



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



## A Journalist's Answer on Gun Policy

By Dale Jodoi  
Columnist

People often ask me for my opinion on gun policy. They usually expect a reaction driven by emotion. I do not give them that. I am a journalist. When I answer, I answer the same way I write. I rely on facts, patterns, and outcomes that can be measured. Feelings matter in human stories, but public policy has to stand on evidence or it collapses under its own weight.

When someone asks why I oppose repeated gun bans aimed at legal owners, my answer starts with context, not ideology.

First, let me be clear about one thing that should never be blurred. The Montreal massacre was a crime of pure evil. Those women were murdered. Nothing excuses it. Nothing justifies it. Acknowledging that truth is not optional and it does not weaken any argument that follows. It strengthens it by keeping facts grounded in reality instead of denial.

Now to the data.

In Canada, the majority of firearm related violent crime involves handguns. Police statistics, court records, and border seizure reports all point to the same conclusion. These handguns are overwhelmingly illegal. They are smuggled into Canada, primarily from the United States. They are not bought at Canadian gun stores. They are not registered. They are not owned by people who passed background checks or completed safety training.

That fact alone should shape policy. Instead, policy continues to move in the opposite direction.

The federal government has spent years expanding restrictions on legal firearms owners. Billions of dollars have been allocated to buy back firearms that were never used in crimes. Some hunting rifles have been swept into prohibition lists despite having no link to urban violence. At the same time, smuggling routes remain active, border enforcement remains thin, and repeat violent offenders continue to cycle through the justice system.

This is not a matter of opinion. It is observable.

If removing legal firearms reduced violent crime, we would expect to see a clear downward trend after each major legislative change. That trend does not exist. In fact, gun crime involving handguns has increased in many cities during the same period that legal ownership has been further restricted.

That contradiction is not explained away by slogans.

Another question I am asked is why anti gun advocacy groups push so hard for these measures when evidence shows they do not address the main source of crime. The answer is uncomfortable but necessary. Many of these groups receive government funding. Their survival depends on the continuation of the issue. If the problem were solved through border enforcement and serious sentencing, their relevance would diminish. That creates a built in conflict of interest.

Again, that is not an accusation. It is a structural reality.

When policy discussions are dominated by groups whose funding depends on fear, the conversation drifts away from results and toward symbolism. Banning visible objects creates the appearance of action. It generates headlines. It reassures people who want quick answers. But it does not stop criminals who operate entirely outside the law.

Police leaders across multiple provinces have said this publicly. Chiefs of police have stated that confiscating legally owned firearms will not stop gang shootings. Provincial governments of different political stripes have opposed federal overreach in this area. These are not fringe voices. These are professionals tasked with public safety.

Yet their input is routinely ignored.

There is also the issue of expertise. Some of the strongest voices pushing firearm bans have limited technical knowledge of firearms themselves. That matters because policy based on misunderstanding leads to unintended consequences. When lawmakers cannot distinguish between different types of firearms yet regulate them broadly, precision is lost and fairness disappears.

The justice system presents another hard truth.

Violence is violence regardless of the tool used. A murder committed with a gun is as wrong as one committed with a knife, a club, or bare hands. Focusing solely on the instrument distracts from the individual committing the act. Public safety improves when violent offenders are removed from the public, not when inanimate objects are blamed.

Canada has seen too many cases where individuals with long violent records were released early, breached conditions, or reoffended shortly after parole. Each time this happens, the response is rarely a serious discussion about sentencing or supervision. Instead, attention shifts back to lawful firearm owners.

That pattern raises legitimate questions.

Why is it politically easier to regulate people who comply than to confront people who do not. Why is enforcement at the border underfunded while buyback programs are generously financed. Why are repeat violent offenders released while licensed citizens are treated as potential threats.

These questions deserve answers grounded in evidence, not moral posturing.

Legal firearms owners in Canada already live under one of the most regulated systems in the world. Licensing involves background checks, references, daily eligibility screening, mandatory training, and strict storage rules. These individuals are statistically among the least likely to commit violent crime. That is not speculation. That is supported by decades of data.

Targeting them further does not make communities safer. It simply diverts resources away from where harm actually originates.

If the goal is to reduce violence, the path is clear. Invest in border security. Monitor rail and port traffic. Fund organized crime units. Impose serious consequences for gun trafficking. End the cycle of catch and release for violent offenders. Support police with tools that address real threats, not symbolic ones.

As a journalist, my responsibility is not to comfort or inflame. It is to connect policy claims to outcomes. When those outcomes do not align, it is my job to say so plainly.

Facts do not take sides. They simply wait to be acknowledged.

