

Blogs, Articles and Speeches

Table of Contents

Preface

Introduction

Part 1: Blogs and Articles in 2011

Chapter 1: June 11 to June 19, 2011  
First Blog, Appeal Hearing Coverage

Chapter 2: June 21 to November 5, 2011  
About My Memoirs, Other Topics

Chapter 3: November 7 to December 3, 2011  
About the Appeal

Chapter 4: December 5 to December 23, 2011  
Questions and Comments About My Memoirs

Chapter 5: December 27 to December 31, 2011  
For Christmas and the New Year

Part 2: Blogs, Articles and Speeches in 2012

Chapter 6: January 2 to March 12, 2012  
Resolutions, Memoirs, Health, Questions

Chapter 7: February 2012  
Speech: World Affairs Conference

Chapter 8: March 27 to May 30, 2012  
Decision Time, Updates and Comments on the Case

Chapter 9: June 2012  
Speech: Idea City Conference

Chapter 10: July 22 to July 28, 2012  
Book Optioned, Media Project Explored

Chapter 11: December 2012

Speech: Acton, Ontario

### Part 3: Blogs, Articles and Speeches in 2013

Chapter 12: March 2013

Speech: Big Suzie's

Chapter 13: June 27, 2013

Reply to Newspaper Article

Chapter 14: June 2013

Speech: Allan Gardens Rally

Chapter 15: December 14 to December 30, 2013

Supreme Court Decision

### Part 4: Blogs, Articles and Speeches from 2014 to 2017

Chapter 16: January 2 to June 2, 2014

The Debate Continues

Chapter 17: January 2014

Speech: University of Windsor

Chapter 18: February 2014

Speech: Concordia University

Chapter 19: March 2014

Speech: Law Union of Ontario

Chapter 20: June 4 to June 18, 2014

Blog and Articles: Bill C-36 Introduced

Chapter 21: September 2014

Speech: Senate

Chapter 22: November 2014

Speech: Ontario Civil Liberties Association

Chapter 23: May 29, 2015

Blog: Justice Minister Quits

Chapter 24: October 2015

Message to Activists

Chapter 25: December 2015

Speech: Carlton University

Chapter 26: April 2016

Submission on Human Trafficking

Chapter 27: July 2017

Speech: The 2013 Red Umbrella Rallies

Part 5: Blogs, Articles and Speeches from 2018 to 2022

Chapter 28: January 2018

Speech: University of Windsor Law School

Chapter 29: February 2020

Blog: Day Before Court Decision on New Law's Constitutionality

Chapter 30: December 2020

Speech: WISH Drop-in Centre Society

Chapter 31: December 2020

Speech: Maggie's of Toronto

Chapter 32: May 2022

Speech: Windsor Feminist Theatre

Chapter 33: June 2022

Article: Justin Trudeau and the Sex Trade

Chapter 99: The Present

Conclusions

.....

Preface

I am Canada's most famous dominatrix. I became known because of my legal battles and the establishments I ran. During the course of my last legal battle I appeared outside the courts and on television to meet with reporters. I also wrote blogged, wrote articles and gave speeches. The written materials were put on my Web and social media sites. By the end of 2014 I said what I had to say. The battle for better laws was in good, younger and healthier hands. So I have rarely blogged or whatever since.

Since then people whose judgment I respect told me that with some narrative and explanatory context these blogs, articles, prepared speech texts and my testimony in the constitutional case would make a good book. They said the reader would be informed by these various writings on much about the legal and political battles over the sex trade in a manner that my earlier books did not do. They said it would interesting to read about what prompted the writings, how I chose what to say, and how what I said or wrote was received, as well as what I myself think about the writings and speeches now. So, as always with help, I collected everything I wrote and offer most of it here. I would have done this sooner, but other, more formal, writing projects had to be finished first.

This book is dedicated to a few close friends and supporters. As always, they wish to remain in the dark. They helped me at various points in the creation, collection and editing of my blogs, articles and speeches. Their help did not end there. If thanking me, society should thank them first.

I hope this collection proves helpful, or at least interesting, to those who honour it with a reading.

Terri-Jean Bedford  
July 2022

## Introduction

If you have never heard of me or read about me here is a short auto-biography. I was born into poverty and had a troubled childhood in almost every way. I am a black woman but with only slightly dark skin. My mother was white, my father black. I was abused as a child and my adolescence was troubled in almost every way. I became a single mother in my early 20's and my child had to be placed in a foster home. To get by and support my drug use I became a regular prostitute, which I mixed with some dominatrix work, until the early 1990's, when I was in my early 30's. During that time I was busted numerous times and spent about a year in jail.

In 1993 I opened an upscale S&M house just north of Toronto, which also catered to cross-dressers, and various other fantasy role play. There was no sex for sale. Yet, I was raided in this so-called Bondage Bungalow late in 1994. In 1998 I was finally convicted after a few nationally publicized trials. My 1999 appeal did not succeed. In late 1998 I had reopened a house in downtown Toronto which I voluntarily closed in 2002 because of my health and the need for renovations. The first house was discreet, the second was advertised openly and publicity was sought, yet there was no raid.

Since 2002 my working days were over. I have been basically a shut-in since. I would get myself together for media appearances or to attend the courthouse, which was not of course every day, and tried to rest up before and after. My writing and painting, and my pet, have been great comforts to me. I have suffered from and been cured of Hepatitis C. However my liver remains damaged and that, along with other health problems are a constant challenge. Being home so much I could, with a lot of guidance and help I must say, organize my papers and write. I touch type. It is amazing to me how

much one can produce in one hour of typing if one knows what to type. Over these many years the writing added up.

In 2007 Professor Alan Young enlisted three plaintiffs, including myself, in a massive constitutional challenge to Canada's prostitution laws. The case was called *Bedford Versus Canada*. When we won decisively in 2010 my picture was shown around the world and my words quoted. The legal battle continued with appeals for three years. We won for the most part at the Court of Appeal early in 2013, and unanimously at the Supreme Court of Canada in December 2013. Then for about a year a national debate on the sex trade culminated in a new law in 2014. The law targeted buyers and enablers in the sex trade. In 2015 a new government was elected, with a promise to repeal that law. At this writing another national debate is under way. Overall, things are coming along as I hoped.

During the years from 2011 to 2014 I did interviews, wrote articles, blogged and gave speeches. I was in the headlines for some of the speeches and certainly made headlines in 2014 when I was thrown out of the hearings at the Canadian Senate on proposed new legislation. I am the only witness ever to be thrown out of the Senate. I also threatened to name politicians who were clients of sex trade workers and this of course resulted in more major publicity.

In my writings I have shared my experiences, as well as those of my clients and fellow doms. In 2011 *Dominatrix on Trial* my memoirs, appeared. In 2012 *Bondage Bungalow Fantasies* followed it. In that book you get to read extracts from correspondence my clients sent to me about their fantasies and requests, follow me through a couple of hectic dominatrix days, and read my replies to various questions.

My third book was worked on from 2012 to 2016. It became apparent from reactions to the first two books that people had an enormous interest in what made the clients and doms do what they did. The readers wanted to know their stories and, when I thought about it, so did I. So, later in 2012, I interviewed two doms who worked for me, and two of their clients. I asked all four of them to tell me absolutely everything about themselves and their experiences together, including their innermost thoughts, as the foundation for my third book *Bondage Bungalow Stories*.

At the same time I completed two projects to which I had committed. The first involved collecting my papers and other items, which are now available to the public in twelve boxes at The University of Windsor Archives. The second project was the creation of a stage play, basically a one woman show, about my life and legal battles. Finally, I was able in 2017 to collect my blogs and speeches into the present book.

The writings are presented chronologically. I decided against reordering the writings by topic or combining them. This way present readers get a sense of how original readers followed the writings. Articles, many of which appeared in the mainstream media, are presented along with the blogs. Prepared texts of my speeches are presented in full, and each speech gets its own chapter. Italicized comments are offered throughout the book to offer some perspective.

## Part 1: Blogs and Articles in 2011

### Chapter 1: June 11 to June 19, 2011

## First Blog, Appeal Hearing Coverage

*In June 2011 I was asked constantly what was going on with our case and when my book was coming out, so I posted blogs and told friends and reporters to first look at my Web site for updates and my views. I made sure to blog when anything happened that was legally or politically significant and regularly to advertise my first book and answer questions arising from it. I introduced myself in this first blog and said the event of the moment was the hearing, at the Ontario Court of Appeal, of the historic 2010 lower court decision striking down the main prostitution laws.*

June 11, 2011. Greetings From Madame de Sade. For those of you who are just finding out about me let me say a few words of introduction. I am Terri-Jean Bedford. I am a retired Canadian dominatrix, whose trade name was Madame de Sade. I have been in the news for many years because I was charged under the prostitution laws yet, I maintain to this day, my conviction was wrong. I never sold sex or sex acts. I operated two “dungeons”, one from 1993-94, for which I was convicted and one from 1998-2002, for which I was not even charged. I have been engaged in numerous legal proceedings to clear my name and reform the laws. The most recent of these, where I joined with two other women as plaintiffs, resulted in Canada’s laws against prostitution being struck down in September 2010. As you may know, my memoirs are about to be published. I have been working on them for almost fifteen years. In March 2011 the manuscript left my hands and went to the editors. The book should be ready for publication in May. However I want to withhold its release until after the appeal of the decision. This appeal is being held in Toronto at the Ontario Court of Appeal, from June 13 to 17 inclusive, at least. I will not delay the release of my memoirs much beyond June 17, if at all. For now, let me just say that these proceedings are a disgrace. They involve five or six judges and thirty-two lawyers and countless other support work and resources. Judge Susan Himel, who wrote the decision under appeal, was clear. The issues raised are for Parliament. I accuse Prime Minister Harper of cowardice in hiding behind the courts. Real criminals and serious crimes will go unaddressed as he clogs the court system so he can sidestep the issue. At least for now. Or so he thinks. Thank you for sharing this time with me. I will continue to enter my blogs daily during the next couple of weeks, and regularly thereafter.

June 13, 2011. Court: Day One. Today, Monday, was the first of five consecutive scheduled days before the Ontario Court of Appeal, who are reviewing Justice Susan Himel’s striking down of Canada’s prostitution laws in Ontario. She issued her decision in September 2010 and there is a stay on the strike-down until at least June 17. I attended most of the day and then went to the CBC for interviews. Now I’m back home and here I will stay until, I think, Wednesday. On that day Professor Young, my lawyer and head of our lawyers will reply to the federal and provincial governments’ arguments. From what I saw and what I heard the federal government lawyer was not doing well with the judges. That comes as no surprise. The issue is whether Justice Himel erred. She took a year to prepare her decision. It was 131 pages. There were eighty-eight volumes of evidence and

transcripts. Hers was not a whimsical utterance. From what I and the press have seen so far it appears that it is standing up on appeal. In my comments to the press I attacked the Prime Minister Harper. I believe he can stop deferring dealing with the fact that the present laws are a fiasco, whatever your views on prostitution, but I think he is afraid to do it. I look forward to when Parliament considers new laws, as I think they will. That is what I have fought for. But I am mad at Mr. Harper for his determination to keep intact the laws the Liberals kept intact for so long at such a high human cost. Nothing can be worse than what we have now, whatever your views.

June 14, 2011. Court: Day Two. We have now had two days at the Ontario Court of Appeal and both the federal and provincial governments have been questioned by the panel of five judges. I was not at the court today, but from reports and from what I saw yesterday it appears that the judges are having problems with the appeal. Tomorrow, Wednesday, my lawyer, Professor Young, will respond. I am hoping to be there. On Thursday the intervenors on both sides will make their presentations and on Friday final replies and discussion on possible extension of the stay on Justice Himel's decision striking down the prostitution laws. I am struck by the crown attorneys on the one hand saying that the government has no responsibility to protect prostitutes (prostitution is legal while activities surrounding it are not) yet at the same time arguing for the present laws because they say they want to protect prostitutes (which is nonsense). Already there is widespread acceptance of the need for Parliament to act. The National Post today called for Parliament to overhaul the laws to make them more logically consistent. I found it amusing that their editors noted that prostitution is legal and then concluded their editorial by saying that prostitution should be legalized. When Parliament does get around to acting the important thing is that the laws are clear, equitably enforced and recognize that this is a free country; and that what consenting adults do in private is not under the control of Prime Minister Harper.

June 15, 2011. Court: Day Three. Wednesday. I was in court for the entire sitting on day three of five scheduled. The seats were hard and narrow and my back was killing me. On day one I was only there half the day and yesterday, day two I was not there at all. However it was so interesting I often forgot the discomfort. Alan answered back for our side. He answered the judges more directly than the federal and provincial crowns. His summary was so on point and moving that after we rose I went outside and wept tears of joy. Reporters approached me outside but I asked them to give me some time. A couple did interview me as I sat on a bench in the shade after the hearing. But, as I said before, the focus must now be on the lawyers, judges, other activists and the issues – particularly whether Judge Himel erred or not in the decision now under review. But I wasn't going to miss our day in court, and Alan's presentation, for the world. He answered back so well that I had to cry. It was one of those times when one has the feeling that the fight is worth it and right can triumph in the end. It seems to me that the editors of the Globe and Mail support our side. The Toronto Star also seems headed in that direction. My view is that Parliament should bring in new laws. I will have plenty to say about that in the future. Tomorrow, Thursday, the intervenors will be making presentations. My understanding is

that fifteen groups have submitted documents to the judges who will question all their lawyers briefly. I don't know how that is enough time for so many groups to be dealt with, but if it is the appeal concludes Friday. On that day the judges will decide if the stay on the striking down of the laws continues, and what the terms of the continuation will be. Or, they may say the laws fall on Friday night or shortly after. We will see.

June 16, 2011. Court: Day Four. Thursday. I was in not at the court today. I am following the plan to attend on the Monday, Wednesday and Friday of the week. My health will not stand going every day. And it works out well. Monday was the first day, so significant decisions might have been made on how to proceed or whatever, and it was wise to be there. Wednesday was our presentation by Professor Young, which I told you about in my previous blog. And tomorrow, Friday, there are the replies to the presentations of the intervenors the day before, and a scheduled ruling on the extension of the stay on Justice Himel's strike-down of the prostitution laws. Today, Thursday, the numerous intervenors were heard. It is important to keep in mind that the judges were presented with materials by the intervenors well before today. The issue is whether the lower court judge erred, not further arguments or evidence about the issues. A knowledgeable supporter watched the full proceedings from the media overflow room and told me that there was nothing unexpected in the proceedings. Judge Himel ruled against having any intervenors, excepting the Province. However the Court of Appeal overruled her and there were three intervenors in the main hearing, all opposed to our motion. Yesterday there were many more, about half in favour and half against. I hope they added something to the question of where the first judge might have erred, if at all. But let us not lose sight that the present laws are the worst laws we can have, whatever your views on prostitution, whatever that is. And further, almost all commentators seem to agree that Parliament, not judges, should make the changes. That brings us to Prime Minister Harper, as usual. As I said before, he is clogging the courts so he can hide from leading on this issue. Impressive? More about that another time. Much more.

June 17, 2011. Court: Day Five. Friday. Last day. Well, the appeal hearings are finally done. They ended this morning after just a short sitting. I was home for lunch. Today the lawyers for the federal and provincial governments and our lawyer Professor Young replied to the intervenors. As I have said before, the intervenors, in my opinion, just reinforced or reiterated the arguments made by us and the government lawyers. However, the judges wanted them to be heard. Yet again, these hearings were about Judge Himel's 131 page decision and the evidence presented to her. New arguments and evidence were not relevant. The question is whether the judge erred. But of course so many commentators and even lawyers wanted to speak to the issues as if the issues were being raised for the first time. They just don't get it. I have made many comments in public this week and last. Some have taken offence at some of my remarks and some have pointed to factual errors I may have made. Others have praised what I have said, and of course some have disagreed. I apologize if I made any factual errors or poor choices of words. I assure all of you that I would never intentionally do so. I am not a lawyer or professional spin doctor, so I don't have the presence of mind that they do. Yet, if I was not to speak



publicly, I would be condemned as too scared to do so, just like Prime Minister Harper (even though I haven't even touched him yet). I am doing the best I can. I am so grateful to all the other activist gals who are speaking to support our side.

June 18, 2011. Some Reflections on the Prostitution Appeal. We have now concluded the hearings of the appeal by the governments of Canada and Ontario. They were appealing Justice Susan Himel's striking down of Canada's prostitution laws in the fall of 2010. A decision is expected in the fall of 2011. It is widely expected that the matter will go to the Supreme Court of Canada, but this is not certain. The stay on Judge Himel's decision remains in effect until at least the release date of the current appeal decision. There is also widespread agreement among those following the case and involved in the case, that Parliament, not judges should decide what is legal and not legal between consenting adults. I will comment on that in the future, but for today I just want to share a couple of observations looking back on the week just passed. Most of those studying this matter, by far, in the academic community are women. I know this from contacts I and others have made during the three years of this case and from seeing who attended the overflow room at the courthouse. In my opinion, many women are concerned about being told how to conduct themselves in private and about being legally denied the right to take measures for their security. This case has hit a nerve among women, whether for or against the original decision. Perhaps the current laws remind them of the authorities in other countries denying women basic rights and protections. Another observation to share. At the Conservative Party convention before last week delegates voted to oppose any liberalization of the prostitution laws – meaning not giving prostitutes any more rights. At their convention this weekend, as far as I know, the New Democrats have been silent on the issue. Whatever these parties advocate, I hope they begin by defining exactly what prostitution is. I hope they distinguish which private behaviours between unmarried adults at home for free are to be illegal in private for money. The more specific they are the fairer they are. Fairness would be a start.

June 19, 2011. Some Reflections on Recent Media Coverage. I am appreciative of the media for presenting me in their reports so frequently, but I must remind everyone that I am one of three plaintiffs in the current constitutional challenge. Val Scott and Amy Leibovitch have for years been in the forefront of the battle to change the laws. In the 1990's Robert Dante headed a coalition to amend the laws. Some years later Richard Hudler and numerous others met regularly at 519 Church Street in Toronto. They discussed how to seek amendments. Andy Anderson is not to be forgotten. He too has been a presence during all these years. This list of activists is long and not confined to Toronto. I and some of my key supporters have been in touch with some educational institutions and may be participating in histories and other studies to be written on the initiatives over the years to change the laws. The media has largely ignored this history and this is a shame. It is my wish that all the heroes in this long struggle be acknowledged. I am going to be publishing my memoirs this week, so in future blogs I will talk about my book and address some questions about it that people may send me. I will attempt to share the questions and answers with you on this blog. Also, I will now

reduce my blogs to every second day or so for the present time. Thank you for reading what I have to say.

*With the end of the hearings I was able to write about my self-published memoirs.*

## Chapter 2: June 21 to November 5, 2011 About My Memoirs, Other Topics

*The publishing company was waiting for the go-ahead to release the book. I chose the title Dominatrix on Trial. The book was not officially my property, as my condition was so poor I had to allow for my possible death. Also, it was a way of repaying the many favours done for me by others. However, it was advisable that this fact not be disclosed. That being said, as has been said to me, despite the fact that I had help in the actual writing, and extensive editorial input, the book is by me.*

June 21, 2011. Upcoming Publication of My Memoirs. I am advised by the publishing company in the United States that my memoirs have gone to press and should be up on the Internet any time. I will have instructions on how you can get them in the coming days. For now I just want to share a few thoughts about them with you before they come out. At the encouragement of some of my key supporters in the early days I wrote about what was happening to me and about what I did as a dominatrix. For example, the chapters about my practice as a dominatrix were written many years ago. I worked on them after my first house was raided and closed and again after my second house closed. The two chapters on my life before my first house were written first. The chapters on the early legal battles were drafted not long after the events occurred. Final consolidation into a complete draft for all but the last two chapters was done in 2009 after the Himel decision was released. I was assisted by my key supporter Scott and my Web master. The editorial staff at iUniverse (the U.S. company for self publishers) edited the drafts during the months of January and February of 2011 and in March I made my final revisions before the final editing process set in. During this time my lawyer, Sender Herschorn, ensured that the manuscript was fair and balanced in its recounting of legal events. A few last changes were made in April and May. Basically the book ends early in March 2011. Obviously the book could not have reached the standard it has without the extensive editorial assistance provided. I salute the three editors who worked on the book with me during the last months. The book has been circulated to some media and intellectuals a few weeks ago, before final editing was completed. Some chapters were provided in draft form to graduate students at a couple of universities who were writing papers on the current case. A couple of interviews with me were published before the Court of Appeal sittings so as not to be conflicting with the coverage of that. This was at my explicit directions. I did not discuss the memoirs while the court was sitting. But now that this has happened, there is no longer, in my view, any reason to withhold publication any longer. The book will be available on the Internet any time now and in Canadian bookstores in about ten days, possibly sooner. I hope you will find it informative not only about me, but about the issues that have surrounded me and so many others over the years.

June 26, 2011. My Memoirs are Published. It is with great pleasure, and appreciation to all those who helped in the process, that I can announce that my memoirs are now available to the public. Go to my Web site, [terrijeanbedford.com](http://terrijeanbedford.com), and click on My Book for how to get a copy.

*I waited about three weeks to see how people reacted to the book before I said anything about anything.*

July 16, 2011. Public Reaction to My Memoirs I. My book *Dominatrix on Trial* has been available on the Internet through retailers like Chapters Indigo, Amazon and Barnes and Noble for about two weeks now. These companies will promote the book more when the printed books arrive. I am told that this is quite normal. I only approved the actual hard and soft cover productions just over a week ago. In the coming days it will arrive in the bigger Chapters stores in Toronto, Vancouver and Ottawa. You can also order a hard or soft cover book by following the instructions on this Web site. The major retailers should soon be offering it by both delivery and download. From what I am told it has been starting to sell electronically in a number of countries. Early words of reaction have been reaching me. In the main people have been very surprised by what they read. The length and complexity of my legal battles came as a surprise to many. Others were also surprised by how elaborate the goings on in my houses were. Yet others have told me they were reduced to tears by the hardships they read about. But the most common reaction was that as they read they became more and more “angry.” What seemed to anger them was the failure of the authorities to do justice, and how someone has to fight just to fight back. I’ll leave it at that for now. For those of you who have bought it, or those who will, I thank you most sincerely.

*I stopped blogging for about a month. I simply do not remember why. Then when I resumed again people who only just started looking at my blogs had to be considered.*

August 22, 2011. Introducing Myself and Why I Wrote the Book. You may have just started reading my blogs now so let me introduce myself. I am Terri-Jean Bedford, Canada’s most famous dominatrix. I presume you know what a dominatrix is. If you don’t you are going to learn some very interesting things. On my Web site [terrijeanbedford.com](http://terrijeanbedford.com) you can order my book. That tells you about all I can about the craft of the dominatrix. It also tells about my legal battles fought over a period of 15 years. It is because of those legal battles that I became famous. Before I came into the public eye I had an early childhood of severe poverty, a youth of abuse and neglect, and wild teenage years filled with drugs and prostitution. My years as a young woman were like that too, until I became a dominatrix. When I was charged with prostitution despite not selling sex I fought the charges and supporters came from all over. My final legal battle, waged beside two other courageous women and with three great lawyers headed by Professor Alan Young – a Canadian institution in himself. It led to the striking down of Canada’s prostitution laws; a stunning legal victory that is still under appeal. I am now in my 50’s,

very ill and may not have long to live. I spend any time I can with my grandson and daughter and close friends. My supporters wanted me to tell my story in book form. Right from the time I was raided I kept notes and drafted chapters. I would sometimes put the draft on the market to get reactions and raise a bit of money. So the book that was published in June and is now being launched formally in August is really the completion of a work in progress. I was going to finish it and self publish in 2005 or 2006 but when the constitutional challenge began it seemed to make sense to wait a bit longer and tell a more interesting story. My main reason for writing the book was to explain why I fought, what I fought, why I got so much support and to tell the world what needs to be done to protect freedom and improve the safety of women. If the book makes money that's great. But I wanted to be heard, and from what the marketing people overseeing the formal launch of the book tell me I am being read and will be for a very long time.

August 27, 2011. Public Reaction to My Memoirs II. I am pleased to be able to tell you that the formal launch of my memoirs in the United States began earlier this week. The book was made available on the Web sites of major retailers, such as Amazon, Barnes & Noble, Border and Chapters Indigo over the last month. There is usually a period of a couple of months for retailers to gradually begin their promotions, and this is a very quiet time of the year, being the end of summer vacations. I do not have sales figures, as these don't become available for some months yet. However, Barnes & Noble has conferred their Rising Star designation immediately and will be featuring the book. Early reactions from the industry have been most encouraging. The professionals in the publishing industry have been telling us that the book is a well paced page-turner and is well written. They have been impressed with the number of events and persons the book deals with and find my story to be a fascinating one. I myself consider that I have been at the center of a number of fascinating stories, and the number of people who have helped me over the years, such as the lawyers, activists and the group I call The Dozen, are as much the story as me. This is also part of their stories. It is also a Canadian story, about how Canadian society has dealt with the matters surrounding me and those who have stood with me, for me and against me. I cannot begin to yet again express my gratitude to those who helped me write these memoirs. The editors at iUniverse were amazing. My personal lawyer, Sender Herschorn, reviewed the manuscript and made recommendations. In the early years the man called Scott in the book and the woman called Camilla, helped me draft some of the chapters about those times. This is their book too. I hope you enjoyed or enjoy reading it.

*I was asked many questions by readers. Also, I was advised to mention the title of the book often to stimulate its presence on the Internet search engines. As you will see, I sometimes went to what I now consider embarrassing lengths to mention the title.*

August 29, 2011. Being Exposed to the Public: How It Feels. For me, today, it feels good. Not embarrassing now. After all, I have a book for sale and some causes to advocate. This means that long ago I accepted that my life would become an open book itself. The opening of that book began in Windsor in 1986 when my dungeon and escort service was

busted and my name and face were in the papers. Then in 1994 came the big raid near Toronto and I was again front page news but this time in Toronto, and my name was very exposed; as were the private practices I sold to the public. When I fought the charges I was interviewed and photographed continually and my private life and history discussed continuously in the media. Nothing the people I am closest to privately see in the media takes them by surprise. So I have got used to living as a public figure. I did so gradually. I love to talk and fight for what I believe in and, as I say, I just published my memoirs (go to my Web site [terrijeanbedford.com](http://terrijeanbedford.com) if you are interested) so for me it is now second nature to live my life knowing that everyone who knows who I am knows my history, public and formerly private. However the fact that it is now second nature does not always make it easy.

September 5, 2011. Thoughts on the 1994 Raid. When I first realized I was being raided I was shocked and angry. I had been there doing this openly for almost two years. I had checked with lawyers, a couple of whom were clients, to ensure legality. I had run my dominatrix house as if all visitors, repeat all, were police. There was absolutely no need for a SWAT team. There was absolutely no need for them to strip the place almost clean by seizing 700 items, most of them everyday items. There was no need to mock us. And they didn't have to call a press conference the day after the raid to display what they had had taken. They could have just charged me or given me a ticket and awaited trial. I knew this during the raid and it was raised in subsequent legal proceedings. In future I was actually glad they made such a big splash, because it led to my profile in the media where I could advocate for my rights and bring big issues to national attention and publish my story as well. I'm not sure what I would have done differently. I had a chance to run a first rate dungeon and facility for adult role play. I had a chance to earn a decent living. My dream of running such a facility came true, and the cause brought me allies to enable me to rise up again with another facility a few years later and bring forth my book. I don't think, looking back, I would have changed a thing I had done.

September 12, 2011. The Life of a Dominatrix. I devoted about four chapters in my memoirs *Dominatrix on Trial* to describing how I operated as a dominatrix. For those who are curious about the lifestyle I want to say that being a dominatrix, or dom, can mean a number of possible lifestyles. For those who do out calls only it means you just pack a bag of equipment and perhaps clothing, or wear your fetish wear under an overcoat, and go to the client's home or hotel room. Other doms will have a small dungeon, perhaps even one bedroom in an apartment or a bachelor apartment set up as a dungeon. Yet other doms will rent dungeons in which to see their clients. So different doms use different locations. Some doms will work in teams and share clients, whatever their locale. Others will hire someone to handle all phone calls and just go to sessions or be in their dungeons when the clients arrive. If the dom has an extensive dungeon she must clean and tidy up or have it done for her. Some will allow loyal clients, slaves, to exchange their labour for sessions or just to be around her and her staff. What is common to all is that they must have records kept and be aware of what laws they must observe concerning licensing, taxes and prostitution. The latter, as we are well aware, is a fiasco

in Canada and now before the courts. They must have good records kept like client files, schedules and contact information of associates. The job part of the lifestyle is as much like another job as it is unlike it. It means responsibility and work, as well as creativity and role playing. The personal part of the lifestyle can be as much or as little as the dom wants it to be. In my book I tell all about that. I hope you will read it.

September 19, 2011. My Struggles Through the Years. I have been asked in interviews about my book, *Dominatrix on Trial*, to compare my struggles, my trials, in my younger years to the legal battles I have fought. I was first busted for having an escort service, with dominatrix services as well, in 1986 and have basically been fighting in courts since that time. I was born in 1959. For the first thirty years of my life my struggles were for survival. I sometimes had to steal to eat. I had to sell my body in the most dangerous ways possible. I was so down and out and desperate most of the time that the only people I could associate with were those on the margins and things like drug and alcohol abuse, which got them there, rubbed off on me. I was always just responding to the needs of the day and mistakes of the days before. I was almost always in over my head. Sometimes from poor judgment, sometimes from desperation. When I wrote about those days in my memoirs I glossed over some things just to keep my story moving, because I think the reader was getting the idea. I tried to tell about some times when things went well for me, but didn't last because I was either betrayed, or I screwed up, or changes occurred that were not anybody's fault. My later struggles however were of a very different type. My time as a dominatrix and the behavior of the authorities in my cases brought me many allies. I did not struggle alone. Now the struggles are carried on for me, as I must struggle with my chronic health problems. I stand by what I wrote in my memoirs. I have regrets, but not about fighting for what is right and just. That makes me a winner.

September 22, 2011. Dominatrix at the Supermarket. The other day I went to a small supermarket down the street from where I live. A woman who was also shopping there came up to me and said "Are you Terri-Jean Bedford?" Although I was in my sort of disguise I said yes, I am. She told me she had always wanted to meet me and asked me for my autograph, which I gave her, on back of a flier she found. We had a nice chat and she told me to keep up the fight and stand up for women victims of our laws. It is always interesting to keep a finger on the pulse of opinion and see what people's perceptions are. It is amazing how out of the most obscure corners there often comes the most solid support. It is also amazing, watching or listening to call-in shows and the like, how much people know about the current legal battle, and how little some others know.

September 24, 2011. Dominatrix Not in Practice. In the last while I have sometimes been asked what it is like not to be running a dungeon any more. More specifically, they wanted to know if I missed the lifestyle with all its activities and the people I encountered. In the first place I have to remind them that I closed my Toronto facility, known as The Bondage Hotel, among other names, in 2002. I have since then practiced my trade in a very limited capacity, rarely for money, among a close inner circle only. If I was healthy, and was funded to the point that I did not have to make ends meet, I would have no

problem with reopening. I do miss doing sessions. However, when your health is as bad as mine, with my failing liver, spinal stenosis and fibromyalgia; you don't feel a big desire to take on responsibilities. I can't even be depended on to make a session I have booked. Some days I am bedridden. I make a point of setting an afternoon once a week to go to interviews for my book that are not over the phone, and only go out when I am up to it otherwise. So, as you can see, there are everyday things I miss more than the life I lived as a dominatrix. So I have restricted myself to two interests. One was finishing my memoirs, *Dominatrix on Trial*, now published. The other was the current constitutional challenge to the prostitution laws. I try to look forward now that I have confronted my past.

September 26, 2011. The Dozen. I dedicated my recently published memoirs, called *Dominatrix on Trial*, to twelve people: "The Dozen." Briefly, they are those who fought with me and enabled me to fight. One was a wealthy client. One a journalist and activist against the current laws back in the 1990's. One was an owner of a cross-dressers' clothing store in Toronto, Paddy Aldridge. Another was her husband, one of the most well known transvestites in Toronto, known as Roxy. Roxy in normal life was a distinguished looking man who retired early to enjoy being his true self. Roxy died early in 2011. Paddy and I were with him when he died. Albert was a prosperous retiree who helped me financially and otherwise with my legal battles. He was in his late seventies when he began to do so and he is gone now too. Some clients and friends who have been helpful to me and my daughter to this day are among The Dozen. The range of backgrounds of this group is highly varied, but they all came forward to fight for me and with me, or help me in other ways. I think *Dominatrix on Trial* is as much about The Dozen as it is about me. My biggest regret about the book is that I could not do them justice. I tried, but their desire for privacy and the pressures of space in the book made me omit telling the reader the extraordinary things they did and what wonderful people they are. Maybe an entire book about them is in order. I will certainly consider it.

