

## SUPREME COURT WIPES OUT THE PROSTITUTION LAWS

**“The Supreme Court ... concluded that the prostitution laws were unconstitutional because they were ‘overbroad’ (went too far) and ‘disproportionate’ (their effect exceeds their objective).”**

Like busy housewives, who like to repeatedly renovate and redecorate, the Supreme Court judges are constantly bustling about doing just that to Canadian society, so as to make it more to their taste. Their latest renovation took place on December 20, 2013 when they threw out Canada’s prostitution laws.

REALWomen of Canada, together with the Christian Legal Fellowship, and the Catholic Civil Rights League, intervened in this case, arguing that the prostitution laws both reflected Canadian’s shared morality and protected prostitutes from the harms inherent in their activities wherever they take place—on the streets or in brothels.

The Supreme Court, however, concluded that the prostitution laws were unconstitutional because they were “overbroad” (went too far) and “disproportionate” (their effect exceeds their objective).

To reach this conclusion, the court pulled a card hidden up its sleeve (it’s not the first time it has played this card), by which it mischaracterized the purpose of the prostitution laws as being merely to deter community disruption. The court referred specifically to the purpose of the prohibition of brothels as being to prevent a public nuisance, and it ruled that the purpose of the laws, re: living off the avails of prostitution, was only to stop the exploitation of prostitutes.

Really? The purpose of the prostitution laws was much more far reaching than that. They reflected society’s moral objections to the selling of a human body for sex, provided protection for prostitutes from pimps, and prohibited the encouragement and spreading of prostitution, as well as the horrors of brothels in our communities, e.g., sex-for-money happening in the house next door or in the apartment down the hall.

This new artificial characterization of the purpose of the prostitution laws enabled them to make the law more amenable to a Charter analysis under Section 7 of the Charter

(security of the person). It was pursuant to this latter provision that the court threw out the prostitution laws, claiming they increased harm to prostitutes. The court specifically stated that the prostitution laws prevented prostitutes from using “safer” fixed indoor locations (brothels) and prevented them from employing security measures, such as hiring drivers, managers, and bodyguards (formerly known as pimps), as well as accountants and receptionists, etc.

Perhaps the court thought we wouldn’t notice its sleight of hand in its misinterpretation of the purpose of the prostitution laws, but we did.

Moreover, the Supreme Court’s conclusion that the prostitution laws were unconstitutional was directly contrary to its views on this point in 1990 when it upheld the constitutionality of the prostitution laws.

Therefore, one of the casualties of this decision was that the Supreme Court tossed out the fundamental legal principle developed over the centuries, of stare decisis, which requires judges to be bound by their previous decisions. This principle was deemed no longer fashionable nor necessary according to this judgment.

That is, in 1990, the Supreme Court held as constitutional the prohibition against brothels (S210 of the Criminal Code) and communicating (soliciting) for the purposes of prostitution (S213 of the Criminal Code).

As a result, under the legal precedent of stare decisis, the court should have been bound by this previous decision.

### CONTENTS

SUPREME COURT WIPES OUT THE PROSTITUTION LAWS .....	PAGE 1
A GOLD MINE FOR FEMINISM AND HOMOSEXUALITY.....	PAGE 2
THE FRAUD OF FULL-DAY KINDERGARTEN .....	PAGE 4
THE SICKNESS ON OUR UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES .....	PAGE 5
CHILDREN OF SAME-SEX PARENTS ARE DISADVANTAGED .....	PAGE 6

The court, however, airily disposed of this troublesome legal principle by simply declaring that it can be ignored in cases where new legal issues are raised (lawyers, as a matter of course, raise new legal arguments in a case, or else why bring the case forward?) or when the “circumstances are significantly changed by newer richer research” (which always occurs over time). In short, the Supreme Court has now applied new criteria, which can be applied to any case in which it wishes to change its previous opinion. We can now expect the Supreme Court to change its opinion on the legality of assisted suicide, which it upheld in 1993, in the Sue Rodriguez case. It seems that the court has now opened the door to do just that. In short, the court, by this decision, has freed itself to apply the newest trends, i.e. politically correct arguments in its decisions, by simply dismissing previous decisions as no longer being applicable because of “changing circumstances”.

