

TERRI-JEAN BEDFORD'S
BLOGS, ARTICLES AND SPEECHES
PART 2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

.....

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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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 advocated 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. *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. 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. 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. 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.