*While I was discussing things raised in the book events occurred to which I reacted. The federal government won a majority in parliament at this time and introduced some very right wing style laws that they could not bring in when they were a minority government. Also, we had an election in Ontario just a month after after the so called "Tough on Crime" agenda of the federal government was introduced.*

September 28, 2011. The Harper Anti-Crime Agenda. Last week the federal government introduced new laws to combat crime. I will not take the kind of partisan positions I am taking on the prostitution and related laws. If I have learned anything it is that one needs to know what one is talking about before taking a position. I spent two years in hearings and several days in court, not to mention living the issues for decades, before coming to my position on the prostitution laws. Those of you who have read my book *Dominatrix on Trial*, will know what I am talking about. While I know something about the justice system I will not take the irresponsible position of commenting conclusively about the latest law changes introduced into Parliament. For those who are not aware of these the

laws are essentially being changed to mean more time in jail for violent crime and the like and take away judicial discretion in some areas. There may be some deterrent effect, maybe not, and there may be more or less justice as a result of the new laws. However what struck me was the absence of anything preventative or curative, such as more police or more rehabilitation for offenders. There was also no recognition of how much better rich people with lots of talented legal representation fare than do poor people. Is that justice? Isn't that something the government should be worried about?

*Despite the political developments, there remained interesting questions about my story.*

September 30, 2011. My Favourite Dominatrix Scenes. People who have read my book *Dominatrix on Trial* have written to ask me which "scenes" were my favourites. In the book I was careful not to say which scenes were my favourites. Every dominatrix enjoys some things about her job more than others. Obviously we like the pure dominatrix stuff more than the administrative aspects of the job, such as cleaning, paperwork and answering phones. However, outside the book I will give you these additional comments. First of all, longer scenes were better. I was always frustrated, as was the client, when the hour went by so quickly. For example, a cross-dresser would take off his clothes, I would help him into restrictive female attire, and there might only be a bit more than enough time of his hour left to get him changed again. Role play can be greatly enhanced when prolonged. Secondly, I would say, honestly, that there were many role-play scenarios I enjoyed above the others, but at that I will stop. Some things are best kept secret. Sorry. It would be like a magician giving away the secrets of doing the magic tricks.

October 2, 2011. Locations of My Dungeons. I had three dungeons. The first was in Windsor, the small Canadian town near Detroit where I came from. That was in the 1980's. The second was in Thornhill, basically a suburb of Toronto, which was famously raided in 1994. The third, from 1999 to 2002 was in downtown Toronto. The first was a house with the dungeon in the basement. The top floor was used for the escort service. It was near downtown Windsor. The second was a bungalow in a posh neighbourhood. All rooms on the ground floor and basement were put to use. The third dungeon was a four story semi-detached house in downtown Toronto. About eight rooms were in use by the time I closed. Some dominatrices have cottages which are fully equipped. Some work out of apartments. Some have houses like I did. Some do out calls or rent facilities for sessions. When I chose a location it was not based on the location itself, it was based on the availability of a place within my budget and with a landlord who was on side. If I was healthy and had unlimited funds and wanted to go back into business I am not sure where I would reopen and locate. All locations have advantages and disadvantages, as do all choices of a full facility or minimalist approach.

October 4, 2011. My Artwork. A number of people who have read my book *Dominatrix on Trial* have written asking about my paintings and whether any are for sale. My paintings range from tribal fetish-like medicine man images to wilderness settings to floral arrangements. Most are in colour. I have never had them looked at by an art critic



or appraiser, but am planning to do so at some time. It has been suggested to me that I have an auction. This may happen too. I have never sold any. In my modest home they cover almost all the wall space in the main rooms. Fortunately, the desire to paint more is less pronounced and I have been taking photos and arranging them on my computer with music. I did little painting in the last couple of years because I was finishing my memoirs and we had the constitutional case. There was, and is, also the matter of those days when I am too sick to do much of anything. I can now only read at most an hour a day and writing is difficult, so I only respond to select e-mails and do a bit of bookkeeping for a nearby business, which fortunately is now routine for me. I can talk and listen without too much trouble and I am able to watch television without too much trouble. But the urge to paint, and the ability to do so comfortably, may return sometime and if it does I'm all for it.

October 6, 2011. Ontario Election: Before the Vote. Today the people of Ontario are voting in a provincial election. The Liberal Party, led by Premier Dalton McGuinty, has a majority of seats in the provincial legislature. They are neck and neck with the Conservative Party. Each is expected to get about 40 per cent of the seats. The New Democratic Party (NDP) is projected to get about 20 per cent of the seats. If these projections hold up, it means a minority government which in turn means the NDP will support one of the major parties in return for the government putting some of their policies in place. However, it is still possible for a majority government to be won by any of the parties. I do not want to say which party I prefer, and I am not so sure I in fact prefer any party. I am very familiar with the issues that have been points of discussion in my legal battles. I suspect that the Conservatives will, like the federal Conservatives, refuse to even consider accepting Judge Himel's decision or conclusions. The Liberals have already taken the course of following the federal decision to appeal. The New Democrats have been strangely silent about Judge Himel's decision, and the decision to appeal it. It should be interesting to see if and how that changes when the election, later today, is over. At that time all levels of government will have had recent elections and I will be addressing my comments to those in power, except this time without the complication of upcoming elections.

October 8, 2011. Ontario Election: After the Vote

Two days ago we in Ontario, Canada's largest province, went to the polls. The result has been the re-election of the Liberal government, but with a minority. Unless there are recounts or whatever, they will have fifty-three seats in the 107 seat legislature. Assuming no members resign, die or change parties, the two opposition parties can bring down the government and force another election. It also means that the government must seek support or non-opposition from members outside its own party for anything it does. It is my hope that the new legislature will pay attention to the current debate of the Himel decision striking down Canada's prostitution laws. As I have said before, the issue before the Court of Appeal is not prostitution. The issue is the decision. In a bigger sense though, the issue can be said to be the desire of the governments of the country and province to keep the current laws in place – regardless of one's views on prostitution. The judge was

clear, Parliament pass new laws, laws that are clear, laws that are fair, laws that will be enforced. The present laws are dramatically under-enforced and when enforced often applied in an arbitrary and select fashion. Parliament should do something now, not just try to do nothing for as long as possible. The new provincial legislature must do the right thing too. It should withdraw support for the appeal of the Himel decision, and instead advocate, like me, that the federal government write new laws and justify them. I will have more to say about that in the future. The federal and provincial elections are over and the time to act has arrived. This should not be before the courts any longer.

October 10, 2011. Thornhill Press Coverage. This month there was an article about my book, *Dominatrix on Trial*, in the Thornhill Post. Some of you may recall that this is the town right at the top of Toronto where my Bondage Bungalow was raided in 1994, giving rise to many of the matters dealt with in my memoirs. I hope of course that book sales result from the article, but above that I hope that my book will remind the residents of Thornhill to be vigilant in ensuring local officials are not corrupt. When you add official corruption and incompetence to bad laws which are subject to arbitrary enforcement (or non-enforcement) it is an open invitation for our society to backslide to the dictator-like conditions so common in other parts of the world. After the raid on my bungalow it was discovered that the Chief of York Region Police was corrupt, and that many officials and police officers had acted inappropriately in my and other matters. Julian Fantino, who is now a member of parliament for a riding near Thornhill, was brought in to clean up the York Regional Police. Numerous investigations led to corrective actions. When he became Chief of Police of Toronto around the year 2000, I was back in business there. I had no police problems at all.

October 12, 2011. Waiting For the Appeal Decision. The decision on the appeal of the September 2010 decision striking down Canada's prostitution laws is expected in the coming months, if not weeks. We, the parties to the proceeding, will be advised of the date of the release a few days in advance. I have had to wait for numerous verdicts and decisions during my legal battles, and I have learned a few lessons on how to handle the wait. For one, it does no good to dwell on it or worry about it. If I do an interview or respond to correspondence, or do something else tangible, I will think about the matter of course. At other times I work at chasing the matter from my thoughts when I am alone. My friends know they should not raise the topic when with me. This way I don't burn out. I have the added advantage that Val and Amy, the other plaintiffs, have also done their share. A number of activists have also been very supportive in furthering the cause in the media. Of course the lawyers have as well. After the activities following the release of the September 2010 decision I turned my energies, when I had them, to finishing my memoirs and then promoting them. If, after the decision on the appeal is released there is another appeal, as most expect, I will have prepared myself for a long process with episodes of activity. That is the way to run the long race. Pace yourself.

October 14, 2011. Tomorrow is my birthday. I turn fifty-two. Several years ago, when I found out that I had advanced Hepatitis C, and began chemotherapy, I knew that every

birthday would be something to be grateful for. I look good for my age and feel bad for my age. Most days I can only function for a few hours at most. On special days in the current legal battle I would, as they say, run on adrenaline. On the days after I would have to recover. Now I must be selective about how I spend my time. I have heard people say that without your health you have nothing. I don't agree. Without my health, confined to home, I was able to finish my book. That was a great motivator. I also have had many interviews about *Dominatrix on Trial*, and have tried to respond to the many who have written. I also make a point to keep this diary and tweet. People have told me they are glad I am staying in touch in this manner, and I want to take this opportunity, my birthday, to thank the many who have sent their good wishes and support.

October 16, 2011. The Picton Hearings. In Canada the public hearings into the serial killing of women by Robert Picton has begun. Picton abducted dozens of prostitutes from Vancouver to his pig farm and murdered them there. The hearings are looking at why he went undetected for so long. I have been asked to comment, but I say that everyone should listen to those testifying before the commission and read the decision. We cited the Picton matter as evidence that the prostitution laws should be struck down, and we won. Yet the government appealed, in less time than it took to get and read the decision. This time, however, the hearings are public and what we said about the laws will, I think, be amplified. But as I say, let's listen and watch. That means you too Prime Minister Harper.

October 18, 2011. My Dominatrix Wardrobes. Some readers of my memoir *Dominatrix on Trial* have asked me where I got the clothes I wore in the dungeon and so forth. The clothes they are talking about are described in detail in the book and I did make some reference to a couple of the places I shopped. But let me also add here that I was constantly adding, so it was not all bought at the outset. Also, clients brought me items as gifts that they wanted to see me or my staff wear. Finally, it is important to keep in mind that there was a wardrobe selection for the cross-dressers, as well as one for the doms. Most, as I say was bought at the two stores mentioned in the book or given by clients. However, much of what I had, such as leather skirts, boots and gloves, was also bought at second hand stores.

October 20, 2011. My Dominatrix Equipment. What I said in my blog two days ago about how I stocked my wardrobes in my houses could also be said about my equipment. I had a couple of clients who were long time S&M enthusiasts, but were also carpenters. They built me a jail cell and some devices clients could be fastened to. Things like chains and fasteners I got at hardware stores. Clients also bought me restraints, harnesses and straight jackets from the fetish stores in downtown Toronto. However I personally selected my whips, paddles and specialty bondage masks.

October 22, 2011. School Days. I have had a lot of requests and questions from students writing papers on the current court decisions on the constitutionality of Canada's laws to combat prostitution. For those who may not be aware I will offer the following sources of

information. My recently published memoir, *Dominatrix on Trial*, has two chapters about the current matter. Go to the Web site [dominatrxontrial.com](http://dominatrxontrial.com) for ordering details. Also, there are the links on this very Web site, [terrijeannedford.com](http://terrijeannedford.com) as well as another site I have [madamedesade.com](http://madamedesade.com). These sources provide the factual information on the matter, as well as my perspectives. In these blogs I will comment further once the decision on the appeal is released and my co-plaintiffs and I, and our lawyers, have had a chance to assess the decision and our options to respond.

October 24, 2011. Tweeting. As many of you know I have been tweeting twice daily. I started doing so at the request of supporters who wanted me to keep in touch daily. I have found it to be good fun, and there are times I look forward to sharing interesting tidbits. There is also a more serious reason for tweeting twice a day. Soon the Ontario Court of Appeal will release its decision in *Bedford Versus Canada* – Justice Himel’s decision striking down the laws combating prostitution. There will be plenty to be said then, and much will be said by many very quickly. You can be sure I will be tweeting and blogging then.

October 26, 2011. Client Letters I. In my book *Dominatrix on Trial* I spoke about the many scenes the clients requested. Often they would put their requests in writing. I have been asked to share a few with you. In these next few blogs I will share excerpts with you. “Dear Headmistress. I would like you to train me in being a sissy because I have come to the realization that I am a girl and I would like to be trained as a girl. Do we live with each other and do we wear all female clothing and how much is it for a month at the academy? Can you train me as a Sissy Socialite? How is this done, and what is the difference in the cost? I will obey you at all times.”

October 28, 2011. Client Letters II. In my book *Dominatrix on Trial* I spoke about the many scenes the clients requested. Often they would put their requests in writing. Here is another excerpt. “Dear Headmistress. My name is ..... I am a forty year old single submissive widower presently living in ..... All I want is to spend the rest of my life as a submissive sissy cross-dressed maid slave serving a group of older dominant mistresses. I am willing to travel anywhere and move anywhere to serve my mistresses. I would like to be called Stephanie. Please send me your illustrated booklet and application form so I can enroll in your academy and begin my real true calling.”

October 30, 2011. Halloween. Halloween is when people put on masks and costumes. When I have gone to Halloween parties since 1993 I have of course dressed as a dominatrix, with a mask. When the party involved clients they too dressed up as slaves or sissies. One of the great advantages of my trade has been that I have never been short of costumes or disguises. Sometimes my clients would just wear a hood, and so preserve their anonymity in public. Fetish clubs love this time of year and some extraordinary parties take place in Toronto.

November 1, 2011. Client Letters III. In my book *Dominatrix on Trial* I spoke about the many scenes the clients requested. Often they would put their requests in writing. Here is yet another excerpt. “Dear Headmistress. I have a few fetishes I should tell you about. They are a leather fetish, rubber fetish, a lingerie fetish a p.v.c. fetish, a vinyl fetish and a fetish for over the elbow evening gloves; and my more intense fetish for thigh high stiletto boots. So please send me your application form and booklet.”

November 3, 2011. Client Letters IV. In my book *Dominatrix on Trial* I spoke about the many scenes the clients requested. Often they would put their requests in writing. Here is yet another excerpt. “Dear Headmistress. Although I may not meet your requirements as mention in your ad, I am very much interested in your sissy maid training since I am a submissive woman who needs and requires proper discipline training and humiliation. To let you know how I don’t meet your requirements you see I am a post-operative transsexual, which in actuality means I have had my gender changed from male to female a number of years ago. Since my preference is woman, I enjoy serving women and being disciplined and humiliated when I do not follow instructions properly. I do hope I hear from your sissy academy soon. Until I do, I remain Submissively Sissy Janice.”

November 5, 2011. Client Letters V. In my book *Dominatrix on Trial* I spoke about the many scenes the clients requested. Often they would put their requests in writing. Another excerpt from another letter. “Dear Headmistress. Thank you for seeing me on such short notice. My name is Slave Bob and it is an honour and a privilege for me to serve you. I have been a submissive for approximately twenty-five years. I am very submissive and I enjoy being treated and trained as a slave. In an effort to be helpful so you will enjoy our time together I have detailed below my likes and dislikes and limitations: tight bondage, strict discipline, humiliation, (especially in front of others), maid service, animal training, nipple clamps.”

### Chapter 3: November 7 to December 3, 2011 About the Appeal

*It was almost half a year since June, when the Ontario Court of Appeal heard arguments about the lower court decision striking down the prostitution laws. People were asking when the decision was coming out. I decided to give my thoughts on the matter in November. It could have come out any time, or it might be months away.*

November 7, 2011. Prostitution Appeal Decision I. It is expected by many that a major court decision will be released soon. I will be blogging about that this month. I have been asked to. As many of you know, in September 2010 Justice Susan Himel struck down the three laws which were intended to restrict prostitution in Canada. Prostitution itself is legal. The government’s appeal was heard in June 2011 by five judges of the Ontario Court of Appeal. I will have much to say in these blogs both before and after the decision comes out, and much after. Keep visiting this site. And thanks for all the support we have been getting.

November 9, 2011. Prostitution Appeal Decision II. When the decision comes out it is important to remember above all that the judges are deciding on the decision of the superior court by Justice Susan Himel. She read tens of thousands of pages of affidavits and transcripts of cross-examination and spent nine days in court hearing arguments by numerous lawyers. She took one year to prepare her 131 page decision. You can link to it via this site, or one of the sites it links to. You can also read a summary of what she decided in my book *Dominatrix on Trial*, which all good Canadians should buy.

November 11, 2011. Prostitution Appeal Decision III. The decision the appeal judges are deciding on found that the exhaustive evidence is that the current laws do little to discourage prostitution, are under-enforced anyway, are discriminatory, and encourage real criminal behaviour. The judge pointed out that prostitution would not dramatically increase if the laws are removed. The judge pointed out that Canada was lagging most of the developed world in changing its prostitution laws. The judge pointed out there will be less violence against women if the current laws are struck down than if they remain in place. Yet Prime Minister Harper announced his intention to appeal in less time than it took to get and read the decision. Bad boy!

November 13, 2011. Prostitution Appeal Decision IV. There is an expectation that the decision of the Court of Appeal on the striking down of the prostitution laws is automatically going to the Supreme Court of Canada. In fact, this is not a given. For one thing, if the appeal goes decidedly in our favour, the Supreme Court may not consent to hear another appeal. For another, the government of Canada can choose to bring in new laws which address the points made by Justice Susan Himel in September 2010. She pointed out that this is a matter for Parliament. What is the Prime Minister afraid of?

November 15, 2011. Prostitution Appeal Decision V. Whatever the appeal court decides, there are so many issues requiring decision that it is almost inconceivable that they would not call upon the federal government to get involved. If and when they do I will have plenty of advice for the Prime Minister, who says he is against prostitution, whatever that is, but does nothing to make it illegal. It is amazing how anxious he is not only to support the positions the Liberals took for so many years, but also that he is supporting the most disgraceful laws the Liberals kept in place. Maybe he should stop behaving like a Liberal lackey.

November 17, 2011. Prostitution Appeal Decision VI. I have been getting many requests to go to functions to raise funds and otherwise show support for our constitutional challenge. Again, I appreciate all invitations and I am a very social person. But the reality is I am very ill, often in pain, and sometimes, because of that, not in good spirits. But when I am well for a few hours I love going on to my social media site and my Web site and these blogs and interacting that way. I have been sharing many photos and writings, including excerpts from my recent book that I have accumulated over the years.

November 19, 2011. Prostitution Appeal Decision VII. There have been many people asking when the Ontario Court of Appeal will release its decision on the September 2010 decision of Justice Susan Himel. That decision struck down the laws restricting activities around prostitution, which has always been legal, in Canada. Yes, the laws were a fiasco. My short answer is that I don't know, but when they do I will have plenty to say to the Prime Minister, no matter what the court says. He is going to wear this issue like a tight girdle.

November 21, 2011. Prostitution Appeal Decision VIII. In my book *Dominatrix on Trial* I explained the reasons for the prostitution laws being struck down. I want to say again here that it was a three year process. It was not a sudden decision by a judge making a decision on impulse. The grounds offered by the government for overturning the decision have been, in my view, either irrelevant or weak. Saying there is a downside to the sex trade and not saying there are downsides to many other activities is a feeble reason for the laws to stand. I hope and I think that the Ontario Court of Appeal will tell Parliament it must act. Then the real discussion can begin.

November 23, 2011. Prostitution Appeal Decision IX. The current debate on prostitution must recognize the insanity of the government telling adults that they can have sex when they want and with whom they want, yet legislating that they have it for free. Do you remember when having sex at all, for free or otherwise, was illegal between members of the same sex? Oh, and by the way, do my activities as a dominatrix, when no genital contact occurs, qualify as sex? Interesting times ahead.

November 25, 2011. Prostitution Appeal X. In my book *Dominatrix on Trial*, there is a chapter where I commented on the Prime Minister, Mr. Harper, and where I quote what I wrote to him. Since then, I have addressed him verbally in the media. I have said he is a bad boy and that he lacks courage. I have said either he does not care much about women, or if he does he has not shown it in his reactions to Judge Himel's decision. He has ordered his lawyers to keep the Himel decision before the courts so he can avoid dealing with it. The government's decision to appeal was made and announced in less time, about three or four hours, than it took to get the decision and read it. That is verifiable. This may do him more political damage than he realizes.

November 27, 2011. Prostitution Appeal XI. I believe I am right to be so critical of the Prime Minister for appealing the decision striking down the prostitution laws. Common sense should tell him he should not reject all the findings of a three year virtual public inquiry, and not even say whether he has read it? The judge pointed out that prostitution is flourishing under the current laws, and would not increase significantly if those laws were dropped. Not only that, but keeping the current laws, she said, actually works against the objectives of both the government and the laws themselves. I hope the Ontario Court of Appeal points all this out to him as well.

November 29, 2011. Prostitution Appeal XII. I will continue, in these blogs, answering questions and giving my views on the decision striking down the prostitution laws, and the appeal of that decision, for another week or two. By then it is likely that the decision of the appeal court will not be released until the New Year. I will continue blogging about my book, *Dominatrix on Trial*, over the holidays. I have received many questions I have yet to answer. I am so grateful for the interest being shown in my story by people all over the world.

December 1, 2011. Prostitution Appeal XIII. I don't envy the judges of the Ontario Court of Appeal or the Supreme Court of Canada. Most observers believe that their appeal decision of the lower court decision striking down Canada's prostitution laws will end up in the Supreme Court. But until that last court makes a decision, do we keep the old laws in place? Knowing what we know, that means the dangers facing women are ignored yet again. If they do this they will live the rest of their lives in shame. Or do the judges make the lower court decision effectively immediately and put the onus on Prime Minister Harper to act instead of hide. It promises to be interesting.

December 3, 2011. Prostitution Appeal XIV. In all likelihood the Ontario Court of Appeal will not announce its decision on the striking down of Canada's prostitution laws until at least January 2012. I just can't see them re-igniting the debate less than twenty days before Christmas. I have pretty much said what I want to say in advance of the release of the appeal decision. I will assist our team in alerting the media and supporters of the impending release. I will comment as soon as our lawyers explain what the court decided. I will certainly comment in the days and weeks following the release of the decision. Check in with me then. You won't be disappointed.

#### Chapter 4: December 5 to December 23, 2011 Questions and Comments About My Memoirs

*Having had my say about the case before the upcoming release of the decision by the Court of Appeal, I was free to turn back to answering questions about and promoting my book.*

December 5, 2011. Questions and Comments About *Dominatrix on Trial* I. During the weeks I have been commenting about the impending release of the appeal decision questions and reactions to my book, *Dominatrix on Trial*, have been coming in. Also, thanks yet again to all those who have read it. Thanks as well to those who have commented on it. I am pleased that people who have been critical in their remarks were critical of the positions I have taken and not of the book. *Dominatrix on Trial* has been very well received. In the coming blogs I will share the questions and comments and my reactions to them.

December 7, 2011. Questions and Comments About *Dominatrix on Trial* II. Be sure to become a friend of mine on Facebook so you can follow all the detailed discussions and



other things there. I have been asked, since the book came out, how I occupy my time. I have been spending, I would say, an average of about thirty minutes a day doing some administration for a local small business. I spend an average of about two hours a day on Facebook. I am “meeting” so many interesting people there and I have so much material accumulated over the years to share with them and the public. I can’t get to the gym or pool these days for a number of reasons, but I do my stretches at home. The social media interaction has made being home bound so much easier to deal with.

December 9, 2011. Questions and Comments About *Dominatrix on Trial* III. Some readers of the book from the United States and elsewhere have been in touch with me after reading the book. Some actually said reading got them thinking about how their authorities have dealt with people like me, a dominatrix. Some of them could never even recall a dom being busted in their community or city. Others said their police do not even bust prostitutes at all, not even the ones who work the streets. Still others said they could not recall any significant coverage of a trial such as mine. I reminded them that in the book I went into the reasons charges such as those against me rarely come to trial, and that there are in fact many women in jails in Canada and the U.S. that are basically forgotten.

December 11, 2011. Questions and Comments about *Dominatrix on Trial* IV. Some readers of the book have asked about the pictures in the book. One of the things they wanted to know was why the faces of some of the people in the pictures were obscured. Basically it was because you must have a person’s permission before you publish their image. This is something that must be done by a lawyer, and the editor’s advised me that it would not hurt the quality of the book if I protected privacy. I also wanted to reproduce newspaper headlines and photos in the book, but it involved so much extra work and expense that it was clear that I should use what was mine to use.

December 13, 2011. Questions and Comments about *Dominatrix on Trial* V. Let me share some more thoughts about the pictures in the book. I had no photographs of the “Bondage Bungalow” which was the subject of the big trial in the 1990’s. It just never occurred to me or anyone else to take any. I learned and took many at my second house, operated from 1999 to 2002, and I can assure you that it is fundamentally representative of what the first house was like inside. However, I am going to be posting, on my Facebook pages, some of the photographs taken by York Regional Police, inside the Thornhill Bondage Bungalow before they stripped it bare. You can see few of those items in the pictures in the book. This is because I got most of the stuff lost in the raid on the first house back while I was operating the second house.

December 15, 2011. Questions and Comments about *Dominatrix on Trial* VI. Some people were curious about whether I am in touch with the various doms who worked for me. Of course my answer is sometimes. I hear from a few of the gals from time to time, but don’t see any of them regularly. Where I live is not quite convenient to downtown Toronto. Also, they all know that it is hard for me to make dates and keep them, simply

because I may not be well enough to do so that day. Also, most of my communication nowadays is with people involved with or following the decision striking down the prostitution laws.

December 17, 2011. Questions and Comments about *Dominatrix on Trial* VII. I have a few more things to say about the doms who worked for me. Some of them have read my book and gotten back to me. Those who did think they were reasonably portrayed in the book. They also said they were happy I told the public about the grunt side of the dominatrix trade, meaning the paperwork, phone calls, cleaning and all that sort of thing. A couple of them told me that they had no idea until they read the book how horrible my earlier life was or what I have been through with all my legal battles or how many others were involved in these battles.

December 19, 2011. Questions and Comments about *Dominatrix on Trial* VIII. Some more comments about the doms who worked for me. Here I am going to speak about the ones I have spoken to who did it for a while in the past and moved on. I asked them if they regretted the experience. None of them did, and they were fully in agreement with my comments in *Dominatrix on Trial*, my memoirs. Next time I'll tell you what the doms still in practice told me.

December 21, 2011. Questions and Comments about *Dominatrix on Trial* IX. In my last blog I told you about how some doms who worked for me for a short time and then left the business felt about that experience looking back. I have also spoken to some professional dominatrices who have been at it for many years. Believe it or not, some of them have done nothing else since being teenagers. Most of them would not have made another career choice. When they expressed regrets it was about specific decisions made while working within the field, such as which facility they set up, who they hired and that sort of thing.

December 23, 2011. Questions and Comments about *Dominatrix on Trial* X. Someone who had read my book *Dominatrix on Trial* asked me an interesting question. He wanted to know whether, when I was in business, we were open on Christmas. Let me expand a bit on that and say that on most statutory holidays I just operated my dungeons like any other day. I needed the revenue, and clients often had more time those days. However on Christmas Eve, Christmas and Boxing Day I would be closed so as to spend time with family and friends and allowed my staff to do the same. It was also a welcome break.

#### Chapter 5: December 27 to December 31, 2011 For Christmas and the New Year

December 27, 2011. For Those Not Celebrating the Season. I have noticed that over the years more and more people I meet here in Toronto are not celebrating Christmas. When I grew up in small town Ontario, and later Toronto, I rarely met anyone who did not celebrate Christmas. Now I would say at least one third don't. In my own time there has

come to be a huge increase in the diversity of the people in Toronto. Part of that diversity is people who are born Christians and do not celebrate Christmas, or those who dread it as a stressful time of year. It reminds me that society should not impose its values on people. I, of all people, should not need to be reminded.

December 29, 2011. The year 2011 in Review (Personal). This year my health was basically static. I am in bad health, but not, as of today, in any immediate danger. I can do little and not get out much, but it is comfortable for me at times to be at my computer, so I have been writing to many people using social media, writing blogs and doing some clerical work for a local business. The highlight of the year was publication of *Dominatrix on Trial*, my memoirs, in the summer. It is selling around the world and on bookstore shelves. I think it is going to continue to be well received.

December 31, 2011. The year 2011 in Review (Political). The year 2011 was a continuation of 2010 in some respects. In 2010 our constitutional challenge begun in 2007 succeeded and Judge Susan Himel struck down the prostitution laws. The government appealed and in 2011 the appeal was heard. This time five judges, two of them women, heard the matter in June. That was over six months ago. Their decision is coming out soon, and whatever it is it will lead to a massive national debate on how government should govern the consenting private behavior of adults. More about that soon.

## Part 2: Blogs, Articles and Speeches in 2012

### Chapter 6: January 2 to March 12, 2012

#### Resolutions, Memoirs, Health, Questions

*I did less blogging in 2012 than in 2011. In fact, after May, I hardly did any at all. Up to late March, when the decision was released, I continued to discuss my personal life, book and other topics of interest at the time.*

January 2, 2012. New Year Resolutions (Personal). I resolve that this year I will be even more vigilant in following doctor's orders. I have not been bad, but I don't have much room for error. That means remembering to eat and drink what I am told and not more or less or other. It also means not waiting until I am run down to rest. I resolve to spend some time each day collecting my written materials for some possible future publications that have been suggested to me. I resolve to remember to tell those around me and who have bought *Dominatrix on Trial* how grateful I am. I resolve to try not to feel sorry for myself or to be afraid.

January 4, 2012. New Year Resolutions (Political). This year I resolve to persuade Prime Minister Harper not to retain or pass laws that don't respect the freedom and safety of women who obey the law. I will seek to persuade him to pass laws that are clear, specific and don't give broad authority to unelected officials. I resolve to join others in making him accountable and answerable for those new laws. I also resolve to continue to do what

I can in the current court case, were the government is appealing in order to sustain the old laws against prostitution, whatever that is. But I resolve that above all, you will be hearing from me. You already are in my book, *Dominatrix on Trial*. The coming ruling by the Ontario Court of Appeal just marks a beginning.

January 6, 2012. More Questions and Comments about *Dominatrix on Trial* I. When I was at a Christmas gathering some women who had read my book were very kind in their praise about how long I fought and what I fought for. Naturally they had many questions. One of them was whether I missed running a dungeon. My answer to that was that in my current state of health the thought of having to keep appointments and prepare for them is now simply beyond the pale. It has now been almost a decade since I have run a full facility. Even when I was in good health and younger, as I pointed out in the book, it was a tough grind – though it certainly had its moments.

January 8, 2012. More Questions and Comments About *Dominatrix on Trial* II. As I mentioned in the previous blog the women at the Christmas gathering had so many questions and things to say about my book. One of the interesting things was the variety of women who worked for me. Indeed. As I pointed out in the book women of almost any size, shape, age, colour or ethnicity can succeed in the role. The variety of role play and players sought by clients has never ceased to amaze me. The gals at the party said that was one of the things about the book they found surprising.

January 10, 2012. More Questions and Comments about *Dominatrix on Trial* III. I have one further thing to say about the reactions of those women at the Christmas party to my book. They told me they did not realize how much in the way of resources and resolve is involved in a legal battle. They told me that it is terrible when innocent people are pressured into pleading out because of what it takes to fight. They realized that too many innocent people are convicted. Some of them said they were very depressed and frightened by this.

*I had tried two rounds of chemotherapy for the Hepatitis C that was destroying my liver. A minor procedure was done to help relieve the pressure from the cirrhosis, and a biopsy as well. Hence the one month break in blogging, with the exception of one update on January 22. Aside from the recovery, I also wanted a break from blogging.*

January 22, 2012. Update on My Condition. I am continuing to recover from my liver surgery. It was a success and though it was not a cure by any means it did help with my symptoms. Soon I will be responding to those who have sent their good wishes. Some interesting times to come. It may not be much longer before the decision on the prostitution laws comes down. Then I will have plenty to say. I am getting ready for that time.