As a result, the Supreme Court is no longer the court of last resort, but has now become the court of interim resort or opinion.

In view of the “interests at stake” in the prostitution case, the court agreed to suspend its decision for one year to allow Parliament to bring in a new law that would not “infringe on the constitutional rights of prostitutes”. Fortunately, it will be a Conservative government that will bring in a new prostitution law in 2014 rather than a left-wing Liberal or NDP one.

It must be said, however, that the current prostitution law

leaves much to be desired. For example, it provided that the actual act of prostitution was not illegal in itself, but only the activities surrounding it, such as operating a brothel, soliciting on the streets (escort services were seemingly ok) and living off the avails of prostitution. This law, therefore, was in some ways hypocritical.

It is certain that a new prostitution law must be quickly enacted because having no law on prostitution cannot stand. We know what happened on the Picton farm in British Columbia after the police created a *de facto* zone of tolerance for prostitutes in Vancouver. This led to lawlessness and the freedom to arbitrarily pick up women, which led to their terrible deaths.

Also, evidence from other countries that have experimented with liberalization of prostitution has revealed that it leads to an increase in sex trafficking. Further, in 2008, a New Zealand Law Review Committee found marked increases in violence and coercion of sex workers following liberalization of prostitution laws. A recent German report states that following liberalization, there was a great increase in prostitution: there are an estimated 700,000 prostitutes now operating in that country, of which only 15% are German citizens — the others coming from other countries.

Hopefully, the Conservative government will develop a positive and effective law on prostitution in order to provide genuine protection for women and communities from trafficking and the control of organized crime, which inevitably assumes control of this lucrative industry. †

## A GOLD MINE FOR FEMINISM AND HOMOSEXUALITY

Have you ever wondered what keeps feminist and homosexual activists in Canada beavering away doing relentless “research” promoting their cause? The answer is the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC), a division of Industry Canada, which provides funding for them to do so. It is a true gold mine for feminist and homosexual activists.

### SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES RESEARCH COUNCIL (SSHRC)

The SSHRC is a division of Industry Canada, which was created by Liberal Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau, in 1977. It now has an annual budget of \$698M. According to its website, it is funding research that “can help change the world” (to a left-wing only perspective, it might have accurately added). Although there is legitimate research carried out under this program, some of it is profoundly bizarre, such as that conducted since 1998 under the Women and Gender Issues funding categories. Some of the bizarre feminist research topics funded by SSHRC include:

- Implementing the feminist vision;
- Queer conceptions: re-shaping cultural meanings and experiences of reproduction and sexuality in Canada;
- Parent night will never be the same: lesbian families challenging the public school system;

- Queer women on the net: identity, community, and agency in the landscapes of computing;
- The motivations and emotions of women in pole-dancing classes;
- An intergenerational study of Montreal queer and feminist performance artists;
- Trans masculine parenting experiences;
- Multiscalar forms of feminist organizing (establishing a new approach to feminist organizing);
- The politics of body hair...gender and religious identities in Middle Eastern salons;
- An analysis of Vancouver’s strip-tease industry 1945–1975.

### CURA (COMMUNITY–UNIVERSITY RESEARCH ALLIANCES)

Under CURA, SSHRC partners with universities to provide research funds on social issues. This enables ideological research at such institutions as the University of Ottawa’s Human Rights Research and Education Centre, and Institute of Women’s Studies; the UBC Centre for Feminist Legal Studies; York University’s Atkinson Faculty of Liberal and Professional Studies; Laval University’s Status of Women; Queen’s University’s Feminist Legal Studies, and others, with

the financial resources to carry out their ideological research.

