The ‘Tampon tax’ is a policy under which feminine hygiene products are taxed as “luxury goods” despite the fact that many countries exempt “necessary goods” (e.g. basic groceries, medical products) from sales tax. Academic literature supports the idea that taboo, which stigmatizes open discussion of menstruation, has contributed to the continued existence of gendered taxation policies like the ‘Tampon tax’ throughout the world. In the summer of 2015, the Canadian parliament took steps to exempt feminine hygiene products. This study examines public arguments (e.g. parliamentary debates, news reporting, in the formal arena and Twitter in the informal arena) for and against the ‘Tampon tax’. This will provide insights into how menstrual taboo plays into the public discourse in formal and informal platforms through content analysis. The study reveals trends among certain speakers. Politicians were more likely to use “degendered” and sterile language. Activists are significantly more likely to break taboo by openly discussing menstruation in both formal and informal discourse. They use humor and imagery with feminine hygiene products and blood. Additionally they explicitly gender the discussion. Laypeople engage in the conversation by sharing links and expanding the reach of public discourse. Greater understanding of the significance of menstrual taboo in public discourse imparts a greater understanding of how all taboos influence public policy.