February 11, 2012. It's Good to be Back. Thanks to so many who have sent kind messages while I recovered from my surgery. I am much better now and am going to

resume my blogs. We are approaching the release of the Ontario Court of Appeal's decision about Justice Susan Himel's decision of September 2010. She struck down the laws which supposedly restricted prostitution in Ontario, and Canada. The government's appeal was heard in June 2011. No matter what the higher court says in its decision a huge national debate on the issues involved will begin. I was a panelist at a major conference at Toronto's Upper Canada College debating the issue of whether prostitution should be decriminalized. My remarks were about the opposition to Judge Himel's decision. Over the next couple of weeks I will share a text of those remarks with you, and after that have further comments about the issues about to come before the country. You can see a video of me delivering my remarks on my Web sites, and you can get background on the Himel decision in my book: *Dominatrix on Trial*.

*The speech appears shortly, on its own, below. What you will read, the prepared text, was also posted on my Web site and social media. Again, awaiting the release of the decision, I shared my views and answers to questions.*

February 23, 2012. My Definition of a Feminist. I was recently asked how I defined a feminist and whether I see myself as a feminist. I believe a feminist is a woman, or man for that matter, who believes in maximizing the equality of the sexes in every respect and minimizing discrimination of any type based on gender. I see myself as a feminist in terms of supporting equality of opportunity in the workplace, but I do not believe in equality in relationships. I believe that one partner should dominate the other. For example, as a dominatrix I see this desire of men to submit to women all the time, not to be equal. They want to revel in female superiority and worship a woman as a goddess, at least when they are role playing with them. I don't think that describes feminism in relationships.

February 25, 2012. Crimes on Campus that Target Women. I don't want to sound racist but the colleges and universities in Toronto have many students that come from, or whose parents come from traditional cultures, where men's pride can be more easily hurt by women than is the case with, say, third generation North Americans. Also women, like the elderly, are a safer target for attackers than able-bodied young men and most college students today are women, so they will be the main victims of crime. So I don't think misogyny is the only reason for the targeting of women on campus. To change any misogyny that does exist will take time, cultural changes and also women fighting back by reporting incidents and there being supports to encourage more women to come forward.

February 27, 2012. Feeling Empowered as a Dominatrix. I went into a great deal of detail on those things in my book: *Dominatrix on Trial*. I ask you to buy it, not only to increase sales, but to get my full views on that. You can go to [dominatrixontrial.com](http://dominatrixontrial.com) for information on how to get it. But to answer the question of whether being a dominatrix gives a woman a feeling of empowerment as best I can now, I would say a few things. Sex work (in the conventional sense) let me survive, and if you do sex work from a

secure location and in a clean environment it is much better than being forced underground the way the laws do to us now, despite prostitution being legal. People are having sex, often anonymously, all over the place now, so these millions don't seem to think they are degrading themselves. High end prostitutes are making good livings for short hours and many love what they do and endure no sexual harassment the way secretaries, waitresses and other poorly paid women do. As a dominatrix I felt even better than a high end sex worker, except that it was a more costly and burdensome business to run. But I can tell you that nothing beats having men who occupy positions of power being at your mercy and worshipping you. For a woman to have that kind of power is intoxicating and must be experienced to be believed. It is not just the physical control over and power to inflict punishment on a big man who is helpless, it is also the experience of him wishing to be in that position for me. Of course I felt empowered. I had concerns when running my establishment too. I was concerned about the police raiding. I was concerned about making enough money to continue on. I was concerned about losing the premises, which I did not own. But I was never concerned about violence against me or my staff. Girls who work in traditional occupations or in male dominated occupations endure sexual harassment and bullying all the time.

February 29, 2012. Why the Image of the Sex Worker is So Often Taboo. A difficult question. Taboos of all types are very uneven. Some people condemn birth control. Some people condemn per-marital sex. Some people condemn anonymous sex. Some people condemn cross-dressing. Some people condemn homosexual encounters. Some people condemn bondage and consensual and safe torture. They may see these things as degrading. They may see taking money for doing these things as degrading. The current laws leave matters confused. Prostitution is legal, but there is no clear definition of what it is. Public policy and the laws around prostitution were themselves ruled unconstitutional by the judge and we will soon hear from the appeal court on the matter, or will have heard from them by the time you are reading this. However society's perception, whatever that is, will not be changed by the court's ruling. When Parliament gets involved the real issues will emerge. It will be like the Internet monitoring and minimum sentence bills. There will be blow back from the people and the judges and the discussions the government is desperate to avoid will begin in a big way. Meanwhile, people in private will continue to do what they want because they want to be free. That is what this country stands for and Mr. Harper will once again have to take a stand against freedoms if he wants to take a stand against prostitution. The media and public will pick up on that and it will be historic.

March 2, 2012. How the Prostitution Laws Affect the Average Person. I presume you mean the laws that were struck down, but tentatively being kept in place. These laws impact few because they are under-enforced; as the judge who struck them down pointed out. New similar laws will also be disobeyed. But for those who the authorities wish to target, as they did me in the 1990's, the laws are a tool for the police to impose morality and target individuals. Indeed, the disgusting presence of "morality squads" over the years should make any thinking person sick.

March 4, 2012. The Remaining Legal Battle. I was recently asked in an on-line interview what remains of the current legal battle. First of all the term sex work is too vague. Exactly what acts are we talking about? The current case before the courts has all parties agreeing that prostitution (whatever that is) is legal. It was legal going into the case. The government wants to keep some of the things that prostitutes and those who work in the business do illegal. What is likely to happen is that the courts will tell the government to be more specific about what people can and cannot do in private with full consent for money or other payment. Then the real fight begins.

March 6, 2012. Is Prostitution an Issue? In a recent on-line interview I was told that people call prostitution an “issue.” They wanted to know what I thought of that. I told them that prostitution, whatever that is, is booming. It will boom no matter what public policy is. A significant portion of the population wants the freedom to pay for and be paid for acts of prostitution and do so with the safety and choices available to participants in other legal activities. So prostitution is not an issue in that sense. The issue is Canada’s Prime Minister and his unwillingness to tell consenting adults what they can and cannot do in private. He lacks courage. He says prostitution is bad, yet won’t define it or make it illegal. He seems to lack the ability, as well as the courage, to deal with this. He just wants the current laws, ruled unconstitutional, to remain in place.

March 8, 2012. The Influence of the Pickton Inquiry on My Case. The Robert Pickton inquiry has brought up issues that we have been talking about for a long time, issues of security, and problems with victimization, among others. The Picton matter already has, in my view moved people and hopefully the Court of Appeal to rule against the government. The government is appealing our victory. I think they are pissing against the wind. A number of other cases such as the safe site injection rulings, the rulings against mandatory minimum sentences and the public blow back against Internet snooping powers for the government without warrants have also demonstrated that Canadians don’t like being controlled in their private lives, and want to be free to protect themselves when doing things, like prostitution, that are legal.

March 10, 2012. The Unfairness in Canada’s Prostitution Laws. I was asked in a recent on-line interview how the current case involves fairness in the prostitution laws. The judge who struck down the laws in 2010 was clear. The laws discriminate against women. The laws allow a segment of society engaged in legal activity from protecting themselves, while participants in other legal activities are not prevented. The laws are vague as to what, prostitution, is and is not. Laws also need to be clear to be fair. The judge also said it is up to Parliament to write and pass laws telling people what they can and cannot do in their sex lives or fantasy role play, and what they can and cannot do to protect themselves in doing so. I have written about this in my book *Dominatrix on Trial*.

March 12, 2012. How the Laws and Courts Have Treated Me. I have had a few experiences with the law and the courts. The public has been very sympathetic on the

whole. For example they keep asking, about my previous trials: “What was the crime if there was no sex?” They have also been very supportive of my tenacity in fighting the laws which are so unfair and dangerous. However up until recently the courts have not been fair. Judge Himel’s ruling in 2010 striking down the prostitution laws finally recognized the unfairness of the laws. Before that the judges, in the main, were not only unsympathetic, but unfair bordering on corrupt.

Chapter 7: February 2012

Speech: World Affairs Conference

*Upper Canada College may be Canada’s most prestigious private school for boys, and Branksome Hall for girls. They hold a joint event each year where they invite well known speakers on a variety of topics. Retired politicians, journalists, media figures and so on are featured, usually in a debate format or panel discussion. That day I was on a panel of four. Nikki Thomas spoke before me, as did a prominent advocate of abolition of the sex trade completely and a graduate student who did a major study on what led to increases or decreases in women participating in the sex trade. All of us had interesting things to say of course. This was my first speech in front of a large audience, if you except the media scrums and interviews. I was speaking at the time just before the release of the decision of the Court of Appeal. I did not know how much media would cover the event or my speech, if any. So I made sure that there were some juicy lines, kept the speech within the short time limit and kept in mind the audience I was addressing.*

Before anything else I want to thank Nikki Thomas for being such a wonderful spokesperson for our successful motion to strike down those appalling laws which were supposedly against prostitution. Nikki has told and can tell you about what is likely to happen if Judge Himel's ruling is upheld.

The federal government announced an appeal before they even had time to read the decision! The lawyers who argued on their behalf at the hearings from 2007 to 2010 and the appeal in 2011 were merely following orders. They couldn't even get credible experts. But what were those orders? I think the orders from Ottawa were to make the debate go away. Those who have read the Himel decision and seek to overturn it are looking after themselves for sure. But they are also seeking to maintain a status quo that benefits organized crime at the expense of women.

So what I am telling you is that our opponents are either ignorant of what the current debate is about, ignorant about the realities of the sex trade issues, and they are trying to prevent Parliament from framing new legislation.

Judge Himel said her decision was not about whether prostitution is good or bad, or whether it should continue to be legal, or, for that matter, what prostitution is and is not. Her 131 page decision, after two years of hearings from experts and lawyers, was that the laws seeking to restrict prostitution (whatever that is) were unconstitutional. In a nutshell she said that those laws impacted negatively on those they were supposed to protect. For example, they prevent prostitutes from hiring security or working from a



regular location. She also said that these harmful laws impacted in a discriminatory and arbitrary fashion on a narrow segment of society-- on women.

Yet, many voices rose saying that prostitution should not be made legal. First of all they forget it already is. These uninformed voices tell us that prostitution and pimping will increase dramatically, as will human trafficking, if the decision is upheld and nothing else is done. They also tell us that prostitution is bad.

This is all crap. The judge said the evidence does not support those assertions. You can read her decision where she looks at other countries and the evidence at length and says why. I would like to add a couple of other considerations. For one thing, do men who pay prostitutes have unlimited money to ramp up their demand? For another, prostitution is rampant today and the current laws, as the judge said, are rarely enforced anyway. And something else. Human trafficking and women being illegally exploited in this country occurs across a number of occupations such as household domestics, farm labourers, office cleaners and, I could go on. The judge did point out that the negative aspects of human trafficking and so on are addressed by other laws: such as those against immigration, confinement and assault.

And they say prostitution is bad. Well guess what. I say it's good. Who the hell are they to decide? I say it is wrong to allow women to have premarital sex for free yet make them criminals if they get a dinner or favour or money for it. We are not slaves! They say smoking is bad. They say overeating is bad. They say getting drunk is bad. So why when women exercise free choice in the bedroom does it have to be illegal, even if it is bad, which it is not?

Why do I say prostitution is good? It's not just me. All over town men and women are paying for sex acts now. Would they do it if it was not good? And what about acts that may or may not be sexual. Some of you may have tied up your boyfriends and tickled them, or had them do it to you. What's wrong with that? Is that a sex act if your clothes are on? And of course, if they paid you to do it are you a criminal? I think we should get a medal when we punish men or take their money.

Just think of what will happen if Prime Minister Harper has to bring in new legislation. He will have to define what is and what is not a sex act. He will have to define who is and who is not a prostitute. I will have plenty to say about all that in the future, but the thing to remember is that laws cannot be impermissibly vague. That means he must tell us exactly what we can and cannot do in private and why, if he wishes to make prostitution illegal.

Do you want the Prime Minister to control your sexuality and what you choose to do with your body in the privacy of your home or business?

Our opponents do not want that discussion to happen. They just want some vague and indirect legal and moral condemnation of sex for money to appear to be the policy of the country. I say to you here today what a number of academic papers that have been sent to me since this began are saying. We must move away from a moral basis for legislating on this issue and towards a safety basis. We women must not lose control of our bodies and our lives. Other countries are hopefully moving forward in emancipating women. Don't allow Mr. Harper to take us backward. Thank you all very much.

*The speech was delivered twice, once in the morning and once in the afternoon. Each time there was an audience of about one hundred. The speeches were filmed and are on the Internet. The speeches were both well received. I departed from the prepared text a few times to joke with the audience. I was told after that our session was the best attended and voted most successful of the entire conference. My key supporters gave me feedback on the speech, both text and delivery, and told me that my major speeches were yet to come, probably after the last of the court decisions.*

#### Chapter 8: March 27 to May 30, 2012 Decision Time, Updates and Comments on the Case

*Finally, after almost a year from the conclusion of the hearings, there was a decision. On the two main laws we won clearly and on a third we lost three votes to two. In the main it was quite a decisive victory. Almost all commentators expected the case to go to the Supreme Court. I did several interviews on the day of the release. One famous one was where I said I had the prime minister by the balls and was going to squeeze.*

March 27, 2012. The 2012 Prostitution Appeal Decision: An Expression of Gratitude. On March 26, 2012 five judges of the Ontario Court of Appeal ruled on the government's appeal of the 2010 decision of Justice Susan Himel, which struck down the three laws seeking to prevent prostitution, whatever that is. Those laws were against living off the avails of prostitution, keeping a bawdy house for prostitution and communicating for prostitution. First, the court upheld Justice Himel on the avails provision, so basically prostitutes can now have security, chauffeurs, accountants, landlords and so forth. Second, they told Parliament it would have to rewrite the bawdy-house provision to remove the reference to prostitution within twelve months or the provision falls. And third, they left the communicating provision intact, although the judges split 3-2 on that. The media recognized that the Court has essentially legalized brothels in Ontario and thrown the matter to Parliament. Remember, the communicating provision remaining intact is essentially to deal with street prostitution and the penalties so minor as to be on the level of a traffic ticket. Police officers sympathetic to us have told my supporters that they are no longer going to act against indoor prostitution because it is prostitution, whatever that is. This is an historic victory because it shows that we were right about the laws being unfair for a whole host of reasons and have now ensured that the debate will not be suppressed and changes will come. In the coming weeks I will be writing about fairness in any new laws that might be brought in. However, for now, I want to express my gratitude to many wonderful people. Professor Alan Young has worked on this case for a decade, and against these laws for years before that. He supervised, in my estimate, about fifty students who assisted as part of their studies. He had to advocate for funding. He devoted summers and worked extra hours when he had teaching duties. He did this on the heels of publishing his wonderful book profiling the terrible shortcomings in our legal system. He defended me in the past when I was arrested under these laws despite offering no sex. He has inspired scholarship and advocacy in an area of the law desperately crying out for attention from governments. The Order of Canada award was created for people

like him. My fellow plaintiffs Amy Leibovitch and Val Scott deserve the nation's thanks for coming forward and exposing their private lives and taking a position, so as to make the challenge legally viable. They have stood against these laws for years prior to this challenge coming to maturity. They have walked the walk in every way. Val has also served as Executive Director of the Sex Professionals of Canada (SPOC), and as such has led others who have helped to work towards more fairness in these laws and in society's treatment of sex workers. Val has been an amazing spokesperson. Nikki Thomas has succeeded Val and has also spoken for the current initiative with amazing insight and effectiveness. I also want to pay my thanks to lawyers besides Alan who have represented me and assisted me in the past, and generally enabled me to carry on and tell my story. As they defended me or represented me in appeals and other ways they too fought these laws. I will, as I have in the past, list them now in the order they participated and they all have my gratitude: Ken Danson, Morris Manning, Theresa Simone, Murray Klippenstein, Charlie Campbell, George Callahan, Leah Daniels, Paul Burstein, Justice David L. Corbett and Sender Herschorn. Their assistants and staffs are not to be forgotten either. Finally, let us not forget the many activists from the past. There have been coalitions in the past seeking to amend the bawdy-house and related laws. In the middle 1990's Robert Dante headed up the coalition formed after I was raided. Andy Anderson and the late Richard Hudler and so many others over the years are not to be forgotten. Their stories will be told, and it is my intention to do so or see that it is done. This is their victory too. Long live freedom.

*After my open letter of gratitude on March 27 I took ten days to read the decision and gather reactions before giving my opinions on the decision and related matters.*

April 7, 2012. A Historic Prostitution Law Decision. In March 2012 the Ontario Court of Appeal upheld most of the decisions made by a lower court in September 2010 striking down Canadian laws seeking to restrict prostitution in Ontario. As of today, less than two weeks after the release of the decision, all parties are looking at next steps. But one thing is clear. It was a win for those of us who challenged the laws. The six judges who have sat on this case are agreed that the laws are basically dysfunctional and in the main do not even work against their stated ends. They have agreed that parliament has work to do, and so many questions to answer. More in my next blog.

April 9, 2012. Is the Supreme Court the Next Stop? The issue of what legal steps remain to the parties in the prostitution challenge is complex and often technical. For one thing, the Supreme Court is not obliged to hear an appeal of the decision of the Ontario Court of Appeal. For another, it is a very big task to mount an appeal, and not cheap. For yet another, the side appealing may actually have something to lose if the Supreme Court finds more issues with the Appeal Court decision than the appellant raised. The federal and Ontario governments are reviewing it and so are we. Until these discussions are concluded, and positions are taken, I don't want to speculate on whether the court battles will be over.

April 11, 2012. More about Possible Appeals. There is an important aspect about appeals that people often overlook. The time from a decision to the date the judgment takes effect is called a stay. For example the current decision by the Ontario Court of Appeal put a thirty day stay before the living on the avails law is changed and a twelve month stay on the dropping of the bawdy-house law against prostitution. An appeal to the Supreme Court will take more than thirty days so the Supreme Court must grant an extension of the stay or the law is dropped even if another appeal is heard. So decisions are about to be made soon by a number of parties, or things will change.

April 13, 2012. More about Changes in Progress. A number of police forces have already greatly curtailed their activities against indoor prostitution, whatever that is. Some supporters have told me that senior police officials have said that there is little practical purpose in enforcing laws that have already been struck down twice and were under-enforced to begin with. So even if there is an appeal of the second striking down of the laws against living on the avails and keeping a bawdy house for prostitution, there seems to be a recognition that the old laws are done for. There is also public support, of about two to one, in favour of the Court of Appeal's decision, based on polls I have read about. The silence of certain media on the issue speaks volumes. We won and we were right.

April 15, 2012. What are the Prime Minister's Options? Just a refresher. He can instruct the government lawyers to seek leave to appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada. They may or may not choose to hear an appeal. They are not obligated to do so if the government seeks one. He may also instruct them to seek an extension of the thirty day stay on the dropping of the living on the avails laws. He can order the drafting of new legislation against bawdy-houses for prostitution as the court offered to let him to during the stay. He can do nothing and effectively let prostitution become an open industry – which it basically is anyway. Finally, he may wish to make prostitution illegal. It is now legal. If he does that, it will be very interesting and he may be opening cans of worms he and his lawyers never considered.

April 17, 2012. What does the Prime Minister Want? The Prime Minister does not believe that women (or men) should sell sex. He believes prostitution is bad for society. So let's get this straight. According to him all the pre-marital sex going on during first dates or at swinger clubs or married people cheating is no problem for him – so long as it's free. Do I have that right? We have to lie back and think of Harper and the only reward outside of the sex itself is the thought of him? How much is that worth? Is it taxable?

April 19, 2012. The Prime Minister May Be Confused. Prime Minister Harper says he is tough on crime. He says he is against prostitution. Prostitution is legal, not a crime. In fact he was fighting in the courts to keep intact the laws centred on the fact that prostitution is legal. These laws were supposedly to restrict activities related to prostitution, whatever that is. Yet these laws were declared themselves unconstitutional by two courts. It will be interesting to see how he sorts all this out, now that his futile

struggle to continue the policy of the Liberals on prostitution and related activities has failed.

April 21, 2012. The Prime Minister's Dilemma. If he does nothing about the recent court ruling striking down the prostitution laws, brothels will be legal, at least in Ontario. If he tries to appeal the recent ruling he may not get heard. If he is heard he has to convince the court to extend stays on the laws that are about to fall – keeping a bawdy house for prostitution and living on the avails of prostitution. If he does not get the stays we will have brothels by the time he gets heard, if he is heard. If he is heard he may lose. If he wins he may only win in part, in which case a conviction will be hard to get under those obsolete laws. What will he do?

April 23, 2012. Is Prostitution Bad For Society? No. It is under-enforcement of laws that protect people that is bad for society. For example, weak enforcement of immigration in the workplace has led to sweatshops, illegal farm workers being exploited, illegal nannies, and illegal caregivers for the elderly, recruits for organized crime and so forth. Within each of those situations we see women being treated miserably and sexually abused, why doesn't the government crack down on that. Why pick on the prostitutes?

April 25, 2012. The Government Wants to Appeal Again. This afternoon the government announced and served notice that it will be seeking leave to appeal the Ontario Court of Appeal's decision to uphold the Himel decision striking down two of the three laws which the government believed worked against prostitution and for women, and which six judges agreed was unconstitutional. They also want to extend the stay on the judicial decisions, meaning keep the old laws in place for now, again. The judges said Parliament has work to do. But the government just doesn't get it. They will. Watch.

April 27, 2012. Supreme Court's first Ruling on Our Case. The Court has granted the government's request for an extension of the thirty day stay on the date on which the living on the avails of prostitution law was to fall. This is reasonable and expected, since it was only this week that the government advised the court that they wanted to appeal our victories. However, the court will, within thirty days, unless the extension is again extended a bit, not have the excuse that they have not had a chance to familiarize themselves with the matter of whether the stay should be extended while the court decides whether to hear any appeals. It is going to get very interesting. Watch.

*I was anxious to return to questions arising out of the book and the debate on the sex trade generally.*

April 30, 2012. Do Prostitutes Want to be Prostitutes? Some do some don't. Same with waitresses. Same with office cleaners. Same with factory workers. Same with nursing home orderlies. Women all over the place are doing things they might not wish to do, to earn a living. If a woman can make a living in a few hours a week, safely if the

prostitution laws remain struck down, having sex rather than work many days a week in hard labour, shouldn't that be her choice?

May 6, 2012. Is Prostitution Bad for Society? The Prime Minister thinks so. But if he is right, why is it such a booming business? If he is right, why does he want the current laws, under which it is legal, upheld? There is a market for the sale of sex and fantasy role play, and everyone agrees that it is not going away. The judge whose ruling was basically upheld by appeal, said that removing the current laws will not result in an increase in prostitution related activity. What removing those laws will do is let what people want to do and are doing come up from underground. When that happens, the Prime Minister is free to choose not to pay for sex.

May 9, 2012. Why don't Our Leaders Lead? Many if not most people think elected officials and not appointed judges should decide what is and what is not acceptable behaviour by our citizens. So why does the Prime Minister want to keep the struck down laws meant to restrict prostitution before the courts? He now has every reason to bring in new laws, and he has a majority government. Why does he need a third court to tell him that the current laws are problematic, to say the least? What is he afraid of? I think the time is coming when we will find out.

May 22, 2012. Upcoming at the Supreme Court. First the court has to decide how long to extend the stay on the struck down laws while it decides whether to hear the appeal of the decisions by two lower courts. Then it must decide whether it will grant leave to appeal. I will comment on the case therefore only when these decisions are handed down.

May 30, 2012. About *Dominatrix on Trial* Again. I have a couple of signings for my book *Dominatrix on Trial* during June. People have been so kind in their comments. People who report on the media to me are surprised at how little people who normally attack me cite the book, even though book store clerks have reported to us that they bought it. If you want me to name names I thank you for your interest. A good dominatrix never tells.

Chapter 9: June 2012  
Speech: Idea City Conference

*This was only my second formal speech, and it was only a short statement, and I was one of a few speakers in the same session. Each year in Toronto Moses Znaimer, former media mogul, hosts a gathering of famous intellectuals, business leaders, politicians and so on in a big ticket series of sessions on topics trending. It is taped by CBC radio for broadcast some months later. The sessions are also filmed, and our session is on the Internet. The three of us who were plaintiffs appeared as a group and we each spoke for a few minutes and then answered questions from the audience. There was no debate format, unless the audience questions were adversarial in nature. I spoke first and it was agreed I would make a couple of jokes and attack the lack of integrity of the government*

*and prime minister. Amy spoke from a more personal perspective, and Val spoke about the many implications of the decisions. The audience gave us all a good response and seemed very interested and sympathetic, but it was hard to tell at the time because they were somewhere in a sea of black due to the stage lights. My supporters told me I was getting better in my delivery and more comfortable in front of an audience. The speech got no mainstream media coverage. The entire conference, for that matter, got very little. But the audience liked the opening jokes.*

I see some former clients in the audience. Does it still hurt?

Before anything else I want to thank Val and Amy for leading this fight and for being such wonderful spokespersons in this and other initiatives to protect women and our freedoms. They will have many important points for you to consider today.

Now, if I was an adversary of Prime Minister Harper, I would thank him too – for being so feckless in this matter. I really have no business commenting on his handling of the economy, his foreign policies, or what he is doing to protect the environment and so forth. But on his handling of the issues we are discussing today, I can tell you he has been a very bad boy indeed.

His government was caught totally off guard when Judge Himel's ruling came out in September 2010. I am told they made no preparations for the release. They announced they would appeal about three hours after the release. They did so without time to read it properly and consult properly. Incompetence. He fired no one for this.

Naughty Mr. Harper says unelected judges should not make laws. Six judges have told him to involve himself and the laws are problematic to say the least. Yet the elected bad boy runs to hide behind the robes of yet more unelected judges. What does that say about him?

Mr. Harper says he is against prostitution, and he vowed never to make it legal. Yet he wants to keep the current laws intact. Under the current laws prostitution is legal. Can you believe this guy?

Does he know that these proceedings are the culmination of four years of a virtual public inquiry? Does he know that the findings were that the present laws create more violence against women and human trafficking than they prevent. Does he know that the judges found that there will not be much of an increase in prostitution, if the laws are removed?

Does he know that while he hides women suffer? Does he care? Please, Mrs. Harper, have him read the decision and send him to me for behaviour modification.

Thank you all very much.

Chapter 10: July 22 to July 28, 2012  
Book Optioned, Media Project Explored

*I had not blogged for almost two months. The case was being prepared for the Supreme Court, and the hearing there was many months away. A Toronto film company wanted to get my book made into a movie and en route to that do a reality show with me, my daughter and some clients and others. So I told people about that.*

July 22, 2012. *Dominatrix on Trial* Headed to the Screen? As many of you may be aware I published my memoirs, *Dominatrix on Trial*, in 2011. It has been very well received. So well, in fact, that an option has been taken out to make a movie or television series of my story. There may also be a reality series or possibly other projects. The option was acquired by a production company in Toronto.

July 24, 2012. My Book as a Movie or TV Series I. The producers have explained to me in some detail how films or television series are produced. We of the general public, even authors, have no idea of how many people do so many different and technically complicated films to bring a story to the screen. If there is a reality series, I will probably be involved in front of the camera. Of course my poor health will limit how much I can do, and they are making every effort to keep that in mind.

July 26, 2012. My Book as a Movie or TV Series II. Reality series seem all the rage these days. The producers are looking into the possibility of one. My daughter is thrilled at the prospect of participating in it. So are a couple of the doms who worked for me in the past. For us it is just being ourselves and doing our thing. I don't know what the writers or whatever will do about getting us clients. I wonder if some of my old clients will come forward. Some of them like the idea of an audience, but being on television might be another matter altogether.

July 28, 2012. My Book as a Movie or TV Series III. If my book becomes a movie I wonder what the focus of the movie will be. There is my personal life, my practice as a dominatrix and probably courtroom scenes. I wonder if they will also approach the story through the eyes of clients or journalists, or perhaps police officers. Maybe they will see it through the eyes of my supporters, or my daughter. There are many interesting perspectives to consider.

*As it turned out they were not successful in getting the financing for the reality show or movie, but of course the possibility of all that happening remained.*

Chapter 11: December 2012  
Speech: Acton, Ontario

*Late in the year Alan Young and I spoke to a community meeting in this small Ontario town. The audience was very mixed in both its make-up and sympathies, and Alan handled most of the questions. He spoke, eloquently of course, to the issues. I just spoke to the general issues, returning to the theme of the government's refusal to define what are and what are not sex acts. The meeting got no mainstream media coverage that I am aware of.*

Before anything else I want to thank Valarie Scott and Amy Leibovitch, my fellow plaintiffs in this fight and for being such wonderful spokespersons in this, and other



initiatives to protect women and our freedoms. I also want to thank my lawyer Professor Alan Young who headed our legal team. My superhero disguised as an ordinary citizen!

Now, if I was an adversary of Prime Minister Harper, I would thank him too – for being so feckless in this matter. Feckless means lacking in efficiency and vitality, and being unthinking and irresponsible.

I really have no business commenting on his handling of the economy, his foreign policies, or what he is doing to protect the environment and so forth. But on his handling of the issues we are discussing today, I can tell you he has been a very bad boy indeed.

His government was caught totally off guard when Judge Himel's ruling came out in September 2010. I am told they made no preparations for the release. They announced they would appeal about three hours after the release and they did so without time to read it properly and consult properly. Incompetence! He fired no one for this.

Naughty Mr. Harper says unelected judges should not make laws. Six judges have told him to involve himself and the laws are problematic to say the least. Yet the elected bad boy runs to hide behind the robes of yet more unelected judges. What does that say about him?

Does he know that these proceedings are the culmination of four years of a virtual public inquiry? Does he know that the findings were that the present laws create more violence against women and human trafficking than they prevent? Does he know that the judges found that there will not be much of an increase in prostitution, whatever that is, if the laws are removed?

Mr. Harper says he is against prostitution, and he vowed never to make it legal. Yet he wants to keep the current laws intact. Under the current laws prostitution is legal. Can you believe this guy?

Now we all know that pre-marital sex is also legal. Women can have sex with whomever they want, when they want. Does Mr. Harper have a problem with that? It appears he does. It seems to me that he has no problem with it, so long as she does it for free. It seems to me that he wants to control women's bodies. If she negotiates dinner for sex, is she a criminal? Does she have to lie back and think of Harper when she has sex?

What does Mr. Harper mean when he says prostitution anyway? Does he mean sex for money? How about when I tie men up and tickle them? Is it sex? Is it legal if I do it for free? When, I put men in corsets and dresses, am I a prostitute? I am sure Mr. Harper can share with us some of his acknowledged expertise in these matters. He should, because the laws he seeks to preserve are impermissibly vague in giving us the answers. That means that unelected officials, for arbitrary reasons, will decide when people's private consenting behaviour is not legal. If anyone knows something about officials like that, it's me.

Women are having sex for free all over town, all day, every day, anywhere they want, whenever they want, including the privacy of their own homes. Yet the minute one red cent is exchanged Mr. Feckless says she is a criminal. Why does Prime Minister Harper feel the need to have his lackeys tell you what you can and cannot do in the privacy of your own home with another consenting adult?

We must move away from a moral basis for legislating on this issue and towards a safety basis. We women must not lose control of our bodies and our lives. Other

countries are hopefully moving forward in emancipating women. Don't allow Mr. Harper to take us backward.

So I turn to Laureen Harper, Mr. Harper's wife. I ask her to read the decisions and tell her elected husband what the findings were and then send the prime minister to me for a lesson in behaviour modification he'll never forget. I will make a man of him. Thank you all very much.

Chapter 12: March 2013

Speech: Big Susie's

*Big Susie's is a sex workers' advocacy group in Hamilton, Ontario. That is a city of about 500,000, about an hour's drive from Toronto. Some key activists in the sex workers' rights movement were associated with Big Susie's. My sense of the event was that it would receive little if any mainstream media coverage. That turned out to be the case. There was nothing about the meeting in the media afterwards. However it certainly was a great evening for me. It was very reassuring. I had my picture taken with many of the girls from the trade. They told me this was a very big deal. A few bought my book. I told them they could have it at half price, which I thought was fair all round. I gave the standard speech which I had prepared just as the Court of Appeal decision came out. I did not want to speak about it yet, but referred to it briefly.*

I want to thank Big Susie's for having me here tonight. I want to thank the activists in Hamilton for what they have done, are doing and will do to prevent sex workers from being victims, not only of violence, but of unfair stigmatization. There are similar activist efforts in Toronto and Vancouver of course. I am regularly invited to speak on campuses and of course in the media. My fellow plaintiffs in this constitutional challenge, Val and Amy, have also been out there. So you see, you are not alone. You also happen to be right.