SSHRC-CURA partnerships draw together women's (feminists), anti-poverty, human rights, homosexual, social justice NGO's and childcare networks to carry out left-wing project research. For example, the feminist organization, FAFIA (Canadian Feminist Alliance for International Action), formerly funded by Status of Women, is a project partner with the Poverty and Human Rights Centre (with lesbian partners, Shelagh Day and Gwen Brodsky as directors) on a CURA funded, social-legal feminist network, for the purpose of "reconceiving human rights practices for a new social rights paradigm" and developing "new rights claiming strategies." The feminist organization CRIAW (Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women), which has received millions of dollars from the Status of Women over the years, was given a \$1M CURA research grant in 2012 by SSHRC, which has enabled it to continue with its feminist research and to acquire a brand new office in a heritage house situated on the University of Ottawa campus.

### SSHRC FUNDS HOMOSEXUAL GLOBAL POLITICAL ADVOCACY

EGALE (Equality for Gays and Lesbians Everywhere), a politically activist GLBTQ organization, receives \$200,000 a year in funding from a SSHRC- CURA partnership for a human rights research project called "Envisioning global GLBT human rights", partnering with York University and the University of Toronto. The project supports international partners and LGBT activists with legal and social research, in the Caribbean, Africa (Kenya, Uganda and Botswana) and India. It also helps form "dynamic working relationships with leading human rights lawyers in Canada", to advocate at international LGBT conferences, and the United Nations, including the UN Human Rights Council in Geneva.

Executive Director of EGALÉ, Helen Kennedy, was co-applicant for the SSHRC, CURA grant. She worked for the Ontario NDP party for 14 years, and for NDP MP Olivia Chow at Toronto City Hall. She is now under fire from gay activists for daring to switch her allegiance from the NDP, by supporting the successful, very left-wing federal Liberal candidate, Chrystia Freeland, in the riding of Toronto Centre, in the November 13, 2013 by-election. Although EGALÉ is being funded by the Conservative government, this, apparently, is not a problem as long as EGALÉ maintains its complete allegiance to the NDP.

EGALÉ recently carried out a survey of Canadian high school students to "identify the forms and extent of homophobic and transphobic incidents at school" and to advocate for anti-bullying programs for transgender rights. This survey was developed by a lesbian professor at the University of Manitoba. The survey was funded by SSHRC and CIHR (Canadian Institute for Health Research). The study, which was not peer reviewed, was used to defend the NDP private member's transgender Bill C-279. The study, however, was fundamentally flawed because "students" could respond

on-line to the survey's questions. Who knows who responded and how many times? This was scarcely a genuine research project but, rather, was a taxpayer-funded propaganda tool for homosexual activists.

SSHRC also funded "Queer Bathroom Monologues" with EGALÉ and York University as partners. This is a play about lesbian, gay, bisexual and transsexual (LGBT) experiences in Canada's public restroom facilities. The play, supposedly, is based on 100 interviews with LGBT individuals. It premiered at the Toronto Fringe Festival in July, 2011. It has been staged since then at human rights conferences, universities, etc. across Canada and the United States. It will be professionally staged in Toronto in June, 2014.

### LEFTIST COALITION

A coalition which protests recent Conservative government funding cuts, Voices-Voix Coalition, includes not only feminist groups but also day care advocates, major unions, drug liberalization advocates, environmentalists, Queers Against Israel Apartheid, CRUSH (Canadians Rallying to Unseat Stephen Harper), abortion advocates and, dozens of other leftist agitators. Voices-Voix is funded by its members, many of which receive SSHRC funding. Many of these groups signed a petition to oppose the Russian law, passed in June, 2013, to protect children from the promotion of harmful and risky behaviours.

### POLITICAL LEFT PROPPED UP BY THE TAXPAYERS

SSHRC is serving as a money bag, giving funds, helter-skelter, to left-wing social advocacy groups. Although, as previously stated, SSHRC funds some legitimate research, too much of its money is wasted on bogus advocacy research. It has no monitoring of results for its community activist grants. In effect, SSHRC is propping up the unelected far left at the taxpayers' expense; no questions asked, even though a Conservative government is in power.

