

TERRI-JEAN BEDFORD'S
BLOGS, ARTICLES AND SPEECHES
PART 3

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

.....
Chapter 12: March 2013

Speech: Big Suzie'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.

June 27. 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 Morgantaler, 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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.

January 8. 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?

January 8. 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?

January 8. 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.

January 8. 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?

January 8. 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.

January 8. 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. 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. 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. 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).

January 29. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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.