I would also like to thank my lawyer Professor Alan Young who headed our legal team! My superhero disguised as an ordinary citizen. I would like to thank Her Honour Justice Susan Himel and the Ontario Court of appeal for striking down those monstrous laws!

It is wrong for governments to regulate consenting adult behaviour on private property. The state does have business in the bedrooms of the nation, but that should be when there is spousal abuse, not fantasy role play or consenting sex.

The Canadian government claims they are tough on crime. What have they said about cracking down on wife-beating? What have they said about allowing women's shelters to take in family pets? Many women won't leave an abusive relationship because it means the family pet would be a hostage. What about cracking down on deadbeat dads who don't pay their child support?

Now, since we are talking about prostitution let's talk about Prime Minister Harper. Politics is the world's oldest profession. If I was an adversary of Prime Minister Harper, I would thank him too – for being so feckless in this matter. For those of you who may not know, 'feckless' is a person who is lacking in efficiency or vitality – who is unthinking and irresponsible.

I really have no business commenting on his handling of the economy, his foreign policies, or what he is doing to protect the environment and so forth. But on his handling of the issues we are discussing today, I can tell you he has been a very bad boy indeed.

His government was caught totally off guard when Judge Himel's ruling came out in September 2010. I am told they made no preparations for the release. They announced they would appeal about three hours after the release and they did so without time to read it properly and consult properly. Incompetence! He fired no one for this.

Naughty Mr. Harper says unelected judges should not make laws. Six judges have told him to involve himself and the laws are problematic to say the least. Yet the elected bad boy runs to hide behind the robes of yet more unelected judges. What does that say about him?

Does he know that these proceedings are the culmination of four years of a virtual public inquiry? Does he know that the findings were that the present laws create more violence against women and human trafficking than they prevent? Does he know that the judges found that there will not be much of an increase in prostitution – whatever that is – if the laws are removed?

Mr. Harper says he is against prostitution, and he vowed never to make it legal. Yet he wants to keep the current laws intact. Under the current laws prostitution is legal. Can you believe this guy?

Now we all know that pre-marital sex is also legal. Women can have sex with whomever they want, when they want. Does Mr. Harper have a problem with that? It appears he does. It seems to me that he has no problem with it, so long as she does it for free. It seems to me that he wants to control women's bodies. If she negotiates dinner for sex, is she a criminal? Does she have to lie back and think of Harper when she has sex?

What does Mr. Harper mean when he says prostitution anyway? Does he mean sex for money? How about when I tie men up and tickle them? Is it sex? Is it legal if I do it for free? When, I put men in corsets and dresses, am I a prostitute? I am sure Mr. Harper can share with us some of his acknowledged expertise in these matters.

He should, because the laws he seeks to preserve are impermissibly vague in giving us the answers. That means that unelected officials, for arbitrary reasons, will decide when people's private consenting behaviour is not legal. If anyone knows something about officials like that, it's me.

Women are having sex for free all over town, all day, every day, anywhere they want, whenever they want, including the privacy of their own homes. The minute one red cent or deed is exchanged she is a criminal. Why does Prime Minister Harper feel the need, the need, to have his lackeys tell me what I can and cannot do in the privacy of my bedroom with another consenting adult?

We must move away from a moral basis for legislating on this issue and towards a safety basis. We women must not lose control of our bodies and our lives. Other countries are hopefully moving forward in emancipating women. Don't allow Mr. Harper to take us backward.

So I turn to Laureen Harper, Mr. Harper's wife. I ask her to read the decisions and tell her elected husband what the findings were and then send the Prime

Minister to me for a lesson in behaviour modification he'll never forget. I will make a man of him. Thank you all very much.

Chapter 13: June 27, 2013  
Reply to Newspaper Article

*Margaret Wente is and has been for many years one of the main opinion columnists in the Globe and Mail, often called Canada's national newspaper. She had written very nice things about me and had visited my second house and spent some hours with me while I ran it. However, when the charter challenge advanced she opposed liberalization of the sex trade in any way. One article in particular got our side bristling, and I was urged to join the response. Her article was called "Legalize Prostitution? Are We Nuts?" She called me a poster girl for the cause and cited a study to support her position. The title of my article was identical to its first sentence.*

Margaret Wente is a Bad Girl. Margaret Wente is a bad girl. Margaret is a high profile regular columnist for the Globe and Mail, often called Canada's National Newspaper. On Saturday, June 22, 2013 she wrote an article critical of attempts to, in her words, legalize prostitution. Among other things she said the current case being made before the Supreme Court, Bedford Versus Canada (I am Bedford – one of three plaintiffs), cannot change the fact that legalization would, in her opinion, mean more sex sold and that this is always bad for the women involved and for society as a whole.

I do not expect the members of the media to be fair, or even properly informed when they write or speak. They have so many issues to follow, deadlines to meet and advertisers to satisfy. But when someone of Margaret's stature descends to an uninformed rant, and her editors publish it, it cannot be allowed to stand unanswered. My supporters have asked me to respond.

To begin with, I am not a poster girl. Not one of we three plaintiffs are poster girls. Margaret has spent time with me and said many positive things about me. The other two plaintiffs are dedicated and long time activists against the current laws. I am covered in the media a great deal because I have been before the courts for years. I have been to jail for prostitution and have been fighting the laws for two decades. I have walked the walk. Margaret mentioned none of this. Nor did she say that the court is not making decisions about the right or wrong of prostitution or its legality. It is legal. Margaret did not say any of this in her article either.

The court is examining whether the preceding courts, six judges, erred in striking down laws or not doing so, because the laws are in not in accord with fundamental justice. Margaret also did her readers a terrible disservice by failing to mention that the evidence considered by the courts exceeded 25,000 pages, heard with cross-examinations over three years. Within that evidence was comprehensive court tested evidence of the experiences of other countries and their prostitution laws. That debate about the experience of other countries is over.

Margaret's comments are not court tested. Margaret writes as if she did not read the two judicial decisions, a frightening thought. I might add that Margaret did not

tell you that any attempt to outlaw the sale of sex means the government telling people what is legal and not legal between consenting adults in private. She did not tell you how government is supposed to go about enforcing correct private consenting behaviour. She did not tell you that the judges said that the worst aspects of prostitution are already addressed by other laws. She did not tell you that on numerous occasions the editors of her own paper called for removal of the current laws. As to the good and bad of prostitution, whatever that is, or other acts between consenting adults, people should inform themselves, and others, before giving opinions.

Chapter 14: June 2013

Speech: Allan Gardens

*A few days before the Supreme Court heard the final appeals in Bedford Versus Canada Red Umbrella rallies were held across Canada. This involved sex workers taking to the streets to protest in favour of the Himel decision of 2010. The marchers carried red umbrellas, which of course came in handy if it rained, but also symbolized the desire for protection under the law, among other things. I did interviews at the CBC head office in downtown Toronto and then went to the rally by cab. The cab driver recognized me and refused to accept any money because, he said, I was owed so much by so many. I was very moved by this. It was a sunny day. I spoke when the marchers reached the park. There was a heavy police presence and much media. I was not the only speaker. In advance I was aware that a short, but not too short, speech was what was called for.*

I'd like to thank you all for having me here today. Thank you for our magnificent support here and in Ottawa next week. Thank you for supporting freedom for Canadian women, and their safety. I also want to thank my fellow plaintiffs, Val and Amy, for their leadership in this challenge, and of course Professor Young, my super hero, and his legal team. I want to take a moment to express the appreciation we all feel towards Doctor Henry Morgentaler, who died this week. We can take strength from his conviction and courage. He went to jail for us. Let us never forget his example.

All over Canada today women are demonstrating for their freedom and safety. In Ottawa, next week, the highest judges in the land will give the final legal word on the despicable laws we now have. But whatever they say and rule, we know that no thinking person will believe that things can go on as they have before.

The prime minister can only hide and cower for so long. Where are measures against deadbeat dads and for more womens' shelters in his tough on crime agenda? Why won't he say if he has read Justice Himel's decision? Why does he complain about unelected judges making decisions in one breath and then hide behind them in the next?

He's a bad boy and his bad behaviour needs to be modified. So let's go to Ottawa and modify it. Thank you very much.

*The scene in Ottawa was in fact tremendous. While the hearings were going on the court was surrounded by chanting marchers for and against the Himel decision. One lawyer*

*told me the judges could hear the demonstrations while the court was sitting. A reporter told me she had never seen anything like it. History.*

#### Chapter 15: December 14 to December 30, 2013 Supreme Court Decision

*Finally the case was going to end, but of course the debate on the sex trade would continue. I decided to travel to Ottawa to be on hand for the release of the decision at the Supreme Court building. Val and Amy, my fellow plaintiffs, were there too. After the release we did a lot of media. I was there in my leather outfit complete with riding crop. I made sure I gave the media some good quotes, including that the prime minister had offered to appoint me to the Senate as a government whip. Not true of course. At that time the Senate was being scandalized by all sorts of charges of corruption.*

December 14, 2013. Supreme Court Decision – Release Scheduled. In 2010, after three years of hearings, with 25,000 pages of evidence and cross-examination, the judge ruled completely in our favour in our constitutional challenge to strike down Canada's laws meant to restrict prostitution, whatever that is. In 2012 the Ontario Court of Appeal upheld most of the lower court's decision. Hearings at the Supreme Court of Canada were in June 2013. You can look at all the key documents available to the public at the Web site [bedfordsafehaveninitiative.com](http://bedfordsafehaveninitiative.com). The final court decision will be released at 9:45 on Friday morning. I will be communicating my reactions as soon as possible after the release of the decision. While it has been a long battle, much lies ahead no matter what is in the decision.

*The release was on the morning of the December 20 and that evening I traveled back to Toronto. There was a huge snowstorm forecast for early on December 21 so I was anxious not to get stranded. I made it home on time. Next day I read the decision and read what others had to say about it and so forth and then had my say.*

December 21, 2013. Historic Supreme Court Victory. It was a victory in all respects. I have examined the decision. I have now read many media reports and heard and read a number of commentators. You can also get my early comments that way. I want to add a few things here. In the first place, the fifteen judges have made it very clear that Mr. Harper and his government, and the provinces, must bring in laws that are clear, specific and do not discriminate against or endanger people. Second, if people point to some prostitutes as victims they should realize, as the judges did, that the very laws in place were much of the cause of that: which is why I keep saying that the prime minister is doing what organized crime wants him to do. Third, when people point to other countries, they should first look at the decision of Judge Himel, who had weeks of testimony and cross-examinations of experts about other countries and what their experiences teach us. In other words, as Rosie Dimanno of the Toronto Star said: "Read the damn decision." Fourth, anyone who says prostitution (assuming their definition is clear) is always bad, is making a moral judgment and is a fool. I say that because we allow people to smoke,

drink, overeat, not exercise, and so forth. We also allow promiscuous, anonymous pre-marital sex and fantasy role-play for free. Fifth, let the people who want laws against prostitution tell us how to enforce such laws and whether there are better uses of public resources than to interfere in the private behaviour of consenting adults when those adults are permitted to take precautions. And sixth, all prostitutes are someone's daughter. My daughter has worked for me. If you want your daughter to be a soldier or be sexually harassed in the RCMP or in an office or to work for the minimum wage while having sex for free I would rather she do what she wanted and not what you wanted. And finally, seventh, if Mr. Harper is really interested in getting tough on crime let him crack down on wife beaters and dads who don't pay their child support. Have you heard him talk about that? Anyway, enough for today. The debate is beginning and I look forward to being part of it and am so very grateful to my fellow plaintiffs and Professor Young and his legal team, and all the activists who are too numerous to mention. Truly a great day for Canada.

December 23, 2013. More Thoughts on the Supreme Court Prostitution Laws Decision. It has now been over two days since the decision has been released. On Saturday December 21st I put up a blog where I asked readers to keep some things in mind as we go forward. Please have a look at that by going to [terrijeanbedford.com](http://terrijeanbedford.com). Today I want to tell you what I think will happen if the Canadian government lets the laws fall and does not bring in any new laws. First, as Judge Himel ruled from the evidence, there will not be a significant increase in prostitution. This is because men who want to buy sex from women, or smoke marijuana, are already doing so. Massage parlours are all over the place, as are escort services. Secondly, the existing laws are under-enforced, to say the least, anyway. New laws likely would be under-enforced as well. Third, if the so-called Nordic model was brought in (where only clients are charged), the harms the judges found with the current laws would reappear, and those laws would not be enforceable in court. Remember, the countries with the Nordic model don't have the constitutional protections we have in Canada, but the laws may fall in some of those countries as a result of our case anyway. Fourth, those who say the buying and selling of women for sex is wrong are wrong themselves. First of all, they don't define sex. Can a man pay for a massage, or to kiss a woman's feet? I could go on. I think you get the idea. I will have more to say in the new year about how laws must be specific to be enforceable – to say nothing about constitutional – to say nothing about enforceable. A happy holiday season and new year to all.

December 26, 2013. My Possible Appointment to the Senate. Some of you may have seen me say on television that the Prime Minister called and offered to appoint me to the Senate as the government “whip.” I have turned him down because I don't like to engage in behaviour that upsets the police.

December 28, 2013. The Federal Government and the Supreme Court Prostitution Decision. I have been reading many stories in the media where members of the government are quoted or appear in interviews when the decision was released and after.

My first reaction is to tell the public that these are the guys who announced they would appeal the initial lower court decision without reading it properly (if at all). Then they appealed the parts of the Ontario Court of Appeal decision (that upheld most of what the lower court ruled) to the Supreme Court, insisting that they still believed the laws were constitutional. After a unanimous decision of the Supreme Court, it meant that fifteen judges told the government that they were wrong. Are these the guys we are going to trust to bring in new laws? If they really believed the laws were constitutional then they were and are stupid. If they were just saying this to make the issues go away for a while they are liars. Either way, they cannot be trusted to legislate on this issue. Therefore they should either not bring in new laws, or resign and let others who can be trusted do the job.

December 30, 2013. Forget the Nordic Model. I have been reading and viewing the Web to see public reaction to the decision. By this I mean how the public responds to the issue of what the federal government should do now. A clear majority says prostitution should not be made illegal. Those who do actually want restrictions on the private behaviour of consenting adults in private advocate the so-called Nordic model, where customers are charged. Those of us who worked to strike down the laws know that this approach drives prostitution underground because the girls do not want to lose business. It is also under-enforced in countries that have adopted it. The judges in the case examined the experiences of other countries and concluded that other laws now in place in Canada address the worst aspects of prostitution. The only argument for making prostitution, whatever that is, illegal, are moral arguments. Such arguments have no place in a free country and those who make them should be ashamed of themselves.

#### Chapter 16: January 2 to June 2, 2014 The Debate Continues

*A huge national debate began the new year. I made the points I wanted to, and during these months made speeches, noted below, which you will see shortly in full.*

January 2, 2014. The New Year for Sex Workers and Women. It has been brought to my attention that police enforcement of our now unconstitutional laws has fallen off dramatically, particularly in Toronto. It appears that the police have only been enforcing the laws against street sex workers, and this may be because the Ontario Appeal Court upheld that one law of the three. It will be interesting to see if they now continue to prevent screening of clients in public. If so, will they use other laws meant to prevent selling things on the street, or will they continue to invoke the laws set to expire in December? I am also curious to see if they will step up investigations of reported rapes, sexual harassment on the job or wife-beating. I hope so.

January 4, 2014. Prostitution is Not Bad. In various occupations women are subject to violence, intimidation, sexual harassment and even rape. I believe only about 10 per cent of rapes are even reported. Women in the RCMP, Armed Forces and police forces are



routinely being sexually harassed. Do you want your daughter in these situations? Do you want them being nursing home orderlies? Do you want them working in sweatshops, or minimum wage service jobs where sexual harassment may be thrown in as an extra? These same women, by the way, are having sex where, when and with whom they want. They may have sex in sex clubs. They may work in massage parlours. They may be strippers. Yet, when they simply decide to ask for money, at a good rate of pay, for intercourse or some fantasy role play somehow someone's line has been crossed. Those who draw such lines should be ashamed of themselves. If women chose to sell themselves or men chose to buy sex with them, nobody has any right to tell these consenting adults what they can or cannot do in private; and no clever play on words will make it otherwise.

*One of the main reasons I have fought the laws was the lack of clarity, both in the laws and how they would be enforced. I sent this letter to the prime minister and of course to the media. Various media reprinted it in whole or in part. Here it is in its basic final form, much as it appeared in some newspapers and on line, but I have done a bit of editing here. I will give the article in several installments, each date January 8, to make for easier reading.*

January 8, 2014. Six Questions for the Prime Minister on Prostitution. New prostitution laws may be on the way thanks to last month's decision by the Supreme Court of Canada, but much will now depend on the sexual orientation of the prime minister – namely, his orientation on whether or not to restrict what consenting adults do in private. The PM and his former justice minister, Rob Nicholson, insisted the laws were constitutional. Now, fifteen judges, including those in the lower courts, have put to rest the government's feckless handling of the file and unanimously declared prostitution laws null and void. Not that we need laws, but the PM has a year to come up with new ones. Since Stephen Harper has a majority and runs a tight ship, he's the one on the spot. That means he'll tell you – yes you – what you can and cannot do in private and what happens if you break whatever new laws he brings in. That means answering some questions.

January 8, 2014.

Question 1: What is a sex act? Is it a sex act when a man gets an erection and inserts his penis into a woman or another man? Is orgasm an issue here? Is it a sex act if a registered masseuse massages a naked man, without touching his genitals, and he has an erection? What if the masseuse is not registered? Say it's me. Is it a sex act if I give a naked man a massage while he is fully restrained and I don't touch his genitals? What if another man is watching and masturbating while watching all this? I could go on. I think you get the idea.

Question 2: What is a prostitute or sex worker? Is a woman a prostitute or sex worker if she has sexual intercourse with a man in gratitude for a favour, such as home repairs? What if she just gets a promissory note in return for sex? What if a man pays his wife or girlfriend for sex? What if he pays her to hold his hand or let him masturbate in

front of her while she verbally humiliates him by calling him a lackey of the prime minister?

Question 3: What is a bawdy house? Is it a bawdy house if a woman, almost daily, stays home and has sexual intercourse for money or some other form of payment? What if a man pays to just look at her as she washes dishes? Is it a bawdy house when in this home or place of business there is no genital touching? What if all customers are fully clothed? Is it a bawdy house if the woman sets up a dungeon with bondage and discipline equipment and rents the room to others, such as married couples, who are not involved in any financial transaction?

Question 4: What is an indecent act? Under the old laws, indecency was loosely defined as something that violated community standards. Can the prime minister be more specific and list acts that are indecent, and do so with a high degree of specificity? The courts struck down the old prostitution laws last month partially because they were too vague. So it is important for the PM to be clear. I look forward to his lists and explanations.

Question 5: What is violence? As a dominatrix, I enjoy controlling and punishing men. As a dominatrix, I have never been charged with assault or unlawful confinement, despite significant acts of restraining, whipping, spanking, tickling and pinching of clients. Is paying to get whipped by me, where no injury results, more violent or more abhorrent than being blindsided by a 300 pound lineman whose job it is to play football?

Question 6. What is a conservative? Here's what I think a conservative stands for: he believes government should respect the privacy of citizens; he respects the rights of consenting citizens to privacy in the bedroom or dungeon; he believes these freedoms should extend to all segments of society; and he believes government should refrain from imposing arbitrary more judgments on citizens.

Conclusion. I think people should be free to decide about prostitution for themselves. I also know that prostitution is going on all over the place under Harper's government, and that women – get ready for this – are actually often asking criminals to protect them from the authorities under the laws the prime minister has fought to retain. The PM's handling of this issue to date has been a blow against safety for women and in favour of organized crime. Going forward, he really must define his sexual orientation if he is serious about doing his job.

January 12, 2014. Surfing the Internet About Our Canadian Prostitution Debate. Over the last several days I have spent several hours reading articles and comments posted on the Internet relating to our Supreme Court victory striking down Canada's laws intended to restrict prostitution, whatever that is. The first thing that had me shaking my head was that when critics of our position point to the negative aspects of sex work, they often completely fail to realize that when something (or related activities) is illegal, those negative aspects arise largely because of the very fact it is not legal. They also fail to point out that women are victims in many conventional workplaces. In the Canadian and American military sexual harassment and rape are almost systemic, as are the cover-ups. Even in offices women are subjected to it. Domestic household servants are trafficked in illegally and sexually abused, yet we don't outlaw nannies. Many factory workers in

Canada are trafficked in illegally and sexually abused, and we don't close factories. They also fail to point out, and this is critical, that in the future many women who come from advantaged backgrounds, or who have choices, will enter the sex trade. They did not do so before because of fear of the authorities and the negative aspects created by the laws that were struck down. I know a number of such women who earn good livings now, love their work and are free from the sexual harassment, low wages and long hours that are the lot of so many women. If the government does not bring in any laws to replace the ones struck down, and for a change enforces the immigration and other laws, I have no doubt that the people who look into the sex trade will find fewer members who were forced into it and fewer who want to exit.

January 14, 2014. Read the Decisions. In my last blog I wrote about some things that occurred to me when I read articles and comments posted on the Internet about the Supreme Court decision striking down the existing prostitution related laws once and for all. In this blog I want to mention one thing I held back on mentioning then. That is, simply, how rare it was for those commenting to say that they had read the decisions (there were three decisions by three courts). When I spoke in the lobby of the Supreme Court on December 20, 2013, and was asked about other countries, I said that any comment about other countries should be a comment about what the decision of the trial judge said. She looked at the evidence, trial tested, about other countries. Two years of hearings and tens of thousands of pages of trial tested evidence were the basis of her decision. That was part of the basis for striking down the laws. The same is true about the judge's findings about any negative impacts on society if the laws remained struck down (none), and the negative aspects if they remain in place (many). Again, trial tested. So, if people have an opinion, it is good to know if it is informed. I don't expect many people to read these documents of course, but it would be nice if they started their comments by saying either: "I have read the decisions" or "I have not read the decisions." If someone says "I don't need to read the decisions to comment on the decision of the Supreme Court, or the lower courts," that someone is a fool.

*In this interval I spoke at the University of Windsor. The speech will appear below shortly.*

January 26, 2014. Giving Interviews. I have been invited to over a dozen interviews or to speak at events in the last month. With the exception of my pre-planned visit to the University of Windsor, and the Windsor Star, I have turned them all down. I must now get ready for another round of chemotherapy and use what energy I have for doing necessary things. That being said, I spend an average of one hour a day at my computer. Half the time I reply to e-mail and Facebook messages. The other half I review articles supporters send that they think I would be interested in reading, along with some comments of their own as they see what is being said or done about the issues we have been involved in. I have resolved to tell you what I am thinking once or twice a week in a blog, and I will make public appearances or release statements beyond my blogs, if

possible if any of the key people who have fought with us think I can make a difference. My blogs will appear on my Web site ([terrijeanbedford.com](http://terrijeanbedford.com)).

January 29, 2014. Taking the First Step. I have been told by reliable sources that the so-called right wing commentators have been remarkably silent about what the government should do about our victory at the Supreme Court. They tell me that our opponents realized that the so-called Nordic model is not workable for the same reasons the old laws were not. They also tell me that my letter called "The Sexual Orientation of Stephen Harper" helped remind all discussing the issues before us that before we discuss any new laws or models, we must first decide specifically what behaviours or acts among consenting adults in private are to be prohibited and why. If that first step is not taken, on all sides of the debate, the discussion will be pointless and any new laws will be a fiasco. Any uncertainty will breed waste and misery.

February 9, 2014. The Laws Fall Further. One by one the provinces are announcing that they are not using the struck down prostitution laws, meaning they are not laying new charges and are often dropping charges where cases were pending. We should note that the number of such charges have been falling steadily over the last few years, despite a growing population and growth of the sex trade. The reason for this last development has been that the authorities do not want to proceed using laws that are unconstitutional. For years Justice Minister Nicholson said the government viewed the laws as constitutional. Now his replacement, Mr. MacKay, says not enforcing them is not an option. Yet he is no longer being listened to. Prime Minister Harper hired these guys and keeps paying them. Do we want anyone, let alone these guys to tell us what consenting adults may do in private? For now we are free and we activists must ensure that any new laws (and there should be none) are fair and don't do the same damage as the old ones.

February 15, 2014. The Debate Before the Debate. There have been meetings across the country about what new legislation should replace the struck down prostitution laws. Here are some of my observations from the information that has reached me. There is a general understanding of how the so-called Nordic Model (which criminalizes the purchase of sex but not the sale) is flawed in the same ways the old laws were. There is also understanding about the horror of imposing someone else's morality on consenting adults in private. Also, there has been no comment from the so-called abolitionist side in response to my letter saying the government must specify what behaviours among private consenting adults are prohibited. There has been much discussion about the decision of police forces and provinces to stop enforcing the existing laws which were left in place for a year. Some nasty surprises await the government if they try to bring in new laws that are not clear and not up to constitutional standards. Might we have a Canadian spring? Or are we going to just let the prime minister continue to do what organized crime wants him to do?

February 19, 2014. The Government Consults Consenting Adults. The federal government is now seeking input from Canadians about how to regulate sex acts between

consenting adults in private. Problem is, they don't say which acts are sex acts. I asked this in a paper I circulated last month called "Prime Minister Harper's Sexual Orientation" (also issued as my blog on my site -terrijeanbedford.com- for January 7, 2014). I asked straight questions. The answer to each question was a yes or no. I also asked for a why to each yes or no. I said that Mr. Harper's sexuality would guide his answers, and it was his answers that were going to guide new laws. So I think before Canadians give their input they should be clear about exactly what it is the government wants direction on. Is it going to be illegal to run or go to a fetish house where no sexual intercourse occurs? Are couples who play bondage games at home for free to be arrested if some sort of payment is deemed to have occurred? The Supreme Court said any new laws cannot be over-broad or arbitrary. They also said that new laws must be clear with precise definitions. Is the prime minister going to take the unbelievably stupid option of the Nordic Model and top it off without giving precise definitions - just so he can buy some more time while the courts again repudiate him - and so keep the sex trade underground, which puts women in unnecessary danger, and is what organized crime wants? How long is he going to put limited law enforcement resources under further strain while not even speaking out about sexual harassment of women at work, in the RCMP, in the armed forces – or domestic abuse? Does he want the forces of the state controlling men who might be clients of sex workers? A man might be afraid to pay for dinner on a date. A woman could blackmail a man by reporting to the police that he tried to "buy sex." I look forward to hearing from him. I'm sure you do too.

*In this interval I spoke at Concordia University. The speech will appear below shortly.*

February 27, 2014. Once Again: Why the Nordic Model is Bad. Laws supposedly meant to protect sex workers by penalizing only so-called pimps and clients, and not sex workers, will replicate the harms and illegalities of the laws just struck down and may not survive the courts. The other countries did not have our recent court ruling on what makes laws themselves right or wrong – meaning whether the laws are arbitrary in their application, unclear about what is or is not a crime, discriminatory in how they impact sections of the public, or contribute to the ills they are supposed to prevent more than prevent them. So, that ruling means the Nordic Model is wrong. Here are a few more problems with it. (1) Such laws criminalize anyone who shares in a sex worker's earnings, including her husband, other family members and friends. These are people police can harass or threaten to charge as an associate. (2) The laws even form a barrier to sex workers who wish to marry and or leave the business for other reasons. A husband becomes legally vulnerable, even if he shares the household expenses. Women who support their husbands in whole or in part in other occupations, and, yet, no one passes laws against living off the proceeds of a their work. Why are sex workers singled out from women in other occupations? That singling out is not legal after the recent court decision - discriminatory. (3) The Nordic approach also makes sex workers less safe. Pimps often provide services for and protection to sex workers. For example, they drive women to appointments, wait in the car, and know when to worry if the woman does not return. They copy down the license plates of cars into which street walkers climb, which

provides some safeguard against the women simply disappearing. (4) Laws against clients endanger sex workers on the street. These women are the most vulnerable of sex workers because they lack the safety of working indoors and non-violent men are far more likely to be afraid of and discouraged by the prospect of being arrested than are psychopaths. This is especially true of family men or those who have a respected position in their communities. A minister, a lawyer, a teacher, a psychologist or a doctor have a great deal to lose by being arrested and having the arrest publicized, so are reluctant to take the risk. (5) There will not necessarily be fewer women selling sex, however, especially on the street level where driving forces like drug-use keep the numbers high. With a smaller pool of customers for whom to compete, these women may act with less caution; for example, they may be more willing to get into cars they might otherwise not get into. On the other hand, there will be as many physically abusive men and criminals in the client pool because a person who is willing to beat or to kill a sex worker is unlikely to be discouraged by the possibility of a minor charge of buying sex. The preferred clients have moved to the Internet, but the dangerous ones stayed on the streets. (6) Those on the streets work in risky conditions because they go further into remote areas. Under the Nordic Model they have to do the negotiation very quickly. It doesn't give them any time to assess risk. The quick negotiation will also result from a client's unwillingness to linger a moment longer than necessary. (7) It is currently common practice for sex workers to screen their clients in advance to seeing them. They know the client's name and phone number. Under the Nordic Model, however, clients have more incentive to remain anonymous rather than risk arrest. Sex workers will have to accept calls from blocked numbers and won't know who they are seeing. (8) There is no indication that the Nordic Model being considered for Canada at present would adequately define what are not permissible acts between consenting adults in private for money or not, and so the law will fail for that alone. (9) I could go on and on, but enough for now.

March 4, 2014. How I Am Doing. I want to thank all those who have been asking after me. I came down with a cold about three weeks ago and because of my other problems I was in very bad shape and had to have help just to get around and prepare some food and do the chores. That was for about a week. Over the last two weeks I have been getting better. Most days I can spend some time at my computer, and so have been able to do a couple of blogs and respond to e-mails. I will be making a couple of major speeches this month, or so I am told. More about that another time, but I will have my remarks posted on my Web site.

*In this interval I spoke at the Law Union of Ontario. The speech will appear below shortly.*

April 3, 2014. It Looks Like They Got It. I have been getting reports and reading media from all over the country and it is quite clear that there is no consensus among authorities or the public that the purchasers of sex acts, whatever that means, should be targets of any new legislation. Ditto pimps, whatever they are. Instead, there is a consensus that if

people are being forced into sex work or want out of it they should have help made available to them. Just like our side has been saying. But let's not stop there. Let's have help for our women in uniform who are being sexually harassed and assaulted. I wouldn't want my daughter in the military or the RCMP. Too much sexual abuse. Let's have exit strategies and rescues for them as well. We might even want to throw in a rescue program for whistle blowers in the civil service who have been betrayed. Is this beginning to sound like a Tough on Harper Agenda?

April 6, 2014. The Barrage Against the Nordic Approach. I have seen and been told that there has been a constant stream of articles saying the government should not criminalize the purchase of sex or being a pimp. It appears that a couple of items in favour of that approach, such as put forward by Member of Parliament Joy Smith, have been demolished. Other articles have revealed how police in several areas of Canada are cooperating in treating the sex trade, whatever that is, just like any other business. So the question going forward is who gets hurt. If Mr. Harper brings in new laws, instead of basically enforcing remaining laws for a change, organized crime and bad pimps and so forth will prosper and celebrate. If he does what we have advocated, women will be safer and better off in every respect. If he finds the idea of women being paid for sex acts (which he has yet to define) wrong, he should look at the booming businesses of strip clubs, massage parlours, dungeons, and escort agencies that have flourished since he came into office. It's a little late in the game to get up on a high moral horse. I'm up on mine, and I think women should not be legally required to perform sex acts only for free.

*There seemed to be little more to say as we waited to see what the government would do.*

May 4., 2014 New Prostitution Laws May Be Coming Soon. I believe that the government has the information it needs to recognize that the Nordic approach will replicate the harms of the laws just struck down and won't even be legal in itself. They also do not want to have the burden of telling us what we cannot do as consenting adults in private. So two things. If they do bring the Nordic model, meaning say they are targeting customers and associates of sex workers, it means they are just kicking the can down the road again, so they can say the courts forced them to decriminalize sex work. If they don't, they will finally in effect decriminalize it, and just bring in laws targeting the negative aspects of the sex trade such as human trafficking. Laws like that are already there, so it means they say they will enforce existing laws for a change, or actually do something to protect women. Either way, we have won, will win and there is no going backwards. When the new law comes out, I will make sure I read it and ask what other informed observers think of it before I comment publicly. That is something those opposed to our challenge should consider trying some time.

