottawa to hear: Canadians asking to be respected, answered and remembered between elections.

We deserve better than another campaign that treats our fears as votes already safely collected.

Because I fear we could lose something precious while congratulating ourselves for hating the right person.

Taking our country back means peaceful votes, public questions and a government that remembers whose money it spends.

How much are Canadians prepared to overlook at home because they hate one man abroad?



The Trojan Horse Interview Strategy: Future Pacing

By Nick Kossovan

In the 1998 film Meet Joe Black, Brad Pitt's character, Joe Black, meets Susan Parrish, played by Claire Forlani, in a New York City coffee shop. They share an immediate connection sparked by mutual curiosity. Midway through their conversation, Joe leans in and casually proposes a bold "what if" scenario: "Say you and I were married..."

In an instant, the boundary between Joe and Susan dissolves. Joe's hypothetical scenario compels Susan to envision a shared future, a critical mental framework for building a relationship. Joe used "future pacing" to explore hypothetical scenarios, building emotional rapport and fostering a sense of "we." In an interview, offering a low-pressure glimpse of a potential future connection can be a game-changer.

By asking forward-looking, high-yield questions, such as "Say I'm six months into this role and looking back at a massive success, what did I achieve?" you invite the hiring manager to picture you in the role. Now you're not an applicant defending your work history; you're a colleague solving a problem, which makes hiring you feel natural.

Thanks to self-proclaimed career coaches, many job seekers fixate on superficial interview etiquette, such as what to wear, how to sit, or whether bringing a coffee looks unprofessional. Flawless manners alone won't win an offer, though they help. What matters is controlling your narrative. Obsessing over supposed "rules" unnecessarily creates anxiety and nervousness, giving interviewers a reason to reject you.

An interview isn't a social hangout where you casually nurse a drink; it's a theatrical performance of competence. For me, whether in a professional or social setting, I perform best when I don't give too much of a f*ck. That significantly eases the self-imposed stress of having to be perfect. Instead of worrying about whether I should've worn my blue sports jacket, brought copies of my resume, taken notes (I never do), accepted the water I was offered, or whether my handshake was too limp or too firm, I focus on the one thing that actually moves the needle toward being hired: psychological alignment.

Think about how effective communication works at its core. Rather than simply telling someone what to think, a master communicator helps them imagine what the future could look and feel like.

Great leaders use it to inspire their teams: "Imagine what we could accomplish if we worked together toward this vision." Great salespeople use it to help prospects envision a better future: "Imagine how much time you'd save if you could automate this process. Now imagine spending those extra hours with your family instead of sitting in front of a screen." Legendary communicators like Steve Jobs used it to change the world. Jobs didn't pitch a hard drive with technical specs; he asked consumers to imagine "1,000 songs in your pocket."

The key to persuasion is simple: people connect not only with what you say but also with what you help them imagine and see.

When you sit across from a recruiter or hiring manager, you're fighting an uphill battle against their risk aversion. They're scanning your background for flaws, comparing you to ten other nervous candidates with similar qualifications and experience, and imagining the headache of managing you. If you stick to simply answering questions defensively, you become another forgettable candidate.

You must flip the script. Conversational hypotheticals act like a Trojan horse, bypassing human scepticism and transporting you and your interviewer into a future where you're colleagues, rather than simply rehashing your employment history.+

Here's how you can make that shift in real time. Instead of giving rehearsed answers, use these five conversational pivots to steer your interviewer past your employment history and directly to you as an employee.

Don't save these for when your interviewer asks, “Do you have any questions for me?” By then, it's too late. You've already spent forty-five minutes playing defence. Instead, introduce future scenarios as natural follow-ups to your interviewer's questions, shifting the conversation from interrogation to collaboration.

· The Vision Anchor: "Say we're sitting here six months from today, celebrating the turnaround in this department. What's the single biggest operational bottleneck we cleared?"

· The Problem-Solver Frame: "Suppose you handed me the keys to this project on day one. Imagine walking into the Friday review meeting. What results on that whiteboard would make you feel that hiring me was the best decision you made?"

· The Collaboration Hook: "Let's pretend I'm on board and we're tackling the supply chain lag you mentioned. How do you prefer we work through roadblocks like this?"

· The Cultural Fit Probe: "Imagine we've just wrapped up our first quarter together and the team is hitting its stride. What's a habit or mindset you'll see me bring to the floor every morning?"

· The Strategic Bridge: "Say you look back a year from now and realize that bringing me on board completely transformed this division. What did I master first?"

Stop treating interviews like interrogations where you’re forced to account for your past. Treat them as collaborative auditions for a future that hasn’t yet happened. Don't ask for permission; make your interviewer picture you in the role long before they say,

“You’re hired!”

