**Tutor Copy: A Trial in Error (See original text in tutee’s book)**

**Why should a Toronto court decide Canada’s prostitution laws? by Philip Slayton**

**STEP 1:** What did you understand about the text?

**STEP 2:**

1. What is the name of the person in the picture? *Terri-Jean Bedford*
2. What is her occupation? (read the first sentence of the text).
3. Explain what a dominatrix.
4. Do you think prostitution should be legal?
5. Do you think bawdy houses (maison de débauche) should be legal?
6. According to the title should the trial in the text take place or not? *No*
7. Do you think the government or the court should decide Canada’s prostitution laws?
8. What is the opinion of the writer of this text? *It should be the government.*
9. *Use tutee’s book and ask him/her the meaning of the words in French.*

How do you say \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Tutee should write translation in book)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| English | | French | | English | | French | |
| 1. Jurisdiction 2. Challenge 3. Evidence 4. Case 5. Judiciary 6. Bawdy house 7. Convicted serial killer 8. Expert witness 9. To testify | | 1. Jurisdiction 2. Contester 3. Témoignage 4. Dossier 5. Sysème judiciaire 6. Maison de débauche 7. Tueur en série condamné 8. Témoin expert 9. témoigner | | 1. To be appointed 2. A proposed law 3. To rule 4. To infringe 5. To be struck down 6. Hearing 7. To file (joint submission) 8. Court of Appeal 9. Supreme court | | 1. À nommer 2. Loi proposée 3. Prononcer un jugement 4. Enfreindre 5. Être invalidée 6. Audience/audition 7. Déposer (une proposition conjointe) 8. Cor d’appel 9. Cour suprême | |

**STEP 3 : This is an abridged text. (Have tutee read this text and then read the original)**

**A Trial in Error**

**Why should a Toronto court decide Canada’s prostitution laws? by Philip Slayton**

Terri-Jean Bedford is a dominatrix, who gives men sexual pleasure by tying them up and spanking them.

However, in 2010 she went to court with two other sex workers to try to change Canadian laws about prostitution.

Prostitution is legal in Canada, but operating a place where men can visit prostitutes (bawdy house) or living off money made from prostitution (avails of prostitution) is illegal.

Terri-Jean Bedford and other prostitutes say that these laws make their work much more dangerous. They claim that these laws went against (infringed on) their constitutional right to security, found in Section 7 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and should therefore be abolished (struck down).

The Bedford hearing took place in Toronto. A verdict is expected in a few months. The judge, Susan Himel, spent much of her time listening to the applicants’ evidence trying to establish that it was safer for prostitutes to work indoors instead of outdoors. There were 18 expert witnesses who said that countries that had legalized prostitution and sex-service businesses had less violence against sex workers.

The federal and Ontario governments said that prostitution exploits women and harms the community. Three interveners--the Catholic Civil Rights League, the Christian Legal Fellowship and REAL Women of Canada --filed a joint submission that said that more than 80 percent belong to religions that hold prostitution immoral.

Justice Himel will soon rule on Bedford’s application

The journalist, Philip Slayton, says this trial should not have happened. He says this issue belongs in parliament. A courtroom is not the place to decide moral questions or determine social policy.

If Bedford wins the laws against operating a bawdy house will no longer have any effect.

**Update of case:**

In 2013, the Supreme Court of Canada struck down as unconstitutional the laws prohibiting brothels, public communication for the purpose of prostitution and living on the profits of prostitution. In 2014, a new law, the Protection of Communities and Exploited Persons Act (PCEPA), was introduced that makes it illegal to purchase sexual services, but not to sell them.

Bawdy houses are still illegal.

**STEP 4**

Do you agree with the author or not? Why?

**Tutee Copy : A Trial in Error**

**Why should a Toronto court decide Canada’s prostitution laws by Philip Slayton**

Terri-Jean Bedford is a dominatrix, who gives men sexual pleasure by tying them up and spanking them.

However, in 2010 she went to court with two other sex workers to try to change Canadian laws about prostitution.

Prostitution is legal in Canada, but operating a place where men can visit prostitutes (bawdy house) or living off money made from prostitution (avails of prostitution) is illegal.

Terri-Jean Bedford and other prostitutes say that these laws make their work much more dangerous. They claim that these laws went against (infringed on) their constitutional right to security, found in Section 7 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and should therefore be abolished (struck down).

The Bedford hearing took place in Toronto. A verdict is expected in a few months. The judge, Susan Himel, spent much of her time listening to the applicants’ evidence trying to establish that it was safer for prostitutes to work indoors instead of outdoors. There were 18 expert witnesses who said that countries that had legalized prostitution and sex-service businesses had less violence against sex workers.

The federal and Ontario governments said that prostitution exploits women and harms the community. Three interveners--the Catholic Civil Rights League, the Christian Legal Fellowship and REAL Women of Canada --filed a joint submission that said that more than 80 percent belong to religions that hold prostitution immoral.

Justice Himel will soon rule on Bedford’s application

The journalist, Philip Slayton, says this trial should not have happened. He says this issue belongs in parliament. A courtroom is not the place to decide moral questions or determine social policy.

If Bedford wins the laws against operating a bawdy house will no longer have any effect.