*During this time the government ran an on-line survey for public input into what the new law should be.*

June 2, 2014. Government Prostitution Survey Results: A Message From Terri-Jean Bedford. The survey is a scam. I say that despite the fact that the respondents agreed with us that the sale of sex should remain legal. The respondents were also not decisively against the purchase of sex or in favour of charging all the associates of sex workers. So even this rigged survey, assuming we are being correctly informed about the response, does not give clear direction to the government. I say the survey was rigged and a scam for a number of reasons. Here are some of them. For one, who drew up the questions? Why wasn't there a question asking if the government should tell consenting adults what they can do in private for money? Why wasn't there a question asking what should be included in the definition of a sex act or sex? Why wasn't there a question about which crimes police should ignore in order to devote scarce resources to ensuring that women only have sex for free? As to criminalizing the purchase of sex, I am including below an open letter from many leading Canadian intellectuals familiar with the issues at hand. I ask you to read the letter. Look as well at who received it and who sent it. It should convince you that if the government does introduce the so-called Nordic approach it will ensure that Mr. Harper and his ministers will be seen as cowards only looking out for themselves by doing what organized crime wants them to do: meaning preventing women from protecting themselves, ensuring they can only have sex for free and denying consenting adults in private basic liberty. We can do better than that. Ask the Supreme Court. What follows is an open letter signed by some of Canada's leading experts in the field.

*I am not giving the letter here. It essentially said the Nordic approach should not be adopted. It was an impressive document, as was the very long list of distinguished signatories.*

Chapter 17: January 2014  
Speech: University of Windsor

*The timing for this speech was lucky. Originally scheduled for November it had to be postponed until January, mainly because of pressures on staff and students late in the term compared to early in the term. The Supreme Court victory was in late December. So I was news when it came time to speak. I consider this my first major speech, because due to Bedford Versus Canada the rules of the sex trade were going to change. I was given up to half an hour to speak, a first for me. The striking down of the laws was no longer something that we were advocating or might happen. Also, rules for any new laws were also in place. On top of all that, I was speaking in my home town. The media was there in force and some classes were canceled at the law school so they could hear me speak. Channele Gallant, head of Maggie's, a sex worker outreach project in Toronto, was there with me and would speak as well. She was a staunch ally. After the speeches we answered questions.*

How many of you saw me on television last month? One of the things I said was that Prime Minister Harper offered me an appointment to the Senate, as a government whip.



Well, today, here in my home town of Windsor, I am declining his offer. You see, it seems Senators are always in trouble with the police, and I've had enough of that.

It's exciting to be back in my old home town again. The university certainly has grown. One part of that growth I am told has been the womens' studies and social justice areas of study. I am also told that the legal battles that I and so many other women have been fighting these past two decades have received considerable attention in various departments here, and for that I am grateful. The Associate Dean of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences, Eleanor Maticka-Tindale was an expert witness in 2009, supporting our motion to strike down the so called prostitution laws in Ontario. In 1998 Daryl Hill of the Department of Psychology here was an expert witness at my trial, testifying about cross-dressing, and whether it was sex. Julie Fraser, a Ph. D candidate in that same department spoke at my fund-raiser in 2000; and both graduate and undergraduate students have visited me in person, spoke to me over the phone, e-mailed, and sent me their papers over the years. Thank you all again.

And I have also spoken here. In 2009 Professor Young, Val Scott and I spoke at the law school about our Charter Challenge, then just beginning. Now I have the pleasure to be here just after it has ended, and WE have won. I want to talk about that word - WE. We are thousands, at varying levels of involvement.

The first person to mention, in my view, is Madam Justice Susan Himel. She won too because her decision was reviewed by fourteen judges, first at the Ontario Court of Appeal and then the Supreme Court. In the end everything she decided was upheld.

There are of course the three plaintiffs, or as some would call us, affiants – Myself, Val Scott and Amy Leibovitch. Val Scott has publicly advocated for the rights of sex workers for over twenty years. Amy Leibovitch is younger than Val and I. Her participation was most critical of all because she is not retired like Val and I are and her standing was not subject to challenge.

Then there is Professor Young, who deserves the Order of Canada, and his fellow lawyers and the rest of the legal team. About ten lawyers represented the matter through three levels of court. About twenty students worked on the matter.

Then there were the expert witnesses. About a dozen of them, on our side, who came to Toronto and testified for us – Eleanor included.

There were the activists and sex workers across the country who spoke to the matter and marched in the streets. One of the most prominent women in Canada is beside me today, Chanelle Gallant. She is one of the leaders of such women.

There were as well the vast number of citizens who informed themselves at universities, community colleges, high schools and informally.

In a larger sense WE also includes the women of Canada, for whose freedom a blow was struck, and all Canadians. This is because any new laws must meet new guidelines of fairness.

Before 2010 the federal government's tough on crime agenda was meant to impose harsher penalties for violating laws that were themselves clearly illegal, such as the bawdy house law. When the first decision came out striking the laws down in 2010 they announced their intent to appeal within three hours. When the Ontario Court of Appeal basically supported the first judge in 2012 they appealed again; stating that they

still believed the laws were constitutional. Now I ask you, are you going to accept anything, anything these guys come up with now?

Mr. Harper and his trained seals are on record as saying that prostitution is bad. What does he mean by prostitution? Let's just say for now he means sexual intercourse for money. Well guess what. I say it's good. And I happen to be right. Escort services, bawdy houses, strip joints, massage parlours and informal arrangements among adults are occurring everywhere. And this was under the now defunct laws and under Mr. Harper's tough on crime agenda – which is a scam. Mr. Harper was doing what organized crime and bad pimps wanted him to do, which is to keep women underground and subject to blackmail and potential harm.

I can't comment responsibly about his economic policies, his foreign policies or about what he is doing to protect the environment. But I can say that he has been a national disgrace in his handling of the matter in which I have been involved. If he is really concerned about the welfare of women, why does he not speak out about wife-beating, which is a national epidemic, or about divorced fathers who can but don't pay child support. Why is he silent about sexual harassment in the armed forces and RCMP? Why is he silent about the shortage of women's shelters or the refusal of women's shelters to accommodate family pets, which abusive husbands use as hostages to keep battered wives in the home. Why doesn't he speak out about low wages and low social assistance or the shortage of affordable housing – which encourage women to become prostitutes by the way? Why do he and his supporters undermine groups which promote human rights and address matters that affect women? A real man protects poor women and children. Why doesn't he visit food banks or public housing complexes or our overcrowded jails? Are aboriginals better or worse off since he came to power?

Whatever the reasons are the facts are there. Show me press clippings or videos where he has spoken on these matters. You won't find much. What you will find is that he only needs to appeal to a minority of voters to remain in power. Thus he has hidden from these issues. Take the current matter as an example. He crows about how judges should not make policy because they are not elected. Yet he hid behind the robes of the judges to make the matter go away for a while. Now he is in a bigger mess than ever.

I fought this battle before. In 1986 I was raided in Windsor, but I did not have the means to fight. In 1994 I was raided in Thornhill and decided to fight, because this time I had help. In 1998 the judge gave an appalling short oral decision after a long trial and refused to say what I could and could not do. The real travesty then was that the Ontario Court of Appeal made an even worse decision, and the Supreme Court refused to hear the matter. Professor Young said he took the case because, as he said “You guys broke all the rules.” What he meant was that the justice system was not designed to allow justice, and that if the authorities did what they did you just took it and moved on. To this day, I cannot tell you what my crime was back then. The laws as they were written were so vague and arbitrary in their enforcement, that they were unconstitutional. Remember, in my first trial in 1995, the charges were thrown out because they were too vague. But the courts then basically said that was okay, and what was done to me was okay. Well, it wasn't, and the ruling last month by the Supreme Court, unanimously said so. Remember that the three provisions which were struck down specifically were done so in part

because the Criminal Code definitions were vague as to what was a crime and what was not. That, in my view, is the first stage of the debate now under way. Exactly what private activities between consenting adults will the police devote scarce resources to stopping? The Supreme Court has now said that this must be answered before we comment on what model, or what laws, if any, should be brought in to the Criminal Code to replace what was struck down.

It's good to come back, after twenty years, a winner and in the right. Remember, I had a lot of help. They say that the price of freedom is eternal vigilance, and that means every citizen who can should do something, however little, to ensure that our freedoms are protected. If prostitution remains legal and no new laws are passed to regulate it, things will be better. We have many other laws that protect women. We just need those laws enforced for a change.

Thank you all very much.

*After the speeches and questions we got a standing ovation from about half the audience and the applause was sustained. I noticed that most were women. I then was interviewed by the media, mainstream as well as campus press. The rest of the day was spent at a lunch with professors and graduate students and then at the library concerning the placing of my papers in the archives. In the evening some old friends visited me at the hotel. It was a great day. The next day, before heading out of town, I did an interview at the Windsor Star, which can still be seen on the Web.*

Chapter 18: February 2014  
Speech: Concordia University

*I visited Concordia because one of the expert witnesses for our side, Frances Shaver, was a professor there and a staunch supporter of the cause. I did not treat this as a major speech because I had one coming up less than a month later, there were other speakers and a panel discussion.*

It's good to be back in school. In two of the facilities I ran we had classrooms too, complete with desks and blackboards. Have you ever been in the classroom of a dominatrix? I make the students, most of them middle-aged men, dress as girls. Their lessons usually included the strap, the whip and of course standing in the corner. The tuition was hundreds of dollars per visit, and they would leave deep in debt. Just like Concordia.

So, we may have new prostitution laws. The government wants our input. That's going to be tough, since they won't specify what they are talking about. I think it's safe to say they mean, by prostitution, sexual intercourse for money or other payment. But what about what I do? If a man pays me to kiss my feet, or for me to spank him with his pants on, is it prostitution? I wrote an article which some of you may have read asking many such questions. I am on record as saying that any model or whatever we may discuss, must first specify what behaviour between consenting adults in private is being controlled by the government. The Supreme Court, and the lower courts agreed. Any new laws must

be clear in defining what constitutes a sex act. If they are not, no model will be enforceable. So I look forward to hearing from my fellow speakers tonight, and perhaps from you in the audience, what I can and cannot do if I open another facility. And why.

One thing everyone is agreed on is that sex workers, whatever that means, have a right to safety. The courts were clear. No other person involved in a legal activity is prevented from taking basic safety measures. The fact that some operators who hire and supervise sex workers are not good people is not a basis for legislating against that practice. Women are sexually harassed in the RCMP, the armed forces, offices and the home. Why not outlaw the people responsible for that? Why just the so-called pimps, good and bad? And why should I not be allowed to hire security, salespeople, receptionists and so forth? Why should I be denied police protection for doing a legal activity? Why single out sex workers, whatever they are?

If Mr. Harper gets tough on prostitution he will be doing what organized crime and terrorists want him to do, meaning, he will divert the already strained resources of police, courts and jails to cracking down on women in their bedrooms while dangerous criminals get a pass. The Harper government, in 2010, announced an appeal of Judge Himel's decision within three hours of its release, which caught them off guard. Shame. Then, after the Ontario Court of Appeal sided with her for the most part, Mr. Nicholson, then justice minister, said the government still believed the laws were constitutional, all three laws. Well, fifteen judges say he was either lying or stupid. You choose which. The sad part is that this is the same Harper bunch that may bring in new legislation. Mr. Harper himself has not even answered the simple question of whether he has read the Himel decision. Sad. I can't comment responsibly on his policies on the economy, foreign affairs or the environment. But I can say that the less he brings in to regulate the sex trade, and the more he does to enforce the laws still on the books to protect women, the better he will be doing his job. Thank you.

Chapter 19: March 2014

Speech: Law Union of Ontario

*This was my second major speech. In it I make major points that should be considered when new laws for the sex trade are considered and how to respond to possible new legislation is considered as well. The audience was legal professionals, so I shared that part of my experience with them. Of course I attacked the government for their handling of the sex trade issue. My supporters did not publicize the event and perhaps the Law Union did not make a full effort in that respect or did not want publicity for their meeting. The upshot was that it received no media coverage, but the speech is on the Web now. The closing joke went over big.*

Before I say anything else I want to acknowledge Dr. Henry Morgantaler, who died this summer. I appreciate what he was up against, not just because I have been in legal wars and in jail too, but also because both of us were advocating for women. Blessed be his memory.

Now, on the lighter side, let me tell you a little story I think you'll appreciate. Some years ago I was whipping a client strapped to a bench. With each lash he had to call out "thank you mistress, another please" and he had to sound like he meant it. After he had wept to my satisfaction I removed his restraints and let him kiss my boots. Then I told him to get dressed and meet me at the front door. Now get this. When I let him out the door we said goodbye to each other. He said "Goodnight mistress." I said "Goodnight Your Honour."

Speaking of judges, our judges are now, thankfully, addressing the federal government's so called "Tough on Crime Agenda", which is a scam. The government itself is an offender if laws passed are unconstitutional, or contrary to Canada's values. Is it patriotic to focus on length of sentences and ignore overcrowding in prisons? Ignore the misuse of warrants? Ignore the under funding of legal aid? Ignore spousal abuse? Ignore the shortage of shelters for women, or of shelters that accept family pets so the wife beaters can't use the family pet as a hostage? Is it patriotic to be caught by surprise by the sexual harassment scandals about women and minorities in the armed forces and the RCMP? And, my friends, is it patriotic to tell women they can only have sex if they have it for free?

Did you know that our constitutional challenge prevented a mandatory minimum prison sentence for keeping a common bawdy house? Even a sad sack like former justice minister Rob Nicholson should have realized that the law was flawed. Justice Himel struck down the law in 2010 and the government was caught completely off guard. They didn't even know the decision was being released. I doubt if Mr. Harper and Mr. Nicholson even knew of the challenge. Yet, an appeal was announced within 3 hours of the release of the decision, despite the fact that Judge Himel said Parliament's involvement was required. Same reflex reaction after losing at the Ontario Court of Appeal. Nicholson said the government's position was still that the laws were constitutional. Beverly McLaughlin and the Supreme Court, in my opinion, then confirmed that Mr. Harper and Mr. Nicholson and their cronies were either liars, who just wanted the issue to go away, or dummies. She did not say which. Take your pick. Then remember that this is the same gang that may be drafting new legislation.

Mr. Harper has replaced Mr. Nicholson with Mr. MacKay, the former defence minister. Women and minorities being harassed in the armed forces is more of a problem than enemy fire. Let that be Mr. MacKay's legacy. Now it appears he is going to add to it by bringing new laws that will not stand and will not be enforced or be obeyed, perhaps something like the so-called Nordic approach. If they bring that in it will blow up in their faces. My fellow speakers will be telling you all about that shortly. But I want to make a couple of observations of my own.

For one, that approach targets men and Mr. Harper gets more support from men than women. The governments that brought in that legislation are more left wing and more female supported than Mr. Harper's government. It also means we women can accuse a guy who took us to dinner of trying to buy sex from us. The potential for blackmail of men is endless because women cannot be charged for selling sex. I'm sure Mr. Harper's power base of white collar men will be thrilled to have that hanging over them.

And remember something else, something very important. The other countries who outlawed the purchase of sex acts, whatever they are, did not have a Himel decision which the Supreme Court has made a guideline for new legislation. Those very laws from other countries might be illegal in Canada. Discriminatory, too broad, overreaching, work against their stated objectives, blah, blah, blah and on and on against the Nordic approach. I think we get it.

Judge Himel said that laws other than the ones she struck down address the worst aspects of prostitution, aspects which, in large measure, resulted from the laws she struck down. So no new laws need to be introduced. The higher courts agreed. They seemed to say there was nothing less patriotic than to take the position the government has taken and is considering.

And of course law enforcement officials point out that serious criminals would go undetected and unpunished if resources had to be devoted to ensuring women only had sex for free.

And there's more. Perhaps most important of all. New legislation must tell us what we cannot do in private as consenting adults for money or not. The Supreme Court said new laws, if vague, would not be viable, whatever the approach. When a new law comes in it will have terms of reference. It will say "for purposes of this act, a sex act is defined as" and blah blah. If the blah blah is not clear, the law is not itself legal. Thank you Beverly McLaughlin. Home run girl!

Now tell me, what part of all this does Mr. Harper not get? Why didn't Mr. Nicholson and Mr. MacKay, who are lawyers, resign rather than advocate laws that everybody knows are unworkable and are a disgrace to a free society? I cannot comment responsibly about Mr. Harper's economic, foreign or environmental policies and so forth. But what I can say is that, in my opinion, on matters of criminal justice he has fallen beneath the dignity of many of the criminals he says he is getting tough on.

Not only that. Some of you may have heard that Mr. Harper keeps calling me and offering to appoint me to the Senate, as a government whip. Well, I am a convicted prostitute, and he keeps trying to buy me, so he would be a John. I will have to report him. No – means – no, Stevie! Bad boy!

Well, enough about him. I also want to talk tonight about lawyers and my long journey at their side. First I want to bring to your attention that I believe that Val Scott, Amy Leibovitch and I probably got too much credit for striking down the prostitution laws. Our legal teams got too little credit. Let me drop a few names: Professor Young, Marlys Edwardh (who fought for Dr. Morgentaler), Ron Marzel, Stacey Nichols, Sabrina Pingitore, Kendra Reinhardt, Katrina Pacey, Daniel Sheppard and other lawyers fought for our side directly and indirectly.

I have been fighting, and my lawyers have been fighting on my behalf, against the laws that were struck down for twenty years. In my youth I was too poor and lacked the support to contemplate challenging the laws. But in 1994, when I was raided in Thornhill that changed. I had support. You can read all about that in my book, but with that support I took a position. I was selling role play and refused to sell sex. Yet I was raided and charged as a prostitute. David O'Connor represented me at my bail hearing and did a good job. The late Ken Danson began my defence preparations and Morris Manning took

over from him. Morris also represented Dr. Morgantaler. My supporters recommended that change and Ken was supportive. Ken told me, even after he was replaced, “Terri, you can't plead guilty. Promise me you won't”. Morris lived up to his reputation and at my trial the charges were thrown out because they were too vague. Unfortunately that did not hold up on appeal. Murray Klippenstein took over. He worked with Charlie Campbell and was advised by Paula Rochman and assisted by Wendy Snelgrove. That was in part because I and my supporters felt that lawyers with a reputation as activists were going to be important as the matter became a high profile battle of attrition. During this time George Callahan, a true gentleman and pit bull as the situation required, assisted me in ensuring my private affairs were in order. He also joined Klippenstein's team, which was then disqualified. They were ruled in conflict because they represented all the accused together. Fortunately, Osgoode Professor Alan Young signed on as an advisor to the team and was ready to take over if the Klippenstein team was disqualified, and he did. He was assisted by lawyer Leah Daniels, who taught at Seneca, when my trial finally got under way in 1998. They spent all summer on the case and had a team of students assisting them.

It was a barn burner of a trial. The CNN truck and all the major networks staked out the courthouse in Newmarket, wherever that is. The trial went on for weeks and the questions to be decided, as some reporters said, were as fundamental as those raised in the recent Supreme Court decision – in my view more fundamental. Judge Roy Bogusky, with all the mass media assembled, gave a short oral decision. He said the people there had to make a living and were in a hurry to leave. What a fool. Even he was lucky to get a seat at the trial. He refused to say which of the things I did were not legal and what he did specify was for such poor reasons that no appeal that was not rigged would uphold such a disgusting miscarriage of justice. He said the misuse of the search warrant was an understandable reaction of young bucks. Rosie DiManno finished off his reputation for good in her column.

Professor Young and Paul Burstein (who needs no introduction) did the appeal in 1999. Well, Judge Finlayson of the Ontario Court of Appeal wrote the worst decision in its history. Read it some time. It was so poor, lawyers told me, that it meant that a stripper or waitress could be charged as a prostitute and it was almost impossible to have a search warrant that could be challenged. It was so poor that judges afterwards threw out prostitution and bawdy-house charges simply because my conviction and appeal decision were such garbage that they became precedents to cite when acquitting. Ever wondered why prostitution convictions fell steadily since, despite the rising population and the growth of the sex trade, whatever that is? Answer in part, Finlayson.

Some of this was pointed out by now Judge Corbett, who sought leave to appeal to the Supreme Court. He worked with Lucy McSweeney and Timothy Banks, then an articling student, when David prepared his masterful factum in 2000. Unfortunately it was not heard.

Professor Young remained active for me, and when I reopened in downtown Toronto just after my conviction he asked the police if they had any objection to what I was doing, which was identical to Thornhill – which resulted in a massive raid and trial. I was open 4 years. No raid, no trial. Another lawyer, Pierre Cloutier, advised me on and

assisted me in the handling of the administrative matters of my business, like registration and minute books and so forth.

Just after I closed Professor Young told me he was considering challenging the constitutionality of some of the prostitution laws in court and wanted me to be one of the plaintiffs. Want to know what is involved in a Charter challenge? Try it some time. Half a million dollars when you cost everything it takes. Like tons of volunteer legal time. The work involved with the experts. Try three years of hearings and related preparation. Try dealing with government lawyers who do not hesitate to offer crap as evidence and argument. If you don't believe it was crap ask Judge Himel and the Supreme Court. Try to deal with a government that orders their lawyers to make it go away by any means necessary and then orders them to appeal, when there are no grounds to appeal, simply to make the issue go away. A government that has no regard for Charter challenges.

Then try dealing with a portion of the media who in one breath points to the downsides of the sex trade, whatever that is, while turning a blind eye to the finding of the courts that the very laws they are fighting to retain are largely the cause of those evils. Try dealing with commentators who bring in obscure new studies or reports, not tested in court, to attack legalization of the sex trade, while ignoring the findings of a virtual three year public inquiry, with evidence tested in court, that resulted in the Himel decision and what it had to say about other countries. Barbara Kay and Margaret Wente are two recent examples of such cherry pickers who don't even say in their columns if they have even read the decision. Rosie DiManno said "read the damn decision," out of frustration with such lousy journalism.

It was never our intent to work our way to the Supreme Court. If Mr. Harper and his justice ministers were doing their jobs, they would have said that even if Judge Himel was partly right the laws needed changing, and not defending. They had the choice of acting all along. But they put themselves first.

In 2011 I published my memoirs, where I tell all about my legal battles. I got help from, you guessed it, a lawyer. Sender Herschorn and his staff were wonderful in ensuring I was within the law in writing the book, in what I said in the book and in advising me on drafts. He wrote to those mentioned in the drafts and sent them copies and made sure that no one had grounds to sue me. He also helped me with the writing and was encouraging throughout. He assisted me in private legal matters as well.

So you see, there is a great deal that lawyers can do for their clients in the sex trade, or those considering entering it, other than just react to charges or arrests. Lawyers can act proactively. Channele and Karen are going to talk about that, and believe me, they know their stuff and I am so grateful to share this time with them tonight because what they have to tell you is very important.

I want to conclude by sharing just one one last thing about lawyers with you. It's the same lousy joke I tell whenever I speak to audiences of legal professionals or law students. The one good thing about the joke is that it's so bad, it ensures I have to shut up and sit down immediately. Here's the joke.

Question. What's the difference between a dominatrix and a woman lawyer?  
Answer. The dom returns phone calls. Thank you all very much.



Chapter 20: June 4 to June 18, 2014  
Blogs and Articles: Bill C-36 Introduced

*The legislation was a version of the so-called Nordic model, named after legislation in Sweden which had as its focus the making of the purchase of sex acts illegal, but not making the sale illegal. It appeals to types who want to abolish the sex trade and view all sex workers as victims and all clients and enablers as victimizes. In the Bedford Versus Canada decision the approach was discredited, but the government seemed to be more interested in its moral agenda than in protecting women.*

June 4, 2014. Dominatrix Responds to New Prostitution Law. I have read the document in question and had it carefully explained to me by experts. The new law would basically prohibit the purchasing of and advertising of sex for sale. It would also penalize persons who were in an exploitative relationship with sex trade workers. Mr. MacKay called sex work degrading and said other means must also be added by other bodies to enable women to get out of the sex trade. I see now why Mr. Harper told MacKay to table the bill while he was out of the country. The bill is a rework of the old legislation and will fare no better. We may not even need a constitutional challenge to gut it. It spits in the face of the courts and judges will know this. It repeats the legal and safety shortcomings of the old laws. It does not even define what is and what is not a sex act. As a dominatrix I need to know this so I can punish Mr. Harper for such incompetence. Mr. MacKay called the sex trade degrading. Who the hell is he to tell women they have to only have sex for free? Who the hell is he to tell consenting adults what they can and cannot do in private? How can he stand for a ban on advertising an activity that is legal? I have news for him. Many women love being sex trade workers. Many men who visit sex trade workers, which include some well known members of his own party, are prominent and highly regarded members of society who love their families. This is the same government that kept insisting that the old laws were constitutional and should be kept. Are we going to believe them now? Neither he nor Mr. MacKay nor the dumped Mr. Nicholson would say if they had read the decision of Justice Himel which the Supreme Court endorsed. It said there are plenty of existing laws which address the worst aspects of prostitution, aside from the ones she struck down. Politics is the oldest profession. Mr. Harper and Mr. MacKay have trumped up incompetent and unethical legislation so they can blame the courts when all restrictions on the sex trade, as distinct from other forms of business, are finally removed. Just like the rest of his "Tough on Crime Agenda" this is a scam and ignores real measures that could be taken to protect Canadian women. Organized crime, human traffickers and exploitative pimps are celebrating today. Mr. Harper is encouraging the women in the sex trade to go underground, where these evil people lie in wait.

*On June 15 this article appeared in some publications in advance of red umbrella rallies across Canada, where sex workers demonstrated against C-36.*

June 15, 2014. In 2007 I was one of three women who began a constitutional challenge of Canada's prostitution laws. I am the Bedford in Bedford Versus Canada. Before that I was wrongly convicted under these laws, which were struck down in 2010 by Justice Himel. In 2012 the Ontario Court of Appeal basically supported her decision and in 2013 the Supreme Court, Chief Justice McLachlin writing, voted unanimously to support it as well. They said the laws were arbitrary, too vague, worked against stated objectives, endangered specific groups and put unfair restrictions on a legal activity, the sex trade. Unfair because no similar restrictions exist on other legal activities.

All through this Mr. Nicholson, the Justice Minister, insisted the laws were constitutional, while Mr. Harper hid from the media and said he didn't know who I was. Who were they kidding? Perhaps the legal advisors they had then were the ones who are advising them now.

Finally Mr. Harper dumped Mr. Nicholson and replace him with Mr. MacKay, possibly to reward Mr. MacKay for making the military a hotbed of sexual harassment and cover-ups. Mr. MacKay, with Mr. Harper out of the country of course, tabled new laws to replace the ones struck down and made other amendments to the Criminal Code.

That was over a week ago. I have been reading and hearing a lot of reaction since that time. In fact, so much has been written and said about the proposed new law in recent days that I don't need to tell you about it here, except to say again that it will not survive the courts, is not enforceable on any significant scale and is a gift to organized crime if it does stand up.

Word is getting around already that these new laws will bog down. In my opinion, the end result is in sight. The government will once again, as in the past, fail to legislate private sexual behaviour of consenting adults, abortion rights, rights to safe injection sites, mandatory minimum sentences, same sex marriage, inter-racial marriage, and so forth. This is just more politics at the expense of the vulnerable to kiss up to religious nuts. This hopefully last chapter is no surprise to me at all given the government of the day.

I don't know to this day if any of these men have read the 2010 judicial decision. If they did they would have realized that a three year trial of such depth would have provided some insights about needed changes, and they could have changed the law back then. Instead it is only now that they decide the purchase of sex should be illegal. They had three years to arrive at this brilliant insight. The judge in 2010 told them to act then if at all. They chose not to act, but to run, and now they are doing it again.

This is because these new laws are actually designed to fail, and they know it, but it makes the issue go off their desk for a while. They do not seem to understand or care that the new laws create the same harms and injustices as the old ones, probably worse. Instead, they want to oppose prostitution, or appear to do so, at all costs – and the costs will be high.

If they were seeking to assist vulnerable Canadian women they would, as I have said, have read Justice Himel's decision, which said, after a three year trial, that no new laws were needed. She said existing laws that were not challenged, laws against human trafficking, assault, confinement, coercion and so forth, addressed the worst aspects of prostitution. The higher courts agreed because it is a waste of law enforcement resources

to punish consenting women for not having sex for free. You would need a camera in every bedroom.

Yet, Mr. Harper and Mr. MacKay said more study and consultation, under their supervision, where the outcomes could be controlled, was needed. They were wrong, they never even said they looked at the evidence from the three year trial, or the recent submissions of hundreds of Canada's leading intellectuals. They are fooling almost no one with cynical and malicious partisanship. They don't seem to care that they are throwing law enforcement into chaos and creating an open field for terrorists, child pornographers, burglars, drunk drivers and the like – by having the police chase after consenting women and their customers for not having sex for free.

Mr. MacKay called the sex trade degrading. He is wrong. For starters, the customers are there by choice. They are half the transaction. Most of the women who work in it are there by choice. How many people who clean toilets for minimum wage at a burger joint while getting sexually harassed in a poor job market are doing that by choice? The sex trade business is booming.

The fools who ask if you want your daughter to be a sex worker might also ask if they want their daughters joining the army abroad, changing bedpans in a nursing home, selling shoes, collecting garbage, or working in menial jobs while getting sexually harassed in the bargain. Or do you want your daughter to get married and be one of the ten percent of women who are battered by their partner – an issue Mr. Harper won't get tough on for fear of offending his base. The people who use the "Do you want your daughter?" argument are fools, because they single out the sex trade.

And while we are at it, I want my daughter to work in the sex trade, but it is her choice. And on top of that, I want your daughter to work in the sex trade, for it to be her choice, and for you to mind your own business and move to a country where women are controlled very strictly so you can have your way there. Many women in the sex trade work their way through college, support their kids without daycare, do not work long hours and are their own boss – despite the laws that reduce safety, which were struck down despite the opposition of uninformed religious nuts and others.

Mr. MacKay said the sex trade has been around for thousands of years. So it appears he is a historian as well as a sex therapist. Sex is indeed very popular, as he and his father know. More brilliant insight. Unfortunately, if women don't have sex for free they are, in his view, degraded. Sounds like Reverend Jimmy Swaggart and Reverend Jim Bakker, two television evangelists who preached like Mr. MacKay and Mr. Harper while being adulterous to say the least. The most sanctimonious usually have the most to hide. All in due time.

Did I mention that Mr. MacKay was minister in charge of the armed forces of Canada, where sexual harassment, assaults and cover-ups were rampant? Did I mention that women who came forward became victims of Mr. Harper and Mr. MacKay as well as of the abusers? Never have whistle-blowers been so persecuted in Ottawa. Now to top it off they are seeking to limit the conditions under which women in Canada can have sex in private with another consenting adult. All this while sending our troops abroad to fight for freedom, or criticizing non-democratic governments! Wow!

Oh, and did I mention that under the proposed new law a man will likely have more chance of going to jail for paying a woman for sex than for raping her on a date or beating his wife? Many women like being sex trade workers. Many women in other occupations don't like what they do and dream of exit strategies from these other occupations. Many more women, women with choices and means, would go into the sex trade if Mr. Harper and Mr. MacKay would allow them to protect themselves and stop calling the free choices of women in the bedroom degrading.

All that being said, I view victory as inevitable for our side. This outburst by the government at the expense of more dead women is one thing on the list of their criminal justice program. Like the others it will fail, and our police will be able to get back to dealing with real criminals, and not just chase after women who don't have sex for free or the men who pay them.

I am asked if Mr. Harper is still calling me and asking me to accept a job in the Senate, as a government whip. I had to tell him to stop calling. I could not accept the job. I was afraid I would run into too many former clients on Parliament Hill.

*After the rallies I posted this blog.*

June 18, 2014. Sex Workers Demonstrate. On the weekend just ended sex workers in cities across Canada demonstrated against Bill C-36, the federal government's legislation to control sex work. I was invited to a number of these and decided not to attend any. This was because I did not want to say no to all but one, but also because it is important to have attention on those emerging to lead this effort to ensure new laws are fair and constitutional. There are so many ways in which this initiative of the government can be neutralized, and I will not list them here. Also, there is no shortage of reasons for doing so. A few days ago, June 15, I sent out a detailed article on all this. But there has been so much written so well, by so many respected commentators and legal experts, that I can add little but my personal opinions, which I did on June 15. What I think is important to remember going forward is that we must not worry if the government rams the new law through Parliament, because then we have something concrete to attack, and attack we shall, and prevail we shall. As Val Scott has said, "There is no going back." She is right. And everyone knows it. If we make well organized efforts, we will win sooner. If there is apathy or lack of involvement, it will take longer. Other than about that, I have no doubts.