Please write to the following to request the disbanding the SSHRC feminist homosexual left-wing research and advocacy:

The Right Hon. Stephen Harper  
Office of the Prime Minister  
80 Wellington Street  
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0A2  
Fax: 613-941-6900

The Honourable James Moore  
Minister of Industry  
C. D. Howe Building  
235 Queen Street  
Ottawa, ON K1A 0H5  
Fax: 613-992-0302

Your MP  
House of Commons  
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0A6 †

# THE FRAUD OF FULL-DAY KINDERGARTEN



**“Parents may find it useful to drop off their children early in the morning at the full-day kindergarten, ... [h]owever, the cost of this program is being paid by both the children and the Ontario taxpayers...”**

In September, 2013 the Minister of Education in Ontario, Liz Sandals, held a Press Conference, reporting that research on full-day kindergarten was “nothing short of incredible”. Daycare advocate Margaret Norrie McCain claimed the results were “like winning Olympic gold” and advisor to former Ontario Premier Dalton McGuinty, Charles Pascal, said he was joyfully doing cartwheels about the excellent results.

All this excitement was to justify the \$1.5 billion dollar annual cost to support the full-day kindergarten launched in September, 2010 in Ontario. The \$1.5 billion covers only the capital cost and the retrofitting of schools, but on top of this are the millions paid out in actual operating costs for these schools

Simultaneously with the announcement of the program for full-day kindergarten in September, 2010, the government contracted with both Queen’s and McMaster Universities to measure the results of this new program. The Ministry of Education also conducted a study on full-day kindergarten entitled: “A meta-perspective on the evaluation of full-day kindergarten during the first two years of implementation”.

## STUDIES DO NOT SUPPORT FULL-DAY KINDERGARTEN

Although the studies from Queen’s and McMaster Universities were completed in the fall of 2012, a year before this press conference, the government did not disclose that their findings were not at all positive about full-day kindergarten. Apparently, the Ontario Government did not think that anyone would actually read the research on the issue of full-day kindergarten for which they had commissioned studies. Fortunately, the Ottawa based Institute of Marriage and Family actually read the research and discovered that the findings promoted by the government were quite different from those of these studies.

The Queen’s University study found that some students in full-day kindergarten had more behaviour issues because many of these kindergartens were overcrowded (30 students per class). It also stated that students with special needs were not receiving proper support from the program. The report stated: “even with two adults, meeting

the needs of 30 demanding young children is difficult, but this is even more challenging (if not impossible) in classes with students who need more support, like in the case of students with special education needs”. Further, according to this Queen’s University study, the results for senior kindergarten students in English language schools were “lacklustre” and in most areas, there was no improvement at all. In fact, reports stated that some children appear to have done worse in full-day kindergarten than without. Any “good” results were limited to senior kindergarten in high needs schools (i.e. lower income children).

The McMaster study stated: “In almost all domains, children in the no full-day kindergarten group had better scores than children in either of the groups with full-day kindergarten, and sometimes this difference was statistically significant”.

The researchers spoke of “levelling the playing field”. However, they found that high needs students may benefit, but that low needs students do not benefit from full-day kindergarten. Consequently, any “levelling” comes from perhaps bringing the low needs students to the level of the high needs students. Significantly, 75% of Ontario students are considered low needs children.

Further, it is significant that the study completed by the Ministry of Education acknowledges that the benefits of the full-day kindergarten program fades in the long term as has been observed by previous research.

## TROUBLING DECEIT BY ONTARIO GOVERNMENT

It is troubling that the Ontario Government has misled the public on the supposed advantages of its full-day kindergarten program. Clearly, the government is playing politics by attempting to rationalize the waste of taxpayers’ money to fund this program, which does not benefit most children.

Parents may find it useful to drop off their children early in the morning at the full-day kindergarten, and then pick them up there after work without having to pay for the care of their children. However, the cost of this program is being paid by both the children and the Ontario taxpayers, who are being defrauded by the government. †



**WE NEED YOU TO BE OUR FAN ... NOW**

Keep abreast of late breaking news on social and family issues by joining the REAL Women of Canada FACEBOOK page. It is easy to do and is free. Go to the REAL Women of Canada website at [www.realwomenofcanada.ca](http://www.realwomenofcanada.ca) and click on the blue Find Us on Facebook icon. Click on the LIKE icon at the top of the Facebook page. Also, invite your family and friends to become fans.