If we want honest public debate, we have to stop confusing visibility with effectiveness. We have to stop punishing compliance and start addressing criminal behaviour directly. And we have to stop pretending that repeating the same failed approach will somehow produce a different result.

That is not ideology. That is observation.



## 'Taste Like Chicken' Is Not a Compliment

By Nick Kossovan

More than ever, the job market is noisy, and competition is, to say the least, fierce. For job seekers, the biggest challenge isn't a lack of skills or experience; it's a lack of visibility.

Recruiters and hiring managers are inundated with applications. I receive at least 10 emails or DMs daily from job seekers, most of whom send a bland message like, "Please look at my résumé and let me know if you have a job for me." This lazy outreach tastes like rubbery chicken, making it easy to ignore, delete, and forget.

At the risk of stating the obvious, hiring paradigms have shifted dramatically thanks to the Internet and social media. Today, recruiters and hiring managers don't just read résumés. They scour LinkedIn, Google people, and social media to find individuals who are not only qualified but also relevant, who clearly explain what they do (read: the results they've achieved), in which area they are a SME (Subject Matter Expert), and who are moving forward. They're seeking industry leaders and thinkers who can propel their client or company into the future.

Whether you're job searching, maintaining your career, or looking to advance it, positioning yourself as a trusted voice in your industry or profession gives you a significant advantage.

Reminiscent of a Greek tragedy, many over-50 job seekers and Gen Xers, despite being incredibly qualified, struggle because of limited social media proficiency. They built their careers before social media platforms mattered, leaving them at a disadvantage in today's cutthroat job market.

So how do you capture the attention of recruiters and hiring managers? Start with the basics:

### Optimize your LinkedIn profile:

Your LinkedIn profile is your professional landing page, which recruiters and employers will inevitably review to determine whether you're worth speaking with. It's here that you provide employers, recruiters, and your network with a 360-degree view of your career and personality by showcasing your skills, experience, and achievements. By simply doing what I still see many job seekers not do, which is making sure your LinkedIn profile includes a professional headshot, an eye-catching banner, a keyword-rich headline, and an 'About' section that conveys your career story in a way that makes the reader say, "I must meet this person!" you'll be ahead of most job seekers when it comes to making yourself visible.

### Recommendation:

Subscribe to Kristof Schoenaerts Substack newsletter, Job Search Unlocked.

### Adopt a "proof of results" mindset:

Although numbers are the language of business, few job seekers speak that language. Whether on your résumé or LinkedIn profile, listing duties is, from an employer's perspective, inconsequential. Employers are only interested in the results you achieved—your impact—for your previous employers. Therefore, speak the language of business and speak of your results (e.g., "Increased website traffic by 200% within 18 months," "In 2025, the number of accounts in my assigned territory grew from 150 to 225.").

### Leverage the hidden job market:

Nowadays, connections are key to job search success. Recruiters and employers are increasingly relying on referrals and their networks to avoid being inundated with applications and having to weed out mostly irrelevant applications. Get serious about networking with individuals in your industry and profession, as well as at your target companies. One strong conversation with a decision-maker outweighs sending hundreds of generic applications.

### Two recommendations:

1. Read *Dig Your Well Before You're Thirsty*, by Harvey Mackay
2. Subscribe to Greg Roche's Substack newsletter, *The Introverted Networker*.

### Engage Strategically:

As I mentioned, your LinkedIn profile is a 24/7/365 living portfolio of your work and, more importantly, of how you think. Beyond optimising your profile, you must actively engage with your network. Engage daily with 2-3 key posts related to your industry or profession. Focus on thoughtful commenting rather than just liking, aiming for 15-20 influential, relevant connections. Use a 3x3x3 approach daily to enhance your visibility: engage with 3 posts, 3 people, and 3 comments. This'll go a long way toward helping you appear in searches and be top-of-mind with recruiters and employers.

By taking the proactive steps outlined above, you'll gain visibility that far surpasses most job seekers'. However, for the most part, you'll still "taste like chicken," making you easy to dismiss in today's job market. It's crucial to offer something more, something all employers crave beyond finding a candidate who'll merely get the job done. Today, employers are especially hungry for fresh ideas and perspectives, which is why I recommend presenting an idea when applying.

What better way to showcase your knowledge and passion for their business than by sharing an innovative suggestion to improve their products, services, or processes? This shows you're serious about the opportunity and have taken the time to understand their business. If your suggestion ties to profitability, you'll position yourself as an invaluable candidate.

As a job seeker, are you making yourself visible in the current crowded job market? If not, you're prolonging your job search. You need to be more than just another indistinguishable application. Stand out! Engage! Don't be afraid to promote your experience, the results you've achieved and how you think. Ensure you're not just another job seeker who tastes like chicken.