*On July 16<sup>th</sup> the following article was published in the Globe and Mail. It was entitled "As a former sex worker, I am sure the conservative bill will fail." It introduced me with the words "Terri-Jean Bedford is a former dominatrix and advocate for sex workers."*

I am the Bedford in *Canada v. Bedford*, the constitutional challenge striking down the prostitution laws. I was one of the three plaintiffs. I patiently and carefully watched the first four days of prostitution law hearings by a committee of Parliament last week. But prior to that, I had plenty of opportunities to learn about the issues. During the challenge I sat in on most of the sessions, private and public, trial and appeals. I was a witness and

was cross-examined. I read most of the evidence as well. As a plaintiff I had the right to be present at all times and have access to all the materials.

I also learned about the issues by working in and managing almost all aspects of the sex trade for over 30 years. I have fought the prostitution laws for many of these years. I have been in jail because of the laws. I have been in court as a defendant or appellant more times than I care to remember. I am Canada's most famous dominatrix and perhaps Canada's most famous prostitute. So maybe I know what I am talking about. Here are some of my thoughts about those four days.

I asked myself, what exactly do they want to outlaw? What would be illegal between consenting adults in private for money? The response? Words to the effect that "everyone knows" or "the courts would have to decide." If everyone knows, why not answer the question? If the courts would have to decide, why not refer the bill there immediately?

I found myself wondering why almost no one mentioned that in the past the purchase of sex was already effectively illegal. If not, where did all the so-called John Schools come from?

I was very pleased the committee was reminded that the government spent years and millions of dollars defending the old laws as constitutional. That makes those in the government responsible either stupid or liars. Three levels of court told us that. Take your pick. Are they suddenly credible now?

I was revolted by the way Peter MacKay was preaching about protecting women when he, as minister of national defence, was responsible for the armed forces and their open season on sexual harassment. If he didn't know what was going on he is twice as guilty as if he was covering up. He has lost the moral authority to speak about protecting women.

I was glad to see clients of sex trade workers defended. I have known hundreds, many in the biblical sense and many at the end of my whip. Clients are not bad men just because they are clients. Most abusers of women are not clients.

I got the sense that some of the witnesses who spoke in support of C-36 sadly behaved as if they had been bought or were kissing up for funding, and of misfortunes being paraded gratuitously. That being said, I feel for those who have suffered. I have been there myself, in spades.

I was very, very pleased to hear that wider social and economic problems have to be addressed to help women who wish to exit the sex trade, but that the government is not proposing to do much.

Bill C-36 will fail. Changes to or removal of clauses from a fundamentally flawed bill are irrelevant. It is flawed in its intent. It will be flawed in its implementation. It is flawed as to whether it is itself legal or constitutional. It is flawed in that it will make things worse for women. Its passage will be victory for human traffickers and organized crime.

At the same time, Stephen Harper has lost in a colossal way. This discussion will help to make people forget the positive things he achieved. This discussion will benefit his political opponents more than him. There are so many negative things being said about him, Mr. MacKay and the Conservative members of the committee, across the

country. It is not possible, even to members of his base of support, to see the government's handling of this matter as anything but dishonest, vindictive, incompetent and reckless.

It is only fitting that Mr. Harper is being punished by a dominatrix.

Chapter 21: September 2014

Speech: Senate

*The government, when introducing legislation, is required to hold committee hearings in both the House of Commons and Senate. These hearings are often little more than ritual, especially when the government had a majority. But it is a chance for various people and groups to go on the record and sometimes useful information has an impact. I decided to go and testify, because if I didn't it might be said by some that I did not speak out against the new law and answer questions about my positions. I testified before the Senate Committee on Justice and Constitutional Affairs. I was allowed a five minute opening statement. I decided to follow up on the joke about the prime minister offering to appoint me to the Senate and add the point that many clients of sex workers were in government.*

Prime Minister Harper called me again. He offered to appoint me to the Senate, as a government whip. I turned him down. I might run into former clients on Parliament Hill.

I am the Bedford in Bedford Versus Canada, the constitutional challenge striking down the prostitution laws. I know the sex trade in Canada as well as anyone. I learned about the issues by working in and managing almost all aspects of the sex trade over thirty years. I have fought the prostitution laws for many of these years. I have been in jail because of the laws. I have been in court as a defendant or appellant more times than I care to remember. I am Canada's most famous dominatrix and perhaps Canada's most famous prostitute. I was in attendance for most of the sessions of the three years of the constitutional challenge. So, maybe I know what I am talking about.

In these brief remarks I will make only a few points of my own. You have a library of evidence against Bill C-36, and I don't want to repeat or submit briefs saying what so many others have said so well.

First of all senators, when it comes to consenting adults, the state has no business in the bedrooms of the nation.

Second, the national debate currently under way has not given enough attention to sex trade workers who don't want to exit and are there by choice. If you ask me today I will tell you about some of them. These women, and indeed male sex workers, should not be grouped in with those who want out.

Third, what exactly is Bill C-36 supposed to outlaw? What exactly would be illegal between consenting adults in private for money? The response from some supporters of Bill C-36 are words to the effect that "everyone knows" or "the courts would have to decide." If everyone knows, why not answer the question? If the courts have to decide, why not refer the bill there immediately?

Fourth, why does the government claim they are making the purchase of sex illegal. If it was legal to purchase sex before, where did all the John Schools come from? This new law changes nothing in that regard.

Fifth. The Justice Minister was wrong to call the sex trade degrading. The clients are there by choice. They are half the transaction. Many are pillars of the community, often business leaders, professionals and politicians. Most sex trade workers do not consider their work degrading. Lumping them in with those who want out is not acceptable in a free society.

Sixth, those who ask if you want your daughter to be a sex worker might also ask if you want your daughter working in any number of poorly paid, dangerous or menial jobs while getting sexually harassed in the bargain. And while we are at it, I want my daughter to work in the sex trade, but it should be her choice. Not only that, I may want your daughter to work in the sex trade and for it to be her choice. If you don't like that I suggest you mind your own business and move to a country where the choices of women in the bedroom are controlled by the government.

Senators, it is bad policy to direct scarce law enforcement resources to stop consenting adult behaviour in private - while tax evaders, wife beaters, terrorists and what have you go unpunished.

So Senators, please don't allow Bill C-36 to pass. Stand up for your country first. Use laws you have to help those most in need, in and out of the sex trade.

Senators, please, please don't allow Parliament to force Canadian women to only have sex for free. Thank you.

*During questioning I refused to keep quiet when the Chair told me to and he threw me out. I told them I might name politicians who use sex workers if the legislation passed. This of course got national media attention. On the way home I issued a press release explaining my behaviour. Here it is.*

This afternoon I testified before the Senate Committee on Justice and Constitutional Affairs. I gave my speech and then was ejected from the question and answer session for failing to stop speaking when the Chair asked me to. I apologize for losing my temper. I was barely able to read my speech because I was so angry at the government for parading victims with repeated irrelevant information and then organizations who were shilling for government handouts on which they are dependent. The shameful use of victims by the government in this process, and their disregard for life by ignoring court findings, refusing to listen to their own legal staff and refusing to answer questions from legitimate sources made me snap. I have already been told that people are sympathetic to the points I made and even to my outburst. They seemed to agree that the government can't handle the truth. They have repeatedly shown disrespect for various institutions, processes and persons. The truth will win out.

Chapter 22: November 2014

Speech: Ontario Civil Liberties Association

*The OCLA was founded to defend freedoms. Each year in Ottawa it presents a Person of the Year Award. I was selected long before I appeared at the Senate, and it was particularly gratifying that the conferring of the award received some international as well as national attention. I recognized that this was to be a major speech and I also did some interviews. The speech is on the Web, along with some of the interviews. There were not a large number of people in the audience. It was a Friday evening, but the speech was well received and I have been told that for some in the audience it was something of a defining revelation. I kept in mind when preparing the speech that the themes of freedom and truth were important.*

Thank you. I see some former clients in the audience. How was today's caucus meeting?

It's good to be back in Ottawa. Maybe this time I won't get thrown out. But in case I do, I want to first thank the Ontario Civil Liberties Association, executive and members alike, for this award and this event.

Yet, I have to admit I was surprised by the honour. After all, you guys believe in freedom. I believe in bondage. You like free speech. I gag my clients. You support equality. I preach female superiority. You promote humane treatment of prisoners. I torture mine.

Tonight I'm going to tell you about my journey through the criminal justice system and how and what I learned about civil liberties. The main point of my talk is that I did not travel and learn alone. I had and have a group of supporters who are steadfast. None lawyers. I will have some words about them. I will also talk about activists, activism, and those who govern us. And I have certainly had lawyers at my side. I'll talk about them first.

Val Scott, Amy Leibovitch and I probably got too much credit for striking down the prostitution laws. Our legal teams got too little credit. Let me drop a few names: Professor Alan Young, Marlys Edwardh, Ron Marzel, Stacey Nichols, Sabrina Pingitore, Kendra Reinhardt, Katrina Pacey, Daniel Sheppard and other lawyers, and law students, many law students, who fought for our side directly and indirectly. The amount of work they did was staggering. They were hardly paid, if paid. They could have made money hand over fist using their talents elsewhere. Their opposition, acting as lackeys for the governments of Canada and Ontario were overpaid, under-worked and accumulated defined pension credits indexed to inflation.

For twenty years I have been fighting, and my lawyers have been fighting on my behalf, against the laws that were struck down once and for all last year. In my youth I was too poor and lacked the support to contemplate challenging laws, or even defending myself in court. But in 1994, when I was raided in Thornhill that changed. I had support. I took a position. I was selling role play and refused to sell sex. Yet I was raided and charged as a prostitute. I, and I might add, my four fellow defendants, entered not guilty pleas. That alone got their charges dropped. I was able to fight on.

David O'Connor represented me at my bail hearing and did a good job. The late Ken Danson began my defense preparations and Morris Manning took over from him. My supporters recommended that change and Ken was supportive. Ken told me, even after he was replaced, "Terri, you can't plead guilty. Promise me you won't." Morris had



the charges thrown out because they were too vague. Unfortunately that did not hold up on appeal. Murray Klippenstein took over. Murray has since risen to prominence. He worked with the highly regarded Charlie Campbell and was advised by Paula Rochman and assisted by Wendy Snelgrove. That was in part because I and my supporters felt that lawyers with a reputation as activists were going to be important as the matter became a high profile battle of attrition. During this time corporate lawyer George Callahan, a true gentleman and pit bull as the situation required, assisted me in ensuring my private affairs were in order. He also joined Klippenstein's team. At trial the team was disqualified. They were ruled in conflict because they represented all the accused together, but only after the charges on those other than me were dropped.

Fortunately, Osgoode Professor Alan Young signed on as an advisor to the team and was ready to take over if the Klippenstein team was disqualified, and he did. He was assisted by lawyer Leah Daniels, who taught at Seneca, when my trial finally got under way in 1998. They spent all summer on the case and had a team of students assisting them. They flew in experts and prepared an elaborate defense.

It was a barn-burner of a trial. All the major networks staked out the courthouse in Newmarket, wherever that is. The trial went on for weeks and the questions to be decided, as some reporters said, were as fundamental as those raised over a decade later in the recent Supreme Court decision – in my view more fundamental. The media treated it as front page news, and many of the spectators attended the entire trial for research purposes. Judge Bogusky had a landmark case and the country expected a landmark ruling after a twelve day trial, probably a long written decision which would work its way through the higher courts. He had a few weeks after the close of the trial before he gave his decision.

So what did Bogusky do? He gave a short oral decision. He said the reporters and spectators there had to make a living and were in a hurry to leave. He said there was no reason to rule on what was illegal between consenting adults in private that supported my conviction. The reasons he gave for convicting me were so weak that he was ridiculed in the media. No appeal court that was not rigged would uphold such a disgusting miscarriage of justice. He said the misuse of the search warrant was an understandable reaction of young bucks. Rosie DiManno finished off his reputation for good in her column in the Toronto Star. When I went for my sentencing I faced a broken old man who was angry and humiliated because he got what he deserved. He had become a laughing stock. But it was no laughing matter. He ran his court like it was the time of Stalin. To this day, I do not see a basis for the conviction.

But wait, it gets worse. Professor Young and Paul Burstein did the appeal in 1999. Well, Judge Finlayson of the Ontario Court of Appeal wrote the worst decision in its history. Read it some time. It was so poor, lawyers told me, that it meant that a stripper or waitress could be charged as a prostitute and it was almost impossible to have a search warrant that could be challenged. It was so poor that judges afterward threw out prostitution and bawdy house charges simply because my conviction and appeal decision were such garbage that they became precedents to cite when acquitting. He lied about evidence. He saw absolutely no merit in my appeal. Lawyers were alarmed by his decision. So were judges. Ever wondered why prostitution convictions have fallen

steadily since, despite a rising population and growth of the sex trade? Answer in part, Finlayson's decision.

Some of this was pointed out by now Judge David Corbett, who sought leave to appeal to the Supreme Court. He worked with Lucy McSweeney and Timothy Banks, then an articling student, when David prepared his masterful factum in 2000. Unfortunately it was not heard. Corbett needed all his abilities just to find the words to explain why Finlayson's decision was so appalling. The Crown's Reply was as bad as Corbett's appeal factum was good. No justice. But wait. Look at what happened in the years after.

Professor Young remained active for me. When I reopened in downtown Toronto just after my conviction he asked the police, in writing, if they had any objection to what I was doing, which was identical to Thornhill. Well, I was open four years and even gave media tours. No raid, no trial. What a contrast. In York Region the police tore my place apart, broke laws and so on. The Crown came at us with full force in a battle of attrition. The judge, and the appeal court, in a manner Stalin would have approved, produced a conviction and fined me \$3,000. The legal fees and legal time amounted to a king's ransom. The property values in the area of the raid fell by hundreds of thousands of dollars per house. I had no place to live and no means of support. Compare that to the Bondage Hotel in Toronto. No investigation. No raid. No trial. And so forth. Who, I ask you who, decides the difference? And there were other civil liberties issues that arose during all this. But I have spoken about those in my memoirs.

But lawyers were not only at my side to fight charges. When I was in business again another lawyer, Pierre Cloutier, advised me on and assisted me in the handling of the administrative matters of my business, like registration and minute books and so forth. In 2011 I published my memoirs and got help from, you guessed it, a lawyer. Sender Herschorn and his staff were wonderful in ensuring I was within the law in writing the book, in what I said in the book and in advising me on drafts. He wrote to those mentioned in the drafts and sent them copies and made sure that no one had grounds to sue me. He also helped me with the writing and was encouraging throughout. He assisted me in private legal matters as well.

So you see, there is a great deal that lawyers can do for their clients in the sex trade, or those considering entering it, other than just react to charges or arrests. Lawyers can act proactively. So can non-lawyers with legal training, such as paralegals or law students or case managers from law offices.

All this moves me to speak about what I call secret rules that exist in the Canadian criminal justice system. Here are a few. Secret rule: search warrants are not just to gather evidence. Secret rule: each defendant must have his or her own lawyer to fight a charge, so if not rich likely cannot fight. Secret rule: legal aid given to those charged is not viable in court for a proper defense. Secret rule: if you do raise the funds or help to fight they come after you with all guns as punishment. Secret rule: your resources are better spent anticipating and on moving on after a bust and ensuring those busted are expendable. Secret rule: laws are left vague so authorities don't have to account for their actions. Secret rule: constitutional challenges are so expensive that it can be decades before long due challenges are ever brought forward. The prostitution laws ruled unconstitutional in

2010, 2012 and 2013 were unconstitutional 20 or more years before they were challenged. Secret rule: there is window dressing to obscure all these secret rules. Things like credit for time served, legal aid, charges not standing up because of civil liberties violations are all cited by governments like Mr. Harper's as evidence that the system favours those charged.

Secret rules gave rise to a new organization: The Harper Brotherhood of Overpaid and Under-worked Trained Seals. Unless pressed by a scandal they do not speak out against wife beaters, workplace harassers, bullies of all types, dead beat dads, corporate thieves, polluters and I could go on. Organized crime has never had it easier because institutions and organizations that speak for people without means do not have the ear or heart of the Harper Brotherhood. Anyone belonging to a union, or who is a sex worker, or who is part of an anti-poverty group, or who belongs to an environmental group, or who is an intellectual, or even who is a judge is not being listened to. The Harper Brotherhood does not believe in accountability. They do not believe in transparency. They do not believe in open debate. They are creating a Canada where young people see laws made for the wrong reasons and so are all the more tempted not to respect or obey the law.

I say again and again that I cannot comment on the government's policies on external affairs, the economy or on what it is doing to protect the environment. I only comment on their policies in areas where I am informed properly. But if what I see in those areas is going on elsewhere, I have to wonder how patriotic Mr. Harper and his brotherhood of trained seals are.

Is it patriotic if laws passed are unconstitutional, or contrary to Canada's values as laid out by the Supreme Court? Is it patriotic to focus on length of sentences and ignore overcrowding in prisons? Is it patriotic to ignore the misuse of warrants? Is it patriotic to ignore the under funding of legal aid? Ignore spousal abuse? Ignore the shortage of shelters for women, or of shelters that accept family pets so the wife beaters can't use the family pet as a hostage? Is it patriotic to be caught by surprise by the sexual harassment scandals about women and minorities in the armed forces and the RCMP? And, my friends, is it patriotic to tell women they can only have sex if they have it for free?

We have seen, in Canada, not too many years ago, morality and vice squads arrest drinkers, gamblers, gays, lesbians, readers of adult pornography, and sellers and buyers of sex acts in the absence of a list of prohibited acts.

Since then we have also seen changes. Now, governments sell alcohol, sell lottery tickets, gays are openly gay, lesbians are openly lesbian, adult pornography is part of cable television packages and now, thanks to Bill C-36, legalization of the sale of sex acts has been formalized. Maybe one day, we will even get a list of what constitutes a sex act under Bill C-36. Until then, we may have to learn by trial and error.

These freedoms did not fall from the sky. They were fought for. But by whom? I dedicated my memoirs to The Dozen. None are lawyers. They are citizens who saw wrongs being done to someone they knew. So, first of all, they were mad at those who did it. Second, it alerted them to the broader issues and they got angrier. Third, they realized they could make a difference individually and collectively. Here is what I learned from them, and from the lawyers and activists with whom I have fought.

If there is a wrong committed by the authorities, find the enemy of your enemy and become their friend. Find people with money, time, numbers or compromising information. But above all, above all, make sure the effort is in the hands of capable, reliable people. We don't have lawyers doing court cases only because they care. They also have training on how to win and create change. The same must be true of the activists. I am an activist, but I am not a professional organizer or administrator. But I have around me people who have track records not only of activism, and maybe not even that, but of corporate success, community leadership, academic and administrative expertise and political experience. Some have money. Some have time. The lesson is to put together a winning team to guide and even head the committed activists.

Let me also put it this way. If something is wrong and you want to do something about it, don't be shy or ashamed to ask everyone to ask everyone else. If the cause is just you will be surprised at how often you get what you want simply by asking for it, asking for it and asking for it. When enough good, capable, reliable people are asked enough they will attract more such people.

Let me come back to the lawyers for a moment. I have had about twenty lawyers represent me and/or my fellow defendants or plaintiffs. One of them, Professor Alan Young, should get the Order of Canada. Another, David Corbett, became Canada's first openly gay judge. Most of the others have distinguished themselves in ways too numerous to mention. But they all have had something in common, something very important. They fought for what was right, not profitable or career enhancing. Lawyers will devote part of their time to the high ideals of their profession, if asked. Lawyers get angry about some things too. I have many recollections of how incensed many of those representing me were at how the authorities have behaved. It is good to have a skilled and angry lawyer on your side, and one skill that is crucial is that he or she works well with the activists and supporters.

Now, sadly, one lawyer is the polar opposite of all that. Former justice minister Rob Nicholson. I want to tell you about one single moment in his life. I think it was a defining moment for both him and Canada. In March 2012 the Ontario Court of Appeal basically upheld Justice Himel's 2010 decision striking down the key laws against prostitution. A few weeks later Nicholson stood up in the House of Commons and said something to the effect that he was pleased to say that the government would appeal to the Supreme Court and would not discuss the matter further until the court had ruled.

Now let me tell you why I think that was a defining moment. Reason number one. I think he knew there were merits to what Himel's decision contained, merits that he could have acted upon immediately – like allowing sex workers to hire off-duty police as security or work in groups from fixed locations, or support spouses and children who lived with them. I think he knew the laws were void for vagueness and could have made them clearer and fairer. I think he knew that other laws could, as Himel said, be used to control the worst aspects of sex work. And I think he knew the laws themselves created dangers for women and resulted in deaths. I think he knew all this yet, with pleasure, as he put it, appealed the whole package.

Reason number two. He knew or should have known that it was against every principle his party stood for to lump consenting harmless adult behaviour in private, like

women paying younger men for sex, men keeping women, women like me who enjoy punishing and humiliating men who pay me to do it, in with trafficked or abused women. That is not allowing for individual autonomy and responsibility for one's own decisions. I think he knew all this, yet, with pleasure, he appealed.

Reason number three. If I am wrong about the first two reasons it was definitely an even more defining moment. Perhaps he actually believed his stated position that the laws were constitutional, and that no changes were needed. If that is true, if he believed that nothing being said by all the judges, experts, sex workers and others had any merit at all, he is a mental defective.

So, my friends, it was a defining moment because it was then and there that the justice minister proved himself and his government to be either liars or mental defectives. Three levels of court are there to show it.

Did Nicholson, the country's highest legal official, who swore to defend our constitution forget, or even know, what is involved in mounting a constitutional challenge? How many has he done? He should try it some time and see what it involves. For instance, big bucks. Add to that tons of volunteer legal time. The work involved with the experts. Try three years of hearings and related preparation. Try dealing with government lawyers who do not hesitate to offer crap as evidence and argument. If you don't believe it was crap ask Judge Himel and the Supreme Court. Try to deal with a government that orders their lawyers to make it go away by any means necessary and then orders them to appeal, when there are no grounds to appeal, simply to make the issue go away. A government that has no regard for Charter challenges. A government that dismissed with a wave of a hand tens of thousands of pages of court tested evidence that should have been an alarm bell to any reasonably intelligent person.

Then try dealing with a portion of the media who in one breath points to the downsides of the sex trade, whatever that is, while turning a blind eye to the finding of the courts that the very laws they are fighting to retain are largely the cause of those evils. Try dealing with commentators who bring in obscure new studies or reports, not tested in court, to attack legalization of the sex trade, while ignoring the findings of a virtual three year public inquiry, with evidence tested in court, that resulted in the Himel decision and what it had to say about other countries. Barbara Kay and Margaret Wente are two recent examples of such cherry pickers who don't even say in their columns if they have even read the decision. Rosie DiManno said "read the damn decision", out of frustration with such lousy journalism.

Mr. Harper has replaced Mr. Nicholson with Mr. MacKay, the former defense minister. Women and minorities being harassed in the armed forces is more of a problem than enemy fire. That will be the MacKay legacy.

Let me speak for a moment about Peter MacKay. He recently said he was not aware of sexual harassment in his party or in parliament and so forth. He of course conveniently forgets to mention a few things. One is the problem of rape and sexual harassment in the armed forces during the time he was defense minister, as I have just mentioned. It is also an epidemic in the RCMP. But with Vic Toews as minister, who is surprised? But why be surprised at any of this. Elmer MacKay, Peter's father, was a prominent conservative. When it comes to father and son ask around. Ask Karlheinz

Schreiber. Ask David Orchard. Ask Belinda Stronach. Ask Brian Mulroney's former staffers. Ask the women in armed forces about the culture of blame the victim, blame the women who come forward. Ask around about the fecklessness of the Integrity Commissioner's office. Ask about the iron grip the government has taken on the internal audit process and destroyed it. Ask about Mr. MacKay's appearances before the Senate and Commons justice committees where he skated around legitimate questions about C-36. Why didn't he get thrown out? And this, this is the guy who is talking about zero tolerance for abusive behaviour towards women? Good heavens, he is the only guy in Ottawa who doesn't know what is going on if he is being honest. His notion of accountability and zero tolerance would scare Joseph Stalin. Well, enough about Mr. MacKay. Believe me, you'll be hearing plenty more about him and his in the months to come.

Well, regardless of what he knows I also know a few things. I and my supporters and many others have been asking around. You wouldn't believe what I am being told and shown. I will not take up any more time tonight about what we have been told and provided with, except to say that I will not accept criticism if I, and my fellow activists, refuse to keep to the high road in the debate on the new sex trade laws or in dealing with this government and its supporters. The government and its trained seals hit bottom long ago. They deserve everything they are going to get. They don't deserve fair treatment. If sex workers are worried about the code of confidentiality, and we are, we must remember that the Harper Brotherhood has disregarded all sorts of codes of honour and we should not, in a fight for the lives of our sisters, feel compelled to hold ourselves to a higher standard.

Canada faces some threats from terrorists and hate groups. Our men and women in uniform are fighting for us here and abroad. We know what they are fighting against. But let me respectfully say to Canadians what I think our troops are fighting for as well. They stand for security, yes. But security for what? I think they are fighting for our freedoms, meaning, yes, our civil liberties. We disrespect our citizens in uniform when we allow people with power to act arbitrarily, the way Mr. Harper and his lackeys are doing with the sex trade. We disrespect them when we allow Mr. Harper's government to disregard prominent citizens – judges, professors, leaders in unions, churches, community organizations and other bodies in society that speak for people without money or political power.

So my friends we must all be soldiers, and each do what we can to ensure our governments at all levels are held to a standard of accountability that ensures they respect truth and properly justify their actions. For that matter, governments can hold other governments to such a standard. For example, Vancouver has asked the federal government to refer C-36 to the Supreme Court and has indicated that C-36 will work against the guidelines of the Supreme Court decision

In Ontario, Premier Kathleen Wynne and Toronto Mayor John Tory must now speak. She has a majority government in Canada's largest province. He was just elected mayor of Canada's largest city. I believe how they act, not just speak, in response to C-36, will define their level of integrity.

Thank you again so very much for this honour, and for having me here tonight.

Chapter 23: May 29, 2015  
Justice Minister's Quits

*Peter MacKay replaced Rob Nicholson as Justice Minister and Attorney General of Canada not many months before. Perhaps Harper didn't trust Nicholson to bring in the new law on the sex trade. An election was expected in the autumn, and MacKay and his wife had two young children. He was only about fifty, so he could begin work, with a law firm, at a more regular job, one more suitable to a man with a young family. That being said, the man let his country down when he had choices. He could have resigned rather than bring in C-36. If he believed he was doing the right thing then he was a fool, rather than a traitor with the blood of innocent women on his hands.*

Earlier today Peter MacKay resigned as Canada's Justice Minister. I am being asked for my reaction. I said in a brief statement earlier today that his legacy will be that he abandoned Canadian women. In earlier speeches I said that his legacy will be the open season of sexual and other harassment of women in the military while he was Minister of Defence. In any event, his legacy should not be one of courage or public service. Let me tell you why. Mr. MacKay betrayed his political allies when he merged his party with Mr. Harper's in 2003. It was betrayal because much of his support to be leader was given in response to his promise of no merger. He sold out for power. His failure to take responsibility for the sexual harassment and related scandals in the military was an act of cowardice. Prime Minister Harper moved him to the Justice portfolio before the scandal broke. When MacKay got to Justice he was the perfect lackey for the shameful government response to the Supreme Court's decision striking down the prostitution laws. If Canada is a better place for women it is because Bill C-36 is not being enforced and will not be significantly implemented for long, if at all. Most of the rest of the government's criminal justice law reform is equally shabby. And nobody can tell me any achievement, legitimate achievement, of Mr. MacKay's that he should be proud of – which I find shocking. I will say of Mr. MacKay's departure what I said one time of Mr. Nicholson's, his predecessor's, departure: that hopefully the replacement will not be another cowardly mediocrity.

Chapter 24: October 2015  
Message to Activists

*Many women in the sex trade were writing to me for advice and information. I told them about my Web site and other sites and the organizations in their cities. I told them that I was not now at the forefront in the battle against the new laws. To this end, I posted this blog and sent it as a release to the media and leaders in the sex workers' rights movement. The intent was to say to all that there was a new government much more favourable to our point of view and good young activists to whom the torch was being passed.*

I am the Bedford in Bedford Versus Canada, where Canada's prostitution laws were struck down. Many have been in touch to ask for my reaction to the results of the recent federal election. I have as a result prepared the following remarks for activists and others. I confine my remarks to how the new government should proceed to change the federal legislation, Bill C-36, now in place to regulate the sex trade. The landscape for the future of Bill C-36 has changed. The political party supporting Bill C-36 was rejected by voters. The party that voted against C-36 was elected. The new prime minister has pledged to listen, and to make evidence based decisions, instead of imposing laws which reflect some specific morality. The new parliament must withdraw C-36. Nothing should be passed in its place, but if anything is it should promote the safety and dignity of sex trade workers, and allow them to protect themselves. Morality based considerations should have no place in the discussions where consenting adults are concerned. To that end there should be no doubt about who at what age is entitled to do what in private, for money or not. Aid for those wishing to exit the trade should be available. It could be made available by enhancing various federal programs. Human trafficking or forced entry into the sex trade should be stopped and can be enforced via laws not specific to the sex trade. At the same time any harassment of consenting adults buying or selling sex acts should be stopped. The government has no business interfering in the sex lives of consenting adults. A national deliberation on how these goals can be achieved should occur. This would clear away the myths, selective or unverified evidence, and stories that cloud proper discussions. So it is understandable that time will be required, if something like a round table or public inquiry or further parliamentary hearings occur. That requirement for time does not diminish our astounding victories these last few years. Let us remain active in the national debate to come, and move beyond the bumps in the road that may remain. We owe that to those who fought for our cause before we did and when we did. The cause of advocating for sex trade workers is now in good hands and, if I am able to, I will continue to help when asked.

Chapter 25: December 2015  
Speech at Carleton University

*Carlton is in the nation's capital of Ottawa. As you will read in the early part of the text, women's studies and other areas of study where the sex trade is an issue had great presence at Carlton. They had a three day conference on issues surrounding the trade, with many interesting workshops. I wish I could have spent more time there, but I traveled with some helpers and they had things to attend to back home, so we were only there for one night. There were about 300 people at the speech, which was filmed and is on the Web.*

It's good to be back in Ottawa again, and I'm pleased to be part of this important conference. The students and staff from The Carleton Human Rights Society and The Womyn's Centre, and others, organized it. Those others include The Pauline Jewett Institute for Women's and Gender Studies. They include the Department of Anthropology



and Sociology, and the Department of Law and Legal Studies. And also the Institute for Interdisciplinary Studies. Please join me in thanking them for all they have done.

Then there are the sponsors of the conference. Thanks to Ottawa Public Interest Research Group Carleton, The Rideau River Residence Association, The Graduate Students' Association, The Carleton Disability Awareness Centre, and the other clubs and departments who helped out.

Wow. Carleton certainly has much to boast about. And, I'm told their dominatrix courses are first rate. Here's a riddle for you. What do a dominatrix and a woman professor at Carleton have in common? Answer. They both give you marks.

I have been to Ottawa before. I have been to Ottawa several times to fight the laws against the sex trade. In 1994 I was charged with running a bawdy house, The Bondage Bungalow. The charges were thrown out of court in 1995. The Crown won their 1996 appeal and in 1997 I was at the Supreme Court, which threw out my appeal. We went to trial in 1998. I was convicted, but to this day cannot tell you why. I lost my appeal in Ontario in 1999. That decision was legendary for how bad it was. In 2000 the Supreme Court in Ottawa refused to grant leave to appeal. Of course during and before all that I was in court many other times, and in jail, all under the old laws, which were finally struck down as unconstitutional. And remember, most of what happens is not publicized. I wrote a book about that called *Dominatrix on Trial*.