# THE SICKNESS ON OUR UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES

**“There is no doubt that our western society has collapsed into a degenerate sex obsessed world. No better example of this is what’s occurring on our university campuses today.”**

There is no doubt that our western society has collapsed into a degenerate sex obsessed world. No better example of this is what’s occurring on our university campuses today.

Pro-life groups are refused funding, and are censored by their student unions for speaking the truth about abortion, men’s issues groups are banned, as are pro-Israel groups. Courses of study are provided, which are shallow, uncritical indoctrination programs, such as women’s’ studies (why don’t these women take a meaningful degree in engineering?) and in human rights, diversity, sexuality, etc. – all of which do not make any useful contribution to society but only reinforce prejudices. Such courses do not teach students to think critically or analytically. The university graduates who specialize in these courses can’t find jobs. Who wants them?

What is particularly alarming, however, are the sexual activities that are being pursued on the campuses. Today’s students are part of the “hook-up” generation, whereby they engage in sex without emotional involvement with the partner. It is the “friends with benefits” mentality, whereby students casually flit promiscuously among many partners, detached from any commitment. This behaviour degrades and dehumanizes young people. Young women, however, are told by the media and liberal activists such as Planned Parenthood that this casual approach to sexuality is “empowering” to women in that it makes them equal with men.

An intelligent and emotionally stable woman knows instinctively that being used for sexual purposes only, without any commitment, to be casually discarded and ignored afterwards, results in self-disgust, and emotional void and depression.

Then why do these young women engage in these emotionally detached sexual acts? The reason is not a desire for sexual pleasure, but rather a desire to “fit-in” or conform to the university culture of endless, meaningless sex. For a young woman to admit to the politically incorrect desire, to be a wife and a mother, is to be considered eccentric and definitely odd by her peers.

Further, university campuses are now becoming known for the binge drinking carried on by the students. Alcohol excess impairs judgment and can lead to tragic consequences, yet alcohol is never blamed for sexual assault that may occur as a result of inebriation. Instead, this new culture promotes the idea that a young woman, sexually assaulted when deeply intoxicated, bears no responsibility for the assault. It’s a two-way street, however, for both men

and women who are both responsible for the wrongful act.

It is not surprising therefore, that according to research conducted by a student “dating” website called “Shag At University”, as reported in The Huffington Post U.K. (October 17, 2013); a quarter of university students contract a sexually transmitted infection during their first year of university, that most of the sexual encounters took place when the student was drunk, and that more than half could not remember who passed on the sexually transmitted infection.

Further, Ohio State research in 2013 has found that there is a strong link between casual sex and depression in teens and young adults. The research was carried out on data from a National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (on about 10,000 young people). The study found 29% had engaged in a casual sexual relationship, which they defined as “only having sex” with that person instead of dating them. The researchers found that participants who had thoughts of suicide were much more likely to have had casual sex as young adults. Participants’ suicidal thoughts increased by 18 percent with each additional casual sexual relationship – for both males and females.

Other consequences include casual sex stunting young adults’ ability to cultivate committed relationships during this crucial time of life.

The U.S. Centres for Disease Control (CDC) is warning that gonorrhoea is now at epidemic levels and is becoming resistant to treatments by antibiotics. The CDC estimates that in the U.S. every year 820,000 gonorrhoea infections occur, and that 570,000 of these infections are among young people between 15 and 24 years of age.

The CDC further advises that “the most certain way to avoid gonorrhoea is to not have sex, or to be in a long-term mutually monogamous relationship with a partner who has been tested and is known to be uninfected”. This is quite contrary to what is occurring on university campuses today.