After the hearings and decisions in Toronto on the constitutional case from 2007 to 2012, I was back in Ottawa again in June 2013 for the hearing day for the final appeals in Bedford Versus Canada, the case that struck down the old laws against prostitution once and for all. You probably remember the pictures of demonstrations by sex workers and those against sex work in front of the court. Reporters told me they had never seen anything like it at the Supreme Court. I came to Ottawa again in December 2013, when the decision was released. It was a day that made headlines around the world – just like in 2010. I came to Ottawa yet again, in September 2014, to testify about the proposed new law, Bill C-36, at the Senate. I got thrown out for not shutting up. In November 2014 I came to Ottawa again, to the University of Ottawa campus to speak to the Ontario Civil Liberties Association, who made me the recipient of their award for 2014. They didn't throw me out.

And now I'm here again, this time at Carleton, but what a difference. Instead of me getting thrown out the government got thrown out; just under two years after their prostitution laws were thrown out. The new law, Bill C-36 is doomed one way or the other. And, at long last, we may finally have a fair and open discussion in this country about the sex trade, and about who decides what, before any policies are adopted.

But before I tell you what I think should be allowed and not allowed, I want to speak to you about why there is a sex trade and what it means in the real world.

I'd like to begin by talking about the motivations of sex trade participants and activists, for and against. Why motivation? Well, it explains so much.

Let's start with the clients, and here I will focus on heterosexual men paying women. There are of course several reasons why men pay women for sex acts, whatever that means. Let's take married men. After a while most of them crave some variety. They see women on television and the Internet, at work and on the street or when they socialize

with friends. They are attracted to some of these. They remember what it was like at the beginning of their relationships, and miss that excitement. They miss being physical with a woman without knowing her baggage. The then and there. And if the woman is discreet, like a sex worker, he can confide in her the way he can't confide in his wife or girlfriend. He can tell her the kinky things he wants to do but is afraid, often with good reasons, to tell his partner. It's a lot of pressure to keep deeply felt desires secret, let alone have them fulfilled. It may be something as simple as having sex without worrying about satisfying his partner or being pressured about commitment.

Then there are clients who have no partners. They may be handicapped. They may be shy. They may be too poor to marry. They may be separated or divorced. Or, they may simply not want to live with a woman or have a steady girlfriend. A man who has sex with a sex worker once a month is as sexually active as many couples married for several years, at least those couples that even stay together for several years.

So, our clients have a piece in the puzzle of their lives available to them. Many have told me that knowing they were going to have a session with me once a month or whatever seemed to make the rest of their lives much better. It was a wonderful secret to have. And keeping it secret protected them from ridicule or damage to their relationships with their partners, if they had one, or their families. It is unfortunate that we have to live secretly so often in what we say and do, but that is reality.

Now, on to the motivations of the sex trade worker. Well, why does anyone do anything? Usually it's because they need an income, or more income. How many women want to clean toilets for low pay or want to work in a factory for low pay? How many want to serve in the armed forces and get sexually harassed, and persecuted if they complain about it? The point is that few people would do their jobs for free, even if they had big savings. And they often choose to follow the money.

Sex workers can make good money. You may only need a few hours a month for the administrative parts of the job and seeing a client once a week might provide enough income to get by. It may not be the only thing you do for money, or the only thing you do. Some students work their way through university, and some of them see only one client or a few. Some have sugar daddies. They can work around their class schedules and so forth. Other sex workers work for agencies. Others are in business for themselves.

Women want to be desired and pursued. Being paid for their time and attention is very flattering to some. Some women enjoy sex with multiple partners. I could go on with examples of why women may be attracted to sex work. But at the bottom of it is money. If the government wanted to reduce sex work among those less inclined to it the best way is to invest in higher welfare for single mothers and in daycare centres, and in collecting court ordered payments from dead-beat dads.

Now, how does one go about being a sex worker in a safe setting? Well, for one, have a steady location, with others on the premises who can act as security. When I had my houses I had a baby monitor hidden in the room with my security employee in another room who was on the alert when I had clients. The clients never knew, although they were told security was on the premises. You can hire expertise about advertising for such clientele as you wish on the Internet and elsewhere. You can also join an agency where these services are shared. And of course you can meet men in bars and hotels,

among other places, aside from the streets. I won't go into any more details now, but I think you get the idea.

Now get this. From time to time the law may, repeat may, be a minor factor, repeat minor factor, in what you choose to do. The old laws were rarely enforced, the new law almost never has been and is going the way of the dodo one way or the other. The authorities only have the resources to concentrate on clear cases of human trafficking and underage sex workers and clear violence against women that comes to their attention. Even if the new law was upheld and vigorously enforced, the trade would just go further underground, and its worst aspects would proliferate.

Prior to 2010 the prostitution laws were a mess. The sale of sex was legal, as was its purchase. But if it was done from the same location repeatedly, or if someone earned an income helping a sex worker, or if people communicated for the purpose of paid sex, they were breaking the law. Not only that, but sex acts were not listed. For example, if I tied up and whipped a client, and I have done plenty of that, especially to professors, under what circumstances is it a sex act? I think you get the idea. Not only that, but the laws themselves endangered people engaged in a legal activity – paid sex. Professor Alan Young organized and led a constitutional challenge to the prostitution laws. I was one of the three plaintiffs. Val Scott and Amy Leibovitch were the others.

In 2010, after almost two years of hearings and one year of deliberation, Judge Susan Himel, issued a 131 page decision. I quote from my book what she said. “She found that our application was right. The laws against communicating for the purposes of prostitution, living off the avails of prostitution, and keeping a common bawdy house were unconstitutional for a number of reasons. For one thing, they did not achieve their objectives but in fact worked in the opposite direction. She agreed that the laws prevented prostitutes from protecting themselves, and that the laws protected the perpetrators of violence against women more than they inhibited such violence. She agreed that indoor prostitution was safer than street prostitution. She agreed that the current prostitution laws were only minimally enforced. She agreed that the laws were too broad, leading to unelected officials distinguishing right from wrong. She agreed that striking down the laws would not lead to a dramatic increase in prostitution. She pointed out that numerous other laws are already on the books to combat the worst aspects of the sex trade.” So, the judge was saying the laws themselves were illegal.

The government fought our application. They spared no expense. They appealed when there were no grounds to appeal. They offered crap as evidence and arguments. Above all they wanted the issue to go away as long as possible. They did not want to be in the position of having to tell women when and under what conditions they could engage in sex acts. They did not want to define what are and what are not sex acts. They knew that women were being abused and killed because of the laws. They knew from the evidence in our case. But they also knew from the Pickton Inquiry, where the judge said the laws were much of the cause. They knew because of the epidemic of missing and murdered Aboriginal women into which they refused to call an inquiry. They knew but they put themselves first and kicked the can down the road. They lost right down the line and the Supreme Court laid down guidelines for any new laws that might come along.

The government, as we predicted, brought in a variant of the so-called Nordic model, which penalizes purchasers of sex acts and those such as advertisers who assist sex trade workers with their business, but does not charge those selling sex. As predicted the new law was not constitutional in the view of independent legal experts. Professor Young, in his testimony before the Senate annihilated the law's constitutionality. The witnesses appearing in support of C-36 gave the same crap that was rejected by the courts. Conservative commentators prostituted themselves to support the bill. Overpaid and under-worked trained seals. C-36 replicated the flaws of the old laws and was no less unconstitutional.

So, why did the Harper government bring in Bill C-36? Why did they spend endless dollars on lawyers, biased witnesses and other lackeys to appeal the findings of the trial that struck down the prostitution laws, or to defend the shameful Bill C-36? The answer is that they were pandering. Religious Christians and others did not want women to have the freedoms they now have. These same donors to Mr. Harper and his party fought access to abortion that we now have. They fought against same sex marriage. Mr. Harper pandered to these types of people when he fought court rulings on safe-site injections, medical marijuana and mandatory minimum sentences. He said he was being tough on crime. He lied.

For example, if Mr. Harper was really interested in protecting women, as he claimed, he would have at least spoken out against wife beaters, dead-beat dads, lack of daycare or affordable housing, high tuition for women students from non-privileged backgrounds or the shortage of women's shelters or shelters who accept family pets so the wife-beaters don't use the pets as hostages. On these matters, and on matters like prison overcrowding and the wrongly convicted, or backlogged courts, or the cost of legal representation, he was silent. He talked about the rights of victims. What about the victims I just mentioned. Again, pandering to a base of donors and a base of voters. It was no different with the sex trade. He acted like he was promoting more missing women. No wonder he refused to call the inquiry into missing aboriginal women. The courts had already told him that the laws he was advocating were part of the cause. And then, with C-36, he doubled down. Under Mr. Harper human trafficking has become rampant. Tough on crime? Please.

He and his so-called justice minister were even caught up in their own lies. Mr. MacKay and his officials were testifying in support of C-36. When he and his officials were asked about the constitutionality of C-36 being questioned extensively by reputable legal experts, they said there was no need to refer the law to the courts. Then, within minutes, when asked what acts were sex acts under the law, they said the courts would have to decide.

I have spoken elsewhere about Mr. MacKay's record regarding sexual and minority harassment in the armed forces when he was minister. Mr. MacKay is a national disgrace, as is Rob Nicholson his predecessor as justice minister. I have spoken about him before as well. They have got part of the fate they deserved when their party was humiliated in the election. But enough about them.

Now that Mr. Harper and his lackeys are out of office I believe this new Parliament can do better. They can tell Canadians to take their moral judgments and

shove them. Instead, crack down on corporate crime. Crack down on tax evasion. Crack down on those traffic in undocumented foreign women as nannies or men as farm workers. Crack down on terrorists. Crack down on polluters. And like I said before, have the authorities help women who are forced to do what they do or stay where they are, and not on women who are acting freely. Stay out of the private sex lives of consenting adults. Show some courage on that issue. The people will approve. Not all of them - but enough.

Tomorrow the new Parliament will meet for the first time and in two days the Throne Speech will be delivered. We may hear more of the new government's pending decisions on what to do about the sex trade. They have already committed to repeal or amend C-36. I think the federal government is right if it calls for a task force report before telling Canadians under what circumstances they may be paid for sex acts. And the Supreme court also said that for any new law to be legal it must not be vague. It must tell me, as a sex worker, as a dominatrix, and as a woman, what I may or may not do in the privacy of my bedroom. I believe they must begin by setting a time-line for the repeal of Bill C-36, and call for its non-enforcement until that happens.

In other countries liberalization of the laws restricting the sex trade has been a success. In every area of society and the economy laws are broken and things happen underground, and the sex trade is no exception. Yet, for their own purposes, governments or journalists cherry-pick the so-called evidence. The most blatant and frightening examples in the debate on C-36 were when Margaret Wente and Barbara Kay, two somewhat prominent conservative journalists, ignored even mentioning judge Himel's exhaustive review of court tested evidence about other countries and cited a recent study each, neither of which were court tested, and both of which have been discredited, to support C-36. Their lack of integrity in debating this issue is frightening. They have sunk to the level of hate groups on the Internet. Fortunately both of them are old and I don't think anyone takes them seriously any more, if they ever did, or if they have even heard of them.

But even more of a danger than lies and funded propaganda, is morality. We must never allow policies to be driven by morality – as opposed to the considerations of freedom, safety and privacy. That's the Canada I want.

In the sex trade that means I can operate a brothel or dungeon in full view and with full protection of the law. It means that I can't force anyone to enter or stay in the business against their will. It means I obey the labour laws obeyed by a restaurant or factory. It means I pay taxes. It means I do not assault anyone. It means my employees do nothing they are not comfortable with. It means my customers are free from harassment and their privacy is protected. It means I can advertise my services. It means that any restrictions on where I locate and where I advertise and who I hire are the same as, say, any other adult entertainment facility. It means that people who have a moral objection to my line of work can go to Hell. These are the same people, all too often, who objected to birth control, equal pay for women, homosexual relations, same sex marriage, interracial marriage and more. These are also the same people who in one breath condemn sex for sale and within hours buy it. If you want to know who is on that list, a good guide is to look at who is most sanctimonious.

I hope historians and other researchers will tell the stories of those who, for decades, fought for the freedoms and protections that sex workers and members of the LGBT community have been and are now in the process of achieving. The names that make the media are the tips of icebergs. Great changes take time, money, effort, perseverance, savvy and many good people to come about.

As you hear the presentations over the next day or so and read the materials you are being provided, you will see that some things are getting better in Canada, and you will find out more about how and why that has come to pass, and share your findings. We are obviously at a landmark time in deciding the most crucial questions on issues relating to the sex trade.

But in my view the most crucial question should be asked the most often. The question is 2 words. It is the question at the heart of almost every level of almost every issue. Here are the 2 words. "Who decides?"

I want to thank you again for having this important conference and for inviting me to speak here tonight.

*The speech was very well received, it seemed to me, and so I was told afterwards. Most people made reference to the joke about what the women professors at Carlton had in common with a dominatrix. There was no coverage of the speech in the mainstream media. This was because my circle did not participate in the publicity for the event, and there was no desire for mainstreams media coverage that we were made aware of. The speech was followed by a panel discussion, which I watched from the back while various people paid me a visit. The next morning I was in a room where various other people paid a visit and then I and my helpers were taken to a nice lunch in the faculty dining room.*

#### Chapter 26: April 2016 Submission on Human Trafficking

*I was individually invited to submit a letter to this task force. It was easy to do, since it was what I had been saying all along. So here it is. Everyone knew and knows it is a big problem, but few bear in mind it is not confined to the sex trade, and few were bearing in mind that the more nations tried to reduce the sex trade the more human trafficking there was.*

#### Submission to the Government of Ontario. Combating Human Trafficking.

I am the Bedford in Bedford Versus Canada, which struck down the old laws against the sex trade. I have also spoken against Bill C-36, based on the so-called Nordic model, the current criminal provision against the sex trade. I have pleaded with Toronto mayor John Tory, the Wynne Government and now the Trudeau federal government to stop standing by while women are trafficked for the sex trade, or trafficked for any reason.

Premier Wynne said she has grave concerns about C-36 and Prime Minister Trudeau has said he would prefer an evidence based approach to any laws concerning the sex trade. The evidence has been that the Nordic approach drives the trade underground, which facilitates human trafficking.

So here are my recommendations to the Ontario Government to combat human trafficking, focusing on the sex trade.

One. Ask the federal government to repeal C-36 and decriminalize the sex trade completely, and until that happens continue to not enforce it. The law is blatantly unconstitutional and the officials who have told the Ontario government otherwise have done a grave disservice.

Two. Ensure that any new legislation is highly specific on what consenting adults may do in private for money or not, and where, and why. This is one of the things the courts have said are needed for new laws to stand.

Three. Ensure that private security, landlords, advertisers, dependents and others paid by sex trade workers are not legally at risk simply because they were paid by sex trade workers.

Four. Offer financial rewards and special protections to sex trade workers or their clients who offer information leading to the conviction of human traffickers or abusers of any type.

Five. Clamp down on illegal immigration overall, so people are not trafficked as nannies, senior care givers, farm workers, factory workers, or of course sex trade workers. But at the same time, do not threaten those trafficked with deportation.

Our leaders should show leadership and integrity. If they care, they should act like they care. That means not being afraid of uninformed or unthinking people with moral reservations about what some consenting adults are doing in private. As the prime minister said, it's 2016.

Chapter 27: July 2017

Speech: The 2013 Red Umbrella Rallies

*An event was held to jointly commemorate the fourth anniversary of the June 2013 Red Umbrella rallies and to launch a new record album by the well known Canadian band Whitehorse. Whitehorse members were passionate supporters of the fight against the laws we were waging and even wrote and recorded songs to this effect. There were four special guests besides the band. One was Dan Savage, a famous broadcaster and columnist on sex related topics. His pod cast and column, called Savage Love, have a huge following. Then there was the director of a sex professionals safe house in Winnipeg. Also, Nikki Thomas, former Executive Director of the Sex Professionals of Canada. She was the formidable chief spokesperson against the government on behalf of sex trade workers during the years of the constitutional challenge. Then there was me. I was the only speaker and then a panel of the guests and the two members of Whitehorse went on for half an hour. Here are my remarks.*

In June 2013 sex trade workers and supporters of their rights rallied in most of Canada's major cities. We voiced support for the 2010 court decision striking out the bawdy house laws, and other related provisions, from the Criminal Code of Canada. The rallies were days before the Supreme Court was to hear the final appeal against the decision.

On hearing day in Ottawa the Supreme Court was surrounded by opponents of the decision and we who supported it. Reporters told me they had never seen anything like it. Several speakers, including me, addressed their supporters from the steps of the court.

The red umbrella crowd who was there and in the rallies across the country did not see themselves as victims of the sex trade. Rather, they were more the victims of the authorities. The Supreme Court agreed unanimously. Despite the reckless government spending on lawyers to fight Professor Young and his team, we won. They kept insisting that the laws were constitutional. They were wrong. And now, they are not only wrong, they are gone.

But before Mr. Harper got a job dancing for rich people in the United States, and before Mr. MacKay (then justice minister) got a job dancing for rich people at a law firm about a mile from here, and before Mr. Nicholson (MacKay's predecessor) got a job dancing in opposition, they passed Bill C-36.

Result? More human trafficking and the other ill effects we warned about if they went the so-called Nordic route. Yet, the sex trade is booming. The authorities are focused on street nuisance and trafficking and don't have the time or inclination to engage in any sort of crackdown on consenting adult behaviour. Criminal lawyers are telling me they hardly have any clients with sex trade charges. The statistics in the media tell of huge reductions in such charges, at the very time the trade is booming. Tell me who won.

There is a significant amount of substantive discussion about reform of the criminal justice system going on at the highest levels of government. So when they choose how to follow up their pledge to repeal C-36 and make changes for evidence based reasons, it will be along with many other needed changes. That is one reason it is taking so much time.

Alan Young, Val Scott, Amy Leibovitch, Nikki Thomas, Katrina Pacey. Shall I go on? I alone could give you many more names, going back at least forty years, of people like them all across Canada who made a difference.

Our successes were greatest when we stayed focused on our objectives and avoided infighting, trivial side issues, personal conflicts or airing dirty laundry in public. It was important to stay on the attack. It was important to be willing to be as cunning and sly as the other side, and not be naive. The cause was too important to get squeamish about the means. Remember all this going forward. Thank you so much for having this event.

*The event was not covered by the mainstream media, aside from the very large circulating NOW Magazine in Toronto, which publicized the event beforehand. The audience was very welcoming when I was introduced and the speech was well received.*

Chapter 28: January 2018



Speech: University of Windsor Law School

*This was the third time I spoke at this university. The first time, in 2009, I was on a panel with Professor Young and Val Scott, discussing the then in progress constitutional challenge. The second time, in 2014, I talked about our third and final win in that matter, in the Supreme Court. When I returned in early 2018 the case was already part of the content of their courses and a frequent topic for research and discussion. It seemed natural that with so many having heard of the Bedford case, they would invite Bedford herself to share her experience and thoughts in person. I was glad to do so. It also gave me a chance to visit my papers in the archives at the university and do a bit of work on the collection. When I prepared the speech I had to keep in mind that these were law school students I was speaking to in person, but also that the speech might in time reach a wider audience. The large Moot Court room was almost filled, which I was told was quite rare. The audience was about three quarters female, by my guess. I stuck very closely to the prepared text.*

Thanks for having me today. Thanks to the Speakers Committee for arranging it. It's good to be back.

I'm from Windsor. I had my first large scale dominatrix and escort operation here. I recently placed my papers in the University of Windsor Archives. Also, this is the third time I have spoken at the University of Windsor. The first time, in 2009, I came here with Val Scott and Alan Young. We spoke about the Charter challenge and related things. I was here three years ago, one month after the Supreme Court struck down the sex trade laws, and I spoke about that.

Today I'm going to speak about four things. First, the greatest joy, which everyone knows is sex. Second, the worst gloom, which everyone knows is being a lawyer. Third, my insider's perspective on Bedford Versus Canada. Finally, some thoughts about the sex trade issues many of you will be participating in when you graduate.

Sex. Sex is very popular. Men are conditioned to lust after women. Women are conditioned to want to be lusted after. Yet women don't want to be harassed. Even before the current flood of women coming out in 2017 to complain of unwanted attention or other inappropriate behaviour, men found the process of dating or courting women to be very intimidating. Look at the messages women send out.

Message: women want to be chased. Message: women want a commitment. Message: women like sensitive men. Message: women like aggressive men. Message: women want a man who spends time with his wife and children. Message: women like successful men. Message: women want to be stay at home mothers. Message: women want a career. Message: women do not like men who dominate them. Message: *Fifty Shades of Grey* sold millions. Message: women want men to be intimate with them. Message: when men disclose their true wants, they are often seen as wimps or perverts.

So, even men who are presentable, sociable, gainfully employed and so forth are usually intimidated by dating and afraid of commitment. Then of course there are men who may be poor, ugly, shy, inarticulate or disabled. What do they do for companionship?

Enter the sex trade. I have been in the sex trade for most of my life. Here are some things I've come to believe.

First, most men want companionship where they don't have to worry about doing and saying the right things. Examples. A man's blood pressure shoots up when he has to get a woman a gift. Men hate sending cards or flowers. Men are afraid to flatter women because of fear of saying the wrong things. If you gals run into a guy who is good at these things, odds are he is a con man, or he found a woman to coach him in dealing with you, like his mama.

Sex workers commonly tell of clients who pay and then are content to do nothing other than look at and talk to her, clothes on. So great is the relief of not having to worry about what to say or do. Then of course there are the clients who want physical companionship where they can touch and be touched, again without worrying about whether they are doing and saying the right things.

Second. Despite all this, men seek intimacy, but not with their regular partner. One of the reasons men hate communicating their thoughts is because they may be thinking about other women or about doing things that most people might laugh at, or worse.

However, when a man tells a woman he hires what he wants to do, really wants to do, and she accepts it and makes it happen, he is rewarded for self disclosure, instead of punished. They do not have to share any other part of their lives with these women. Nobody has to know he likes to wear women's clothes or be chained and whipped. But just disclosing it to someone, and perhaps acting it out, is like therapy. It is also escapist recreation. Dreams are coming true. Also, women are beginning to pay men to be the man of their dreams for a time.

The point is that there's a market for the purchase and sale of sex and fantasy role play. It's significant and it's not going away. Most of the business is repeat business. Most of the business is indoors. The authorities have limited resources to sweep clients and rarely do so indoors. Enforcement of the current law is negligible.

Now, on to the motivations of the sex trade worker. Well, why does anyone do anything? Usually it's because they need an income, or more income. How many women want to clean toilets for low pay or want to work in a factory for low pay? How many want to serve in the armed forces and get sexually harassed, and persecuted if they complain about it? Few people earn their living the way they want to. Most people follow the money, and some work at jobs that accommodate needs other than money, such as hours that are manageable, or locations that are accessible.

Sex workers can make good money. More than most junior lawyers. They may only need a few hours a month for the administrative parts of the job, and seeing a client once a week might provide enough income to get by. It may not be the only thing you do for money. Some students work their way through college in whole or part, sometimes only having one client or a few. They may work for agencies and others are in business for themselves. Some girls at this university reportedly have sugar daddies.

If the government really wanted to reduce sex work among those less inclined to it, the best way is to invest in higher welfare for single mothers, affordable daycare, and the collection of child support from dead-beat dads, lower tuition, better protection for

women from sexual harassment in the workplace, more enforcement of the laws that prevent human trafficking, like immigration laws, and repealing the laws that encourage it, like the current law against the sex trade, Bill C-36.

So. Now that you know all about sex and the sex trade I can take over from your professors and let you in on a few things about the greatest gloom. So you want to be a lawyer? Well, there are some things about the law and the legal profession that your professors may have overlooked. And pay attention. This may be on the exam.

Let's start with a few thoughts about the sex trade laws. The law is often, if not usually, a minor factor, repeat minor factor, in what happens out there. About 20 per cent of Canada's economy is underground. Much above ground activity is fraudulent, with those breaking the law often not even knowing they are doing so. Most men buying sex today don't know what the law on that is. Really. Many who run massage parlours or escort services don't know. These are sometimes illegal immigrants who are grateful for money to send home. They and their employers may view being nabbed by the cops as a minor interruption in their business. Clients who get nabbed usually just look for the path of least cost and least notoriety. That being said, clients very rarely get nabbed. That is mainly because so much of their buying is repeat business.

The lack of enforcement of the sex trade laws is also because the authorities, even before they consider going after the sex trade, already have overcrowded courts and jails. Police forces are very busy, and many officers are burned out from other pressures too. So they have to prioritize. That is in part why very few women, and few men, are being charged.

However, there are massive numbers of transactions out there which relate to the sex trade. Proper business management is required for licensing, tax planning, health and safety, labour relations, advertising, leases and so on. So think of future clients associated with the sex trade as business people. The trend is even towards the sex trade becoming mainstream and corporate.

Now on to lawyers. I'd like to share some of my thoughts about lawyers with you, and this may be on the exam.

I am an expert on lawyers, judges and, this you will like, law professors. I have flogged them, diapered them, made some of them sissy maids, hired them, fired them, and made some well known. Some became judges. I have had about twenty lawyers represent me in court or do other legal work for me. They were either not paid or were paid by someone other than me. I was not a very representative client. But I was a client.

When you graduate you will encounter clients. Some of them will not be a dominatrix. There are many types of clients. Some clients are businesses. Some, like banks, employ the lawyers. And of course some are individuals. All clients have something to say about lawyers and the law, and not just in lawyer jokes.

For example, what makes a good lawyer or bad lawyer? I think most lawyers are smart, knowledgeable and good talkers, but often it is only when they have other lawyers and judges ready to criticize them that they produce for you. When clients deal with their lawyers, the adversary isn't there watching. It can be a nightmare. They avoid and bully clients as much as they serve them.

So the presence of an adversary, or another lawyer working with them on a case, will help keep them up to the mark. Another option is to have someone who is skilled at dealing with lawyers assist clients in dealing with their lawyer. This as much as anything has enabled me to fight over the years. I did not have the knowledge or confidence to hire and fire lawyers with authority, the way some of my supporters did and do.

Lawyers sometimes hate dealing with middle people. Fire those lawyers. Clients need representatives in dealing with their lawyers more than they need lawyers dealing with their adversaries. Frequency of communication is the key and one man bands don't cut it. Now, in large or mid size law firms the juniors and case managers fill that role of middle person sometimes. They make sure communication is timely. Calls are returned. Things are explained patiently.

So clients, and lawyers for that matter, should think team, not just about the main lawyer. A good law practice is more important than a good lawyer. Good lawyers collaborate well and delegate well. Having a great legal mind often has little to do with being a good lawyer.

There is also one more thing for you women law students to consider. Some of you may be in the sex trade now. Some of you at this university reportedly have sugar daddies. You do it by choice. And, I think law school is an excellent training ground for becoming a dominatrix. Girls, think of debating some guy who's gagged and bound. Think of being prosecutor, judge, jury, and jailer over some jerk who really deserves punishment, and then punishing him. And think of getting paid for it, plus tax. Or, you can do it as a class project.

Most of you know me from the Supreme Court decision in Bedford Versus Canada in 2013. The challenge to three of Canada's laws targeting the sex trade was filed in 2007, a decision given in 2010 in Superior Court, early 2013 in the Ontario Court of Appeal and late 2013 in the Supreme Court. You may have studied the decisions and the issues. Rather than tell you what you probably know already, I want to go into some considerations that may not have come to your attention.

But before I do I want as always to express praise and gratitude to my fellow plaintiffs Val Scott and Amy Lebovitch. They, more than me, have been and are dedicated ongoing activists and have been recognized as such. Kudos as well to Professor Young and his team of lawyers and law students, and to the other volunteers.

So, now some considerations. The first consideration is someone who graduated from this law school. I'm talking about former justice minister Rob Nicholson. I want to tell you about one single moment in his life. I think it was a defining moment for both him, and Canada. In March 2013 the Ontario Court of Appeal basically upheld Justice Himel's 2010 decision striking down the key laws against prostitution. A few weeks later Nicholson stood up in the House of Commons and said something to the effect that he was pleased to say that the government would appeal to the Supreme Court and would not discuss the case until the court had ruled. Of course, that made the matter go away for about a year.

Now let me tell you why I think that was a defining moment. Reason number one. I think he knew there were merits to what Himel's decision contained, merits that he could have acted upon immediately – like allowing sex workers to hire off-duty police as

security or work in groups from fixed locations, or support spouses and children who lived with them. I think he knew the laws were void for vagueness and could have made them clearer and fairer. I think he knew that other laws could, as Himel said, be used to control the worst aspects of sex work. And I think he knew the laws themselves created dangers for women and resulted in deaths. I think he knew all this yet, with pleasure, as he put it, he appealed the whole package and did nothing.

Reason number two. He knew or should have known that it was against every principle his party stood for to lump consenting harmless adult behaviour in private, like women paying younger men for sex, men keeping women, and women like me who enjoy punishing and humiliating men who pay me to do it, in with trafficked or abused women. That is not allowing for individual autonomy and responsibility for one's own decisions. I think he knew all this, yet, with pleasure, as he put it, he appealed.

Reason number three. If I am wrong about the first two reasons, it was definitely an even more defining moment. Perhaps he actually believed his stated position that the laws were constitutional, and that no changes were needed. If that is true, if he believed that nothing being said by all the judges, experts, sex workers and others had any merit at all, If he believed all that, he is a mental defective.

So, my friends, it was a defining moment because it was then and there that the justice minister proved himself and his government to be either liars or mental defectives. I'll compromise, and say they were both. Three levels of court are there to show it.

But wait, wait. It gets worse! If, instead of appealing again, he had just brought in the new law we have now, there would have been no Supreme Court decision.

The Supreme Court! A unanimous decision! Decision authored by the Chief Justice! You students and you professors have a massive interest in the matter simply because it was a unanimous Supreme Court decision, laying out the grounds for new laws to stand up. The Supreme Court! What would be your thinking if they had kept this out of the Supreme Court? Now, again, what law school did Nicholson attend?

So, why did it go to the Supreme Court at all? I think it's partly because Nicholson and Harper didn't think of any of this, or listen to people who did. The temptation of another year with an excuse not to comment was too great. Also too great was doing what their base of voters and donors would want. That meant not admitting defeat. It meant fighting pointlessly against us, and Judge Himel, and the Ontario Court of Appeal, with taxpayer money.

Now on to what it took to mount the challenge. Professor Young told the Senate committee looking into C-36 that at full freight the case would have cost our side alone over a million dollars, and probably cost the government that much a number of times over. Perhaps I can give you some insight into why. After much consideration, I think the best way to do this is to tell you year by year what had to be done. And remember, this was just on our side.

2002 to 2003. My legal battles had ended and my second house was closed. I was out of the public eye. I was going into chemotherapy for Hepatitis C and essentially, from then on, have been disabled. I occupied my time, when not doing essential errands and appointments, on writing projects, painting and doing some clerical work at home for a small business.

Alan Young told me he was going to do what he ended up doing, meaning strike down the prostitution laws in court, and wanted me to be one of the plaintiffs. People around me were divided, but the decision to support my participation was mainly driven by the fact that my chemotherapy would be done by the time anything substantive occurred. He also wanted Val Scott, a long-time and articulate activist for reform of the sex trade laws. Finally, Amy Lebovitch came forward. Her importance was that, unlike Val and me, she was still active in the trade. Indeed, her presence was the most important, from a technical standpoint, because her standing in the case was not subject to possible challenge on the grounds she was not being impacted by the laws. Others from the trade who were willing to be plaintiffs were asked by Alan to be expert witnesses. So, in getting all this in order, how many billable legal and administrative hours are we at? Remember the Supreme Court decision was in late 2013.

2004 to 2006. I did little in the next couple of years, but much more in 2006. Once Alan had his plaintiffs lined up he organized students and other lawyers who were to participate in various aspects of the initiative, such as: keeping correspondence organized, drafting and obtaining finalized affidavits, identifying and locating expert evidence and expert witnesses, interviewing and hiring a legal team, arranging and executing the logistics of transporting and accommodating them, preparing factums, preparing for examinations and cross-examinations, preparing courtroom appearances, scheduling and rescheduling as required, and of course obtaining the financing for all the above that had to be paid – such as travel costs. I recall that Val, Amy and I spent many hours at my place together. Our focus was on the logistics of the travel and accommodation of experts. I have put a lot of the correspondence in my papers in the archives at this university, and it shows how many things needed attending to, just on our side. The law students and lawyers dealt with assisting the lawyers in assembling the expert evidence and preparing the experts for their appearances. The federal and Ontario justice officials had to undertake similar challenges, but their work was all paid work, and it seemed to us that they had too many lawyers and summer student helpers. Fiscal conservatives my ass!

2007. That year saw the acceleration of the activities of 2006, plus we had a press conference to announce the challenge, and then, as the first documents were filed and first hearings were about to get under way, the issue got little mainstream publicity. Where are we at in billable hours now? What about the value of the time spent by the volunteers? There were volunteer groups on our side and the other side who sought standing and made submissions.

2008. For me the year was mainly taken up by the movement of the experts from out of town and their appearances. I attended about two thirds of the sessions in which evidence was examined. I would say there were about fifty full days in total, meaning days where the hearings were not in public, but there were transcripts. The purpose of the meetings was for experts who had submitted evidence to be cross-examined. Plaintiffs were also cross-examined as to their affidavits.

When my time came arrangements were made to have the media interview me outside the meeting room in the federal government building where most of the sessions were held. Then they asked to sit in on the testimony Alan had nothing to do with it, but the idea was

to screw up their cross-examination timing and send a message that they were being watched. The reason it screwed up their timing was that counsel had to meet to figure out how to deal with reporters, who up until now were absent. It was Alan in fact who wanted the sessions to remain in private because the personal lives of witnesses was so exposed. The whole thing got some press. More billable hours too, paid and unpaid.

2009. The first half of 2009 was a continuation of 2008. The hearings wrapped up and after the summer the case moved into open court. I will speak briefly about the official hearings and then about things that are likely new to you, even those of you who studied the case. The judge in Ontario Superior Court, Susan Himel, had reviewed tens of thousands of pages of factums, affidavits, expert evidence and it's testing in cross-examinations via transcripts. Then she heard submissions from the lawyers of the plaintiffs, governments and intervenors. She rejected applications for intervenor status from three groups, basically Christian groups who opposed the challenge. They appealed that decision and the Ontario Court of Appeal overturned Himel's decision. So they got media as well and contributed their moral views, but nothing of substance. There were nine days in court. The billable hours metre blew up.

I came to court the first day dressed in my leather suit, boots and carrying a riding crop. Val and I made a point of posing for the media. I was told by my advisor for the day, a supporter savvy in these things, to walk up and down the street a bit with Val, keeping the riding crop near my face and carrying a light briefcase under my arm. Black leather briefcase of course. The key was to keep these two props near my face so they would appear in photos. I had to try to remember to face the sun so the images would be better. And I was told to be sure they got pictures with my sun glasses on as well, and of me talking on the phone. I remembered most of the advice and it paid off. In fact, one of the guys in the media pack was that supporter. When I looked at him he would remind me of these things as discreetly as possible.

I have to confess to you that I often found the public hearings dull. The technical references and quibbling over words seemed stupid at times, at least to me. However, Alan's concluding speech had me in tears. I only attended about half the hearings, as my health was continuing to deteriorate.

2010. The year 2010 was quiet until the end of September. The judge used all of the allotted twelve months to deliberate the 25,000 pages, and issued a 131 page decision in our favour. I was dressed in my leather suit for the press conference just after the release. We really did not know what to expect, despite the clear indicators that our case was better. The uncertainty was in part Alan's caution about giving false hopes to clients. My uncertainty was in part from being the victim of blatant judicial corruption and incompetence in the past. I did not have anything prepared in the way of a speech. A couple of one liners were in my back pocket if we won or lost. I was going to let Val and Nikki Thomas, both experienced communicators, do most of the talking. Nikki Thomas was the Executive Director of the Sex Professionals of Canada, a post Val had previously held. You can see me with both of them in pictures on the Internet.

When we found out we won my supporters sent out press releases. I called them with interview requests I received and they handled the scheduling and my movements. The sessions I had watched during the case, what I had said before, and what Val and

Nikki and Alan said at the press conference provided me with the words to say to reporters in the days after the release. At the press conference I remembered some of the tips about providing the media with content.

2011 and 2012. There were hearings about how long the stay of the Himel decision would last. The decision of the courts was that the old laws would remain until at least after the Court of Appeal had ruled on the lower court decision. I appeared at the court house at strategic times, gave our case in the media personally, and of course made sure the media had good images. I was advised by one key supporter to beg reporters to ask the prime minister a question from me. One of them did. His response was on television. He said he had never been asked to respond to a dominatrix before and did not know who I was. The reporters laughed. He was either lying or the only one there who didn't know who I was. What an idiot. However, unlike Nicholson, he did not go to law school here.

The appeal was heard at the Ontario Court of Appeal in the summer of 2012, and their decision came out almost a year later. There was a lot of publicity and discussion in the media during the hearings, which lasted five days at the Court of Appeal. There were overflow rooms with screens. We were mobbed by reporters on the three days I was there.

So, to recap. September 2010, Himel decision. Summer 2012, Ontario Court of Appeal holds week of hearings. March 2013, Ontario Court of Appeal hands down its decision.

2013. When the Ontario Court of Appeal decision came out in March we did another press conference and all that. Basically we won. As expected it was going to the Supreme Court. We expected hearings to be held in the summer or fall and a decision after the new year, meaning some time in 2014. Of course the lawyers had to prepare their factums and books of authorities. If you look at what was filed with the Supreme Court, along with what their preceding courts had, which was also filed in the Supreme Court, each judge had, I believe, about 30,000 pages dumped on their desks. I knew we would win. There was no way Beverly McLachlin would allow anything else. A sex worker in Ottawa who had clientele in a position to know told me on good authority that there was no substantive argument among the judges against what Himel had wrote.

I did not share those reports with Alan, or anyone else. I attended a red umbrella rally in Toronto in the summer, the week the case was heard at the Supreme Court. The rally was one of many across the nation, where sex workers and our supporters marched in support of what we were fighting for. Then I went to Ottawa to attend the rally at the Supreme Court during the day the case was heard. Our opponents were there too. The reporters said they had never seen anything like it.

On decision day we all went to the court in Ottawa for the release. When I found out we won big I cried, dried my eyes, had a quick phone call to my off site coach for the day, and did the interviews. The coach told me the key at all costs was to get in the joke that the prime minister had offered to appoint me to the Senate as a government whip. Media ate it up. The Senate at that time was scandalized for a number of things. I looked and sounded like a winner, not a victim. This gave our cause credibility.

So, I think you can appreciate that a Charter challenge is not a simple, easy, cheap or short term undertaking. Remember also that British Columbia lawyer Katrina Pacey



led a challenge to the laws, which was before the courts and would have been heard if ours had not succeeded.

Here are some take-aways from my experience in Bedford Versus Canada. One is that it is understandable that there are so few Charter challenges. It just isn't worth it for most people. Law schools, however, can make the difference. Alan Young's initiatives on the wrongfully convicted, abortion access, medical marijuana and my matters come to mind.

Another take-away is that new laws, to avoid the flaws of the old ones, need to benefit from the evidence and decisions that our challenge made available. The previous federal government, who were voted out of office in 2015, did not make use of those resources. I want to tell you why I think that was the case.

They believe in sexual slavery. They believe a woman should only have sex for free. They believe she should have no choice in the matter. Male sex workers ditto. A woman selling sex was seen by them as a victim, even if she was fully independent. So she would not face charges. But while she was selling sex anyone protecting her, being her landlord, doing her taxes, advertising for her, babysitting her children, paying her rent or loaning her money, keeping her as a mistress, they would be charged.

But wait, it gets worse. In the hearings Mr. MacKay, Mr. Nicholson's successor as justice minister, another piece of work, said there was no reason to refer the new bill to the courts to see if it was constitutional. When asked what acts were deemed illegal under the act and which, like those of a dominatrix, might not be, the jerk said the courts would have to decide. I'm being kind to him. His legislation is probably void for vagueness alone, if I read the Supreme Court decision correctly.

So another take-away is this. When a government tries to tell consenting adults what they can and can't do in private, they should be opposed. The Liberals, who were in opposition in 2014, voted against that legislation and promised to repeal it if elected. They were elected. The repeal has not happened yet, but there is no widespread outcry. That is because enforcement of the present law is minimal, and the sex trade and everything around it is booming. The government is happy to avoid the controversy that would accompany full legalization of the sex trade. Sex workers there by choice don't see an urgency for new legislation, since it would involve licensing and registration burdens and what not.

But some sex workers are not content. Human trafficking is flourishing under the new law. We warned about that. The 2014 law encourages sex work to be more underground. If the sex trade was fully legalized there would still be human trafficking, but clients would know whether they were attending a licensed business and would have no fear of facing charges if they reported suspected abuse of women. Landlords and hotels would be more willing to report, and less willing to look the other way when the laws were broken, because they could make money from the sex trade without breaking the law. Sex trade workers obeying the law could reduce competition by reporting violators. Police could concentrate on more serious matters than making sure women are only having sex for free.

In the hearings during Bedford Versus Canada it was proven that other countries found what I just said to be true. Organized crime and human trafficking did not go away. But that is the case in any activity.

For example, there are sweatshops, illegal nannies and what not. And you can be sure women are being abused there as well. You get the idea. You don't have to be in the Canadian Armed Forces under Peter MacKay or RCMP under Vic Toews to be a sexually harassed woman, although it helped. All that under a law and order government with stiffer and mandatory minimum sentences. But enough about Harper and his trained seals.

Mr. Trudeau and his justice minister Jody Raybould-Wilson now have a chance to differentiate themselves from Harper, Nicholson and MacKay on these issues. As I said, there is no pressure on them to hurry. Also, the interrelated issues are complex, and time is needed. The controversy, no matter what they do, or don't do, is going to be intense. Look at the marijuana reform. That came over a decade after it was, I read somewhere, Canada's third largest export crop. I don't know what the monetary value of the sex trade is, or was, but it ain't peanuts.

I hope you will remember going forward that as law students and then as lawyers or lawyer graduates, you will have more ability and opportunity than most people when it comes to defining our rights and freedoms. I have seen law students in action in my legal battles. I have seen the lawyers. I have seen the activists. I have seen the media. I have seen the voters. I have seen the criminals. I have seen my immediate supporters. No shortage of villains. No shortage of heroes. I hope you have the privilege of a role when the debate on the sex trade begins again. Thank you again for having me here today.

*The speech was well received. I found it rewarding to be speaking to a large, mainly female audience who had an appreciation of the matters I was addressing. The students were listening very closely and some told me after that they found much of what I said to be new information. When it ended they applauded vigorously. There were only a few remaining minutes before classes resumed at the top of the hour. Some students remained behind after the top of the hour. A few had their picture taken with me. Some congratulated and thanked me for either speaking that day or for my legal battles. None said anything negative. One girl told me that I helped inspire her choice of law as a career. The speech can be watched on the Internet.*

Chapter 29: February 2020

Blog: Day Before Court Decision on New Law's Constitutionality

Entitled: Trudeau's Choice – Sex Trade Law Reform or  
Missing, Murdered and Abused Women

*An escort agency in London, Ontario was charged under the new law a few years previously. The defendants filed a motion challenging the constitutionality of parts of the new law. The judge first moved the venue to Kitchener, it was said to have more court space. Then he took a year to release his written decision. So it was almost four years after the agency was raided and charged that they got a court ruling. I issued this statement the day before the ruling.*

I have been asked by reporters to comment on a court ruling, scheduled in the coming days, on the constitutionality of Canada's prostitution laws. I think it more important to comment before the ruling. I am the Bedford in Bedford Versus Canada, a case decided by the Supreme Court in 2013. That decision will likely weigh heavily on the upcoming ruling on a motion concerning the law's constitutionality. The upcoming ruling has taken the judge a year to prepare and the motion was presented by an eminent legal team, no doubt at great expense.

In 2013 the Supreme Court ruled that the laws restricting the sex trade worked against their stated purposes and exposed women engaged in a legal activity to danger. For example, the laws prevented sex trade workers working from secure premises or hiring security. The government then rammed through a new law, patterned after the so-called Nordic model, which allows the sale of sex acts but outlaws buyers or enablers.

Opponents of the new law say it replicates the constitutional flaws of the old laws. The Canadian Alliance for Sex Work Law Reform, on their site, provides all the relevant arguments and citations of evidence. The evidence from 2013, and after, is that the new law is unconstitutional for many reasons, not the least of which is that it has led to missing, murdered and abused women.

Despite the new law, the sex trade is booming. A strong economy is one reason. Reason number two is that most clients of sex trade workers don't even know what the law is. Reason three, women are encouraged to go into the trade by the very fact that Prime Minister Harper's government in 2014 explicitly brought in a law that said they could not be charged for selling sex. Reason four, advertising on-line is now done off-shore. Reason five, landlords and hotels who obey the law lose revenue, so they break it. Reason six, the authorities do not have the resources to clamp down.

The new law has been a gift to organized crime and human traffickers of women for sex. These people are not concerned with obeying laws. If they are to be stopped, it would be because sex workers, their landlords, their advertisers, their security and so forth would not have to be concerned with dodging authorities. The judge who first struck down the old laws, Susan Himel, said existing laws against assault, confinement, illegal immigration would address the worst aspects of the sex trade. The authorities have important issues to address, rather than ensuring consenting women only have sex for free.

In the discourse over the issue of whether to decriminalize the sale of sex acts between consenting adults there were many cherry-picked stories used to argue for the new law. The so-called evidence used to that end has been debunked. Yet both the stories and the "evidence" are dredged up over and over again by opponents of decriminalization or legalization. This will continue and should be seen for the fraud it is. There are also those who support the new law for what may be called ideological or moral reasons. Their morality is as perverted as their so-called evidence. Women have a right to control their own bodies.

Professor Young, who headed our legal team in Bedford Versus Canada has criticized the new law for legal reasons. He and others have also lamented it because of the missing, murdered and abused women who it was foreseen would arise because of the

new law. It is sad that it takes so much and so long to challenge the legality of such legislation.

Trudeau and his party voted against the new law when in opposition. Again, the judge who struck down the old laws at the outset said no new laws were needed. She said the existing laws against illegal immigration, assault, and forcible confinement, among others, already address the worst aspects of the sex trade.

The new law has made Stephen Harper the godfather of sex trafficking in Canada. MacKay and Nicholson, his justice ministers, were his eager henchmen. Why should they care? Those victimized were unlikely to vote for them.

So, what about Prime Minister Justin Trudeau? His late father, Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau, said the state has no place in the bedrooms of the nation. Justin has a choice, regardless of what happens in court. If he says he cannot comment because the matter is before the courts, I have no problem with that. But he can act. When there is a national crisis, and the matter is before the courts, real leaders act, if they care. Or perhaps they enjoy candlelight vigils, and missing and murdered women inquiries.

So, does he want to help women by getting rid of the law, or hurt them by doing nothing? Right now, he is doing what his predecessor Stephen Harper and organized crime want him to do. He is doing nothing. What he says is irrelevant. Will he continue to do nothing? Missing and abused women probably want to know his choice. Before it's too late.

*The defendants won the motion. It ruled unconstitutional, basically, all parts of the law except that which criminalizes the purchase of sex. Unfortunately, because the law was in a lower court it was not binding going forward, unless the crown appealed and lost. The crown has not appealed. The decision got publicity nationally. However, on the day of the release, February 21, 2020, there were three other major issues flaring up: the Covid-19 virus emergency was rapidly gaining momentum that week, there was a teachers' strike in Ontario under way, which was causing chaos for families, and members of our first nations were blockading rail lines.*

Chapter 30: December 2020

Speech: WISH Drop-in Centre Society

*The Covid-19 pandemic had begun in Canada about ten months previously. A full staff meeting of the Centre was held virtually, using the software application called Zoom. I was a featured guest speaker, and answered a few questions after my speech. The Centre, in Vancouver, was the first of its kind in Canada. It provided 24/7 support for sex trade workers including: a place to sleep, eat, shelter and receive advice and other support – invaluable to street and survival workers. Also at this time the pandemic was preventing many sex trade workers from working, or even getting the benefits available to most out of work.*

I'm privileged to have this opportunity to speak to everyone associated with the WISH Drop-in Centre Society. More Canadians should seek the privilege of helping WISH. You are saving lives. You are setting a lasting example and following a great tradition.

You are doing so as the world confronts a terrible pandemic. How sex workers, and indeed everyone, survives economically and otherwise during this crisis is rightly their main concern at this time. That being said, it is important to remember all the things we are fighting for: fair treatment of first nations, help for impoverished single mothers, help for victims of domestic abuse, and of course rights for sex trade workers and those who assist them. We are living in the time of the liberation of the sex trade, from status of criminal activity to status of legitimate work. I will address that later.

First I want to talk about Vancouver. Vancouver will occupy a very special place when the history of the liberation of the sex trade is written, hopefully not too long from now. It is a very special place for me, because in the late 80s, for almost a year, I was on the stroll there.

Vancouver is the hometown of some of the giants in the liberation of the trade. I want to mention some names. I could mention more names and organizations, but time does not allow it today. Vancouver boasts: Hedy Fry, Libby Davies, Sheri Kiselbach, Katrina Pacey, Kerry Porth and lately Mebrat Beyene. These, and others I had hoped to mention, are now well-known and will be mentioned when histories are written. When politicians and celebrities are forgotten, they will be remembered.

Several years after I left Vancouver, and a few years after I got out of jail, I became a dominatrix. I did not sell sex. Yet I was charged with keeping a common bawdy house. The case took four years to come to trial and made national news for months. I was convicted. I still do not know why. I then set up a new house and did what I did before but was not charged. Something was wrong with the law. Something called the Innocence Project was established at York University. Professor Alan Young was the founder and ran it. He recruited three plaintiffs, including me, to sue the federal government over its sex trade laws. The short of it was that we won and legal ground rules for new laws were established by the Supreme Court in 2013. About a year later the new law, the Protection of Communities and Exploited Persons Act (PCEPA) itself broke the rules, but needed high level courts to overturn it, or governments to withdraw or amend the law. A lower level court has ruled most of the law unconstitutional and has not ruled on the other major part of it one way or the other.

So what do we make of all this? Let's start with former Prime Minister Harper. He legalized the sale of sex acts in Canada. Then he denied women who sold sex acts the rights and protections that other legal occupations have. He ignored the Supreme Court, and so condemned thousands of women.

Then Prime Minister Justin Trudeau came along. He said he would make evidence-based decisions and give special attention to the concerns of women. Jody Wilson-Raybould, who looked into the sex trade issue very seriously and has read my book, *Dominatrix on Trial*, was forced to leave the cabinet. Trudeau and his new justice minister have done nothing. The reason they might cite is that it was up for parliamentary review, which has been delayed by the pandemic.

So, that is the situation. Meanwhile, sex workers are victimized. Authorities around Canada can act arbitrarily and unevenly. They sometimes conflate trafficking with free choice, sometimes saying there is no free choice in the sex trade. First nations women are over-represented as victims of human trafficking. The current law causes disproportionate harm to aboriginal women in the sex trade.

I am asked what sex worker activists should do to get the law changed. I am asked this because I have been walking the walk and fighting the fight for thirty years, one way or another. I am retired and in poor health, almost surprised to be alive. But I can speak and write and I have been doing that and will continue. My story is instructive. Here are some things I've learned.

Public opinion is a funny thing. It is very powerful, if it is well used. Be constantly aware of how to move public opinion and decision-makers, meaning how to approach the media to shape public opinion. With that in mind the following is often how to proceed. When you discuss victims of the law, say they are victims of the actions or non-actions of Harper and Trudeau. Point out how breaking the current law may afford women protection and obeying it may harm them. For example point out how Mrs. Trudeau has paid security around her but a woman legally selling sex is denied even paying for it. Point out that women seeking a place to legally sell sex cannot get premises from law-abiding landlords, but can from gangsters and human traffickers. When discussing trafficking, point out that this state of affairs is partially Trudeau's fault because he has chosen to retain Harper's law. He is preventing women from protecting themselves. He could at least say he is in favour of replacing PCEPA, rather than remain silent as the women scream. Make these points over and over.

Make sure the persons making these points to the public are chosen for their ability to do so and will not engage in infighting over matters that are not important. This has hurt our activism in the past. Attack adversaries. Praise allies. Even in private.

I tell sex workers to look after themselves first, but also to do a bit of volunteer work to improve the laws and conditions. Those in a position to do much should. That way, things will get changed.

Those doing much should always seek allies who can help. Directly approach people who can help significantly. The important point is that asking those you want to help to do so is a smarter approach than calling for volunteers.

I could go on. But you have so many others to speak and discuss things today that I will stop here, and again thank you so much for having me.

Chapter 31: December 2020  
Speech: Maggie's of Toronto

*I spoke to a general meetings of those associated with Maggie's the same evening that I spoke to WISH. The Maggie's gathering was also virtual. Val Scott and Amy Liebovitch, my fellow plaintiffs in the 2007-2013 constitutional challenge, also attended and spoke to the meeting. I said many of the things here that I said earlier to WISH.*

Hi. I'm very pleased to speak to those associated with Maggie's. Because my legal battles were fought out of Toronto many of you there were witness to them and even involved in them.

Kara Gillies of Maggie's was an expert witness for our side in Bedford Versus Canada.

Many from Maggie's participated in demonstrations leading up to the 2013 ruling, and against the new law since its introduction in 2014.

Chanelle Gallant of Maggie's was with me at the University of Windsor in January 2014. It was just after the December 2013 Supreme Court ruling. Each of us spoke to a large audience. Many were female law students who canceled classes to hear us. The media was there. We got a standing ovation.

But taking a public position is nothing new to Maggie's. Maggie's has represented the disproportionate harm done by the laws and the authorities to members of first nations and women of colour. I am a black woman, and nobody has to tell me how very much that means.

I have been in the sex trade all my adult life until I took ill about twenty years ago. I was a sex trade worker in every sense before I focused on being a dominatrix. As a dominatrix I did not sell sex. Yet I was charged with keeping a common bawdy house. The case took four years to come to trial and made national news for months. I was convicted. I still do not know why. I then set up a new house and did what I did before but was not charged. Something was wrong with the law. But what could be done?

Well, the Innocence Project was established at York University. Professor Alan Young was the founder and ran it. He recruited three plaintiffs, including me, to sue the federal government over its sex trade laws. The short of it was that we won and legal ground rules for new laws were established by the Supreme Court in 2013. About a year later the new law, the Protection of Communities and Exploited Persons Act (PCEPA) itself broke the rules, but needed high level courts to overturn it or governments to withdraw or amend the law. A lower level court has ruled most of the law unconstitutional and has not ruled on the other major part of it one way or the other.

So what do we make of all this? Let's start with former Prime Minister Harper. He legalized the sale of sex acts in Canada. Then he denied women who sold sex acts the rights and protections that other legal occupations have. He ignored the Supreme Court, and so condemned thousands of women.

Then Prime Minister Justin Trudeau came along. He said he would make evidence-based decisions and give special attention to the concerns of women. Jody Wilson-Raybould, who looked into the sex trade issue very seriously and has read my book, *Dominatrix on Trial*, was forced to leave the cabinet. Trudeau and his new justice minister have done nothing. The reason they might cite is that it was up for parliamentary review, which has been delayed by the pandemic.

So, that is the situation. Meanwhile, sex workers are victimized. Authorities around Canada can act arbitrarily and unevenly. They sometimes conflate trafficking with free choice, sometimes saying there is no free choice in the sex trade. First nations women are over-represented as victims of human trafficking. The current law causes disproportionate harm to aboriginal women in the sex trade.

I am asked what sex worker activists should do to get the law changed. I am asked this because I have been walking the walk and fighting the fight for thirty years, one way or another. I am retired and in poor health, almost surprised to be alive. But I can speak and write and I have been doing that and will continue. My story is instructive. Here are some things I've learned.

Public opinion is a funny thing. It is very powerful, if it is well used. Be constantly aware of how to move public opinion and decision-makers, meaning how to approach the media to shape public opinion. With that in mind the following is often how to proceed. When you discuss victims of the law, say they are victims of the actions or non-actions of Harper and Trudeau. Point out how breaking the current law may afford women protection and obeying it may harm them. For example point out how Mrs. Trudeau has paid security around her but a woman legally selling sex is denied even paying for it. Point out that women seeking a place to legally sell sex cannot get premises from law-abiding landlords, but can from gangsters and human traffickers. When discussing trafficking, say to the media that this state of affairs is partially Trudeau's fault because he has chosen to retain Harper's law. He is preventing women from protecting themselves. He could at least say he is in favour of replacing PCEPA, rather than remain silent as the women scream. Make these points over and over.

Make sure the persons making these points to the public are chosen for their ability to do so and will not engage in infighting over matters that are not important. This has hurt our activism in the past. Attack adversaries. Praise allies. Even in private.

I tell sex workers to look after themselves first, but also to do a bit of volunteer work to improve the laws and conditions. Those in a position to do much should. That way, things will get changed.

Those doing much should always seek allies who can help. Directly approach people who can help significantly. The important point is that asking those you want to help to do so is a smarter approach than calling for volunteers.

I could go on. But you have so many others to speak and discuss things today that I will stop here, and again thank you so much for having me.

*After we spoke there was a discussion for all those logged in. Val, Amy and I were invited to speak again in the future.*

Chapter 32: May 2022

Speech: Windsor Feminist Theatre (WFT)

*In 2015 it was suggested I write a one woman show to complement my first two books (Dominatrix on Trial and Bondage Bungalow Fantasies). I did. It came easily, although I had lots of help. I read drafts of scenes for friends, and got suggestions on other aspects. It came to the attention of WFT in 2016. (They have since been renamed the Waawiiyaatanong Feminist Theatre). They had local actor / playwright / director Joey Ouellette rewrite it for a full cast and musical ensemble. Its production was delayed because the WFT reorganized, and then because of the pandemic, which hit just as the production was to be staged. That was March 2020. Finally, in May 2022, it ran for three*



*nights in Windsor and the Kordazone Theatre. The publisher of my first book, Lori Perkins of Riverdale Avenue Books in New York, flew in and saw the first two shows. I was at all three, and signed books and autographs. There was media coverage of the show. On the day after the close a cast party was held and what follows are my prepared remarks to them. I delivered it from memory and I think I remembered to say most of what I prepared.*

It was so exciting to come back to my old home town, because it was for the world premiere of my play, mine and Joey's that is. Joey also directed it, as you all know all too well. My gratitude to WFT, Kordazone Theatre, and Trevor Malcolm and his musicians is immense. Patricia Fell, your Artistic Director, had to step in late, as did Rebecca Mickle, who played me. And they delivered!

I stand and applaud Rebecca, who absolutely held me captive with the way she dominated and controlled the stage in her performance as Madame deSade. Kudos to Jolie Katembo, who played the role of Mistress Assistant. She deduced the wide-eyed audience with the cutie pie style and ferocity with a whip. Bravo Maestro Trevor Malcolm, music arranger. As the play began I heard a faint pounding of the drums above the stage. The percussion was very exotic. It began to arouse me. My heart was in sync to the rhythm. I loved it before the dialogue even began. I wanted to punish the slave boys, French maids and clients myself. They made me laugh out loud.

Watching the play unfold was like living in a dream. It was so surreal. I'd lost a bit of hope after the play was canceled because of the pandemic. Throughout my feelings ran the gamut of emotions. I laughed, wept and laughed some more. I was triggered to anger when the early legal battle was mentioned. The blatant injustice perpetrated on innocent women by authorities still haunts me, but the play restored my hope in a brighter future.

When I was a little girl I wanted to be an actress. I was good at it. Friends and family called me a showoff. I became a dominatrix and that was very much an outlet for that inclination. It's ironic how things have turned out. A beautiful actress played out my life on stage.

Chapter 33: June 2022

Article: Justin Trudeau and the Sex Trade

*This month the House of Commons Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights released its review of the 2014 Protection of Communities and Exploited Persons Act (PCEPA), which the Conservative Government of Stephen Harper brought in to replace the laws against the sex trade struck down in Bedford Versus Canada, first in Superior Court in 2010, then finally in the Supreme Court, 15-0, in 2013. I have written and spoken on this much elsewhere. But the Act required a review by the Committee after five years. This is a release I sent a few days after the report was released and I read it and ask learned people to comment to me.*

I am the Bedford in *Bedford Versus Canada*, which struck down Canada's sex trade laws in 2013. Since then plaintiffs Val Scott, Amy Leibovitch and I, along with Professor Alan Young, who led the Charter challenge, and the extraordinary sex trade reform activists across Canada, have written and spoken against the Protection of Communities and Exploited Persons Act (PCEPA) of 2014, which replaced the 2013 laws. What follows are my personal observations and opinions.

Parts of PCEPA have been ruled unconstitutional by courts. Regardless of whether the law in whole or in part is not constitutional, it has by now become obvious that it must be removed or replaced. It replicates the harms of the old laws and has led to new harms. It has not abolished the sex trade nor made it safer for sex workers. Women have died and been harmed as a result of this Act.

Last week a review of PCEPA by the House of Commons Committee on Justice and Human Rights confirmed all this and recommended that PCEPA be removed or replaced. The New Democrats want the sex trade decriminalized. Mr. Trudeau, when in opposition, voted against PCEPA.

I have been receiving messages of support from around the world from people who have read my memoirs, *Dominatrix on Trial*, the second edition just published in New York. The first edition of the book was given to Jody Raybould-Wilson, then Justice Minister, just prior to her removal. I said there that our leaders, if they allow such laws to remain intact, have blood on their hands. That was the essential message of the Committee as well, in my opinion.

Women should have control over their own bodies. That means no laws saying they should only have sex for free. If Mr. Trudeau continues to uphold his predecessor's law, which is nothing if not sexual slavery, he has blood on his hands. He should repeal PCEPA and use other, existing laws to deal with problems in the sex trade.

## Chapter 99: The Present Conclusions

I am often reminded of this passage from Somerset Maugham's *A Writer's Notebook*: "It is said that suffering results in resignation, and resignation is looked upon as a solution to the perplexities of life. But resignation is a surrender to the hostile whims of chance. Resignation accepts the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune and calls them good. It kisses the rod that chastens it. It is the virtue of the vanquished. A braver spirit will have no dealings with resignation: it will struggle unceasingly against circumstances, and though conscious that the struggle is unequal, fight on. Defeat may be inevitable, but it is doubly defeat if it is accepted."

Agreed. I have said in my speeches and elsewhere that if one is in a position to fight for something as part of a full life one should do it. Being a worker and consumer full time, even of luxuries, does not give the same satisfaction as making a difference or righting wrongs. Circumstances often arise putting individuals in the situation where they have decisions to make. When I was first raided, in 1986, I lacked the means to fight back. I also happened to be guilty. In 1994, help was forthcoming, and I was not guilty. Still,

for many it would have made more sense not to fight back. But not to me. If you have been reading my writings you might get some sense of why.

All the lawyers, especially Alan Young, knew I was in a position where I could make a difference, both in the 1990's and ten years later. By publishing what I have written I hope I am continuing to do so. I am told I have inspired many young women. I hope in doing so I am inspiring them to be realists.

Realistically, most of morality is crap if it tries to restrict the behaviour of consenting and informed adults. Look at what has changed in my lifetime.

When I was born coloured people could not vote, had to attend coloured only schools, could not live where they wanted, were not permitted entry to many public places and had to sit at the back of buses. I don't have to tell you that indigenous people were no better off. This was the reality in much of the United States, South Africa, Australia and many more countries around the world. Canada was not much better. Look at things now.

When I was born inter-racial relationships were rarely tolerated in most places in the world. Look at things now.

When I was born same sex relationships were illegal almost everywhere in the world. Things are better now in many countries.

Of all the advances in human rights the rights of women may have advanced most slowly. Even in Canada in my lifetime, even today, we have had to fight to be allowed birth control, to have the government do its job in enforcing child support orders, to have sexual assault reports taken seriously, to not be harassed on the job or even to stop the harassment of women police and soldiers by their male counterparts.

Remarkably, all this has occurred more and more during the term of office of governments that claimed to be dedicated to law and order. The claim is bogus. The reality is that Stephen Harper, Rob Nicholson, Peter MacKay and their numerous trained seals will be seen by history as some of the worst indirect women molesters in Canadian history. They governed Canada from 2006 to 2015, the last 4 of those years with a majority government. Their tainted leadership in dealing with needed changes to legislation concerning the sex trade is part of that.

They are out of office now, and the new government has said it will make decisions on the sex trade that are evidence based. You may have read my message to them above (Chapter 33: June 2022).

It is my hope that better is to follow in constructing a criminal justice system that enables women in the sex trade to protect themselves and fight back when they are wronged. But it is not only our governments that make a difference. Each of us, from time to time, are in a position where we too can make history, each of us doing a bit, together. We have come a long way.

.....