Sociological studies also indicate that the risk of divorce increases with the number of sexual partners and the co-habiting history of the partners. In short, women who eventually marry, but who co-habit prior to marriage or have pre-marital sex, have an increased likelihood of marital disruption. Unfortunately, pre-marital sex and co-habitation have now become the normal pattern of behaviour in our society. In fact, the concept of courtship has been eliminated from this generation of young people. They do not get to know one another before falling into a sexual relationship and when reality hits, and they find their partner unsuitable, they are left to put together the broken pieces of their lives.

It is a tragic world in which students find themselves. It only leads to future unhappiness, medical and emotional problems. There is no fulfillment and no satisfying future for the “hook-up” generation. †

# CHILDREN OF SAME-SEX PARENTS ARE DISADVANTAGED

**“According to this study, ... children in same-sex households were only 65% as likely to graduate from high school as those living in traditional opposite-sex families.”**

The mainstream media, together with some institutions such as the American Psychological Association (APA) and the American Sociological Association (ASA), are constantly promoting an invalid proposition – namely, that there is no difference between same-sex parenting and parenting with a mother and a father. The problem with this proposition is that it is based upon studies of only a small, non-random “convenience sample”, often using self-reports by same-sex parents. This is not valid research, but is only advocacy studies. Large random samples of the population, which do not include self-reporting, etc. are required in order to provide a competent study of this issue.

However, valid research is emerging on the topic of same-sex parenting, due to the fact that Canada has an established record on same-sex couples, providing them with all taxation and government benefits since 1997, and same-sex marriage since 2005. Also, Canada, in its census of 2006, differentiated between same-sex couples and opposite-sex couples. This has provided sufficient data on same-sex couples and parenting to permit proper research on the topic.

A study, “High school graduation rates among children of same-sex households” was carried out by Douglas W. Allen, Professor of Economics at Simon

Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia, published in the journal, “Review of Economics of a Household”, published online, on September 26, 2013. Professor Allen based his study on the Canadian 2006 census records and random population samples.

According to his study, there is a striking difference between children of same-sex couples and opposite-sex couples. His study found that children in same-sex households were only 65% as likely to graduate from high school as those living in traditional opposite-sex families. Indeed, girls living in same-sex households were only 15% as likely to graduate from high school compared to girls from opposite-sex married homes. Interestingly, daughters of a male same-sex couple had significantly worse graduation rates than the daughters of lesbians. However, among sons of same-sex couples, the opposite was true in that with two male parents, the son was better off than those with lesbian mothers. An unexpected finding in this study was that even children of single parents have higher graduation rates than children in same-sex households.

This study may well be the tip of the iceberg, indicating significant problems arising from same-sex parenting. Vulnerable children should not be used as tools of social engineering as it is highly likely that during this experiment, innocent children are being harmed.

What is it about same-sex parenting that causes this inability of children of such couples to achieve academically? What is going on in these households? We should find out, instead of handing children over to these couples. †

## MESSAGE BOARD

- A special **Thank You** to our members for your memberships and financial support. It is greatly appreciated.
- Please **share your newsletter** with friends.
- Please invite one person to become a member. Personal one-to-one contact is the best method to **enlist new members**.
- Click to renew or start a [membership](#).

*REALity* is a publication of **REAL Women of Canada**

PO Box 8813 Station T Ottawa ON K1G 3J1 • Tel 613-236-4001 Fax 613-236-7203  
[www.realwomenofcanada.ca](http://www.realwomenofcanada.ca) • [info@realwomenofcanada.ca](mailto:info@realwomenofcanada.ca)

## SUPPORT REAL WOMEN OF CANADA

PLEASE MAKE A CONTRIBUTION TO JOIN OUR WORK  
TO DEFEND & PROTECT LIFE & THE FAMILY

Membership \$30/year • Groups \$50/year • Donation \_\_\_\_\_

*Being a political lobby group, contributions are not tax deductible.*

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_

Province \_\_\_\_\_ Postal Code \_\_\_\_\_

Tel \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_

Send online at [www.realwomenofcanada.ca](http://www.realwomenofcanada.ca) or by mail. Thank you.